**Operational Steering Group (OSG)**

**Date: 18th May 2021**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:** |  |
| Jan Buchanan (Chair) | Director of Finance and Corporate Services, Glasgow Life |
| Naghat Ahmed | Project Manager, Chief Executive |
| Lynn Norwood | Senior Strategic Human Resources Manager, Corporate HR |
| Alan Taylor | Job Evaluation Manager, Corporate HR |
| Angela Anderson | Senior Communications Officer, Chief Executive |
| Andy Waddell | Director of Operations, Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability |
| Moira Carrigan | Head of Financial Systems Control, Financial |
| David McClelland | Head of Service, Education |
| Christina Heuston | Assistant Chief Officer (HR), Health and Social Care Partnership |
| Rhea Wolfson | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbor | GMB |
| Brian Smith | Unison |
| Mandy McDowall | Unison |
| Colette Hunter | Unison |
| Eddie Cassidy | Unite |
| Wendy Dunsmore | Unite |
| Rosie Docherty | Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor (External) |
| Julie Emley (Notes) | Corporate HR |
| **Apologies:** |  |
| Julia McCreadie | Head of Catering and Facilities Management, Development and Regeneration Services |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

| **Notes** |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous Note**     1. Previous note approved |
| 1. **Re-engagement Job Evaluation Process, Job Holder Cohort and Corporate Communications**    1. Alan Taylor summarised the report and proposed communication. Alan asked the OSG for agreement to move forward with the proposals.    2. Rhea Wolfson asked if contact details for the Trade Unions could be added to the communication. Alan Taylor Confirmed that contact details have now been added to the invite templates and supporting documentation.    3. The Trade Unions confirmed their need to re-engage with the services and highlighted that job holders will need to be released for briefings, etc. Brian Smith confirmed that briefings will now be online and condensed. David McLelland confirmed full support of this approach and advised that service management are prepared for the release of staff.    4. Brian Smith asked if the number of job holders within each job title can be provided. Alan Taylor confirmed that he will send this information across.    5. Jan Buchanan asked if the proposals could be agreed so that the project could start again. The OSG agreed recommencement of interviews.   **ACTION: Issue job holder volumes for the re-engagement cohorts. (Alan Taylor).** |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment**     1. Jan Buchanan confirmed that commitments to the project had been raised at an interim meeting with the Trade Unions. Jan advised that the points raised by the Trade Unions are areas that need to be addressed for the project to move forward. |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment – Project Plan**    1. Naghat Ahmed summarised the project plan.    2. Jan Buchanan highlighted that the project plan is a work in progress and explained why the plan does not currently give the level of detail requested. Jan stressed that the project plan needs much more discussion and debate to make the document meaningful and suggested that this should be done at the sub group meeting. Rhea Wolfson acknowledged the progress made but highlighted the need for dates to ensure accountability. Rhea stressed that Rosie Docherty must have input in to the plan. Jan agreed that an end date is required but explained that there are currently too many assumptions to be able to provide a realistic date at this stage. Mandy McDowall highlighted that the plan impacts on other areas for the Trade Unions and welcomed the opportunity to discuss this at the sub group. |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment – Risk Register**    1. Naghat Ahmed referred to the document and highlighted the change in format. Naghat explained that the OSG need to regularly review the risk register to establish additions and what can be closed off.    2. Rhea Wolfson highlighted the need for updates due to the length of time since the last review. Rhea stated that failure to implement and delay should be separated out for CEX001. David McLelland suggested that this could possibly be rectified with a change of wording.    3. Moira Carrigan explained that financial implications should not be included on this risk register as the OSG have no control over them. Moira highlighted that the financial implications would sit within another area of the Council. Rhea Wolfson noted that there is no mention of legal implications but acknowledged that this might be for the same reason as financial. Jan Buchanan clarified that legal and financial implications need to be separate from the delivery of job evaluation. Rosie Docherty advised that the current remit of the OSG is solely job evaluation but highlighted this will need to change at some point.    4. Rosie Docherty advised that the software used for evaluations is a risk and highlighted that the SJC are currently doing work on the scheme with other councils which could cause delays for Glasgow. Rosie recommended that Lynn Norwood and Alan Taylor engage with COSLA to get the technical working group back up and running.    5. Eddie Cassidy raised concern regarding financial risk and who the risk sits with. Naghat Ahmed confirmed that the risks are with Glasgow City Council. Lynn Norwood advised that she could not give a legal position on this matter but stated that it is a Glasgow City Council risk register.    6. Jan Buchanan advised that it would be better to recirculate the risk register to capture the feedback in writing for further review.   **ACTION: Recirculate risk register for feedback (Naghat Ahmed)** |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment –Job Overview Document (JOD)**    1. Alan Taylor advised the following:  * Session with Rosie Docherty outlined the background to the changes. * The latest version is as a result of the session with only 2 minor changes made. * Feedback from the team is generally positive.   1. Alan Taylor asked for approval to classify the process as final with the acknowledgement that the process will be under continuous review.   2. Rhea Wolfson confirmed that she had received positive feedback on the session and praised the work that has been done.   3. JOD process agreed. |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment – Terms of Reference (TOR)**    1. Lynn Norwood summarised the document.    2. The Trade Unions welcomed the proposals and the governance that this would bring. Clarification was requested from the Trade Unions on the following:  * Individual roles and responsibilities to be clarified within the document. * How the information will filter from the OSG to the group. * Which elected members will be involved.   1. Lynn Norwood advised that she would be meeting with the workforce Convenor tomorrow and explained that she will come back to the group to confirm the arrangements. Lynn confirmed that the next workforce board will take place on the 23rd June 2021.   2. Wendy Dunsmore referred to correspondence the Trade Unions received from the Chief Executive and expressed disappointment with the content. Wendy highlighted the need for a channel to relay the positive work that is being done by the OSG and the job evaluation team at a higher level. Jan Buchanan advised that the correspondence was not shared with the OSG and confirmed that although she has seen it, she does not have a copy. Jan explained to the OSG that the correspondence being referred to was in response to a letter from the Trade Unions. Jan confirmed to the Trade Unions that she does not require a copy of the letter and expressed the need to progress in a positive way. |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment – OSG Partnership**     1. Alan Taylor referenced the tracked changes document.    2. The Trade Unions agreed that the content is heading in the right direction but confirmed that it needs to be more explicit about the partnership arrangements, shared goals and delivering equal pay for work of equal value. Rhea Wolfson confirmed that it would be agreeable to put the statement on the website.    3. Jan Buchanan asked the OSG to send their feedback and comments to Naghat Ahmed for collation.   **ACTION: OSG to feedback on the content to Naghat Ahmed (All)** |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment – New Ways of Working and Independent Technical Adviser reporting arrangements**    1. Alan Taylor confirmed the need for a more visible connection with Rosie Docherty and advised that the following consultancy arrangements with Rosie will now take place:  * Where challenging topics have been identified, Rosie will be invited to provide reports. * Where relevant, Rosie will incorporate advice in to the OSG papers. * Continued engagement with the team to provide help and support.   1. Rosie Docherty highlighted that as the author of the methodology and practice manual it is important that both sides make use of her expertise. Rosie stressed that although Glasgow will have to do some things differently, it is important that the principles of the scheme are followed. |
| 1. **Job Evaluation Commitment – Recruitment Plan**    1. Rhea Wolfson highlighted that recruitment is still high on the agenda for GMB and confirmed that this matter is causing them difficulties. Lynn Norwood confirmed that she is currently not under pressure regarding resourcing but acknowledged the importance of finding an acceptable solution moving forward. |
| 1. **Training & Development**     1. Alan Taylor summarised the paper and confirmed that he will continue to report development activities to the OSG. |
| 1. **Conflict of Interest**    1. Alan Taylor summarised the paper and explained the options available.    2. Option 1 was agreed. |
| 1. **Internal Audit**    1. Naghat Ahmed referred to the internal audit documentation and provided a summary of what was involved.    2. Rhea Wolfson stated that lessons learned would be a valuable exercise and would help with the audit trail. Naghat Ahmed confirmed that key lessons will be taken for future business continuity planning. |
| 1. **Meeting Schedule**     1. Jan Buchanan outlined the proposal to move to 8 weekly full OSG meetings with interim sub groups going forward.    2. Brian Smith queried if 8 weekly meetings would be frequent enough for the service OSG members. The services confirmed that the change in schedule would be welcomed. Jan Buchanan highlighted that the attendees of the sub groups will be determined by the agenda items and confirmed that where required service OSG members will also be invited to attend.   **ACTION: Amended meeting schedule to be issued (Naghat Ahmed).** |