

# Personnel Appeals Committee (Pay Board)

Minutes of a meeting held at County Hall,  
Colliton Park, Dorchester on 19 August 2013.

## Present:

Peter Richardson (Chairman),  
Deborah Croney (Vice-Chairman),  
Paul Kimber, Pauline Batstone, Beryl Ezzard and David Harris (Observer).

## Officers attending:

Natalie Adam (HR Manager - Central Services), Chris Matthews (HR Business Partner - Children's Services and Dorset Waste Partnership) and Jason Quinn (Democratic Services Officer).

(Note: These minutes have been prepared by officers as a record of the meeting and of any decisions reached. They are to be considered and confirmed at the next meeting of the Personnel Appeals Committee to be held on 23 September 2013.)

## Apologies for Absence

44. There were no apologies for absence received.

## Code of Conduct

45. There were no declarations by members of any disclosable pecuniary interests under the Code of Conduct.

## Minutes

46. The minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2013 were confirmed and signed.

## Exclusion of the Public

### Resolved

47. That, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the item of business specified in minutes 48 and 49 because it was likely that if members of the public were present there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 2 and 4, of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act and the public interest in withholding the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing that information.

## Review of Labour Market Increments (Non Schools Posts) (Paragraphs 2 & 4)

48.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director for Corporate Resources in relation to a review of Labour Market Increments (LMIs) for fifteen non schools based posts.

48.2 It was explained that the information provided in the report regarding each post had been gathered from Croner, which provided the median salary for each post and from the Head of Service relevant to each position. Members were informed that no neighbouring authority comparative data had been gathered, unless the Head of Service had provided that information. The Committee was reminded that the retention of LMIs should be based on objective justification and where no such justification exists, the LMIs should be reduced or removed.

48.3 Members were informed that the report accurately reflected the recent change in salaries following a 1% pay award.

48.4 It was explained that if increments were reduced or removed from posts as a result of the decisions of the Committee, individuals currently in the post would be pay protected for three years.

48.5 A member asked that where the data supported the retention of LMIs, was it possible to increase the salary as an alternative to attaching increments. It was explained that salaries were determined through the County Council's job evaluation scheme but the scheme does not link to the labour market. The Labour Market Adjustment Scheme enables the labour market to be considered and where the case was supported the salary would be brought in line with neighbouring authorities.

48.6 The first case related to post that had two LMIs attached to it. It was explained that it had been difficult to accumulate Croner data for this post as it was a career grade position. The Head of Service data provided explained that the Council usually progressed postholders through from level 1 to Level 3, and as the post was a part qualified role (level 2), it was difficult to find comparative salaries.

48.7 Members were told that if the postholders obtained the relevant qualification, on progressing to Level 3 of the career grade, the salary would significantly increase, and coupled with the Head of Service information it was difficult to find evidence to support retention of the LMIs for the post.

48.8 Members asked if the postholders would be expected to fund their own training if they wished to progress to a Level 3 qualification. It was explained that the Council currently funded the cost of the training.

48.9 After reviewing the Head of Service information provided, members decided to remove the LMIs attached to the post.

48.10 The second case looked at the review of a post with four LMIs attached to it. It was explained that there were thirteen postholders in the role, and the last time the posts were recruited, there had been no external. The data provided in the report supported retention of the LMIs attached to the post, and as a result, members decided to support the retention.

48.11 The third case related to a post with a single LMI attached to it. It was explained that there had been no recent attempts to recruit to the post as the current postholder had been in post for a long period of time. Both the Croner data provided and the Head of Service for this role supported the retention of the increment. Members agreed to support the retention of the LMI.

48.12 The fourth case related to a post that had five LMIs attached to it. It was explained that the postholder had been in post for a number of years. The information provided in the report supported the retention of the LMI and members agreed to support the retention of the five labour market increments attached to the post.

48.13 Case number 5 related to a post with a single LMI. It was explained that even with the LMI attached to the post, the Croner data and comparative salaries were higher than the post's salary, which supported the retention of the increment. Members agreed to support the retention of the increment attached to the post.

48.14 The sixth case related to a post with 5 LMI's. It was explained that twelve people were currently in the role. The data provided in the report supported retention of the LMI's. Members were told that there had been five leavers from this post over the last twelve months, and that three of these leavers had expressed that the salary was the reason they had decided

to leave. After reviewing the information provided in the report the Committee agreed to retain the five increments attached to the post.

48.15 Case number 7 looked at a post with two LMI's. It was explained that the information in the report supported retention of the LMIs attached to the post. Members agreed to support the retention of the two LMIs attached to the post.

48.16 The eighth case related to a post that had a single LMI attached to it. It was explained that there was a single postholder in this position and that it had been recruited to within the last twelve months. The Head of Service supported the removal of the increment and felt that there would have been no issue recruiting for the post without the LMI attached given how similar the role is to other administrative comparators. Members agreed that based on information provided in the report and that of the Head of Service, the LMI should be removed.

48.17 The ninth case related to a post with two LMI's attached to it. The Croner data provided in the report showed the salary for this post was significantly lower than the median. Members were informed that there had been difficulties in recruiting to this role as the private sector paid a higher salary. As a result of this information, members agreed to support the retention of the two LMIs.

48.18 Case number 10 related to a post that had a single LMI attached to it. It was explained that there were three postholders in the role, and the Croner data provided showed the salary was in line with the median, although comparative data from the private sector was slightly higher than the salary attached to the post, which supported retention of the LMI. Members agreed to support retention of the LMI.

48.19 Case eleven related to a post where accumulating comparative data had been difficult to identify, but the Croner data provided supported the retention of the four LMIs attached to the post. Members agreed to support the retention of the LMIs.

48.20 The twelfth case related to a post that had a single LMI attached to it. It was explained that there were currently four individuals in the post. The data provided supported the retention of the LMI, and as a result, members agreed to support the retention of the LMI.

48.21 The thirteenth case related to a post that had two LMI's attached to it. It was explained that the Croner data provided was similar to the salary of the post, but the comparative data from the private sector was significantly higher, which supported the retention of the LMIs. Members agreed to support the retention of the two LMIs attached to the post.

48.22 The fourteenth case related to a post that had two LMIs attached to it. It was explained that there had been no recent recruitment to the post as the postholders had been in post for some time. Members were informed that comparative data from the public sector showed a lower level of pay than the salary for the post. It was also explained that national advertisements for this role paid a lower salary (many children's homes are outsourced to the private sector). It was decided to remove the LMIs attached to the post.

48.23 The fifteenth case related to a post that had four LMIs attached to it. It was explained that the Head of Service had struggled to accumulate comparative data for the post, but the Croner data provided supported retention of the LMIs. Members agreed to support retention of the four LMI's attached to the post.

**Resolved**

49.1 That following consideration of a number of cases presented in accordance with the Labour Market Adjustment Scheme, the Labour Market Increments in respect of Cases 2-7, 9-13 and 15 (as detailed in the Director's report) be retained.

49.2 That following consideration of a number of cases presented in accordance with the Labour Market Adjustment Scheme, the Labour Market Increments in respect of Cases 1, 8 and 14 (as detailed in the Director's report) be removed.

Meeting Duration: 10.00am – 11.05am