**Operational Steering Group (OSG)**

**Date: Tuesday 13June 2023**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Present:** |  |  |  |
| **Attendee** | **Initials** | **Title** | **Service (if applicable)** |
| Jan Buchanan (Chair) | JB | Director of Finance and Corporate Services | Glasgow Life |
| Lynn Norwood | LN | Head of Human Resources | Chief Executives |
| Alan Taylor | AT | Job Evaluation Manager | Chief Executives |
| Angela Anderson | AA | Senior Communications Officer | Chief Executives |
| Lorna Goldie | LG | Head of Resources | Education |
| Stephen Sawers | SS | Head of Service | Financial Services |
| Andy Waddell | AW | Director of City Operations | Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability |
| Tracy Keenan | TK | Assistant Chief Officer | Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP) |
| Sean Baillie | SB | GMB Lead |  |
| Mandy McDowall | MM | Unison Lead |  |
| Brian Fisher | BF | Unison Representative |  |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison Representative |  |
| Sylvia Haughney | SH | Unison Representative |  |
| 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)** |
| Naghat Ahmed | NA | Project Manager | Chief Executives |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison Lead |  |
| Jean Kilpatrick | JK | Unison Representative |  |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite Representative |  |

| **Notes** |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous Note**
	1. Previous note approved
 |
| 1. **Proposed secondary benchmark and unique job mappings**
	1. AT advised the following in relation to secondary benchmark positions:
	* The services have now completed their alternative mapping reviews with Trade Union input offered by the services and considered where requested.
	* Education submission was added to slides after the meeting pack was issued. The updated pack will be sent round after the meeting.
	* Glasgow Life data is still to follow and will be incorporated once available.
	* A managers briefing is being prepared to guide managers on secondary benchmark requirements.
	* The mapping data needs to be finalised before communications can be issued.
	1. AT advised the following in relation to unique positions:
* Desktop evaluation is broadly being discussed as the method, but this still needs to be agreed so that communications can be finalised for job holders.
* A small sample of interviews may be carried out on a sample of jobs, not job holders, for comfort.
* An online briefing will be made available for job holders and managers to advise them of the requirements.
	1. RD queried if the analysts could request an interview for a position if they are struggling to obtain the required information from the desktop evaluation. AT advised this would not be unreasonable.
	2. Unison raised concern regarding just an online briefing option as this could exclude staff that are not comfortable with technology. AT explained online is initially the best option due to the high volumes and allows everyone to access the briefing at a time that is convenient for them. AT confirmed alternative arrangements could be made for staff without access to technology.
	3. Unison highlighted the questionnaire as a barrier to job holder participation and queried if there will be the option of a face-to-face interview if this would be preferable. AT confirmed the team try and accommodate job holder requests where possible but explained this cannot be an option due to the volumes.
	4. JB specified there is a need to understand the PC/Non-PC facing split of staff within the unique positions to understand the impact and discuss solutions further.

**ACTION 1:** AT to issue updated slides.**ACTION 2:** AT to provide breakdown of PC/Non-PC facing split of staff within the unique positions for the next meeting.  |
| 1. **Job analyst team activities**
	1. AT summarised the slides issued in advance of the meeting and added the following:
	* Generic Job Overview Document (JOD) work is new and currently needs to be face-to-face.
	* Where there are inconsistencies in the application of the scheme this will be highlighted through this piece of work.
	* Overall, the team are enjoying working cross hub.
	* Travel is an inconvenience for some of the Analysts.
	1. Unison queried if the following was factored in for analyst hub allocations:
	* Disabilities - AT confirmed if informed of a disability this would be explored through occupational health and reasonable adjustments.
	* Location near home address/more central location – AT advised that many factors were considered; conflict of interest, composition of grades and even hub representation and therefore the locations may not suit all staff home addresses. AT explained a central location would not necessarily be suitable for everyone. AT highlighted this is a finite piece of work that could potentially reduce and move online at some point.
 |
| 1. **The matching process**
	1. AT referred to the flowchart on the 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.
	1. RD explained the following:
* This process was not in the earlier versions of the SJC Scheme.
* The scale of Glasgow will be a challenge.
* Consistency checking needs to be done on the final rank order of jobs before issuing.
* Time needs to be factored in for briefings to ensure job holders and line managers are properly briefed on the process and options.
* It might be better if all jobs within a service can be issued at the same time to avoid job holder concern.
* JOD line managers will need structure for the discussions. These discussions could potentially be done in groups.
* Managers need to flag issues early. The analysts will assist with non-agreements and queries, but management escalation may be required where this cannot be resolved.
* Variations may be identified through this process.
* Other councils have afforded 3 opportunities to respond before closing off the right to query the match. Job holders still have the right to appeal at the appeals stage. 4 weeks could be reasonable for the initial deadline to respond.
* It is important this piece of work is completed before pay and grading start looking at the potential structure.
	1. The OSG stressed the importance of communications throughout this process to ensure everyone involved is clear on the requirements.
	2. SS and JB queried if a 4-week initial turnaround is too long and suggested 2 weeks would make this more of a priority and achieve better outcomes. JB explained extensions could be granted if notified of annual leave, etc. MM advised the opportunity to respond shouldn’t be closed too early. SS highlighted term time staff need to be considered within the timelines.
	3. SB emphasised the responsibility needs to sit with management to schedule the time with their job holders in appropriate meeting spaces suitable for formal discussions.
	4. MM recommended mapping out the process so the OSG can see what all of this will potentially look like. AT advised work can commence on starting to map out the process and explained this will need to be continually brought back for discussion.

**ACTION 3:** Matching process required for the next meeting (AT)  |
| 1. **Benchmark position statistics**
	1. Issued in advance of meeting
 |
| 1. **Job holder nominations and illustrative sample size**
	1. AT summarised the slides providing the rationale for ceasing BM001 – Home Carer nominations and interviews.
	2. Unison advised they would be agreeable to discussion around ceasing interviews providing the 24 nominations they provided are scheduled.
	3. Unison requested a list of the scheduling information for their nominations to help encourage them to see through the process. MM explained this could involve alleviating concerns about the questionnaire and discussing hub location difficulties that could potentially be overcome by the analysts attending their workplace for the interview rather than job holders travelling. AT advised it may not be possible or suitable for the analysts to go to their workplace, as when meetings have been convened out with normal working arrangements this has been done through good will. MM explained job holders need to see the same flexibility from job evaluation that they are asked to provide. AT advised there is flexibility and highlighted that online is still the default method which involves no travel time. RD advised it is best practice for the analysts to go to work locations and this may help with the final push of interviews.
 |
| 1. **Job holder feedback survey**
	1. CH advised Unison have recently become aware of the survey and advised it could be intimidating for job holders to complete due to the volume of questions. AT advised the survey could be reviewed if there is a requirement but explained it has been in circulation for 3 years and provides useful information. AT clarified job holders have the choice to fill it in and don’t have to complete all the questions if they don’t want to. RD advised the comments provided within the survey results are helpful.
 |
| **Date of next scheduled meeting:** Tuesday 11 July 2023 |