**Operational Steering Group – 29/10/2019 at 2pm**

|  |
| --- |
| **Present:** |
| Jan Buchanan | JB | Finance & Corporate Services/Glasgow Life |
| Julia McCreadie  | JMc | Development & Regeneration Services/GCC |
| Naghat Ahmed | NA | Project Manager/GCC |
| Angela Anderson | AA | Chief Executive’s/GCC |
| Lynn Norwood | LN | Corporate HR/GCC |
| Alan Taylor | AT | Corporate HR/GCC |
| David McLelland | DMcL | Education/GCC |
| Janice Timoney | JT | Finance/GCC |
| Christina Heuston | CH | Social Work/GCC |
| Andy Waddell | EM | Neighbourhoods & Sustainability/GCC |
| Kirsten Maut | KM | GMB |
| Geraldine Agbour | GA | GMB |
| Sylvia Haughney | SH | Unison |
| Mary Dawson | MD | Unison |
| Brian Smith | BS | Unison |
| Mandy McDowall | MMcD | Unison |
| Wendy Dunsmore | WD | Unite |
| Rosie Docherty | RD | Independent Job Evaluation Technical Advisor (External) |
| Eddie Cassidy | EC | Unite |
| Lynda Wilson  | LW | Job Evaluation Team |
| Alex Mitchell | AM | Job Evaluation Team |
| Caroline Yates | CY | Job Evaluation Team |
| Stevie Dougall | SD | Job Evaluation Team |
| Drew Rigden | DR | Job Evaluation Team |
| Jackie Smith | JS | Job Evaluation Team |

|  |
| --- |
| **Apologies:** |
| Julie Emley  | JE | Corporate HR/GCC |
| Jackie Kerr | Jackie K | Social Work/GCC |
| Rhea Wolfson | RW | GMB |

|  |
| --- |
| **SOFT LAUNCH feedback session*** 1. AT provided an update of the Soft Launch. AT outlined the process and highlighted the key challenges/lessons of the Soft Launch. It was noted the first session was poorly attended however for the remaining sessions there was good attendance. The key points noted as lessons learned/challenges to consider from the session included:
* Identifying cohorts
* Ensuring services are selecting staff that meet the criteria
* Briefing sessions were long and technical
* Concerns about the size of the questionnaire
* Practicalities around posting questionnaires
* Quality of questionnaire i.e. too much detail or less detail
* Time to receive questionnaires (may not be an issue longer term).
* Interview feedback was positive and processes were in place
* Duration of interview was varied from 3 ½ Hours -7 hours depending on nature of the job.
	1. Lead Analysts updated the OSG and it was noted from a JE Hub perspective the soft launch went relatively well and the team are still learning. SD mentioned the team were keen to start and the Govan hub did a 7 hour interview. It was re-iterated there are hurdles and continuous learning from the Hub. It was noted from an analyst perspective it was a positive experience even though the analysts at times were nervous.
	2. LN provided a brief feedback in terms of the three hub visits conducted on Friday 25th October. It was noted there is a learning curve and lessons to be learned. It was noted further site visits are required and there is further work still to be carried out in terms of consistency checking and planning for the next cohort. LN mentioned there was a meeting with the HR managers to feedback on the Soft Launch session. It was agreed further site visits to be arranged. **ACTION: AT to arrange further site visits**

 * 1. The Trade Unions feedback in terms of the Soft Launch session was the analyst approach was professional, welcoming but at times they did appear nervous. It was noted some briefings were different although it was noted this was not a criticism. The questionnaires were completed in good time. There was still clarity required in terms of travelling expenses. For example, if colleagues attended instead of TU representative would expenses be paid?
	2. EC advised Head Teachers did not release two staff members at the same time. EC also confirmed to the group this is not ‘Go Live’ and the language described is important in terms of communicating this to staff. JB advised the group this is not ‘Go Live’ and this was the soft launch. EC raised the point about creativity - when is it included as part of the job and when this is not \ is this a consistency issue. LN advised as part of the consistency checking this will be picked up and if it is incorrectly positioned then this will be raised to JE team. EC raised the point it is inappropriate for Job Analysts to raise expectations for job holders. LN requested for queries/specific detail to be shared if there are any issues. EC reiterated it is important not to raise or lower expectations for colleagues. It was raised staff should not be filling questionnaires in their own time. Managers should be given time and support to colleagues.
	3. KC raised the feedback was similar to the points raised previously and included the following from the GMB:
* Interviews were very stressful and difficult even with comfort breaks.
* Analysts trying to steer the interview as there was an example of a job analyst mentioning this is not relevant to your job.
* Need to review the duration of interviews and feedback to Service managers.
	1. JB advised once the project is ‘Go Live’ then we can forward plan including the points raised from the feedback session.
	2. DMcL advised in Education Services there has been communication of what is reasonable in terms of releasing staff members and it needs to be re-iterated staff do not have to return to the office if the interviews does take longer as it is not reasonable to expect staff to return to work for one hour.
	3. RD provided feedback and noted some interviews took a longer time. There was lack of familiarity in the software and the Analyst’s experience at this early stage. There is a need to recognise some jobs are much more complex. The team appeared nervous although very thorough. The team did well and although there are initial teething problems over time experience will be gained. It was noted to allow the job holders to talk about what they do. It was noted it terms of consistency checking the data needs to be verified in terms of the interviews of the same job. The next steps is confirm how the 3 hubs will work together. It was agreed the subgroup would meet following this feedback session. **ACTION: AT to arrange session.**
 |
| 1. **Next steps**
	1. Unison expressed concern that the numbers engaged were not as many as hoped. It was agreed for the next OSG meeting the learning would be captured from the soft launch. There would also be a review of the timetable.
	2. EC raised the point of the benchmarking process. RD advised the benchmarking process is to test whether they are variations in similar job titles and if something is missing in the Benchmark list then this will be presented to the OSG to consider. The process should be continued until fully captured and will also consider how we apply it to the remaining jobs in the Benchmark list.
	3. RD advised the local guidance to be applied is still a work in progress
	4. BS asked for clarity of the SJC scheme revision for the next OSG meeting.
	5. EC mentioned timelines need to be realistic and asked can this be delivered by November 2020? JB advised this will be reviewed at regular intervals however at this stage we are unable to confirm.
	6. Lessons Learned Review- BS requested an update from GCC. **ACTION NA/JB to speak to RA.**
	7. Benchmark list- LN suggested providing a list of the top Benchmark jobs and to provide a rolling programme for the next 3 months to plan time, support for services. The project plan/ communication plan to reflect the activity when agreed.
 |
| **Next Meeting** The next scheduled meeting of the OSG is 14th November 2019. OSG requested for the 19th December meeting to be scheduled the week before. **ACTION: NA to check available dates** |