

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE | AGENDA ITEM No. 4 |
| 17 JANUARY 2019 | |

| |
|---|
| ASSISTANT DIRECTOR HR & DEVELOPMENT Author: Karen Craig |
|---|

| |
|--|
| New Pay Spine - Standard National Joint Council (NJC) PCC salary grades w.e.f. 1 April 2019 |
|--|

| |
|---|
| RECOMMENDATIONS |
| FROM : Assistant Director of HR and Development |
| That Employment Committee: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve the implementation of the revised pay scale on 1 April 2019. 2. Agree to assimilate staff on to the revised pay point and then apply the increment to those who are entitled to an increment. |

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

1.1 This report follows changes made to the National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government Services pay agreement from 1 April 2019, as part of a two year pay deal negotiated and agreed nationally for 2018-2020.

2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

2.1 The 2018-2020 nationally negotiated pay agreement included the introduction of a new pay spine on 1 April 2019. This report is to gain approval from members on:-

2.1.1 the revised pay scale from 1 April 2019 and

2.1.2 how the council will implement the revised pay scales on 1 April 2019 (referred to as Approach F throughout this report).

2.2 This report is for Employment Committee to consider under its terms of reference no. 2.3.2.4

'To determine local terms and conditions of employment for employees'

3. TIMESCALE

| | | | |
|---|-----------|---|--|
| Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan? | NO | If Yes, date for relevant Cabinet Meeting | |
|---|-----------|---|--|

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Under current arrangements, the council is bound to follow the pay spine negotiated by the national joint council. The pay spine runs from points 1-49. Each council then takes the pay spine and transfers the points into grades using the NJC job evaluation scheme. The result of this is the published pay scale. Because the pay spine has been amended by the NJC, each council will now have to amend its pay scale to take account of the revised pay points. This affects our current Grades 1 to 15 (approximately 1015 staff). The financial modelling undertaken was based on actual staff in post in July 2018 and included gender information.
- 4.2 A summary of the changes that have been agreed nationally which we have had to follow are as follows:-
- A bottom rate of £9.00 per hour (£17,364) on new Spinal Column Point (SCP) 1 (*equivalent to the old SCPs 6 & 7*). (*This amount is to ensure that the minimum rate paid by a council is above the national minimum wage rate*).
 - 'Pairing off' of the old SCPs 6-17 inclusive to create new SCPs numbered 1-6 inclusive
 - Equal steps of 2.0% between each of the new SCPs 1 to 22 inclusive (*equivalent to old SCPs 6-28 incl*)
 - Because equal steps have been created between pay points, there are new SCPs 10, 13, 16, 18 and 21 which have been generated to which no old SCPs will assimilate. This means that if we accept these points then the current number of pay points in a grade will increase as they are additional points.
 - On new SCPs 23 and above (*equivalent to old SCP 29 and above*), a relatively straight forward 2.0% increase on the 2018 rate will apply.
- 4.3 Providing that we settle on a straightforward assimilation of pay points from the old points to the new, then we have been informed that there will be no need for further national trade union agreement. We expect that our local and regional representatives will be able to agree the proposals. However, the new points will mean that some changes to our existing pay grades are required and some decisions needed to be made to allow the new pay spine to be implemented from 1 April.

The initial key decisions that had to be worked through were as follows:-

1. Whether all of the new points should be included into our pay scale or whether they should be ignored. Ignoring them would create unequal steps through the pay grades. (However, this would be allowed under the rules stated in the national terms and conditions (Part 2 of the Green book)).
2. How increments and assimilations are dealt with. The NJC have set out suggestions but have not been prescriptive regarding how each employer manages their assimilation process, providing the employer's approach is consistent.
3. The Equality Act 2010 allows for pay to be based on length of service for employees with between one and five years service. However, it would be necessary to justify the business need for a pay scale that requires the post holder to have more than five years service before they reached the top of the scale. Therefore we need to ensure that no grade contains more than six points to ensure that it does not discriminate on the grounds of age.

5. PROPOSAL

- 5.1 Since July 2017 a joint working group made up of colleagues from Unison, Unite and GMB have been working with HR and Finance to model and cost various options. Six different approaches have been costed and considered. The option we are recommending is considered the preferred option as it is non-discriminatory, is the most cost effective workable option and results in the closest match to the

previous scale. This has been supported by all members of the joint working group and Directors at the Corporate Management Team meeting on 7th December 2018.

6. IMPLICATIONS

Financial – The budget for the NJC pay award for 2019/20, including on costs is £725,000. It is clear that the revised rates negotiated by the NJC increase the cost beyond what had been budgeted as the lower grades are receiving more than a 2% increase. This has been flagged as a pressure in the budget setting exercise and an additional £100k set aside. The financial impact of each option modelled is attached at Appendix 3.

Human Resources – This proposal is supported by the trade unions which will assist with implementation as all correspondence to staff will be issued jointly.

Legal - As we are following the principles set out by the NJC there should be no legal challenge on the proposals.

7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 There is no option but to implement the pay points and the working group have devised a pay scale structure that takes account of some of the new pay points but not all. It follows the principles put in place by the NJC. No staff will lose out by the proposal, (*but staff in two of the lower grades will gain more by adopting the approach of assimilating staff first on to the new scale and then awarding an increment, rather than awarding the increment and then assimilating*). The trade unions were keen that we protected the lower paid over the higher paid.
- 7.2 The other options that would cost slightly less would not work as they would mean that there was too many points in one of the grades. This would be considered age discriminatory and inappropriate as it should not take more than five years to reach the top of a grade for an employee performing at the required level.
- 7.2 An equality impact assessment was undertaken to consider whether the proposal had any discriminatory impact on any particular group. The full results were shared and discussed with the trade unions and it was agreed that there was no equality issues identified. The EIA is attached at Appendix 3.

8. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Current & Proposed Pay Scales

Appendix 2 - Costings of the six approaches considered

Appendix 3 - Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix 1 - Current & Proposed Pay Scales

| Payscale: Approach E & F (Includes new SCP's 10, 18 & 21) (Excludes new SCP's 13 & 16) | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Current SCP 01/04/18 | Annual Salary FT 01/04/18 | New SCP 01/04/19 | Annual Salary FT 01/04/19 |
| GRADE 1 | 06 | 16,394 | 1 | 17,364 |
| GRADE 1 | 07 | 16,495 | 1 | 17,364 |
| GRADE 2 | 07 | 16,495 | 1 | 17,364 |
| GRADE 2 | 8 | 16,626 | 2 | 17,711 |
| GRADE 2 | 09 | 16,755 | 2 | 17,711 |
| GRADE 3 | 09 | 16,755 | 2 | 17,711 |
| GRADE 3 | 10 | 16,863 | 3 | 18,065 |
| GRADE 3 | 11 | 17,007 | 3 | 18,065 |
| GRADE 4 | 11 | 17,007 | 3 | 18,065 |
| GRADE 4 | 12 | 17,173 | 4 | 18,426 |
| GRADE 4 | 13 | 17,391 | 4 | 18,426 |
| GRADE 4 | 14 | 17,681 | 5 | 18,795 |
| GRADE 5 | 14 | 17,681 | 5 | 18,795 |
| GRADE 5 | 15 | 17,972 | 5 | 18,795 |
| GRADE 5 | 16 | 18,319 | 6 | 19,171 |
| GRADE 5 | 17 | 18,672 | 6 | 19,171 |
| GRADE 5 | 18 | 18,870 | 7 | 19,554 |
| GRADE 6 | 18 | 18,870 | 7 | 19,554 |
| GRADE 6 | 19 | 19,446 | 8 | 19,945 |
| GRADE 6 | 20 | 19,819 | 9 | 20,344 |
| GRADE 6 | | | 10 | 20,751 |
| GRADE 6 | 21 | 20,541 | 11 | 21,166 |
| GRADE 6 | 22 | 21,074 | 12 | 21,589 |
| GRADE 7 | 22 | 21,074 | 12 | 21,589 |
| GRADE 7 | 23 | 21,693 | 14 | 22,462 |
| GRADE 7 | 24 | 22,401 | 15 | 22,911 |
| GRADE 7 | 25 | 23,111 | 17 | 23,836 |
| GRADE 7 | | | 18 | 24,313 |
| GRADE 7 | 26 | 23,866 | 19 | 24,799 |
| GRADE 8 | 26 | 23,866 | 19 | 24,799 |
| GRADE 8 | 27 | 24,657 | 20 | 25,295 |
| GRADE 8 | | | 21 | 25,801 |
| GRADE 8 | 28 | 25,463 | 22 | 26,317 |
| GRADE 8 | 29 | 26,470 | 23 | 26,999 |
| GRADE 8 | 30 | 27,358 | 24 | 27,905 |
| GRADE 9 | 30 | 27,358 | 24 | 27,905 |
| GRADE 9 | 31 | 28,221 | 25 | 28,785 |
| GRADE 9 | 32 | 29,055 | 26 | 29,636 |
| GRADE 9 | 33 | 29,909 | 27 | 30,507 |

| | | | | |
|----------|----|---------------|----|---------------|
| GRADE 9 | 34 | 30,756 | 28 | 31,371 |
| GRADE 10 | 34 | 30,756 | 28 | 31,371 |
| GRADE 10 | 35 | 31,401 | 29 | 32,029 |
| GRADE 10 | 36 | 32,233 | 30 | 32,878 |
| GRADE 10 | 37 | 33,136 | 31 | 33,799 |
| GRADE 10 | 38 | 34,106 | 32 | 34,788 |
| GRADE 11 | 38 | 34,106 | 32 | 34,788 |
| GRADE 11 | 39 | 35,229 | 33 | 35,934 |
| GRADE 11 | 40 | 36,153 | 34 | 36,876 |
| GRADE 11 | 41 | 37,107 | 35 | 37,849 |
| GRADE 11 | 42 | 38,052 | 36 | 38,813 |
| GRADE 12 | 42 | 38,052 | 36 | 38,813 |
| GRADE 12 | 43 | 39,002 | 37 | 39,782 |
| GRADE 12 | 44 | 39,961 | 38 | 40,760 |
| GRADE 12 | 45 | 40,858 | 39 | 41,675 |
| GRADE 12 | 46 | 41,846 | 40 | 42,683 |
| GRADE 13 | 46 | 41,846 | 40 | 42,683 |
| GRADE 13 | 47 | 42,806 | 41 | 43,662 |
| GRADE 13 | 48 | 43,757 | 42 | 44,632 |
| GRADE 13 | 49 | 44,697 | 43 | 45,591 |
| GRADE 13 | 50 | 45,660 | 44 | 46,573 |
| GRADE 14 | 50 | 45,660 | 44 | 46,573 |
| GRADE 14 | 51 | 46,615 | 45 | 47,547 |
| GRADE 14 | 52 | 47,585 | 46 | 48,537 |
| GRADE 14 | 53 | 48,548 | 47 | 49,519 |
| GRADE 14 | 54 | 49,575 | 48 | 50,567 |
| GRADE 14 | 55 | 50,610 | 49 | 51,622 |
| GRADE 15 | 55 | 50,610 | 49 | 51,622 |
| GRADE 15 | 56 | 51,641 | 50 | 52,674 |
| GRADE 15 | 57 | 52,661 | 51 | 53,714 |
| GRADE 15 | 58 | 53,691 | 52 | 54,765 |
| GRADE 15 | 59 | 54,718 | 53 | 55,812 |
| GRADE 15 | 60 | 55,747 | 54 | 56,862 |

Appendix 2 - Summary of costs

| | 2019/20 Includes on costs | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Budget | Estimated Cost | | | | | |
| | Pay Award | Pay Award Single Status | Pay Award Other | Total | Variance Pay Award | Increment Single Status | Total Additional Pay Award Cost plus Increment |
| | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| Current - increment + 2% pay award | 850 | 725 | 125 | 850 | 0 | 473 | 473 |
| Approach B New - increment first then assimilate (including new scp) | 850 | 834 | 125 | 959 | 109 | 473 | 582 |
| Approach A New - assimilate first then increment (including new scp) | 850 | 839 | 125 | 964 | 114 | 434 | 548 |
| Approach C New - increment first then assimilate (ignore new scp) | 850 | 834 | 125 | 959 | 109 | 473 | 582 |
| Approach D New - assimilate first then increment (ignore new scp) | 850 | 839 | 125 | 964 | 114 | 478 | 592 |
| Approach E New - increment first then assimilate (ignore scp 13 & 16) | 850 | 834 | 125 | 959 | 109 | 473 | 582 |
| Approach F New - assimilate first then increment (ignore scp 13&16) | 850 | 839 | 125 | 964 | 114 | 452 | 566 |

Note - Currently budgets are not given to departments for increment costs, these have to be met from staff turnover savings/making savings elsewhere.

Appendix 3 - Equality Impact Assessment

Equality Impact Assessment

Initial assessment – Implementation of pay scales (Assimilate first rather than Increment first or Increment first then Assimilate option) (Include new points excluding new point 13 & 16)

What are the proposed outcomes of the policy?

EIA definition from the Green Book: An EIA is an analysis of a proposed change to an organisational policy **to determine whether it has a disparate impact on groups with relevant protected characteristics** as identified in the Equality Act 2010. It applies both to external policies (i.e. those having an impact on customers or clients of an organisation) and to internal policies (i.e. those affecting the organisation's employees). This is an internal EIA but the pay scales changes may be taken up by external bodies.

Peterborough City Council apply the pay scales and pay awards negotiated by The National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government Services. The last time the council determined how the pay points would be grouped into grades was as part of the single status negotiations. These grades were implemented wef 1st April 2007. The NJC pay agreement for 2018-20 included the introduction of a new pay spine on 1 April 2019 that was based on the following:-

- A bottom rate of £17364 per annum on SCP 1 (equivalent to the old SCPs 6 & 7)
- Pairing off of old SCPs 6-17 inclusive to create new SCPs 1-6 inclusive
- Equal steps of 2% between each new SCP 1-22 (equivalent to old SCPs 6-28)
- New SCPs 10, 13, 16, 18, and 21 to enable the equal steps to be achieved
- 2% flat increase on SCPs 23 and above (old SCPs 29 and above).

The council has no choice in respect of whether or not to implement the new pay scales. The scales have to be implemented on 1st April 2019. However, there is discretion in respect of how the scales are implemented. Therefore this assessment is considering if there is any negative impact on any group as a result of how we choose to undertake the implementation.

This proposal is as a result of very detailed work that has been undertaken by the Senior Reward Advisor, Reward Advisor, Financial Accountant and regional and local members of the GMB, Unison and Unite unions since July 2018. The group have looked at various potential ways of reaching an agreed set of pay scales, using actual gender data of staff in post when the data was cut in July 2018. This assessment includes more up to date information as it has been carried out on actual numbers of staff in post on 19/11/18.

The final two favoured approaches are:-

1. Include all new SCP's excepting 13 and 16 - Increment first then Assimilate (known as Approach E)
2. Include all new SCP's excepting 13 and 16 - Assimilate first then Increment (known as Approach F)

The project group decided from the outset that this review should not look to change any of the principles of the Job Evaluation system and process which works effectively and ensures consistent and fairness in respect of the points score of each evaluated role. The aim was to 'lift and shift' the new scales into the PCC existing scales. The proposals adhere to this. There is no proposal to change the single status agreement in respect of starting salaries, pay progression, performance related increments or market factors. The overall aim is to continue to achieve equal treatment of all groups in respect of pay.

The comments inserted on the proposal documents shared with the trade unions as part of the working group papers also provide additional information about the impact on each pay point (this is in addition to the information detailed in this EIA).

By undertaking a 'lift and shift' exercise as simply as we have this does mean that the lower grades see a reduction in the number of points within each grade. Grade One will only have one point (was two), grade two and three will have two points (was three), grade four will have three points (was four), and grade five will have three points (was five). The overlaps in the grades will remain.

Factors or forces which could contribute to or detract from delivery of the outcomes and success measures:
Incorrect data extracted from the HR/Payroll system.

Which groups will be affected by this proposal?

All staff employed and paid on the NJC pay scales will be affected.
 This assessment is carried out on the 1036 staff who were directly employed by the council on 19/11/18.

As it is likely that some of the council's schools may wish to use the same grades going forward we have also undertaken a further gender breakdown analysis of staff employed in two primary schools on 26/11/18.

Having assessed the two favoured options already employees on existing SCP 12 of Grade 4, and existing points 14 and 16 of Grade 5 would be better off under Approach F and worse off under Approach E. However, employees on existing point 20 of Grade 6, existing SCP 25 of Grade 7 and existing SCP 27 of Grade 8 would be better off under Approach E and worse off under Approach F. However, all staff in all grades will be in receipt of a pay increase regardless. There is no difference to staff on all other grades in respect of the approach and therefore this assessment will focus particularly on Grades 4,5,6,7,and 8. Data has been provided however for all grades.

Now consider whether any of the following groups will be disproportionately affected:

| Equality Group | Note any positive or negative effects |
|--|---|
| Disabled people | The % of disabled staff in the total workforce is 2.1%. The % of non disabled staff is 56.7%. A very high 41.2% have not stated. 1.6% of the G4&G5 staff and 0.7% of the G6&G7&G8 staff state that they are disabled. Therefore it is clear that a very small % of disabled employees in both groups would be affected, and in both cases the % is below the rate for disabled employees in the total population. It is worth noting that the high % of staff in all grades who do not state whether they are disabled or not does mean that it is difficult to accurately assess the impact. It is of course the employee's choice as to whether they inform their employer. We are hoping that when the new HR system is introduced we will have more up to date data but these figures are representative of the records currently. |
| Married couples or those entered into a civil partnership | The procedure focuses on consistent and fair treatment irrespective of status. We are not currently collecting data on civil partnership but may extend our monitoring to this group at a later date. |
| Pregnant women or women on maternity leave | Data not available and therefore the assessment cannot discount the fact that there may have been women in these grades who are pregnant currently or on maternity leave. Women on maternity leave will be treated in accordance with the NJC maternity scheme in respect of pay if they are on maternity leave on 1st April 2019. |
| Particular ethnic groups | The HR Resource Link system is used to monitor and identify where any such trends may be occurring. The % of staff who have declared that they are from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in the total workforce is 15.3%. The % of staff who have stated that they are not from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in the total workforce is 7.14%. An exceptionally high 77.5% have not stated. The % of staff from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in G4&G5 is 29.5% and in G6&G7&G8 is 17.5%. The % of staff not from a mixed or minority ethnic origin in G4&G5 is 27.9% and in G6&G7&G8 is 7.4% A very high % in both grade sets have not stated their ethnic origin (42.6% in G4&G5) and 75.1% in G6&G7&G8. This means that in G4&G5 there is a much higher % of staff against the overall workforce and a marginally higher % in G6&G7&G8. Therefore potentially there is an impact in G4&G5 unless we proceed with Approach F. |
| Those of a particular religion or who hold a particular belief | We are not currently collecting data on religion or belief. When a decision is taken regarding the HR system going forward then the council will work with |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| | its equalities groups to decide whether to extend our monitoring to this group. |
| Male/Female | <p>The data from July 2018 that formed the basis of the detailed proposal documents included gender breakdown data as this was an important consideration for the project group from the outset.</p> <p>The gender data for this equality impact assessment has been refreshed during November 2018 to bring it right up to date and this EIA reviews the refreshed data in depth.</p> <p>The current system only allows for M or F to be recorded and therefore there is no 'not stated'.</p> <p>The % of male staff in the total workforce is 29%. The % of female staff in the total workforce is 71%.</p> <p>The % of male staff in G4&G5 is 31.1% The % of male staff in G6&G7&G8 is 22.2%</p> <p>The % of female staff in G4&G5 is 68.9% The % of female staff in G6&G7&G8 is 77.8%.</p> <p>These results do show that there would be a slightly higher number of males that would benefit if we decided to implement approach F as there is a higher than the population average of males in G4&G5 (29% in the total workforce - 31% in G4/5). Conversely there is a slightly higher number of females in G6/7&8 than the overall population. However, the figures are not significantly above the averages (77.8% / 71%). In our view this is not significant enough to require further investigation or to evidence that we should take one approach over the other. Reviewing the data further at G6 current SCP 20 there are equal numbers of men and women in the affected points. In G7 current SCP 25 there are 50% more women than men - under Approach E they would receive a total increase of 7.3% and under Approach F it would be 5.2%. In G8 current SCP 27 where there are 75% more women than men - under Approach E they would receive a total increase of 6.73% and under Approach F it would be 4.64%.</p> <p>Another important factor to consider is that our proposed new G7 includes most of the new SCPs. However, as we will not be using SCP 13 and 16 staff in G7 will move from bottom point 12 to point 14 (ie a double increase of 4% between points) and the same will occur for those on point 15 of G7 who will move to point 17 so receiving a 'double' increase. The main reason that we made this decision not to include all the new points was to ensure that there was no age bias in our grades as explained in the column below.</p> <p>As there is actually no effect at all for employees on G9 and above it was decided that we should also consider the gender impact based on Grades 1 to 5 against Grades 6 to 8 rather than (as above) Grades 1 to 15. The results were as follows:- The % of male staff in G1-G8 only is 25%. The % of female staff in G1-G8 only is 75%.</p> <p>The % of male staff in G4&G5 is 31.1% The % of male staff in G6&G7&G8 is 22.2%</p> <p>The % of female staff in G4&G5 is 68.9% The % of female staff in G6&G7&G8 is 77.8%.</p> <p>Again these results do show that there would be a very slightly higher number of males that would benefit if we decided to implement approach F as there is still a higher than the population average in G4&G5. Conversely there is a slightly higher number of females in G6/7&8 than the overall population. However, the figures are even closer than the figures above (77.8% / 75%). In our view this reinforces the opinion that the difference is</p> |

| | <p>not significant enough to require further investigation or to evidence that we should take one approach over the other.</p> <p>In terms of actual staff numbers there are only 61 staff in total in G4&G5 which equates to 42 F and 19 M.</p> <p>G4 roles are largely Domestic roles in residential homes, Drivers in passenger transport, and staff employed in the Tourist Information Centre. G5 roles are very varied but include 'Assistant' roles in HR, and other teams, technical roles in Growth & Regeneration, Chapel & Crematorium technician roles, and Reablement Workers.</p> <p>Currently there is no one in post on existing G4 SCP12 and therefore no one ever would be affected as all staff in G4 are on existing SCP 13 and 14.</p> <p>G6, G7, and G8 roles are very diverse ranging from Bereavement Officers (G6) to Assistant Caseworkers (G7) to PES Officers (G8). There are a large number of Residential Workers at G7&G8.</p> <p>Also, as we are not the employer and do not have the data we are unable to fully assess how data from the school workforce may or may not vary these results.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-------|--------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|----|-------|------|
| Particular age groups | <p>One of the main decisions the project group took from the outset was to only have grades that were six SCP's or less. The reason for this was two fold (1) we did not want grades that would appear to discriminate against younger staff and the view nationally is that no grade should be more than six points. Taking five years to reach the top of the scale is considered to avoid any disparate impact on younger staff, and (2) no role on these scales should need someone to be in the role for more than five years before they were fully competent in the role.</p> <p>The HR Resource Link system is used to monitor and identify relevant data.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age</th> <th>G4&5</th> <th>G6&7&8</th> <th>Total workforce</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>16-24</td> <td>6.5%</td> <td>4.19%</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25-34</td> <td>19.7%</td> <td>17.77%</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35-44</td> <td>24.7%</td> <td>25.18%</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>45-54</td> <td>26.2%</td> <td>30.88%</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>55-64</td> <td>22.9%</td> <td>20.5%</td> <td>20.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65+</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1.48%</td> <td>1.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>There are very slight differences in each age range – for both bandings. Some are slightly less and others slightly more representative of the age band. The biggest variance is in the 16-24 age range where there are 3.5% more staff than the total workforce in G4&5 and also 1.19% more in G6/7/8 but neither of these are significant. This doesn't actually represent many individuals. There would be no justification for determining the scheme for the whole workforce based on the age of a very small section of the workforce. However, by opting for Approach F it would be favouring the younger workers in this pay group (in the same way as the older workers in the grades). Both schemes will be applied consistently irrespective of age.</p> | Age | G4&5 | G6&7&8 | Total workforce | 16-24 | 6.5% | 4.19% | 3% | 25-34 | 19.7% | 17.77% | 17% | 35-44 | 24.7% | 25.18% | 28% | 45-54 | 26.2% | 30.88% | 30% | 55-64 | 22.9% | 20.5% | 20.5% | 65+ | 0% | 1.48% | 1.5% |
| Age | G4&5 | G6&7&8 | Total workforce | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16-24 | 6.5% | 4.19% | 3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25-34 | 19.7% | 17.77% | 17% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35-44 | 24.7% | 25.18% | 28% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45-54 | 26.2% | 30.88% | 30% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55-64 | 22.9% | 20.5% | 20.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65+ | 0% | 1.48% | 1.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Those proposing to undergo, currently undergoing or who have undergone gender reassignment | The council does not currently collect data on gender reassignment but is considering whether to extend our monitoring to this group at a later date. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sexual orientation | The council does not currently collect data on sexual orientation but is considering whether to extend our monitoring to this group at a later date. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

What impact would the two approaches have on community schools?

The council still provides payroll services to some of its community schools which has meant that a gender assessment can be made on spot schools. Two primary schools were chosen randomly from the payroll records.

Schools use the council job evaluation scheme and grading system. We understand that various academy trusts also still use the PCC systems to evaluate and pay roles within their schools. Due to this the trade unions asked that we consider the impact of approach E and F on schools by using a sample of the schools data that is available to us.

School One

Total support workforce - 95.2% F 4.8%M

G4&5 - 100% F

G6&7&8 - 86% F 14% M

In actual numbers there are 60 F and 3 M in this workforce - all three of the M are in G6,7,&8. There are more F in the lower grades than there are overall and therefore in this school approach F would favour the Female dominated workforce.

School Two

Total support workforce - 97.4% F 2.6%M

G4&5 - 100% F

G6&7&8 - 93% F 7% M

In actual numbers there are 38 F and 1 M in this workforce - the one male is in G6,7,&8 (G8). There are more F in the lower grades than there are overall, but in this school there are also 14 F in G6,7,&8 but obviously the average is below the school overall average. Due to the fact that there is only 1 male in this school it is less relevant to draw conclusions from this example. Based on numbers of staff alone, rather than percentages, in this school approach E would favour the Female dominated workforce.

What information is available to help you understand the effect this will have on the groups identified Above?

The data used was taken from the HR Resource Link system. It includes the details of the actual staff in post on a given day in November. If we undertook the same assessments in another month's time the data could have changed as staff join, leave or receive a pay change. Many of these staff will move to a higher increment in April or later in 2019 but this is the most accurate set of data that we consider appropriate to use. From an equal pay perspective and to operate fair practices it is very important that wherever possible there is equity across the pay scales. The council has always opted to protect its lowest paid staff and this applies in respect of various elements of local terms and conditions.

Who will be the beneficiaries of the policy?

All of the NJC paid workforce will benefit. Our decision is in respect of implementation and deciding whether there is any detrimental impact on any group by how we apply the new scales. Costings have been considered throughout and no approach has been discarded on the basis of cost. However, cost is a very important factor due to the budget reductions that the council has to manage over the next three years. Therefore we are constantly reviewing what impact on budgets each approach will have.

Has the policy been explained to those it might affect directly or indirectly?

The initial discussions are being held with the trade unions and decisions have so far been made jointly. Employees were informed that this was a two year pay deal that would result in some changes to pay scales in the second year of the deal. Employees will be informed when an approach has been decided.

Can any differences be justified as appropriate or necessary?

Yes - gender difference can be justified as these staff are in higher paid groups and the council and its trade unions always seek to protect the lower paid.

Yes - the data shows that although the number of male staff who would benefit more from Approach F is above the percentage of males in the workforce the % is very minimal. As the council can evidence an unbiased approach to job evaluation, recruitment, and opportunities for training this means that both males and females have equal access to all roles.

Yes - the difference with the **overall population** is minimal. We usually only investigate gaps of 5+%. Our gender pay gap results were higher than this (9%).

Yes - all staff are receiving pay increases of at least 2% (incremental) and 2% (pay award). This means that **all staff** will benefit from the revised pay scales. It is only how we carry out the implementation that impacts on staff on six specific SCPs.

Yes - the cost will have an **impact on the council's budget** especially because there are so many more staff employed in G6,7,and 8 rather than G4&5.

Are any remedial actions required?

No. Because under the proposed new grades all staff will benefit - this assessment looks to assess which grades should benefit more than other grades. Progression to a Full Equality Impact Assessment is not required.

Once implemented, how will you monitor the actual impact?

Monitoring will take place through the HR Resource Link System and through feedback from employees, trade unions and senior managers across the organisation plus HR team members.

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Policy review date | 1.4.2020. |
| Assessment completed by | Karen Craig |
| Date Initial EqIA completed | 28/11/2018 |
| Signed by Head of Service | Mandy Pullen |