



RESOURCES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Panel Report

Public

Date of Meeting: 7 January 2010

Title: PWS REVIEW

Report of: Deputy Chief Executive

Report reference: CE 26 09

Summary: Attached is the report of the former Head of Personnel and Development following his review of the Pay & Workforce Strategy Project.

Questions for / input required from Scrutiny: The Panel is asked to consider the report and in particular the recommendations, which will be considered and auctioned by the new Senior Management Team as appropriate.

Recommendations: To consider the Head of Personnel & Development's report.

Contact Officer: Jason Gooding

Ext: 7009

Note: in compliance with section 100d of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 the report has been prepared in part from the following papers: None

A Review of the Pay and Workforce Strategy project 2005 - 2010

Contents	Page
Contents	1
Introduction and acknowledgements	2
Project overview	3
Review methodology	6
Review findings	9
Summary of recommendations	22
Appendix	23

Introduction and acknowledgements

By the time the Pay and Workforce Strategy (PWS) project concludes in March/April 2010 it will have lasted over 4 years, involved dozens of project staff, cost millions of pounds, and affected every employee, many profoundly. The Council owes a debt of gratitude to quite number of people across the authority for their efforts in this undertaking, probably the largest internal project that there has ever been here.

I do not propose to name such people in this report but they know who they are and what the effect has been on them personally and upon their workload. I can however mention the role in which they have contributed.

Firstly, those staff who serve (and many continue to do so) on the Job Evaluation (JE) scoring, moderation and appeal panels. These people come from all parts of the authority and at all levels. They are either union representatives, managers, or from Personnel and Development Services. They have put in so many hours attending panels and yet it is the hidden work – the crucial preparation needed for each panel – that often gets overlooked. They have put their heads above the parapet on behalf of the authority or their union, sometimes at risk to their own reputations, and fully deserve all our thanks.

Secondly the PWS project team who again come from across the authority. Their contribution put very simply has been immense. Thank you.

Also staff in P&DS who have helped the project team in so many ways e.g. mail-merges, envelope stuffing, handling enquiries, and covering the work of project staff. Thank you also.

Many line managers across the authority have had to read dozens of JDQs (they will know only too well what that acronym means!) identify omissions, and negotiate amendments with their staff. They have also had to supply further information for the project team, work on complex career grades, and attend appeal hearings. Then they had to find the time to prepare for their own evaluations. Thank you too.

Last, and I guess least, we should thank the two Corporate Directors on the PWS Board. Not just for their work at Board meetings but especially for devoting a whole year of their time to sitting on JE appeal panels as a Chairman. JE needed integrity and their presence supplied it. The PWS project needed senior level buy-in and it got in spades from these Directors.

David Williams

PWS Project Manager

November 2009

Overview of the PWS project

The PWS project had 6 work-packages:

- Job Evaluation (JE)
- Equal Pay Review
- Review of People Policies and Terms and Conditions
- Single Status (harmonisation of terms and conditions)
- Workforce Development Plan (WDP)
- PWS Implementation, including pay modelling.

The latter is where all the others are brought together as a new Pay Policy to be negotiated with the trade unions.

The project began with JE and the WDP. Job Evaluation then took nearly 4 years to conclude, and indeed is still ongoing now that JE has become mainstream (it is how we now determine the value – grade – of jobs). The WDP on the other hand proved much easier and was achieved within 12 months. Indeed it is due for a review in 2010. Single Status was handled in two phases: the first concentrating on what everyone agreed were unjustifiable differences in the terms and conditions of staff, namely sickness, overtime rates, and holidays. Other aspects were harmonised later in the project. The review of people policies goes on continuously (as legislation changes and practices evolve) and so the project focussed on those policies related to pay and conditions so as to feed in to other work-packages. The Equal Pay review could not be conducted until we had an outcome from JE and pay modelling and so was tackled last.

The project is in accordance with Prince 2 methodology and as such is overseen by a Project Board chaired by the Deputy Chief Executive. Regular progress reports are presented to Members of the Resource Overview and Scrutiny Panel. Project decisions are made by Members at Employment Panel who make recommendations to full Council for ratification. Each package had a senior officer work-package leader with an associated union contact for each.

There has been extensive communication with employees throughout via the intranet, a regular newsletter, frequent briefings to managers, roadshows, and personal letters.

The whole project has been conducted as a partnership with the unions from the start, and this ethos continued through three years of project activity and into the negotiations that were expected to conclude it about one year ago, Agreement had been reached with the trade unions in December 2008 on all aspects of single status and all elements of a new pay policy. In early January 2009 we had also achieved a Final Negotiated Position on the key issues of a new pay structure, back pay and protection. Two further steps remained before a formal agreement could be reached – a ballot of union members by the two main unions (GMB and Unison) and approval of the package by Members.

GMB conducted their ballot and the result was a resounding endorsement of the deal. Unfortunately Unison refused to go to a ballot and withdrew from the agreement we reached in principle with them. Without the support of both unions a collective agreement to proceed was impossible.

The status quo was not sustainable for several reasons, not least of which is because it would leave us vulnerable to legal challenge, so we were not in a position whereby we could tolerate this stalemate for long. As such senior officers recommended to the Employment Panel at its meeting in June that as a collective agreement was now a remote possibility the Panel should instead recommend to Council that they agree to unilaterally impose the outcome of PWS and to formally consult with our employees on this intention. This they did and following a 90 day consultation and another recommendation from the Employment Panel Council finally agreed on 10 November to implement the new Pay Policy on 1 March through imposition.

In order to put the new Pay Policy into practice legally we must dismiss and offer to re-employ all staff. Thus imposition involves dismissing all employees on 28 February 2010 and re-employing them again on 1 March under new terms. This sounds a lot worse than it is: apart from the changes arising as a result of job evaluation and single status their employment with the Council will in effect remain unchanged. There will be no break in service, no loss of holiday entitlement, no change to their working week, no impact upon their pension etc.

The key PWS project outcomes are that on 1 March 2010:

- 505 staff will gain pay
- 389 of whom will get an immediate increase

- And 116 will gain through future increments
- Those due an immediate increase will also get 32 months back pay
- 218 staff will lose pay in 1 March 2011 after the end of 12 months pay protection
- Although several of these staff are temporary with contracts due to finish before this date
- Those staff whose pay is unaffected number around 70
- Several hundred employees will benefit from harmonised terms
- 250 will go onto an incremental pay scale for the first time
- We will have a modern Pay Policy that is fair, clear, and consistent
- We will have closed the existing pay gaps (once pay protection has ended and people work through their increments) thereby addressing our equal pay issues
- We will have incurred costs close to £3m non-recurring and £1m recurring (pay bill)
- We will have complied with the 2004 National Agreement that prompted the commencement of the PWS project.

The methodology for the review

Approach

Look at Staff Surveys, liP assessments, Future Focus outcomes

Seek views from:

- Heads and Directors
- Management Briefing
- Unions
- Members
- Staff involved in project

Discuss within the PWS Board

Discuss within P&DS and with other work-package leaders

Project Managers' (2) reflections

Examine press coverage

Analysis of the new Job Evaluation database

Use staff feedback from the formal consultation exercise on implementing the outcome.

Timescale

In September the Project Board agreed the scope of the review which was then conducted during October and November.

The findings will be reported to ROSP in due course.

Views to be sought from (and about what specific areas):

1. PWS Board members

- Prince 2 project management
- Negotiations with unions
- Reporting to SMT
- Reporting to JMT
- Reporting decisions/recommendations to Executive, Employment Panel and Council
- Reporting progress to CROS/ROSP
- Risk management
- Press and publicity
- Communication and consultation with staff

- Pay modelling
- Analysis of outcomes: on budgets, on staff, on other Council business

2. The (previous) Project Manager

- Relationship with Board
- Project Implementation Document (PID)
- Local Implementation Agreement with unions (LIA)
- Working arrangements with the project team
- Project budget

3. The project team (various staff from P&DS, Finance, and Community Services)

- Link with project manager
- Work-packages
- Project staffing
- Project budget
- Timescale
- Union partnership
- Pay modelling
- Job Evaluation schemes: choice of, training in, membership and experience of the scoring, moderation, steering, and appeal panels
- National picture
- Links between P&DS and Finance
- Analysis of JE database
- Project management/action planning
- Project administration
- Impact upon the 'day-job' within P&DS

4. The unions (Unison and GMB branch and regional officers)

- Partnership with employer (including LIA)
- Job Evaluation schemes: choice of, training in, membership and experience of the scoring, moderation, steering, and appeal panels
- Consultation
- Negotiations
- Outcomes

5. Elected Members (Portfolio Holder for Finance, Portfolio Holder for Performance, Chairman of ROSP, plus any others as advised by these 3 Members)

- Project monitoring (CROS/ROSP)
- Recommendations from officers (Employment Panel)
- Outcomes
- Financial implications
- Publicity and press coverage
- Portfolio Holder engagement

6. SMT

- PWS Board decision making
- Senior manager engagement with PWS
- Outcomes
- Impact on staff and managers
- Publicity and press coverage
- Financial implications

7. Heads of Service and line managers (using management briefing list)

- Communicating progress and outcomes
- Impact on staff
- Ownership of PWS by managers
- Training for managers and staff re change.

No further feedback was sought from employees as there was at the time an authority-wide consultation exercise underway on PWS implementation and it was felt that this would provide sufficient feedback.

Advance notice was given on 12 October to all the above 7 groups explaining what was to happen and why and requesting their contribution to the review.

Then each of these groups were contacted directly on 16 October and given a 'steer' respectively as to where they were to focus their comments, albeit they were also advised that they could comment on anything they wished with regard to this project. They were asked to respond by 30 October.

.

The review's findings

The key findings are presented within nine themes:

1. The new Pay Policy
2. Financial implications
3. Staffing implications
4. Equality within pay
5. Relations with trade unions
- 6 Project management
- 7 Member involvement
- 8 Impact upon P&DS
- 9 The project's legacy.

1. The new Pay Policy

The aims of this are to have a pay structure that:

- Is based on an objective measurement of jobs
- Can withstand equality challenges
- Is Affordable
- Is Transparent
- Applies equably across the authority
- Is fit for purpose for the next few years
- Is attractive to current and prospective employees.

This has been achieved by:

- The use of Job Evaluation schemes which provide as objective and consistent means of measuring jobs as is possible. Two schemes are used because the Council has such a wide range of occupations that no one scheme suits all. There is extensive checking at the interface between the two (the cross above point) to ensure it is reasonable
- The JE schemes used have been equality proofed. We commissioned an independent equality report on old and new pay structure. The 'old' pay structure would have left the Council vulnerable to equal pay challenges. The new one achieves equality within three years when all current employees will have reached the top of the grade and pay protection ends (after one year).

- Affordable – the on-going pay bill is within the limits set by Council (see section 2 below).
- Transparent – all aspects of the policy are documented, and have been widely consulted upon. Inevitably, however much as we attempted to ‘dot the Is and cross the T s’ there were a few issues that required interpretation. These are all being documented. Where they are outside of the principles agreed, the PWS Board has agreed them (again documented).
- Equality – has been achieved and will be monitored to ensure this remains so. Prior to this policy there was a practice of one directorate in particular making their own payments that were not necessarily in line with the rest of the authority (for historical reasons that were valid in the past but are no longer).
- Fit for purpose – unknown as yet as we really need time to assess this.
- Acceptable – all aspects have been widely consulted upon. Where appropriate/practical, national conditions have been retained. We have also kept the ability to pay recruitment and retention payments, but have put more structure into this. Clearly it is going to be more acceptable to those employees who will gain from the new policy but on the whole, the majority welcome consistent application.

Recommendation 1: the disciplined approach to structure changes as detailed in the new Pay Policy must be applied consistently across all departments hereon.

2. Financial implications

In February 2007 full Council approved the sum of £3million to be provided from reserves to cover the potential impact of the project in terms of non-recurring costs. This initial estimate was based upon 6% of the overall payroll costs, which was the level of increase experienced by some other district councils who had already gone through this exercise. These one-off costs included:

- the costs of the project (mainly temporary staffing but also training, licence fees etc)
- early harmonisation (of holidays overtime and sickness)
- back pay of up to 32 months
- pay protection of 12 months.

Once the project had been implemented there would also be recurring costs which are the impact upon the pay-bill of the new pay structure and pay policy. Council set aside a maximum of £1m for this although in time savings would be needed to offset these recurring costs.

The project stayed within this budget envelope. There remains around £200,000 unspent in the non-recurring reserve, albeit some final costs are still to be determined, and the recurring annual pay-bill is not expected to increase much beyond £835,000. In terms of the outcomes achieved this has to be seen as a success for the project. The review found that people acknowledge the fact that the Council has invested heavily in this project and that there had to be a limit to what could be spent without there being an unacceptable impact upon services and staff levels.

3. Staffing implications

All staff had to be involved in this project and few remained unaffected by its outcomes. Thankfully for the majority of staff it was a positive outcome. Over 500 staff gaining pay and hundreds benefitting from single status is a remarkable achievement when coupled with the fact that the project came within budget.

Nonetheless it also came with a price. The number due to lose pay is over 200 which is a large proportion of the workforce and these staff remain a cause for concern. Council has agreed that a funded career support and development package be put together for these people, the details of which will not become known for some time, and this is generally welcomed.

There is also the Transformation exercise underway. It is not inconceivable that those staff due to lose pay will seize this opportunity to better position themselves. Perhaps for some this could mean the opportunity for redundancy if that is what they want, or, hopefully, they will instead put themselves forward to take on more responsibility as and when jobs become vacant or reorganised and so earn more JE points to regain their lost pay. Indeed maybe this could happen even before they are due to lose any pay, given that the end of pay protection is still over 15 months away and there will be a lot of change in the meantime. Perhaps the support package will derive legal and fair ways in which all the coming changes will serve to benefit those due to lose pay.

Among lower paid employees a good majority will be better off under the new Pay Policy. It is however the case that significant numbers of lower paid female administrative staff will be negatively affected. If it can be said (and it should) that this

project enabled the authority to finally recognise that operational staff are important to the organisation, then it has probably also resulted in some administrative staff feeling that they aren't.

Findings from our liP assessment, the Future Focus exercise, from the Staff Survey, and from the recent staff consultation exercise all make it clear that we have a problem with staff morale as a result of change, for which PWS is clearly partly responsible. The morale of all staff should now be a priority for the new SMT to address.

Surprisingly PWS appears to have had only a limited impact upon staff turnover. Overall across the authority turnover has increased since last year from the norm of around 80 to around 110. However, this is not due to PWS but instead to redundancies through downsizing and other organisational structural changes (e.g. in ECCP, IT, Facilities). Stripping out these multiple redundancies (the first for several years) reveals there has been no significant increase in turnover.

50% of all voluntary leavers during this last year were due to lose pay but equally the other 50% of leavers were due an increase in pay. As over 90% of our staff are affected one way or the other by PWS this statistic offers us no insight.

Over 100 employees responded to the PWS consultation exercise but it is not appropriate to list all their feedback here, indeed this has already been done – within the report to the Employment Panel of 15 October 2009, part A of which is available on CMIS. The unions made proposals too. These proposals and the key issues were presented to the Employment Panel who did formally discuss whether to make changes to the final Pay Policy as a consequence. Indeed one or two changes were approved albeit relatively minor ones. One of the main reasons given by Members as to why they did not make more changes was that the funding was not available. Section 2 above provides the details behind their decision.

Recommendation 2: explore whether the career support package could contain legal and fair ways in which the changes to jobs brought about by Transformation will intentionally benefit those staff due to lose pay.

Recommendation 3: the issue of staff morale across the authority to be a priority for the new senior management team to address.

4. Equality within pay

Equal pay was one of the main drivers behind the 2004 National Agreement and it remains a big issue within local government and elsewhere today. The unions campaign vociferously on behalf of female workers and in most cases rightly so. In this authority however our issue is not so much equal pay for women as equal pay for men.

As Appendix 1 reveals, the existing pay arrangements benefit women in the bottom seven grades (as viewed using the new pay structure) with the bottom five being a cause for concern. Thus nearly 300 male employees currently earn less than female employees with the same JE score as themselves. Legally morally and contractually (the National Agreement) we are obliged to address these pay gaps.

And this, as Appendix 1 clearly shows, we have managed to do: once pay protection has ended and people work through their increments these pay gaps will have effectively been closed. This is a major success for the project.

Sadly we lack the financial resources to do this without quite a number of staff having to lose pay. Female employees are disproportionately represented among the 218 staff due to take a cut. This is not wrong as such and is entirely justifiable. It is however clearly an unfortunate and unforeseen outcome which could only have been avoided had the Council been able to afford a virtually unlimited budget.

To date there have been no equal pay claims. That does not mean that there will not be any in the future but it does mean that should they arise we will be in a strong position to defend them.

5. Relations with trade unions

Given the lack of a contribution to this review from the unions themselves the contents of this section need to be taken in that context.

At the outset the PWS Board sought out a partnership with the unions who reciprocated positively. This partnership, which was spelt out at the start of the project in a Local Implementation Agreement (LIA) was maintained for over 3 years and, in an apparent contradiction, proved to be both a successful and yet ultimately unfulfilled approach.

GMB played the role of sleeping partner during the bulk of the project, albeit their Regional Officer was kept informed throughout. GMB were content for Unison to represent all union members in the five work-packages only getting involved in the final one 'implementation'.

Thus work-package leaders worked with a specified union representative and union officers were trained in job evaluation and performed at JE scoring, moderation, steering and appeal panels.

This was intended as reassurance for both employees and the unions themselves. It also provided the project with a critical mass of trained JE panellists in order to take the project forward. It must be remembered that the unions wanted JE and pushed for its adoption by the Council so this was in their interests also. The union representatives could barely be distinguished from their management or HR counterparts during JE as all JE panellists unambiguously pursued the right (fair) score for each employee: both sides recognising that this was simply not the place for game-playing or banner waving. All decisions made in JE were unanimous: the only correct score was one that all the members of a panel felt comfortable with and I believe Unison deserve great credit for the approach they took to JE scoring.

The partnership approach meant that the early days of negotiations around the final pay model and outcome from the project also continued to be amicable and constructive. It was also at this point that GMB became active in the project and they maintained this attitude in their dealings with both management and the other union. A Final Negotiated Position was achieved in a surprisingly quick time and without threat or pontification by either side. It was at this point that the partnership approach began to unravel, albeit not for anything GMB did.

Unison branch and regional officials now had to involve their Head Office people and they effectively blocked any deal. It was a further six months before Unison re-engaged with the project by which time a collective agreement was impossible and the employer ultimately had to impose the outcome, something neither it nor the unions had wanted. Hence the partnership approach failed to stay the distance but this was not for the want of trying by both unions' local officials.

There will now be an imposed outcome to this project, but at least there has been an outcome achieved, and it has been done without rancour or an industrial dispute.

Our partnership approach was an early example of good practice and we should repeat it where appropriate. National and international research evidence suggests that trade unions can be critical to supporting staff involvement and improved organisational performance, thereby delivering significant advantages in terms of new forms of more effective service delivery, service quality, productivity and efficiency. APSE is carrying out research looking at the role that trade unions can play in engaging the workforce and it is worth following the progress of this work.

The project allowed some individual union members to 'shine' and provided an opportunity to develop their potential in ways that perhaps their 'day job' does not. It has given the unions greater insight into the difficulties of implementing national agreements; however it also revealed the extent to which union national/regional thinking can be divorced from local thinking. Locally the project revealed an issue with the way in which the unions consult with their members which only serves to affirm accepted good management practice that it is the employer's responsibility to communicate with its workforce and not to delegate/abdicate this responsibility to the unions.

Recommendation 4: similar large scale projects in the future should at the onset seek a partnership approach from the unions in order to achieve both smoother progress and a better outcome.

6. Project management

On 1 March 2010 the project will have delivered an outcome (no mean achievement given that this is more than many other councils have managed to achieve) which has been to the benefit of most staff and which is within budget. This is highly commendable.

What it did not do was to come in on time. The PID – the planning document used in Prince 2 projects – envisaged a completion date of March 2008 so clearly we will be implementing the project two years late. This is probably being rather harsh on ourselves. Having never done anything like this before the timescale planning could only be guesswork at best. Some aspects of the project, such as the number of appeals we would face, were beyond our control. It is the case that a rate of 60% of appeals will take twice as long to address as one of 30% which is the reasonable planning assumption we had made. In the event we faced around 60% which alone added one year. Similarly we had a hiatus for 6 months whilst we waited in vain for Unison to ballot on the agreed deal. The causes lay within the union which we could not influence directly.

The original Project Manager was an experienced Prince 2 practitioner and the plans (PID), Board meetings, risk register etc conformed accordingly. The Head of Personnel took over the role for the last third of the project, by then the project was well into its stride and the project team knew what was expected of them.

By far the biggest and most contentious work-package was that of JE. Here inevitable mistakes were made and with the benefit of hindsight, and without in any way criticising those members of the project team involved in this work-package, there is the need to reflect on some of these to see whether any lessons can be learnt.

Probably the biggest mistake we made was to unintentionally and unnecessarily turn some 130 staff against the project, or at the very least lose their support. In the planning for JE we decided that, for what at the time seemed very good reasons, we needed to complete Phase 1 of JE before starting on Phase 2. When, up to two years later, we eventually got around to Phase 2 some 130 staff - perfectly legitimately - gained an increased score from their Phase 2 evaluation over the temporary one they had in Phase 1 with the consequence that 100 gained pay and 30 no longer lost pay. Had these staff known during Phase 1 that this would have been the outcome there would almost certainly have been considerably less resistance and discontent with PWS among the workforce. Perhaps Unison may even have been able to go to a ballot thereby enabling a collective agreement to be reached rather than an outcome having to be unilaterally imposed by the employer. This is speculation of course but there is no doubt that as phase 2 progressed the number of staff coming out in support of the project outcome increased significantly, whereas in Phase 1 it felt as if everyone was against us.

Another issue, again with the benefit of hindsight, was to have introduced what turned out to be a superfluous stage into the JE Appeal Process, namely the Steering Panel. This was used in Phase 1 but dropped, with the blessing of the unions, for Phase 2. It simply added little real value and yet took up an inordinate amount of time and administration. It was there primarily to give reassurance to the unions at the start of the project at a time when they needed to be convinced as to the fairness of our procedures, and in that sense should not be regretted. The lesson for us now is that there is no need for such reassurance anymore – JE is well established, has rigorous procedures, and is effective: it has earned the trust of the unions.

Staff communication was crucial to this project and that was recognised at the onset. However, it is clear that we could have done more to keep staff informed. We tended to wait until we had something to say or the time to say it. It is clear in hindsight that when there was a vacuum staff tended to fill it themselves, and as invariably this was with negative or unhelpful comment or rumour, we should have avoided creating the vacuum in the first place.

It is inevitably true that staff did not want to hear messages that they do not like, but generally the project has gained begrudging respect from many of the staff that face an unwelcomed outcome, for our attempts to explain the whys and wherefores, and for giving them ample opportunity to ask questions and to give their opinions.

As discussed in section 5 above, partnership with the unions on such projects is beneficial and yet the 'contract' embedding this partnership (the LIA) was not a Prince2 device and indeed was introduced against the advice of the Prince2 practitioners. There may be a lesson here about the need for Prince 2 to be more flexible to suit the circumstances of the project.

Recommendation 5: communicate frequently with staff on matters that evidently concern them even if there is little or nothing to say.

7. Member involvement

Members were involved in the project in various ways:

- Monitoring and scrutiny – by CROS/ROSP
- Oversight – by two Portfolio Holders on an ongoing basis along with occasional discussion at JMT
- Budget setting and approval – by the Executive and by full Council
- Decision making – by the Employment Panel and by full Council
- Grievances (temporary JE Grievance Procedure) – by the Member Appeal Panel.

These respective roles are consistent with the Council's Constitution. However some Members also got involved personally from time to time which proved less constructive and which raises the issues discussed below.

The review found no problems with the content amount or frequency of reports presented by officers to Members.

Some Members have asked whether they should not have been more involved in the JE appeal process, presumably beyond their current role which is to sit on a Member Appeal Panel hearing a temporary JE grievance. At the time of writing this report no officer had taken a grievance through the specific temporary JE Grievance Procedure all the way to Members. There is however a possibility that one or two cases may go to Members but almost certainly that is all. This is probably because the JE grievance procedure is limited to the JE process: staff can only raise a grievance about a flaw in

the process and not about their JE score itself (quite correctly as is explained below). But also because the JE appeal process was inclusive and rigorous and so adequately dealt with most issues.

It has been suggested that there perhaps needed to have been more scrutiny of the appeal process by Members although it is difficult to see how this could have been done without compromising employee confidentiality.

It would also have been extremely problematic for Members to have sat on JE appeals. This was recognised at the start of the project and their involvement was, as it were, designed out then. Both the unions and Portfolio Holder acknowledged the good sense of this.

For one main reason: appeals are decided by an objective assessment of each case by people trained in the JE scheme and there is no room for subjectivity if this process is to be fair and seen to be fair. The outcome is therefore determined by expert judgement and for Members to be involved they would have to be specifically trained in the JE scheme and then be willing to spend considerable time over two years taking part in scoring and moderation panels building up their expertise in order to then sit on appeals for a further year. An appeal is not something that can just be 'picked up'.

Were Members to hear JE appeals without being a JE scheme expert then they would inevitably be limited in what they could decide. They could not decide to give a post-holder more JE points as they would lack the knowledge of the scheme to make that judgement. They could not award an individual more pay as that, among other things, would be in breach of their constitutional role. The most they could do is to ask that the post-holder has another appeal hearing heard by experts. Even then, this suggests that in order to make this call Members would have to be sufficiently experienced in the JE scheme. Hence their role is limited to hearing a grievance about matters other than the JE score itself.

Unfortunately a few Members became further involved in JE, seemingly after having been lobbied by individual employees. This raises issues for these employees in that such behaviour may be in breach of the officer code of conduct. But for those Members who became active in campaigning on behalf of individual employees this may be seen to be a breach of the Member Code of Conduct also.

Officers are, for obvious reasons, unable to talk about individual cases in the public domain and understandably unwilling to challenge Members. It may have been made more tolerable for the PWS project team were the Members to have looked into the

claims they had received from staff. Instead these Members seem to have chosen to accept at face value the validity of these cases and then campaigned on behalf of the affected staff, in doing so generating unwelcome publicity for the Council and damaging the morale of the PWS project team.

8 Impact upon P&DS

The project involved considerably more work, and a longer timescale, than anyone envisaged at the outset with the inevitable negative consequence upon the services that this department supplied to other departments and to the authority corporately. For example, the largest (Community Services) had several different Personnel Officers providing it with advice and guidance over four years as this role was performed by temporary/agency staff back-filling for P&DS staff involved in the project among whom turnover was high. Similarly corporate projects such as shared services were hampered by the lack of capacity within P&DS to provide support.

On the plus side it has given those involved in the project – indeed not just P&DS staff - a far greater understanding of how the authority operates and invaluable experience that will hold them in good stead for the future.

P&DS staff should be accorded great credit for their professionalism throughout the project particularly when, following Phase 1 of JE, several of them personally were due to lose pay.

The decision within the new Pay Policy to stick with the national spinal column but to eliminate some points from the grading scheme presented a problem for the design of Trent the HR/Payroll Business System. Indeed we seem to have been somewhat disjointed in connecting the PWS project with this business system. At some point it was inevitable that the two would need to assimilate and yet we left it rather late. As a result we found that we had evaluated jobs that do not appear on the Establishment and as a result confused people and job roles; created a vast record system without a common reference point to the Establishment; agreed changes to job titles with staff / managers at job analysis stage without ensuring proper procedures were followed and therefore causing additional work for the implementation stage. This created problems for ourselves and could have been better handled.

9 The project's legacy

JE is now mainstream and rightly so but this does have implications. Firstly there is no permanent resource: the existing Job Evaluator is temporary and yet JE will be (indeed is already) profound to progressing shared services and Transformation. I am however very hopeful that provision has now been made for this post.

Secondly there is a shortage of trained JE volunteers for scoring panels especially those with sufficient insight to score our higher level jobs. Despite repeated requests of SMT to deliver more volunteers to be trained to support JE there are still far too few to enable the sustainable use of JE. This shortage will put at jeopardy Transformation and shared services as it means the same few are continually being drawn upon.

Indeed as Transformation reduces staffing levels it seems inevitable that we will lose some of these people. Such employees need nurturing, support *and acknowledgement* for the crucial work that they do on behalf of others.

It is not inconceivable that every employee's job will need to alter over the coming year or two and many will need to go through JE all over again so there will be a massive amount of work for the JE scoring panels whose members will need time freed up for such work.

This review found several people believing that the JE scoring should have been done by experts external to the organisation rather than by our own employees trained up for the role. They suggested that this would have been fairer and more acceptable to those staff who lost pay, but of course we will never know. Given that JE is now to be with us for the foreseeable future it is just as well that we do have a home-grown' resource to employ on JE because otherwise we would be incurring consultants fees for ever to pay for the work to be done.

There was evidently mixed ownership from managers of this project: many were active in or supportive of the project, others appeared not to want to know. It probably would have been helpful for those managers who were responsible for going through the process with their staff to have understood as much as the JE trained staff did as to how the information was analysed as this created issues when the scores came out. What is certain is that we need full manager ownership now that JE is to be mainstreamed and be such a key element of organisational change.

Overall I think we should have done more to brief staff on the details of JE prior to their involvement in it, but in mitigation, at that time a number of staff were probably in denial and it is unlikely that they were ready for such information. It was only when the JE

scores came out did some staff start to realise the significance of all of this, which may explain why we had so many appeals. I believe that in future all staff will be fully engaged with the JE process.

Recommendation 6: A permanent Job Evaluator should be put on the Establishment.

Recommendation 7: SMT to address the shortage of staff volunteers for JE.

Recommendation 8: A network for JE panellists should be created

Recommendation 9: Provision (time and support) needs to be made for JE work within each panellist's individual job role.

Recommendations

1. The disciplined approach as detailed in the new Pay Policy must be applied consistently across all departments hereon.
2. Explore whether the career support package could contain legal and fair ways in which the changes to jobs brought about by Transformation will intentionally benefit those staff due to lose pay.
3. The issue of staff morale across the authority to be a priority for the new senior management team to address.
4. Similar large scale projects in the future should at the onset seek a partnership approach from the unions.
5. Communicate frequently with staff on matters that evidently concern them even if there is little or nothing to say.
6. A permanent Job Evaluator should be added to the Establishment.
7. SMT address the shortage of staff volunteers for JE panels.
8. A network for JE panellists should be created.
9. Provision needs to be made for JE work within each JE panellist's job role.

Appendix

Model 18 Gender Equality without protection

Proposed Grade	Gender	Average Current Package		Average Proposed Package		Job Holders	
GR M							
	Female	44853	105.86	45801	104.70	2	
	Male	47480		47954		9	
GR L							
	Female	42090	96.62	41204	96.45	1	
	Male	40669		39742		5	
GR K							
	Female	34881	103.58	35514	101.77	6	
	Male	36128		36143		19	
GR J							
	Female	32666	100.21	32390	100.14	15	
	Male	32735		32435		26	
GR I							
	Female	29068	104.09	29865	102.18	25	
	Male	30256		30515		29	
GR H							
	Female	24933	104.21	27310	98.36	12	
	Male	25982		26861		16	
GR G							
	Female	24480	98.92	25070	100.24	27	
	Male	24216		25131		25	
GR F							
	Female	22092	97.66	22879	99.25	37	
	Male	21574		22707		40	
GR E							
	Female	19879	93.37	19986	98.65	71	
	Male	18561		19717		51	
GR D							
	Female	17671	89.16	17605	99.73	50	
	Male	15755		17557		60	
GR C							
	Female	16368	94.80	16014	98.52	70	
	Male	15517		15777		51	
GR B							
	Female	14998	89.67	14519	97.65	54	
	Male	13448		14178		68	
GR A							
	Female	12766	93.96	12414	99.36	26	
	Male	11995		12334		6	
			0-3 %	No gender bias			
			3 -5%	ok			
			5% and ab	Cause for concern			