

**Consultation Feedback - Suggested Position vs Staff Rep Position on reviewing SHBC Employment Stability Policy**

	<b>Present Policy</b>	<b>Suggested amendments</b>	<b>Staff Representative Suggestions (pre JSCG meeting)</b>	<b>Members comments (pre JSCG meeting)</b>	<b>Outcome from JSCG</b>
<b>Multiplier</b>	Currently x1 multiplier used on weekly salary. There is a discretion of increasing this to x2 multiplier on the weekly salary.	Keep the x1 multiplier on weekly salary but remove the discretionary element.	<p>The multiplier to be acknowledged as 2, not discretionary. The removal of the multiplier to be introduced over a period 2-3 years, on a sliding scale.</p> <p>We believe this acknowledges and addresses the council's need to ensure minimum costs in a redundancy situation. Whilst also addressing staff concerns over the removal of previously held perceived support and benefits. A softer and more transparent approach will be beneficial to morale. Cost is minimal when considering the number of staff likely to be affected.</p> <p>Use actual weeks' pay when calculating redundancy payments but use the statutory amount for the grades where it is greater than weekly pay.</p> <p>Real concern that SHBC is moving to the bottom in comparison to other Surrey Councils. See benchmarking information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discretion, if it is to remain then must be very clear it is a discretion and clarify when it might be used</li> <li>• Suggested discretion of x1.5 instead of the existing x2</li> <li>• Following on from above, conversations lead to circumstances when discretions could be used and no examples came to mind for a redundancy situation</li> <li>• Remove discretion completely so there is no ambiguity</li> <li>• Remove discretion but have x1.5 multiplier instead of x1 for next 2-3 years then it reverts back to x1 multiplier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the discretion and add 1.5 multiplier for the period up to 31st Mar 2023 with all restructures started before this date to have this multiplier applied</li> <li>• Staff reps agree with this but with a date of 31st March 2024</li> </ul>

<p><b>Protected salary</b></p>	<p>Currently 2 years protected salary and no restriction on what grade a role can be considered for as part of the redundancy process. No clarity as to whether this includes any additional allowances.</p>	<p>Reduce the term of the protected salary to 12 months. State it can only be applied if someone accepts a role one grade down from their redundant post. If someone does want to go to a role which is more than 1 grade then they do so without protected salary and take the role at the new grade therefore keeping continuous service. Alternatively, they can still take redundancy but will lose continuous service and will not be able to work in local government for 1 month (4 weeks to be precise) to constitute the break in service. See <a href="#">Modification Order here</a></p>	<p>Agree to move from 2 years protected salary to 12 months. For 1 grade drop.</p> <p>With regard to not allowing salary protection where there is a drop of more than 1 grade below substantive post. We recommend that this is considered, retained for 6 months. As this would be preferable where the individual is willing, rather than subjecting the Council to the cost of recruitment, redundancy cost and the loss of corporate knowledge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement to reduce to 12 months from 2 years</li> <li>• Happy with suggestion from Staff Reps to keep the ability to go more than 1 grade drop but only keep protected salary for 6 mths or possibly 9 mths</li> <li>• General feeling of reasonable suggestion from Staff Representatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree to move from 2 years protected salary to 12 months. For 1 grade drop.</li> <li>• 6 months protection for more than one grade drop.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Notice periods</b></p>	<p>Currently we ask staff to work their notice period if they are being made redundant. No</p>	<p>Make it clear notice will need to be worked.</p> <p>Discuss if there are any situations where 'payment in lieu of notice' or</p>	<p>Would like the opportunity for payment in lieu of notice to be retained</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General rule staff work their notice and use up any annual leave but having other options like 'payment in lieu of notice' and 'garden leave' can be useful option for Employers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General rule staff work their notice and use up any annual leave. The employer will have the option of 'payment in lieu of notice' and/or 'garden leave'.</li> </ul>

	t clear in existing policy.	Garden leave would be applicable.			
<b>Voluntary Redundancy</b>	No enhanced payment for this. It would be a request as part of a restructure any staff put at risk can put in a VR request.	As is. But clarity around whether this could shorten the restructure if VR was approved	Agree Voluntary redundancy should remain as an option. Would recommend for consideration the opportunity where skills and ability are similar, and cost is the same or less, that there is an opportunity to swap packages. Allowing someone who wishes to leave to take the place of a colleague who doesn't.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep this and generally good practice to allow someone to go under VR rather than compulsory redundancy</li> <li>• Suggestion of enhancement to 1.5 multiplier</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VR to be kept as an option and it is best practice</li> </ul>
<b>Link to Pensions and Pension Discretions Policy</b>	Not clear and not linked in current policy	Clarity around pensions particularly around redundancy situations.	There is a general lack of understanding around the effect of redundancy on the individuals pension. Specifically around the 'pensions strain' whether there are enhancements that would benefit the individual being make redundant. We would like additional information or a link to the information included within the policy. Is there an opportunity to consider an enhancement in a redundancy situation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not discussed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pension Discretions explained and pension strain explained and to be included in the document.</li> <li>• Retirement Policy has been added to the work programme for Jan alongside the Pension Discretions Policy</li> </ul>
<b>Outplacement</b>			Would like outplacement for all staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle agree this should be available to all staff who are made redundant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All in agreement to support outplacement</li> </ul>
<b>Policy to be Informative as to the processes to be followed</b>	Current policy is old and out of date. Does not answer a lot of questions someone in a restructure process would need.	Make it a lot clearer and try to include the process as fully as possible but not tying ourselves in knots IF there is any reason why a restructure may need to be	Agree and confirmed they like the new layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy layout not discussed</li> <li>• Page 12 punctuation needs correcting</li> <li>• Make clearer that the minimum period of consultation is 30 days</li> </ul>	

		slightly different. There would never be a reason to deviate from ACAS guidance and Gov legislation.			
--	--	---	--	--	--