

EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE

THURSDAY 17 JANUARY 2019
7.00 PM

Bourges/Viersen Rooms - Town Hall

AGENDA

Page No

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point Members must declare whether they have a disclosable pecuniary interest, or other interest, in any of the items on the agenda, unless it is already entered in the register of members' interests or is a "pending notification" that has been disclosed to the Solicitor to the Council.

3. **Minutes of the Meeting Held on:**
 - 3.1 **7 December 2018** 3 - 6
 - 3.2 **17 December 2018** 7 - 8
4. **New Pay Spine - Standard National Joint Council (NJC) PCC salary grades** 9 - 20



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Dan Kalley on 01733 296334 as soon as possible.

Did you know? All Peterborough City Council's meeting agendas are available online or via the modern.gov app. Help us achieve our environmental protection aspirations and view this agenda online instead of printing it.

Emergency Evacuation Procedure – Outside Normal Office Hours

In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front of the Cathedral. The duty Beadle will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the Beadle is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair. In the event of a continuous alarm sounding remain seated and await instruction from the duty Beadle

Recording of Council Meetings

Any member of the public may film, audio-record, take photographs and use social media to report the proceedings of any meeting that is open to the public. Audio-recordings of meetings may be published on the Council's website. A protocol on this facility is available at:

<http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk/documents/s21850/Protocol%20on%20the%20use%20of%20Recording.pdf>

Committee Members:

Councillors: C Hogg, J Holdich (Vice Chairman), D Lamb, M Jamil, W Fitzgerald, Iqbal and R Brown

Substitutes: Councillors: J Goodwin, N Sandford and Hemraj

Further information about this meeting can be obtained from Dan Kalley on telephone 01733 296334 or by email – daniel.kalley@peterborough.gov.uk

**MINUTES OF THE EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 10.00AM, ON
7 DECEMBER 2018
COUNCIL CHAMBER, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Holdich (Vice-Chairman), Councillors Fitzgerald, Lamb, Seaton, Jamil, Amjad Iqbal and Hogg

Officers Present:

Gillian Beasley	Chief Executive
Mandy Pullen	Assistant Director HR & OD
Dan Kalley	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Karen Craig	Senior Reward Advisor
Debbie Hiller	Organisational Design & Development Manager

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nadeem.

Councillor Seaton was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Nadeem.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 OCTOBER 2018:

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

In accordance with Standing Orders, the Committee was asked to determine whether item 6 'Shared Leadership Proposals as defined by Paragraph 4 of Schedule 12A of Part 1 of the Local Government Act 1972, should be exempt and the press and public excluded from the meeting when they were discussed, or whether the public interest in disclosing this information outweighed the public interest in maintaining the exemption.

The Committee unanimously agreed to the exclusion of the press and public for agenda item 6.

5. REVISED EMPLOYMENT POLICIES AND APPRENTICESHIPS UPDATE

The Committee received a report in relation to revised employment policies and apprenticeships update.

The Organisational Design & Development Manager introduced the report around apprenticeships. Since the introduction of the apprenticeship levy in April 2017, which

the Council was obliged to pay, work had been undertaken to increase awareness and the value of using apprenticeships. This had been particularly useful when trying to fill specific skills gaps across the Council and in maintained schools. Around £30,000 is paid into the Council's levy pot each month, this also included a 10% top-up from central government. The aim of the Council was to reach a position whereby the amount of levy the Council paid equalled the amount paid out to apprenticeship providers.

The central government target for overall apprenticeships within organisations was 2.3% of the total workforce. At the end of September this year, when the Council's report was submitted to government, we had achieved 0.5% of headcount, which was broadly in line with the national average in the Public Sector. Since September of this year an additional resource had helped deliver and promote apprenticeships across the Council and in schools. It was now estimated that the overall figure to date for apprenticeships stood at 1.4% of overall workforce.

All level 2 and 3 apprenticeships would be offered to care leavers in the first instance, this had been agreed by the central management team at the Council.

The Senior Reward Advisor introduced the report around the pay structure and policies in relation to apprenticeships. Due to the wide ranging and varied apprenticeships available it was essential that the Council had in place a pay structure for apprenticeships. The policy also took into account the qualification and skill levels of different apprentices, allowing the Council to be flexible and competitive when offering apprenticeships.

The Employment Committee debated the report and in summary the key points highlighted included:

- In terms of comparison with other local authorities, Peterborough followed the example in Cambridgeshire. It was important that the payments offered at the Council were competitive when compared to the rest of the City.

The Senior Reward Advisor introduced the report on the updated social media policy. The most important inclusion in the policy was around the Regulation Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA). This act enabled set out what officers were able to do in terms of surveillance. Parts of the RIPA policy needed to be included into employment contracts especially around those who worked within intervention services.

The Employment Committee debated the report and in summary the key points highlighted included:

- RIPA usage was reported to the Audit Committee and kept under review. It was rare for the Council to use this power.
- Democratic Services would use the social media policy and align this with the Councillors social media policy to create greater consistency across the Council.

The final policy was around capability, which was to be reviewed on an annual basis. This required some minor tweaks at the current time to improve management of performance going forward. It was stressed that the manager should engage with their HR business partner and that they managed staff in the most fair way possible. Time restraints were put in place to show how quickly managers were dealing with any issues.

The Employment Committee debated the report and in summary the key points highlighted included:

- The changes were made based on previous experience and the HR team were constantly looking at ways of taking on best practice and advice from professional bodies in the sector.
- The policy had been shared with the trade unions in an informal setting. The policy was then sent to the Joint Consultative Forum before being brought to members.

In addition, in respect of any employment policies that needed to be changed due to changes in legislation or where the Council had no say over any required amendments - information on these would be circulated via a briefing note only particularly if the changes had any significant financial implications.

RESOLVED:

The Employment Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- 1) note the update on the Apprenticeship position in the council (this includes the current position on the apprenticeship levy, and governance of the apprenticeship levy), and
- 2) approve the updated employment policies (Apprenticeship Pay Policy, Social Media Policy, and Capability Policy and Process).

6. SENIOR LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE - PROPOSALS

As agreed at item 4 the Committee moved into exempt session.

The Committee received a report in relation to senior leadership proposals.

RESOLVED:

The Employment Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- 1) note the proposed consultation with staff and consider the feedback on a shared senior leadership arrangement with Cambridgeshire County Council for staff;
- 2) recommend any appropriate actions in response to the proposals prior to implementation by the Chief Executive under her delegated powers;
- 3) consider the proposed job descriptions for approval, making any necessary proposals for changes and, if required, delegating authority to finally approve the job descriptions to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chairman of Employment Committee and
- 4) approve that the current joint appointment process be followed for recruiting to the new Executive Director and Service Director roles for Place and Economy and the appointment/extension to joint roles.

Chairman
10:00am – 10:34am

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 4.00PM, ON
17 DECEMBER 2018
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Holdich (Vice-Chairman), Councillors Fitzgerald, Ayres, Seaton, Jamil, Amjad Iqbal and Hogg

Officers Present: Gillian Beasley Chief Executive
Mandy Pullen Assistant Director HR & OD
Dan Kalley Senior Democratic Services Officer

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nadeem and Lamb.

Councillors Seaton and Ayres were in attendance as substitutes.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

3. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

In accordance with Standing Orders, the Committee was asked to determine whether item 4 'Outcomes of Approved Shared Senior Management Proposals' as defined by Paragraph 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Schedule 12A of Part 1 of the Local Government Act 1972, should be exempt and the press and public excluded from the meeting when they were discussed, or whether the public interest in disclosing this information outweighed the public interest in maintaining the exemption.

The Committee unanimously agreed to the exclusion of the press and public for agenda item 4.

4. OUTCOMES OF APPROVED SHARED SENIOR MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS

The Committee received a report in relation to the outcomes of approved shared senior management proposals.

RESOLVED:

The Employment Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- 1) Endorse the appointment of Sue Grace in the post of Director Customer & Digital Services across both Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.

- 2) Endorse the appointment of Amanda Askham in the post of Director Business Improvement & Development across both Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.
- 3) Conclude the employment contract of Simon Machen, Corporate Director Growth and Regeneration by reason of redundancy.

Chairman
4pm – 6pm

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	<p>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.</p>
Married couples or those entered into a civil partnership	<p>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.</p>
Pregnant women or women on maternity leave	<p>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.</p>
Particular ethnic groups	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Those of a particular religion or who hold a particular belief	<p>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</p>

	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 it's 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