



State of emergency 2018

A public service: state of transformation shadow report
from RedQuadrant



State of emergency 2018

A public service: state of transformation shadow report

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN

978-1-9996851-4-0 (self-printed)

978-1-9996851-5-7 (electronic version)

978-1-9996851-8-8 (Amazon printed and fulfilled version)

As yet unallocated (Amazon kindle version)

First published 2018

By Public Service Transformation Publishing

27-29 South Lambeth Road London SW8 1SZ

info@redquadrant.com

020 3664 6712

RedQuadrant is a limited company registered in the UK, number 6944005

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0

Editor: Benjamin P Taylor

Authors: Peter Cooper, Deborah Jones, Gerald Power, Peter Johnson, Jane Searles, Clive Gilbert

With thanks to the authors and Nataša Sears – let's change things for the better, together

www.redquadrant.com

Contents

Introduction – Benjamin Taylor	4
Making integrated working effective across public services – Deborah Jones	5
A ‘new social contract’ – negotiation or ultimatum? Peter Johnson	8
Blinkered by saving money – Jane Searles	11
Transformation of leadership culture and productivity: lessons over two decades of work with chief executives – Peter Cooper, Advanced Dynamics.....	14
Rise of the robots part one: robots and people – Clive Gilbert.....	18
Rise of the robots part two: a manifesto for living and working with artificial intelligence and bots – Gerald Power	21
The practice of system leadership – Benjamin Taylor	28
RedQuadrant offerings through the Public Service Transformation Academy.....	32

Introduction – Benjamin Taylor

These seven pieces don't offer a complete view of public service transformation – now do they offer something necessarily more radical than the Public Service Transformation Academy report and case studies which this report shadows.

But they do accurately reflect the kind of thinking, the kind of ethos, and the approach that we in RedQuadrant apply when we attempt to help public services change for the better. We offer a range of services – strategic advice (classic consultancy projects), people to deliver programmes and projects (often with additional skills and some strategic thinking in support), and all kinds of coaching, mentoring, and capability building.

Through the Public Service Transformation Academy, we offer our Leading Transformation programme and other interventions that help to build your capacity to transform. Our goal is to do ourselves out of business – to not be needed any more. We believe that's a worthy goal not just for all consultants, but for all public services too.

We believe in conversations – so please contact us to continue the discussion.

Benjamin Taylor

Managing Partner, RedQuadrant

& Chief Executive, Public Service Transformation Academy

www.redquadrant.com



Making integrated working effective across public services – Deborah Jones

Whether it's a parent or grandparent being discharged from an NHS hospital to the care of the local authority, or a school liaising with youth workers or social services, we all have our own or heard of other's 'disheartening stories' of poor communication when public services overlap.

When communication fails between these organisations we get duplication – which means wasted resources – and the citizen, between one service and the next, ends up falling into these well-known 'information gaps' in the system.

To quote just one person we spoke to recently: 'I'm sick of retelling my story to different professionals!' So, the case for better 'integrated working' between public services is clear.

Avoiding duplication and wasted time saves every organisation money. Yet integrated working remains an elusive goal; easy to talk and write about in a strategy paper, but not so easy to implement in practical terms on the ground.

Over the past few years, RedQuadrant has been working with public sector organisations who are 'integration pioneers'. These professionals have been busy implementing transformation programmes which require integrated working across teams, professions and, indeed, organisational boundaries.

Typically, at the start of these programmes, attention is given to the 'vision for the future' and a strategy paper is written by a Director. The 'vision' is presented at an away day or launch event and then – often on email – it's cascaded down through the management hierarchy. And this is when communication can start to break down or become vague.

Challenges in making it work

Managers and frontline staff will begin by deciphering what the words in the strategy document mean for themselves and citizens in their local community. Then they will attempt to establish what the new strategy will actually mean for the existing service. They will look at what will change, what will stay the same; whether processes, job descriptions, and IT systems will need changing and how working together will alter job roles. Last but not least, they will look what it says about existing policies and professional standards, will they still be appropriate? Do they still apply?

This is a huge challenge for managers and frontline workers who, after all, are still required to deliver a frontline service to citizens around the clock during the integration process. When this vision requires working across professions and organisations, for example a team of social workers, teachers, health visitors, youth workers, the police and voluntary agencies, the complexity is multiplied even further!

What is being done?

Some of the organisations we work with recognise this thorny challenge. Their answer is to give their staff dedicated time to work through immediate issues and time to build their teams; but, given the state of public sector budgets these days, the allotted time is never enough, mainly because staff numbers are low, teams are stretched *and* staff are still expected to deliver a frontline service.

'How can we be in two places at once?'

In a recent workshop with some social workers, one lamented 'meetings are put in at the same time as other meetings and client meetings have to take precedence.' Absolutely they do, but that leaves questions around boundaries, job roles, processes, policies and practice standards unanswered for months, perhaps years. This results in greater levels of stress and greater disengagement among staff.

Attention needs to be paid to the hard and the soft boundaries across the system

Policies, procedures and standards

It is crucial that attention is given to developing common processes and policies, as these are hard boundaries or 'brick walls' preventing fully integrated working across professions and organisations. The Department for Health and Social Care has recently recognised the need to reform its practice standards and policies and has recently closed a consultation period, examining a flexible model of regulation that secures public trust, fosters professionalism and improves clinical practice, **while, significantly, also being adaptable to future developments in healthcare.** (Integrated working is certainly one of those future developments).

In response to this government consultation which closed on 23 January 2018, the Professional Standards Authority, which oversees nine different regulators, identified the need for a single UK-wide assurance body for all health and care professions and occupations. However, this only focussed on practice standards, not policies.

The Care Quality Commission (CQC) requires health and social care providers use up-to-date policies and procedures to standardise practice - but which policy takes precedence when you are working in an integrated frontline team? For any group of integration pioneers, deciding upon and standardising policies must be a priority.

Integrated working naturally increases the levels of anxiety in our brains, so measures need to be put in place that recognise and reduce anxiety wherever possible.

Uncertainty around how to do our jobs and working with people we don't know, are both factors that contribute to psychological stress and anxiety in our brains.

When we feel stress and anxiety our performance goes down and we are less able to generate new ideas, adapt to and embrace change.

Therefore it is critical that leaders give enough attention and time for integrated teams to build relationships and co-create the common processes, governance structures and policies needed as they start to work together so that clarity, certainty and enthusiasm builds quickly for the new team to thrive and perform.

Compassion, team work, relationships, partnerships and leadership

As well as rethinking policies, practice standards and processes, attention must also be paid to the soft elements, which, after all, are the heart and soul of the system and keep our public services afloat. **Time** and resources must be given to support the people at the heart of the system. This has to start with inspiring and empathetic leadership. Leaders need to be **visibly** developing strategic partnerships across public services and the third sector and getting out there to support their frontline staff as well as sharing their stories, answering questions (where they can) and sharing a sense of purpose. This kind of leadership by example will guide, motivate and empower frontline staff through this complexity and help to reduce the levels of stress they currently face.

Multidisciplinary teams must be given time to meet regularly so they can get to know one another and build the quality relationships needed to be able to trust one another and begin to share the work between them and deliver services that are truly integrated.

At RedQuadrant, we are privileged to support some of the UK's integration pioneers. Our focus is on helping professional organisations build their teams, develop common working practices and behaviours, and to assist them in solving the complex problems they all face, *together*.

About the author

Deborah supports clients to navigate complex change, including developing strategies and programmes to help leaders innovate and achieve attitudinal and behavioural change. She is the RedQuadrant lead for leader and team effectiveness. Trained as a coach, she is a member of the International Coaching Federation and practices mindfulness.

Her research for the MSc in Consulting & Coaching for Change at Oxford University & HEC, Paris was a live case study of a global financial services organisation undergoing cultural transformation and considered the role and impact of behaviours and leadership in cultural change.

deborah.jones@redquadrant.com

A 'new social contract' – negotiation or ultimatum?

Peter Johnson

'Man must be forced to be free' Jean Jacques Rousseau, 'On the Social Contract', 1762

'A hypothetical contract isn't worth the paper it's not written on' attrib. Sam Goldwyn

If, as commentators on public services transformation sometimes propose, 'we need a new social contract', what might that mean and, specifically, how do citizens participate in the process?

Rousseau's seeming paradox deftly embodies the ambiguity and imbalance between the two 'sides' of the contract- the state and the citizen(s). What he meant (I think) is that unlimited individual liberty doesn't work in a society because my liberties impinge on yours, and vice versa, so we need what he called 'the collective will', what we would call some form of state, to mediate and legislate (apply 'force') so that we retain essential freedoms while living in society.

Rousseau was a major contributor to social contract thinking among the political philosophers of the Enlightenment, who sought a concept to help negotiate the transition from absolute monarchy to early-modern forms of democracy, in which citizens pursued and established rights and obligations both between themselves as individuals and between themselves collectively and the state. The social contract is not, therefore an actual constitutional document, but an implied contract consisting of conventions and, perhaps, assumptions and hypotheses. It is the basis upon which the citizen in a democracy consents to be governed; it establishes the legitimacy of government.

But how are these conventions and assumptions reached when, plainly, not every individual citizen has been asked to consent and may not indeed have the knowledge or information to make an informed consent? So, when I hear the call for a 'new' social contract, I ask these questions:

Who is making the call, and why?

Is it the state? If so, does it really mean 'we've got a lot less money these days so we're going to have to reduce or stop some services and/or you're all going to have to do more for yourselves'. I hope not, because that doesn't sound much like a ('new') contract, more like a unilateral change which could actually amount to a breach of the social contract if it results in detriment to the health or well-being of the most vulnerable citizens. Or is it a genuine attempt to co-produce a new concept of public service and what public services can and cannot do?

This thought occurred to me in the process of designing a local Commissioning Academy (a development programme about delivering outcomes through the widest range of resources, see <https://www.publicservicetransformation.org/>) when a local authority director used the

phrase 'we need a new social contract' in response to the pressures on health and social care caused by budget reductions and demographic factors.

If the call comes from a union or civil society organisation, what agenda are they pursuing, what interests do they represent and not represent?

How exactly is the citizen side of the renegotiation to be conducted?

I think this has to be something other than a periodic election or one-off referendum. Elections are retrospective judgements on political action as well as expression of support for or rejection of manifesto promises, and in any case turnout is almost always unimpressive. Referenda are pretty blunt instruments, dependent crucially on the framing of the question, and don't really have the sense of 'renegotiation' about them. There is some experience of citizens' juries and other methods of participatory democracy alongside the representative (elections) form. But I think a 'new social contract' deserves to be deliberated through more sophisticated forms of sortition in which representative samples of the population, chosen by lot, consider and debate an issue over time and in depth, supported by expert and able to call for additional input and public consultation. We use sortition to select juries, and there are really interesting examples in the area of democratic governance:

- In Ireland, from 2012, a representative group of 66 citizens deliberated, alongside 33 elected politicians, significant constitutional changes including the right to same-sex marriage.
- In Iceland, after the financial crisis of 2009, a larger group of 950 citizens were selected to consider what the fundamental values and principles of a new constitution should be.
- The City council of Utrecht drafts by lot 150 citizens to co-produce a sustainable energy strategy.

Is it open to citizens individually or collectively to withhold consent to the new contract?

This opens up issues of protest ('Not in my name', Occupy etc.) of civil disobedience, insurrection and outright revolution too large to go into here. Perhaps, as the new social contract will (probably) remain a tacit understanding between citizens and state, legitimate and widespread protest should be regarded by the state as a signal that all or part of the contract is under strain and that the legitimacy of government is in question: in the absence of revolution, the contract is taken to remain in place.

I have argued here that it is important not only to be clear about what lies behind a call for 'a new social contract' (and what the results might be of failure to agree one), but also that there are interesting and compelling approaches, based on sortition, which can enable a renegotiation process to take place in an enhanced democratic environment. If politicians have the vision and courage to take this route, they will have a better chance of engaging citizens in the process of democracy and achieving transformation.

About the author

Peter's career embraces senior management and consultancy experience throughout the public sector, having held strategic roles at County and District level, in the training field, and having delivered consultancy assignments since 1995. Most recently, these assignments have had a high national profile as Peter has worked in association with IDeA (now LGID) and CLG. His legal background and his top management experience give him a firm analytical grasp of the key influencing and decision-making processes of organisations, as well as the ability to negotiate and broker solutions to complex issues.

peter.johnson@redquadrant.com

Blinkered by saving money – Jane Searles

This article introduces and then explores the implications of some deep assumptions about the nature of two critical aspects of life in the public sector (and indeed any organisation): money and change.

So, what if you saw money as a token representing valuable commodities, not as a commodity in its own right?

What if change were a business-as-usual activity occurring everywhere, not a series of special projects run by separate teams?

What effect would this re-framing of basic assumptions have on your organisation?

My starting position is that money is a token, and that the amount of tokens is both an enabler and a constraint to what you can do. In the public sector, money acts to limit the possible ways to address citizen needs, rather than being an organisational purpose in its own right. So, I was surprised when a public sector senior manager stated – ‘my job is to save money’. This statement made me consider, how that could be?

I understood that the person concerned was the Senior Responsible Officer for a change programme, designed to deliver desired outcomes at lower cost (and hence was tasked with ‘cutting costs’). To my mind, such a separate programme creates blinkers, where the decisions on changes are not being addressed holistically within the operational management chain, and could make cuts leading to outcomes, which have not been foreseen. If money does not have value in its own right, but can only ever *represent* value, then a business objective to save money is meaningless - at best incomplete.

The benefit of change as an aspect of business-as-usual, is that it can respond to direct and rapid feedback on citizen insight and front line activity, deploying resources differently or adopting new approaches. The funding then acts as an effective enabler and/or constraint on how, and to what extent, the citizen needs are being addressed. Senior managers monitor front line changes and do what they can to match budget allocation to needs and citizen priorities, whilst support activities adapt to new or changed demands for their services.

A healthy economy is a pre-requisite for a functioning society, however, economic blinkers are so prevalent within society, that it is now common to believe that growing the economy (in a quantitative way) must take precedence over all other concerns and objectives. I hear underneath most political rhetoric (regardless of party) the speakers chosen doctrinal economic policy. So if, for example, I believe (amongst other things), that the long-term future of our planet is pretty important, then the growth of the economy is about easing constraints which hold us back from addressing the needs: of people, of our planet with its many species, and of our world future. This might seem like splitting hairs, but simple and inexpensive measures to address citizen needs, our future as a species and as a planet, might get lost in this sort of confusion between purposes and enablers / constraints.

I can see that financial models are really useful to address some purposes, which can be and have been, fully translated into financial terms. However, if I rely on financial models for

decision taking, I ignore many high value aspects of my life: for example, social connectivity within the family, friends and community has no financial equivalent. I found this when trying to apply the Social Return on Investment approach. There is a need for multiple models, and valuing the diverse perspectives they exemplify, as part of assembling a holistic decision context.

Garrett Hardin talked about the 'tragedy of the commons' – things which are free, like the air we breathe, have no immediate economic equivalent, so got forgotten in financial model based decision making, until a lot of damage was done. I loved his later reframing of this as the 'tragedy of the *unmanaged* commons'. That for me means the public sector taking off its financial model blinkers and addressing all aspects and their interdependencies, whilst working within resource constraints.

The social and media focus on economics not only affects public decision making but also seems to focus the concerns of voters. Following this path would result in me voting for my own favourite economic theories, or for the politician promising to save (or, conversely, spend) the most money, rather than voting for the sort of practical transformations I want to see.

Perhaps it is time to rethink our prejudices about public, private, charitable and community economic sectors. Life is actually a lot more diverse. Sure there are examples of the stereotypes: public sector inefficiency, private sector greed and irresponsibility, charitable sector narrow focus and rigidity, community sector lack of reliability and strategic vision. There are also examples of exactly the opposite to these stereotypes in all the sectors. Perhaps what really matters is the strength in teamwork of individual organisations regardless of sector and their ability to co-operate fluidly, to address their local issues as best they can with their available financial resources, adopting roles that enable them to give of their best and complement each other. This is more about balancing and adapting than focussing. It is about effective, ground level, co-ordinated decision making and change.

So how do you focus on needs, rather than focus on saving money?

You recognise that a spread sheet, on its own, provides a blinkered perspective for decision making. You empower your collaborating operational management teams to make change happen, both improvement and transformation and to gather and learn from their citizen insight. The rest of the organisation can then follow their lead. Yes of course they all need to work within their budgets, but that is a normal operational constraint, not a separate purpose.

You do this by building responsibility for change into business as usual at all levels in your organisation, ensuring that the difference between objectives and constraints are distinguished in negotiating delivery targets and budgets. You recognise that, sometimes, you need to spend to save.

You encourage co-operation. acting to reduce prejudicial practices based on economic sectors, and preferring alternatively to partner and encourage strong team players, wherever they exist.



You gather citizen insight regularly and act upon it. You share it across collaborating organisations, so that cross organisational citizen-facing teams can co-operate in whatever way works for them, to maximise the difference that they can jointly make, while working alongside, and on behalf of, citizens and the world.

About the author

Jane is a hugely experienced systems thinker, facilitator, and consultant who has worked across IT, education, transformation, and in the development of significant methodologies from sense-and-respond to the Circles of Citizen Need.

jane.searles@redquadrant.com

Transformation of leadership culture and productivity: lessons over two decades of work with chief executives – Peter Cooper, Advanced Dynamics

Post Brexit, Britain will be faced with a return to an independent Westminster governed nation state, structurally not dissimilar to its antipodean cousins. Despite the challenges of distance to markets, Australia and New Zealand have prospered under these conditions, partly due to the need to stand on their own two feet. Despite the short-term impacts, this suggests that there is no reason why, in the long term, Britain cannot continue to improve its own prosperity post Brexit¹. Much can be learned by anticipating a need for transformation that will be forced by Brexit. It can be anticipated that service delivery agencies, in particular, will need to make a step change in their productivity to provide those services more effectively.

The need for transformation in public service organisations raises its head whenever there is a major unexpected negative event. My first public sector experience of this was in 1996 following the Cave Creek disaster in New Zealand on 28 April 1995. This was a man-made disaster caused by the collapse of a platform constructed by the Department of Conservation (DOC) killing 14 young people. Over the following year there were a number of inquiries, most notably the Commission of Inquiry by Judge Noble² which stated ‘the ‘root causes’ of the collapse were systemic problems in the Department as a whole’. The Director General at the time accepted accountability and set about making systemic changes. Following the resignation of the ‘responsible’ Minister, and installation of a new Minister, an oversight group was formed to support the systemic changes. Every day the Dominion newspaper contained negative press, and by mid-1996 there was a strong public campaign to disband the department. This was the situation I walked into as the responsible partner of Bach Consulting³. Our collaborative diagnosis of the systemic issues looked at the organisation through the lenses of the manifest, extant, and requisite organisations⁴. By explicitly asking the leaders to validate the accuracy of the diagnosis a focussed conversation on ways to transform the system was created. Success in the accuracy of the diagnosis led to set of

¹ <http://www.prosperity.com/rankings>

² Judge Noble (1995). ‘[Commission of inquiry Cave Creek report: Issues](#)’. The Department of Internal Affairs.

³ <https://web.archive.org/web/20100519033040/http://doc.govt.nz/publications/about-doc/a-short-history-of-doc/cave-creek-and-afterwards/>

⁴ As defined in Elliott Jacques, Requisite Organization: A Total System for Effective Managerial Organization and Managerial Leadership:

Organization: Any system with an identifiable structure of related roles.

Manifest Organization: The structure of an organization as it appears on the organization chart.

Requisite Organization: The pattern of connections which ought to exist between roles if the system is both to work efficient and to operate as required by the nature of human nature and the enhancement of mutual trust.

Assumed Organization: The pattern of connections between roles as it is assumed to be by the different individuals who occupy positions in the organization; likely to have as many variations as you have people, and produce confusion.

engagements with the Department over many years, and subsequently multiple other public sector engagements at chief executive level in Australia and New Zealand.

The DOC case study is useful because the fundamental issue was named by the judge as ‘systemic’ and having worked with all four chief executives (albeit not continuously) over the last 20 years, I have had the opportunity to learn much about the nature of transformation. The Department has recently been independently assessed by Trans-Tasman as the third best overall in the New Zealand public service and second best for value. So, although, and perhaps because, the path has not been smooth, the challenges of a genuine transformation are clear. Regrettably, such a sustained long-term approach to tackling systemic issues is not the norm. Most attempts at public service transformation do not sustain the consistency, tension, and constancy of purpose to transform the organisation. These failures reveal the nature of the transformation challenge. There are three key components necessary to sustain the transformation of a public-sector organisation from a less productive state to a more productive state. The absence of any one of these will undermine genuine transformation:

1. Citizen facing employees need to be engaged in transformation of the organisation’s services.
2. Senior managers need to be engaged in transformation of the organisation’s culture
3. The top team must engage with their own personal development as leaders. Failure to do this will prevent the first two actions from being successful.

There is plenty of knowledge about how to do this, but a recent Deloitte survey found that, by and large, leaders lack the maturity to be successful – ‘most organisations will need to transform their cultures to become fully inclusive. Whilst an overwhelming majority of organisations aspire to have an ‘inclusive’ culture in the future, Deloitte’s survey results have found that actual maturity levels are very low’⁵.

A public service chief executive once pointed out to me that surviving as a chief exec is the art of doing what is possible in the political context. This is an interesting statement because it reveals both the complexity of the context AND the level of leadership development of the person. Genuine transformation is not possible with this mindset because genuine transformation must rise above the context and change it, not just accept it. A recent Harvard Business Review article on ‘The New CEO Activists’⁶ describes a more developed mindset. Development of this later stage mindset or ‘action-logic’ has been well researched and correlated with the success of transformations⁷. Torbert’s research found that ‘senior teams operating at early action-logics, individually and collectively, attempt to develop and implement *by fiat* a major new strategic direction, organizational transformation, or culture

⁵ Bourke, Juliet., and Dillon, Bernadette, ‘The diversity and inclusion revolution: Eight powerful truths’ published Deloitte Review, 22 January 2018

⁶ [Aaron K. Chatterji](#) and [Michael W. Toffel](#), THE JANUARY–FEBRUARY 2018 ISSUE of HBR

⁷ William R. Torbert, The Pragmatic Impact on Leaders & Organizations Of Interventions Based in the Collaborative Developmental Action Inquiry Approach, *Integral Leadership Review*, August–November 2017


⁷¹ Christopher Hood, Paradoxes of public-sector managerialism, old public management and public service bargains, *International Public Management Journal* 3 (2000) 1–22

change. Without the senior team engaging, individually or collectively, in its own developmental transformation, the rest of the organization is likely to feel ill-led, to gain neither inspiration nor example from senior team actions, and to respond with low-risk, self-protective actions which lead to failure of the entire effort.'

Public service is full of paradox. The reader will be able find numerous examples (see for instance public service management⁸) Paradox leads to organisational confusion and confusion destroys productivity. The leadership challenge is therefore to create clarity at the same time dealing with the inherent paradoxes. Fortunately, looking at this through a transformational, later stage action logic, the paradoxes provide the perfect context to combine service, organisational, and leadership transformation. The starting point matters. For chief executives and their teams to be successful at transformation they must start with a genuine inquiry about how the people throughout the organisation experience its culture, service effectiveness and personal productivity. Well structured, such a process of listening into the organisation and its customers will create the insight to design a successful approach to transformation.

So as a public sector leader, wherever you are in the organisation, what can you do?

1. Engage with your own development. This is the most important part. Find out how you interpret the world. What suite of action logics are available to you? What is your development edge? How do you use power? Find a coach operating from late stage action logics who can extend your personal understanding of your own transformational challenge and support you as you discover how to lead systemic change.
2. Using an inquiry-based process, engage your team in understanding how the culture of your organisation creates the experience of people on the front line and their customers. Use the experience of learning how to work on organisational culture as a developmental opportunity for your team. Focus on learning from practical actions that shape the culture so that greater value is created for customers through enhanced front line productivity.
3. Using your understanding of yourself and the culture to design a bespoke approach to service transformation that reconfigure the service to generate results quickly and build confidence in your culture change plan. Have the courage to change the system and learn about yourself, discovering how you can create a better, more productive organisation.



About the author

After participating in the transformation of a multinational corporation over an 18-year period, Peter entered the consulting field, briefly as a partner of Bach Consulting and then as one of the founders of Advanced Dynamics. After 20 years leading Advanced Dynamics in multiple multi-year public and private sector engagements he has now transitioned to a role as independent director and associate consultant to Advanced Dynamics and RedQuadrant. His interest remains in the practice of transforming organisations to create the conditions where people can be their best selves contributing to the success of their organisation.

peter.cooper@redquadrant.com / peter.cooper@advanced-dynamics.com.au

Rise of the robots part one: robots and people – Clive Gilbert

What once would have seemed other-worldly to most people is now almost received wisdom. According to a survey of British citizens undertaken last year, two thirds expect robots to be working in government within the next 20 years. Sixteen percent thought this could happen by 2019.⁹

In fact, robots are already hard at work in the public sector serving at both national and local levels of government to the extent that they have become well-established fixtures in some services. The UK Border Agency has used facial recognition to automatically screen air passengers since 2008.¹⁰

The new machinery of government

One of the robotics applications that has attracted the most attention from public sector managers is represented by Robotics Process Automation (RPA), which Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs first began to explore in 2012. RPA is species of software that can carry out a range of repetitive, transactional and time-consuming processes, often with greater accuracy and speed. HMRC now has 10,000 robots doing over 57 different tasks. The Department for Work and Pensions and the Ministry of Justice have taken HMRC's lead in setting up dedicated RPA teams and a government-wide community facilitates discussion across ten Whitehall departments, arms-length bodies and the NHS.¹¹

Other robots are capable of assuming customer-facing roles. Enfield Council has turned to Amelia, an artificial intelligence system that has been programmed to help answer questions from visitors to its website. Amelia is a chatbot that can read, digest and make sense of not only everyday language but also recognise the emotions of the people it is interacting with.¹²

In the future we are likely to see robots working alongside humans to deliver frontline services. Moorfield Eye Hospital has partnered with Google DeepMind to pioneer the use of artificial intelligence in healthcare with a programme that aims to increase early diagnosis of degenerative eye conditions.¹³ In the realm of social care, everything from furniture to kitchens and pets may be roboticised to help disabled and older people live happily and healthily in their own homes in the not-too-distant future.¹⁴

Scanning the horizons

⁹ <http://www.digitalbydefaultnews.co.uk/2017/03/22/two-thirds-of-british-citizens-believe-robots-will-be-working-in-government-by-2037/>

¹⁰ <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2008/apr/25/theairlineindustry.transport>

¹¹ http://www.ukauthority.com/NewsImages/2017/Chris_Hall_Cabinet_Office_-_Return_of_the_Bots.pdf

¹² <https://bookofthefuture.co.uk/robots-in-public-service-automating-local-authorities-a323e45afadf>

¹³ <https://www.moorfields.nhs.uk/news/moorfields-announces-research-partnership>

¹⁴ http://hamlyn.doc.ic.ac.uk/uk-ras/sites/default/files/UK_RAS_wp_social_web_retina.pdf

Although the UK is recognised as a global innovator in the field of robotics and artificial intelligence, the country's start-ups only account for 6% of the international market. The government has announced £17.3 million of funding to foster a growing ecosystem of dynamic entrepreneurship and university brainpower with the ambition of turning the country into a world leader in applied robotics. Public funding is increasingly buttressed by private sector initiatives such as the British Robotics Seed Fund, which invests in UK based start-ups, and Britbots CROWD, the world's first dedicated equity crowdfunding platform for high-potential companies in the field.¹⁵

While robots will undoubtedly have a profound impact on the public services of the future, it is difficult to say exactly how these changes will manifest themselves. The search for cost efficiencies and better ways to deliver services are key attractions. Studies of the implementation of RPA in the business world suggest that return on investment can vary from 30% to 200% in the first year.¹⁶ Fielding virtual workers to carry out tedious tasks or answer basic questions about services relieves staff of the pressure of rising workloads and expectations and frees them to deal with more complex matters.

Fears of workforce displacement are probably overblown. A 2015 analysis of robots used in industry concluded companies that have installed autonomous systems are increasingly employing more people at the same time as adding extra robots, creating 1.25 million new jobs over the previous six years. Some positions such as library technicians and office-based roles are likely more at risk of automation than others, for example, hospital staff and teachers. In the short term, redundancies and the need for retraining is likely to add to the burden of employers and government.¹⁷

Putting people first

Whether the introduction of a robotics in the public sector represents a paradigm shift will depend on how successfully organisations channel the benefits and neutralise the potential disadvantages of the new technologies. Not enough has been done so far to address the ethical dimensions of using robotics to serve members of the public and the potential implications for the staff who work alongside them. The difficulties associated with foreseeing all the ramifications of public sector robotics precludes the use of hard regulation but all public sector organisations will need some kind of practical code of ethics to ensure that robots are used responsibly and accountably.

There are plenty quick cost savings to be made from these new technologies. But the real prize will be increasingly responsive services guided by organisations that constantly seek to improve through a combination of technological evolution as the field of robotics advances and the ability to experiment and adapt. This strategic approach will require the commitment of senior management and involvement of staff across the organisation. It also requires technical staff who are capable of configuring, installing and developing the robots.

¹⁵ <https://www.techworld.com/picture-gallery/startups/15-of-best-robotics-startups-in-uk-3654908/>

¹⁶ <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/financial-services/our-insights/the-value-of-robotic-process-automation>

¹⁷ <https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/thierer-artificial-intelligence-policy-mr-mercatus-v1.pdf>

Such organisations will be best placed to make sure the technology genuinely serves the needs of their employees and the public.¹⁸

We have only just begun to appreciate the role robotics can play in government. Robots are already lending a helping hand across a variety of public sector functions but these initial strides into automated government have been uneven. Trailblazers have demonstrated the promise of robotics in the absence of any significant strategic planning from central government.

Building on the insights generated to date will require concerted action throughout the public sector with Whitehall taking a leading role in setting standards and good practice. Failing to grasp the opportunity over the coming years to shape public sector robotics while the field is still in its infancy could hold back the adoption of potentially transformative technologies and result in unnecessary disruption for both service users and organisations and their staff.

About the author

Clive is a freelance research consultant and writer based in London, and contributing editor for RedQuadrant's blogs, including www.socialcareinnovation.com. He conducts research and writes articles on a diverse range of social issues and offers a variety of services including the provision of policy and practice research briefings, support with data analysis, advice on service process and impact evaluation techniques, surveys and stakeholder engagement and white paper writing.

His work spans a range of subjects such as disability, health and social care, education, crime and justice, and accessible technologies and environments, and his passion for improving public services is partly motivated by the fact that he riles on them more heavily than most people. He was born with the physical disability cerebral palsy, and from the day he was born, has had extensive contact with education, health and social care services, and have experienced the best and worst they have to offer. He also sits on the boards of public bodies and charities.

clive.gilbert@redquadrant.com

¹⁸ <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/financial-services/our-insights/the-value-of-robotic-process-automation>

Rise of the robots part two: a manifesto for living and working with artificial intelligence and bots – Gerald Power

Writers and film makers have been addressing the theme of robot revolution for over a century. The robot in the film 'Metropolis' by Fritz Lang, is etched into our collective memory as an icon of a beautiful machine. Stanley Kubrick's malevolent computer HAL in 2001 a space odyssey is the epitome of cold malevolent machine intelligence. However, after a long wait, this revolution has arrived. The technologies that paved the way have steadily evolved and expanded through the World Wide Web and the cloud has been their place of gestation. Out of our sight, or below the surface, in factories or data centres robots and AI have evolved and it is only now becoming visibly evident that something game changing is about to happen.

If you have a smart phone – like 66% of UK adults did in 2017 – it will now have some kind of 'smart agent' such as google or Siri embedded in it and when you get home you may have Alexa waiting for you in in the corner of the living room, listening and ready to obey. Alexa can order you a pizza or a taxi as it changes the mood music. You might also have a fit bit or similar device tracking your sleep and heart rate 24/7 and sharing that data to the web. I have banned Alexa from our house, as I think it's too creepy having it listen to my every word and sound and storing it in a cloud warehouse, but I am probably fighting a losing battle on that one.

These physical devices should not be mistaken for the actual AI, most of them are cheap and clever, but far from smart, they are the real world points of contact and keep us connected. The AI itself lives in the virtual world, where vast cloud warehouses store data on us and use powerful algorithms and processing centres to understand us, create logic maps of what we say and do, log where we are, possibly who we are with, and from this can predict our desires and behaviours pretty accurately. It has been claimed that after a hundred or so 'likes' Facebook knows our personalities better than our friends and families.¹⁹ I wonder what Google knows after a year of searches and google maps? Even when we are not engaging with it, the AI is still engaging with us. This technology is increasingly being used by police when investigating crimes as its inside our homes, pockets and sometimes our bodies, every second of each day.²⁰

In the workplace things are also changing or have changed. If we work in delivery and distribution, then our work will already have changed massively; automated systems are now doing a lot of the planning and increasingly robots are doing more of the actual moving and 'picking' of stock. Pretty soon they will be driving the delivery vehicles. Most supermarkets have no store rooms; goods go straight from the lorry the shelf under the direction of computers that know which shelves are empty or will soon be. Go to a major

¹⁹ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-43869911>

²⁰ <https://www.cnet.com/news/alexa-fitbit-apple-watch-pacemaker-can-testify-against-you-in-court/>

port or warehouse and no human knows where the goods are and there is no paper ledger. A delivery driver won't plan their route; the machines will plan it better and update it in real time to optimise it. If we work in customer contact roles we may have seen customers increasingly able to 'self-serve' using digital technology.

However, those of us unaffected so far should not get complacent, AI's and robots are advancing rapidly up the career ladder and into the 'professions' in the process they will require us to re-shape our society and how we relate to this 'intelligent' technology and think about our work.

Opportunity knocks

Let me say up front I am a fan of technology and I will tend to focus on the positive and the potential for good is huge, in fact so huge we may simply not be able to say no to it. If in the future I arrive at my GP surgery or in A&E with a set of vague but worrying symptoms, I won't be entirely reliant on a newly qualified medical student with a copy of the 'cheese and onion' in their pocket.²¹ I will be very happy to have a trained technician connect me to the diagnostic machines and have an expert system, that has learnt from tens of thousands of cases and hundreds of practitioners, work out what's wrong. AI is very good at recognising and matching patterns, it can see things invisible to the best human practitioners, it never tires or get bored with repetition, it just get better.²²

Similarly if I phone up a company or the government to ask a question, I may be happy to talk to an AI as long, as I know they will give the same or better service than a human. How many HMRC call advisors fully understand the complexities of the tax system? In my personal experience very few and they don't work in the call centre. They call you back two weeks later and if you are lucky you pick up. In reality that service should be better as the AI will never forget a rule or process no matter how seldom it gets applied or how strange or new it is.

There are many situations where a human expert, whether it's a lawyer, doctor or engineer, looks like they are solving novel problems, but are actually using their brain to 'pattern match' to a common problem and solution. In the way that the last industrial revolution made high quality manufactured goods available cheaply for the first time; this revolution will make it possible to 'manufacture' skills and experience in the way we once did with cups, jugs and bolts. It's also going to be an awful lot cheaper to employ an AI in these 'expert' roles; once you have trained them you can copy and share them.

In December 2017 it was revealed that the AlphaGo Zero programme went from no knowledge of the game Go to world champion skills level in 40 days simply by playing the game with itself.²³ In contrast humans are expensive to train, impossible to copy and take a

²¹ <https://blog.oup.com/2014/01/nine-facts-oxford-handbook-clinical-medicine-ohcm/>

²² <https://spectrum.ieee.org/the-human-os/biomedical/diagnostics/in-hospital-intensive-care-units-ai-could-predict-which-patients-are-likely-to-die> and <http://www.cs.princeton.edu/courses/archive/fall02/cs597A/papers/icu.pdf>

²³ Go is recognised as a more complex game than chess and was seen as a major challenge to machine learning <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AlphaGo>

lot of effort to manage. Being both cheaper and potentially better means there will be powerful incentives to push the use of machine intelligence ever further giving us ever greater access to expertise.

From a corporate and government perspective it makes total sense to embrace AI and robots. The private sector cannot ignore the potential; any company that does may not last very long unless it has a very special niche. It simply would not be able to compete on cost or quality. In the face of unprecedented challenges to public services, from an aging population and ever more expensive health care system, local and central government similarly cannot say no to technology that could deliver game changing efficiency gains and improvements. If a robot driven by an AI could answer most of your customer services calls, and do it quicker and more reliably than a human, would you say no? However, it's going to be challenging for us all.

'Off-shoring to cyber space'

There is a strong similarity between how this revolution will impact society and how the industrial revolution did, but most of us don't see it yet. It is clear that large numbers of unskilled or low-skilled jobs will cease to exist; they won't go offshore, as they did in previous decades, the robots and AI will do them. However, as with the last industrial revolution, many jobs previously seen as highly skilled may also cease to exist. The accountant making up your accounts, lawyer doing conveyancing, the pathologist reviewing slides (possibly even the one doing your post-mortem) and the pension advisor may all go the way of the farrier, the cooper and the potter. Niche trades replaced by automated systems that give us the same services and products cheaper and better.

This all seems fine when it's someone else losing a job and *us* getting a lower cost service; but in the end its going to re-shape what work is for humans. In principle it could mean 'higher value' jobs and less work for humans; a kind of socialist leisure work utopia. In the language of Marxian economics, the means of production could simply produce what we need with little or no human labour. But, in practice our economics and our basic psychology, is not designed for a communist machine utopia after centuries of market economics. Low cost skilled labour may simply mean a 'race to the bottom' with humans competing, on price, for jobs where it's just not yet economically viable having an AI or robot do. If we are savvy we will start to think about complimentary roles for AI's, bots and humans, perhaps with the human empathising and conceptualising with the AI's and bots doing the more repetitive stuff and shifting the boxes.

Masters or servants of the robot

Whichever way it evolves it's going to mean we start to work alongside AI's as 'colleges' or even have AI's as managers and not just as our 'servants'. The AI will start to take on tasks such as evaluating our work performance. The AI is likely to be very good at these kinds of evaluation tasks as it has no prejudices, will not get tired and has no limit to the base of knowledge it draws on. It won't expect the team to come out drinking with it or feel the need to talk about its messy divorce at the Christmas party. However, how would we feel

about life altering decisions being taken by an AI, how could we argue with them if we felt them to be wrong? Could a machine motivate and lead a team?

If you have ever read Dr Faustus, you may remember that Faustus sells his soul, which he feels to be of no real value to him, and in return he gets the services of Mephistopheles for twenty four years. Although there is a contract, it's clear from the start that Faustus is not the master, he just thinks he is. Mephistopheles's distracts him with spectacles and tricks to keep him loyal to the contract, but ultimately he serves the Devil, not Faustus. When we are looking at our relationships with AI systems and robots I feel a very useful question to ask is who's interests does this machine serve?

This gets us into interesting political and economic territory as we, as individuals, are very unlikely to ever 'own' an AI. I would argue you don't own Alexa or your smartphone tech; you invite it over the threshold into your life and then it does what it was designed to do, it manages you. While some AIs will be owned by our governments, the majority are likely to be owned by multi-national corporations, with no clear allegiance to any particular nation and no absolute obligation to state their intentions. As individual citizens we may find ourselves between the devil and the deep blue sea. On one side we will have governments, or political parties, seeking to use this technology to manipulate us for political gain. On the other side there will be corporations' intent on using it to manipulate our behaviours and choices to make money from us.

Perhaps Amazon is a still a servant; but with Amazon Prime and Alexa it's now a servant that has permission to use your credit card and knows your 'weaknesses' in terms of impulse buys. Sometimes when I hear the package drop on the mat I forget I ordered anything and I feel Amazon has simply read my mind. It's great. But, I know that if my credit was bad then I would cease to exist for them.

In the case of FaceBook it's now clear it's about capturing me as part of a large flock of machine managed consumers. They hook me through the dopamine hits I get from watching the 'likes' on my posts get to double figures and then 'sell me' to the highest bidder, or at least rent me out around election time. I know this and yet I still use my account. Although I did deleted it from my phone several years ago as it was just too creepy FB wanting to track my location *and* my SMS messages 24/7.

Also we often forget that the Facebook business model relies on automation to keep its costs down; this implies that moderation and content management must be automated. If we pulled back the curtain on Facebook, Wizard of Oz style, we would find surprisingly few humans standing there with Mr Zuckerberg behind the curtain. In the first quarter of 2018 Facebook had 2.19 billion monthly active users and 25,000 full time employees or one human per 87,600 accounts and most of them will be working on tax planning.

In the case of Google it's probably more subtle but ultimately more frightening; while it's guiding me with free maps, finding me a hotel and helping me with my work it's getting to know me very well. It probably knows stuff about me I don't know and may not want to know, never mind share. Google Deepmind will soon probably be trawling through my medical records, tax history, travel and shopping habits and every other dimension of my

life. I assume it's anonymised, but if anything could re-match the data profiles to me its Google. How long before it's looking at my DNA.²⁴

Being human – a manifesto for AI

The benefits of AI and robots are clearly huge; but there are also huge risks. If Stephen Hawking thought it could result in the end of mankind, you have to consider the threat is credible. Powerful AI for hire to the highest bidder may make it hard to have a meaningful democracy or a stable society. If constraints are not placed on how governments, political parties, 'social elites' and corporations use this technology how can we be all 'equal' in society.

Look to recent news about FaceBook, Brexit, Trump and then ask if our own politicians and business leaders aren't already going down this path. There is also the question of having an orderly transition from the old to the new worlds rather than allowing market forces and vested interests to shape the future. The sheer power of it is so great that it needs some laws if we are going to preserve our humanity, which is why I think we need a manifesto for using AI and robots.

If you know the name Isaac Asimov you will be aware of his 'laws of robotics', he conceived these back in the 1950's as he wrote about a future where intelligent robots and humans coexisted and any self-respecting computer scientist will know them. Nearly seventy years on he has proved remarkably prescient; I don't think I can improve on Asimov's laws, but they may need a little updating.

1. **A robot may not injure a human being or, through inaction, allow a human being to come to harm.**

In 2018 Asimov's robot is more like our AI and we probably need to extend the description of 'harm' beyond 'squishing our feeble bodies'. There will need to be some pretty tough laws about emotional, political, economic and social harm. With this will come a need for far greater transparency regarding who is using them, what they are being used for and what their full impacts are. Some companies are already voluntarily offering to declare when an AI is talking to us that could be mistaken for a human, but some will not want to.

In addition there is the basic issue of the 'social contract', their use can't be allowed to benefit 'the few' at the expense of the many and externalise the true social and economic cost of their use and abuse. That might mean a ban on them being used for

²⁴ If you have run a DNA test to check your ancestry you probably signed a licence agreement that allowed the company to use that data, exactly what the limits of that use are is a hot topic. You might want them to do that to help you find your long lost uncle Bob through social media; you might not want them to share it with insurers or political parties canvassing in your area.

political campaigns and some really stringent privacy laws going beyond the GDPR ²⁵ to stop them being used to 'groom', sort and profile us like sheep or chickens. We might also need specific laws of disclosure to prevent 'robot catfish' roaming the internet pretending to be humans. Currently humans groom and scam other humans online, but robots might be pretty good at it soon and will have convincing avatars to deceive us with.


2. **A robot must obey orders given it by human beings except where such orders would conflict with the First Law.**

This probably needs a clarification to apply to 'humans' more generally and state that individuals, organisations and governments should not be using AI's in ways that compromise our human dignity and fundamental rights as humans. For example the use of AI by a state to profile and catalogue its citizens or for a corporation to use one in a way that was anti-competitive or damaged its consumer's interests. The Metropolitan Police has recently managed to get itself in trouble with a gangs database; imagine how much deeper into the mire it could have gone with a profiling AI? Police are in fact already using AI to assess the risk of reoffending when deciding on whether to bail or detain a suspect. We might need to set rules on how they are used in making important decisions; they can apply rules and laws but cannot yet apply empathy or compassion. Perhaps we need a total ban on using them in situations like deportations or deciding immigration status where issues of justice, compassion and morality go beyond simple rules. At a very minimum there needs to be absolute clarity on how an AI is reaching a decision, the ability to check that it is morally and legally correct and challenge it.

3. **A robot must protect its own existence as long as such protection does not conflict with the First or Second Law.**

This is an interesting one; as AI's become more important to the effective running of business and nations they are likely to come under attack. Given their complexity and value we are probably going to have to teach them self-defence and equip them with some 'weapons'. We probably won't be able to act quickly enough to defend them from an attack. Although these 'weapons' would probably be virtual ones it's still a slightly worrying idea that we will need to consider with care. There will be a very fine line between an AI capable of effective defence and one that is the equivalent of an atomic bomb when unleashed on an opponent. Conversely an intelligent NHS network might not

²⁵ The **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)** (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) is a regulation by which the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union and the European Commission intend to strengthen and unify data protection for all individuals within the European Union (EU).



have been such an easy target for crypto locker; it would not have waited hours or days for the bemused humans to catch up before it acted.

About the author

Gerald started his career as a research scientist and gained a PhD from Manchester University in polymer chemistry. He then joined the Ministry of Defence on its science and technology fast track management training programme. During his career in government he worked across all of the major Central Government departments including DWP, DH, HMRC, DfT, Directgov and CLG. This involved working with Local Government, the third sector and industry. His most prominent role within Government before leaving to become a freelance consultant was with the Cabinet Office where he provided advice to Ministers and Departments on the economic case for digital services. He continues to work on service transformation and is currently a service lead for RedQuadrant.


gerald.power@redquadrant.com

The practice of system leadership – Benjamin Taylor

Our understanding of public services, developed over twenty years and more, is that they work best when they:

1. are founded on strong shared understanding of:
 - organisational purposes – what the organisation exists to do; and
 - recipient and stakeholder purposes when engaging with the organisation
2. measure and work to the fulfilment of purpose in both these senses
3. design channels, processes, and services to meet demand
4. design the organisation, leadership, ICT, and accommodation to support the process and service and ensure clarity of roles and tasks
5. engage leaders to intentionally shape the culture to support individual, team, and organisation development and exercise of discretionary effort

These principles apply equally to a team, a whole organisation – or a conglomerate, like local government – or a place or issue-based partnership. They inform our ‘five worlds’ of public service transformation model, and all our work:



In the teeth of the problems faced by the sector, a rich mix of hard, complicated technical problems and truly wicked, messy, complex social problems, a leadership approach is needed which helps people at all levels to:

- Lead and manage their organisation as a complex system, balancing tension and security for the employees or participants, creating boundaries so people can exercise their discretion and act freely, without fear and without bumping into or contradicting each other
- Work with the wider system, including the people or 'beneficiaries', in the same way – enabling real codesign and effective coordination across complex partnerships
- Take a systems approach to management, supporting distributed power where appropriate, understanding real human motivations and responses, and acting in a way that engages the maximum discretionary effort.

This means avoiding the false dichotomies of control versus 'letting go, of hierarchy vs network, of centralisation vs decentralisation – recognising that these are all, always, in tension that can be a creative tension if managed right.


Some starting points are to create learning experiences that disconfirm received management wisdom, that help people open their thinking and learn safely. Typically, these include:

- Designing against demand – as expressed by the citizen at the 'front line' or boundary of the organisation – a powerful starting point which allows people to experience new and better ways of delivering public services.
- A focus on citizen outcomes which enables creativity about ways to deliver, breaking the assumptions that 'we must deliver services with ever-decreasing funding to meet demand or need', and allowing wider thinking about achieving outcomes without assuming 'a service' is the route.
- A strengths-based view which creates community-led solutions, breaking assumptions of 'problem solving' and 'fixing deficits'.
- A motivational approach which breaks the assumption of 'resistance to change' by helping people inside and outside the organisation get what they want through positive change.
- A reflective approach which breaks the assumption that managers must be technical experts with all the answers through demonstrating the power of learning.
- An inquiry approach which demonstrates the power of culture, balancing limits and freedoms, to achieve results, showing that most 'behaviour' and 'culture' work is counter-productive.

This allows us to help leaders to use a menu of appropriate interventions that focus on learning, on people, and on relationships:

- Citizen world – ethnographic studies of citizens, looking from demand back to need and purpose, positive deviance, and strengths-based approaches, demonstrating how to see possibilities instead of problems.
In one London borough, leaders came to realise they led a ‘pinball council’, with counter-productive signposting and triaging which cost money but actually discouraged the most in need from productive access.
- Service world – mixing back-to-the floor work with demand analysis and customer journey mapping to learn how to build services around citizens (where customer intimacy is demanded) and against demand (where transactional effectiveness is demanded).
In one borough, leaders realised that their ‘rational decisions’ in housing management had created a ‘great big shit-shovelling machine’ – a self-fuelling industry of failure.
- Management world – an active inquiry process based on the team dynamic, demonstrating how to generate better results by not leaping to expert solutions.
In a city council, the team dynamic process drove effective organisation and radical change.
- Leadership world – cultural inquiry through being trained and undertaking the cultural audit, hearing the stories that shape culture and tracing them back through core emotional reactions to leadership behaviours, people systems, and organisational symbolism.
In a city council, leaders discovered that their best intentions had create a culture paralysed by not having clarity of responsibilities and boundaries, and that organisational systems and symbolism was so undermining of their espoused goals that their values statement was counter-productive.
- Whole-system working – bringing the system into the room, running whole-system learning conferences to engage the wisdom of the whole system, and providing the tools to see how the five worlds and their relationships predict organisational outcomes.
In a city council, leaders unleashed radical new ideas through the application of the whole system process.
- Learning world – reflective practise (journaling, discussion circles, action learning) based on all the above, and practising formal and informal agile approaches to generate faster, more effective, and more positive learning.
In an outer London borough, sprint-based approaches accelerated change by building real service prototypes quickly and demonstrating success and learn from failures.

Leading in this new way needs to be recognised as a practice, that requires action learning and action inquiry – radical self-reflection, alongside real testing of theories in the world. It requires changing habits, one of the hardest things to do. And it is highly rewarding.



About the author

Benjamin has been in local public service reform for nearly 20 years, from front line work in an advice centre through work at the heart of a council's leadership, and worked for both a partnership firm and a managed services provider before setting up RedQuadrant, now a top ten public service transformation consultancy. He believes passionately in the power of systems thinking and system leadership to improve the experience of organisations and public services for employees, customers, and citizens. He leads the Public Service Transformation Academy, is a non-executive director for SCiO, the systems practitioner organisation, and lectures on applied system thinking. He is an avid learner and an enthusiastic sharer and reformer.

benjamin.taylor@redquadrant.com

RedQuadrant offerings through the Public Service Transformation Academy

Sample Leading Transformation for free

Only one transformation in three succeeds – at an optimistic estimate.
Learn how to buck the trend with our free webinar on leading successful transformation
1pm-2pm Thursday 14 June

Sample the PSTA's Leading Transformation programme at a free afternoon workshop
2 July, 12:30-5:30pm

Register at publicservicetransformation.org/events/

The Leading Transformation programme

The Leading Transformation programme is designed to give participants all the theory, models, tools, and learning you need to be a successful transformation leader. The 24 learning modules take you on a journey through all the skills needed to lead transformation, including system leadership, behavioural insight and demand management. The online learning is supported by webinars, action learning to apply the thinking, in-business support, learning review, a simulation and hundred-day plan implementation.

‘Throughout the Leading Transformation Programme it was really beneficial working with other key colleagues and making links between different states of Guernsey departments, so there was a real benefit of having that rich mix of different knowledge and expertise ‘ – Dermot Mullin, Head of Adult Social Care, States of Guernsey

‘What I liked about the programme particularly was that I could study at my own pace and fit it around my work. Revisiting the things I have done in past courses and picking up new hints and tips about what is being done today, as supposed to what I have covered several years ago is beneficial for my day to day business’ – Ed Ashton - Deputy Chief Officer - Social Security Department, States of Guernsey

Core modules cover:

1. **Introduction and overview:** key concepts and familiarisation

Leading transformation

2. **Transformation and the possibilities of organisations:** core theory behind transformation

3. **System leadership – purpose and measures:** how to create shared purpose
4. **Leading in complexity – the uses of power:** your power as a change leader in a complex world
5. **People in systems:** and how to maintain your own resilience

Being a transformation agent

6. **The limits of methods:** why no ‘methodology’ or step-by-step approach can guarantee results, and how to adapt to your context – and why you only ‘learn’ things when you test your ideas in the real world
7. **Mapping systems:** how to visually map complex systems

Management world

8. **Understanding organisations:** productive ways of looking at and analysing organisations
9. **Designing organisations:** from enterprise architecture to role and task allocation
10. **Shaping culture:** understanding and intentionally shaping culture for the better!

Citizen world

11. **Citizen and customer insight:** developing deep understanding of citizens to drive transformation
12. **Behavioural insight and strengths-based approaches:** powerful ways to understand the assets in the community and how behaviour is shaped

The boundary between citizen world and service world

13. **Understanding demand:** how to use demand to focus on value and remove waste

Service world

14. **Understanding and designing services**
15. **Cost analysis and building the business case**
16. **A deep dive into lean**

Change and learning world

17. **Prototyping:** more effective ways to achieve service change
18. **Delivering change:** proven approaches that make sure your transformation programme is in the 20% that succeed, not the 80% that fail
19. **Communications and stakeholder management**
20. **Understanding people:** insights into ‘how we tick’ which are invaluable in change
21. **Managing change positively**
22. **Embedding change:** tools to make change stick and become ‘the new normal’
23. **Strategy and change:** how to effectively set strategy, use scenarios, and bring the ‘whole system’ together to effect change

Summary

24. **Recap and summary**



Each participant receives in-business mentoring and support, online and webinar review of modules, peer action learning, and attends a learning review session and three-day simulation. Participants are then supported to apply hundred-day transformation plans.

For more information, contact sarah.johnston@redquadrant.com

Digital Analytics Programme

The digital analytics programme is a peer-to-peer knowledge sharing network for local authorities aimed at helping members implement new customer contact and service delivery models and realise benefits from digital technology.

One instant change is that we have used the data to make a case for changing some of our service KPIs that are outdated, but have been seen as 'not to be touched' by senior figures. The benchmarking data has helped make the case. Andrew Fellowes, Sheffield City Council

For more information, contact gerald.power@redquadrant.com

Coaching, mentoring, and shadow consulting for transformation

The PSTA's coaching practice supports individuals to improve their thinking, behaviours and performance. It is rooted in the latest discoveries from neuro-science and focusses on helping individuals become aware of their mental 'hard wiring' and learn how to make new connections. Working with a coach can give individuals the really powerful lift that they need to get the results that they want.

The response from managers has been overwhelmingly positive. Not only are we seeing direct improvements in leadership behaviours but managers have valued the coaching experience as an opportunity to develop personally and as a leader; and this has positively affected their view of the authority.

Paul McChrystal, Head of Workforce Development, Leicester City Council

For more information, contact deborah.jones@redquadrant.com



We understand the problems you're facing. Our network provides the public service expertise you need.

Our goal: to help the public service to successfully transform

We are a dedicated public service consultancy working to build capacity, reduce costs, and improve outcomes. Our approach to change interventions and major transformation is to make the change happen and ensure that it is sustainable.

- In the short term, we help to set direction and solve problems
- In the medium term, we deliver change through transformation resources or interims
- In the long term, we build your capability as well as capacity

Our goal is that you don't need us any more



We have extensive experience working closely with public service organisations from the NHS and mental health trusts to police and probation services, local authorities, and central government.

Unlike most, we start with the positives, and what works well. We support innovation, enable in-house learning, and ensure long-term, sustainable results.

We believe in conversations:

Benjamin Taylor
07931 317230
benjamin.taylor@redquadrant.com

Frank Curran
07515 875381
frank.curran@redquadrant.com
www.redquadrant.com

RRP £5

