Item 1: Introduction

1. This was the first meeting of the Leadership Group (LG).

2. After a recruitment exercise, David McGill had been appointed Head of Chamber and Reporting. He would formally take up post on 1 April but was a full member of the Leadership Group with immediate effect. Paul welcomed David and other colleagues to the Group.

3. As a new team, the Leadership Group would be seeking areas of possible development to ensure that it was working at its optimum level going into the election period. Ishtar Swaffield and Kevin McGeever were attending the meeting to observe proceedings and would do so again on 28 February. They would then be providing feedback for the group and advice on possible development opportunities from which the group might benefit. Paul would report back on their observations at the meeting in March.

Item 2: Leadership Group Remit and Operating Principles (LG (2011) Paper 001)

4. LG agreed the draft remit and operating principles. The following behavioural principles were also agreed:
• All colleagues were equal during meetings regardless of grade.

• Members would adopt a parliament wide cross-cutting approach to issues of strategic importance, with their individual group priorities taking secondary importance.

• Members would be expected to challenge colleagues’ ideas and be open to constructive criticism during meetings and to support the Group’s agreed position.

• Meetings would provide a forum for free and frank discussion and debate. All members of the leadership group would debate topics thoroughly and vigorously but once a decision has been reached would stand firmly behind that decision.

• Members would actively undertake to build upon their existing working relationships.

• LG was responsible for its agendas and owned the forward plan. Members would work with the Secretariat to form the forward programme of work.

• Any issue coming to LG would be sponsored by a member of the group to provide support to an official both at the meeting and outwith.

• LG members would continually challenge themselves as to the appropriate methods to communicate with all stakeholders as part of the discussion of each topic.

5. The assumption was that meetings would be monthly. LG agreed to reflect upon the frequency and length of meetings relative to the volumes of work requiring consideration after a few meetings had taken place.

   **Action: LG, Secretariat**

6. Responsibility for compliance issues would lie with LG. It was agreed that Lynda would produce a short note for the group, working with Colin, Jerry, Stewart and the Business Continuity Manager.

   **Action: Lynda**

7. Paul and Lynda agreed to review the existing delegations from Paul to ensure that they were still appropriate under the new senior management structure.

   **Action: Paul/Lynda**


8. The draft agenda for the next SPCB meeting was noted and updates provided.
**Item 4: Election Programme Board Update**

9. Bill Thomson provided an oral update of the work of the Election Programme Board. It was noted that the projects within the programme were all running as planned and that further updates on these would be provided to the Leadership Group (LG) in due course.


10. This document was a draft SPCB paper and provided LG with the opportunity to have sight of the issues on which the Finance Office was reporting.

**Item 6: Leadership Portfolio (LG (2011) Paper 004)**

11. The leadership portfolio had superseded the operational and strategic portfolios previously considered by OMG and SLT respectively. Given the size of the portfolio, LG agreed that Willie Heigh should look at consolidating some of the projects into more cohesive programmes. This would improve governance at programme level whilst reducing the time constraints on the agenda. This work would be carried out in tandem with production of a new version of the strategic plan.

**Action: Willie Heigh**

12. It was agreed that thought should be given to phasing project work and the programme of reviews planned as part of the change management programme. Stewart agreed to take forward this piece of analysis as Chair of the Change Management Board.

**Action: Stewart**

13. LG reviewed the overall performance of the portfolio. The closure of the Holyrood Desktop portion of the Tech Refresh Programme was noted and the revised prioritisation list was agreed.

**Proposals and PIDs**

14. LG considered a number of project proposals and PIDs:

**Change Management Programme PID**

15. The PID was approved.

**SPPA - OR Corrections**

16. LG approved the required resources to undertake detailed planning and completion of a PID.

**Members’ Case Management**
17. Officials had done some initial work looking into the possibility of BIT providing a case management system to Members. Given the balance of likely cost/benefit, it was agreed that no further work would be taken forward at the present time. A closure report would be produced and held on file. This could be referred to should a decision be made to revisit the idea in the future.

BIT - Implications of Structural Changes

18. LG approved a proposal to initiate a project that would manage future changes to the Scottish Parliament’s IT infrastructure and systems, endorsing option 2, to create a new file structure with the ‘offices’ at the top layer in the hierarchy whilst maintaining the folder structure beneath the office level, as they are at present.

Networked Print Management Review

19. LG noted the update on the Networked Print Management Review.

Contract Re-lets

20. LG reviewed a summary of the significant contract re-lets within the organisation.

Portfolio finance and prioritisation

21. LG noted the financial position of the portfolio and list of budgeted projects for 2011/12.

22. The format of the new combined strategic and operational report was approved and LG thanked Willie for his efforts in putting it together. The next quarterly update would be in May.

Item 7: Internal Communication in the SPS (LG (2011) Paper 005)

23. Tom Wheeler presented a paper which invited LG to consider options for the future management of internal communication within the Scottish Parliament.

24. LG was first asked to consider the effectiveness of current internal communications and where ownership for it should lie in the future. It was agreed that significant improvements had been made over recent years but there continued to be room for improvement. LG was clear that it would have responsibility for internal communication. It would therefore set the context of messages and make decisions on what should be communicated and the method for doing so. As the group was large, it was not practical for it to draft written messages. This would be the responsibility of a member or members of staff in the corporate support group of offices which was currently under review.
Elizabeth Watson was leading this review and would consider internal communication as part of this work. LG would discuss the issue again once Elizabeth had reported her findings.

**Action: Secretariat**

25. LG also discussed the important role middle managers had in passing on corporate messages to their staff at oral briefings. They would also perform an important function in feeding back staff views to LG members. Group Heads agreed to ensure that their staff carried out their responsibilities in this area.

26. It was agreed that LG should take time to discuss internal communications at meetings. This would include considering how to communicate decisions as well as evaluating how recent communications had been received and whether there were any lessons to be learned.

27. Tom was asked to develop proposals for revising the Internal Communication Strategy, based on the steer from LG that it should be briefer than the current version and should include a number of illustrative examples. He was also asked to consider where responsibility for the ongoing management of the strategy should lie, taking account of the relevant recommendations in Elizabeth’s review.

**Action: Tom Wheeler**

28. Tom would attend a future meeting of the group to agree the strategy and next steps.

**Action: Secretariat**

**Item 8: AOB**

**Committee Room Name Changes – Impact Analysis**

29. BIT had undertaken an impact analysis of the work required to incorporate the new committee room changes into various IT systems. There was no intention to instruct any work on this following a strong steer from the Corporate Body that the name change should cause minimal impact. Should any Group Head wish to make a change, they should contact Alan in the first instance. If any change were to be made, Jerry and Michelle should be informed to ensure there were no impacts on FM or Visitor Services.

30. Alan agreed to discuss the impact on ticketing for events with Michelle and Jerry.

**Action: Alan**
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