

Management of Change policy Summary of feedback and agreed response

There were five comments provided directly to the HR department, with none provided to the Union specifically about the Management of Change policy.

The JCC and Corporate Leadership Team discussed the four comments below and have agreed the following responses. The fifth comment was supportive of the document and required no further response.

- 1) The first comment relates to the composition of the Management of Change panel questioning whether representation of non-Union members of staff was through HR. It was suggested to cap Union involvement to one person and involve someone from ACAS to represent non-Union staff.

Response:

- i) To clarify that HR is not on the panel to represent non-union staff members, but instead performs an independent role to guide the process of managing staff change.
- ii) The wording of “up to 2 union members” in the policy is to protect against the need to change the policy in the future in case additional Unions become recognised within the Council. We will keep the wording saying “up to 2 union members”.
- iii) It is unlikely that ACAS will be suitable member of the panel as involvement in day to day operational decisions is not their main remit.
- iv) Instead, we have **changed the wording in the policy** so that the panel can include a staff representative for times when it is deemed appropriate depending on the nature and circumstances of the change.

- 2) A second comment provided feedback that the wording of one sentence in section 7.1 relating to assimilation, was not as clear as it could be.

Response:

- i) **The third bullet point has changed** from “There are no other internal candidates for the new post”, to “The postholder of the exiting post is the only person considered eligible for the new post on the criteria already listed above”. The opening sentence in 7.2 has also been changed, as it referenced the amended 7.1 text. 7.2 now reads: “Where the first two criteria for assimilation (as detailed above) are met but there is more than one person considered eligible for the new posts, posts will initially be restricted and ring-fenced to those staff identified as assimilated”.

- 3) A comment was made about whether the Council had used the correct comparison Councils in the benchmarking comparison data, and whether we should look at Councils who pay similar salaries for similar roles. It is believed that “the wages at Eden are low but we have better redundancy payments” to compensate [sic].

Response:

- i) It has not been a policy to keep wages at Eden District Council low and compensate staff with higher redundancy benefits instead.
- ii) It is very difficult to access salary data for “comparable roles” as there is no easy way of identifying like for like roles. It is also difficult to gain access to this confidential information in other Councils.
- iii) We are comfortable that the comparison data we have been able to obtain reveals that Eden is very much in line with the market in this current financial climate, and in some cases, is offering more preferential benefits than is typical.
- iv) We do not think the complexity of undertaking further benchmarking will produce a meaningfully different result and continue to believe the benefits are fair and reasonable. **There will be no further benchmarking undertaken and the benefits listed will remain.**

- 4) A final comment was made that the policy had justified text which can be harder to read by people who are dyslexic.

Response:

- i) We have **made the policy unjustified** in layout.

HR Department, 26 August 2020.