

MINUTES of the People Committee 9am 24th January 9am Video Conference

Present:	Chair – Kirk Lower (KL) Alan Debenham (AD) Jose Bamonde (JB) Tina Ellis (TE). Jude Owens (JO) Stuart Rimmer (CEO/Principal SR) and Liz Howard (LH)	
In Attendance:	Wendy Stanger – Director of Governance (WS) Ann Wall Director of People and Wellbeing (AW)	
L/23/01/1	Membership and Apologies	Action
No apologies as all in attendance		
L/23/01/2	Declarations of Interest	
There were no declarations of interest		
L/23/01/3	To approve the Minutes of the last meeting 8 11 22 and any other matters raised previously not otherwise included in the Agenda	
<p>The minutes of 8 11 22 were agreed as a true record.</p> <p>The Committee Chair updated the Committee on the pay review outcome which had been amended following Finance and General Purposes review of the proposal's affordability. The Chair had discussed the disconnect in the decision making and it has been agreed in future to have a joint People and Finance and Resources meeting on the pay review in future and to start the review process at an early stage so that the award is budgeted. The main decisions were that Corporation resolved to remain a real living wage employer and awarded a 6% of salary non-consolidated honorarium payment. As part of the award the Job Evaluation Scheme was suspended and will be reviewed by the Committee.</p> <p>The CEO advised that there was ongoing consultation with the Unions and that other Colleges had already been or were likely to be affected by industrial action and that the national union position was likely to be a ballot for industrial action.</p> <p>The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that the College's unions were having an informal industrial action ballot and would inform the College of the result. The retention of the real living wage had been welcomed and the effort the College had gone to, to maximise the award had been recognised. But there was concern about the non-consolidation of the award and the suspension of the job evaluation scheme.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that an additional committee meeting may be required to consider the 2023/24 pay review and to start the review of the job evaluation scheme.</p>		
L/23/01/4	To review the post meeting action log	
<p>The action log was reviewed.</p> <p>Governors discussed the actions related to succession planning: All agreed that succession planning was important and should be part of the appraisal and talent assessment conversation, which needed to be an honest and realistic one. Department Managers needed to consider and be accountable for their area's succession planning.</p> <p>Governors discussed how succession planning reconciled with open recruitment and agreed that talent management does not exclude open recruitment. It is preparing home grown talent so that</p>		

	<p>they are ready to apply for posts when they become available and this advancement is not an automatic right.</p> <p>The Director of People and Wellbeing commented that even though the College used a 9-box grid with clear descriptives, training had been provided on its use and Assistant Principals moderated not all talent assessments were realistic. Governors commented it may in part be more about leaders not wishing to disappoint their team with a difficult message and a fear they may leave if they don't see a clear route for progression. The CEO advised that the talent assessment had matured and successes had been seen through the Emerging Leaders programme and in management progression but there still needed to be a more honest and open conversation.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following action, and agreed this would supersede the succession actions on the log:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A risk assessed map of the wider College management group to be produced in order to identify areas of risk and produce individualised plans, with the summary considered at the May People Committee. 	AW
L/23/01/5	People Update	
	<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing presented the update which covered absence, vacancies and recruitment, appraisals and the People Team.</p> <p>Governors discussed the reasons for the increase in absences and the mitigation the College was putting in place and challenged what the impact of absences was on other staff. The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that this was mixed with some managers being proactive and arranging cover through agencies, or other staff including managers covering. The budget included an element for cover but this would be insufficient for an interim for long term absence. Governors noted that the absence cost recorded was not the full genuine cost to the organisation.</p> <p>The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that the number of vacancies had reduced. Governors noted that there was though a number of long-term absences and challenged what action was being taken. The Director of People and Wellbeing advised there was a need for the College to be more proactive in its recruitment. The introduction of differential pay had made a difference in the number and quality of applicants in the areas where it had been introduced. Other areas were now becoming difficult to recruit too with the number of applicants for any role low and other more creative options were being considered.</p> <p>Governors commented that there was a need for recruitment to be inclusive, which would also have the benefit of increasing applicants. Advert wording, where advertised and interview guarantees all needed to be considered but it shouldn't go as far as positive discrimination. The CEO commented in some departments this would require cultural change.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following actions</p> <p>Future People updates to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comparative data, both internal and external • data in percentages as well as actuals • recruitment KPIs such as advert to offer and • recruitment section to include positive and inclusive actions taken and their impact. 	AW

L/23/01/6	Staff Pulse Survey	
<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing presented the staff pulse survey results which overall had been positive with a circa 60% response rate. This good response rate had been helped by the work of the Engagement Ambassadors.</p> <p>Governors commented that results were excellent especially given the pressure of the financial crisis. The positive response to the autonomy question was a key indication of satisfied staff.</p> <p>The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that the College had been proactive in trying to support staff through the financial crisis with for instance the last professional learning day including the money advisory service, the Staff Wellbeing Lead providing budget advice, the Employee Benefits Scheme and reduced prices in the canteen.</p> <p>The CEO advised that the Best Companies survey would be launched before the Easter break. This would give a cross check of the pulse survey results but would not be directly comparable due to the range of questions the Best Companies survey contained and the weighted comparable data output.</p>		
L/23/01/7	Review of the College's use of the Apprenticeship Levy - Verbal Update	
<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing verbally updated the Committee on the College's use of its apprenticeship levy. This was used for apprentices and for professional learning. It was hoped that the increase in the apprenticeship starting salary would attract candidates.</p> <p>Governors discussed how apprenticeships helped social mobility and the social diversity of the workforce. There was a need for the College to encourage departments to have an apprentice and it should be asked at budget setting why an apprentice was not included in their staffing plan. Using examples of where apprentices had succeeded would help to change managers mindset.</p> <p>The Director of People and Wellbeing advised that at performance management all managers had been asked to consider an apprentice where they had a vacancy.</p>		
L/23/01/8	Gender Pay Gap	
<p>The Director of People and Wellbeing presented the annual report and advised the Committee on the findings. The College at management level had a predominance of females but had areas that were predominantly female at the lower pay levels such as Co-educators.</p> <p>Governors discussed the report and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gender pay gap was not always comparable as it depended on what services had been outsourced. • Advertising needed to be inclusive and not use stock photos. • Progress was difficult when roles were attracting few candidates. • Differential pay tended to have to be used in male dominated areas and this would therefore have a detrimental effect on the gender pay gap. • Some teams were female dominant and needed to be diversified too and • That the report needed to be inform and be part of a College wide EDI approach. 		

L/23/01/9	To review the risk register	
<p>1. Has the risk register been reviewed It was noted that the register had been reviewed in January 2023.</p> <p>2. Is the Committee content that the risks are relevant and are being updated Governors discussed if there was a need for a risk around a workforce structure that is financially unsustainable. The Director of Governance advised that this was a finance risk and that the Finance Tactical Risk Register had a risk of 'The number of teaching staff employed is higher than required for the delivery of the curriculum plan' and 'College unable to afford to meet the terms of joint pay award submitted by the College's recognised Trades Unions.</p> <p>3. Is the Committee content that the risks are being mitigated Governors agreed that the meeting reports considered risk mitigation.</p> <p>4. Where a red risk is the Committee assured that appropriate action is being taken The red variance from risk appetite risks were high levels of staff absence through sickness and College unable to deliver full range of teaching and support services to students and staff due to industrial action. These had been discussed in the meeting and the Committee had been assured that appropriate action was being taken.</p> <p>5. Where does the Committee have significant concerns. The Committee's concerns were around the red risks noted.</p> <p>Governors agreed the following action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To recommend to Finance and General Purposes Committee that a risk around the workforce structure being financially unsustainable is added to their risk register. 		WS
L/23/01/10	Agenda Planning	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job evaluation review Pay Review Best Companies EDI 		
L/22/11/10	Review of Meeting	
<p>1. Confidential Items – None</p> <p>2. Risk Management: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment – as noted and referred to F&GP</p> <p>3. Health & Safety: any issues discussed which may require an additional Assessment -None</p> <p>4. Equality & Diversity: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment – pay review and inclusive recruitment</p> <p>5. Sustainability: any issues discussed which may require an additional Impact Assessment - None</p> <p>6. Media: any issues discussed to inform local media – None</p> <p>7. How did the meeting go – it was agreed that due to the amount of People business that future meetings should be diarised for 2 hours and that these should be on site.</p>		