



SURREY

Dear Headteacher

January 2018 update: Revisions to job families consultation timetable

I am writing further to recent meetings of the Reward Steering Group, and with our trade union colleagues following the extended deadline of 7 November which was given to allow more time for schools to provide supplementary information on their job family mapping decisions.

There has been much discussion about the time required to undertake the complex task of analysing the volume of anomalies highlighted by schools. Of the 261 maintained schools who have submitted their data sheets, over 200 schools indicated that they had roles which mapped differently from the current grade levels. However, only a third of schools have provided the supplementary information explaining the reasons behind their mapping decisions. Consequently, it has been agreed that the outcomes from the mapping exercise will not be ready to be shared with schools until February 2018 instead of December 2018 as previously communicated.

I would like to remind you that all the communications regarding the job families programme of activity can be found on the [schools reward webpage](#) and would encourage you to familiarise yourselves with this on a regular basis.

Please also review the [recent detailed presentation](#) shared with our trade union colleagues and at the Schools Forum on 7 December 2017 where an overview of the latest position showing the response rates from schools and number of roles mapped differently from the current grade levels can be viewed together with the [revised timeline](#). A summary is provided in **Appendices A** and **B** attached to this letter.

For those schools who have not yet submitted their data, it is still not too late to do so; and you can find information about what is required in this [easy to follow guide](#) which is also published on the schools reward webpage.

In the absence of any job family workforce data spreadsheets and/or any supplementary information, the SCC HR team and trade union colleagues will have no alternative but to evaluate roles based on the information submitted by other schools/**or** not evaluate roles at all where there is very limited data to analyse. Please also refer to the **Q&A** document attached for further information.

Please note that at the bursar briefings delivered at the beginning of the autumn term, Bursars were advised that where schools have mapped roles to a higher grade level than the substantive grade for the position, they should make budgetary provision at the higher grade level. Where roles have been mapped to a lower grade level, budgets should not be adjusted, and schools should work on the basis that roles remain as per current grade levels pending confirmation of evaluation. A copy of the [Bursar Briefing presentation](#) is also published on the schools reward webpage.

I would like to thank again all those schools who have endeavoured to respond to requests made for information and for your continued co-operation on this project. For those schools who are still unsure about what is required, please do speak to your Babcock HR Consultants for advice/support or contact the SCC HR Reward team on 0208 541 9676 or email at scchr.rewardteam@surreycc.gov.uk.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Liz Mills'.

Liz Mills
Assistant Director, Schools and Learning

Table 1: Shows the number of schools who have not yet returned their JFWDS

Overview of number of maintained schools who had not yet returned their Job Family Workforce Data Spreadsheets (JFWDS) as at 7 November 2017.					
School Phases	Community	Voluntary Controlled	Voluntary Aided	Foundation	Totals
Infant	1			1	2
Primary	3	1	1		5
Junior	2			2	4
Secondary	1		2		3
Special Schools					0
Pupil Referral Units	1				1
Total number of maintained schools which have not returned their JFWDS	8	1	3	3	15
Total number of maintained schools by governance type as at June 2017	154	18	80	20	272

Table 2: Number of schools who have mapped their roles differently from the current grade and submitted supplementary information.

Mapped Outcomes	No. of positions that need to be looked at in this category*	No. of schools that have submitted anomalies in this category	Status of returns at 13/10/17	Status of returns at 27/10/2017	Status of returns at 3/11/17	Status of returns at 7/11/2017
Roles mapped higher	636	154	8	16	16	49
Roles mapped lower	297	99	4	6	6	33
Roles not mapped/Unique	104	26	0	8	8	11
Roles with wage type 999 (this includes those roles with spot salaries or mapped as 'Other')	302	105	6	9	25	31
Children Centre anomalies (Included in the above figures)	75	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •All Children Centre roles were mapped initially by Lesley Hunt, SCC Supporting Children's Manager. •Some CC roles were mapped to non-schools job families i.e Personal Care and Public Engagement. The schools job families will be expanded to take account of this. 			

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS – JANUARY 2018

1. Why job families were introduced?

The job families project was launched following many months of discussion with Headteachers representing all the school phases, Trade Union and Babcock HR colleagues (who had in various forums), expressed strong views about the need to identify and address legacy pay anomalies, create pay equity as well as consistency within job roles across Surrey schools.

These were mainly legacy issues that had arisen over the years where the job capsules did not reflect current roles; where duties have evolved over time or where due to particular circumstances, pay rates for schools support staff have fallen behind market rates and therefore pay bands were being adjusted locally to compensate.

2. How many schools have not yet returned their job families workforce data spreadsheets (JFWDS)?

As at December 2017, all but 15 maintained schools had submitted their JFWDS, which is a vast improvement from where we were some months ago.

3. How many schools indicated that they had roles which mapped differently from the current grade levels (i.e. higher/lower or not mapped)?

Approximately 200 schools highlighted that they have roles which map differently from current grade levels. However only 90 schools have so far provided the supplementary information requested.

4. What supplementary information are schools being asked to provide?

All schools who mapped roles differently to the current grade or were not sure where to map the role, were asked to provide:

- A copy of the **existing job description** for the position and
- A [rationale](#) for mapping it differently to enable an evaluation of the role.

An [easy to follow guide](#) about what is required has been published on the schools reward webpage at www.surreycc.gov.uk/schoolsreward.

5. What will happen for schools that have not provided a JFWDS form or submitted any supplementary information to support their mapping decisions?

The SCC HR reward team and trade union colleagues will only be able to consider roles for evaluation where supplementary information has been provided. Where it is possible to do so, the data available will then be used to create '**model role profiles**' for each roles evaluated.

For roles where there is **no** rationale or supplementary information supporting mapping decisions, it will not be possible to evaluate the role and requests for grade changes will not be supported. Instead, the newly created 'model' role profiles and evaluated grades will be

shared with all schools in February 2018 (*including those which did not submit a JFWDS or provide sufficient information to substantiate their request for a grade change*).

Schools will then have a final opportunity to review and confirm that these '**model role profiles**' reflect the work activities and grade level for their roles.

6. What support will be given to schools concerned about the impacts on their budgets of resolving the legacy pay anomalies i.e particularly where roles map higher?

We fully acknowledge that there will be budget pressures for schools, who as a consequence of resolving legacy pay anomalies, will find that they now have roles which map higher than the current grade levels. The council is also well aware that schools are facing additional pressures from rising pensions and national insurance contributions, in addition to new contributions required towards local authority statutory services brought about by the end of Education Services Grant.

The Reward Steering Group is committed to working in partnership with all maintained schools headteachers to support them to adopt the recommended outcomes following the review of their roles. While no extra funding will be available, schools will be provided with all the necessary information and advice to be able to determine the most appropriate establishments.

7. Can maintained schools choose to disregard the advice/recommendations of the Steering Group?

It is important that schools understand that the final recommendations of the Steering Group about the proposed job families and corresponding grade levels for roles will have been arrived at following a rigorous process involving the analysis of information by SCC HR Advisors who are trained in HAY job evaluation methodology and further scrutiny by trade union colleagues.

Therefore, while it is a matter for individual schools Headteachers / Governing Body Pay Committees to agree how to implement the recommendations based on affordability; schools that wish to depart from the published Surrey pay grade levels and job families for support staff roles, will need to ensure they have a justifiable defence for doing so in order to avoid risks of equal pay claims and/or consider creating their own new pay policies.

We would therefore encourage schools to discuss any specific concerns they have upon receipt of the final outcomes of the moderation process/evaluation of roles in February 2018 before making any final decisions.

8. What are the implications for maintained schools wishing to depart from the Surrey Pay grade levels, job families and create their own pay structures/policies

Surrey County Council is the employer for Community and Voluntary Controlled schools and as such there is an expectation that these schools will abide by the recommendations of the Steering Group (there will be continued discussions with individual schools where cost impacts are significant and HR support from Babcock to help review staffing structures).

Voluntary Aided and Foundation schools have more discretion as regards the adoption and implementation of the recommendations of the Steering Group as these will require ratification by their Governing Bodies.

That said, VA and Foundation schools should be aware that the cost of investing in their own job evaluation system to underpin a new pay policy can be very expensive and time consuming. Adopting the proposed job families, the council's grading and pay arrangements has many benefits:

- It will save time in writing role profiles
- Includes the facility to add local context to the role profiles
- Ensures equal pay considerations are met
- Avoids the need for local bargaining processes with the trade unions (which creating a new pay policy will require) and
- Ultimately results in savings and efficiencies for schools.
- The role profiles provide clear signposts for progression not only through a particular job family, but also between families.

We have already seen a growing interest by academies in adopting the job families as many of them continue to 'mirror' Surrey Pay. Working together on the job families will avoid creating competitive pressure on salaries, which would destabilise the whole Surrey school community.