

**Devon and Cornwall Police Authority****29th September 2006**

FOI classification - OPEN

Joint Report of the Director of Human Resources and the Acting Chief Constable

---

**A New Job and Grading Review for Devon & Cornwall Police Staff****Recommendation(s):**

- |  |
|--|
| <p>(i) <b>The Authority should note the content of this report.</b></p> <p>(ii) <b>The Authority is asked to approve the recommendations</b></p> |
|--|

**Strategic issue for consideration**

1. To agree the appropriate introduction of a modern grade and remuneration strategy, which takes into account best practice, is fit for purpose and is affordable. Such a strategy should ensure that staff are treated equitably, their work is valued and the Constabulary is able to recruit, retain and motivate high quality individuals to give their best in achieving the organisation's goals.
2. To agree the need for an interim grading scheme to support the operational requirements of the Force Development Programme.

**Recommendations for decision**

3. That the Force proceeds with a new Job and Grading review, following consultation with and having gained the support of the Police Authority, Force Management Board, Staff, relevant Unions and Staff Associations.
4. That the Force develops and implements an effective remuneration strategy which enables us to recruit and retain staff, ensures the Force is competitive with the external labour market and is an affordable employment proposition.
5. The Force follows the key recommendations in the Goodman report, which have been amended and endorsed by the JCC; and incorporates the learning points and recommendations from the Police Authority report.
6. That the Force commits a realistic implementation budget, it commits to sufficient internal and external HR resources to ensure success.
7. That the design and set up phase of the programme are begun in the latter part of 2006/early part of 2007, with targeted completion over a 24 month period and final implementation in the spring of 2009.
8. That the new scheme is branded the 'Job and Grading Review' (JAG) to avoid association with the previous job evaluation scheme and to signal a fresh start.
9. That an interim arrangement is agreed to deal with any imminent organisational changes resulting from the Force Development Programme.
10. To ensure the Force is able to recruit and retain staff effectively it has the facility in the new remuneration structure to utilise market supplements in exceptional circumstances to ensure that Devon and Cornwall Force salaries are fully competitive with the external labour market.

## **Salient points**

11. Devon and Cornwall Constabulary has faced considerable difficulty since the aborted launch of a new Job Evaluation system in April 2005. This has created a lack of trust and confidence in Force management, a difficult employee relations environment, and negative media coverage. Some police staff are now reluctant to move forward with a new scheme until they see 'closure' on the original scheme launch. However continued inertia is not an attractive option as the Force needs clear and decisive leadership over this issue. On his first day in post Acting Chief Constable Arnold directed that this matter be progressed at the earliest opportunity.
12. A number of reports were commissioned into the reasons for the 2005 debacle. The completion of the three reports (Metropolitan Police, Goodman and Police Authority) provides a watershed between the past and the future. While specific investigations are still underway, these should not delay further the introduction of a new scheme.
13. The announcement that police Forces will not be forced into mergers in the near future also provides the Force with the opportunity to shape its own destiny and to determine its choice of scheme, method of implementation and timing.
14. Without an effective form of job evaluation and grading the Force is vulnerable to claims under equal pay legislation and does not have a coherent pay strategy. There is also the risk that without a new and successful review the Force will find it difficult to escape from the poor legacy and low morale associated with the old scheme.
15. The Force Development Programme involves the creation of new and changed police staff roles, needing grading and salary decisions. A new Job Evaluation scheme could take between twelve and twenty-four months to complete, and interim arrangements are therefore required to support and facilitate organisational change in the immediate and short-term future.
16. By demonstrating strong leadership and a pragmatic way forward in dealing with job evaluation progress should be made towards inspiring trust and confidence. This will contribute to a positive employee relations climate which is key to a successful future for the Force and its staff. However, the current employee relations climate means we cannot rush into a new evaluation scheme, it needs to be introduced carefully and in a measured way.
17. Scheme investment will be significant in terms of both finance and personnel during the planning, training and set-up stages. In addition, implementation will result in additional costs being incurred by the Force payroll with effect probably in the latter part of the 2008/09 financial year. Final implementation costs will be subject to consultation and management/Police Authority approval but adequate budget provision will need to be made and alternative sources of funding identified where necessary.
18. However, without a new scheme we face an even more costly alternative of lack of staff commitment, a failure to retain key staff, the potential for industrial action and the debilitating effect of low morale including inflexibility and increased sickness absence. These factors would inevitably have a detrimental impact on a range of Force performance targets.
19. It is made absolutely clear that the new job and grading review (JAG) is being undertaken to lay firm foundations for an equitable system of remuneration. While staff should not anticipate increases in salary, there will be no agenda to save money by implementing the new scheme. It should be recognised the JAG review will have costs to the Force associated with its implementation.
20. The new remuneration structure must enable us to recruit, retain and motivate staff but it should also be manageable, competitive in the Devon & Cornwall labour market, equitable, legal, affordable and

sufficiently flexible to cope with future changes to the organisation. It should ensure there is a cohesive remuneration structure from junior clerical through to senior management posts.

21. Appendix A provides details of aspects for consideration in the design and selection of a future scheme and its relationship to a wider remuneration strategy.

<b>Force Policy</b>	Will result in changes to Force Policy at implementation stage.
<b>Performance</b>	Successful implementation should have a positive result on staff morale and therefore performance.
<b>Financial</b>	Significant implications for initial costs of introduction and also for ongoing salary costs.
<b>IT</b>	Planning and set-up phases may require additional IT resource.
<b>Estates</b>	Project team will require accommodation.
<b>Contractual</b>	Contract and procurement involvement may be required.
<b>Diversity</b>	Any system selected must comply with and support the Force Diversity standards.
<b>Personnel – Training</b>	Significant involvement in training for all those involved in role evaluation.
<b>Information Security</b>	Essential during introduction to avoid breaches that occurred in the previous scheme.
<b>Consultation (internal and external/staff associations)</b>	Internal consultation will be essential to the success of the scheme as will full involvement of the staff, Police Authority and unions.

Contact: for further information

**Nigel Holt**

Director of Human Resources

Telephone 01392 452262

E-mail [nigel.holt@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk](mailto:nigel.holt@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk)

## **1. Future Solution**

### **1.1 Full union and staff involvement**

The active involvement of the unions in helping determine a way forward on job evaluation is key. The Force has already concluded a partnership agreement, which involves setting up a partnership group to complement the current JCC meetings. This signals our intent to fully involve the recognised unions in any change programme particularly involving changes to terms and conditions.

We would look for the unions to have a representative on all grading panels in the implementation of the new programme. We would also embark on significant programme of face to face communication with all staff through meetings and briefings.

### **1.2 Selecting the new Job Evaluation Scheme**

Whilst it is clear that no prejudgement should be made as to what the new job evaluation system should be, some initial parameters should be set for the programme.

The new system needs to be credible, reliable and robust. Generally speaking it is not appropriate for an organisation of this size to develop its own in-house approach, but to utilise a proprietary system available from the market, which has been tested adequately.

It must have the buy-in of the management, workforce, police authority and unions. It is recommended that the options available are explained and communicated to all interested parties together with the pros and cons of the approaches and an allaying of any fears, concerns, misconceptions and myths. However, management need to provide effective leadership and retain the right to make recommendations to the police authority what system is used after the proper consultation, communication and negotiation.

For Devon and Cornwall Constabulary, this would suggest that either the Hay Guide Chart or the Local Government system should be implemented. Each of these is used by a number of police Forces.

The Local Government system used by the Force is scheduled to be re-designed. Unison has asked if Devon and Cornwall would like to be a pilot for the new scheme once it is developed. We are unsure at this stage of the timeframes for when the redesigned system is likely to be completed and this could impact our choices. Additionally, it may be very difficult to generate staff confidence in essentially the same type of JE system as was attempted in 2005.

An early decision needs to be made on the two main options available and a suitable tender process undertaken. The tender process should be based on fitness for purpose not lowest cost.

The 2005 job evaluation exercise utilised a computerised system called 'gauge'. The new scheme should consider the use of a paper based system and evaluation panels. This will help to maximise the degree of participation and thus a higher level of ownership of the outcomes.

### **1.3 Scope of roles to be included**

Where job evaluation systems are concerned it is normal in most organisations to separate the workforce at the point of senior management. This is because organisations need to have separate pay governance processes that ensure senior management pay decisions are free from the potential for abuse.

Additionally, it is common for organisations to have separate job evaluation processes for senior management posts. This is partly linked to the governance issue, and partly reflects the need for evaluators to have a good understanding of the roles they evaluate. It is suggested that the PSMG grades are covered by this approach.

Due consideration will need to be given as to how this group will be handled in the new system but it is recommended that the Police Authority has overall accountability for senior management pay and grading strategy through a Remuneration Committee with access to independent advice. The Police Authority will also have accountability for the pay and grading strategy of all other police staff

#### **1.4 Grading and salary system**

The Goodman report makes some recommendations regarding the relationship of job evaluation, grading and salary structures, and performance related pay, reflecting the concerns that were raised in his investigation. Whilst we accept these in principle, a way needs to be found to reconcile these issues as there is an intrinsic link between the job evaluation, grading and pay system. It is also recognised that no job evaluation system can be implemented without reference to its financial cost.

Implementation involves developing a grading system (i.e. a method of grouping jobs of a similar size together), which then obviously leads to a pay range attached to each grade. It is important that jobs are not individually down-graded to accommodate the financial concerns of the new system. Jobs should be evaluated against the system, and then grouped into a grading system, and pay ranges then set which enable the organisation to recruit and retain staff by being competitive in the market and affordable.

It is therefore recommended that once the review is completed, the grouping of jobs into grades and salary ranges is then undertaken. To achieve this, the Force will need to develop a remuneration strategy, at an early stage, which defines the philosophy and principles that will underpin the grading and salary structure. This will be aimed at attracting and rewarding skilled staff for high levels of performance.

#### **1.5 Performance related pay**

It is recommended that, whilst salary ranges may have to be reset, performance related pay is not included in the scope of this project. After implementation of the new evaluation and grading scheme a project should be set up to consider the options for a performance related pay system in the future. This would have the benefit of not contaminating the job and grading (JAG) review and keep the processes totally separate.

#### **1.6 Communication to staff, unions and management**

A planned programme of education, communication, consultation and negotiation will need to be in place. It is expected that there will be a series of regular communications to all stakeholders to keep them informed at all times of what is happening. In this way, staff should be aware at all times of the progress of the project, the likely times for implementation and how it will affect them. Force management will be happy to meet with all staff who have concerns over the implementation of the new scheme including staff in the PSCG.

#### **1.7 Phasing & appeals**

Introducing a new job and grading programme is a huge undertaking involving detailed analysis of a large number of jobs. Inevitably this will mean the need for phased evaluation of areas, albeit without any final JAG points determined until the final 'stack' of jobs with allocated scores is agreed. Once the stack is agreed consultation on allocation of grade can commence the Force will seek a mutually

agreed approach but the Force reserves the right to implement if agreement cannot be reached but only with Police Authority approval.

When individuals have been notified of their grade they will have up to one month to lodge an appeal. The appeal panel should include, inter alia, a union representative, HR manager and a line manager, none of whom personally evaluated the role as part of the Job and Grading Review (JAG).

While the appeals process can be used for amending job grades, in line with most other organisations the grievance process will not be available for such purposes.

## **1.8 Grading & pay changes and effective dates**

Subject to negotiation it is recommended that the effective date of implementation will be the same for all staff. Therefore, there will need to be an agreement with the union about the negotiations and the date for finalisations of those negotiations. All grade and pay changes will then be effective from that date. There should be no backdating to any previous exercise or when the role was first analysed but only to the negotiated date of implementation following appeals. This will enable the whole Force to move together in an ordered way.

## **1.9 Pay and grade protection**

In the event that staff secure a post at a lower grade than their current post, it is recommended that protection be put in place. The approach recommended is that salary is protected for a period of time, but the new grade is implemented immediately. The new salary range applicable for the new role will then restrict any future increments in salary. This protects current salary for staff, whilst putting in place a plan for dealing with equal pay issues. It is also the simplest approach from an administration and systems point of view. The period of protection utilised is typically 2-3 years and this would form part of the collective negotiations.

While guarantees of this kind are the norm to create greater trust in the new scheme serious consideration should be given to a policy of extended protection as this would help to overcome any negativity to a new review. While an individual's basic salary would not drop from their existing level they would not receive future cost of living, salary scale reviews or increments until their basic salary came into the appropriate salary range. While for example a four-year guarantee period could entail increased costs taking this stance but after four years many individuals would have moved jobs anyway, so the real costs are likely to be marginal. The Force may need to obtain further legal and consultancy advice before finalising this approach. This and other salary management scenarios are explored in Appendix B.

## **1.10 Job evaluation protocols**

The Goodman report details concerns on how the project was conducted especially with regard to those staff who were on the project and part of the job evaluation team.

There were concerns raised as to whether or not those who were trained on the system gained an unfair advantage with regard to their own jobs. Processes and safeguards will be put in place to ensure the project is conducted in an equitable way.

For example, no person on the job evaluation team will be allowed to participate in evaluating their own role, their line managers or any directly reporting staff and senior project managers should be excluded from this type of activity entirely.

No one in a senior management role who was involved in the previous job evaluation exercise core project team should be involved in the new Job and Grading Review (JAG) programme team.

### **1.11 Equality Check**

Once all roles have been reviewed the impact on male, female, ethnic group, age group and disabled staff should be checked and any necessary re-considerations of outcomes undertaken. The use of external consultancy advice will be considered at this stage to quality assure the process in addition to peer review from other Forces if required.

### **1.12 Moderation**

Within a successful JAG scheme it is important for an organisation to check for consistency before arriving at the final job points 'stack'. This process is known as moderation or 'sore-thumbing' and it is vital that staff are made aware of the need for this process in all JE schemes to ensure consistency and reliability of results. To maximise trust either external consultancy or peer Force resources can be utilised at this stage.

### **1.13 Impact assessment**

Comprehensive impact assessment is required before any decisions are taken affecting terms and conditions.

### **1.14 2005 Gainers**

The subject of 'gainers' from what is perceived by many staff as a flawed exercise in 2005 is an emotive subject, particularly those involved formally on the core implementation project team. This aspect should be considered as part of the negotiated solution with the unions.

### **1.15 Key skills**

To ensure the Force is able to recruit and retain staff effectively in areas of key skills it has the facility in the new remuneration structure to utilise market supplements in exceptional circumstances to ensure that Devon and Cornwall Force salaries are fully competitive with the external labour market.

## **2. Structure of programme and responsibilities**

Clear roles and accountabilities will be set for personnel involved in the project. It is suggested the following structure is adopted.

### **2.1 Force Management Board**

Must be regularly briefed on the progress of the project and have visible responsibility for it and be the ultimate decision making body within the Force, subject to Police Authority final approval.

### **2.2 Police Authority**

As the legal employer the Authority must be regularly briefed on the progress of the project, monitor its implementation, have representation on the Steering Group, have overall accountability/control of the strategy and outcomes.

### **2.3 Job and Grading Programme Steering Group**

The group consists of representatives from management, union/staff associations, ACAS representatives, Police authority representation and experts who will quality assure, question, steer and advise.

## **2.4 JAG Programme Working Group**

Representatives from the management and lay representatives from unions, will have the responsibility for agreeing the project plans, protocols etc. put forward by the project team. The Group will be chaired by the HR Director. The Programme Leader will also sit on the Working Group due to their technical expertise.

## **2.5 Programme Leader**

Head of Reward and Employee Relations. Will have responsibility to lead the programme, drawing up the appropriate plans, protocols, and recommendations, and manage the work of those on the programme. This will include any external consultants appointed to the project. Will have responsibility to make day-to-day decisions and be the in-house technical expert on the design of job evaluation, grading and pay systems.

## **2.6 Programme Team**

All staff that are working on the implementation of the new system. This will include those staff that are acting as internal job evaluation experts and the external consultants. Where Union involvement is agreed and it is on a non-negotiating basis, they will be within the project team. It will also include a programme-planning manager to assist the Programme Leader.

## **3 Interim Solution - Issues**

### **3.1 Transition from the current to the future**

A key to success is to ensure the workforce is taken through the changes in a positive, open and professional manner to build up trust in the new approach.

There is an existing framework for grades and salaries. This is not necessarily fit for purpose and may not reflect what the new system will look like following negotiations. Additionally the organisation is going through a period of change, whereby structures and responsibilities will change before the new job and grading system is implemented. There therefore needs to be an interim method to cope with sizing jobs and determining salaries.

### **3.2 Constraints for the interim solution**

- The interim system must enable the Force to recruit and retain key personnel during a significant time of change. The current grades, in particular, are an issue in this regard and necessitate frequent use of market supplements.
- It is important that the interim job and grading system does not taint the future position and has the agreement of union representatives.
- The interim system must not affect staff whose roles are unaffected by the organisation changes.
- It does not seem sensible to implement a radically new interim system. Trust would have to be built up in the system and the time frame for the Force Development Programme changes might not be met.
- Whatever system is used in the interim it must not detract from the existing grade structures, pay and benefits, as this would cause workforce unrest and union issues.

- Age discrimination legislation becomes effective from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2006 and this will influence our approach to incremental pay spines if we are to avoid vulnerability to discrimination claims.

#### **4. Proposals for an interim Job and Grading Scheme**

It is recommended that, subject to negotiation with the unions, the following practices be adopted for jobs that change as a result of the Force Development Programme in the near term. These are part of the broader package of HR support to the Force Development programme.

##### **4.1 An opportunity for improved role clarity**

The JAG programme creates a major opportunity to gain more consistency and clarity in the design of the organisation. It will be helpful in determining new organisational structures, establish consistent broad categories of role and a similar job description methodology to facilitate future evaluation, for example:

Director  
Head of Function  
Managers & senior specialists  
Specialists and supervisors  
Support staff

These categories group together job roles of similar levels of responsibility and knowledge. This can help to ensure that we have consistency in our organisational design, without prejudging how many grades there will be in future.

Further consistency with our long term direction can also be achieved by developing a two page job description format containing up to 10 key responsibilities and a second page with a brief person specification and an organisation chart. This format will provide good role clarity.

##### **4.2 General principles covering all staff gradings and salaries:**

- Only new jobs and jobs that are substantially changed will be subject to interim grading. All jobs that continue unchanged will continue on their current grade and salary until the full evaluation exercise is underway.
- It is recommended that all promotions under the interim system carry the appropriate grade and salary (under the existing scheme). This will give the workforce confidence that they are being treated fairly and equitably in a difficult time. It is also recommended that increases in salary should be made permanent, not that indicative supplements or temporary allowances be used, as staff might perceive these as unfair. However, all letters of appointment should clarify that the new grade and salary range are temporary and will be subject to review under the new job and grading scheme.
- To ensure that the Force is able to recruit and retain key staff it will reserve the discretion to apply market supplements where it is unable to recruit new staff or is at risk of losing key skills.
- In the event that, due to the changes, staff are assigned to a post at a grade with a salary range lower than their current grade provides, it is recommended that some protection is put in place. The approach recommended is as set out in paragraph 1.9 above.

- 4.3** For staff up to Level M3 it is recommended that the existing grading system is used and the existing practice of job slotting/matching is continued. Staff will be given grades appropriate under the current system to match their new job responsibilities.
- 4.4** The small number of roles in level PSMG 1 and above tend to be one-off roles. In line with many organisations, a system of spot salaries is proposed to cope with promotions and new recruits to this level. This system would be based on internal relativity's and market based information. A broadband approach could be adopted to replace the existing PSMG 1/2/3 (i.e. remove the numerical suffix and call the band PSMG). The system could then adopt a market-based approach with a salary range from 80% up to 100% of the spot rate. The salary offered from this range would depend upon the individual's skills, experience and match to the job requirements. The Police Authority would review these roles separately as part of a Remuneration Committee, chaired by the Chair of the Police Authority with the Director of HR and external consultancy support.

## **5. Project Staffing and Costs**

### **5.1 Staffing requirements and continuity**

There is a significant amount of work to be undertaken through the process of moving from the current situation, through the interim, to the full implementation of the new job and grading system and all subsequent required changes. In order to manage this extent of work, it is expected that there will be a requirement for a programme team comprising a Head of Reward and ER, 1 Senior Analyst, 2 Analysts, ER Manager and a programme manager. Additional interim support may be required in the early phases.

There will also need to be significant input from other HR staff. Estimated costs are shown in Appendix B. While there may be a temptation to recruit a Head of Reward & ER, plus Senior Analyst under a fixed term contract, a key learning point in the last exercise was the need to maintain team continuity during this period and this is much more likely with permanent appointments.

In addition to HR and external consultants, there will be a need for staff representing each of the main Force functions to be on the project. These will be trained as internal experts and used throughout the process as the panel to evaluate all jobs within the organisation below senior management level and to help each department put together their new role descriptions.

### **5.2 Consultancy support**

It is apparent that the Force requires external expertise to support the new programme. For external consultants, bearing in mind the experience of other Forces recently ( e.g. Avon & Somerset), it is recommended that the Force budgets between £200 - 250k. This would be spread over the duration of the project and the ultimate cost would depend upon how long it took and what is incorporated into the consultants' remits.

### **5.3 Estimated costs of implementation (excluding additional consultancy and HR support).**

Implementing a new job and grading scheme inevitably entails significant costs. The final implementation cost would be subject to negotiation and management/police authority approval.

Major organisations typically budget at least 5% of their staff payroll costs for any new evaluation scheme. On current 2005/06 salary figures, this would mean an additional £2.67m to the existing police staff payroll costs (excluding 'knock on' increases in NI and pension contributions). Projected costs would need to be budgeted based on the 2008/9 financial year.

It is crucial that the Force Executive and Police Authority recognise the extent of these costs and budget accordingly as the increased salary costs will continue in subsequent years.

Future costs will be modified in the light of future pay settlements and the gradual reduction of salary guarantees.

During 2005-6 we would therefore expect HR set up, consultancy and JE training costs, with only limited additional salary costs from evaluated jobs that are new or changed significantly. Significant additional costs from the programme to the Force payroll would be incurred from the spring of 2009.

These figures are estimates at this stage in order to set expectations and prior to any formal negotiations. The Force and Police Authority will need to budget adequately for these changes and consider how this will be funded. .

## **6. Conclusion**

Energising the organisation and overcoming the mistrust and cynicism that currently exists is hugely important and requires the backing of all stakeholders to maximise the degree of success with the JAG programme.

Expectations need to be managed carefully from the start if we are to under promise and over deliver.

It is time to put the fears of job evaluation behind us. This will not be easy but with a positive mindset we can achieve the successful implementation seen in other organisations.

Author: N.A.Holt - HR Director  
29/8/2006

JAG TEAM – ESTIMATED COSTS

Head - £60k

PA - £17.5k

Given the volume of meetings and the volume of work required to be delivered from this role, the role holder will need this person.

Senior analyst x 1 £35 - 40k

Analyst x 2 £27.5 - £33k each

A project manager £35k

For external consultants, I would suggest we budget between £200 - 250k. This would be spread over the duration of the project and would depend upon how long it took and what we incorporated into it.

**Example of effects of salary and grade changes**

*Person A - Grade change puts salary above Salary range maximum*

Grade	Current Salary	Salary Range Minimum	Salary Range Maximum	Comment
Existing grade	£35,000	£32,000	£37,500	Person can move up to Salary Range Maximum
New grade	£35,000	£29,000	£34,000	Person is above the Salary Range Maximum. Salary will be protected, but will receive no further increases until falls within the range

*Person B - Grade change produces a higher Salary Range Maximum*

Grade	Current Salary	Salary Range Minimum	Salary Range Maximum	Comment
Existing grade	£34,000	£29,000	£34,000	Person cannot receive any further increases except cost of living as at Salary Range Maximum
New grade	£34,000	£32,000	£37,500	Person is now below the Salary Range Maximum. Therefore can receive salary progression until reaches Salary Range Maximum. Consideration of an immediate increase to reflect skills, knowledge, expertise.

*Person C - Grade change means Salary below new Salary Range Minimum*

Grade	Current Salary	Salary Range Minimum	Salary Range Maximum	Comment
Existing grade	£34,000	£29,000	£34,000	Person can not receive any further increases except cost of living as at Salary Range Maximum
New grade	£34,000	£37,500	£42,500	Person is now below the Salary Range Minimum. Therefore receive salary increase to bring to the minimum immediately. Progression until reaches Salary Range Maximum. Further consideration of any other immediate increase to reflect skills, knowledge, expertise.

## Appendix D

It is understood that this is a complex programme involving many different stakeholders however as detailed in section 2 of the paper assignment of accountability is key.

The Police Authority retains overall accountability and control of the programme including its strategy and outcomes. It achieves this through active involvement and representation on the JAG steering group, in addition it reviews and monitors the progress of the JAG programme through the Police Authority Hr Committee, Police Authority Remuneration Committee and full Police Authority meeting structure.

The Force management are responsible to the Police Authority for the effective delivery of the programme and will recommend to the Police Authority for consideration the remuneration and grading strategy. It will achieve this through the formation of a JAG programme working group with a programme leader and Programme team.

To achieve greater impartiality and expertise a JAG programme Steering Group will quality assure, question, steer and advise the JAG Programme Working Group with representatives from the Police Authority, management, union / staff representatives, ACAS representatives and external experts as required.

Strategic decisions can be determined as follows:

- 1) JAG Programme Working Group – recommend
- 2) JAG Programme Steering group (including Police Authority) – advise
- 3) Force Management Board – recommend or reject
- 4) Police Authority Hr Committee – recommend or reject
- 5) Police Authority – Final approval or reject
- 6) JCC/JNC – consult / negotiate