



## **Case Study.**

### **Working in a Large Public Sector Organisation in Scotland**

#### **Executive Summary**

We took on a short 12-week assignment with this Public Sector Organisation in January 2010. The quality of our input resulted in our working with them for virtually 12 months ending in January 2011.

The scope of our work was to act as 'business managers' in support of a very specialist, highly effective, very busy team of five people, looking at areas of efficiency gain, effectiveness, project management, strategy delivery, process, back-office systems and administration alignment, and business apportionment.

During our time in this Public Sector Organisation we had the opportunity to observe how the Directorate and Divisional organisation operated as a whole during a period allocated as one of major restructuring and reshaping to meet significant budget cuts between 2011 and 2014/15.

We took the opportunity to observe leadership and management styles, their effectiveness and how the multiple teams and individuals responded to the workload and restructuring. Our observations refer to the Division.

Officials are Civil or Public Servants



**Contents:**

- Perspective
- Employee base
- Inward Looking vs Outward Looking
- Reach
- Governance
- Structure
- Silos
- Leadership and Management
- Dysfunction
- Communication
- Records Management
- Freedom of Information
- Conclusion
- Our Recommendations

**Perspective:**

The Public Sector Organisation in question employs over 2000 people in Scotland and is segregated into Directorates and Divisions. The Divisional head count at the time of our involvement was 59.

Throughout the period of our engagement the Executive management team, (less than ten people) in this organisation, were looking at plans for reshaping and restructuring to reflect the cut in Public Sector funding from Central Government as part of the Austerity Measures following the election and budget of 2010 and covering the period to 2014/15. To put these cuts into context, the expectation was for a 25% reduction in Capital Expenditure over the period.

The observations we make include commentary on how effective this reshaping and restructuring was over the twelve-month period ending in January 2011.

**Employee Base:**

This organisation has one of the most diverse employee bases we have ever encountered with a few notable exceptions. Age, gender, physical ability, mental ability, and nationality were very broadly based though mostly White Anglo-Saxon in appearance. Notable exceptions were the very few Black employees though other ethnic groups were also in minorities, Muslim, and Asian employees for example. We do note that this is a reflection of the geographic setting of this Public Sector Organisation.

There were clear and distinct age profile gaps. We estimate that the average age of the Division we worked in was late thirties early forties – maybe even slightly older than that. There was then a clear gap to the next age group estimated to be in their late twenties early thirties. The gap emphasised by experience, know-how (and how not to), and reaction to issues when dealing with the day-to-day was noticeable. It also differentiated work ethic. The older being more diligent and conscientious than the younger, particularly the new (er) starts who had not yet shed their Student attitudes or acclimatised to the work place and its requirements.

With the Public Sector encouraging staff to take redundancy packages, and in the main the uptake coming from the older generations, the exiting of skills from this Public Sector organisation is a very real problem. We saw no evidence of succession planning or managed exit. Knowledge, experience and know-how are being lost in considerable quantities, an issue that should not and cannot be ignored in the long-term, and one that will surely impact on future effectiveness and efficiency of this organisation.

This Public Sector Organisation might wish to consider carrying out a team LAB Profile, in order to enable the determination of a team's strength and weakness in respect of their mandate. This would also identify communication patterns within the team and between teams in the Division as a way of either determining the patterns of the next person to add to the team and/or those members that ought to be retained in order to ensure that knowledge, experience and know-how is captured and not lost.

The LAB profile also enables exit from the organisation to be managed for the individual in that the individual's strengths and weaknesses can be highlighted thus enabling a thorough and clear explanation to be given as to why they have been selected for release, as well as providing future career guidelines for them.

**Inward Looking versus Outward Looking:**

This Public Sector Organisation appears to be typical of the overall sector. It is genuinely inward looking. The idea that there should be more than a passing reference to their external audiences is met with derision if not shock in many cases. None the less managing relationships with their stakeholder groups is part and parcel of the day-to-day operation. Some teams do it better than others. Those who have and are making a concerted and sustained effort to engage are seen as being more trustworthy, approachable, and genuinely receive assistance from their external stakeholder groups whether these groups agree entirely with what is being done at Policy or legislative levels or not.

Where the stakeholder management is poor the opposite is the case.

Of particular note here is the internal effect when considering the relationship between different public sector organisations operating in similar business spheres.

We saw several examples where one Division was trying to align with another organisation working in an overlapping operational area but there appeared to be no attempt to create the environment where both could mutually agree on how best to proceed. The consequent 'shoving and arm wrestling' wasted time and money and failed completely to move any agenda forward with individuals blaming each other for the failure to move forward.

The picture was repeated within the Division where people working in comparative isolation on day-to-day issues have no idea of what other teams are doing or how good, bad or indifferent the individual team relationships on a subject were. We saw clear evidence of this resulting in a prolonged disagreement at the end of which the Divisional Deputy Director had to step into save face and calm things down.

**Reach:**

There appears to be almost a total lack of understanding about, and certainly little interest in understanding the influence some teams have as a consequence of their work - not just the influence they have in Scotland but also at a UK, European and International level. This matter can be compounded further as it is not always clear where overlaps lie especially in topic areas where multiple public sector agencies are involved.

The teams with this degree of reach are invaluable to this Public Sector Organisation as they bring in learning and best practice from around the globe.

**Governance:**

Some teams have governance roles over Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Once again we saw how seriously some took this aspect of their work and their frustration particularly when UK and European public agencies and governments did not necessarily remember or even recognise the devolved aspects of Policy and Legislation development in Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales.

From Observation we were surprised at how often Officials in NGO's and in other public sector organisations had to be reminded of the balance between Policy making and regulation. There obviously has to be a clear divide in respect to the different roles between Policy makers and those who regulate the Policy.

With no clear external focus it is not surprising to us that the priorities of the external stakeholder differ from those of the Public Sector. This lack of understanding has manifested itself, as we note below, in the shape of Directorates and Divisions being determined by retaining head count rather than in resourcing appropriately to meet stakeholder priorities.

Furthermore the Public Sector Organisation in question had not identified its priorities.

It was nearly ten months into our assignment before we heard the word priority mentioned and then it was related to redundancy packages rather than business and functionality.

**Structure:**

We noted comments made by staff that Divisional and team structures had historically been founded on the pretext that each team making up a Division or Directorate had to include one member of each grade within the pay scales rather than on required skills. This implicitly implied that at any given time a team should include between five and six people irrespective of need or workload. In addition there were individuals who were 'administrators'. Originally we were told there had been one per team. During our involvement, two teams included an administrator in their make-up but had other grades missing. There was a 'central services' team of two or three individuals fulfilling the role for the remainder of teams where administrators were missing.

The smallest team we encountered was four people, the largest eleven people. There were six teams in this Division.

On at least four occasions in the twelve months we were party to presentations, group or one-to-one discussions or recipients of documents that 'discussed' restructuring and reshaping the Directorate and Division. With the exception of seeing senior management figures take retirement the changes were actually none existent. All that appeared to be happening was that people were being moved into post from outside of the Directorate or Division, or the post vacated was being scrapped entirely reducing the overall head-count.

More worryingly from an organisation change or development perspective there was a persistent view that structure should be fixed and be decided upon *before* the priorities of the organisation were determined.

We saw no 'public discussion' or involvement of staff in determining requirements within any restructuring process even though opportunities arose for the senior management team to do so.

We believe that this Public Sector Organisation might wish to consider the benefits that could be derived from determining personal and organisation value sets to establish the degrees of misalignment being faced. There are many instruments available to instruct this process. Cultural Transformation Tools (CTT) being one of the most visual facilitating links to operational and behavioural change and measurement.

Once again this Public Sector Organisation might want to consider using the LAB Profile where they could choose activities which will create the desired behaviour changes for any target group, first by decoding the Motivation Patterns for the group and then understanding which LAB Profile patterns are addressed by any given activity. Their managers might want to be trained to identify the LAB Profile Patterns and thereby the strengths of their team members, so they can adjust assignments to suit what staff members naturally do best at work.

**Dress code:**

Dress code for Officials is pretty much 'anything goes. Many are in tee shirts, jeans, and 'trainers' on a daily basis. Without doubt in a commercial operation many of these individuals – men and women – would have been sent home to dress more appropriately for the workplace.

**Silos:**

The Division did not operate as a team but a series of individual silos, some with silos within silos! Each area within the Division had its own specialisation and in some cases a very narrow field of reference. Interaction between teams was either deemed unnecessary at best ('them and us') or at worst a chore to be tolerated or positively discouraged. There was clear evidence that between teams there was friction particularly in some areas of managing personal relationships. Tonality, posturing, language, aggression and raised voices seemed to be the order of the day in managing the relationship.

We were aware of team leaders having to cajole other divisions into agreeing to meet and have discussions with external stakeholders even though these divisions should have been aware of the necessity of their involvement. Socio-economics was a clear example of this narrow focus and internalised perspective.

When team leaders were brought together on occasions the agenda was not to create a group wide focus or forward momentum but concentrated purely on the top two recent outputs from each team leader present – those outputs achieved since the last meeting – more an information gathering exercise for the Deputy Divisional Director chairing the meetings than team building or issue management.

Potentially even worse than having silos was the issue of a particular team who in reality were aligned to the wrong Division. Although their work in part was relevant to the Directorate and Division title, the work undertaken was more aligned to one or another of related areas managed elsewhere in the organisation – by different Directorate and Divisions in separate geographic locations. In reporting and responsibility terms, from a devolved perspective, this team even reported to a different Department in Whitehall to the rest of the Directorate and Division. For all intents and purposes it looked as though at some point in the past this team had been aligned to the Division as – with singular lack of perspective – no one knew where else to put them. The alignment had not been challenged or reviewed since!

**Leadership and Management:**

Leadership and management across the Directorate and Division were non-existent in most cases. Leadership in the form of establishing direction and purpose, aligning people, and motivating and inspiring staff was never encountered in 12 months. From the management perspective of planning and budgeting, organising and staffing, controlling and problem solving, the picture was confused. Overall management was virtually completely lacking with people being left to get on with their task and very much to their own devices. Frankly, people were just too nice to each other.

At Director or higher, the modus operandi was outmoded and very out dated relying still on a clear command and control methodology found, for example, in many manufacturing and engineering organisations – the nearest comparison we can think of. “Do as we tell you”, “We know what’s best for you” coming through at almost every encounter. While these very senior individuals made themselves available from time to time to hear from their staff compliment it appeared to be a ‘necessary evil’ and not enjoyed by the individual concerned. How much notice these Executives took is hard to estimate, as everyone was so polite and obsequious in the meetings nothing of real substance was actually discussed.

What was clear however is that few if any recognised the difference between business management and Policy management. Consequently strategy appeared to be neither understood nor discussed in any meaningful way. Much is micro managed unnecessarily.

**Leadership and management at Team level:**

When considering leadership and management in or at team level there was a much more mixed bag. Some Team leaders or Heads of Teams were exceptionally good, some exceptionally poor. Those that were the best had commercial experience as well as Public Sector experience. It made for uncomfortable bedfellows during some team encounters as the better ones were seen to be ‘overtly’ aggressive by those without commercial experience.

It became clear to us over time that there is a complete lack of trust between the Executive and their layer of management, the Deputy Division Directors. Equally so between the Deputy Divisional Directors and their direct reports the team leaders.

There is considerable resistance to authority and to change.

This lack of trust was manifest in different attitudinal and behavioural ways. Non-implementation of agreed courses of action because the Executive were seen as too far removed from what was actually required at an operational level; Immediate dispute with comments made by or information received from senior executives; No records being kept so that accountability could not be claimed or determined, and so on...middle managers being caught between effectively managing their teams and implementing instruction from above that negated their efforts.



Emotional intelligence within teams varied widely. The better performing teams had high EQ with team members being supportive to each other and understanding the broad aspect (if not the technical detail) of each other's work. These teams were task, output and time focused and delivered invariably on time with an extremely high quality of work.

Those with lower EQ contained individuals rather than team players and it appears little attempt was made to change the way these individuals perceived themselves or other members of the team. They came in did what they needed to do and then went home. Their engagement with other people and teams very much centred around being approached rather than taking it upon themselves to make an approach. The exception by these individuals resulted from them having to ask for assistance or specialist advice from time to time.

We noticed that there were very few individuals – and certainly no teams – who had the complete picture of their role and function. In relation to delivering successful project outcomes this manifested itself in many cases as everyone having a piece of the picture. Some more pieces than others that created diversion from the main task in hand. Without a complete rationale or purpose being supplied within or to a team at the outset it is not surprising that efficiency gains and effectiveness are hard to come by in this Public Sector Organisation.

The multiple layering of the management 'team' in the Division – the classical pyramid - did not help form or function. Two individuals who ranked second only to the Deputy (and therefore the nominal Head of Division on site) had the most appalling people management skills: arrogant, self centred, overly opinionated, poor listening skills, command and control attitudes were some of the very obvious attributes on display.

Staff reporting to or interacting in any way with these two individuals showed clear signs that they did not trust them in the slightest. Both, it became clear over time, were only 'Looking out for number one', taking advantage of the generous training and learning opportunities to improve their lot at the expense of their staff members and to a degree the Division as a whole. They virtually confessed to "knowing what was good for the public".

People were less guarded - or more honest - in their comments and actions in the absence of these two individuals.

**Training courses and skills:**

While there is a concerted effort to make Officials aware by email of training courses available to them, it was difficult to assess how effective the uptake was. The division had a dedicated member of staff acting as the 'learning officer' who distributed the information on a reasonably regular basis. Bookings to the course could be made electronically by individuals directly from the email highlighting the nature of the course, its timing, location and the availability of places on it. Few courses appeared to be certificated in anyway. They appeared to be supplied by a mix of external suppliers and internal 'specialists'. We do not recall seeing any costs attributed to any of these learning opportunities.

The organisation supplied staff members with written provisions or guides to the skills perceived to be required to the job – both personal and interpersonal. This third A3 ‘poster’ is remarkable for the detail it includes, particularly in the area of strategic leadership and strategic thinking. The two key areas where skills are demonstrably so sadly lacking. Perhaps its because these details are last, at the bottom, of the page under other topic areas such as Managing self, Managing people, and Leadership?

We were astounded to see personal reviews being undertaken in open public spaces where discussion could clearly be overheard. Some of these reviews had both parties displaying highly agitated body language. A prime example of poor management awareness and complete disregard for the privacy of the individual.

There appears to be no talent management framework in place. Promotion or increases in wage are determined by half yearly and annual personal reviews within very strict guidelines. Promotions are subject to independent adjudicators being present at the interview stage. This latter system is clearly not foolproof as we evidenced individuals clearly promoted beyond their capability and competence. The sad part here was the negative impact on the people around these individuals resulting in additional workloads being distributed amongst other team members who could or would deliver an outcome on time to the required quality levels.

In the current climate of change, especially the internal debate about potential or actual changes to terms and conditions, it was not surprising to see and hear at an individual level staff asking themselves “What’s in it for me”? When job security is top of many minds looking after number one – survival is perhaps a better word - had become an over-riding objective even if the individual was job-sharing, was part-time or a full-time employee.

Little was being done on a leadership or management platform to handle what was clearly in some cases despair, anger, and increasingly indifference. All of which was having a negative effect on performance, effectiveness and efficiency. We were told on more than one occasion “I like the job – I just don’t like being here”

We do express concern however that there remains a reasonable amount of superfluous staff in the overall Division compliment and a duplication of roles. Roles that individuals could manage themselves without any onerous increase in their workload (and would be in a commercial organisation) are currently managed by an additional staff member. These areas of duplication should be reviewed and removed. The administrative level is an obvious area that could see a redesign of function along with, we believe Division lawyers who appear to be an expensive duplication of the main or central legal department function.

By resourcing to meet the genuine external priority needs of stakeholders, rather than to fulfil a perceived structure, cost savings could be made and used to pay for the expertise required to achieve necessary outputs.



The Public Sector Unions of course can see this and are happy to drive a wedge in wherever and whenever they can. The Union email and visible poster activity in-house was very noticeable. The Union stance was a traditional “Us and Them” approach which seemed at odds with the whole collective communications effort encouraged, but not necessarily effectively delivered, throughout the organisation.

Health and safety is taken seriously with regular Divisional audits. An enforced clear desk Policy would make the HS officers’ task considerably easier.

**External assistance:**

There is a debate between senior Officials and teams over the use of consultants, temporary staff and secondees. Our evidence suggests that this organisation has a requirement for all three. Consultants to fill the areas of expertise that are lacking (its actually about the quality of these consultants, how they are used and managed that is not understood by top executives); temporary staff to fulfil necessary roles that allow teams to keep their business on track; and secondees to gain experience of working in the Public Sector that they can use to the advantage of their commercial employers in managing relationships with Public Sector organisations at all levels over time.

**Dysfunction:**

Combining the elements of the observations above its not surprising that the Directorate and in particular the Division were dysfunctional.

Each team had its own way of doing things around a set of central guidelines and processes that had been imposed some years previously. It was difficult to asses whether these processes remained fit for purpose as the team leaders new what 'format' was required in their outputs whether those were Policy documents, Legislative matters, Briefings, Submissions or 'Lines to Take'. A team member moving between teams had to learn new 'methodologies' or processes as the guidelines had obviously developed 'a lot of elastic'. Some were capable of adapting quickly others found the process incredibly difficult and struggled even after sustained one two one interventions over a period of time.

The negative impact of the latter on individual and team effectiveness and its emotional quota was very noticeable. The delays created in work delivery on many fronts were unrecoverable leading to some individuals working very excessive hours to meet timetables set elsewhere by other agencies or even other countries.

Primarily we identified that the dysfunction was down to a complete lack of understanding of the need for a clear core purpose to engage and align the staff compliment around a common set of values or beliefs. Staff had no clear meaning provided as to why they turned up to work everyday. To many it was 'just a job'. As a consequence motivation was generally lacking and the quality and effectiveness of output was not as high as it could or should have been resulting in evidenced rewriting and restructuring of documentation on multiple occasions amongst other behavioural issues.

There are five 'cornerstones' in this organisation expressing their 'beliefs'. These very high-level organisation wide 'beliefs' have been used to try and create direction across the whole of this area of the Public Sector to drive Policy and Legislation direction and expenditure criteria and behaviours. Unfortunately they appear to be meaningless and irrelevant to many Officials. Few could even tell us what the five 'cornerstones' where when asked. We did so once and the individuals concerned had to go and look them up! There is no ownership at staff level in the organisation drivers. No attempt appears to have been made to translate or align Directorate or Divisions purpose and outputs to meet these five 'cornerstones' at a staff level and as such the attitudes on display do not in any way support the direction the 'cornerstones' are intended to set.

The dysfunction of the leadership group has led to there being a shadow culture in this organisation and is also driving a strong denial culture. This group of ten people appear to live in their own world unaware or impervious to the chaos they have created below them. The Deputy Divisional Heads have to grapple with this major distraction.

We would also suggest that there exists a squeeze culture where middle managers are under intense pressure to produce results from above while being asked for decisions from below. A clear case of people being given accountability without authority.

While the organisation attempted a form of forward planning there was far too much emphasis on the use of a business-planning tool that was neither fit for purpose or adequately flexible enough to do the job it was supposed to be designed to achieve.

To make a project fit this planning tool we evidenced re-engineering of existing projects to appear as if they had been in long term planning in order to fit the model.

If the end game for this organisation is to achieve relatively low-level aims and goals then they are succeeding. The focus for this Public Sector Organisation should be on something far more substantive and valuable.

Much of what we witnessed during the 12 months highlighted that Officials in general were busy for the right reasons. In some cases, overly so. The concept of overpaid under worked public servants was something, with few exceptions we did not see. Our concern lies in line management inaction or the style of action taken when appropriate – ‘there it is’ or prejudgement of an individual or an outcome before facts were fully known.

We do recognise that there is a lot of activity that could be described as fire fighting and we can clearly state that there are a number of teams in the Division not in control of their own destiny or their own agenda. Managing priorities is an area where this organisation needs to really get to grips with its agenda. It cannot continue to manage itself on a purely reactive basis.

We also believe that the system of flexible working hours (Flexi-time) does not necessarily help the organisation though it is a godsend for individuals, particularly those with children or have to travel a lot. We did evidence individual Officials leaving because their 37 hours per week were up leaving an important time bound job until their next working day (or week) rather than finishing it as would have been preferential to the overall Divisional effort.

There is a pervading attitude ‘that I’m entitled to it’ running throughout the organisation whether around Flexi-time or other of the many ‘perks’ available. It was noticeable that increases in pay per year were expected – almost a ‘natural process’ – rather than having to be earned or forgone because of external economic conditions

As we have seen elsewhere Parkinson’s Law pervades this organisation.

Centralised procurement of products and services in this Public Sector organisation is a mixed bag. In some cases procurement is completely opaque. We saw evidence and heard negotiations that were not necessarily the best, cheapest or most relevant for the job in hand because of the way that they had to be handled through the existing procurement framework or process. Travel is an interesting example. The procurement systems straight jackets people into buying in a particular way. Cheaper flights or train tickets with the same carrier could be purchased cheaper over the web than through the procurement framework. The trade off between control and costs must be a good one.



**Communication:**

The predominant method of communication in this organisation is email. Not really a surprise because of the nature of the modern workplace and the dispersed nature of Officials either on site or being physically in different geographic locations. Little appears to be done by telephone or face-to-face even when it would be quicker and more relevant to do so.

Executive leaders 'pontificate' and request that these edicts are cascaded through the divisions by their immediate deputies. Why have secretaries – or more correctly personal assistants - in that case? Is it any wonder that alignment, connectivity to purpose and motivation is so low?

Our observations noted that there are few if any processes written down. If they are written down few are dated, there is a distinct lack of coordination of where the details are kept, who owns them and who has responsibility for keeping them updated. The consequence of which is much duplication of effort and versions of the same idea. This organisation reinvents the wheel daily!

**Records Management:**

There is a requirement for all Public Sector Organisations to have records managed in a way that allows:

- Scrutiny when required by the public
- Information to be found when needed, for reference for example
- To be able to manipulate the data in those records so that it can be used beneficially, for example to stop the wheel being reinvented every time a particular issue is revisited over a prolonged timescale

The system we experienced held vast quantities (literally millions) of records. By far the biggest issues we encountered and heard about were the system fragility (it slowed up dramatically at lunchtimes and late afternoon as people logged out – but interestingly not when they logged in), the duplication of record entries, the difficulty in finding anything unless you had absolute specifics on document references, folder references or file paths. With no standardised nomenclature for filing or folders the system is in effect a real free for all. ‘In folder’ it was impossible to work with data in a way that helped individuals do their job quicker or better. As the data could only be ranked not properly interrogated.

**Freedom of Information:**

The Freedom of Information Act (Fol) is a great idea in principle for injecting transparency and accountability into what Public Sector Organisation’s do on the public’s behalf.

In reality it is a major and a severe burden for Public Sector Organisations. Partly this is because individuals requesting information ask for non-specific information and as a consequence the volume of data that needs to be trawled to answer the request can be vast – thousands of documents in several examples we were made aware of. It also means that not all information may be released because of public interest such as confidentiality or security matters for example.

Our experience of seeing Officials handling Fol request was a genuine eye-opener. In answering the Fol request Officials are time bound and accountable. The process is not simple or straightforward because of the detail required in delivering a response correctly. It being checked where appropriate by internal legal teams and the potential that anything held back can be referred to the ‘ombudsman’ by the person/persons requesting the information if its not released first time round.

We concur with official’s beliefs that in many cases Fol requests are using Public Sector Officials as unpaid researchers for commercial interests. The media are particularly singled out for criticism here. We became aware of several Fol requests that had been running since the UK Legislation was enacted because of the complexity of the enquiry. We are aware that there is a review under way of how Fol cases are managed by Officials. In our view a fundamental review is required.

We estimate that in an average case the official responding to the request has to take approximately a month in terms of manpower hours to answer the Fol case. This is on top of their other, and in some cases, highly demanding day jobs.

**Conclusions:**

- ❖ Restructuring and reshaping had not occurred in the 12 months we worked in this Public Sector Organisation
- ❖ This Public Sector Organisation does not understand and is historically poor at organisation change
- ❖ It may be unlikely that restructuring or reshaping is achieved in the next 12 months unless there is a significant shift in senior management beliefs, behaviours and attitudes
- ❖ There is no clear common purpose – espoused or otherwise
- ❖ There is a complete lack of trust in leadership and senior management throughout the organisation
- ❖ There is no alignment of cultures within the organisation to aid improvement in effectiveness and efficiency
- ❖ Leadership and Management methods are out of date and generally of poor standard
- ❖ Too many leaders and managers are looking after themselves rather than managing their teams effectively
- ❖ Team leaders – middle management - are pivotal in making this organisation work
- ❖ Generally staff need to be engaged and given a clear reason to come to work to give of their best
- ❖ Resourcing should drive the ability to meet priorities not historical team structures
- ❖ Deliver a reduction in duplication of effort, process and jobs
- ❖ Becoming less reactive would have a valuable impact on effectiveness and efficiency

**Our recommendations:**

- This Public Sector Organisation undertakes a cultural transformation programme starting with an audit of values at staff, at organisation and at aspirational levels to assess the degree of cultural alignment/misalignment
- Use of a balanced scorecard to assess where strategic resourcing is required to make the organisation more effective and efficient
- Creation of common shared purpose and direction based around shared values
- Priorities should be clarified and resource committed to ensure they are met
- A wholesale review of operational process and process mapping to align with outcomes of the cultural transformation programme and balanced scorecard resource requirements to meet priorities
- Development and implementation of a long-term programme of coaching for senior leaders and managers using LAB Profiles amongst other ‘tools’
- Coaching around emotional intelligence to team leaders and members
- Alignment of training requirements to the overall strategy of the Public Sector Organisation

Our thanks and appreciation goes to Rosie O’Hara of NLP Highland for proof reading this case study and for her objective comments.