**Operational Steering Group – 09/09/2019**

|  |
| --- |
| **Present:** |
| Julia McCreadie (Chair) | JMc | Development & Regeneration Services/GCC |
| 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 |
| David McLelland | DMcL | Education/GCC |
| Janice Timoney | JT | Finance/GCC |
| Susan Deighan | SD | Glasgow Life |
| Eileen Marshall | EM | Neighbourhoods & Sustainability/GCC |
| Jackie Kerr | Jackie K | Social Work/GCC |
| Rhea Wolfson | RW | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbour | GA | GMB |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison |
| Mary Dawson | MD | Unison |
| Jean Kilpatrick | Jean K | Unison |
| Mandy McDowall | MMcD | Unison |
| Wendy Dunsmore | WD | Unite |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor (External) |
| Julie Emley (Notes) | JE | Corporate HR/GCC |

|  |
| --- |
| **Apologies:** |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite |
| Jan Buchanan | JB | Finance & Corporate Services/Glasgow Life |

**Notes**

1. **Matters Arising – Carole Forrest Letter 05/09/2019**

AT provided an update on the points raised in the email from RW dated 30/08/19

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Trade Union Question/Statement** | **Response** |
| **Selection Process** |
| 3.4 Please can we be supplied with the list of identified JE Liaison Officers who will be crucial in our service specific working?  | Covered in Carole Forrest letter |
| 3.7 We would like this paper to reflect the fluid nature of job evaluation and that the initial suggestion from the JE team to the OSG about numbers is neither a floor nor a ceiling and interview requirements will be continually assessed based on the needs and feedback from the Job Analysts. | The outcome of evaluations will need to come back to the OSG but there needs to be an acceptance that this will include interview outcomes.  |
| 3.7 Given the Trade Union density in Glasgow City Council is approximately 85%, the joint trade unions would like to see 85% of nominations being made by trade unions.  | This is a partnership arrangement which is why the allocation is 50%. There will be no change to the allocation of 50%.  |
| 3.7 We will provide SAP numbers where possible but reserve the right to provide other identifiers and trade unions nominations will not be kicked out for lack of SAP number. | There is no suggestion of this but meaningful identifiers will need to be provided. |
| 3.8 With trade unions making 85% of initial nominations, the Council need provide fewer reserve people and this will ensure trade union nominees have a floor of 50% of people, but can continue in the way as identified in 3.8. We would like clarification on what guidance will be given to management to identify individuals and how people will be selected from that group i.e. in what order and why? | As advised, 85% has been declined. The information supplied to Management will be the selection criteria from the SJC Scheme practice manual.  |
| 3.10 As discussed at the OSG meeting, we can't accept this term. Suggested alternative: The Job Evaluation Team will implement the process described in 3.1 to 3.9 above. However, in exceptional circumstances the Job Evaluation Manager may submit a proposal to the OSG for approval to deviate from the agreed process. | Agreed, this will be revised in the selection criteria document and circulated.  |
| No jobholder will be forced into taking part. This principle should be built into this paper. | Employees will not be forced to participate in interviews. The selection criteria applies the principles to ensure employees are comfortable, they can opt out if they want to.  |
| **Travel & Overtime** |
| Travel & Overtime | Conditions of Service apply for travel expenses. If employees use My Portal they can claim back their expenses through the process that is already in place. If not, there will be a reimbursement process operated at the hubs.  |
| **Communications** |
| Communications | In addition to the letter there are well established protocols in place for this i.e. public facing website, local briefings and comms champions, in line with the GCC comms strategy. The full comms plan has been included in the papers.  |
| **Trade Union** |
| A much longer roll out plan that allows trade unions to build in our own processes with our members | This is a matter for the Trade Unions to deal with. |
| We believe that there is a need for a Job Evaluation specific Facilities Agreement to ensure that all members are able to be supported throughout the JE process and that trade union reps across the city have continuity and clarity. | This has been addressed in the letter from Carole Forrest. There have already been a number of requests that have been agreed to date and we will continue to support this.  |
| **Organisation Charts**  |
| Organisation Charts  | A commitment has been given to this in line with the positions that are being evaluated.  |
| **Pre Cleansed Data** |
| Pre Cleansed Data | Approach to this was discussed at the Job Evaluation Working Group. Some job titles have been grouped together e.g. clerical differentiations. No jobs have been excluded. **Action:** **AT agreed to set up a session with RW to review this data.**  |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. RW referred to the letter from Carole Forrest and advised that there is no clarity as to who the actual decision maker is at the OSG and that there doesn’t appear to be any clear function or purpose for the group. RW stated that it shouldn’t be up to the Job Evaluation Manager to make decisions as an individual and queried who is actually tasked with leading the group. RW stated that the Trade Unions need to be able to discuss with the group if they are not happy and advised that the group seem to just be going round in circles. RW asked where the position in the letter came from. WD expressed concern that the letter undermines the OSG and stated that the integrity of everyone in the group will be questioned at Employment Tribunal if this is not rolled out properly.
	2. RW referred back to the email the Trade Unions sent in on the 30/08/19 and stressed that their concerns are that they are not getting sight of practical documents. RW welcomed the idea of petty cash at the hubs but advised that there is a need for local guidance with regard to the processes that are being put in place. RW stated that they do not believe that the depots and Managers are currently equipped for this and that fundamental work needs to be done to build the framework for partnership working. RW highlighted that the processes for questionnaires and consistency checking still need to be put in place.
	3. DMcL challenged the views of RW and advised that the TOR for the group has been agreed. DMcL stated that there is an appetite to move forward so that the finer details can be fleshed out over time. RW expressed concern again that the TOR is not working as there are no decisions made at the OSG and highlighted the need to be able to revisit items if it is clear that they are not working. RW advised that the unions are fully aware of the financial pressures that GCC face and are keen to support the process, however, this needs to be done right. MMcD reiterated this and advised that the building blocks need to be right so that big issues don’t arise. MMcD highlighted again that the practical measures and processes are important e.g. Gauge, Job Analyst questions and scripts. The unions highlighted that they are not delaying go live for the sake of it, this is challenging and is a new environment that needs to be implemented properly. AT advised that the Analysts are currently developing scripts and FAQ documents.
	4. DMcL raised a risk with a regard to delays for the front line as this could be misinterpreted by the workforce. WD advised that the workforce don’t appear to know what’s happening and they need to know. WD reiterated that they need to build the foundations first.
	5. WD stated that the written response from Carole Forrest undermines the OSG and highlighted that issues should be resolved within the OSG, this should not have went external. LN advised that the timelines within the letter are outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding. WD advised that this was not agreed to by the Trade Unions in the MOU.
 |
| 1. **Go Live**
	1. Unison expressed concern that no further mock interviews have been scheduled and advised that they are disappointed that they have asked on 2 occasions for mock interviews and nobody has got back to them. AT advised that the mock interviews are ongoing and have no impact on the ability to go live. Jean K highlighted that the TU representatives need enough advanced notice for this as they still are still representing at meetings. **Action:** **AT agreed to share the schedule of mock interviews.**
	2. WD queried the readiness of the Analyst teams and asked RD’s opinion if they are ready. RD advised that she had not been involved with the team over the last couple of weeks but advised that 2 weeks ago some seemed ready, however, they need to be sure and they need to be able to say they are ready. AT advised that one to one meetings are being carried out by the Managers and every Analyst met with has said they are ready, some feel nervous about going live but they will feel nervous whenever this happens. AT stated that the Govan hub don’t feel nervous and are ready.
	3. MMcD asked if the issue with the text dropping off from Gauge had been sorted. AT advised that he was aware of this and the issue with the help text. **Action: AT has a follow up call with Pilat 10/09/19 to gain reassurance that the issues are being resolved.**
	4. RW stated that if processes can be put in place they would not be too far off sign off. LN stated that she was encouraged by this feedback and advised that the feedback sessions as part of the soft launch will be collaborative with the Trade Unions and will help thrash out any early issues. RW advised that GMB couldn’t agree to the 16/09/19 but highlighted that the group are getting close. A proposed launch date for the first briefing was agreed for the 01/10/19.
	5. LN advised that the initial benchmark group order for the soft launch may need to be revised due to the October week. RD suggested that the first briefing should go ahead on the 1st October as we have a longer period in between before the interviews. WD stated that this would be beneficial as this would allow more time for preparation and to complete the questionnaire. AT highlighted that analyst team annual leave would need to be factored in. SD highlighted the importance of comms in the process to get teams ready.
 |
| 1. **OSG Sub Group**
	1. JT raised a concern that the OSG are getting bogged down in too much detail and suggested that a sub group is established. JT suggested that the sub group should consist of key individuals from the Trade Unions and members of the Job Evaluation Team so that items can be talked through in advance of the OSG, allowing the OSG to be a decision making meeting. MMcD advised that this would be welcomed. **Action: AT to set up sub working group.**
 |
| 1. **Communications (AA)**
	1. The all staff communication is now with SIT/CGI and the indication is that this could be out early next week. On the same day of the letter an all council email will be issued. A pre note for Managers is also being prepared and a draft will be circulated round the group once prepared.
	2. MMcD raised a concern that there are different versions of the SJC Job Evaluation Scheme in circulation and asked RD if GCC have the most up to date version. RD advised that the version provided by her for GCC is correct and the most up to date a version. RD confirmed that it is only typos and other minor amendments that have been made to the document which is being used by the Job Analysts.
	3. RW highlighted the importance of local managers knowing what their roles are in the process, this is a risk for non pc facing staff. AA advised that the plan outlines the approach, and that there will be repetition throughout the process which is good. Layered comms will be used (corporate and local). RW stated that GMB are still concerned about the fragmented workforce but this could be looked at by the sub group.
	4. **Action: RW to send over suggested changes to the comms plan to AA.**
	5. AT talked through the recent changes to the briefing document that will be issued with the letter. SD had concerns over the language used in the 3rd paragraph on the 1st page and advised that this would cause confusion as to which employees are in scope. Jackie K highlighted that the timescales need to be revised in the document. **Action: AA and AT will review the wording and the revised document will be circulated before issue.**
 |
| 1. **Project Plan (NA)**
	1. The provisional soft launch date has now changed to the 1st October 2019.
 |
| 1. **Hubs update (AT)**
	1. **Govan**
* The team have moved in and are settled.
	1. **Anniesland**
* The team are moving in 10/09/19.
* Window frosting will be used on the large public facing windows.
	1. **Eastgate**
* Space within Eastgate is no longer available.
* We are working on securing another space and a proposal is now with DRS.
* **Action: AT to provide an update to the OSG on this when available.**
 |
| 1. **Interim Grading Arrangements**
	1. Jean K asked for clarification on interim grading arrangements.
	2. LN advised that this is BAU and current WPBR department arrangements still stand. The HR teams should notify the Job Evaluation team of the outcomes, which will then be recorded for future reference. Regrades will be picked up through Job Evaluation at the end of the process.
 |
| 1. **Next Meeting**
* An additional OSG to be scheduled for W/c 23rd September 2019
 |