

# GUILDFORD & WAVERLEY JOINT APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

## MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 5 APRIL 2022

### Present:

Councillor Joss Bigmore, Leader, Guildford Borough Council  
Councillor Paul Follows, Leader, Waverley Borough Council  
Councillor Peter Clark, Deputy Leader, Waverley Borough Council  
Councillor Jan Harwood, Guildford Borough Council  
Councillor Julia McShane, Deputy Leader, Guildford Borough Council  
Councillor Stephen Mulliner, Waverley Borough Council

### Action By

#### 20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

#### 21. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

#### 22. MINUTES

The Joint Appointments Committee

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2022 be approved as a correct record.

#### 23. SALARY BENCHMARKING FOR THE JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVE PAY AWARD

The Joint Appointments Committee (JAC) considered a report on salary benchmarking in respect of the pay award for the Joint Chief Executive with effect from 1 April 2022.

In considering the report, the JAC recognised that the Guildford/Waverley Joint Chief Executive was accountable to the third largest population and the second highest number of councillors from the collaborating councils included in the benchmarking. The salary per head of population was the second lowest.

In debating this matter, the following points were raised:

- The Joint Chief Executive should be appropriately remunerated bearing in mind the two councils' responsibilities across 275,000 residents and budgets for delivering services to them, and that a pay award of between 3% and 3.75% should bring the Joint Chief Executive's salary well within the third quartile referred to in the report (£150,352 to £165,850)
- Although some increase at this stage in the current spot salary of

£150,000 would be warranted, it was suggested, given that the basis for the collaboration was to make savings, that it might be more appropriate to wait for a full year in post before considering a more generous pay award for the Joint Chief Executive.

- The benchmarking exercise should be used to bring the Joint Chief Executive's salary into line with the "industry standard", or to at least address the current imbalance.
- A more comprehensive review of salary, involving further benchmarking, might be more appropriate once the Joint Management Team was in place
- The JAC would determine future pay awards for the Joint Chief Executive and would take into account, as a guide, future pay awards to staff at both councils.

The JAC was advised that it was normal for the pay award for the chief executive to be at the same percentage rate as other staff from the employing authority. In the case of the Joint Chief Executive, the pay award could be expected to be at some point between 3% (which had been awarded to Waverley's staff) and 3.75% (which had been awarded to Guildford's staff). It was also noted that the budgeted pay award in this case had been a maximum of 3.75%.

Accordingly, the JAC unanimously

RESOLVED: That a pay award of 3.75% be approved, with effect from 1 April 2022, in respect of the Joint Chief Executive post.

SK

Reasons for Decision:

- a 3.75% pay award had been budgeted for in 2022-23;
- it was understood that £150,000 was at the lower end of the spot salary for the Joint Chief Executive role;
- in recognition of the work carried out so far by the Joint Chief Executive.

## **24. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

The Joint Appointments Committee

RESOLVED: That pursuant to Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during consideration of the item, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information (as defined by Section 100I of the Act) of the description specified in Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the revised Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act:

- (4) Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matters arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office-holders under, the authority.
- (5) Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional

privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

## **25. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS FOR JOINT SENIOR OFFICERS**

At its last meeting held on 14 January 2022, the Joint Appointments Committee (JAC) had asked officers to design a performance management process for joint Senior Officers for approval by the JAC and subsequent publication.

The JAC considered a report setting out a proposed performance management process for all joint Senior Officers, including directors and members of the joint management team, which had been taken from the JNC for Local Authority Chief Executives Conditions of Service Handbook.

The report had proposed that the objective setting process should be by agreement and the result should be to identify specific objectives which were relevant and challenging, but achievable.

The process should not become complex and, at all times, it would need to focus clearly on the following:

- 1) The role of the senior officer
- 2) What had been successfully achieved
- 3) What could be improved upon
- 4) Key issues anticipated over the next year
- 5) Any developmental needs identified

The responsibility for performance management of the Joint Chief Executive would lie with the Leaders of both councils and the Joint Chief Executive. The responsibility for performance management of other joint senior officers, including statutory officers, would lie with the respective line managers of those officers and with the officers themselves to participate positively in the process.

It was envisaged that formal performance agreement meetings should take place annually, supported by informal continuous review/monitoring meetings on a regular basis with the line manager (in the Joint Chief Executive's case, with the Leaders of both councils) at which objectives would be reviewed for continuing relevance. The outcomes and actions from all meetings should be recorded in writing, agreed and securely stored by all parties with a copy of the formal performance agreement meeting record placed upon the joint senior officer's personal file.

Councillors were reminded that, at its last meeting, the JAC had considered the extent to which individual performance objectives for joint senior officers, including the Joint Chief Executive, and the assessment of the postholder against those objectives, should be made available to councillors. The JAC had deferred the matter to enable further HR and legal advice to be sought and reported back to this meeting.

The report had included the further advice sought, together with an analysis of the risks involved. The advice had concluded that objectives and assessment of performance against objectives should remain confidential and not be made available to all councillors.

In debating this matter, the following points were raised:

- There should be a distinction between the objectives, of which councillors should be aware in the interests of effective transparency, and the assessment of performance against those objectives, which should appropriately remain confidential.
- There was a need to decouple the monitoring of performance of senior management, which should be confidential, and the monitoring and scrutiny of the specific objectives of the collaboration, which were already in the public domain.
- The Joint Chief Executive's objectives were likely to be a combination of the corporate objectives of each council, the objectives of the collaboration arrangements, and personal objectives, for example, relating to training and development.
- The Joint Chief Executive would be held to account by the Leaders of both councils for the delivery of the corporate and collaboration objectives.
- It was accepted that the setting of the objectives in the context of the employer/employee relationship and monitoring of performance against those objectives should be a private matter.

Having considered the matter, the JAC

RESOLVED: That the performance management process for joint senior officers, as set out in the report submitted to the Joint Appointments Committee, be approved.

FC/SK

Reason:

To ensure that the performance management of joint senior officers is set in the context of both councils' strategic objectives, priorities, and targets, generally expressed in the community and within corporate plans and strategies.

The meeting finished at 9.33am