

### Delegated Powers – Unison Comments

Unison has concerns over the use of delegated power 19 (to permit all Directors to carry out restructuring including appointing new posts; converting one post to another; changing grade; changing job titles in conjunction with the Head of HR&OD, provided it is within approved Service budget), and in the inconsistent manner it is applied across the Council.

Although we accept that minor tweaks to structures may require the use of delegated powers, Unison does not believe that delegated powers should be used for restructuring or establishing teams.

What would We like to see:

1. Delegated Power 19 deleted from the scheme of delegation.
2. For all minor restructuring – a fully populated business case to be presented for TU consultation, to be signed thereafter (with TU comments included) by the relevant Convener and the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee.
3. A fully populated business case presented to committee inclusive of TU comments) for all non minor restructuring.
4. One pro forma and guidance document to be developed and used for all requests to ensure consistency at all times.

Examples of the random use and inconsistencies in the use of this delegated power:

1. We receive business cases regularly asking for grades to be changed, aware of at least one occasion when a post has been re-evaluated and gone up grades without a business case.
2. A business case for an increase in hours (from 36.25 to 37) (one extreme to the other)
3. A team being established using delegated powers
4. An officer authoring a report in which their own grade was increased.
5. Wholesale changes to a team being undertaken using delegated powers, in converse, recent restructure took place in the legal team, a full business case was presented to committee, and then a fully populated business case was presented to implement delegated powers. This has not happened in other restructuring.
6. Multiple business cases coming forward only weeks apart for the same team (no holistic approach)
7. A case where "new jobs" were created where we believed that in terms of the Job Matching Process Policy they should have been straight matches.

8. Inconsistencies regarding paperwork – some services only use the delegated powers form, others use a business case form, other examples of a version of committee report template being used.

9. downgrading of some jobs, at a time when we should be skilling up our workforce.

10. There are clearly inconsistencies between the Consultation Protocol and the Delegated Powers scope - in relation to proposed restructuring. The former requires CMT approval, but we are not aware that this happens.

11. In general terms when you look at what we receive there is not a standard approach, there is no formal guidance for officers and there are no quality checks being undertaken. Often information is incomplete and we don't know to what extent officers affected by proposals have been engaged. Often these reports come to us before they have been agreed or supported by the Director or Head of Service - so we don't ultimately know if the proposals are implemented or changed.

12. At least one example of the guidance in relation to Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessments not being carried out.