

**APPENDIX 5**

The Union consulted their National JE Officer on the proposals who provided the following observations:

**Attendance at the JE Panel 3.2.4**

*The control that members of the panel cannot review applications from within their own service area has been removed because the membership of the panel has been expanded, I think there should be some caution exercised. I would suggest amending "Members of the panel cannot review applications from within their own service areas" to "Members of the panel should not normally review applications from within their own services areas".*

*Although one of the panellists can be a trade union representative, the panel does seem to me to be management dominated – Chief Officer, 2 Heads of Service, Payroll and Job Evaluation Manager, although I note a panel can operate provided 3 members of the panel are present, which could dilute the management dominance. I note also that the Chair will be a management officer – Chief Officer or Head of Service – and they will have the casting vote.*

**Attendance at the JE Panel 3.2.4**

*The control that members of the panel cannot review applications from within their own service area has been removed because the membership of the panel has been expanded, I think there should be some caution exercised. I would suggest amending "Members of the panel cannot review applications from within their own service areas" to "Members of the panel should not normally review applications from within their own services areas".*

*Although one of the panellists can be a trade union representative, the panel does seem to me to be management dominated – Chief Officer, 2 Heads of Service, Payroll and Job Evaluation Manager, although I note a panel can operate provided 3 members of the panel are present, which could dilute the management dominance. I note also that the Chair will be a management officer – Chief Officer or Head of Service – and they will have the casting vote.*

**Appeals 3.2.6**

*I think it would be helpful to spell out the grounds on which appellants believe the scheme has been wrongly applied. The Green Book and jointly agreed Technical Notes gives the examples of:*

- *The scheme has been wrongly applied e.g. factor levels have been wrongly allocated, the evaluation panel has failed to follow guidance etc.*
- *The job description questionnaire did not provide complete information*
- *It is believed that an equivalent job is more highly graded and paid*
- *The job has been wrongly matched or clustered (i.e. where similar jobs are grouped together and evaluated as one job)*

*I think the second example could be expanded to include job description, person specification and effort and environment proforma (physical, emotional and mental demands and working conditions are rarely included in JDs and Person Specs).*

***The JE Appels Panel 3.2.7***

*It would appear this does not include on the panel a union representative. This seems illogical if they can be a panellist on an evaluation panel.*

***Employee Initiated Application Formal Stage and Appeals***

*These are solely determined by a Hay Consultant and not by a panel. This is not partnership working and, I would imagine, is an expensive process. Trade unions should also be involved in this process for consistency and to ensure that the process is applied fairly and correctly.*

***Extract from Report for Broxtowe Borough Council from Project HR.***

*I do not necessarily agree that reducing the number of evaluators increases consistency or, if it does, it may be perpetuating flawed decisions.*

*I agree that internal comparisons can be made and I note the policy has been amended to include this.*

*I agree that recruitment and retention issues are not ones requiring a job evaluation solution. Additional payments should be based on market data, which should determine the level of supplement needed; not limited by fixed percentages.*

However, on the whole, they thought the policy changes were reasonable and addressed most of the issues we initially raised. There were concerns that this would not be going to LJCC for discussion before being presented to the Personnel Committee.