**Operational Steering Group – 12/02/2020**

|  |
| --- |
| **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 |
| Janice Timoney | JT | Finance/GCC |
| Eileen Marshall | EM | Neighbourhoods& Sustainability/GCC |
| Christina Heuston | CH | Social Work/GCC |
| Rhea Wolfson | RW | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbour | GA | GMB |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison |
| Mary Dawson | MD | Unison |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor (External) |
| Julie Emley (Notes) | JE | Corporate HR/GCC |

|  |
| --- |
| **Apologies:** |
| Wendy Dunsmore | WD | Unite |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite |
| Andy Waddell | AW | Neighbourhoods& Sustainability/GCC |
| Mandy McDowall | MMcD | Unison |
| David McLelland | DMcL | Education/GCC |
|  |  |  |

**Notes**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous Note (JB)**
	1. Previous Note approved
 |
| 1. **Consistency Checking**
	1. The Trade Unions advised that there are concerns with regard to consistency across the hubs. BS advised that he is aware of inconsistencies in approach with regard to quality assurance and the Job Overview Document (JOD). BS advised that he is aware of JODs being amended and asked why this would happen before going to the line manager. RD advised that a JOD shouldn’t go out to the line manager and job holder until it has been queried by the analysts and all evidence has been captured. RD highlighted that the JOD is then queried again by the line manager and job holder in order for them to identify if there is anything else that needs to be considered by the analysts. AT acknowledged that discrepancies have occurred with regard to quality assurance across the hubs but advised that the changes are documented and fully auditable as every version of the JOD can still be seen. AT advised that a session has been organised for Friday 14th February with the Leads and RD to tackle this issue and acknowledged that job holders might feel uneasy if the document they see is not the same as from the interview. JB advised that this issue was highlighted to her by EC and stated that she is comforted to hear that a session has been put in place to address this.

**OUTSTANDING ACTION 09/12/2019: Issue revised consistency checking document to OSG (AT).**  |
| 1. **Hubs**
	1. RW stated that the analysts at the hubs are feeling frustrated that they are stuck in the hubs and advised that they feel that site visits and interview follow ups are being blocked. RD advised that verification with the line manager and job holder is the next step in the job evaluation process and therefore the analysts need to be careful with interview follow ups as the line manager needs the context of the JOD to fully understand the verification process. RD advised that ground rules need to be set for the hubs and this issue will be discussed at the session that is taking place with the lead analysts on the 14th February. AT acknowledged that the analysts might be feeling frustrated but they are identifying areas for clarification and creating a bank of questions to facilitate the verification process.
	2. RW raised a concern that management issues do not seem to be getting dealt with at the hubs and stated that it would appear that issues are coming to the Trade Unions instead as the analysts feel they have no other outlet. RW stated that concerns do not seem to be getting addressed at the hubs and consistency in approach is an issue. RW acknowledged that this is not a matter for the OSG but advised that it needs to be dealt with by management. JB advised that a separate meeting will be organised for W/c 17th February and this will be discussed there.
	3. BS raised a concern with regard to the lack of city wide meetings for the analysts. BS stated that the job evaluation process needs to be cross hub to address the inconsistencies that are occurring. AT advised that regular hub meetings are taking place and a job evaluation management meeting has been set up to allow information to flow in and out of the hubs. AT reminded the OSG that only 3 weeks of interviews have been completed and the issues that are being raised at the OSG are live issues which are being discussed. RD stated that a meeting including all of the analysts could be counter-productive but agreed that there does need to be regular meetings and cross hub engagement to ensure everyone is all on the same page. LN advised that there isn’t currently a schedule of meetings but asked if it would be helpful to formally publish a list for the analysts. JB advised that this would be helpful. BS formally requested regular cross hub meetings for the analysts.

**ACTION: Organise separate meeting (JB)****ACTION: Schedule of hub meetings to be produced (AT)** |
| 1. **Soft Launch**
	1. RW raised a concern with regard to lessons learned from the soft launch and asked for clarification on the status of those who participated in the soft launch. RW asked if the soft launch interviews will be counted as live and asked when they would receive their JOD as they are still waiting on this. AT advised that the soft launch interviews are live but consistency checking hasn’t taken place yet for the soft launch or any of the recent interviews. AT advised that it will be a considerable amount of time before the JOD’s and posts will be revisited, however, verification will take place in this schedule. RW advised that she would like this process included in the project plan.

**Work In Progress:** Job Evaluation Team to work with RD to reach agreement on process and apply firstly to the soft launch. |
| 1. **Status Reports**
	1. BS asked if there is an update on his request for a status report. AT advised that this has been worked on and will be issued. JB advised that this will become a standing item on the agenda. AT provided a verbal update for the OSG on the latest stats.
* Maximum capacity for interviews over the 3 hubs is 9 per hub, totalling 27 per week
* As of 10th February, 46 Job holders had attended interview
* So far, 10 Job holders have withdrawn from the process
* So far, 13 Job holders have rescheduled
* 111 employees have been scheduled to attend interviews up until the 26th March
* Obtaining the required nomination numbers for the Support for Learning has been problematic
* Trade Union nominations still required as more service positions have been seen at this point than Trade Union

**ACTION: Status reports to be supplied and reviewed at the OSG (AT)** |
| 1. **Cohort 2 (AT)**

AT talked through the paper* 1. AT advised that he is looking for the OSG to approve the list of positions for cohort 2, however, advised that the positions identified could be amended if need be. AT advised that the next steps would be for management and the Trade Unions to identify the variations and start the process of identifying nominations. AT advised that cohort 2 would commence at the end of April but briefings would need to start at the end of March.
	2. RW raised a concern with regard to the high volume of jobs included for cohort 2 and advised that this could raise continuity issues for the analysts and would need to see how this schedule would work in a plan. AT advised that note taking will be crucial for the analysts to maintain continuity and highlighted that as the volumes drop off, the number of interviews will drop. AT stated that as a result of this, cohort 3 will include more jobs. AT advised that the schedule will be over a 13 week period and although the co-ordination of this will be more complex it shouldn’t impact the hubs. BS asked RD how many jobs would be recommended for the next cohort. RD advised that the analysts need to evaluate jobs across all services at all levels and advised that the numbers in cohort 2 seem better than cohort 1, there needs to be more than one job in a service for consistency checking. RD advised that cross hub discussions will be required and hub processes will need to be addressed to ensure that each hub operates in the same way.
	3. RW stated that there is a need for the exact number of interviews that will be required and asked how the variations are being covered off. AT advised that the numbers for cohort 1 had been communicated but the services still need to provide the variations for the nominations provided. AT advised that the numbers for cohort 2 will depend on the variations. RW advised that the numbers for cohort 1 had not been received. AT advised that he would send this on. BS requested the headcount for cohort 2 positions.
	4. BS advised that it might be worthwhile moving the Escorts to another cohort as they are often also Support for Learning Workers and were included in cohort 1.
	5. BS asked if there will be focus on prioritising the order of nominations coming through as it might be difficult to get the numbers for all of the positions across in one go. AT asked BS how long it will take to get the nominations across. BS advised that it would take approx. 6 weeks. RW advised that the Trade Unions need to brief their members first in order to establish volunteers. LN asked if there is an opportunity to do briefings jointly (job evaluation team & Trade Unions) as everyone is trying to achieve the same goal and it would help with resources. The Trade Unions advised that this would not be possible. RD advised the Trade Unions that what they are doing at the OSG is joint, as per the SJC, and it is the best way to go through the process for their members. RD offered support to the Trade Unions to help them with their briefing message.
	6. AT asked if the Trade Unions would find it helpful to work with just the management nominations and used the example that the majority of Operative 1 roles will predominantly be union members. The Trade Unions advised that the current agreed split of nominations between management and Trade Unions cannot be changed.
	7. BS stated that funding for implementation needs to be confirmed. JB & RD advised that this is not a topic for the OSG as pay & grading is separate and does not impact on what we are doing now. JT asked BS if the separation between job evaluation and pay & grading is being communicated by the Trade Unions to their members. BS advised that it is.
	8. RW advised that GMB cannot support moving to cohort 2 as they feel that there are issues that are not being addressed from the soft launch and this cohort. JB suggested that issues raised could be discussed at the separate meeting and suggested that preparation should start on the detail supplied for cohort 2. LN suggested an agreement in principle for cohort 2. The Trade Unions advised that there is no barrier to planning and preparation but invites should not start.

**ACTION: Issue cohort 1 recommended interviews & headcount for cohort 2 (AT)****ACTION: Justification for larger cohort – Technical note (RD)** |
| 1. **Questionnaires**
	1. CH stated that the timescales to complete the questionnaire are an issue. CH advised that there are members who have been upset and have withdrawn from the process because of the timescales. CH stated that the timescales are unrealistic and advised that there have been occasions where management have expected the questionnaire to be completed in an hour. AT advised that it is the role of the line manager to support the employee and it is not acceptable for job holders to be stressed. AT acknowledged that the questionnaire is a big undertaking and advised that job holders should always have a 2 week turnaround to complete it, the link to the questionnaire is also included in the invite letter in case job holders want to familiarise themselves with it earlier. JB re-iterated this and advised that the questionnaire will take as long as is required to complete it. JT stated that she was concerned by what CH had highlighted as managers should not be putting pressure on staff. JT advised that line managers within finance have been advised that work needs to be realigned to accommodate the requirements of job evaluation. JT & JB advised that if there are specific instances where the process is falling down they need to be raised at the OSG so that they can be addressed.
 |
| 1. **Travelling Expenses (AT)**

AT talked through paper * 1. JT asked for confirmation that the petty cash is only being used for the project and out at the hubs. AT confirmed that this was correct.

OSG agreed the travelling expenses arrangements |
| 1. **Project Plan (NA)**

NA advised the following in relation to the project plan* High level project plan that captures the last 6 months
* Focus on the go live date for interviews
* Status reports will provide more detail
	1. RW stated that the project plan is crucial and advised that not enough time is being spent on this. RW stated that the plan does not reflect the project accurately and advised that there is a need to know how this project is going to happen as the plan does not take in to account key stages of the past, current and future elements of the project. RW stated that the issues with the project plan timelines need to be addressed now as there are areas within the process that are missing and not getting talked about e.g. the matching process. JT agreed that re-baselining and a fuller plan is required. RW requested a revised project plan for review at the next OSG. JT advised that it would be helpful to see key comms activities within the project plan. AA Advised that this could be integrated in with the project milestones.
	2. RW raised concerns with regard to the timelines in the plan and advised that they are not realistic. BS re-iterated this and advised that there is also a need to be realistic about the resources required to deliver the project. JB stated that we are only 3 weeks in to the project and there is a need to monitor progress in order to be able to fully understand the impact on timescales. LN agreed with JB and advised that there is a need to be confident on how the project will be delivered, and when, before decisions can be made on the timetable.
	3. RD asked if an overview plan would be helpful to understand all of the stages of project. The OSG agreed that this would be helpful. RD also proposed a separate planning meeting for OSG members.
	4. RD advised that there is still a large amount of work that has not been completed for Glasgow and stated that the project is under resourced from a project management perspective. RD advised that support would help from someone who has been through this before and there is an offer of help available. JB advised RD that resourcing is not a matter for the OSG. RD advised that she would like this formally raised as an issue. JB noted this for discussion with LN. RD stated that this issue cannot wait another 6 weeks until the next OSG and needs to be addressed.

**ACTION: Revised project Plan to be presented at the next OSG (NA)****ACTION: Overview Plan to be provided to OSG (RD)** |
| 1. **Risk Register (NA)**
	1. JT suggested that an issues log may be needed in addition to the risk register. JB agreed

**ACTION: Consideration to be given with regard to how OSG issues are recorded (NA)** |
| 1. **Communications (AA)**
* Managers’ briefing published in January
	1. RW stated that messages should be tested with staff first to see if they understand what is being communicated to them and highlighted that FAQ’s had been sent in by GMB that they haven’t received a response to. AT confirmed that the FAQ’s had been received and are currently being reviewed. RW highlighted that there is a need to ensure that everything that is being communicated is accurate and asked for anything that will be made public to be reviewed by RD first. RW also asked if planned communications could be circulated round for information in advance of being published to the OSG after being reviewed by RD. AT advised that it would be reasonable for RD to review communications before publication.
	2. BS highlighted that there might be a connection with the message in the briefings and the number of cancellations. BS stated that job holders might be pulling out when it is re-iterated to them that the process is voluntary. BS advised that the Trade Unions are trying to reassure job holders that they are not accountable for the outcomes of Job Evaluation. AA advised that she is concerned that people don’t feel confident enough to continue through the process and advised that the briefing will be looked in to. JB advised that there is a need to revise the communications to ensure the message is getting out there to staff. JB advised that OSG minutes and status updates will be published on the job evaluation website.
	3. RW raised a concern that key information is not getting to front line managers and that answers to staff questions are being sought through the Trade Unions instead which shouldn’t be happening. AA advised that there is a process in place for front line managers but this will be looked at. AT advised that line managers play a key role in the next steps of the job evaluation process and need to understand what is expected of them. RW advised that there is not enough information available on the service arrangements in place to allow job holders to attend interviews. RW stated that although a common sense approach should be applied it is not happening across all of the services and advised that there have been specific issues with DRS. RW advised that Neighbourhoods & Sustainability provided a plan and communicated how the process will work for job holders which was helpful. RW advised that the issues with DRS have been raised at an operational and strategic level but have not been resolved. JB advised that all job holders should be paid as part of the working day and this issue will be raised with DRS.
	4. AT advised that the accepted position list for the benchmark jobs will be published on the job evaluation website to allow staff to see if their jobs match in to a benchmark position.

**ACTION: Job holder Interview arrangement agreements to be clarified with DRS. (JB & LN)****ACTION: Managers Q & A to be prepared. (AA)****ACTION: Briefing content to be reviewed (AA & RD)****ACTION: OSG minutes, status reports & accepted position list to be published online (AT)** |
| 1. **Gauge +**
	1. RW advised that the inconsistencies between Gauge + and Gauge need to be addressed. RW advised that Gauge + is different to Gauge due to the issues with the help boxes. RD advised that this has been acknowledged by the SJC technical group and RD is attending meetings to scope this out, any outcomes that are highlighted from this will need to be implemented for Glasgow. RD advised that the front screen on Gauge + is different to the SJC specification and although this is not fundamental it should match the standard specification. RD advised that AT is dealing with Pilat and any issues will be dealt with through the user group.
 |
| 1. **OSG Meeting Schedule (JB)**
* Meeting timetable updated for 2020
* 6 weekly schedule
* Next meeting either 31st March or 1st April
 |