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There is No Substitute for Knowledge

The Commission has a golden opportunity to apply new knowledge to radically transform how the Public Sector in Scotland is managed. This new knowledge is readily available, but it is difficult to appreciate because it requires a paradigm shift in thinking. Its application will require the courage to challenge status quo thinking and practice. The benefits would be immense.

1.0. A Step Change in Thinking

In context of management of the public sector we do have an established mode of thinking that determines the methods we use. (As represented by the blue line above) It has been successful in the past. But modern research has shown that the underpinning assumptions behind this style (Commonly referred to as “Command and Control) are now out of date. Research over the past decades has developed concepts that are much much more effective. (As represented by the red line.)

Modern concepts recognise two fundamental truths – the first is that our organisations are now so complex and interdependent that it is no longer possible to lead and control operations through inspired leadership from the top and/or the centre – the second is that the vast majority of employees come to work wanting to do a good job,

---

1 This is the primary theme of W Edwards Deming’s final book “The New Economics”
2 These concepts are in fact far from new, most were developed prior to and soon after the Second World War.
their pride and feeling of self-worth encourages them to do their best. We become demotivated when our working environment restricts this basic desire.

The problem is that changing from the old mode of thinking to modern concepts is difficult. It was the American Richard Pascale who considers the change to be “as radical as the metamorphosis from a caterpillar to a butterfly.”

What is required is change at the **thinking** level.

*“We cannot solve our problems from the same level of thinking that created them.”*  
*Albert Einstein.*

In expanding Einstein’s quote we acknowledge the relationship between level of thinking and the methods we use.

**Levels of Thinking** - lead to - **Methods Used** - which provide **The Results**

In other words we will **not** secure progress if the level of thinking remains the same. If we apply new methods such as Lean or Six Sigma, and retain the original thinking, no significant change will happen.

Might we emphasise the point we make here. If we do not make changes at the thinking level, nothing will change. The Independent Budget Review (IBR) and its chapter 7 “Shaping the Future” does not go down to the thinking level and will therefore not achieve the significant step change that is available to Scotland. For example the current consideration of bringing the various Scottish Police Forces into one body does not address the old thinking within the management structures. It will not address the extensive inefficiencies that have been caused by out of date thinking. If anything a bigger organisation will compound these inefficiencies.

2.0. **Wisdom**

Inscribed on The Scottish Mace are the four words

**Wisdom, Justice, Compassion, Integrity.**

The Chambers Dictionary defines **wisdom** as the application of knowledge. As mentioned above new knowledge in context of management is readily available. It would surely be a gross injustice to the Scottish people and to the employees within the public sector if the commission did not avail itself of this new knowledge.

A crucial question that is asked in the remit for this commission is:

- *What shared values and ethos should underpin Scotland Public Services?*

Are our values and ethos of the Public Sector going to reflect the use of knowledge or are they going to reflect the continued use of concepts that we know to be out of date and inefficient?³

³ We labour this point because there have been so many “calls for change” and Commissions that have failed to consider modern knowledge. In fact we do have to admit to a feeling of scepticism that this commission will not have the vision and strength of character to incorporate modern fully researched knowledge.
Might we further stress we are not advocating the application of “methods,” but the development and application of “knowledge” (Wisdom). The Engineering and Medical fraternity have made fantastic strides forward over the past century because their profession is based around scientifically developed knowledge. Doctors who do not base their practice around soundly developed knowledge are referred to as “Quacks.” Furthermore “knowledge” is never static, it is continually developing. Appendix 1 is an article entitled “There is No Substitute for Knowledge”

3.0 A Comparison
The primary theme of this submission is that the methods we use are underpinned by how the organisation thinks. Often the organisation is not aware of these assumptions. The enterprise learns when it identifies these assumptions and challenges them in light of modern research.

There is no one right set of assumptions. One set will be relevant to one situation and may not be relevant to another. The manager’s skill is in knowing which set of assumptions to use in which circumstances.

Below we polarise two sets of assumptions, with the methods that evolve from these assumptions. The first goes under the collective name of “Command and Control.” It is contrasted with the concepts that have evolved out of the extensive research over the past decades. (The two diagrams below depict the contrast between old and new thinking. The first represents command and control where the decisions and thinking occurs at the top. It fails to utilise the innovative thinking at the work face. The second is a system diagram that shows the interdependence of all parts of the system. It was this diagram that transformed Japanese management thinking in the 1950s)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Leader’s primary task is to direct and motivate their people</th>
<th>Budgets, targets, appraisals, standards, incentives etc.</th>
<th>The leaders primary task is to design systems to enable the intrinsic motivation of staff</th>
<th>As above plus listening to staff, service users, suppliers etc. – as customers of the design of the system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation can be managed through those things that can be measured.</td>
<td>The monthly management report. Managers tend to remain remote from the work face.</td>
<td>Only 5% of processes within an enterprise provide figures, the rest, the unmeasurable still needs to be managed</td>
<td>Observation, waste is evident to all and staff are enabled to make corrections to the system. The monthly management report for those areas that can be measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single figure compared with budget has meaning; it will show improved or worsening performance</td>
<td>The monthly management report presented in tabulated form, comparing period performance against budget</td>
<td>Acknowledging the existence of variation and that each piece of data has to be viewed in context of past measures</td>
<td>Data presented in Control Chart format so that expected variation can be differentiated from unexpected variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge – we learn from experience</td>
<td>We learn by identifying and challenging our underpinning assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>A cyclical learning discipline that includes our assumptions, doing, studying the results and acting to close the loop to secure learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 Just a Few Examples of Waste in the Present System

4.1 Bureaucratic Waste: The diagram below represents the system for repairing a 3 pin socket in a Council House in one of our city councils.4

We wonder how much it costs to replace this socket, which costs about £4.50. Would £2-3000 be a reasonable guess? No one person designed this system; it has evolved over the years through the underpinning thinking in the public sector.

---

4 This diagram was supplied by a staff member within one of our City Councils.
4.2 Lack of Support for Improvement Teams: Councils have been running “improvement” departments under various titles for many years. They secure significant improvement by getting sections to think differently. But these improvements are soon eroded by the dominant status quo thinking. The gains secured are usually lost within two years. Change will only happen if the whole council and the whole of the Public Sector move into a learning mode and develop the commitment and skills to learn from examples. The problems faced by these improvement sections are depicted by the following diagram.\(^5\)

![Barriers to Sustained Progress](image)

4.3 Our Inability to Learn from Examples: The Public Sector does on occasion use external consultants to lead improvement projects. Vanguard would possibly be one of the most prominent, certainly most forthright. The following diagram depicts one of their projects with the Grampian Justice System. It involved a range of public sector bodies – the Police, The Court Services, The Procurator Fiscal’s office, Social Work, The Prison Service, Judges and Lawyers etc. The project secured an improvement in the time taken from when a person is charged to the conclusion of their court case. They improved the time taken from an average of 247 days to 35 days. The improvement was sustained for a limited period, but has now gone back to the status quo because one of the participants was unwilling to change the thinking that the project demanded.\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) This diagram was constructed to reflect the frustrations of Jim Duffy and his section working on improvement within Dundee City Council.

\(^6\) This diagram came from one of the senior police officers involved in the project.
4.4 Lack of Learning: This inability to learn from examples and successful projects is not only restricted to the Public Sector. There have been numerous excellent initiatives over the past 30 years, but we have failed to learn from their successes – see appendix 2 “What has not Worked in the Past.” The reason we have failed to learn is because we have been unwilling to go down to the thinking or theoretical level when considering “management,” and we fail to think holistically. For an organisation to change the whole organisation requires to take on board new concepts.

4.5 Overhead Burden: The Public Sector has a massive overhead burden, as depicted below. This entire overhead burden seeks to instruct and direct those at the work face. In practice as the majority are intrinsically motivated and are facing the customer they need virtually no instruction. What they need is the freedom to do the right thing.

---

7 This diagram was constructed from a presentation by Stephen Maddocks of Vanguard
4.6 Regulations: The practice and cost of providing regulations and centrally written standards and then ensuring compliance through auditing has ballooned over the past years. What has now happened is that the regulations and standards have become the customer rather than the service user. The ballooning of regulations and standards has been caused by the underpinning Command and Control thinking of Government and the Public Sector. They believe that leadership/centre has to provide instructions as to how the work is done and then check/audit that it is being done as instructed. Companies like Toyota are very standardised but, the difference here is that the standards are set by those at the work face and can be, and regularly are, updated. The standards are also customer focused rather than authority focused.

4.7 Management by Measureable figures Alone: At best 5% of the operation of an organisation can be measured. It is stating the obvious that the other 95% has to be managed. The practice of managing by measureable figures alone has arisen through attempts at remote management, and the belief that leaders can manage an organisation through the figures that are supplied to them. To manage any organisation the leader has to have an intimate knowledge of the workings of the enterprise. This is not achieved by hiding behind a desk reviewing statistics.

4.8 Targets – Outcomes: The idiocy of targets and managing outcomes has been extensively documented in many books including “Profit beyond Measure” by Tom Johnson and Anders Broms and “Systems Thinking in the Public Sector” by John Seddon. The use of targets is simply founded on the out of date command and control thinking that believes it is necessary, and possible, to motivate people. Their extensive use over the past 15 years has led to the manipulation of data and the demotivation of staff. The evidence identifying this failure has been extensive.

4.9 Bonuses: Another area that has been written about extensively is the aspect of bonuses and how they do NOT motivate. In fact in relation to the job itself they demotivate. What they do is move our attention from the task itself and onto how we maximise the return from the bonus system. See Dan Pink’s 10 minute presentation “Drive – The Surprising Truth about What Motivates Us” – available from the RSA web site at http://www.youtube.com/user/theRSAorg#p/u/0/u6XAPnuFjJc Bonuses are used to enhance the pay of senior executives – nothing more (see the banking and financial sectors)

4.10 Customer Focus: Some time ago a senior representative of Grampian Enterprise (as it was then) presented to a meeting of a group of Aberdeen Chief Executives. His introductory slide stated that Grampian Enterprise was “Customer Focused.” The CEOs questioned this claim and there followed five minutes of discomfort, until the

---

8 This has been recognised by Russel Griggs – Chairman of the Scottish Government Regulatory Review Group
9 “Unique processes that produce figures amount to only 3% of the whole.” – Ed Baker of the Ford Motor Company
11 This practice has been accentuated over the past 40 years by the computer which makes these stats so readily available
representative realised that he was amongst friends who would respect his
confidentiality. He then relaxed and started to tell us of his considerable frustration,
and that of his colleagues. They found that local initiatives developed relative to the
needs of the Grampian area were being dismissed and the company were required to
deliver programmes developed at the head office in Glasgow. This culture persists to
this day such that Scottish Enterprise Grampian has faded from the forward thinking
scene in Aberdeen. The forward thinking people within the enterprise have long since
left. In other words central control (through Command and Control principles)
destroys initiative and moves attention away from the customer and onto central
dictate.

5.0 Evidence
5.1 Pseudo Evidence 1: Our first comment about pseudo evidence is that of making
decisions from a basis of what can be measured (usually accounting figures). As
mentioned in 4.7 above those aspects of an organisation that can be measured amount
to only 5% of the whole. It is illogical to make decisions while ignoring the 95% of
the operation of a service that cannot be measured.

In looking for real evidence it is necessary to listen to and study those working with
the service users. The waste mentioned in section 3 could have been unearthed
relatively easily.

Furthermore it has to be borne in mind that measureable data is invariably doctored to
meet targets, budgets and accountability regimes.

5.2 Pseudo Evidence 2. We have a startling failure to learn from successful initiatives
and projects. (see 4.4 above and appendix 2 “What Has not Worked in the Past”) Before looking for examples it is necessary to examine why we fail to learn. The
answer to that question is going to be in the area of not appreciating the different
thinking or theoretical assumptions that underpin successful projects.

The use of examples is a kind of quick fix. It encourages leaders to pursue “Flavour of
the Month” solutions without fundamentally challenging their paradigms and putting
the effort into appreciating modern research.

A prominent example of searching for quick fixes has been our attempts to learn from
the success of Toyota. (Which we have been trying to do for the past 30years) We
have failed to learn because we have not understood how Toyota thinks, instead we
have applied Toyota’s methods such as Quality Circles, Six Sigma and Lean. These
methods have been applied over our traditional thinking. As a result we have invested
considerable sums on these types of project with little lasting benefit.12

Appendix 3 is comment from Mike Rother, the author of the book “Toyota Kata”
concluding with the fundamental point of this submission. That change starts at the
thinking level, not at the method level.

12 “To copy an example of success, without understanding it with the aid of theory, may lead to
If the commission really want to look for examples they should consider organisations such as W L Gore, The John Lewis Partnership and Loch Fyne Oysters. The underpinning philosophy of these companies is to respect and trust their employees. The thinking in the public sector is diametrically opposite.

5.3 Evidence 1: As detailed in section 3 above there is extensive evidence of the inefficiencies caused by the present underpinning thinking in the Public Sector. This evidence can be gathered by listening to and studying those employed at the work face.

5.4 Evidence 2: The evidence to support a change of thinking is abundant. It is available in books, articles, case studies, etc. etc. – all supported from diligent research. The article by Prof Tom Johnson in appendix 4 is an example of the knowledge that is readily available. Please note that while supporting the use of “Lean” methods Tom’s first call is for a change in thinking. Without challenging the thinking of an organisation no real change is achieved.

A very brief description of modern thinking is provided below in section 6.

5.5 Evidence 3. Once the organisation has changed it thinking it is able to secure all manner of improvements – as detailed in the Executive Summary, 4.3 above and in The Report to the Wales Audit Office by the Lean Enterprise Research Centre of The Cardiff Business School. The report can be downloaded from their web site http://www.leanenterprise.org.uk/lean-research/systems-thinking-cases.html

6.0 The Alternative
In reviewing the alternative thinking it may be useful to have in front of us some of the vision statements set out in the remit of the commission.

- “An innovative, seamless, responsive and continually improving service designed round user needs”
- Is person centred, reliable and consistent”
- Is designed and delivered close to the customer”
- Has governance structures that are accountable, transparent, cost effective, streamlined and efficient.

6.1 We are Intrinsically Motivated: Research from Maslow, McGregor, McClelland, Hertzberg, Kohn, to mention but a few, have all identified that we come to work wanting to do our best. The likes of W L Gore, UK’s most innovative company and John Lewis Partnership the most profitable retail organisation have used this attribute in building up the thinking and structures within their companies.

If we are to have a public sector that is “person centred, reliable and consistent” then the starting point is to recognise the intrinsic motivation of staff. This means that an alternative means of control requires to be designed. Out goes such terms as targets, bonuses, standards, auditing against standards etc. In comes trust, the development of self-control, enabling strategies, experimentation and learning strategies, the design of systems, the recognition that those working in the system are the customers of its design, the refocusing of the audit function etc. etc.
6.2 Systems Thinking: Systems thinking recognises that the relationship between the parts is every bit as important as the parts themselves. We have to move beyond our traditional approach of breaking complex problems down into their parts. The whole is not the sum of the parts but the sum of the parts plus the relationship between the parts. This relationship between the parts can be complex.

The systems thinkers of the past decades have included Deming, Checkland, Ackoff, Juran, Senge etc. etc. What they have discovered is that the design of the system in which people work is the predominate determinant of the outcome. Juran considered that 85% of the outcome is determined by the design of the system, Deming thought it was more like 97%, Peter Senge talks about us being “prisoners of the system”

The two cartoons below portray a chaotic system in contrast to a well-designed system (somewhat mechanical – but they are only cartoons)

These two cartoons aim to portray that it is the design of the system that determines the quality and productivity of the output. A chaotic system produces poor results, a well design system produces good results; little is dependent on the diligence of the individual. It is the design of the system that is accountable not the individual working in the system. The Leader’s role is not the direction and motivation of individuals but the design of robust systems that enables the intrinsic motivation of staff. The follow on recognition is that the customers of the design are those people working in the system.

As has been portrayed in the section titled “waste,” the systems within the public sector are tending towards the chaotic. They most certainly are not “innovative, seamless, responsive and continually improving service designed round user needs”

A further consideration comes from the work of Peter Senge and the Society for Organisational Learning. They have identified that there are two aspects of systems, detail complexity and dynamic complexity. With dynamic complexity we are
recognising that systems are not static, circumstances can ensure that they are continually improving, or conversely they can be getting progressively worse (see the 3 pin socket example in section 4.1)

A full explanation of systems thinking is beyond the scope of this report. For further information please see bibliography in appendix 6.

A challenging implication of the above is that it is the organisation that has the potential to learn. Our old paradigm has us thinking of learning in context of the individual, but what is now recognised is that the primary opportunity for learning is the organisation itself. It has the potential to learn in context of its underpinning thinking and the resulting design of the systems that characterise operations. This is especially true of the public sector.

6.3 Variation: Variation exists all around us. On the one hand it is an asset and should be celebrated. The fact we are all different colours our community and underpins innovation. It is counter-productive to attempt to force sameness. The media’s focus on “Post Code Lottery” and the demand for all public services to be similar is based on wrong thinking and is also damaging. It is through various sections doing things differently that we learn.

The second aspect of variation is in regard to the presentation and analysis of data. The outcomes from all systems contain variation. It is necessary to differentiate between expected variation from the normal operation of the system and any unexpected variation - something that has happened that has disrupted the normal operation of the system. The tool to analyse data is the control chart. If data is not analysed through the use of control charts then there is a good chance that any action taken will in fact make the situation worse. Managers or Politicians, who like to see themselves as dynamic and in control, are very prone to this failing - they make short terms decisions without understanding the system and therefore contribute to destabilising the system. They drive the organisation into a crisis management mode and waste.

6.4 Wisdom - Knowledge: To reflect the vision of the Scottish Mace, it is surely imperative that the public sector and government have a long term commitment to knowledge and its continued development. It is surely an abdication of responsibility to ignore current soundly researched knowledge and to support a thinking and culture that has been proven to be out of date.

Knowledge is never static. It is continually developing. The public sector should therefore be supporting the continual scientific based research into management. See Appendix 1 “There is No Substitute for Knowledge.”

It should also be encouraging experimentation within its own boundaries. It is from the success and failure of such experiments that we learn.

13 Margaret Wheatley in her book “A Simpler Way” recognises that “Organisations are living systems. They too are intelligent, creative, adaptive, self-organising, meaning seeking”
14 The control chart and the development of Statistical Process Control was initiated by Walter Shewhart in the 1930s
We have different situations where different underpinning assumptions will be in use. There will be a time and place when the command and control principles are the most appropriate – for example in a crisis situation where clear commands require to be implemented without question – say at a fire or in riot control. But when dealing with more complex long term issues we require to switch to underpinning assumptions that develops the innovative thought of all those involved, especially those at the workface. A reoccurring theme of this submission is that we learn when we know, and are prepared to challenge, the underpinning assumptions that we use.

Obviously a much greater detailed exploration of modern thought needs to be conducted than is possible within the scope of this submission. (see appendix 6 Bibliography)

7.0 In Response to the Commission’s Remit
A brief consideration of the four vision statements identified.

“An innovative, seamless, responsive and continually improving service designed round user needs”

**Innovative:** Initiative in the Public Sector is undermined through a range of practices, such as standards and targets being set by the top/centre and a strong auditing function that insists on compliance with standards, even though they work contrary to the needs of the customer. Rather than recognise that it is the system that is accountable, there is a strong culture of individual accountability, to the extent that people have lost their jobs for not adhering to standards. They have even lost their jobs through the organisation not using control charts and misinterpreting data. The media are allowed to conduct witch hunts, especially in context of social work. So the thinking within the public sector has produced a “risk averse” culture rather than an innovative culture. This has been known for a very long time. Hoping to reverse of this situation, and still retaining the thinking that causes it, is illogical.

**Seamless:** The public sector manages its complex operation by breaking it down into parts and managing the parts. The underlying assumption is that the whole is the sum of the parts. The thinking behind this approach is referred to as mechanistic or reductionist. (See appendix 4 an article by Tom Johnson) What systems thinking is telling us is that the relationship between the parts is every bit as important as the parts themselves. Both the parts and the relationship between the parts have to be managed. The present practice of allocating budgets per department and turning a blind eye to the competition for budgets has to change. It is the thinking behind the control of budgets that is the primary cause for a lack of “seamlessness” in the public sector.

**Responsive:** As mentioned earlier the service user is not the customer of front line staff. It is the standard, regulation, target or auditing body that is seen as the primary customer. We will not get to a responsive service until the front line employee is enabled to write, maintain and continually improve the standards relative to the customers that are in front of them. In other words we will not get a responsive service till the Public Sector recognises and believes in the intrinsic motivation of its staff.
Is person centred, reliable and consistent”
The sector is authority or hierarchical centred not person centred. As mentioned earlier the culture is commonly referred to as “Command and Control”

Is designed and delivered close to the customer”
The present systems are designed to meet the needs of authority not the customer

Has governance structures that are accountable, transparent, cost effective, streamlined and efficient.
The present system does not meet these criteria because:
  • There is the misconception that the centre can control and manage complex and interdependent systems.
  • As mentioned (4.7) the governance of the public sector relies on measurable data alone. In other words only 5% of the whole. Governance has to include the unmeasurable.
  • Through the use of targets, outcomes and accountability, the data fed into the centre is invariably doctored.
  • The stats collected are not analysed using control charts and statistical process control. They are therefore open to misinterpretation.
  • The data gathered is not fed back to those at the work face - to those who could actually secure improvement

In other words we will achieve proper governance structures only after we have challenged and changed the thinking behind presented practices
8.0 The Solution

8.1 Long Term View: The first recognition is that the present thinking of the public sector (and of society as a whole) has been in place for many many decades. Modernising the thinking within the public sector (and of the service users) is going to require a long term perspective. It could well take 10-20 years.

8.2 The Whole: As all parts are interdependent we have to consider how the whole is modernised. The whole will include those receiving the services, contractors, the media, Councillors, Holyrood Politicians, central government etc. etc. In other words society as a whole.

8.3 The Basic Premise: The basic premise of this submission is that if society, as a whole, thinks differently then the methods applied within organisations will change. The solution is going to be in context of how we change the thinking of the whole of society.

8.4 Factors Helping: There are several factors that will help the Public Sector address the whole: They are:

- **The Availability of Knowledge:** As has been the primary message of this submission there are abundant sources of modern thinking readily available. (see appendix 6 Bibliography)

- **The Internet** – The tool that is available today, and was not in the past, is the internet. It has the ability to communicate with the whole population at one and the same time. It also has the ability to store information and make it readily available for individuals or groups when they are ready to take on board new thinking. The Dan Pink presentation (see section 4.9) made available by the RSA is an example.

- **Critical Mass:** The internet has the ability to connect though to a critical mass of willing individuals who have the desire to learn and move into the future. This critical mass may be as low as 5-10% of the population. So if over the next 5 years we can identify and connect say 100,000 committed individuals we may create the momentum to have Scotland leading the world in the modernisation of the public sector.

- **Many Forward Thinkers:** There are many many forward thinkers across Scotland. Their fundamental motivation is to contribute to the advancement of our society. There is a real possibility that they would be willing to volunteer to contribute to a genuine commitment to transform the Public Sector.

- **Discontent:** There is a growing discontent across the whole country with how the public sector and the large organisations (i.e. the Banks) are being managed

8.5 Changing Thinking: The future lies in developing a culture of learning; learning in context of the individual, the organisation and of society itself. It is especially important to develop a learning culture in context of our organisations; their underpinning thinking and how they continually improve. Some of the parameters of this learning would be:
A Culture of Disciplined Learning in Context of “Management”: The profession of “Management” requires to develop a culture of disciplined scientific learning. Its profession requires to be as disciplined as those of Engineering and Medicine. Our culture expects medical procedures to have been fully researched and proven before being applied to patients. We would be horrified if our doctors used gut feel and custom and practice. Furthermore this scientific discipline in their profession has allowed them to make remarkable progress over the past century. Management has to develop a similar discipline to its profession. It is no longer sufficient for managers to develop their thinking through custom and practice, gut feel, and experience.

Web Page: The modern web and internet is a multifaceted tool for storing and communicating knowledge and for engaging a large number of people. A sophisticated web facility is required to facilitate this process

Knowledge: The web page would be used to communicate and store knowledge

National Presentations by International Thought Leaders: The internet allows presentations delivered centrally, or from any part of the world, to be received locally in all parts of the country – from Lerwick to Stranraer.

Regional and Local Facilitators: We would recommend that a network of local facilitators be created to lead learning. These local facilitators would be supported by a network of Regional Facilitators. Both Regional and Local facilitators would require initial training in modern management thinking.

Training of Facilitators: Our Scottish Universities are not in a position to provide this training. The fact that they are managed by a Command and Control culture has inhibited their development. It is recognised that our business schools teach concepts that are at least 30 years out of date.

It is recommended that a core team be created to lead the learning of the facilitators. This core team to come from those groups at the leading edge of management thought. – such as The International Futures Forum, The Deming Learning Network, The Society for Organisational Learning, The Centre for Confidence and Well Being, etc.

Group Learning: It is anticipated that the local facilitators would organise local groups to receive the broadcast presentations and to develop learning in group situations and through discussions.

Knowledge is never static: It would be essential that a means is established whereby a body of knowledge is created and a mechanism is designed for its continual development. The Wikipedia approach is an example of a source of knowledge that is continually updated by the participants in the system. In time we may get the Universities to lead research.

Experimentation and Application: A culture of experimentation within organisations should be encouraged to provide a basis of continual learning,
especially in the aspect of application. An implication of encouraging learning is that difference will be celebrated. Case studies would be made available on the web facility.

The above implementation strategy is similar to the one detailed for a separate imitative under the Learning Society movement. The business case for this initiative is in appendix 5

9.0 Some Outcomes: Some of the changes that will become apparent over the coming years will include:

9.1 Supervision: As identified in section 1 the underpinning thinking of an organisation determines the methods and structures used. When the Public Sector recognises that staff are intrinsically motivated and they need freedom to do the right thing then the amount of supervision employed will be significantly reduced.

9.2 Leadership in Context of Systems: The primary role of leaders changes from one of supervision to one of ensuring that robust and enabling systems are designed. The role of Politicians and Councillors move from being decision makers to one of studying and understanding the systems in which people work.

9.3 The Auditing Function: The role of the auditor changes from inspecting against standards to one of analysing the systems in place. Are they customer focused? Has there been detailed investigation in context of the requirements of the service users? Is the front line staff involved in the continual improvement of the system? Is the system being continually improved? How fast do identified improvements get implemented? etc. etc. They are moving from a gotcha and judgemental role to one of aiding the learning and development of the systems of the organisation. Each organisation will be different. The auditing function should not be making recommendations as to the design of systems, that is the responsibility of those involved.

9.4 Governance Structures: The means of governing will be greatly extended. It will no longer be based around those things that can be measured, but will include the unmeasurable. In addition it will include a detailed analysis of the multiple interdependencies in an extremely complex public sector. The data collected will be analysed using control charts and proper Statistical Process Control methodologies. The governance structures will be focused on enabling learning and the continual development of the system. The structures will be particularly mindful of the costs of governance and ensure that unnecessary bureaucracy does not develop.

9.5 Improvement Teams and Consultancies: As mentioned earlier the present work of improvement teams and consultancies is undermined because the whole has not appreciated the change of thinking being applied. Once everyone is aware of modern concepts, they will appreciate the work being done, ensure that progress is not undermined and will facilitate the learning of
the organisation. The effectiveness of the improvement teams and consultancies will start to blossom.

Footnote: - Bibliography - appendix 6 is a bibliography of the extensive reading and research behind this submission.
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