**Operational Steering Group – 14/11/2019**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |
| Carol Connelly | CC | Development & Regeneration Services/GCC |
| Andy Waddell | AW | Neighbourhoods& Sustainability/GCC |
| David McLelland | DMcL | Education/GCC |
| Rhea Wolfson | RW | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbour | GA | GMB |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison |
| Mary Dawson | MD | Unison |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison |
| Mandy McDowall | MMcD | 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 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Notes**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous Notes**     1. BS requested an update on the job holder journey documentation. AT advised that he is working on this with AA. **ACTION: Draft documentation to be issued to OSG before published. (AT)**    2. BS advised that the unions have not received the letter providing the GCC legal stance on the SJC Scheme version being used. **ACTION: LN advised that she will chase this up and come back to the Trade Unions before the next OSG.**    3. BS advised that an update on Lessons Learned is required. LN advised that this is currently with Peter Hunter and GCC are waiting on a response from him. BS advised that this has moved on since then as there was a meeting after this with the Chief Executive and an agreement was made to bring someone in from the Improvement Service. **ACTION: LN to chase this up with point 1.2 and come back to the Trade Unions before the next OSG.** |
| 1. **Soft Launch Feedback**    1. AT tabled a paper providing average scores from feedback obtained from Job Holders, Line Managers and Job Analysts. MMcD informed the group that she has a visual impairment and handouts on the day are an issue for her.No further documentation should be tabled on the day, all documentation for discussion to be issued in advance**. ACTION: Issue a copy of the feedback document to the OSG. (AT)**    2. AT advised that the questionnaire was emailed to 55 people and there was approx. a 25% return rate. The feedback obtained was mainly positive and comments had been grouped as positive, negative or neutral. AT stated that the negative comments were probably the most helpful as they can all be addressed. RD advised the OSG that she could not support the high average scorings from the Analyst feedback as herself and the mentors had done work on this with them and felt that the Analysts are not quite there yet.    3. The Trade unions felt that the document could not provide an accurate reflection of the soft launch and stated that they would be unhappy with this being used as a formal document. The Trade Unions highlighted issues with the low response rate, data set size and advised that feedback should be anonymous in order to encourage transparency, participation and honest feedback. DMcL stated that although numbers were small the feedback is still helpful. **ACTION: JB advised that the feedback survey needs to be in a better format and the process/method should be reviewed with reports produced for the OSG. (AT)**    4. MD raised concerns with regard to the cascading of information across the services and stated that this needs to be continual and consistent at all levels. JB advised that there is a commitment from the OSG for this and if anyone is made aware that this is not happening it needs to be reported back to the OSG so that it can be addressed. |
| 1. **Local Guidance**    1. AT talked through the paper. RD advised that this should come back to the OSG in manageable chunks and only after it has been fully worked through by the Analysts.    2. MD raised a concern with regard to the reliability of EDRMS as sometimes the system goes down. AT advised that EDRMS is the document management system used by GCC and creates transparency across the hubs. |
| 1. **Consistency Checking**    1. AT talked through the paper and highlighted the need for a slightly different process as Glasgow is unique due to the 3 locations.    2. BS advised that the Trade Unions will need time to review this paper and the Grade 6 role in this process. MMcD stated that more information around the tasks would be helpful.    3. RD advised that she feels that there is a role for the Grade 6 Analysts in this process as there is a need for a mixture of Analysts.   **ACTION: JB asked for comments and feedback from the OSG by the 25/11/2019 so that this document can be reviewed again at the next OSG. (ALL)** |
| 1. **First Cohort/Go Live**    1. AT talked through paper, volumes and the spread of jobs selected. AT advised that they would like to front load briefing sessions for the first cohort before the Christmas break. AT highlighted that factors such as Analyst holidays and conflict of interest need to be considered for scheduling which means that we can’t schedule too far in advance. AT advised that he would like the OSG to agree the cohort and the approach at this meeting.    2. RW advised that she understood the logic for this approach but the cohort is made up of high volume equal pay positions which would impact the turnaround timescales for the Trade Unions. RW suggested reshuffling the proposed groups. AT advised that it was agreed at the sub group that HR/Management nominations could be factored in first whilst the Trade Unions collated in their nominations. RW stated the Management nominations are still a problem as the nominations still have the right to Trade Union representation and would require briefings beforehand. RW raised a concern with the Analysts knowing which nominations are HR/Management and which are Trade Union as this might cloud their perceptions. AT advised that he did not see this as being an issue due the high volumes of Trade Union members.    3. WD advised that union timescales need to be factored in to the plans and schedule. BS advised that realistic timescales for the Trade Unions would be approx. 5 – 6 weeks minimum. AT advised that we would only be looking at approx. 170 people which would minimise impact. JB advised that we will work as far in advance as possible but there is a need for flexibility in the plan. LN highlighted the need to get a regular pattern in place i.e. Briefings on a Monday and Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday interviews.    4. BS suggested swapping the home carer for the Social Care Worker (fw) as they would be closer to being ready for this. **ACTION: OSG agreed to swap Home Carer with Social Care Worker (fw). (AT)**    5. MMcD stated there is a need to be realistic about the timescales involved for questionnaires and interviews. BS stated that he also has concerns about services allowing appropriate time for the completion of questionnaires. JB advised that the timescales have come up in Glasgow Life and her guidance has been that it will take as long as it takes as we won’t be able to fully understand the timescales until we are up and running.    6. GM raised a concern with regard to interviewing 4 on 4 off employees. LN advised that there will need to be a degree of flexibility involved in the interview schedule for this. RW advised that she feels there is a need for a guidance document specifically aimed at shift workers.    7. WD stated that there is a need for a step by step job evaluation guide to assist Line Managers, Trade Unions and employees as people need to feel confident going through job evaluation. JB advised that this is something that could be developed over time but there is a need to get started so that job evaluation becomes normal business and people start talking about it. WD stated that there is a lot of scrutiny over this project and the OSG need to make sure that everything is right first before they proceed to go live. RW agreed with this and advised that confirmation of the minimum time for questionnaire completion (RW suggested possible 10 working days as a minimum) is required as well as the variations before go live. DMcL disagreed with this and stated that this is a balancing act which could be looked at further down the line. AT advised that he did not see this as a barrier to going live as not everything is needed upfront. LN advised that she has started talking to HR Management about the variations. BS stated that this exercise should have been done by now by the services. **ACTION: Variant information to be supplied for review by the OSG. (LN & AT)** |
| 1. **Equality Checks**    1. RW advised that an equality report is required before there will be a commitment to go live. **ACTION: Equality report required for the next OSG. (AT)** |
| 1. **Travel Expenses**     1. AT talked through the paper.    2. The Trade Unions stated that they were concerned by the balance of how grades impact on the ability to claim mileage. BS stated that the lower grades (below grade 5) are less likely to be set up to claim. MD advised that this would be disadvantaging their lower paid members. The Trade Unions advised that this could not be accepted as this would be discrimination. WD advised that OSG pushback is needed on this matter in order for policy review to be considered. LN reminded the group that considerable change has taken place with the introduction of petty cash at the hubs and there is a limit on what we can push back on. LN advised the group that the additional provisions that have been made with regard to Travel Expenses are for Job Evaluation only and they are only for the front end of the project**.** The Trade Unions advised that the issue of mileage claims needs to be escalated as they cannot accept this. **ACTION: LN agreed to take this back to clarify the rules.**    3. The Trade Unions requested clarification on colleagues claiming travelling expenses whilst attending interviews with employees. RD referred to the SJC scheme practice manual and advised that there is no difference between a colleague and Trade Union rep in the manual. WD stated that if a colleague gets paid time off to attend the interview then it would be classed as council business. **ACTION: LN to clarify rules for colleagues** |
| 1. **Project Plan (NA)**  * Soft launch and go live have been differentiated * Go live date left out until agreed   **ACTION: Version control and dates to be used on Project Plans. (NA)** |
| 1. **AOB**    1. BS requested the number of interim grading arrangement requests submitted by department. **ACTION: Details to be provided to OSG. (LN)**    2. LN advised that a half day job evaluation session will be organised with the OSG and facilitated by RD.    3. Interim OSG to be arranged W/c 25/11/2019. The meeting will be restricted to one hour and will focus on Equalities and variants. **ACTION: Organise meeting (NA)** |