**Operational Steering Group (OSG)**

**Date: Tuesday 19 March 2024**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present:** |  |  |  |
| **Attendee** | **Initials** | **Title** | **Service (if applicable)** |
| Jan Buchanan (Chair) | JB | Director of Finance and Corporate Services | Glasgow Life |
| Alan Taylor | AT | Job Evaluation Manager | Chief Executives |
| Paul McGaulley | PM | Strategic HR Manager | Chief Executives |
| Gena Howe | GH | Job Evaluation Project | Chief Executives |
| Vickky Irons | VI | Project Manager | Chief Executives |
| Angela Anderson | AA | Senior Communications Officer | Chief Executives |
| Michelle McGinty | MMcG | Head of Corporate Policy & Governance | Chief Executives |
| Lorna Goldie | LG | Head of Resources | Education |
| Stephen Sawers | SS | Head of Service | Financial Services |
| Tracy Keenan | TK | Assistant Chief Officer | Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP) |
| Eileen Marshall | EM | Divisional Director | Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability |
| Geraldine Agbor | GA | GMB Representative |  |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison Lead |  |
| Mandy McDowall | MM | Unison Lead |  |
| Sylvia Haughney | SH | Unison Representative |  |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison Representative |  |
| Graham McNab | GM | Unite Lead |  |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite Representative |  |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | External Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor |  |
| Julie Emley | JE | Notes | Chief Executives |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Apologies:** |  |  |  |
| **Attendee** | **Initials** | **Title** | **Service (if applicable)** |
| Nicky Neef | NN | Head of Corporate Services | City Property |
| Cara Stevenson | CS | GMB Lead |  |
| Sean Baillie | SB | GMB Representative |  |
| Shona Thomson | ST | GMB Representative |  |
| Chris Sermanni | CHS | Unison Lead |  |
| Jean Kilpatrick | JK | Unison Representative |  |

| **Notes** |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous Notes**
	1. Notes from previous OSG meeting approved.
	2. GM asked for an update on the outstanding action. RD apologised for the delay in supplying the written summary and confirmed this will be supplied for the next OSG meeting.

**OUTSTANDING ACTION 09/2023:** RD to provide written summary of Allan & Others v Fife Council employment tribunal. RD confirmed this will be provided for the next meeting. |
| 1. **Benchmark Job Overview Document (JOD) Tracker Analysis**
	1. AT summarised the paper issued in advance of the meeting and confirmed the following:
* Progress is moving in the right direction, but this needs to keep improving.
* The escalation process is in place to address gaps in JOD interaction.
	1. BS queried if work on other activities e.g., secondary benchmarks, is reducing analyst capacity to work on the completion of the benchmark JODs. AT acknowledged there is an element of balancing work priorities but confirmed there is a need to work on other activities as the generic JOD work cannot be completed until all JODs are agreed. EC queried what the impact of this will be on the timescales. RD clarified gaps should not stop what is required.
	2. EC asked for an update on the increase in outstanding JODs to ensure the workload is manageable. AT explained that as interviews increase the number of outstanding JODs will increase which is to be expected. PM highlighted resources within the team were increased to manage the increase in activity.
	3. RD explained the benefits that will be achieved by moving the analysts to one location and highlighted the work that will be undertaken to remove hub inconsistencies:
* The 3-hub model required an extra step for quality assurance which can be removed when the hubs merge.
* The move will make it easier for the analysts to get together and will assist with resolving the inconsistencies in approach.
* RD and AT will meet with the Lead Analysts on a hub-by-hub basis to establish inconsistencies and their potential impact on evaluation work.
* Issues around local application will be resolved and brought back to the OSG.
* The analysts need to accept the guidance provided and adhere to it. There are instances where clarification has been provided multiple times but not accepted, this needs to be addressed.

EC specified reassurance is needed around the issue of inconsistencies. JB asked RD for an update on this at the next OSG. RD confirmed a progress report will be provided for the 16 April meeting. * 1. RD confirmed the analysts need to review all the benchmark generic output together horizontally and vertically before bringing to the OSG to review the work and detail. RD clarified services and Trade Unions will need to do a sense check with any queries sent back to the analysts where required. BS specified the Trade Unions will need to rely on feedback from the analysts and RD advice for comfort. JB advised there will need to be a schedule of subgroups to go through the detail.
	2. JB emphasised the challenging timelines and asked the services to prioritise Job Evaluation activities.

**ACTION 1: Progress report to be supplied for 16 April meeting (RD)****ACTION 2: JB to issue a communication to the service representatives to reinforce the importance of Job Evaluation activities.**  |
| 1. **Secondary Benchmarks Update and Trade Union Concerns**
	1. AT advised statistics were supplied in advance of the meeting.
	2. Discussion topics around the concerns have been captured within a table later in the document for ease of reference.

**ACTION 3: AT to circulate indicative schedule.**  |
| 1. **Matching Process**
	1. GH and AT provided an overview of the slides issued in advance of the meeting. The following was confirmed:
* There will be engagement with the services to make sure everything works for each service. Services need to decide what works for them within the Job Evaluation project timescales.
* A plan is currently being prepared to build on the process.
* As much as possible will be pre-populated on the forms to assist job holders and management.
	1. RD emphasised the importance of the following:
* Managers need to be fully briefed and ready to engage in the process.
* Managers will be responsible for the return of the signed documentation. This documentation needs to be signed by both the job holder and the manager.
	1. The services highlighted the following for consideration:
* There are NHS managers within HSCP that manage council staff.
* City Property and Glasgow Life communication channels need to be considered.
* Logistical issues need to be discussed as part of service planning.
	1. The Trade unions highlighted the following considerations:
* There will be a significant impact on resources across the services, including stewards.
* Trade Union representative resources will be an issue and could impact timescales. JB confirmed this risk has been raised.
* Timescales associated with the process points are required. GH advised indicative timelines could be supplied.
* Communications need to be issued as early as possible, so everyone knows what is ahead.
* The process of senior management escalation when a job holder and/or line manager agreement cannot be reached causes concern. JB confirmed these occurrences should be minimal and highlighted the appeals process is still available.
 |
| **Date of next OSG:** Tuesday 16 April 2024**ACTION 4:** Sub-group meeting to be scheduled for Tuesday 9 April 2024 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Secondary Benchmarks – Trade Union Concerns** |
| **Topic** | **Further Information** | **Discussion** |
| JOD Line Manager | JOD line managers need to be allocated to support the arrangements for the group. This approach needs to be consistent across the services and the nominated managers need to take responsibility and be proactive. | AT confirmed where a JOD line manager has not been identified by the services for a group this is creating issues for the groups and advised a JOD line manager needs to be identified for all secondary benchmark positions to co-ordinate the group for completion of the questionnaire. SH provided an example where Unison have had to provide co-ordination for a group within Education as the JOD line manager had not been identified. LG explained this has been problematic for Education, but confirmed a plan is now in place to resolve this.PM explained the communication issued to identified JOD line managers is clear on their role and emphasised the identification of a JOD line manager for each position needs to be a priority for the services. |
| Will the JOD line manager identified for co-ordination be the same manager involved in the JOD discussion?  | AT confirmed this should be the same manager. |
| Service Expectations | Communications | AT confirmed an indicative schedule has been shared with the service HR teams and will be shared with the OSG to help with planning.PM highlighted there have been a few job holders that have failed to attend their interview and stressed the importance of communication in advance if they unavailable to attend as this is not acceptable.BS confirmed there are cases where participants are being asked to return to their service after the interview which should not be happening. AT advised the services need to reinforce that this should not happen. JB agreed and confirmed an interview will take as long as required to capture all the relevant information.SS recognised the need for the services to reinforce the management role in Job Evaluation. EC advised managers also need reassurance about their role to alleviate their concerns.  |
| Position Mappings | Job holders need comfort that their role belongs within the group. | AT confirmed there has been situations where job holders do not believe they do the same job. Most of these interviews have gone ahead but there is an acknowledgement of the job holder’s perspective and their nervousness. RD advised 2 different JODs may emerge due to differences.RD advised job titles are an issue, but this should have been considered by the services under their mapping review. RD confirmed the matching process will extract any differences out. PM highlighted the services have done their best to map jobs appropriately. |
|  | Do role differences within the group create challenges for the analysts? | RD advised the analysts should know how to capture differences and emphasised the importance of the JOD discussion. |
| Questionnaire | There is confusion about how the questionnaire should be completed i.e., collectively, or individually. | SH highlighted there are cases where job holders want to capture different elements so have completed them separately. AT explained that although the questionnaire is useful to get the job holder to think about the 13 factors in preparation, the message needs to be reinforced that it does not form part of the evaluation. RD advised no matter what way it is submitted it is important for the group to meet and discuss the questionnaire before the interview. |
| Rescheduling | Clarification is required on the rescheduling process. | AT provided the following clarification: Rescheduling should not be the default and where there are still 2 job holders within the group the interview will go ahead. However, where a job holder is unable to participate in the scheduled interview, resulting in the representative sample not capturing an appropriate representation of genders within the role, the interview will be rescheduled or alternatively the interview will progress as planned with an additional interview scheduled to include the employee(s). The names of those who are unable to attend will remain on file in case there is a requirement for job holders to participate at a later stage, although most positions should only require 1 interview. The maximum of 5 job holders are invited to interview where we have enough volunteers, regardless of the volumes associated with the position.  |
| Briefing | What is the format of briefings now?  | AT advised the briefings remain online via MS Teams and confirmed line managers are invited.CH asked if Trade Union representation could be reinforced at the briefing as there are members that are contacting their Trade Union at short notice looking for representation.  |
| Quality Assurance and Consistency Checking | Is quality assurance and consistency checking robust for the secondary benchmarks?  | RD and AT confirmed the process remains the same as the benchmarks. |