

Thurrock: A place of opportunity, enterprise and excellence, where
individuals, communities and businesses flourish

Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The meeting will be held at **7.00 pm** on **26 March 2015** in **Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL**

Membership:

Councillors Yash Gupta (MBE) (Chair), Shane Hebb (Vice-Chair), Charlie Key, Val Morris-Cook, Graham Snell and Terry Brookes

Substitutes:

Councillors Robert Gledhill, Barry Johnson and Jan Baker

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Minutes	5 - 10
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 3 February 2015.	
3 Items of Urgent Business	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
4 Declaration of Interests	
5 Month 9 Quarter 3 Corporate Performance Report 2014-15	11 - 26
6 Pay and Reward Review	27 - 36
7 Fairness Commission update	37 - 40

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Matthew Boulter, Principal Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **18 March 2015**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

Members of the public can attend all meetings of the council and its committees and have the right to see the agenda, which will be published no later than 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published.

Recording of meetings

This meeting may be recorded for transmission and publication on the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be recorded.

Members of the public not wishing any speech or address to be recorded for publication to the Internet should contact Democratic Services to discuss any concerns.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Guidelines on filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings

The council welcomes the filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings as a means of reporting on its proceedings because it helps to make the council more transparent and accountable to its local communities.

If you wish to film or photograph the proceedings of a meeting and have any special requirements or are intending to bring in large equipment please contact the Communications Team at CommunicationsTeam@thurrock.gov.uk before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will then be consulted and their agreement sought to any specific request made.

Where members of the public use a laptop, tablet device, smart phone or similar devices to use social media, make recordings or take photographs these devices must be set to 'silent' mode to avoid interrupting proceedings of the council or committee.

The use of flash photography or additional lighting may be allowed provided it has been discussed prior to the meeting and agreement reached to ensure that it will not disrupt proceedings.

The Chair of the meeting may terminate or suspend filming, photography, recording and use of social media if any of these activities, in their opinion, are disrupting proceedings at the meeting.

Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

Wi-Fi is available throughout the Civic Offices. You can access Wi-Fi on your device by simply turning on the Wi-Fi on your laptop, Smartphone or tablet.

- You should connect to TBC-CIVIC
- Enter the password **Thurrock** to connect to/join the Wi-Fi network.
- A Terms & Conditions page should appear and you have to accept these before you can begin using Wi-Fi. Some devices require you to access your browser to bring up the Terms & Conditions page, which you must accept.

The ICT department can offer support for council owned devices only.

Evacuation Procedures

In the case of an emergency, you should evacuate the building using the nearest available exit and congregate at the assembly point at Kings Walk.

How to view this agenda on a tablet device



You can view the agenda on your [iPad](#), [Android Device](#) or [Blackberry Playbook](#) with the free modern.gov app.

Members of the Council should ensure that their device is sufficiently charged, although a limited number of charging points will be available in Members Services.

To view any “exempt” information that may be included on the agenda for this meeting, Councillors should:

- Access the modern.gov app
- Enter your username and password

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

Breaching those parts identified as a pecuniary interest is potentially a criminal offence

Helpful Reminders for Members

- *Is your register of interests up to date?*
- *In particular have you declared to the Monitoring Officer all disclosable pecuniary interests?*
- *Have you checked the register to ensure that they have been recorded correctly?*

When should you declare an interest *at a meeting*?

- **What matters are being discussed at the meeting?** (including Council, Cabinet, Committees, Subs, Joint Committees and Joint Subs); or
- If you are a Cabinet Member making decisions other than in Cabinet **what matter is before you for single member decision?**



Does the business to be transacted at the meeting

- relate to; or
- likely to affect

any of your registered interests and in particular any of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests?

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests shall include your interests or those of:

- your spouse or civil partner's
- a person you are living with as husband/ wife
- a person you are living with as if you were civil partners

where you are aware that this other person has the interest.

A detailed description of a disclosable pecuniary interest is included in the Members Code of Conduct at Chapter 7 of the Constitution. **Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer about disclosable pecuniary interests.**

What is a Non-Pecuniary interest? – this is an interest which is not pecuniary (as defined) but is nonetheless so significant that a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard to be so significant that it would materially impact upon your judgement of the public interest.

Pecuniary

If the interest is not already in the register you must (unless the interest has been agreed by the Monitoring Officer to be sensitive) disclose the existence and nature of the interest to the meeting

If the Interest is not entered in the register and is not the subject of a pending notification you must within 28 days notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest for inclusion in the register

Unless you have received dispensation upon previous application from the Monitoring Officer, you must:

- Not participate or participate further in any discussion of the matter at a meeting;
- Not participate in any vote or further vote taken at the meeting; and
- leave the room while the item is being considered/voted upon

If you are a Cabinet Member you may make arrangements for the matter to be dealt with by a third person but take no further steps

Non- pecuniary

Declare the nature and extent of your interest including enough detail to allow a member of the public to understand its nature



You may participate and vote in the usual way but you should seek advice on Predetermination and Bias from the Monitoring Officer.

Thurrock: A place of opportunity, enterprise and excellence, where individuals, communities and businesses flourish

To achieve our vision, we have identified five strategic priorities:

1. Create a great place for learning and opportunity

- Ensure that every place of learning is rated “Good” or better
- Raise levels of aspirations and attainment so that local residents can take advantage of job opportunities in the local area
- Support families to give children the best possible start in life

2. Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity

- Provide the infrastructure to promote and sustain growth and prosperity
- Support local businesses and develop the skilled workforce they will require
- Work with communities to regenerate Thurrock’s physical environment

3. Build pride, responsibility and respect to create safer communities

- Create safer welcoming communities who value diversity and respect cultural heritage
- Involve communities in shaping where they live and their quality of life
- Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and safeguard the vulnerable

4. Improve health and well-being

- Ensure people stay healthy longer, adding years to life and life to years
- Reduce inequalities in health and well-being
- Empower communities to take responsibility for their own health and wellbeing

5. Protect and promote our clean and green environment

- Enhance access to Thurrock’s river frontage, cultural assets and leisure opportunities
- Promote Thurrock’s natural environment and biodiversity
- Ensure Thurrock’s streets and parks and open spaces are clean and well maintained

Minutes of the Meeting of the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 3 February 2015 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillors Yash Gupta (MBE) (Chair), Shane Hebb (Vice-Chair) and Terry Brookes

In attendance: Councillor John Kent, Leader of the Council
Steve Cox, Assistant Chief Executive
Matthew Essex, Head of Regeneration
Sean Clark, Head of Corporate Finance
Richard Parkin, Head of Housing
Jackie Hinchliffe, Head of HR, OD and Customer Strategy
Matthew Boulter, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Chris Pickering, Principal Solicitor - Employment & Litigation

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

22. Minutes

The Minutes of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee, held on 15 January 2015 were approved as a correct record.

23. Declaration of Interests

No Interests were declared.

24. Terms of Reference for Proposed Thameside Complex Review

The Committee was informed that the stage one options appraisal on the Thameside had been released today and a large amount of work had already been done to progress the options for the Thameside services and building. The Council wanted to make a decision on the Thameside by the summer of this year so that savings could be made in the 2016-17 year. Members were asked to look at the terms of reference and either compact the timescale or choose a working group, which would be more flexible and responsive.

Councillor Brookes felt a working group could work although councillors Gupta and Hebb felt that a task and finish group was more thorough and gave a better message to the public.

Following discussion it was ultimately concluded that the best way forward was for a Task and Finish group to be convened as soon as possible with a date for the first meeting set in March. The Task and Finish Group would set a work programme for officers to carry out over the election period with the Task and Finish Group reconvening after the elections to review the results. Group

Leaders were to be asked to nominate representatives who were not up for election within the current cycle.

RESOLVED: That a task and finish group be convened and to complete its work in the summer of 2015 for consideration by Cabinet. Group Leaders to be asked to nominate representatives for a first meeting in March, date to be agreed.

25. Shaping the Council and Budget Progress Update

Officers explained that the council would receive a reduction in grant from central government by £10.168 million. Despite this reduction, the Council was still delivering a balanced budget. Officers confirmed that the £168,000 was being covered by the use of a reserve but added that all services were being asked to work within a budget envelope even though reserves for population growth and an increased pressure on services had been put aside.

The Committee discussed council tax and learnt that by taking a grant from government to freeze council tax would deny the council £460,000 that would be received if it raised council tax by 1.99%. Director's Board was recommending that council accept the 1.99% rise.

Officers outlined some of the savings that had yet to be delivered and these included funds linked with Adult and Children's Social care and the Better Care Fund to the ongoing issue of staff pay and conditions. Officers stated that the trades unions were currently not receptive to the proposals presented to achieve the savings and if this continued then heads of service would be asked to make specific savings in relation to staff costs instead. Savings from Serco also had yet to be delivered. Officers added that conversations about future savings proposals were already underway and being developed. Members stated that the impact on the staff and services was becoming greater and officers agreed that it would continue as savings were made.

Officers were asked whether the rise of the academy schools meant savings could be made in the education department as the responsibilities of the local education authority must have reduced. Officers confirmed that the department had zero base budgeted its service some years ago and was continuing to monitor that. In the finance department the service they provided to schools had been reduced accordingly.

RESOLVED: That the Committee note the report, including the recommendations set out below agreed by Cabinet on 14 January 2015.

- That the Cabinet note the impact of the Local Government Draft Finance Settlement and the subsequent budget forecasts;
- That the Cabinet agree to the funding recommendations as follows:
 - As explained in the report, the government top slices New Homes Bonus (NHB) funding from the overall pot available for

local government finance. The amount taken is always in excess of the amount distributed and is distributed in a later announcement. Considering past allocations, it is recommended to budget for an additional grant of £0.200m:

- Further to paragraph 2.5, the remaining £0.800m of brought forward pressures be utilised;
- As stated in previous reports, there remains a £0.500m contingency in 2015/16 for demographic pressures. The balance of £0.168m should be met from this sum; and
- That officers be instructed to identify those savings required for the remainder of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and implement as many as possible in 2015/16 to increase resilience.

26. Budget 2015-16 - Proposed Fees and Charges

Members were informed that the legal costs aimed to make full cost recovery and were comparable with the market. It was highlighted that the same services by a private practice would cost much more.

The Committee discussed hop leases and suggested that a gradation of fees could apply to encourage small businesses and fairly charge larger businesses. The Committee also heard that most fees and charges had been increased by a minimum of 3% if not more.

RESOLVED: That

- 1. The fees and charges are noted.**
- 2. The Legal Services Department look to grade their costs for shop leases to reflect the size of the business applying for the lease.**

27. Budget 2015-16 - Capital Proposals

Capital funds were used to modernise services and maintain assets. The capital fund had yet to be allocated to projects and the report contained all the projects which were currently being considered. Not all would be funded.

The Committee felt there was an anomaly between spending money to refurbish IT and the civic offices and the need to make redundancies. Officers explained that this reflected two separate funds that could not be crossed over. Modernising the offices would save money by maximising space and increasing the potential to rent office space to external companies in CO-1.

Councillor Hebb felt three test should apply to each capital bid to see whether it related to health and safety or statutory compliance or whether it was discretionary. Officers agreed with this approach.

There was a brief discussion on the council chamber and Councillor Kent stated that the modernisation of the offices should include the ground floor

where a re-design could increase public access to meetings, improve general access to council services and free up potential commercial space.

RESOLVED: That the report is noted.

28. Customer Services/Channel Shift

Members were taken through the three key avenues of channel shift, which were:

- A new website and an increased digitisation of council work through 'my account' where the public could access services direct online.
- Review the role and use of the contact call centre.
- Implement a modern telephony system.

Officers agreed with Member comments that the contractual targets to answer phone calls were not the best. Members felt it was better to lengthen the target time to answer a call and increase percentage success rate rather than reduce target response rate and lower percentage success rate. Officers stated the targets were historic.

Officers confirmed the Council was looking into pop-up windows to capture customer experience online and also working with Serco to provide a modern customer service which could include responsive twitter feedback to signpost customers to the right services when they tweet about the council. Members stated they had good experiences of the 'Report it' function on the council's website.

Members noted the 100% satisfaction rate with the front desk and officers assured the committee this was captured via an anonymised method. However, the council was currently validating all the performance statistics of Serco services. Mystery shopping could be one way to validate the service desk performance but could prove costly if an external company was brought in.

Officers briefly clarified that there was a 'you said, we did' section on the council website to show the public how the council responded to complaints but this only related to the formal complaints procedure.

RESOLVED that:

- 1. The Committee recommend officers to include pop-up windows to allow online users to provide their feedback on services.**
- 2. The Committee support and encourage the Council to validate satisfaction scores where possible.**

29. Review of the Employee Performance Framework

The Committee was informed that pay progression in the Council was performance related and that 44% of staff received an increment last year with 53% receiving it the previous year. This did not represent a reduction in performance but mostly staff reaching the top of their grade. The Staff Survey demonstrated that one-to-ones were valued and completed to a high level. Officers stated that IIP Gold standard had been awarded to the Council because it could demonstrate a clear 'golden thread' from the council's priorities to the objectives and performance of staff.

It was clarified that holiday entitlement was not part of the review of pay and conditions. Councillor Hebb, in response, stated that holiday entitlement did have an impact on the finances of the council as an extra five days for those receiving a thirty day entitlement could incur overtime costs for other staff. Members did note, however, that sickness absence figures had improved this year.

RESOLVED that:

- 1. The Committee recommend and encourage the performance management of staff to continue to align with corporate priorities.**
- 2. Aspects of the corporate scorecard feature in management objectives with a focus on data.**
- 3. The Council consider calibrating incremental awards within a directorate based on that directorate's performance against its targets.**

30. Work Programme

RESOLVED: That the work programme is noted.

The meeting finished at 9.01 pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

26 March 2015	ITEM: 5
Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
Month 9 / Quarter 3 Corporate Performance Report 2014-15	
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Non-key
Report of: Councillor Victoria Holloway, Cabinet Member for Central Services	
Accountable Head of Service: Karen Wheeler, Head of Strategy & Communications	
Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Assistant Chief Executive	
This report is public	

Executive Summary

This report provides Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee with a summary of performance against the Corporate Scorecard 2014-15, a basket of key performance indicators, as at Month 9/Quarter 3 i.e. end of June 2014. These indicators are used to monitor the performance of key priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and enables Members, Directors and other leaders to form an opinion as to the delivery of these priorities.

At the end of Month 9, 44 (84.1%) of these indicators are either meeting or within an acceptable tolerance of their target.

- 1. Recommendation(s)**
 - 1.1 That the Committee notes the performance**
 - 1.2 That Committee identifies, where it feels necessary, any further areas of concern on which to focus**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 This report provides members with a summary of performance against the Corporate Scorecard 2014-15, a basket of key performance indicators, as at Month 9/Quarter 3 i.e. end of December 2014.
- 2.2 These indicators are used to monitor the performance of key priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and enables Members, Directors and other leaders to form an opinion as to the delivery of these priorities.
- 2.3 This suite of indicators was refreshed for 2014-15 to ensure focus on key priorities and objectives is maintained and monitored.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

This report is a monitoring report for noting, therefore there is no options analysis.

Performance Report Headlines

The headline messages for this report are:

- 3.1 **Performance against target** - of the 43 indicators that are comparable, at the end of December 2014 (*NB KPIs = Key Performance Indicators*)

	KPIs at end of December 2014	KPIs at end of September 2014
GREEN - Met their target	56.83%	48%
AMBER - Within tolerance	27.27%	36%
RED - Did not meet target	15.9%	16%

- 3.2 **Direction of Travel (DOT)** - of the 40 indicators that are comparable, at the end of December 2014 (based on the previous year's outturn or position the same time last year, depending on which is most appropriate for the indicator):

	DOT at end of December 2014	DOT at end of September 2014
↑ IMPROVED	67.5%	54.76%
→ STATIC	12.5%	16.67%
↓ DECLINED	20%	28.57%

The performance of the indicators within the corporate scorecard need to be considered against the backdrop of reduced resources, and in particular, how

these constraints impact on the Council's finances and demands for services. However, the fact that 84% of KPIs are currently hitting or close to target is encouraging.

KPIs 'IN FOCUS'

- 3.3 As part of the council's performance management process, the Performance Board - a council wide group of performance leads – reviews the progress of the Corporate Scorecard on a monthly basis to provide assurance to the Directors' Board and members of delivery.

Where the Performance Board identifies issues that it considers to be of concern or indeed merits the highlighting of good performance it recommends these to the Directors' Board and Cabinet for their consideration.

3.4 Housing Service RAG Status = **GREEN**

Definition	a) Percentage of properties transformed against planned programme		
	b) Average time to re-let Council properties		
Reason for IN FOCUS	c) Percentage satisfaction with housing repairs		
	Consistently GREEN throughout the year		
	December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
a)	100%	100%	100%
b)	28 days	30.3 days	32 days
c)	86%	85%	80%

The Housing Investment and Development service performance has vastly improved over the last year in the repairs service, capital investments and when dealing with empty properties.

The average re-letting time for empty properties continues to improve. After two years of partnership with Mears, the Transforming Homes contractors and our own voids team, the average turnaround for voids has decreased from 109 days in January 2013 to an overall YTD average of 30 days in December 2014.

This has resulted in a reduction in the percentage of properties empty as a result to 1.4% (as at February 2015). Historically, this oscillated between 2.5 and 4%.

These improvements are also mirrored in other aspects of the services. In particular tenant's satisfaction with the repairs services has constantly been

high throughout the year with an average of 85% tenants rating the service received from contractor as excellent or good.

As well as the improvements to the repairs service, the Council also continues its approach in investing in Thurrock housing stock with a comprehensive Housing Transformation programme which goes beyond the decent homes programme. So far this year 1835 properties have been transformed to these higher standards, with the aim to have all properties improved by year 4 of the Housing Transformation Programme. The programme has so far created 40 apprenticeships and 45% of the labour involved in the programme is through local labour/supply chains.

[Commentary agreed by Barbara Brownlee]

3.5 Street Cleanliness RAG Status = **GREEN**

Definition	a) Street Cleanliness: Litter b) Street Cleanliness: Detritus c) Street Cleanliness: Graffiti d) Street Cleanliness: Fly-posting		
Reason for IN FOCUS	Consistently high performing throughout the year		
	Tranche 2 Survey results	YTD Average	Year End Target
a) Litter	1.8%	1.25%	5%
b) Detritus	1.9%	1.75%	5%
c) Graffiti	0.3%	0.42%	3%
d) Fly-posting	0.0%	0.08%	1%

The Tranche 2 survey of 300 sites was undertaken by inspectors independent of the street cleansing service in October, the results of which continue to be very positive.

Performance is better than target for each of the 4 street cleanliness streams and is overall much better than all benchmark comparisons.

The results of the third and final tranche survey will be reported as part of the end of year report.

[Commentary agreed by Mike Heath]

3.6 Free early years places for 2 year olds RAG Status = **GREEN/ RED**

Definition	e) Number of free places available for two year olds to access early years education in the borough f) Number of free places accessed for two year olds for early years education in the borough		
Reason for IN FOCUS	This measure has two parts to it. We have achieved the target for making places available but are under target in relation to filling those places.		
	December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
a (Available)	1024	1024	1024
b (Accessed)	748	1024	1024

At the end of the third quarter the number of children accessing free early years education for two year olds over the autumn term had increased and take up was 73% of the November Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) target of 1024 (including children placed via the Multi-Agency Panel (MAG) panel.

Number of children who meet DfE criteria	738
Additional number of children who meet local criteria (not DfE)	10
Total number of children accessing	748

Feedback from the September voluntary return sent to the DfE not only showed that we had the second best return in the East of England, but that we were placed 34th out of 152 other local authorities across the country.

This is the first year that this target has been set and we have set our expectations high meaning that the target has not been met even though we have had a very strong performance compared with regional and national.

[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]

3.7 Adoption timescales RAG Status = **RED**

Definition	AS1 Average time (in days) for a child to be adopted (3 year average) AS2 Average time (in days) between placement order and placement for adoption (3 year average)		
Reason for IN FOCUS	There are two measures related to adoption turnaround times. Both are currently under target when compared to nationally released figures however up to date local figures show a positive improvement		
	December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
AS1	710	547	547
AS2	244	152	152

No new nationally released figures have been published since the last quarterly report. However, local data for the calendar year 2014 shows that during the year, 11 children became subject to Adoption Orders (i.e. the final conclusion of the adoption process).

For these eleven children the average time against AS1 was 503 days. This would bring our performance for this group of children below the national target of 547 days for 2011-2014, but remains slightly above the 2012-2015 target of 487 days. With such a small cohort, single, protracted individual cases can distort the figures disproportionately. If we remove one such case the average comes down to 399.8 days which is significantly below the target figure.

In addition, 13 children are currently placed with prospective adopters, but still awaiting the Adoption Order. If we combine these children with those described above, making a cohort of 24, the average performance against AS1 comes out as 492.5 days, even including the extreme case mentioned, and without it reduces to 447 days.

In combination therefore these figures indicate significant improvement in performance over the last year against the National Scorecard indicator. We will however still remain vulnerable to the inclusion of older cases when the figures for 2012-2015 are published.

Against AS2, the eleven for whom the Adoption Order has been made were done so with an average of 137 days, which is below the 2011-2014 target of 152 days, but slightly above the 2012- 2015 target of 121 days. However removing the most extreme case brings the average down to 110 days, which would be well below this target.

However if we combine the two cohorts, as for AS1, the performance is slightly less positive, averaging out at 182 days. Although this still represents significant improvement on the last reported figures of 244 days, with a marginal improvement to 161 days by removing the extreme cases. Whilst the direction of travel is clearly in the right direction, this suggests that there is still scope for tightening up on the speed with which the service engages in family finding activity, although there have also been some notable successes, with a best performance of 52 days.

The improved performance needs to be understood in the context of significantly improved performance in meeting the recently imposed target date for the completion of Care Proceedings within 26 weeks. Previously Thurrock was achieving an average of 46 weeks, but most recent figures indicate an average of 21 weeks which would now place us amongst one of the better performing authorities in the country. The impact of this on the three year cycle will only be clear once the next National Scorecard indicators are released.

In addition we have significantly reduced the number of children currently awaiting an adoptive placement, and like many authorities have a surplus of adopters in relation to available children, although for harder to place children identifying the most suitable match remains a challenge.

[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]

3.8 Capital Programme
RAG Status = GREEN







Definition	Overall spend to budget on Capital Programme, expressed as a percentage		
Reason for IN FOCUS	Currently on target as a consequence of significant profiling work between corporate finance and service leads.		
December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target	
65%	65%	90%	

The percentage of the capital programme spent as at the end of December 2014 was 65%, in line with the profiled target. This can be split between the General Fund (55%) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) (79%).

There has been a concerted joint effort over many months between corporate finance officers and budgetary leads within the services to improve the profiling of this area of spend. It is notoriously difficult to predict the exact timing of spend in this area, because there are so many variables at work, some over which the council has little or no control. Therefore with one quarter remaining of the year, there may be some slippage on some of the projects within the programme, however, these will continue to be monitored and managed closely.

[Commentary agreed by Sean Clark]

3.9 The full summary of performance is set out below:

Corporate Priority**	No. of PIs (not inc. Annual KPIs)	Performance against Target				Direction of Travel			
		No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison (n/a)	No. of KPIs at Green 	No. of KPIs at Amber 	No. of KPIs at Red 	No. of KPIs unavailable for comparison (n/a)	No. Improved since 2013-14 	No. Unchanged since 2013-14 	No. Decreased since 2013-14 
Create a great place for learning and opportunity	14	5	2	4	3	7	6	0	1
Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity	5	1	3	0	1	1	2	0	2
Build pride, responsibility and respect to create safer communities	8	1	5	1	1	3	5	0	0
Improve health and well-being	6	0	4	2	0	0	2	2	2
Promote and protect our clean and green environment	8	2	5	0	1	2	4	1	1
Well run organisation	12	0	6	5	1	0	8	2	2
TOTAL	53	9	25	12	7	13	27	5	8
		PIs available = 44	56.83%	27.27%	15.9%	PIs available = 40	67.5%	12.5%	20%

*Please note it is possible to have a different number of indicators comparable against "Direction of Travel" than "Against Target" because for some indicators we only have one year's worth of data and therefore cannot compare Direction of Travel

**Please note that the corporate priorities as written here have since been refreshed and agreed by Council in January 2015. The scorecard was set against the original wording and as such have not been updated here.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 This monitoring report is for noting, with a further recommendation to circulate any specific areas to relevant Overview and Scrutiny for further consideration. It is also considered at Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 This monitoring report is considered on a quarterly basis by Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee and where there are specific issues relevant to other committees these are further circulated as appropriate.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 This monitoring report will help decision makers and other interested parties, form a view of the success of the Council's actions in meeting its political and community priority ambitions.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Michael Jones**
Group Accountant, Corporate Finance

This is a monitoring report and there are no direct financial implications arising. Within the corporate scorecard there are some specific financial performance indicators, for which commentary is given within the report. With regard to other service performance areas, any recovery planning commissioned by the Council may well entail future financial implications, which will be considered as appropriate.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **David Lawson**
Deputy Head of Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer

This is a monitoring report and there are no direct legal implications arising.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Rebecca Price**
Community Development Officer

This is a monitoring report and there are direct diversity implications arising. The Corporate Scorecard contains measures that help determine the level of progress with meeting wider diversity and equality ambitions, including sickness, youth employment and attainment, independent living, vulnerable adults and children, volunteering etc. Individual commentary is given within the report regarding progress and actions.

7.4 Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

The Corporate Scorecard contains measures related to some staff, health, sustainability and crime and disorder issues. Individual commentary is given within the report regarding progress and actions.

8. Background papers used in preparing the report (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- **Year 2 Delivery of the Corporate Plan** - <http://democracy.thurrock.gov.uk/thurrock/MeetingsCalendar/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/2265/Committee/402/Default.aspx>

9. Appendices to the report

- Appendix 1: Corporate Scorecard 2014-15 Quarter 3

Report Author:

Sarah Welton

Strategy & Performance Officer

Strategy Team, Chief Executive's Delivery Unit

Appendix 1

Priority	Monthly KPI	Unit	Freq.	Big/Small is better	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Latest Target	End of Year Target	DOT (since last year)	RAG Status
Create a great place for learning and opportunity	16-19 yr old Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET)	%	M	Small	5.5	5.3	5.7	5.5	6.2	6.5	6.3	6.7	7.2	6.2	5.6	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	Better	G
	Children subject to Child Protect Plan*	Rate	M	-	69	68	71	75	73	66	56	49	49	48	43.7	42.4	42	---	---	Better	n/a
	Rate of Looked After Children*	Rate	M	-	74	74	74	75	74	76	73	75	77	78	76.6	78	75	---	---	Worse	n/a
	% of primary schools judged "good" or better	%	Q	Big	57	64.7			72.7			75.8			75.8			81	84	Better	A
	KS2 Attainment – Achievement at Level 4+ in Reading, Writing & Maths	%	Q	Big	n/a	72.3			76.8			76.8			76.8			78	78	Better	A
	NEW KS2 Attainment – Achievement at Level 5+ in Reading, Writing & Maths	%	Q	Big	n/a	n/a			20.1			20.1			20.2			22	22	n/a	A
	Achievement of Level 2 qualification at 19	%	Q	Big	82	82.2			87.2			87.2			87.2			n/a	89	Better	n/a
	Achievement of Level 3 qualification at 19	%	Q	Big	49.2	49.2			52.8			52.8			52.8			n/a	56	Better	n/a
	Number of free places available for two year olds to access early years education in the borough	%	Q	Big	n/a	621			726			973			1024			1024	1024	n/a	G
	NEW Number of free places accessed for two year olds for early years education in the borough	%	Q	Big	n/a	406			455			657			748			1024	1024	n/a	R
	NEW LAC KS2 Attainment – Achievement at Level 4+ in Reading, Writing and Maths	%	Q	Big	n/a	n/a			50			53			53			59	59	n/a	A
	NEW LAC KS4 Attainment – 5+ A*-C (including English and Maths GCSEs)	%	Q	Big	n/a	n/a			5			7			9.5			n/a	15	n/a	n/a
	NEW Average time (in days) for a child to be adopted (3 year average)	%	Q	Small	n/a	n/a			784			710			710			547	547	n/a	R
NEW Average time (in days) between placement order and placement for adoption (3 year average)	%	Q	Small	n/a	n/a			323			244			244			152	152	n/a	R	
Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity	% of Major planning applications processed in 13 weeks	%	M	Big	67.4	66.7	68.1	65.4	50	75	77.8	72.7	75	80	83.3	85	85.7	70	70	Better	G
	% of Minor planning applications processed in 8 weeks	%	M	Big	93.1	93.3	93	91.7	100	97.1	97.9	92.3	93.5	94.7	91.8	90.4	88.5	88	88	Worse	G
	No of apprenticeships within the council	No	M	Big	44	58	62	65	2	4	15	18	20	24	27	27	35	52	65	Worse	R
	No of jobs created through the Thurrock TIGER programme	No	M	Big	45	45	66	66	0	18	18	18	18	18	87	87	87	80	100	Better	G
	No of businesses supported by Low Carbon Business Programme	No	Q	Big	460	n/a	n/a	456	176			226			n/a			290	n/a	n/a	
Build pride, responsibility and respect to create safer communities	% satisfaction with housing repairs	%	M	Big	78.9	82	83	83	85	85	87	88	85	85	85	83	85	80	80	Better	G
	No of Well Homes Assessments completed	No	Q	Big	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21			107 (128)			100 (228)			280	400	n/a	R
	Average time to relet Council properties	Days	M	Small	34.1	34	35.6	26.9	35	35	35	29.9	32	38.6* (30.5)	30.5	30.5	30.3	38	35	Better	G
	% General Satisfaction of tenants with neighbourhoods/services provided by Housing	%	M	Big	n/a	n/a			71	72	72	67	67	69%	70%	74%	70%	75	75	n/a	A
	Number of volunteer opportunities in the council	No	Q	Big	247	224			252			247			251			250	250	Better	G
	NEW % of properties transformed against planned programme (based on 2000 prop)	%	Q	Big	n/a	n/a			100			100			100			100	100	Better	G
% of young people who reoffend after a previously recorded offence	%	Q	Small	n/a	25			27			20			24			25	25	Better	G	

Priority	Monthly KPI	Unit	Freq.	Big/Small is better	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Latest Target	End of Year Target	DOT (since last year)	RAG Status
	% of offenders who successfully complete substance misuse treatment & don't represent Permanent admissions to residential / nursing homes per 100K pop. 18yrs+	%	Q	Big	100	100			n/a			n/a			n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Improve health and well-being	% adult social care users in receipt of Self Directed Support	Rate	M	Small	87	98	109	127	7	16	20	25	37	56	71	79 (85 REVISED)	88	88	110	In line	G
	No of households assisted to move to a smaller property (downsize)	No	M	Big	72	72	72	71	68	69	69.7	70.4	70.9	72	71.9	72	72	75	75	In line	A
	Obesity: % of weight management course attendees who lose 5% of original weight	%	Q	Big	44	43			54			56			50			40	40	Better	G
	Smoking cessation in most disadvantaged areas	%	Q	Big	44	44			34			34			35			35	35	Worse	G
	% older people still at home 91 days after discharge	%	Q	Big	90	89.9			90			82			92			93	93	Better	A
	% Household waste reused/ recycled/ composted	%	M	Big	42.14	41.41	40.6	40	48	49	45	44	43	43.5	43	37	36	39.6	45	Worse	R
Promote and protect our clean and green environment	Municipal waste sent to landfill	%	M	Small	21	19.3	19.6	23.2	13	12	17	18	17	20.8	20	20.2	19	19	19	Better	G
	% of targeted funding successfully awarded for Environmental programmes	%	Q	Big	100	100			100			100			data no longer collected			25	25	n/a	n/a
	Number of visitors to the boroughs managed natural areas	No	Q	Big	482356	612180			165000 (Prov)			314,616			data no longer collected			n/a	625,000	n/a	n/a
	Street Cleanliness - a) Litter	Score	3 times	Small	3.89			1.81			1.8						5	5	Better	G	
	Street Cleanliness - b) Detritus	Score	3 times	Small	4.11			1.97			1.9						5	5	Better	G	
	Street Cleanliness - c) Graffiti	Score	3 times	Small	0.89			0.33			0.3						3	3	Better	G	
	Street Cleanliness - d) Fly-posting	Score	3 times	Small	0			0			0						1	1	In line	G	
Well - run organisation	Average sickness absence per employee	Days	M	Small	8.36	9.5	10.38	11.15	0.68	1.57	2.44	3.34	3.98	4.99	6.03	7.06	8.04	6.25	9	Better	A
	% long term sickness	%	M	Small	53	52	51	51	50	47	49	49	50	50	51	51	50	38	34	Better	A
	% stress/stress related absence	%	M	Small	25.7	25.6	25.47	25.34	22.66	21.67	22.7	22.25	28.57	24.1	21.52	19	20.5	21	20	Better	G
	Overall variance on General Fund	%	M	0	0	0	-0.4		n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	In Line	G
	Overall variance on HRA	£k	M	0	-300	-300	-300	-460	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	-617	-413	0	0	Better	G
	Overall spend to budget on Capital Programme	%	Q	Big	42	81.43			10.96			28			65			65	90	Better	G
	% invoices paid within timescale	%	M	Big	92.74	92.39	92.52	92.88	95.28	95.09	95.84	94.59	93.92	91.81	93.97	94.37	94.56	97	97	Better	A
	% Council Tax collected	%	M	Big	79.79	88.08	93.56	98.5	10.42	19.19	27.94	36.56	45.32	53.98	62.8	71.28	79.77	80.05	98.9	In Line	A
	% National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) collected	%	M	Big	88.66	97.32	98.67	98.17	9.66	20.6	29.89	39.08	48.54	57.72	66.37	74.97	83.91	88.43	99.3	Worse	R
	% Rent collected	%	M	Big	97.45	97.37	97.6	99.7	77.63	84.48	90.88	92.22	92.84	94.9	95	95.5	97.1	97.25	99.5	Worse	A
	% timeliness of all Complaints	%	M	Big	97.5	97.56	97.64	97.36	98.54	98.93	99.29	99.12	98.69	98.88	98.8	98.21	98.19	97	97	Better	G
	% all Complaints upheld	%	M	Small	48.95	48.44	47.87	47.83	44.53	38.43	37.83	39.82	41.63	42.29	42.19	43.34	42.94	45	45	Better	G

Corporate Scorecard Exception Report – Month 9 Data (Up to December 2014)

At their meeting in January 2015, Corporate O&S Committee Members requested they receive a summary of any RED KPIs within the corporate scorecard basket.

1. Number of free early years education places accessed by 2 year olds

December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
748	1024	1024

See main Quarter 3/Month 9 Corporate Performance Report

2. Adoption timescales

KPI Definition	AS1 Average time (in days) for a child to be adopted (3 year average)		
	AS2 Average time (in days) between placement order and placement for adoption (3 year average)		
	December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
AS1	710	547	547
AS2	244	152	152

See main Quarter 3/Month 9 Corporate Performance Report

3. Number of apprentices* within the council

December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
35	52	65

*new apprentices starting since 1 April 2014.

As of end December, 8 new apprentices have been recruited, bringing the year to date total to 35. Transformation and Workforce Planning have recruited an apprentice through Serco. Wates and Mears, the Council's housing contractors, have appointed 6 apprentices. 9 further apprentices have been offered employment, subject to checks.

There are also a number of other initiatives taking place in the services, which although do not feed directly into the definition of this KPI, are aimed at providing employment and training of our young people. For instance, the Housing Service in partnership with its contractors has a specific pathway programme centred on NEETs working in conjunction with Education and this has resulted in 19 NEETs completing the pathway programme established as a result of other social value commitments from contracting partners.

As at the end of January 2015 the council has successfully recruited 43 apprenticeships. This has been achieved through partnership working across Council directorates and utilising contracting arrangements put in place by colleagues from Housing. The service has continued to ensure that young people have the skills and attitude required to successfully gain an apprenticeship. There are a further 18 apprenticeship opportunities at different stages of recruitment and the service has recently recruited a young person within the care system into a youth work apprenticeship.

This month sees the launch of National Apprenticeship Week and the service is hosting an event in the Inspire Youth Hub. All schools and colleges have selected a range of young people who may be considering an apprenticeship to come and learn more about what is available locally and what skills are needed to secure an apprenticeship, building on the regeneration agenda that is available within Thurrock.

[Commentary agreed by Carmel Littleton]

4. Number of Well Homes Assessments completed

December Actual	Cumulative YTD (December)	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
100	228	280	400

Well homes assessment is a joint Housing and Public Health initiative, where a Well Homes Assessor makes contact with vulnerable households living in the private sector.

The scheme started in June 2014 and so far more than 5000 letters offering support and advice have been sent to residents in the areas of Tilbury, Grays and Purfleet. This is followed by a door-knocking exercise. This has led to 344 successful visits currently having been complete to date (ie mid March). These visits include a comprehensive housing, health and safety assessment which results in both direct housing interventions and refund to other agencies.

The service expects to achieve the pre-set goal of 400 assessments by the end March 2015.

[Commentary agreed by Barbara Brownlee]

5. Percentage of household waste reused, recycled or composted

December Actual	Cumulative YTD (December)	In Month Target (December)	Year End Target
36	43	39.6	45

In December the in-month figure was 3% lower than target. This reflects a pattern that has been consistent throughout the year. The current forecast is that the end of year recycling figure will be circa 41-42%. This is lower than the annual target, and has a significant budget implication for the Directorate.

A number of initiatives have been piloted by the service during the course of the year to address the under target performance. This includes projects with our Housing colleagues to encourage residents in multi-occupancy properties to participate in the recycling services offered to all residents. Audits of waste have been completed to enable the service to better understand the materials and the proportions of those that are not being disposed of in the appropriate waste stream. Additionally projects were run over the Christmas period to ensure that recycling side waste was collected and that any electrical goods that could be recycled were collected.

Whilst those initiatives have had a positive impact, it has not been sufficient to increase the recycling rate to targeted levels for 2014-15.

Activities are underway to implement a targeted communication programme with residents to promote an increase in recycling participation. This campaign should lead to a reduction in the volume of waste incinerated or landfilled at much higher treatment rates, and will be dovetailed with the engagement needed to inform residents of the planned structural changes to the collection service. In the short term a flyer is being sent to all households reminding residents of the key items to be recycled (Paper, card, glass and tin).

[Commentary agreed by Mike Heath]

6. Percentage of National Non-Domestic Rates (NDR) collected

December Actual	YTD Target (December)	Year End Target
83.91%	88.43%	99.3%

At the end of December, the team had delivered a collection rate of 83.91% which is 4.75% less than last year.

The main reason we are experiencing this adverse movement compared to last year is the increasing number of people switching from 10 monthly instalments to 12. This changes the income profile of this portfolio considerably as businesses opt to pay in February and March as opposed to clearing their balance in full by January.

A review of the collection rates in mid-February show that the Council is still on course to meet the year-end target

[Commentary agreed by Sean Clark]

This page is intentionally left blank

26 March 2015	ITEM: 6
Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
Pay and Reward Review	
Wards and communities affected: None	Key Decision: None
Report of: Neil Mercer, Interim HR Strategy & Policy Manager	
Accountable Head of Service: Jackie Hinchliffe, Head of HR, OD & Transformation	
Accountable Director: Graham Farrant, Chief Executive	
This report is: Public	

Executive Summary

This report provides a summary of the progress made during 2014 in reviewing pay and reward, and proposes a way to complete this review during 2015/16, including the adoption of a new job evaluation scheme.

Development of draft role profiles by NGA, an external provider, can commence with immediate effect. The input required from DMT members will be far lower than previously planned.

1. Recommendations

1.1 Corporate O&S are invited to comment on the adoption of the Greater London Provincial Council's (GLPC's) job evaluation scheme to evaluate all role profiles developed as part of this review, and that the council should use the GLPC scheme thereafter.

1.2 It is proposed that that this review should continue as follows:

- **Develop role profiles**
- **Allocate job descriptions to role profiles**
- **Evaluate role profiles**

- **Design a new pay and grading structure**
- **Assimilate staff into the new pay and grading structure**

2. Introduction and Background

- 2.1 In 2013 it was proposed that Thurrock should change their pay and grading structure. The existing model was found to be inflexible, band widths were too long (eg Band 9 contains 11 pay points) and overlapped. As such, it risked breaching equal pay legislation.
- 2.2 Many local authorities were successfully adopting job families as an alternative. The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development listed four key reasons to take this approach, as follows:
- individuals can identify organisation-wide career paths
 - there is greater flexibility
 - it enables closer links to market rates
 - it improves the staff appraisal process by linking reward more closely with personal contribution and progress
- 2.3 A workshop was held with the Leadership Group on 4th March 2014 in which a job family structure was developed. This was ratified at DB on 4th April 2014.
- 2.4 HR then allocated each job description into a job family.
- 2.5 The next step was to develop role profiles, however most DMTs were unable to nominate managers to contribute to this task due to other work priorities.
- 2.6 In July 2014, Melanie Virginie, HR Strategy and Policy Manager, recommended that in the light of this difficulty, and bearing in mind the forthcoming restructure of the council, (i) further work on developing job families should be suspended; (ii) work should continue in adopting a new pay structure with shorter bands which did not overlap, in order to combat the risk of equal pay claims.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

a) Job evaluation

- 3.1 This review offers an excellent opportunity to examine whether the Council is using the best possible job evaluation scheme and, if it isn't, to switch to better scheme.

- 3.2 At present, the council engages the services of an external provider (The Reward Partnership) to carry out job evaluations using the James scheme. The cost of this service is £80 per evaluation and, for example, from October 2012 to March 2014 185 jobs were evaluated at a total cost of £14,800. This does not include the amount of officer time which is spent preparing posts for evaluation.
- 3.3 NGA Ltd, who are assisting the council with this review, have conducted an assessment of schemes used in local government which are compliant with equal pay and single status requirements. The most widely used scheme is the Greater London Provisional Council (GLPC) Scheme, now owned by London Councils.
- 3.4 The GLPC scheme was developed and agreed with the Equal Opportunities Commission and trade unions in London and launched in 2000. It reflects best practice and complies with single status.
- 3.5 The GLPC scheme could be administered either manually or online, at the following cost:

Method	Requirements	Costs	Total
(i) Manual GLPC scheme	Licence from London Councils JE scheme training for HR staff	£5,000 one-off payment Two-day on-site training by London Councils: £1,800	£6,800 in yr 1 only
(ii) Online GLPC scheme (NGA Ltd are licensed by London Councils to host the software for this scheme)	Initial licence fee to Northgate Local systems development Annual maintenance and support JE scheme & IT systems training for HR staff	£15,440 one-off payment 3 days @ £875 pd one-off payment = £2,625 £2,911 pa Two-day on-site training by NGA Ltd: £2,500	£23,476 in yr 1, £2,911 pa thereafter

- 3.6 The online version is quicker to use but more expensive to operate, including annual maintenance and support fees. The set-up costs for the manual version are a third of the on-line version's, and there is no further cost thereafter.
- 3.7 The introduction of job families would reduce job evaluation costs as it would no longer be necessary to devise and evaluate individual job descriptions, of which there are approximately 800 at present. In the future, a far smaller

number of role profiles (estimated by NGA at 60-72) would be subject to an evaluation process.

b) Completion of this Review

- 3.8 An outline project plan is attached at Appendix 1. A summary of the work to be done is as follows:

Develop role profiles

- 3.9 Each job family contains role profiles which have different levels of responsibility. They set out the generic purpose of the role; activities performed and the skills, knowledge etc needed by the post holder to perform the job. Role profiles are not as detailed as job descriptions and are written to cover many roles, which may be in different Directorates.
- 3.10 As described above, drafting role profiles proved a sticking point in 2014, when most managers were unable to make a commitment to help in their development. A less onerous alternative has now been identified.
- 3.11 NGA have accumulated a portfolio of role profiles after implementing job families in other local authorities. These 'off the shelf' documents can be issued to DMT members who would only need to check and, if necessary, amend them to ensure that they are fully appropriate for Thurrock. It is estimated that 60-72 role profiles will need to be agreed in order to cover all types of work in the council.

Allocate job descriptions to role profiles

- 3.12 HR have already undertaken a provisional allocation of existing job descriptions to job families. This allocation now needs to be finalised and each job description should then be assigned to a role profile.

Evaluate role profiles

- 3.13 Each of the new role profiles will be evaluated. This will determine the relative 'value' of each role and will help shape the most appropriate pay and grading structure.

Design a new pay and grading structure

- 3.14 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) deem long and overlapping pay grades to be 'high risk practices' as they can result in discrimination the grounds of gender¹.
- 3.15 They recommend 'specific justification to be provided for increments beyond six', and warn that 'it is not uncommon for those at the bottom of an

¹ <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/private-and-public-sector-guidance/employing-people/equal-pay/checklists-equal-pay-in-practice/19-high-risk-grading-and-pay-practices>

overlapping scale to be undertaking work of greater value to those at the top of the lower scale’.

3.16 NGA have provided examples of how Thurrock’s current pay structure could be modified to comply with the EHRC’s advice. They include:

- 9 bands, each with 6 pay points
- 9 bands, each with 6 pay points plus a 3-point ‘contribution zone’ to reward exceptional performance

3.17 As indicated in 4.6, the most appropriate pay and grading structure can be designed only after role profiles have been evaluated.

Assimilate staff into the new pay and grading structure

3.18 A pay point within a role profile will be determined for every employee. An equality impact assessment will then be undertaken and adjustments made to the pay point and/or grading structure, as necessary. Employees will then be notified of their pay point and will have the right of appeal if they do not agree with it. Assimilation onto the new structure will then take place.

4. Reasons for Recommendations

- 4.1 To ensure an up-to-date, best practice pay and grading structure which is approved by the GLPC, trade unions and the former Equal Opportunities Commission.
- 4.2 To help enable more accurate comparisons between Thurrock’s pay system and those of other local authorities.
- 4.3 To cut job evaluation costs by at least 50%.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 Consultations with management in 2014 are summarised in 2.3 above.
- 5.2 This report was discussed at Directors’ Board on 27th January 2015, where recommendations 1.1 and 1.2 above were agreed. DB asked for 1.1 to be put before GSC for their approval.
- 5.3 GSC met on 9th March 2015 and approved the recommendation 1.1.
- 5.4 Thurrock’s trade unions were consulted on 4th March 2015. Noting that trade unions and the EOC had contributed to the implementation of the GLPC’s job evaluation scheme (see 3.3 above), they had no objection to its use in Thurrock. The unions were also reassured that they would be consulted regularly about the review as it progressed.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

If approved, this pay review would be instrumental in determining matters relating to pay, such as grading, performance and market supplements.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Sean Clark**
Head of Corporate Finance

The costs of past and future involvement by pay specialists NGA Ltd were authorised, and paid for in full, in 2014. The only additional costs in 2015/16 would be those associated with the adoption of the GLPC job evaluation scheme, as outlined in Section 3 above.

Switching to job families should represent an on-going, annual saving of at least 50% in job evaluation fees.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **Chris Pickering**
Principal Solicitor: Employment and Litigation

It is important to move to a new pay and grading structure as soon as possible in order to help safeguard the council from the risk of equal pay claims, as outlined in Section 2.1 above.

Adopting a new job evaluation scheme such as the GLPC's, which has been approved by the trade unions and the former Equal Opportunities Commission, will help to ensure that pay and reward at Thurrock is legally compliant.

7.3 Diversity and Equality

Implications verified by: **Teresa Evans**
Equalities and Cohesion Officer

Switching to the GLPC job evaluation scheme as part of this pay review would address the EHRC's concerns outlined in 3.13 and 3.14 above, and move Thurrock towards a best-practice system.

7.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

All council employees on single status conditions would have their grade and pay reviewed as part of this process.

8. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- Report by NGA Ltd

9. **Appendices to the report**

Appendix 1: Outline project plan

Report Author:

Neil Mercer
Interim HR Policy and Strategy Manager
Chief Executive's Department
Tel: 01375 652832
Email: nxmerc2@thurrock.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1 - PAY & REWARD REVIEW: OUTLINE PROJECT PLAN

Work Strand	Key Tasks	Lead	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	June 2015	July 2015	Aug 2015	Sept 2015	Oct 2015	Nov 2015	Dec 2015	Jan 2016	Feb 2016	Mar 2016	Apr 2016
JOB EVALUATION	AUTHORISATION OF NEW SCHEME BY DB		█															
	AUTHORISATION OF NEW SCHEME BY GENERAL SERVICES COMMITTEE				█													
	TRAIN HR IN NEW SCHEME							█										
ROLE PROFILES	NGA TO SUPPLY ROLE PROFILES & PLACE INTO JOB FAMILIES			█	█													
	FINALISE ROLE PROFILES				█	█												
	EVALUATE ROLE PROFILES								█	█								
PAY & REWARD STRUCTURE	DEVELOP OPTIONS FOR NEW PAY & REWARD STRUCTURE									█	█							
	NEW PAY & REWARD STRUCTURE & ASSIMILATION PROCESS AUTHORISED BY DB											█						
	NEW PAY & REWARD STRUCTURE & ASSIMILATION PROCESS AUTHORISED BY COUNCIL												█	█				
	ALLOCATE GRADE & PAY RANGE TO EACH ROLE PROFILE WITHIN PAY & REWARD STRUCTURE													█	█			
	ALLOCATE PAY POINTS TO EMPLOYEES AND INFORM THEM														█	█		
	APPEALS															█	█	
CONSULTATION	FORMATION OF PROJECT GROUP				█	█												
	REGULAR PROJECT GROUP MEETINGS				█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
	PAY & REWARD REVIEW TO BE STANDING ITEM AT FORTNIGHTLY TRADE UNION CONSULTATION MEETINGS		█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█
	PAY & REWARD REVIEW TO BE STANDING ITEM AT MONTHLY PEOPLE BOARD MEETINGS		█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█

Appendix ~~XX~~

This page is intentionally left blank

26 March 2015		ITEM: 7
Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee		
Fairness Commission Update		
Wards and communities affected: All	Key Decision: Non key	
Report of: Karen Wheeler, Head of Strategy and Communications		
Accountable Head of Service: Karen Wheeler, Head of Strategy and Communications		
Accountable Director: Steve Cox, Assistant Chief Executive		
This report is public.		

Executive Summary

In March 2015 Cabinet approved a recommendation to establish a Fairness Commission for Thurrock. This report provides a summary of progress to date.

1. Recommendation(s)

1.1 Note the contents of the report.

2. Introduction and Background

2.1 The Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed on 12 September 2013 to establish a Task and Finish Group to look at ways other local authorities deploy equality commissions within budgetary constraints and progress equality issues within their localities. The panel's overall aim was to make recommendations on the relevance of a commission for Thurrock, other alternatives, as well as any costs involved.

2.2 The Fairness in Thurrock Review Panel was subsequently established and undertook this investigation, reporting to Cabinet in April 2014. Cabinet approved recommendations to establish a Fairness Commission to progress equality issues within the Borough, and agreed that a Thurrock Fairness Commission Annual Report is received by Cabinet to review and monitor progress.

3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options

- 3.1 The Fairness in Thurrock Review made a number of recommendations to progress a Fairness Commission as the most relevant mechanism for progressing equalities in Thurrock.
- 3.2 The review provided a draft Terms of Reference with suggested members for a steering panel. An open nomination process was held from November 2014 to identify suitable and willing candidates. This included two articles in the local press, as well as contacting target organisations and partnership groups. The final membership list is as follows:

Membership Criteria	Commissioner
Chair, Voluntary Sector and resident	Demus Lee
Voluntary Sector and resident	John Rowles
Voluntary Sector and resident	Diane Lee
Voluntary Sector and resident	Len Orpin
Disability Group Representative	To be confirmed
Head teacher	Dr Asong, Gable Hall School
Health	Len Green, Thurrock CCG
Economist	Andrew Sentence
Local business and industry	Matthew Johnson
Housing Tenant Representative	Carol Purser
Youth Cabinet	George Wright
Labour Councillor	Cllr Oliver Gerrish
Conservative Councillor	Cllr Shane Hebb
UKIP Councillor	Cllr Graham Snell
Assistant Chief Executive, Thurrock Council	Steve Cox

- 3.3 Whilst it has not been possible to fill the post for a disability group representative to date, Thurrock Diversity Network has responded to say they will be willing to provide evidence to the Commission. The post will remain vacant pending any interest from disability groups.
- 3.4 Thurrock Fairness Commission held its first meeting on 12 March 2015. Work prior to this concentrated on the recruitment of Commissioners according to the recommendations set out in the review report.
- 3.5 The first meeting of the Commission focused on reviewing the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Task and Finish Group Review and discussing the detail to inform a work plan for future meetings. Key areas of focus were agreed including child poverty, employment, education, housing, and access to health services.
- 3.6 The discussion at the meeting also highlighted the need to understand more about the reasons behind key examples of inequality, and how residents are supported to help themselves stay healthy, budget well and increase aspirations. The commission is also keen to capture more information about

how community organisations are already working to meet local need, and how funding can support more community led action in the future.

- 3.7 A work plan will be prepared to allow consideration of the key issues alongside a public engagement plan and communications plan. A commitment was made to ensure the Fairness Commission meets people in communities in the places where they are already living their lives, rather than expecting people to come to specific events. The Commission recognised that many people remain silent on the issues they feel impact on fairness, and their voices need to be heard if the commission is to make a difference.

4. Reasons for Recommendation

- 4.1 To update Overview and Scrutiny on the progress made towards establishing a Fairness Commission for Thurrock.

5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)

- 5.1 The nomination process to recruit commissioners was open to all to apply and coverage was included in the local press. The work of the commission will be based on a wide public engagement programme which will invite responses from members of the public as well as local organisations.

6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact

- 6.1 A Fairness Commission for Thurrock will have a positive impact on all of corporate priorities as outlined.

7. Implications

7.1 Financial

Implications verified by: **Mike Jones**
Management Accountant

There are no financial implications relating to this report. The Fairness Commission will be funded through existing resources, facilitated by existing staff and incorporated into current workloads and priorities.

7.2 Legal

Implications verified by: **David Lawson**
Deputy Head of Legal and Governance

There are no legal implications arising from this report beyond the fact that this recommendation will contribute towards good and informed governance as to our equality duty.

7.3 **Diversity and Equality**

Implications verified by: **Teresa Evans**
Equality and Cohesion Officer

The Council is under a statutory duty as set out in the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, advance equality and promote good relations. The Fairness Commission will provide a good mechanism for meeting our equality duty.

7.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

None.

8. **Background papers used in preparing the report** (including their location on the Council's website or identification whether any are exempt or protected by copyright):

- <https://www.thurrock.gov.uk/diversity-and-equality/thurrock-fairness-commission>

The Fairness in Thurrock Review and related information can be accessed via the above link.

9. **Appendices to the report**

- None

Report Author:

Natalie Warren
Community Development and Equalities Manager
Strategy Team, CEDU