**Operational Steering Group – 09/09/2020**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Present:** | | |
| Jan Buchanan (Chair) | JB | Finance & Corporate Services/Glasgow Life |
| Naghat Ahmed | NA | Project Manager/GCC |
| Angela Anderson | AA | CEX/GCC |
| Lynn Norwood | LN | CHR/GCC |
| Alan Taylor | AT | CHR/GCC |
| Julia McCreadie | JMcC | DRS/GCC |
| David McLelland | DMcL | EDU/GCC |
| Moira Carrigan | MC | FS/GCC |
| Eileen Marshall | EM | N&S/GCC |
| Christina Heuston | CH (SWS) | SWS/GCC |
| Rhea Wolfson | RW | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbour | GA | GMB |
| Mandy McDowall | MMcD | Unison |
| Mary Dawson | MD | Unison |
| Colette Hunter | CH | Unison |
| Jean Kilpatrick | JK | Unison |
| Wendy Dunsmore | WD | Unite |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor (External) |
| Julie Emley (Notes) | JE | CHR/GCC |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Apologies:** | | |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite |
|  |  |  |

**Notes**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Previous Note (JB)**    1. Amendment required to previous note. **ACTION: Note with tracked changes to be circulated round OSG for approval (NA)** |
| 1. **Local Guidance (AT)**    1. AT summarised the paper that was issued in advance of the meeting and advised that the updated log will be a standing agenda item for future OSG meetings.    2. AT clarified that each hub contributed to the document and advised that cross hub representatives will be involved to ensure consistency. AT advised that the paper mainly contains items for local clarification but where it is recognised that local guidance is required a specific paper will be produced for the OSG.    3. MMcD asked if Analysts at different grades will be contributing to this piece of work. AT advised that they will and clarified that the representatives will rotate within the hubs so that everyone gets to input.    4. RD recommended that it would be useful to start this piece of work sooner rather than later as the Analysts will be rusty. AT advised that discussions at the hubs started this week and for those that haven’t it will be over the next coming weeks. |
| 1. **Leadership (AT)**    1. AT referred to the Leadership paper and advised that the reason this was being discussed is that it had been agreed at an earlier OSG that the Leadership jobs would come back at a later date and this would allow preparatory work to start. AT clarified that he would like agreement of the Leadership group.    2. AT advised that the list had been worked on by himself and RD and considers a range of jobs across the grades. AT advised that the positions within the list can be flexible but it should be about replacing jobs rather than adding more on.    3. MMcD asked for clarification on the meaning of Ex CSG. EM advised that she would take this offline with MMcD.    4. RW advised that she didn’t see any major problems with this but has not had the capacity to evaluate if this is a good group or not. RW stated that she would not be in a position to agree this at the moment. RW asked if AT & RD could supply a paragraph summarising why this particular group had been selected. LN advised that she would support this request. **ACTION: Supply summary of Leadership jobs selection process (AT & RD)**    5. MC highlighted that the uniqueness of this piece of work could mean that the services all want to input in to it and as such there is a need for consistency in approach and a cap on the number of submissions.    6. JB agreed that this agenda item will be picked up again at the November OSG to allow time to review. **ACTION: Leadership added to November OSG agenda (NA)** |
| 1. **Summary of JE Processes Activity (LN)**    1. LN advised the group that the paper provides an overview of where we are across key areas, as well as addressing concerns about what needs to be finished before something else can start. LN advised that discussions with RD have highlighted the need for expertise to help move forward and move through the issues.    2. RW stated that it is helpful knowing that an agenda is being worked on but advised that it is difficult to gain an understanding of the process from the paper. RW advised that timescales, detail, pace and priorities need to be established in order to have a sense of where this is going. RW advised that a priority must be equalities and this needs to be demonstrated on the to-do list. LN acknowledged that the process activities do need to be fleshed out and advised that the equalities piece is being worked on. RD advised that she is meeting with LN & AT next week to start putting meat on the bones of the activities in order to populate with more details. RD suggested that members of the OSG could observe job evaluation activities e.g. workshops and participate in mock interviews to help build on their understanding and improve confidence.    3. JB suggested that a sub group might be beneficial to allow the members to go in to more detail than is required at OSG level. MMcD & WD advised that this would be welcomed as a starting point but advised that more detail is required with regard to the activities. LN agreed with the formation of a sub group. **ACTION: Sub group proposal to be prepared for the next OSG (AT).** |
| 1. **Cohort 1 (AT)**    1. Stats issued in advance of the meeting.    2. AT advised that he is looking to re-engage with those from cohort 1 who started the process but required to be rescheduled because of Covid-19. AT advised that once IT has been resolved, the team would start with those who have already submitted their questionnaire. LN followed this up by highlighting that those who started the process need to be re-engaged with as staff engagement is crucial.    3. RW advised that she understood the rationale for this approach but advised that refresher training on job evaluation is required for everyone. In addition to this, RW stated that consideration needs to be given to the accuracy of questionnaires submitted pre Covid-19 with regard to the temporary arrangements in place for staff and how temporary the arrangements actually are.    4. MMcD agreed that it will come to a point when staff need to be contacted but stressed that it will need to be done sensitively and pressure should not be put on staff to participate    5. The Trade Unions advised that services need to fully understand the implications of this as stewards are working flat out and there might be difficulties in releasing staff to participate during the pandemic. LN agreed with this and advised that the HR community also need to be involved.    6. JB asked what the Trade Unions would need in order to progress.    7. RW advised that this has already been covered but mentioned that the suggestions by RD to observe and participate are welcome. RW re-iterated that the equalities assessment is absolutely crucial before touching new working processes. AT acknowledged that there are definitely potential equalities issues that need to be explored and advised that the Analysts have been asked to look at potential barriers based on their testing of MS Teams. AT stated that there has been some resistance to this ask from the Trade Union members in the team and asked the Trade Unions if they could help progress this with them as their input would be extremely valuable.    8. WD stated that the timelines need to be considered and advised that there is a need to be open and honest with staff, as their expectations are for a resolution in March 2021. LN agreed to take this forward with Robert Anderson. **ACTION: LN to update Robert Anderson.** |
| 1. **Next Meeting (JB)**  * JB advised that the meeting will move to a Tuesday, 2pm – 4pm, to help with Unison branch meetings. * Next Meeting: Tuesday 6th October 2020 |