**Operational Steering Group – 26/11/2019**

|  |
| --- |
| **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 |
| David McLelland | DMcL | Education/GCC |
| Christina Heuston | CH | Social Work/GCC |
| Rhea Wolfson | RW | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbour | GA | GMB |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison |
| Mary Dawson | MD | Unison |
| Jean Kilpatrick | JKilp | Unison |
| Wendy Dunsmore | WD | Unite |
| George Murdoch | GM | Unite |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor (External) |
| Julie Emley (Notes) | JE | Corporate HR/GCC |

|  |
| --- |
| **Apologies:** |
| Julia McCreadie | JMc | Development & Regeneration Services/GCC |
| Jackie Kerr | JK | Social Work/GCC |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite |
| Andy Waddell | AW | Neighbourhoods& Sustainability/GCC |
| Mandy McDowall | MMcD | Unison |

**Notes**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Variations**

AT talked through the variations paper* 1. AT explained the rationale behind the additional variances for Social Care Worker (FW). This was accepted by the group.
	2. RW advised that she had some queries with regard to the variances, in particular the Cleaner and Catering Assistant positions within DRS. **ACTION: RW to send over list of queries and possible variances so that the information can be validated by the services. The variances document will be updated for review again.**
	3. BS stated that the Clerical Officers may be an issue as they might have different roles depending on what service they work for, BS used Neighbourhoods & Sustainability and DRS as examples. BS asked if all of the Clerical Officers have been included in the numbers. JT advised that she will look in to this but stated that although the locations are different the range of duties should be the same. GM stated that work at a depot would be very different to an office environment.
	4. RD queried the number of interviews that are being committed to for the positions at this stage and advised that she felt that the numbers are too high. AT agreed that this was a valid point and will review this as part of the clarification of the variations. BS asked how the numbers had been decided. AT advised that this was based on the size of the population, variants and gender mix. RW stated that there is a need to factor in revisiting positions. AT agreed and stated that there is a need for this to be open ended with reports back to the OSG in order to complete a cohort.
 |
| 1. **OSG Papers**
	1. WD raised a concern with regard to the late issuing of papers for the OSG and advised that they cannot turnaround a decision within these timescales. WD stated that Trade Union internal processes are not being considered and as every paper for the OSG is being issued late it leaves the group feeling unprepared and unable to make informed decisions. WD advised that if this continues they might not be able to attend future meetings. JB advised that the interim meetings have impacted the turnaround time for producing papers. JB advised that this has been taken on board and the team will do their best to issue papers for the meetings with at least 2 working days’ notice. **ACTION: Papers for the OSG on the 9th December 2019 to be circulated by the 4th December 2019.**
 |
| 1. **Consistency Checking**

AT presented the paper* 1. AT advised that the comments submitted in the version supplied by RD were more detailed but very similar.
	2. BS advised that the role of the grade 6 Analysts in this process needs to be reconsidered. AT advised that the grade 6 Analysts have a different role and are heavily involved at a local level, the notes from the Analysts are crucial to this process and the Senior Analysts will have had discussion with the Analysts to ensure they have all of the details for the next stage.
	3. BS raised three concerns with regard to this process
* All of the Analysts involved in the process should be involved
* The Job Evaluation Analysts have advised that they would benefit from it
* The Technical Adviser has recommended that the Analysts are involved
	1. RD highlighted that Glasgow is different due to the size and hub model and advised that she feels that there is a need to have a mix and bring together everyone who is gathering information, not just the Senior Analysts. RD advised that over time the right balance will be found to ensure the right mix is involved but there is a need to utilise everyone who has been involved service by service.
	2. LN informed the group that the Glasgow process is different for the following reasons
* Glasgow started from a different place than other Councils
* The make-up of the team is different to the SJC structure as the Analysts are paid the rate for the job and are not part time Analysts.
* The scale of Glasgow compared to other Councils is much greater
* Three hubs have been established to take job evaluation out to the communities, this adds another layer of complexity.
	1. LN advised that there is a need to see outputs first to understand if there is a need to bring back the process and revisit it. RW agreed that flexibility is needed but advised that excluding the grade 6 Analysts is not flexible and is a waste of talent. LN advised that she would like to create opportunities for development but it would need to be made clear that it is for development purposes. LN also highlighted that Glasgow is very different to other councils due to the hierarchy. BS stated that this is part of the problem as it is an HR staffing model and this takes away an information source. AT disagreed with this and re-iterated that the Analysts still play a crucial role during the discussion and debate stages with the Senior Analyst. MD stated that if there are questions about note taking at a later stage it should be the Grade 6 Analysts that answer them. RD advised that it doesn’t matter who takes the information forward, it just needs to be the right people, which could be a grade 6 or 7.
	2. JB advised the group that it is impossible to agree something at this stage that will be exactly fit for purpose. **ACTION: JB proposed a review of the paper at the next meeting on the 9th December. BS advised that if the same paper is presented for review the Trade Unions will not agree to this.**
 |
| 1. **Equality Checks (AT)**

AT talked through paper* 1. AT advised that he does not see this document as being final as it should be under constant review.
	2. RW advised that the document produced was not what she expected and advised that the following areas need to be included and/or expanded on.
* Age
* Communication methods
* Interpreting and the service providers
* Flexible working arrangements
* Flexibility with interview times to assist with arrangements outside of work
* Travelling expenses
* Reporting procedure for equalities breaches
	1. LN reiterated to RW that this is not the finished document and asked RW to send over her feedback for consideration. RW advised that this should also have milestones attached with another review of the document after the first cohort. **ACTION: RW to send feedback**
 |
| 1. **Next Meeting**
* Monday 9th December 2019
 |