

Appendix D – Part 1

Copies of consultation responses

Name of item being assessed:	Market Supplement Review
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	
Owner of item being assessed:	Robert O'Reilly
Name of assessor:	Robert O'Reilly
Date of assessment:	19 th February 2013

Service Unit	Responder	Response
Culture and Environment	Elizabeth Brewster	<p>I write in response to your letter to me dated 8 January 2013 concerning the proposal to abolish the Market Supplement from 1st April 2014.</p> <p>I have read the management report and below is my response to this proposal:</p> <p>I am a Senior Enforcement Officer previously employed by Wokingham Borough Council who was tuped over to West Berkshire. As you are aware in December 2004 Trading Standards staff were given a market supplement to encourage staff retention, etc. At the time I was on the top of my scale so I have received the market supplement every year since then .</p> <p>I have been told by Steve Richardson at Wokingham Borough Council no review of the Trading Standards market supplement was ever carried out and as a consequence it has become embedded into my salary and is pensionable.</p> <p>I am now 52 years old and by 60 I will have done 40 years on my pension and hope to retire. My husband is already retired but we still have a mortgage to pay each month. I am now also aware that because of changes to the pension scheme I may have to top up my lump sum with AVC which will impact on my salary monthly. Over the 8 years I have become reliant on this salary. Should this proposal go ahead I stand to lose a considerable amount a year. This will cause me considerable financial detriment and stress. Because of this I have now applied for an enforcement officer post at Bracknell-Forest Council which is</p>

paying [considerably more](#).

With regard to the management report, below is my response to some of the points:

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

1.2 The report says market supplements should be reviewed every two years. Wokingham Borough Council never carried out any review in 8 years of receiving the market supplement, also;

1.2 The report says in recent years the council was able to access salary surveys to see if the market supplements for particular jobs were still justified. Having spoken to Mr Murphy he was only able to offer me a post on WBCs terms [on less than my salary](#). Bracknell-Forest Council are offering an Enforcement Officer post on 30k. So clearly salaries are not comparable.

1.3 The reports state heads of service would undoubtedly receive an adequate number of satisfactory candidates - please provide proof of this. WBC Trading Standards is already having to pay contractors to do work because of a number of vacant posts.

Executive Report

2.2 The report states that to objectively evaluate the market supplements against current market conditions, a bespoke salary survey would need to be commissioned....costing several thousand pounds for each service.

When a review of the Environmental Health market supplements was carried out at Wokingham BC, the Manager did this so I feel this is not a justifiable statement and if WBC are not prepared to do an assessment I feel this could be open to challenge in the light of the length of time ex Wokingham TS employees have received the market supplement with no evaluation ever being done. Could this also be deemed a breach of contract and unfair?

2.3 The report states the purpose of the market supplement policy was to match the rates paid by rival recruiters and avoid recruitment and retention difficulties.

I wish to point out again that WBC are not paying an Enforcement Officer a comparable wage with a neighbouring authority. Plus I believe there are currently 4 possible 5 vacant posts within Trading Standards and they are having to now use contractors. I wish to remind you that I also have a job interview on Friday because of this proposal.

2.7 The report states that there is no protection for typed staff and quotes a statement from Wokingham contracts.

Again this refers to consultation, however there has never been any consultation in the 8 years at Wokingham Borough Council regarding Trading Standards market supplements.

		<p>In conclusion I wish to state that I feel this proposal to be unfair and open to challenge. As no review was ever done on Trading Standards market supplements customer practise would argue that it is now embedded in the salary, being pensionable and reliant on and that to take that supplement away in light of the fact that a similar EO post is offered up to 30K at Bracknell-Forest Council. There is also a case which highlights that the lack of review could be open to a challenge through a Tribunal should the council try to remove that market supplement - http://www.scillytoday.com/2012/04/24/senior-officers-to-receive-permanent-pay-rise/.</p>
ICT	Simon Arter	<p>As one of the West Berkshire Council employees potentially impacted by the above proposal I have been invited to submit my comments for consideration by the Personnel Committee, I understand that other interested parties will have also submitted responses and so I have tried to keep mine brief and to the point.</p> <p><u>Concerning the Executive Report.</u></p> <p><i>“1.4 WBC could face equal pay claims from other staff who do not receive this additional payment if WBC cannot justify them by reference to market rates. It is no longer possible to find such a justification.”</i></p> <p>The ICT service roles affected are unique, not duplicated and therefore claims for equal pay would not apply. I believe the final sentence is making reference to the supposition that it is not possible to find “market rate” information - I consider this statement to be untrue.</p> <p><i>“2.2 In order to objectively evaluate the market supplements against current market conditions, a bespoke salary survey would need to be commissioned. In the current economic climate there is virtually no demand for salary surveys. To commission ones for the market supplements paid in WBC would cost several thousand pounds for each service.”</i></p> <p>In respect of ICT salaries, this statement is untrue. Salary information for ICT roles is freely available; a quick Internet search using Google returns many reputable companies publishing up to date information, both national and regional. Similarly many Internet ‘Job Sites’ have search facilities which reveal vacancies within the local area.</p> <p><i>“2.4 The current experience of recruiting for posts across the Council is that we have no shortage of candidates. Retention rates in the Council are not causing a problem for service delivery.”</i></p> <p>Positive retention rates could be seen as a success of the market supplement payment policy. ICT skills in particular are highly transferable to other industries, the roles attracting market supplement payments are highly skilled in both technical and</p>

managerial fields, the fact that these post holders consider their overall salaries to offer reasonable remuneration in the market place helps to keep 'churn' low.

The current experience of recruiting into ICT posts is NOT that stated in the proposal. Recent recruitment exercises for technical staff have failed; the number of applicants has been low and their technical skills being considered as unsuitable and inexperienced.

"3.1 Based on the economic situation, and the current WBC recruitment and retention rates, an informed management judgement can be made that the Council no longer requires a Market Supplement Policy."

Over recent Years of contraction, there has been little need for recruitment, however this has changed recently and in fact we have faced very real difficulties in finding a good number of applicants, with the appropriate skills and / or experience. These difficulties have applied to both permanent and contractor appointments (even when offering high hourly rates). Retention rates have potentially remained low in no small part due to the application of market supplement payments as staff consider their remuneration comparable to that in other organisations.

My personal view.

My role attracts a market supplement payment in addition to my annual salary. Comparison with published national and regional salary information puts my overall payment into the border of Low and Median bands.

The jobs market for my role is quite buoyant and comparable jobs are currently available locally and across the region advertised with attractive salaries and benefits – certainly the number of advertised ICT jobs across all roles is significant and despite the ongoing fragile economic climate ICT related skills appear to remain in high demand and is trending upwards.

The abolishment of the Market Supplement Policy and associated payments will, in my opinion be a major de-motivational step and likely to lead to indirect impact on all services as many examples of 'good will' based working practices (such as 'silent hours' or weekend work for upgrades/patches) will be curtailed.

ICT skills are highly transferable, it is to be expected that staff turnover will increase as staff seek out employment with remuneration levels in line with their roles and responsibilities – the net result will be a loss the Council of highly skilled, key staff with many Years of experience and acquired knowledge of the Council's systems and operations.

I consider that the removal of market supplement payments will turn out to be a 'short term gain' but result in longer term difficulties for the ICT service, a view shared by my colleagues.

I request that, having read and listened to the evidence presented, that you reject the proposal.

ICT	Chris Matthews	<p>Page 1 – Reason for decision to be taken “Changes in the external jobs market and the economy mean that the Council does not need a market supplements policy to recruit and retain staff.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence to support this statement is presented. • In the general jobs market it is possibly true, however within ICT I would dispute this idea; IT Jobs have remained in demand during the downturn, additionally West Berkshire is located in an of high IT skill demand. • It is incorrect to remove a procedure on the basis of an unproven assumption. The Market Supplement Procedure gives a justifiable basis for supplement adjustments. <p>Page 1 – Other options considered “To continue to operate the existing market supplement policy and to commission a bespoke salary survey at a cost of several thousands to the Council.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Google search took me one minute to find a cost free Salary Survey for ICT jobs; http://uk.hudson.com/Portals/UK/documents/SalarySurveys/it-salary-survey-2012.pdf • The Market Supplement policy also allows for comparison with available jobs rather than the use of a survey, therefore the survey is not necessarily needed to continue with the market supplement policy. <p>Page 2 – Implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus of the implications is purely financial; this ignores other factors such as staff retention and recruitment. <p>Page 3 – Executive Summary</p> <p>1.2. “In recent years the Council was able to access salary surveys to see if the market supplements for particular jobs were still justified. However since the economic downturn these salary surveys have ceased due to lack of demand. To continue with the existing policy, HR would need to pay several thousand pounds to commission a bespoke salary survey.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above, ICT job salary surveys are available (at no cost). • The Market Supplement Procedure states that ‘The Head of Human Resources has the discretion to determine whether a bespoke pay survey should be commissioned and the cost of the survey will be met by HR’ <p>1.3. “The Heads of Service who have posts in their service receiving market supplements have been consulted on this proposal. With the exception of the Head of ICT, they accept that if the jobs were advertised tomorrow without a market supplement, there would undoubtedly be an adequate number of satisfactory candidates. The Council does not have recruitment and retention</p>
-----	----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

difficulties in any of the areas covered by market supplements (ICT, Highways and Transport, EH and Trading Standards and Customer Services).”

- Please note that the head of ICT does not agree that ‘jobs advertised tomorrow without a market premium would attract an adequate number of satisfactory candidates’. This has been demonstrated recently, ICT advertised for a Citrix Infrastructure Analyst, only 4 candidates applied, none of which were deemed to have adequate skills.

1.4 “In light of the economic downturn, the Council can no longer justify the use of market supplements and does not need to have a policy for the use of market supplements”

- Jobs in the ICT sector have remained in demand during the economic downturn and therefore I believe that to recruit and retain effective skilled staff market supplements are necessary. This is especially true given the recent pay freezes.

1. Justifications for continuation ICT market supplement

1. ICT Salary surveys are freely available.

<http://uk.hudson.com/Portals/UK/documents/SalarySurveys/it-salary-survey-2012.pdf>

These surveys demonstrate that WBC is paying below the market rate of ICT roles and that therefore a market supplement is necessary to compete with the private sector to recruit and retain skilled staff.

2. Comparison with available jobs advertised online.

On the day that I received the draft market supplement review I searched for jobs similar to mine online. This returned four jobs all of which are offering a salary greater than I currently receive;

<http://www.cwjjobs.co.uk/JobSearch/JobDetails.aspx?JobId=55490546> £40k

<http://www.totaljobs.com/JobSearch/JobDetails.aspx?JobId=55488942> £38k - £40k

http://www.cv-library.co.uk/cgi-bin/view-job.cgi?jobref=113640274&s=100244&utm_source=Indeed&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=Indeed £30k - £38k

		<p>http://jobs.guardian.co.uk/job/4558238/b-and-q-customer-data-analyst-geo-dem/?utm_source=jobfeed&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=JobFeedXml%253aIndeed.co.uk&ProcessedTrackID=13452 £35k - £50k</p> <p>The market supplement procedure taken from the intranet states that evidence for comparative jobs may be obtained from pay and benefit surveys or <u>through research of like posts.</u></p> <p>3. Head of ICT</p> <p>The Head of ICT feels that recruitment and retention of staff without a market supplement would not attract an adequate number of satisfactory staff (see 1.3 of the draft proposal). Evidence supporting this view can be seen during the recent recruitment to the Citrix team.</p> <p>4. Retention of staff</p> <p>Retention of staff with a market supplement offers better value than losing staff experience and knowledge of the business. I have 12 years experience in post and have detailed knowledge of the business and the bespoke configuration of specialist systems. Due to the broad range of responsibilities I have, a candidate with matching skill to mine could not be found.</p> <p>I carry out additional work outside of normal responsibilities in order to help the ICT service to continue improve; this includes being a member of our Custom Satisfaction Improvement team (CSI Newbury) and work on improvements to our helpdesk system. I believe that this work is highly appreciated by senior management within ICT.</p> <p>5. Morale</p> <p>Morale in the organisation is already low due to three years of staff reductions and the prospect for further cuts. It has been necessary for the remaining staff to absorb additional work to keep all systems running.</p> <p>The remaining staff have been praised for keeping the business running effectively, however this proposal indicates that staff are considered as a cost only, rather than as a valued member of the organisation.</p> <p>ICT carry out many tasks outside of normal working hours to ensure minimum disruption to the business. No additional payments are received by staff for these efforts.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>6. Financial Hardship</p> <p>In the last 3 years there have been pay freezes and there would seem to be a slim chance of an inflation matching pay rise in 2013 and in the next few years. As inflation has been high in the last 3 years the value of our pay has reduced and therefore staff have had to make financially tough choices.</p> <p>Losing my market supplement would mean a further 10% pay reduction on top of a previous reduction to my market supplement and the effect of inflation against my frozen pay.</p>
ICT	Phil Parker	<p>Please take the time to read these comments as this appears to be the one and only point in this review process where the views of affected are being taken into account.</p> <p>The Executive report.</p> <p><i>1.4 WBC could face equal pay claims from other staff who do not receive this additional payment if WBC cannot justify them by reference to market rates. It is no longer possible to find such a justification.</i></p> <p>The posts affected in ICT are all individuals performing different roles, the equal pay claims issue is therefore not applicable.</p> <p>The argument that you can't justify market supplements by reference to market rates, because you are not looking at market rates, doesn't mean that market supplements aren't justified.</p> <p><i>2.2 In order to objectively evaluate the market supplements against current market conditions, a bespoke salary survey would need to be commissioned. In the current economic climate there is virtually no demand for salary surveys. To commission ones for the market supplements paid in WBC would cost several thousand pounds for each service.</i></p> <p>A quick search on the internet, reveals a number of (free) sites that show market rates for salaries in the IT sector (eg itjobswatch.co.uk, uk.hudson.com or experis.co.uk)</p> <p>According to the market supplement procedure, The Head of HR, has the discretion to commission a survey, and, if he chooses not to, may research locally advertised jobs, or contact other local organisations, HR to meet the costs of any such survey or research. There is no suggestion that Market Supplements should be withdrawn because the Head of HR 'feels' they are no longer necessary</p> <p><i>3.1 Based on the economic situation, and the current WBC recruitment and retention rates, an informed management</i></p>

judgement can be made that the Council no longer requires a Market Supplement Policy.

Over the last 4 years, ICT has been reduced from 52 to 37 people. Recruitment has not been an issue as we have not looked to recruit. When we have tried to recruit to technical positions, we have failed to attract candidates with the skills that we require

Retention has not been an issue, but that is because the market supplement is in place.

The views of our Head of Service, while noted in the report do not seem to have been taken into account.

My understanding of the job market in the IT sector is that salaries are still rising, many companies aiming to make savings by the increased use of IT.

There appears little or no justification for this '*informed management judgement*'

3.3 Employees currently receiving a market supplement will be consulted on the proposal to remove the market supplement from April 2014 before a decision is made by the Personnel Committee.

This appears to be the sum total of the "consultation". You, the 5 members of the personnel committee are the only people that will get to see the reactions and feelings of those of us that this proposal affects.

Personal Comments

My salary has already been reduced compared to the Market. - Following the 2011 market supplement review, my salary was reduced by £1000, a decision I accepted at the time as it felt like that saving might help retain the posts of colleagues. Sub-inflation pay rises and increased pension costs have all reduced the value of my salary in real terms.

Another 12% off my earnings. - The proposed change will mean that I lose another 12% of my salary. In reality, this would mean that my salary in 2014 will be worth about 20% less in total than it was in 2011. Looking at the salary surveys mentioned above, I am confident that my current salary is no better than average for similar local posts.

Out of hours support - In order to provide the level of service that the Council has come to expect, I have worked occasional weekends and evenings to ensure that systems that I support are available to their users during office hours. Some things just can't be done to systems when users are logged into them. I have neither received (nor expected) financial reward or time off in lieu for performing these necessary duties. I am not a clock watcher and regularly work more than my contracted hours to ensure

		<p>the job gets done.</p> <p>Valuing what you have – With the reduction of staffing levels in IT, I have, by necessity, taken on more responsibility for systems and functions that required skills in different areas. You have spent a lot of money training me, to enable me to do things above and beyond that which my current job specification requires. All of that training actually increases my value, if not to you, then to others.</p> <p>Morale/Motivation – This does not really need any comment, how would you feel yourself?</p> <p><i>I believe that the 2 statements from the report...</i></p> <p>2.3 The purpose of the market supplement policy was to match the rates paid by rival recruiters and avoid recruitment and retention difficulties.</p> <p>1.3 The payment of market supplements over and above basic pay is legitimate in circumstances where an employer needs to offer a higher pay level in order to attract or retain staff.</p> <p><i>remain true, and that there is no justification for removing the market supplement from the posts in IT.</i></p> <p>I would therefore ask you to reject the proposals in this report.</p>
ICT	Julia Wyard	<p>I am writing to express my serious objection to, and concern over, the proposal to cease payment of the Market Supplement to 30 members of staff from 1st April 2014.</p> <p>I have read the report emailed to me by Robert O'Reilly and wish to explain my objections based on items contained in that document. They are as follows:-</p> <p>Executive Summary</p> <p>1.1 <i>The existing Market Supplements Policy on the HR intranet was designed to increase the salary of individuals in particular jobs above the grade arising from job evaluation, where circumstances meant that recruitment and/or retention levels could not be maintained to meet service need.</i></p> <p>I am of the opinion this situation is still ongoing, certainly within the team in which I work (Education IT based in the ICT Service). The last couple of times we have needed to recruit to vacancies, we have, on several occasions, been informed by potential candidates that the salary on offer was not sufficient. These people were currently working within a school environment and using</p>

the software for which the Education IT Team offers support and training, and so would have been ideal candidates . However, as they were already on a higher salary than we could offer they felt unable to apply for the vacancies.

1.3 *The Heads of Service who have posts in their service receiving market supplements have been consulted on this proposal. With the exception of the Head of ICT, they accept that if the jobs were advertised tomorrow without a market supplement, there would undoubtedly be an adequate number of satisfactory candidates. The Council does not have recruitment and retention difficulties in any of the areas covered by market supplements (ICT, Highways and Transport, EH and Trading Standards and Customer Services).*

My Head of Service, Kevin Griffin, confirms the need for a market supplement within ICT to attract satisfactory candidates for staff vacancies. Within the Education IT Team, I am the Lead Trainer and Support Analyst for all schools (Infant, Primary and Secondary phase) in the submission of annual Key Stage results to meet schools' statutory requirements. In addition I am the Lead Support Analyst for secondary schools in the Exams process. This includes support for the electronic submission of exam entries and the download of exam results to provide headline figures for the authority. I would argue these are fairly specialised procedures that could lead to an inadequate number of satisfactory candidates to apply, should I decide to resign.

Executive Report

2.4 *The current experience of recruiting for posts across the Council is that we have no shortage of candidates. Retention rates in the Council are not causing a problem for service delivery.*

See above points. I think it is rather naive to believe there would be no impact on service delivery if the most longstanding and experienced members of staff were to leave.

3.1 *Based on the economic situation, and the current WBC recruitment and retention rates, an informed management judgement can be made that the Council no longer requires a Market Supplement Policy.*

Please explain how "an informed management judgement" can be made when no survey has been conducted into how salaries in West Berkshire compare to similar posts outside the Council? The Market Supplement Procedure clearly states the Head of Human Resources has the discretion to determine whether a bespoke pay survey should be commissioned and offers alternative solutions should the cost of this prove prohibitive eg researching locally advertised jobs or contacting other local organisations. I would hope both Members and Unison would press for this action before cutting what amounts to a large percentage of workers' salaries.

ICT Salary Surveys are also readily available on the Internet, eg <http://uk.hudson.com/Portals/UK/documents/SalarySurveys/it->

		<p>salary-survey-2012.pdf</p> <p>3.5 This proposal, if agreed by the Personnel Committee, would give staff currently in receipt of a market supplement over 12 months' notice <i>that their temporary increase to salary will cease on 31st March 2014 as a consequence of the abolition of the Market Supplement Policy.</i></p> <p>I find the wording of this paragraph somewhat insensitive. I fail to see how a proportion of my salary, of which I have been in receipt for over 14 years, can be deemed to be a 'temporary increase'. If I had been on a temporary <i>contract</i> for that period of time, employment law would dictate the contract should be made permanent.</p> <p>To sum up, I would argue that abolishing the Market Supplement Policy would actually reverse the following Council Strategy priority:</p> <p>CSP9 – Doing What's Important Well</p> <p>and would ask the Personnel Committee to show appreciation and respect for the longest serving and most experienced staff within West Berkshire Council, who have continued to provide an excellent level of service despite 3 years (and counting!) of zero pay increases.</p> <p>In addition, all staff are now in receipt of a letter from the Local Government Pension Scheme stating we should seriously consider making Additional Voluntary Contributions to ensure we receive adequate pension lump sums. To diminish our monthly salaries further by ceasing the payment of the Market Supplement will seriously impact on both our day to day standard of living, as well as our future financial security, as I for one would definitely not be able to make such additional payments.</p> <p>I would suggest members look at other ways of achieving such savings, whilst recognising staff have already suffered enough financial burdens.</p>
ICT	Andy Best	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current 'Market Supplement System' is working – The argument that the Market Supplement is no longer required is flawed. It is because there are these (minimal) supplements in place, that ICT are able to retain staff and provide a critical service to the Council. That's a primary aim of the current market supplement policy! • ICT salaries are increasing, despite the general economic trend – The information that I receive is that the ICT Job Market is currently buoyant and salaries for our very transferrable skills are seriously in demand in these austere times – many organisations are relying on ICT systems to make further savings and are aggressively recruiting. This view is matched with my own recent recruitment attempts both for permanent and contract staff. In order to deal with this issue, ICT have recently

had to 'down skill' posts in order to recruit – this puts further pressure on more senior and experienced ICT staff who are affected in this proposal. Further evidence of this situation is being provided by my similarly affected colleagues within their own responses together with links to ICT salary information.

- **Salary Surveys are available, or use 'the alternative method'** – ICT salary information is available, and appears to be at no cost – just a little effort. It appears that a flawed assumption is being made based on no evidence at all. The current policy states that in the absence of a salary survey, it may be appropriate to research locally advertised jobs or contact other local organisations – why is this not being done?
- **Breach of current Market Supplement Policy?** - There is no suggestion within the current Market Supplement Policy that the Market Supplements could/should be withdrawn without any supporting evidence at all.
- **Head of ICT Ignored** – It is both surprising and disappointing that the opinion of the Head of ICT appears to be given such little value. Kevin Griffin is not in favour of the proposal, yet this appears to count for nothing.

Potential Impact of Proposals if Accepted

- **Reduction of goodwill** – It is well understood in management texts that although pay increases are not necessarily effective motivators, a reduction in pay will result in significant demotivation and bad feeling. What's less known is that the ICT Service currently relies on significant staff goodwill with many hours of 'invisible effort' given outside of normal hours in order to maintain and enhance services whilst creating minimal disruption to the Council's business. It may be very difficult to expect all the staff concerned to continue to 'go the extra mile' in the way that they/we do currently should this proposal be agreed.
- **Increase in overtime costs** – In line with the statement above, when there is a business imperative that additional / out of hours work is required, it is more likely that staff will insist on payment (as part compensation for their loss). This may significantly reduce any saving potential of this proposal.
- **Reduction in morale** – This proposal serves (albeit not as a deliberate aim I'm sure) to further devalue the ICT Service and key staff therein. From an ICT Management perspective, this proposal will make our job much harder when we set objectives that constantly push for 'continuous improvement', and 'more for less' from a workforce that does not feel valued or looked after.
- **Staff will leave** – It is likely that some staff will leave, not necessarily because they want to, but perhaps more likely because this proposal will make them review the job market and they may be attracted elsewhere, or because of real financial hardship. Recruitment for these more senior and experienced ICT posts **will** be problematic and ultimately we will likely recruit staff with less skills and experience and at considerable management effort, and perhaps with 'special arrangements' in place to provide appropriate remuneration.
- **Re-Grading / Re-evaluation Requests** – Staff that don't leave may well request that their job descriptions are reviewed and will (perhaps justifiably and successfully) push hard for re-grading to compensate for their reduction in earnings. At best this will result in further management effort, but may also reduce proposed savings, or even worse ultimately increase costs where

		<p>spinal point increments in a new grade outweigh the previous functional premium payments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal savings, significant unrest – All of the above potentially results in significant unrest, and management effort, together with a reduction of ‘productive time’ and potentially will result in very minimal savings that aren’t worth the expended effort and bad feeling generated. In the worst case scenario, several key staff may leave and we will not be able to recruit without paying significantly more than we do currently. <p><u>Personal Comments / Observations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have already received real salary reduction over last few years – Due to the (somewhat flawed) previous ‘Market Supplement Reviews’ I have already received real salary decreases between years 2009 and 2011. I suggest that the process was flawed as the ‘job matching’ element is very difficult, and in our lean ICT staffing environment, we are often covering a number of differing roles with a wider variety of required experience and skills than is the convention. However, I didn’t protest much at that time as I felt I was ‘doing my bit’ in hard times – however, this new proposal is a step too far. The main other issue I have with the previous market supplement reviews is that salaries were moderated to the ‘median’ point on the survey – which I feel again devalues myself and my colleagues who I know to be considerably better than average when compared with external peers! • Represents a further 5.25% salary reduction – The proposed change would personally mean a 5.25% salary reduction, in a time when my salary has already reduced over the last few years, and inflation and the cost of living is increasing. • Typical Salaries for my Position – Having now looked again at various IT Job Web Sites, I am very comfortable that my current role and responsibilities more than justifies my current salary including market supplement, when compared to similar roles being advertised right now. Evidence can be provided. • Performance Related Pay Tension – As a third tier manager I have been part of the pilot group for the new staff appraisal system which has a ‘carrot and stick’ pay related aspect. I feel there may be a personal difficulty in working very hard to excel with my goals and objectives, only to have the ‘rug pulled out from under my feet’ in terms of any pay reward. The proposed removal of my Market Supplement would significantly outweigh any ‘performance related pay’ element I might strive for! <p>For all the reasons stated above, I would respectfully ask you to consider rejecting the proposals in this report. I would further recommend that the Market Supplement Policy should be retained as I believe the Council (and ICT) will have further need of it, and that all the posts currently in receipt of a market supplement should be ‘market tested’ in line with the existing policy to determine fair remuneration.</p>
ICT	Stuart Powling	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposal to abolish the Market Supplement Policy</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal to remove my Market Supplement payment. Please find my comments</p>

on the Market Supplement Review below, along with financial justification to maintain my Market Supplement and the benefits gained by the Council.

The Market Supplement Review states:

2.4 The current experience of recruiting for posts across the Council is that we have no shortage of candidates. Retention rates in the Council are not causing a problem for service delivery.

- The report states that there is no recruitment or retention issue in ICT. Retention is due to the fact that rates of pay are currently seen as fair, with the inclusion of market supplements where appropriate.
- The ICT Service has had difficulty recruiting to the recently advertised Citrix Infrastructure Analyst post, as the basic salary rates we offer are seen as uncompetitive in an area of high employment for IT professionals. This post remains unfilled after a recruitment exercise.

3.1 Based on the economic situation, and the current WBC recruitment and retention rates, an informed management judgement can be made that the Council no longer requires a Market Supplement Policy.

- No evidence to support this statement has been presented. The withdrawal of the supplement is based on an assumption, in the absence of reliable salary comparison data, that those receiving the supplements are being overpaid. This is not a sound or fair basis for reducing someone's pay.
- As the survey has not been conducted, there is no proof that these salaries are excessive. To make an "informed management judgement" a survey needs to be conducted to prove that our salaries are excessive before the policy can be changed or removed.

2.2 In order to objectively evaluate the market supplements against current market conditions, a bespoke salary survey would need to be commissioned. In the current economic climate there is virtually no demand for salary surveys. To commission ones for the market supplements paid in WBC would cost several thousand pounds for each service.

- This contradicts the Market Supplement Procedure which states:

8.3 The Head of Human Resources has the discretion to determine whether a bespoke pay survey should be commissioned and the cost of the survey will be met by Human Resources.

8.4 As an alternative to a bespoke pay survey, it may be appropriate to research locally advertised jobs or contact other local organisations. Human Resources will undertake this work.

- Recognised ICT Salary Surveys are freely available on the Internet.
<http://uk.hudson.com/Portals/UK/documents/SalarySurveys/it-salary-survey-2012.pdf>
- If the head of Human Resources declines to commission a pay survey, it may be appropriate to use alternative ways of defining Market Supplements as suggested in 8.4. It appears that Human Resources are unwilling to spend any money or effort to ensure that Market Supplements are fairly calculated.

Justifications for the ICT Market Supplement

Please find below my comments on why I believe the ICT Market Supplement should not be removed:

Hard Work & Loyalty

- The ICT service has suffered staffing reductions over the last three years involving myself and others taking on extra tasks and responsibilities to make these reductions possible. The reduction in my remuneration feels very unfair when I have assisted the Council to achieve its wider savings programme.
- ICT's customers and users expect the systems they use to be available 24x7 even though the Service is not resourced to provide this. However, ICT staff frequently work outside of core hours to upgrade corporate systems, maintain availability and resolve issues. I don't believe there will be as much goodwill to do this in future by those having their pay reduced. This may impact on system availability during core hours.
- I work many additional hours due to the demands of my job. Using logon/logoff statistics from our Citrix system, I have calculated my unpaid overtime. The figures below show how many extra hours I have worked over the last year and illustrate how the council benefits financially, even when taking the market supplement into account.

Unpaid Overtime (495 Hours)	£****
Minus Market Supplement of	£****
Benefit to the Council	+ £5507

(Details can be found in the Market Supplement Appendix spreadsheet)

Morale & Motivation

- The complete withdrawal of market supplements is extremely demotivating and suggests that the staff involved are not recognised or valued by the organisation as individuals. Absolutely no value is put on my skills, knowledge, commitment, hard work or loyalty. 30 Staff will be seriously demotivated in their jobs for an average saving of £1,900 per individual. ICT staff will be less motivated to work outside of their contracted hours.
- The market supplement I receive represents 10% of my total remuneration. This, coming on top of a 3-year pay freeze as well as a previous £**** pa reduction in market supplement, will cause me and my family financial hardship.

Retention & Recruitment of Staff

- The Head of ICT has indicated that there wouldn't be satisfactory candidates for the ICT roles. This has been proven for the recent recruitment to the Citrix Infrastructure Analyst role in ICT. Just 4 candidates applied, none of which were suitable. The post remains unfilled. The supplement is partly to ensure retention of staff with valuable skill sets. The removal of the Market Supplement will do little for staff retention.
- ICT colleagues affected by the Market Supplement Review are very experienced staff. Over the 15 years I have worked for West Berkshire Council, I have attained a very high level of knowledge and understanding of specialist systems and bespoke processes. Alternative candidates would have little understanding of these.


Market Comparison

- My salary without Market Premium is £***** A quick search of jobs online revealed comparable posts:

GIS Project Manager - £65k
GIS Analyst - £55k

Alternative Options

The Market Supplement Review provides few alternative options to the complete withdrawal of market supplement in 2014. I believe there are other options which I have listed below:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of market supplement from the role, not the individual. • To freeze any review of market supplements until reliable market comparison data is available again. • To incorporate Market Supplement payments into our Salary, as I believe has previously been arranged for staff in Finance and Legal.
ICT	Email trail from Head of HR, Head of ICT and ICT Applications Development Manager	<p>From: Matthew Scalpello Sent: 30 January 2013 16:29 To: Kevin Griffin; Robert O'Reilly Subject: RE: Market Supplement Review - Response to Personnel Committee</p> <p>Hi Rob,</p> <p>In addition to wholeheartedly supporting Kevin's comments I would like to add that as a manager who may possibly lose a third of his team (and in reality the <i>whole</i> of the GIS team) due to this change, I do think I am affected and our comments should be heard at the personnel committee.</p> <p>Regards, Mat</p> <p>Mat Scalpello ICT Applications Development Manager West Berkshire Council</p> <p>01635 519151 (wk) 07827 256977(mb)</p> <p> It takes 17,000 gallons of water, 380 gallons of oil and 4,000 kilowatts of energy to make one ton of paper.</p> <p>From: Kevin Griffin Sent: 30 January 2013 16:23</p>

To: Robert O'Reilly
Cc: Matthew Scalpello
Subject: RE: Market Supplement Review - Response to Personnel Committee

Rob,

This takes us straight to the crux of the issue. Stuart Powling's job grade is K and he is on top of grade at SCP 48 (£40,741 pa). The Hay scheme which is fairly narrowly focussed on academic qualifications and budget responsibility and to some degree staff responsibility is unlikely to see Stuart's role re-evaluated at Grade L unless we fabricate his JD. This is where the Market supplement comes in; it allows us to pay the difference between what the somewhat inflexible Hay scheme allows us to pay and the market rate for someone of Stuart's skills and experience.

You know my thoughts on this matter already but I echo Mat's sentiments. Stuart in particular is very distressed at the prospect of losing his Market Supplement and is very distracted by this issue at present. I believe there's a very real likelihood he might leave, not because he wants to, but because he can't afford not to.

I maintain that the remuneration Stuart currently receives is fair but that we will be undervaluing him if we remove the market supplement and will struggle to replace him with someone of the same calibre for the unsupplemented salary if he leaves.

Best Regards

Kevin Griffin

Head of ICT & Corporate Support

West Berkshire Council
Council Offices
Market street
Newbury
Berkshire RG14 5LD

Tel : 01635 519292

Mob: 07780 994887

Fax : 01635 519317

email: kgriffin@westberks.gov.uk



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Robert O'Reilly
Sent: 30 January 2013 14:13
To: Matthew Scalpello
Cc: Nick Carter; Kevin Griffin; Nicola Bailey
Subject: RE: Market Supplement Review - Response to Personnel Committee

Hello Matt

Thank you for your email.

As the role that Stuart undertakes is vital, I would advise you to have a look at the job description and person specification and make sure it accurately reflects his value to the organisation. Nicola can give you a preliminary view of what the grade would be if the revised JD/PS was submitted for job evaluation.

It is also possible to give honorarium payments for exceptional performance.

From an HR perspective we need to correctly label the reason for a payment to an employee (which is important for defending equal pay claims. In WBC the majority of employees are female, whilst the majority of employees receiving market supplement payments are male).

HR is asking the Personnel Committee to consider whether WBC needs a market supplement policy in the current economic climate. If we didn't have one, I don't think anyone would be advocating introducing one.

The final decision on this rests with the elected members on the Personnel Committee.

I don't propose to include your comments with the Personnel Committee report (as you are not an affected employee or trade union rep). If you disagree with this please let me know.

If you wish to discuss please contact me.

Robert O'Reilly
Head of HR
West Berkshire Council
Tel: 01635 519358 or 07500 103028

From: Matthew Scalpello
Sent: 30 January 2013 13:43
To: Robert O'Reilly
Cc: Nick Carter; Kevin Griffin
Subject: FW: Market Supplement Review - Response to Personnel Committee
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

I have read the Management Board report and Stuart Powling's report relating to the removal of Market Supplements and would like to add my support for Stuart's case in particular.

Whilst I am not an advocate of supplements per se, I see that they are necessary in order to attract or retain the right calibre of staff given the restrictive Local Government pay structure.

With reference to point 1.3 of your report it has not been my experience that *'if the jobs were advertised tomorrow without a market supplement, there would undoubtedly be an adequate number of satisfactory candidates'*.

We attempted to recruit externally to the team a number of times over the last few years and my experience is that we get few applications and those we get are of poor quality or lacking in necessary experience.

The last time we successfully recruited was internally, to bring Brian Harper into the team, and this was in large to the wealth of relevant experience he had from working at West Berks for a considerable amount of time.

The effect of this review is that I have three members of my team actively considering whether they could do better elsewhere. The loss of Stuart Powling in particular would far outweigh any savings made.

Consider the growth in popularity of our website, this is in no small part due to the strength of our mapping and 'find my nearest' facilities all developed personally by Stuart. In addition the planning department rely heavily on his experience and knowledge.

The question that needs to be asked is how much saving the Council £4,940 will cost us if we lose an individual such as Stuart.

Regards,
Mat

Mat Scalpello
ICT Applications Development Manager
[West Berkshire Council](#)

01635 519151 (wk)
07827 256977(mb)



It takes 17,000 gallons of water, 380 gallons of oil and 4,000 kilowatts of energy to make one ton of paper.

From: Stuart Powling
Sent: 30 January 2013 10:48
To: Matthew Scalpello
Subject: FW: Market Supplement Review - Response to Personnel Committee
Importance: High

FYI

From: Stuart Powling

		<p>Sent: 30 January 2013 10:24 To: Robert O'Reilly Cc: Kevin Griffin; Nick Carter Subject: Market Supplement Review - Response to Personnel Committee Importance: High</p> <p>Human Resources have put forward a proposal to abolish the policy concerning Market Supplements to 30 staff at West Berkshire Council. This will be decided by the Personnel Committee on 19th February 2013. Please find my response to this proposal attached, along with supporting information for consideration by the Personnel Committee.</p> <p>I am an extremely hard working Council employee who currently receives a Market Supplement. I am asking you to read and consider my response to Human Resources and the Personnel Committee. It outlines the financial benefit to the Council for keeping my Market Supplement.</p> <p>I am very disappointed with the consultation process on this issue. There has been no opportunity for our views to be heard until the final committee decision. I wish to represent myself at the Personnel Committee if this is possible, to ensure my views are expressed. I look forward to hearing from you on this point.</p> <p>Stuart Powling GIS Development Manager ICT and Corporate Support West Berkshire Council Market Street Newbury RG14 5LD (01635) 519466 Ext 2466 spowling@westberks.gov.uk www.westberks.gov.uk</p>
Highways	Mark Edwards	<p>Rob</p> <p>I don't think I formally recorded my thoughts on the proposal to withdraw the market supplements. I'm sure my CEO's will be writing to you separately but in the meantime here are some observations which I would like the Personnel Committee to be aware of.</p> <p>If the very small payment that is made to the CEO's is withdrawn then I suspect a number will simply stop 'going the extra mile' in the way they go about their job. Unlike the IT posts (which receive a MS some 800% higher) these people are quite lowly paid and are expected to do their job in all weathers. I think they are on something like Grade E and receive a MS of £500.</p>

		<p>In addition to their normal duties they fix the pay machines, direct lost visitors, grit the car parks plus many other tasks in line with being 'ambassadors' for the Council as requested by Keith Chopping. This has come as a kick in the teeth and as I say I wouldn't be surprised if my costs go up over the next year or two as we need to call out specialist engineers instead of our CEO's attending to maintenance issues themselves.</p> <p>Between them the 16 CEO's would contribute £8,000 out of your total saving of £58,000. Is it really worth it ? As an alternative proposal couldn't we simply phase out the supplements as we have done with free staff parking and lease cars ? This way the existing CEO's keep their MS but new staff members wont receive it. About one third of the CEO's are almost at retirement age anyway so will probably be leaving over the next couple of years.</p> <p>Thanks Mark</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------