

**Minutes of Meeting of Human Resources Committee  
Albany House, 73 – 75 Great Victoria Street, Belfast**

**Monday 10 February 2020 – 10.30**

**Present:** John Kelly (Chair), Brendan Morgan (BM), Siobhan McElhinney (SMcE), John Unsworth (Vice Chair), Ciara Duffy (CD), Catriona Mullan (CM), Martin Cromie (MC), Shirley McKenna (SMcK)

**Apologies:** Clíodhna Scott-Wills

**In Attendance:** Sam Gallaher (CEO), Alison Chambers – DE (AC), [REDACTED] (HN), [REDACTED] – Headstogether (AB) – from 13.25

**Action**

**1. Welcome and Apologies**

The CEO welcomed attendees to the meeting and noted the normal format would be followed, i.e. the Registrar meets with the Human Resources Committee with a number of other Officers in attendance as necessary

The CEO advised that an independent Minute Taker had been engaged and welcomed [REDACTED] (HN).

The CEO noted the substantial Agenda included significant issues and advised that the purpose of the meeting is to update Members of the Committee on the organisation with additional detail around HR issues. The CEO apologised for an omission in the circulated papers relating to the Absence Report and noted that it was expected that everybody would have read the circulated papers.

The CEO noted apologies had been received from Clíodhna Scott-Wills.

Noting that Headstogether had been appointed by the Council at the end of 2018 to provide HR support through a contract for two years, which could be extended for a third year; the CEO advised that Headstogether were working in the GTCNI office and were available if the Committee had any questions.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

No Declarations of Interest were recorded.

## **5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair of HR Committee and Review of Terms of Reference (HR/20/14/01)**

The CEO recommended the Committee address the **election of the Chair and Vice Chair** of the HR Committee before progressing further with the meeting and invited Members to record their interest in the roles.

CM proposed John Kelly as Chair, CD seconded the proposal and John Kelly was duly elected Chair.

John Unsworth offered to stand as Vice Chair and following Members' agreement was duly elected Vice Chair.

Review of **Terms of Reference** – please see below.

## **3. Minutes of Previous Meeting (23 September 2019 – HR/19/13)**

The Chair referred Members to the Minutes of the previous meeting. The CEO noted that none of the Members had attended the September 2019 meeting, the draft Minutes of which had been sent to the previous Council.

The CEO summarised the key recommendations that went to Council, i.e.

- Proposed staffing structure agreed in principle and to be discussed below
- Progress on Performance Management / Appraisals
- Agreement to consider participation in the Voluntary Exit Scheme (VES)
- NIPSA recognition agreement – the CEO reiterated the proposed negotiating arrangement was agreed by previous Committee and noted that this was to be discussed further by Members
- Headstogether follow up on Action Plan

The CEO suggested that as the current Committee were not present at the September meeting, the Minutes should be recorded as a record of the business of the Human Resources Committee Meeting held on 23 September 2019.

## **4. Matters Arising**

Matters Arising to be addressed during the meeting.

## **5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair of HR Committee and Review of Terms of Reference (HR/20/14/01) - continued**

The CEO highlighted the **Terms of Reference** to the Committee and asked that Members consider if they were content with the Terms of Reference as laid out.

BM advised that in the absence of a Chair for the Committee he had received correspondence from NIPSA regarding the Terms of Reference,

Voluntary Exit Scheme (VES), etc. and invited guidance on when to address this correspondence with the Committee.

The Chair, noting that these matters are on the Agenda, stated that he felt there had been no agreement with NIPSA. The CEO advised that prior to his appointment a Recognition Agreement had been authorised; however, during implementation, NIPSA suggested the Negotiating Committee should be the Council or the HR Committee. The CEO advised that typically negotiations would be between SMT and NIPSA with two meetings per year. Following discussion with HR Committee it was proposed the forum should comprise the SMT; with an open invitation to the Council Chair, Vice Chair or HR Committee Chair to attend the meetings if they so wished. The CEO emphasised that it would be unusual to have a Negotiating Committee above the level of the management of an organisation, i.e. for the Board to be negotiating.

*10.49 – SMcK joined the Meeting*

The CEO advised that when NIPSA had attended the previous HR Committee Meeting to discuss the draft HR Action Plan, [REDACTED] (NIPSA) had indicated that [REDACTED] wished to propose changes to the agreement however, nothing had been received from NIPSA. The CEO stated a task remained to take the Agreement forward and reach a resolution with NIPSA.

*BM briefly left the Meeting*

The CEO noted an amendment to the Terms of Reference, explaining that while the staff operate under NJC Terms and Conditions and pay scales, there is no formal mechanism to deal with the remuneration of the CEO. The CEO suggested that the CEO's remuneration be reviewed through the Chair of Council and this Committee with recommendation to Council.

BM re-joined the meeting and circulated copies of the email correspondence received from [REDACTED] NIPSA at 17.30 on Friday, 07 February. The five points raised by [REDACTED] were noted,

1. Stress still a big issue – request for sick absence statistics and statistics around the use of Inspire services
2. Evaluation of Dignity at Work training and request that [REDACTED] attend the meeting where the Team Charter is to be drawn up
3. Request for satisfaction survey into Headstogether
4. Recognition and Facilities Agreement to be updated to take into account the HR Committee's Terms of Reference
5. Staff preference for [REDACTED] to be conduit between GTCNI, NIPSA and staff

The CEO noted that the matters raised were for the HR Committee to consider and make recommendations to Council, highlighting that the cited HR issues are recurrent themes and symptomatic of deep set

problems in the organisation and stressed that the organisation cannot move forward unless such issues are addressed.

By way of context, the CEO noted that neither the former interim Registrar or himself had been involved in the appointment of Headstogether which had been through an independent tender and stressed that he had found Headstogether's behaviour to date to be professional and independent. The CEO highlighted the consumption of resources in relation to HR- an estimated £80K spend for the year for an organisation with 20 people – the organisation is overspending in this area and distracted from fulfilling its functions. Given recurring HR issues, an HR presence had been in place for three months and people have had the opportunity to speak to the HR advisors individually and collectively.

The Vice Chair stated that as a new appointee, he found himself in a difficult position; it was clear that there are significant HR issues and tensions and he has not been made privy to the Action Plan. He suggested there was some security for the Committee in following the Agenda and being updated on the issues through the Agenda. He reminded the Committee of the need to follow good governance. Noting his concern that the NIPSA correspondence was being shared for the first time during the meeting (he acknowledged that BM had had no facility to circulate the correspondence in advance.

The Chair concurred, noting that he was in the same position as other appointees and that it would good learn more of the context. Likewise, he supported the Vice Chair's concerns regarding good governance.

BM agreed with the Vice Chair's position and the Meeting briefly discussed the reasons BM had been unable to share NIPSA's correspondence of late Friday 07 February.

The Vice Chair noted NIPSA's correspondence referenced the HR Committee's Terms of Reference in relation to the Recognition and Facilities Agreement. During discussion of the circulated Terms of Reference (HR/20/14/01) the CEO advised that only two additions had been made:

1. Effectiveness Review: The Committee shall annually formally review its operational effectiveness and Terms or Reference, and
2. The Committee will also support the Chairperson in employment matters pertaining to the Chief Executive / Registrar.

NIPSA had proposed change to the Recognition Agreement and the previous Committee had said these would be considered; however, nothing had been received. The CEO reiterated the issue with the Negotiating Committee (as outlined above). Noting that no formal correspondence had been received from NIPSA outlining the proposed changes, the Vice Chair recommended that the matter could be considered under Agenda Item 11.

MC outlined two concerns:

1. A Trade Union looking at the Terms of Reference for an in-house Committee as such Terms of Reference are set by the Council, and
2. No correspondence had been received from NIPSA describing accurately what changes NIPSA is seeking. Further, in relation to the Joint Negotiating Committee, MC stated he did not understand why NIPSA was moving away from its normal practice. He was concerned as a Member of GTCNI, if NIPSA were allowed to work their normal manner.

BM noted that NIPSA had not stated that they wanted changes in the Terms of Reference; rather, NIPSA wanted the Recognition Agreement to take into account the HR Committee's Terms of Reference. MC queried if the GTCNI was complying in a way other organisations would in connecting to the Union.

The Vice Chair queried whether the Committee had agreed to the changes to the Terms of Reference, i.e.

- The original Terms of Reference state "The Committee has decision-making powers on matters relevant to its remit ...";
- However, the new version states "The Committee has oversight on matters relevant to its remit ...";

The CEO advised that procedures had been tidied, noting the matters reserved for Council; clarification was being given to separate the non-executive governance function from the executive function of SMT – who run the organisation on Council's behalf. The CEO asked if the Committee was content with the Terms of Reference or had any changes to be fed back to Council.

The Vice Chair, noting that the CEO had provided the rationale for the changes, stated that it was fundamentally important as to whether the Committee had decision-making or oversight powers and how this relates to the Executive Team and the Council; there must be appropriate oversight of the CEO and Executive Team. Otherwise, the Vice Chair recorded that he was content.

SMcE requested that clarification be sought on the Standing Order, i.e. paragraph 31 as reference in the Terms of Reference and the need for reference to be updated.

The CEO advised that the Committee agreed matters in principle but, for example, VES would be the Council's decision. If the Council adopted the Business Plan – appointing a short term contractor or employee would not be something brought to the Committee..

SMcE suggested the relevant paragraph text be extended to clarify the Committee's responsibilities. The Vice Chair recommended the inclusion of some examples; he reiterated that he was content with the draft.

The Chair concluded that the Committee was content with the Terms of Reference and, that being the case, the Committee was committing to annually reviewing its operation effectiveness.

The Meeting recorded that the appointed Chair and Vice Chair were in place [role] for two years.

## **6. Corporate Plan and 2019/2 Business Plan Update (HR/20/14/02)**

The CEO outlined the background to the development of the Corporate Plan and the Business Plan for 2019-20 (please see circulated paper). Prior to the CEO's appointment, the Council did not have a Corporate Plan in place. He advised that due to HR matters having an operational impact, lack of resourcing and unforeseen issues commanding attention some work-streams on the business plan will carry through to the following year.

The CEO noted that continuing reference to staff restructure had heightened staff expectations. He referred the Committee to the circulated GTCNI Corporate Plan which sets out the plan for the period to 2022

SMcE suggested that for an organisation with some 20 staff members, the Corporate Plan was quite ambitious and a massive task for a small organisation. The CEO advised that the reserves could be used in a measured way, budgeted to bring in outside consultants. Further, in relation to the provision of advice and guidance; a lot of materials have already been developed by the Council but require review and targeted circulation. There is also the opportunity to utilise materials from England, Scotland and Wales. CM and CEO noted that the SEO oversaw policy development in the organisation; but does not necessarily write the policies, rather expertise is brought in to develop a collaborative piece of work. CM highlighted previous work undertaken by the temporary education officer. The CEO anticipated more of the Corporate Plan will be achieved than not.

The Vice Chair noted the difficulties as Members of a new Committee and acknowledged the difficulties the CEO had experienced in development of the plan.. He considered whether there was merit in the organisation reviewing a number of the objectives – given that it is now 2020, what is achievable by 2022. He and SMcE noted that the organisation must be fair to the CEO and be conscious of current gaps in staffing and the cost of a further lengthy review given there is some overlap with DE, CCEA, Learning Leaders, etc. The CEO noted the organisation operates within a modest budget and that opportunity for partnership working to gain synergy and maximise budgets should be

considered where appropriate. The organisation will only be addressing areas within its remit that can be managed within resources. BM concurred with the Vice Chair and noted that any suggestions can be fed into the Council meeting being held on 05 March.

**ACTION:** Committee to forward comments regarding the Corporate Plan to the CEO via email by 24 February and CEO will try and incorporate what he can in advance of the papers to Council being issued.

**HR/20/14  
A01 ALL**

The CEO advised that the Corporate Plan was brought to the HR Committee to allow understanding of same. He confirmed that all Committees would have the same opportunity.

*Break from 11.48 – 11.59*

## **7. HR Report (HR/20/14/03)**

The CEO stressed the confidentiality of any matters discussed and stated that GTCNI remains an organisation in transition. The CEO referred the Committee to the circulated paper which would have given the Members a sense of the issues being addressed and the financial commitment for the organisation. He advised that Headstogether were available to attend the meeting at any point.

### **Current HR Matters**

- Industrial Tribunal brought by previous employee being held w/c 24 February and expected to last one week. An offer of settlement was made on the basis of saving on legal costs; however this was not accepted.
- Industrial Tribunal brought by current employee – hearing expected in July 2020.

### **Voluntary Exit Scheme (VES)**

The CEO noted that the previous HR Committee and Council had approved GTCNI's participation in the VES with applications being subject to business need and ongoing staff requirements. Four applications have been received and acceptance is proposed:



The Committee were reminded that once VES applications are accepted, the organisation cannot subsequently recruit to these roles. Compensation cost was £57K against a recurrent annual salary saving of £66K (concurrent as per changes in proposed structure).

An issue relating to one role was briefly noted. BM cautioned that a Grievance had been submitted in relation to this and recommended limiting any discussion. The CEO noted that he was not aware of the grievance MC recommended that legal advice be sought on this matter.

**ACTION:** Legal advice to be sought relating to contracted hours issue.

**HR/20/14  
A02 CEO**

Concluding the discussion on the VES, the CEO asked if the Committee were content to progress the applications. The Chair noted that if approved, the applicants will exit GTCNI at the end of March 2020, and that the Committee was not due to meet before this date – he suggested that a Sub Committee be set up. The Vice Chair, acknowledging that the previous Committee had agreed participation in VES, asked to see the proposed revised staffing structure with the impact and proposed financial saving and then it could be decided whether applications can be accommodated. SMcE stated that given that the Committee is liable, the VES should be reviewed; that the Committee needs to be clear on the needs.

In response to SMcE highlighting the recommendation that “Consideration be given to reducing the size of the Council”; the CEO advised that this was for discussion with the sponsoring Department as this was a recommendation from independent review of GTCNI by the Department. Noting there was a GTCNI Bill drafted prior to the breakdown on the NI Assembly, the CEO suggested there may be merit in reviewing the Bill.

#### **Request for phased retirement**

████████████████████ (SEO) is seeking to exit the organisation on the basis of phased retirement, i.e. three days per week. The CEO noted that while workloads have to be considered; he believes this request can be accommodated for a period – timing would have to be agreed.

Following a query from BM, AC (as the DE representative) confirmed that GTCNI was in Special Measures and this had been confirmed at the last meeting (HR/20/14/03 – Appendix A).

#### **NIPSA Agreement**

Reflecting the previous discussion, the Committee noted that no formal proposal had been received from NIPSA. The CEO noted that if the Agreement is approved, it would have to be considered whether the Chair or Vice Chair attending the Negotiating Committee did so in an advisory or decision-making capacity

**ACTION:** CEO to revert to NIPSA requesting proposals in writing.

**HR/20/14  
A03 CEO**

#### **HR Policy Review**

Noting the issuing of the HR Policy to NIPSA for review, SMcE queried whether a timescale had been set for NIPSA to respond

**ACTION:** Agreed that the CEO would provide NIPSA with a timeframe within which to feedback on the HR Policy.

**HR/20/14  
A04 CEO**



The CEO advised that a range of documents, e.g. Performance Management and Staff Appraisal process should be ready for review by the next Committee meeting.

BM drew the Committee's attention to NIPSA's correspondence (as above) requesting evaluation of effectiveness of recent Dignity at Work training and a satisfaction survey into Headstogether's service and asked if the Committee should consider putting this request through Council.

The CEO advised that the Dignity at Work training was not yet complete; but was due to conclude by the end of the financial year. In terms of a satisfaction survey into Headstogether's service, there is a contract in place including monitoring of the contract at least twice a year if not quarterly.

The CEO stated that he was happy to take staff views; but he recommended reviewing findings with caution. Committee Members and the CEO expressed concerns given the potential for a breach of contract with Headstogether and the consequences. The Vice Chair stated that it would be helpful to have clarity on Headstogether's role. BM advised that Headstogether had been engaged December 2018 / January 2019 as HR adviser to organisation. After a report submitted on staff issues, the requirement for Dignity at Work training was a primary focus.

The CEO reminded the Committee that as the organisation did not have an inhouse HR resource; the Council had contracted Headstogether to update policies, advise on job evaluations and on day to day issues, etc. BM suggested that a satisfaction survey could be on the component that staff came into contact with Headstogether.

Responding to BM's query on the HR overspend; the CEO advised that Headstogether's contract was for two years with an option to extend for a further year and acknowledged that, due to the ongoing HR issues, the HR budget estimate for the current year had been exceeded significantly.

The Meeting noted that it was standard practice to complete evaluations following training and the CEO advised that staff would be given evaluations on the Dignity at Work training; however, the training was not yet completed. It was noted that the Dignity at Work training was to have been completed by 31 January and SMcE questioned the missing of this deadline. The CEO advised that not all staff were available to attend the first training date in December and a further date was set up for the end of January. Now that all staff have attended a session, a third session to bring together the Team Charter is being facilitated by Headstogether on 09 March (the CEO would be attending this session as a participant). It was noted that the Team Charter would 'belong' to the participants, that it would be about how the Team works together – the legal requirements and definitions.

BM concluded that the organisation could revert to NIPSA advising that an evaluation would be carried out at the conclusion of the Dignity at Work training.

The CEO highlighted the logic of an organisation of the size of GTCNI buying in HR expertise; noting that if the organisation is running well, the expertise is essentially back up only. However, for GTCNI this is not the case and substantial input is required. The CEO reiterated that he was surprised by how much resource HR matters are consuming within the organisation.

Following a query as to whether Council Members were attending the Dignity at Work training; the CEO advised that no Members had attended (there being no Chair of Council). He recommended that while BM could attend the training, he would recommend only doing so in consultation with Headstogether as the remit of the training is for people to be able to be open and honest and having the Chair attend the sessions could work against that. In response to BM's query as to whether the Union Rep was attending the training; the CEO the discussion could continue offline.

The Chair stated that a full report on the Dignity at Work training was to be available to the Committee at the next meeting. It was noted that GTCNI has a Dignity at Work policy in place.

**ACTION:** Full report on the Dignity at Work training to be available to the Committee at the next meeting

**HR/20/14  
A05 CEO**

As a separate matter, the CEO confirmed for the Vice Chair that the Registration Manager role would stay within the organisational structure.

To ensure the meeting is quorate and to allow all Committee Members an opportunity to sit on Sub Committees to address current Grievances; BM asked that the Meeting go 'into Committee'.

Proposer: Vice Chair  
Seconder: SMcE

The CEO left the meeting at 12.41.

**'In Committee'** – please see separate confidential minute.

The CEO re-joined the meeting at 13.25; AB joined the meeting at 13.25

HR Committee restarted at 13.32. The CEO welcomed AB from Headstogether to the meeting.

## **8. Absence Report (HR/20/14/04)**

Referring Members to the circulated Absence Report; the CEO advised that in the DE approved Business Plan there was a target absence rate of below 6%. The organisation has struggled to maintain this due to legacy and ongoing HR issues. The CEO acknowledged the high level of absence within the organisation resulting in an overall absence rate of 19.89% over last three quarters.

The Meeting noted the financial cost of sickness absence YTD as £84,479.21.

The CEO suggested that while absence is an issue, it is also a marker for other underlying matters and that organisational development is really critical. .

Absence would continue to be monitored, but no significant improvement is expected in Q4. Running with the equivalent of four full time people out of the organisation is causing operational problems with impact on delivering the Business Plan.

In response to SMcE's query regarding an Attendance Policy, the CEO advised that the Policy was in the Employee Handbook and would be for Line Managers to follow up.

AB advised that the existing Policy had been reviewed and the revised Policy is not hugely changed but does clarify the steps Managers should follow. AB reported that the draft Employee Handbook is to go out to consultation with NIPSA representative and will be phased. Headstogether's plan is for the organisation to have a Handbook in place with all Policies reviewed over a 6 to 12 month period – existing Policies will remain in use until new Policies have gone through consultation.

In response to the Chair seeking clarification as to how many people were part-time.; the CEO advised that 7 people work part-time. He noted that it is unclear as to why there is a high percentage of part-time workers. AB commented that previously arrangements have been made to accommodate personal circumstances; however, there are no new part-time people.

Noting NIPSA's request for sick absence statistics BM enquired if the available statistics could be shared; following discussion, the CEO agreed that NIPSA could receive a summary of absences. In relation to the use of Inspire Services, it was noted the counselling service is anonymous and GTCNI is only aware of the number of sessions availed of monthly through invoices received. Noting that the Committee does not have this information, the Vice Chair expressed concern that any information relating to the use of Inspire's services would be shared with another organisation – even a little. GTCNI offers access to a confidential service and this costs 'x' amount. AB noted that this query had been raised before and the CEO had dealt with it. BM stated that he was happy for the Committee to be assured that Inspire service is being used.

The CEO noted that it would be reasonable to ask NIPSA why they wanted this information. AB commented that it would not be possible to tell if use of this service is work related or personal; the statistics only confirm that people are using the service, but it cannot be assumed that this is related to work.

The Vice Chair asked that it be recorded that the Committee was not aware of the level of reporting on the use of Inspire and he was uncomfortable with information being shared given that people use the service for all sorts of reasons. The CEO stated that the Committee would be advised of expenditure on this service.

**HR/20/14  
A08 CEO**

Members noted that the service should always be available, that it is good that GTCNI provides the service.

It was confirmed that an Occupational Health Policy was in place and AB advised that the proposed Policy would have more clarity. It was noted that it is normal practice to refer people to Occupational Health and that no objections to referral have been received.

**9. Voluntary Exit Scheme Update**  
**10. Revised Staff Structure (Presentation)**

The CEO suggested that Agenda Items 9 and 10 be taken together.

The CEO confirmed that in relation to **VES**, as noted above, four staff wish to leave equating to a 2.2 full time equivalent and he believes the organisation can accommodate this.

The CEO reviewed a presentation on the **revised staffing structure** with the Committee, including the DE recommendation that a restructure and review of Registration cost base be considered.. He noted that the inclusion of the staff restructure in Business Plans for 2017 – 2018 and 2018 – 2019 had raised expectations but progress has been hampered by the absence of a Corporate Plan and HR issues.

The CEO reviewed in more detail covering:

- Staff numbers at end of 2017 – 2018 21 staff 18fte
- Annual income of £1.2M of which £782K accounted for staff costs at March 2018.
- DE Budget for salaries is £709K – GTCNI is overspending year on year
- Temporary allowances – . .
- March 2019 staffing position
- VES (as above).
- Proposed revised structure – emphasis on two directorates, Finance & Corporate Services and Professional Services with the latter incorporating Registration, Regulation, Policy and Promoting Professionalism.

- The CEO outlined the proposed roles and changes. He emphasised that changes were to put in place a settled core structure to streamline where possible and to expand skills of staff to allow flexibility. A structure which can evolve on the basis of business need.

Assumptions including:

- Core staffing adequate to take forward Corporate Plan (not accounting for change in regulation)
- Annual cost of £650K – 16 staff (13fte)
- No compulsory redundancies needed (through VES)
- Assume Professional Regulation as is
- Assumes SEO on phased retirement for a period.

The Committee thanked the CEO for his presentation and raised number of questions:

- The Heads of Regulation and Registration would have one in-common team?

CEO advised that at present in the absence of clarity regarding regulation there is merit in having a team that can be flexible. Separation would take place at the SRO level. . The adjustment has been based on a qualified estimate of what the regulatory workload is likely to be. If it turns out that the workload will be greater with a corresponding increase in legal expenditure, then the workforce would be reconfigured accordingly. The organisation may decide to train Investigation Officers to operate under direction of the legal team as this might prove more cost effective.

- BM made the point of avoiding confusion in line management for those at the lower tier of the structure.

CEO advised line management would be through the Manager and SROs. The CEO emphasised the need to create a flexible team for the time being and the need for investment into ensuring all the team's had capability in the area of Regulation etc..

AB advised that currently the more Senior Managers are handling all line management; while the Senior Regulation Officers do not have line management responsibilities and there should be a role there, i.e. for Appeals.

Noted that the person recruited to the role of Head of Professional Services will also have views on the structuring of their team hence little change at this point.

- The role of the communications person was discussed. SMcE discussed options for communication and increasing teacher awareness of GTCNI's functions.

- Job Descriptions have been written and are being finalised and evaluated
- The CEO noted while there will be some change it is not significant, rather a readjustment to define the roles better to the current needs of the business. The CEO confirmed a consultation process will take place.

*CM left the meeting at 14.21.*

AB confirmed, in relation to the timeframe that the job descriptions are sitting ready for final review and evaluation.. The CEO advised that the restructure cannot go ahead without the agreement of Council. BM noted that the business case goes to Council and then AB conducts the formal consultation with staff and unions. The CEO noted that it would not be normal for the job descriptions to go to Council; AB explained that the Union and Staff see the job descriptions and consultation is with the staff – if the Council agrees the structure in principle.

- SMcE enquired as to how staff feel about the changes.

AB explained the problem is that the staff do not know and it is important to get out what the Council have agreed. VES is not yet confirmed through Council. The CEO commented that he is concerned that unconfirmed information has been floating about the organisation for some time.

The CEO had shared the VES proposal with the previous HR Committee and Council with approval given, work on a business case is ongoing and detail is being shared with this new Committee for information and consideration. , He highlighted that given the underlying context it is important for the Council to reduce fixed costs as sensibly can be done – which will impact on reserves and the extent of any change if necessary to Registration fees.

The CEO stated that moving to the proposed structure would reduce current staff costs by circa £100K per annum..

BM suggested that it would be important to clarify the respective roles of the Regulation / Registration Senior Officers for reporting staff and he supported the idea of flexibility. He emphasised the need to bring the, currently unsettled, staff on board. The Vice Chair agreed – a flexible Team with clear line management direction.

The CEO noted that regulation in its current form and predicted workload does not warrant a dedicated team for Regulation.0 This may evolve over time in light of experience or be necessary as of result of any legislative change forthcoming. . The Registration process is largely

manual and paper driven and it is difficult for staff to see what a new system may look like where, Registration will be online and administrative work reduced.

Vice Chair commented that the restructure is about investing in people and keeping people on board – opportunity for people to develop, for promotion and perhaps a slight increase in salary.

Vacant posts were noted – roles will have to be advertised externally. The Vice Chair felt that consideration might be given to enhance administrative support as the Committee noted that the EA role encompassed supporting the CEO, SMT, and Council. The CEO stated this is a current role and suggested that there were creative options for additional support, e.g. offering apprenticeship, student/graduate placements, etc. These would make good business sense and fulfil asocial responsibility.

SMcE had a concern regarding communication, i.e. having only one Communication Officer. She suggested that there needs to be more activity, need to see tweets, etc. CEO noted that some issues are down to skillsets but the organisation needs to be measured in what it can afford at this time. The Senior Communications Officer is a new starting point and the organisation can build from there. AB suggested considering a Communications student placement opportunity by way of additional resource CEO agreed.

The Chair stated that for the Committee, to move forward the restructure has to be recommended to Council. The CEO asked if the Committee believed they could approve the structure and VES and recommend to Council.

BM stated he would like the structure made clearer and he agreed with the Vice Chair's concern re administrative servicing of the structure being light. The Chair noted the two very useful suggestions.

### **Propose staff structure to Council.**

Proposed: CD  
Seconded: Vice Chair

### **Propose VES to Council.**

Proposed: SMcE  
Seconded: Vice Chair

The Chair asked if Committee Members had any concerns.

SMcE advised that she would appreciate feedback from AB on how staff felt. AB advised that the feedback would be through the Consultation process and she will then come back to the Committee.

AC advised that in relation to VES, DE needs significant movement by the end of March 2020 - with a robust Business Case for VES as part of the restructure to be submitted, or people will have to leave later than currently planned.

*SMcK left the meeting at 14.44*

**11. NIPSA Recognition Agreement (HR/20/14/05)**

The CEO stated that he believed that the NIPSA Recognition Agreement had been discussed.

**12. Date of next meeting**

Noted that the next meeting is 12 May 2020. .Committee discussed the best start time to increase attendance and it was suggested that the next meeting commence at 14.00 (2pm)..

**13. AOB**

With no further business, the Meeting closed at 14.50



## Actions Register

### Actions raised on 10 February 2020

	Item	Details	Owner	Timescale	Status
HR/20/14 A01	<b>6 - Corporate and Business Plans</b>	Committee to forward comments regarding the Corporate Plan to the CEO via email by 24 February and CEO will try and incorporate what he can in advance of the papers to Council being issued.	<b>ALL</b>	<b>24 Feb 20</b>	<b>Open</b>
HR/20/14 A02	<b>7 – HR Report</b>	Legal advice to be sought relating to contracted hours issue.	<b>CEO</b>		<b>Open</b>
HR/20/14 A03	<b>7 – HR Report</b>	NIPSA Agreement - CEO to revert to NIPSA requesting proposals in writing.	<b>CEO</b>		<b>Open</b>
HR/20/14 A04	<b>7 – HR Report</b>	HR Policy Review - Agreed that the CEO would provide NIPSA with a timeframe within which to feedback on the HR Policy.	<b>CEO</b>		<b>Open</b>
HR/20/14 A05	<b>7 – HR Report</b>	Full report on the Dignity at Work training to be available to the Committee at the next meeting.	<b>CEO</b>	<b>12 May 20</b>	<b>Open</b>
HR/20/14 A06	<b>In Committee</b>	The Committee <b>agreed</b> that a new Grievance Policy is required and that it be proposed to Council to change the wording of the existing policy.	<b>Chair</b>		<b>Open</b>
HR/20/14 A07	<b>In Committee</b>	The Vice Chair and CD requested copies of GTCNI's current Grievance Procedure.	<b>BM</b>		<b>Open</b>
HR/20/14 A08	<b>8 – Absence Report</b>	Inspire - The CEO stated that what the service cost during 2019-2020 would be reviewed and the Committee advised	<b>CEO</b>		<b>Open</b>