

SCOTTISH PAY REFERENCE AND IMPLEMENTATION GROUP (SPRIG)

Notes and action points from the SPRIG meeting held on 25 October 2006 in Europa Building, Glasgow

Present:

George Brechin
Jimmy Farrelly
Lindsey Ferries
Glyn Hawker
Brian Houston
Lynne Khindria
Alex Killick
Janis Millar
Alex McLuckie
John Provan
David Renshaw
Ian Reid (co-chair)
Melanie Stewart
Elizabeth Stow (co-chair in the chair)
Tom Waterson
Rona Webster

Apologies:

Laura Ace, Jane Anderson, Alan Boyter, Barbara Ann Boyter, Robert Calderwood, Steve Conway, Colin Cowie, Willie Duffy, David Esplin, Michael Fuller, John Gallacher, Helen Kelly, Lillian Macer, Gerry Marr, Jim McCaffery, Colin McGowan, Dorothy McKinney, Patricia McNally, Chris Murphy, Shirley Rogers, Donald Shiach, Gillian Smith, Gordon Walker.

Minutes of 23 September 2006

1. With the addition of Robert Calderwood as an attendee, it was agreed that the note was an accurate reflection of the previous meeting.

Matter arising and action points

2. Pensions protection under AfC - SPPA had scoped out options for taking forward pensions protection, and this had been sent to the payroll community to comment on feasibility. It will then be circulated to the sub-group for comment.

3. Frozen Annual Leave – a letter has been issued to the Boards outlining SPRIG's position.

4. AHP and Nurse Consultant Posts - Alex Killick had drawn SPRIG's concerns to colleagues at the Executive leading the review, and they will be asked to regularly update SPRIG.

5. Evaluation of new posts – QIS had asked SPRIG to re-consider its position on the evaluation of new posts under AfC. This request was declined.
6. Unsocial hours review – It was reported that the UK sub-group conducting the review was due to meet on 23 September 2006, and as things currently stood the intended target date for implementation is still April 2007.
7. Senior managers pay – It was confirmed that an HDL had been issued outlining arrangements for senior managers pay.
8. A view was expressed that the review of the senior managers pay had not been a partnership process. A view was also expressed that if AfC structures did not fit other non-medical staff groups, then alternative arrangements for those groups should also be considered.
9. It was stated that Senior Managers had never been part of AfC, rather their pay structure was determined by way of Ministerial direction. As a result, the staff covered by this direction were not subject to the same bargaining mechanism as staff covered explicitly by the AfC agreement. It was also stated that the purpose of the review was to assess whether AfC was an appropriate pay structure for those staff covered by the Ministerial direction, and the exercise in no way undermined the Executive's commitment to AfC.
10. Concerns were raised that the job evaluation scheme under AfC was biased towards clinical professions. It was commented that this was not the intention, and that a key part of the JEMG role was to ensure that no such bias occurred.
11. Concerns were raised as to the purpose of the SPRIG monitoring role as outlined in the Senior Managers HDL. It was stated that the expectation of SPRIG would be to advise in circumstances where executive cohort posts were transferred to AfC. It was commented that this event would be relatively rare, and it was agreed that SPRIG should consider guidance as and when the event occurs, rather than base guidance on hypothetical situations.
12. Media enquiries – a Q & A to cover media enquiries had been developed. This had been endorsed by the co-chairs. It was agreed that it should be circulated to staff side organisations to ensure consistency in message.
13. Release of information on matching panels – A paper was circulated and discussed. It was confirmed that the paper augmented the guidance issued at UK level, and should form a framework for NHSScotland on the release of information. SPRIG agreed to the issue of the paper.

Matching/JEMG/assimilation progress reports

14. A verbal report was given as a written report was not yet available. It was confirmed that 72,000 postholder had gone through JEMG. It was also confirmed that 40% of all staff now assimilated, and this figure was 54.5% if bank staff and JAQs were excluded.

15. It was stated that data was being collected on the number of reviews, and this should be available by the end of November. Early indications were that there was a wide range of reviews e.g. speculative reviews, and how to report these back would not become clear until such times as the data had been gathered and analysed.

16. Comment was made that part of the defence for the rigorous approach taken to implementing AfC was that the number of reviews would be low. It was confirmed that trades unions and employers were advising against reviews which did not have real merit, though they could not insist that an employee not put one in.

17. Concerns were raised that grade compression would lead to a number of reviews, as would inconsistent outcomes across Boards. In terms of the latter, it was agreed that this issue would be scoped out over the coming weeks and the way forward agreed in partnership.

Update on KSF

18. A paper was circulated and discussed. It was reported that Janis Millar had met with all but one Board, and generally good progress was being made with implementing KSF. However, efforts were affected by the emphasis placed on matching and assimilation. A report had been requested from Boards on projected implementation progress, and SPRIG would be advised in due course.

19. A view was expressed that SPRIG and the Workforce Modernisation Unit had to work closely with those Boards who were not making progress as expected. SPRIG also supported a session on KSF at the upcoming National Conference in June.

Monitoring outcomes of reviews

20. A paper was circulated and discussed. It was reported that trends in review outcomes would be monitored, rather than individual outcomes. It was agreed that the paper should be issued.

Next years meetings

21. It was agreed that SPRIG meetings for next year should be scheduled up to March.

Summary of action points from the meeting held on 25 October 2006

Issue	Action	Decision
Media enquiries	Q & A to be issued to staff side organisations – Janis Millar	
Release of information on matching panels		Paper augmenting UK guidance to be issued to the Service – David Renshaw
Monitoring outcomes of		It was agreed that the

reviews		paper should be issued – David Renshaw
Next years meetings	SPRIG secretariat to schedule meetings up till March next year.	
KSF national event	Janis Millar to contact organiser of the National Conference to discuss a KSF event	

Date of next meeting: 22 November 2006, from 11.00 – 13.00 in St Andrews House, Edinburgh.