

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE
OF DUNGANNON AND SOUTH TYRONE BOROUGH COUNCIL HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 28 JUNE 2006 IN THE COUNCIL OFFICES, DUNGANNON**

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** In the chair, Councillor Cuddy (Chairman)

Councillors Currie, Gildernew, Hamilton,
McGuigan, Monteith, Morrow and O'Neill
- OTHERS:** Councillor Molloy
- OFFICERS PRESENT:** Mr Currie, Mr Frazer, Mrs Kerr and Mrs Smith

The meeting started at 7.33 pm.

1 PAY AND GRADING REVIEW
CONSIDERATION OF PROTECTION ARRANGEMENTS

The Head of Human Resources circulated document 'Dungannon & South Tyrone Borough Council – Single Status – Pay and Grading Implementation – Draft Agreement – 28.06.06' (appendix 1). He stated that following discussion at previous meeting changes had been made in relation to protection arrangements section 3 and amendment to the appeals procedure section 13 to include 'The appellant or those appearing in support may ask questions or comment on the submission'.

At the previous meeting officers were tasked with considering proposal that we pay everyone on the appropriate grade at the 33½ level. Head of Finance had emailed Local Government Auditor and in his reply he stated that from an audit point of view the aim should be to have staff on the evaluated rate of pay. His view was that it would not be defensible for the Council to protect pay beyond what an individual currently enjoys.

Head of Human Resources advised that he had spoken to Council's Barrister yesterday and his view was that potentially unlawful if pay above evaluated grade and what employees currently earn.

Head of Human Resources stated that fully supportive of members thinking, took members through amendments and proposals (detailed in section 3) and further stated that UCAT and UMB have indicated that they will be recommending acceptance of the revised agreement. The proposals involved 31 employees over 8 job titles.

There is possibility of changing bin loaders on same job description as general operatives 8 out of 31 with possibly one that is buy out.

Had also been agreed with unions that task and finish as detailed in section 6 will be removed on grounds of health and safety and equality.

Head of Human Resources stated that while unions have agreed the proposals he cannot see any signing up following finding of recent court case in England.

During discussion the following questions and comments were put and answers provided:

Members questions/comments	Head of Human Resources answers
What unions saying in relation to buyouts.	Unions will be recommending and then up to individual employees. Cannot force buyout.
What about non-union employees and how many are there.	Staff Consultative Committee, involves non-union employees, meeting called for tomorrow to give update. Among permanent employees approximately 30 people at meetings.
Bonus - may eliminate in terminology but not in practice.	Bonus eliminated (section 4).
Within document maximum period of protection 5 years. Surely we are trying to ensure that all employees remain after RPA.	Five years relative to effective date 1 April 2004 and when RPA comes into effect. Terms and conditions may be negotiated under new employer.
Buyout in danger of creating another tier within workforce at time of RPA.	Pay lump sum now or in two/three stages.
What exact purpose of the grading system.	Defines pay line.
When RPA in force need for equality in relation to staff and former manuals.	Transition will have to be same for all.

<p>If going to move bin loaders to general operatives a redundancy situation will arise.</p> <p>If recommending buyout now why could not have done same with bonus. Believe bonus and pay and grading review linked. Think trade unions doing bad job representing members.</p> <p>RPA – surely someone should have some ruling and direction.</p> <p>Outcome of pay and grading review backdated to April 2004 with buyouts from acceptance of pay and grading.</p> <p>What is extra cost.</p> <p>If vacancies arise in the interests of equality think these should be publicly advertised.</p> <p>Who selects employees for higher level posts.</p> <p>In part of report Job Evaluation Guidelines and Good Practice section 7.3 Personal Protection Arrangements – employer to ensure equitable.</p> <p>Tribunals pending. Does accepting pay and grading review diminish chances of success. Think will hurt case.</p> <p>Do not believe pay and grading review will deal with inequalities.</p>	<p>Under single status every employee has the right to have pay and grading review on their post. Will do away with bonus. Current bonus situation to be dealt with through outcome of tribunal.</p> <p>Shadow councils to come in and decide on way forward.</p> <p>Yes. Implementation date for Single Status, 31 March 2007.</p> <p>Costings were provided to the meeting.</p> <p>Consider transfer to vacancy at higher level, subject to employees agreement and subject to individual meeting requirements of the higher level post. Vacant posts would the be advertised.</p> <p>If interest shown by a number of employees interview and appoint through normal process.</p> <p>Council following good practice and individual would have to check their own situation.</p>
---	---

Head of Human Resources advised that Craftsmen have own union and work under different conditions – building and civil engineering conditions. Considering the grades that have come out of pay and grading review, figures provided at meeting, buy outs would not be an option as Council would have difficulty in recruiting craftsmen in the future. Proposing that consult with the unions to discuss proposals.

Member stated that if cannot pay higher than evaluated grade were general operative are concerned surely would also apply to craftsmen.

Head of Human Resources proposed that he bring report to August Corporate Services Committee dealing with Craftsmen after discussing with union/other Councils. Eight employees fall within this category.

Proposed by Councillor Currie
Seconded by Councillor Hamilton

That the report be referred to Council meeting on Monday night for further discussion.

Amendment

Proposed by Councillor Monteith
Seconded by Councillor McGuigan

That it be recommended to the Council that the document be rejected as still reinforces inequalities in Technical Services Department.

The amendment was put to the meeting 4 members voting in favour and 4 against. The Chairman used his casting vote against the amendment and declared the proposal carried.

Head of Human Resources stated that he will be available between now and Monday night if any member wishes to discuss the matter with him before the meeting.

2 DURATION OF MEETING

The meeting was called for 7.30 pm and ended at 8.45 pm.