

CHIEF OFFICERS' EMPLOYMENT PANEL MINUTES

4 AUGUST 2016

Chair: * Councillor Sachin Shah

Councillors: * Simon Brown * Susan Hall
* Keith Ferry * Barry Macleod-Cullinane

* Denotes Member present

73. Membership

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly nominated Member:-

Ordinary Member

Nominated Member

Councillor Sue Anderson

Councillor Simon Brown

74. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members.

75. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2016 be taken as read and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:-

Minute 68 – Declarations of Interest – Councillors Barry Macleod-Cullinane and Paul Osborn campaigned against public sector bodies that made pay-off payments of over £100,000.

Minute 69 – Appointment of Vice-Chair – The following words be added as a preamble to the resolution ‘Having received two nominations for the appointment of Vice Chair and being put to the vote it was’.

RESOLVED ITEMS

76. Remuneration Packages of £100,000 or Greater

Members received a report of the Corporate Director, People, which sought approval for changes to the remuneration of two senior officer posts.

In introducing the report, the Corporate Director, People, stated that the proposal to uplift the salaries of two senior officers was a difficult issue to bring before Members given the current financial situation but that it was in the interests of the Council to do so. He explained that the uplift was essentially a retention payment to two highly marketable officers, whilst making £100,000 savings to senior management costs. He emphasised the risk to the Council should the officers leave and advised that they had been approached by both the public and private sector. The Corporate Director added that he had evidence in the form of recent job advertisements that it would be more expensive to replace the officers than to make the proposed retention payments.

A Member challenged the business case and expressed the view that the report had a number of shortcomings and was poorly presented, stating that it was not clear what salary the officers currently received. He stated that the job evaluations had not indicated that the salaries should be increased and that the business case only met two of the four criteria set out in the pay policy criteria. The Corporate Director advised that the current Director of Adult Social Services (DASS) was at the top of grade D2 and that the proposed supplement would result in an annual salary of £120,324 which was at the lower end of the salaries offered in recent adverts for similar posts. The DASS had previously been in receipt of an uplift in salary due to her role in Leisure Services which had now been withdrawn following a re-organisation. Similarly, a payment for being an Emergency Response Officer had been withdrawn and the DASS had taken a decision to forgo an essential car user allowance. The retention payment was also proposed as the postholder had taken on additional responsibilities..

In response to the comments in relation to job evaluation, the Corporate Director advised that this was not the sole justification for proposing an uplift. The proposals had been made in line with the Council’s retention policy. For the DASS, the payment would result in a standstill position in terms of salary. The Head of Adult Social Care had been appointed at the top of the salary scale three years ago and had not received any uplift despite taking on significant additional responsibilities due to the reduction in the size of the management team. The Corporate Director stated that he did not agree with the legal opinion that there was no market justification for the retention payments and reiterated that recent advertisements for similar roles demonstrated the salaries currently being offered elsewhere were in line with those proposed. He tabled copies of the advertisements for Members information.

A Member questioned whether the proposed payment would resolve the recruitment and retention issues if the payments did not result in salaries comparable to those being offered elsewhere. He suggested that the Leader of the Council should discuss this matter with the Director of Finance. The Corporate Director thanked the Member for his suggestion but commented that he personally would not accept a pay rise if offered under current circumstances.

A Member stated that whilst the current post holders were good officers she was concerned at the risks outlined in the legal paragraphs and expressed support for the views expressed in terms of the pay policy criteria. There were other good officers within the organisation that the Council would also be keen to retain and these proposals may set a precedent. The Corporate Director reassured Members that the proposals were in line with Council policy and there was already a precedent set for this kind of payment.

Having been put to the vote it was

RESOLVED: That, subject to annual review by the Corporate Director, People, in consultation with the Head of Human Resources and the relevant Portfolio Holder, the following market supplements be approved;

£5,865 per annum for the Director of Adult Social Services; and
£11,876 per annum for the Head of Adult Social Care.

(Note: Councillors Susan Hall and Barry Macleod-Cullinane wished to be recorded as having voted against the above Resolution as whilst it was not a reflection on the officers concerned the evidence and paperwork to support the proposal was not, in their opinion, adequate).

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.45 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR SACHIN SHAH
Chair