Personnel Sub-Committee – 
17 June 2019

Staff Management Policy clarification

Purpose of Report
To appraise members of a variation to the Staff Management Policy – Section 25.20 relating to Major Change - to clarify the Council’s procedures in this area.

Attachments:
Appendix 1 – Extract of Staff Management Policy

1.0 Introduction

1.1 In discussion with Management, HR and Trade Unions, it is clear that the current practice for job evaluations is treated as, and considered to be, a minor variation for which approval is delegated to a Head of Service.

1.2 Section 25.20 wording “where changes to a post may result in a higher grade after job evaluation” appears to contradict current policy interpretation and long standing working practices.

2.0 Proposed amendment

2.1 For the avoidance of any doubt, it is proposed to remove this line from the Staff Management Policy so that managers, staff and trade unions are clear on what requires PSC consideration and approval. (See Appendix 1)

2.2 All policy users are clear that the duties and responsibilities of a role are determined through an analytical job evaluation scheme. Failure to implement that outcome could leave the Council at risk of an equal pay claim.

2.3 Minor variations to the accountabilities assigned to a post should be captured in an up to date job description. Managers are reminded that job descriptions must reflect the requirements of a post, not an individual.

2.4 The Council’s job evaluation scheme aims to ensure that the remuneration of a post is of equal value to other roles in the Council with similar duties and responsibilities. Heads of Service are required to manage increases or decreases, identified through job evaluation, within their prescribed budgets.

2.5 In the event that a job role was significantly redesigned, this would trigger a potential redundancy situation (major change) for which referral to PSC would be required under Section 25.20 of the Staff Management Policy. The wording in Section 25.17 would be amended to reflect this. (See Appendix One).

2.6 Over the last 10 years, management has sought to absorb duties and responsibilities from vacant posts to avoid redundancies. In doing so, this occasionally triggers the need for a job to be re-evaluated.

2.7 Two recent job evaluations can illustrate the above practice:

1. A role had taken on the inclusion of duties aligned to the setting up of the NNSRP, for which the demands and responsibilities had not previously been factored into their job evaluation score.
2. A role had taken on additional supervisory duties and the physical and emotional demands of the role had also increased.

Using the Council’s job evaluation scheme, the revised job demands increased the posts job evaluation points. The JE Score is aligned to the pay spine which, in the above examples, resulted in both post holders receiving grade increments.

3.0 Equality implications

3.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment is not required where a variation amounts to improving clarity of policy interpretation. The JE scheme is designed to ensure that jobs of equal value are given equal pay.

4.0 Legal implications

4.1 Failure to implement a job evaluation outcome could leave the authority exposed to a potential claim for equal pay.

5.0 Risk management

5.1 The main risk addressed by our application of the JE scheme is that the Council might be deemed to have unequal or unfair pay arrangements. The JE scheme is designed to mitigate this risk.

6.0 Resource and Financial implications

6.1 Affordability of job evaluation outcomes remains the responsibility of the budget holder. Where the outcome of a JE is an increase in a person’s grade and therefore their pay, the additional costs will be met from existing budgets where possible. If this is not possible, the Council’s financial rules will apply in determining where the additional funding will come from.

7.0 Constitutional Implications

7.1 There are no constitutional implications arising from this proposal.

8.0 Implications for our Customers

8.1 There are no customer service implications arising from this proposal.

9.0 Corporate outcomes

9.1 This proposal contributes to the Corporate Outcomes of:
   • Effective Management; and
   • Employees and Members with the Right Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours

by maintaining fair pay levels and ensuring roles are equally rewarded for comparable duties and responsibilities.

10.0 Recommendations

10.1 Members are recommended to note the above variation.

   [Reason: to clarify the policy and ensure its correct interpretation]
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Appendix One:
Extract of Staff Management Policy: Part D

25.15 Approval to consult on minor changes

25.16 Where minor changes to job roles and teams are being proposed, approval to consult is required from the Head of Service. HR must be informed prior to consultation commencing.

25.17 Examples of minor changes

- Changes to job descriptions that are unlikely to result in a change of grade.
- Changes of line management.
- Office moves.
- Reduction of staffing levels (without redundancy, e.g. choosing not to recruit to a role following a resignation).
- Renaming a role or team.
- Removing essential car user allowance.

Proposed Variation:
To change wording to: unlikely to result in a “significant change to duties and responsibilities”

25.18 Approval to consult on major changes

25.19 Where there are major changes proposed permission needs to be granted by Members via the Personnel Sub Committee to commence consultation with staff.

25.20 Examples of major changes:

- Potential redundancies.
- Creation of new posts.
- Where changes to a post may result in a higher grade after job evaluation.
- Creation or deletion of teams.
- Creation of new shared services.
- TUPE (into or out of the organisation).
- Increases in staffing levels.
- Adding to the establishment (more roles or more hours).

Proposed Variation:
To delete the highlighted text above