**Operational Steering Group – 12/08/2020**

|  |
| --- |
| **Present:** |
| Jan Buchanan (Chair) | JB | Finance & Corporate Services/Glasgow Life |
| Naghat Ahmed | NA | Project Manager/GCC |
| Angela Anderson | AA | Chief Executive’s/GCC |
| Lynn Norwood | LN | Corporate HR/GCC |
| Alan Taylor | AT | Corporate HR/GCC |
| Julia McCreadie | JMcC | DRS/GCC |
| David McLelland | DMcL | Education/GCC |
| Moira Carrigan  | MC | Finance/GCC |
| Eileen Marshall | EM | Neighbourhoods& Sustainability/GCC |
| Karen Hughes | KH | Social Work/GCC |
| Rhea Wolfson | RW | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbour | GA | GMB |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison |
| Mary Dawson | MD | Unison |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison |
| Wendy Dunsmore | WD | Unite |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor (External) |
| Julie Emley (Notes) | JE | Corporate HR/GCC |

|  |
| --- |
| **Apologies:** |
| Andy Waddell | AW | Neighbourhoods& Sustainability/GCC |
| Mandy McDowall | MMcD | Unison |
|  |  |  |

**Notes**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous Note (JB)**
	1. Previous Note approved
 |
| 1. **OSG meeting Principles (JB)**
	* MS Teams format for the foreseeable future
	* Meetings should be a maximum of 2 hours and should not overrun
	* Meetings will be held every 4 weeks on a Wednesday
	* Papers will be issued 2 weeks in advance to allow for any clarification points to be discussed at the meeting
	* Mute if not talking
	* Hand up to speak and the chair will do their best to prioritise the order
	* Drop hand once raised
	* Accept if in agreement to cut down time

OSG agreed the meeting principles |
| 1. **Travel Expenses (AT)**
	1. AT referred to the Travel Expenses Report and advised that this was being brought to the attention of the group for noting.
	2. MC clarified with the group that this does not mean full blown business use and there is usually no extra cost for this on policies and reminded the group that this is to protect employees in the event of an accident.
	3. BS asked if taxis could be considered due to the current guidance on usage of public transport. JB advised that a pragmatic approach to this is needed. JB would not encourage the use of taxis but advised that there is a need to do what we need to do in order to move on.
 |
| 1. **Cohorts 3 & 4 (AT)**
	1. AT referred to the cohort 3 & 4 paper.
	2. The Trade Unions advised that although there are some concerns with regard to the timescales, they are comfortable with identifying variations, however, they cannot agree to job holder identification at this stage. JB confirmed with the group that identification of variations will commence and advised that the selection of job holders will be brought back to a later OSG.
	3. The Trade Unions advised that they are still waiting on updates on outstanding actions from the previous OSG. **ACTION:** **JB agreed that outstanding actions will be brought to the next OSG with an overview of what can & can’t be progressed for each. (AT)**
	4. BS asked for the stats on cohort 1. **ACTION:** **AT to provide at the next meeting**.
	5. RW asked if the job evaluation supporting documentation could be shared with the group. **ACTION: AT to circulate this.**
 |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Framework (AT)**
	1. AT discussed the JE framework paper
	2. RW advised that there is a need to consider the impact on equalities. AT advised that an EQIA is currently underway.
	3. BS asked if external support could be brought in to look at equalities and IT. LN advised that she is confident that there are the right people internally to support this. RD is aware that the Trade Unions have proposed discussions at a national level surrounding the issues raised..
	4. JB asked what the Trade Unions would need in order to progress. The Trade Unions advised that they require the following:
	* Update on outstanding actions
	* The approach to IT
	* Project Plan
 |
| 1. **Remote Testing (AT)**
	1. AT talked through the paper and advised that he was seeking approval to move to the next phase of testing i.e. interviewing job holders from cohort 1 jobs.
	2. The Trade Unions did not agree to this approach and RD advised that she would not recommend this as incorrect judgements could be made if the quality of the remote interview is not the same as previous interviews. RD also stated that this would undermine confidence in the process and advised that it is better to have the process working well before exposing it to actual job holders. RD suggested utilising the HR community and Trade Union colleagues to iron out quirks. AT agreed that this can be done but stated that he would like to discuss the option of using cohort 1 job holders again at another meeting. **ACTION:** **Mock Interviews to be scheduled for HR & Trade Union (AT)**
	3. RD proposed an alternative method for evaluating jobs i.e. Analysts input the content of the questionnaire directly in to Gauge to produce an outcome that can then be talked through with the job holder, ensuring accuracy of understanding. RD advised that this might not be suitable for all job holders but could be considered as an option. AT advised that this approach would be a major shift from the current process and further discussion would be needed before this could be considered.
 |
| 1. **High Level Plan (NA)**
	1. NA advised that the high level plan demonstrates the work that the job evaluation team have been doing during lockdown to progress with the project.
	2. NA acknowledged that the plan that was circulated for the meeting is not what had been requested as the principles & delivery method still need to be agreed. NA advised that in order to assign timescales there is a need to understand the dependencies. NA confirmed that the plan that she is working on will contain outstanding actions.
	3. RW re-iterated the need for a bigger plan and advised that the job analysts should be factored in to this. NA advised that she is happy to receive feedback and comments on activities that need to be highlighted.
 |
| 1. **Next Meeting (JB)**

09/09/2020 |