

EMPLOYEES' CONSULTATIVE FORUM: 24/01/2012

EMPLOYEES' SIDE REPORT ON: Relating to a DTL Collective Dispute (D@W)

SUMMARY AND DECISION REQUESTED

That the forum recognises the poor treatment received by the staff group that the complaint relates to. We request that recommendations are made by the forum for those responsible to be held fully accountable through the council's internal employment procedures.

CHRONOLOGY:

DATE	ACTION	OUTCOME
	Through DJC & Mr Hills	On going issue, poor response
	Page 13 from Harrow Council's Equal Opportunities Policy	On going issue
	Page 58 from the Full Business Case	On going issue
	Page 20 from the Outline Business Case	On going issue
	Training Records	On going issue
	After Structure	On going issue
	Previous Structure	On going issue
10/08/2011	Emails from Mr Hills to Mr Martin	Protracted issue no adequate response
10/08/2011	Emails from Mr Hills to Mr Martin	Protracted issue no adequate response
23/09/2011	Email from Mr Martin to Mr Edwards	Protracted issue no adequate response
20/10/2011	Letter from Mr Edwards to Mr Martin	Protracted issue no adequate response
07/12/2011, 14/12/2011 & 5/01/2012	Emails from Mr Hills and Mr Martin	Protracted issue no adequate response

REPORT

Unison submits this report in line with the requirements of a collective dispute as identified within the Councils Dignity at work procedure. The first stage to resolving the issues that are encompassed within the D@W collective dispute was to invite Mr Hills to attend a meeting with the incumbent staffing group on the 10/8/2011 the e-mails states a brief outline into the concerns. This invitation to meet with staff was declined by the incumbent director. Due to the actions of the incumbent director the members were left with no alternative but to enter into the formal process.

The DJC meeting was held on the 29/9/2011 to hear the formal complaint and full verbal submissions were provided by Unison in the delivery of the complaint as well as submitting the required D@W complaint form a month previously to the Divisional Director. At the DJC Meeting the management stated they failed to understand the complaint and failed miserably to engage in any debate which is clearly identified in the e-mail to the Divisional Director on the 23rd September 2011. This matter has failed to follow any correct procedure that the council has at its disposal. The Chief Officer has been allowed to conduct matters outside of any process in some perverse belief that they have the delegated authority to do so.

I now refer to the e-mail sent to Mr Hills on the 5th January 2012 again requesting an outcome and some type of resolution to this extremely sensitive issue. The content of this e-mail identifies a clear contempt to undertake matters in a fair and equitable manner. This is clearly evident from the Chief Officers terminology and the use of rebutting rather than the recognised term resolution. This vital e-mail also identifies the dispute in its entirety. Firstly the training issue identifies that no long serving member of staff within this workgroup has received development training as identified in the councils equal opportunities policy, I refer to page 11 of the Equal Opportunities policy headed training and development opportunities where the council is committed to equal access to training and development. As you will see from the training record provided to Unison by the Head of Public Realm Services no training has been provided to any of the Waste services Driver Team Leaders.

The second point to consider is the Restructure undertaken by this Directorate that was both discriminatory and "Less than Satisfactory" according to another Chief Officer in his conclusion to another related D@W complaint. Unison has provided the before and after structure of the PRS which clearly identifies both unlawful practices and a clear victimisation of a certain section of the workforce, which may we add were not identified within the restructure OBC/FBC presented to Cabinet for approval.

The structure and OBC excerpt identify the reduction of 10 Assistant managers when there were actually 12/13 within the previous structure. Two assistant Managers in Waste services were issued with Dismissal letters in or around 22nd July 2011 this then shows the forum that these positions still remain and redundancy notices were revoked by the employer once they were aware of this unlawful act. (This matter is still unresolved)

If as stated three new positions were created above the DTL then why has the employer denied access to apply for these newly created posts? We also question the new structure and state why the DTL on the same level as Streets and Grounds TL prior to the Business case but demoted in the newly created structure, the position above the DTL either remains unchanged or they are newly created positions which should be open to all within the service apart from assimilation rights to the two remaining assistant managers waste services. We have been informed by HRD that the Grade differs from H5 DTL to H6 S&G TL and was therefore the reason. Unison questions this ridiculous response especially when the same situation of grade difference exists at service manager level without a change in reporting lines and position within the structure. This in our member's opinion is a clear demotion without consultation.

The third point is extremely alarming which has invited the council to incur unnecessary cost I directly refer to the councils pay progression GLPC scheme, DTL who entered this authority with the required qualification were required to comply with the spinal point increases. New DTL who were afforded the training to acquire the required professional qualification at the council's expense were appointed and were escalated to the top spinal point after a period of six month. This has discriminatory aspects as well as financial implications. Those who were required to rightfully comply with the spinal progression have been placed at a financial disadvantage over a period of 3year six month, therefore treated less favourably than those employees the council invested in.

The Divisional Director in point 2 of his response fails to understand the basics behind the complaint.

AUTHOR: Harrow UNISON LG Branch

CONTACT DETAILS:

*Harrow L.G. Branch
The UNISON Office
Central Depot, Forward Drive
Harrow, Middlesex
HA3 8NT
Tel: 020 8424 1795
Fax: 020 8424 1835
Email: info@harrow-unison.org.uk*