

Appendix Consultation feed back

Comments from Unison

Unison are concerned regarding the overlapping grades, which they consider raises the problem of individuals doing greater work but being paid less than colleagues in the lower grade. The JTUs advice and guidance states that overlapping grades should not occur for this reason.

Unison question whether the overlaps absolutely necessary and query whether any significant pay difference results or discrimination against individuals within protected characteristic. Concern was also expressed around gender makeup in bands B and C.

Council response

Firstly I think it is important to point out that we haven't changed the overall premise of the original grading structure that was agreed by relevant TU's in 2011 and accepted by staff ballot, which established the principle of abutted grades, the reason for this was to keep within a limited budget envelope to implement Single Status whilst preserving services in house and having a fair and equitable pay structure, the top of one grade is the bottom of the next. In addition and importantly we are looking to implement the nationally agreed pay spine jointly agreed by the unions.

As such we are keeping to 13 pay bands and not moving the grade boundary lines or re-evaluating posts. The council is merely looking to implement the nationally agreed pay award.

1. The Assertion that someone would be paid less for doing a larger job the council considers to be false. The position of a job is dependent on the JE score this defines the relative worth of the job in relation to others and as stated above we have not moved the boundary lines of the grade. If a job is a Band B or H or M that's the grade. If someone is appointed to the bottom of one grade they will get the same pay as someone in the top of the lower grade but for a period of only 6 months with incremental progression achieved after a maximum of one year. In this time individuals will gain experience and knowledge in MCC and specific requirements for that particular job. Individuals will also have headroom to increment over 4 / 5 years which someone on the lower grade would not.

In addition If we were to remove the abutted grades the cost to the Council would severely stretch Council finances as potentially we would need to re draw the grade boundary lines and start all over again and put at risk jobs and services, as applied in 201. The council has no reserve to pay for revised pay structure and so would have the potential to lead direct service cuts.

2. The council does not recognise how the abutted grades would cause pay difference or discrimination for the reasons stated in unisons response. The EIA is based on the grades which are based on Job Evaluation as outlined above..

We are unclear around the point re gender mix in bands B and C For clarity in table 6a it clearly shows more females than males which is the same across the Council. This is because the jobs in the grades are female orientated historically which is stated in para 6.4.2 of the eqia and is a societal issue rather than a predominantly MCC / Local Government bias as these roles are found in the majority of Councils throughout the UK.

Proposed Grade	Male	Male %	Female	Female %	Total Employees	Total Employees %
Band B	69	7.24	556	19.39	625	16.36
Band C	185	19.41	345	12.03	530	13.87

These jobs are:

Band B:

Teaching Assistant L1

Middy Supervisors

Cleaners

Domestics

Social Services Escorts

Band C:

Teaching Assistant L2

Caretaker

Senior Middy Supervisor

Assistant Cooks

Leisure Assistants

Kitchen Domestic

Admin posts

- The data shows that 31.96 of the workers in band B are aged 65+ young workers aged 16-25 years old (25.87%) the majority of young workers sit in this band – Again this is because of the type of jobs found in Band B see above, the Council has an ageing workforce in general as has local government workforce. The Council is not openly discriminating against age.

The majority of the 16-25 age group do not sit in Band B as mentioned but Band C, the majority of which are in Leisure, Teaching Assistants and some in Waste. Again it's the nature of the job and the flexibility this gives that particular age group. We have not looked to limit this particular age group to any specific band.

The question around gender reassignment is not considered significant or related to which band they sit in. The information is so sparse you can't make any reasonable conclusion one way or the other, the total declaring this protected characteristic is only 0.13% of the overall workforce, but once again it relates to their jobs in Leisure not because they have had Gender Re-assignment.

4. 16.67% of the band is of mixed other race in band B. – The council is unclear why this has been highlighted, this is one person who is a Teaching Assistant in a school. The whole of mixed other, is only 0.16% of the workforce. The council acknowledges that the overall percentage of employees with an Ethnic background is small but as outlined in para 6.11.1 it is representative of the location of Monmouthshire and the public it serves.