

## EMPLOYMENT PANEL

THURSDAY, 17 DECEMBER 2015

PRESENT: Councillors David Burbage (Chairman), Phillip Bicknell (Vice-Chairman), Paul Brimacombe, Lynne Jones, MJ Saunders and Christine Bateson

Officers: Alison Alexander, Simon Fletcher, Terry Baldwin and Karen Shepherd

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Dudley.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received

### MINUTES

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2015 be approved.**

### REVIEW OF THE HONORARIA SCHEME

Members considered a review of the Honoraria scheme. Members noted that the scheme was introduced in 2012. Since then 255 nominations had been made with a total of £157,503 paid out. Members noted the breakdown of payments by directorate as detailed in the report. A review had been undertaken and had identified the following issues:

- Timescales – there could be up to 6 months between an event taking place that resulted in a nomination and the payment of an award.
- Payments were capped at £1000, however the actual value could be amended a number of times throughout the process.
- Only 9.8% of nominations were in the category ‘producing an innovative idea’.
- There needed to be a focus on nominations for staff in grades 1-7.
- The Pay and Reward scheme introduced in 2014/15 looked at achievement of objectives and recognised where they were exceeded.

As a result of the issues as detailed above, a number of recommendations were made as detailed in paragraph 2.10 of the report.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that he felt it was harder for those on a lower grade to do an exceptional piece of work in the context of the whole organisation. He believed smaller payments should be made with a lower bar. Councillor Saunders commented that it was good to see the higher profile of ‘innovation and change’ but he was disappointed by the terminology in the box that Members were being asked to approve. He suggested it should read ‘can be nominated for initiating, facilitating or embedding a change’. It was important that the ability to push something through the change curve against resistance was recognised. The Managing Director commented that an idea could come from a member of staff at any level, that would then be driven through by a senior manager. It would be important to recognise both individuals.

Councillor Saunders responded that most change was undertaken 'at the coal face,' particularly attitudinal change, and this was often overlooked. The scheme should make it overtly clear that 'walking your own path and walking where the answer lied' would be recognised and rewarded, which may be different to the person who made the initial suggestion.

Members agreed that section 5 of paragraph 2.10 should be amended to include reference to 'initiate, facilitate and embed.'

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Employment Panel review the content of the paper, which has been endorsed by CMT, and agree the five recommendations made by CMT in 2.10, subject to additional wording in section 5 to refer to 'initiate, facilitate and embed'.**

#### PROGRESS OF CORPORATE SERVICES' PILOT MENTORING PROGRAMME

Members received an update on the pilot mentoring programme that had been taking place across Corporate Services, including feedback from participants. The pilot, launched in September 2015, had originally included 9 people, although one had since left the organisation. Up to three meetings had been held between mentor and mentee. Members noted the overall feedback as detailed in paragraph 2.4 of the report. A further report on progress would be presented to the Panel in March 2016.

Councillor Saunders highlighted that mentors had stated that they felt fully trained and informed, yet the pie charts showed that they were not mentoring as effectively as they could. There was a material gap between the mentors' view on whether clear objectives had been set and the mentees' view on this. Councillor Saunders therefore asked who would be adjusting the training for mentors to deal with the issue? The Head of HR commented that in some cases the mentor and mentee had discussed the purpose of the relationship but had not yet set specific objectives other than overcoming a particular problem. Over time further objectives would be discussed. Councillor Saunders highlighted that 35% of mentors believed that specific objectives had been set but only 25% of mentees were of the same opinion. The Head of HR explained that the mentor group would be meeting to review the survey outcomes. Training was available for all mentors, which would be reviewed and refreshed.

The Chairman agreed there was a different perspective but pointed out that the numbers were small. It would be worth speaking to each mentor and mentee to see if the process was occurring as they wished it to. Councillor Brimacombe suggested that the scheme needed a framework to ensure it did not drift. The Managing Director commented that the mentoring was meant to be for a specific purpose and therefore would be time limited and focussed.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That EP reviews the progress of the pilot mentoring programme and identifies further options where relevant.**

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A) 4 of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting whilst discussion took place on items 7-10 on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.**

The meeting, which began at 9.00 am, finished at 10.03 am

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....