**Operational Steering Group (OSG)**

**Date: Tuesday 11 July 2023**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present:** |  |  |  |
| **Attendee** | **Initials** | **Title** | **Service (if applicable)** |
| Andy Waddell (Chair) | AW | Director of City Operations | Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability |
| Paul McGaulley | PM | Strategic HR Manager | Chief Executives |
| Alan Taylor | AT | Job Evaluation Manager | Chief Executives |
| Naghat Ahmed | NA | Project Manager | Chief Executives |
| Derek Noble | DN | Head of Corporate Services | Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP) |
| Cara Stevenson | CS | GMB Lead |  |
| Shona Thomson | ST | GMB Representative |  |
| Mandy McDowall | MM | Unison Lead |  |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison Lead |  |
| Graham McNab | GM | Unite Lead |  |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | External Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor |  |
| Julie Emley | JE | Notes | Chief Executives |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Apologies:** |  |  |  |
| **Attendee** | **Initials** | **Title** | **Service (if applicable)** |
| Jan Buchanan | JB | Director of Finance and Corporate Services | Glasgow Life |
| Lorna Goldie | LG | Head of Resources | Education |
| Stephen Sawers | SS | Head of Service | Financial Services |
| Angela Anderson | AA | Senior Communications Officer | Chief Executives |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison Representative |  |
| Sylvia Haughney | SH | Unison Representative |  |
| Jean Kilpatrick | JK | Unison Representative |  |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite Representative |  |

| **Notes** |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous note**
	1. Previous note amendments requested under sections 2.2 and 6.2
	2. Outstanding action to provide PC/Non-PC facing staff split for unique positions.

**ACTION 1:** AT to provide breakdown of PC/Non-PC facing staff split for unique positions for the next OSG.**ACTION 2:** Previous note to be amended and recirculated. |
| 1. **Terms of Reference (TOR)**
	1. AW welcomed PM as the new project sponsor and confirmed a service representative for Chief Executives will be appointed.

 * 1. AW explained the TOR has been amended to reflect changes in OSG membership, however, the document still requires some updates for accuracy. AW asked for any feedback to be passed to NA by next week to allow the document to be updated and recirculated.
	2. PM explained the role of project sponsor sits within Chief Executives.
	3. CS requested the additions of ST and Sean Baillie as GMB representatives.

**ACTION 3:** NA to update and recirculate TOR |
| 1. **The matching process**
	1. AT referred to the presentation slides and explained the following:
* Every employee needs to be accounted for and mapped to a benchmark, secondary benchmark, or unique position. The support team maintain this list.
* Approximately 19,500 benchmark job holders need to receive a matching pack.
* Gena Howe will be supporting this process.
* Due to the complexities, this process will be a regular agenda item.
	1. CS queried the process for non-engagement to ensure all applicable staff can engage. AT explained communication across all staff will be crucial to ensure understanding and engagement and emphasised the role of the manager in supporting job holders with the process. AT advised there will be 3 opportunities to respond with the final communication advising of next steps if no response.
	2. RD advised the following:
* Staff need the opportunity to participate; and to ensure they see the evaluation of their job before anything is implemented.
* Information should be issued to job holders and line managers at the same time.
* Managers will need to lead on the process, ensuring it is treated as a priority.
* Communications need to be clear about what happens next where there is no response. Job holders still have the right to appeal at the appeals stage.
* Analyst time and resources need to be considered as they will be required to assist with non-agreements and queries.
	1. The Trade Unions emphasised the scale of this process and the impact of resourcing across the job evaluation team, services, and Trade Unions. PM confirmed job evaluation team resourcing discussions are taking place with AT and Gena Howe.
	2. The Trade Unions queried if further variations could be identified through the matching process and what the impact of this would be on signing off the rank order of jobs. RD advised other variations will likely emerge as this is what happened elsewhere, however, this would not impact the sign off as this is based on bulk with newly identified variations picked up in due course through the OSG.

**ACTION 4:** AT to circulate 11 July OSG presentation slides.  |
| 1. **Appeals process**
	1. AT advised EC has raised concern about the appeals process and asked the Trade Unions to clarify which aspects of the appeals process are causing concern.

**ACTION 5:** Trade Unions to provide feedback to AT on the areas of concern within the appeals process. |
| 1. **Job holder nominations and illustrative sample size**
	1. AT summarised the document and explained the justification behind ceasing interviews for positions with high levels of consistency in the factor levels.
	2. PM asked RD to give a view on the proposal. RD advised where the sample size of interviews is slightly lower, but the analysts are confident in the consistency, it would be acceptable to consider ceasing interviews for the relevant positions but if there are red flags there is a need to obtain further information.
	3. The Trade Unions advised the following:
* The data needs to confirm the variations that have been covered off through the interviews.
* Feedback from the analysts indicates they would be uncomfortable ceasing interviews for some of the jobs. Consistency information and consultation with the analysts is needed.
* There is a need to try and achieve the sample size for large equal pay groups.
* Analysts need to start going out to job holders for interviews to demonstrate flexibility and encourage participation.
	1. AT highlighted the lack of volunteers which is a concern but confirmed the team can demonstrate flexibility by conducting interviews on-site. AT emphasised the recommended change to analyst working needs the support of the Trade Unions. PM confirmed the logistics of on-site interviews are being discussed with AT and Gena Howe.
	2. RD recommended drilling down into the supporting information to show variations, narrative, and team views on the positions we are looking to close off. AW agreed and MM suggested the Support for Learning Worker could be the first example of this. PM advised the detail behind this should be at subgroup level and recommended a subgroup meeting should be scheduled for this discussion.
	3. BS suggested collective analyst sign off could be an option to give the required comfort. PM and CS advised if this approach was taken it would still be important to understand the context of any disagreements.

**ACTION 6:** Revised data to be provided and discussed at subgroup (AT)**ACTION 7:** Subgroup to be arranged before the next OSG meeting (NA) |
| 1. **Quality Assurance (QA) Quorum**
	1. AT referred to the reissued document that has been discussed at previous OSG meetings and the resolution group. AT summarised the rationale within the proposal and asked for approval for the following amendments to the process:
* Quorum of 3 analysts for secondary benchmark and unique positions.
* Quorum of 5 analysts, where possible, for benchmark positions. Where this is not possible a minimum of 3 will be required for the session to go ahead.
	1. AW requested RD input on the proposal. RD advised the proposal for the secondary benchmark and unique positions would be acceptable but expressed concern about changing the quorum for the benchmark positions, however, also recognised the need for a pragmatic approach where resources are an issue. RD advised it is important to remember the QA arrangements in Glasgow are unique to reflect the scale and the 3 hub approach that has been taken.
	2. CS queried if the concern is more of a resourcing issue and asked what protocols are in place for new starts and analysts returning from long term absence. AT explained it is not really a resourcing issue but advised the following:
* The 2 outstanding Job Analyst vacancies will be filled and there are discussions taking place about additional resources.
* There is an established training process for new starts which has a lead in time before going live, this would include participation in QA.
* Team members returning from long term absence may require a phased approach to contributing again to QA sessions.
* New starts in training and team members returning from absence (where required) can sit in on sessions to observe but would not be included in the quorum.
	1. PM advised the detail around this discussion should be at subgroup level. BS queried the benefit of another meeting when the Trade Unions are receiving feedback from the analysts that they disagree with the proposal. BS suggested a meeting with the analysts with the Trade Union representatives in attendance so they can hear the discussion and responses directly. CS agreed this would be beneficial.
	2. AW acknowledged the subgroup creates another meeting but advised further discussion needs to happen. AW confirmed the proposal will be refined and consideration will be given to the suggestion of analyst input. BS emphasised the need to engage with the analysts for things to be looked at differently.
	3. BS asked for statistics outlining the number of completed individual Job Overview Documents (JODs). AT advised he will collate this information and issue to the OSG.
	4. CS advised there has been feedback from some analysts that they are unable to access local guidance documentation. AT explained there are meetings that inform this guidance and there is also documentation available. AT advised arrangements will be reaffirmed with the team.

**ACTION 8:** JOD completion statistics to be circulated (AT) |
| **Date of next meeting:** Tuesday 8 August 2023 |