

**SHREWSBURY & TELFORD HOSPITAL NHS TRUST  
TRUST BOARD 27<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2004  
AGENDA FOR CHANGE**

**Executive Summary**

This paper gives a brief outline of the Agenda for Change project, and attempts to estimate the resource implications of the job evaluation part of the project only. ***There will be other resource implications.*** Some consideration is also given to the operational consequences of Agenda for Change. The paper is based on feedback from Bob Bott, Agenda for Change Lead (WDC), Simon Whitehouse, Best Practice Facilitator (Modernisation Agency), some information from the acute hospital pilot sites and extrapolation from the Agenda for Change Agreement rules. **It is important to note that at this stage, pilot sites are not releasing any official information on their costs. Once official information has been published the paper can be amended – hence the final version, impact and costings may differ. The financial calculations within this paper are indicative at this stage for discussion purposes only.**

**Decisions to be taken**

The HEG/Trust Board is asked to:

1. Accept that Agenda for Change is an essential part of NHS modernisation
2. Agree the Project Structure set out in the attached Draft Project Plan
3. Agree that progress on the project will become a standing item on the Board agenda
4. Identify an Executive Director and Non-Executive Director to lead this project, and agree to the involvement of the Chief Executive
5. Agree that Sara Adams – Senior HR Advisor - act as operational project manager
6. Agree that the whole project must be approached jointly with the Staff Side
7. Recognise there will be significant resource implications for the project – approximately £543,000 for the job matching, analysis, evaluation and project management alone, plus anywhere between £2 - £5 million on a recurring basis - as set out in this paper and the Draft Project Plan
8. Recognise the need for provision of backfill wherever possible for staff involved in this project
9. Agree to the approach of the PCTs and other agencies for resources

**Implications to be considered**

1. Financial – the implications of the project are significant; pilot sites have not released definitive figures but costs for job matching, analysis and evaluation during the implementation stage have been estimated from £100,000 to £750,000. Best case estimated costs for this Trust are around £430,000. Additionally, project management and administration costs are estimated at £113,000 p.a.. Once the project is implemented and new systems are in place, the changes in terms and conditions and pay will also have an impact on the pay bill; an estimate at this stage gives figures of anywhere between £2 - £5 million recurring.
2. Governance – the implementation of the Knowledge and Skills Framework will meet Clinical Governance standards by raising quality and performance and placing patients at the centre of a modernised service.
3. Involvement – Approaching the project in partnership with Staff Side will deliver staff involvement (required as part of Improving Working Lives).
4. Staffing – the staff time implications of delivering the project are enormous. Once operational, the new terms and conditions can be used as a vehicle to assist service redesign and modernisation. However changes like additional annual leave and hours will necessitate improved workforce planning and possibly an expansion of the workforce.
5. Other
  - Although this project is not currently Star Rated it is part of the Government's political drive to modernise the NHS. Pressure to deliver to timescale is likely to be significant.
  - UNISON and AMICUS unions have not yet fully accepted the Agenda for Change project as beneficial to their members. Hence UNISON will be balloting its members again in June 2004 following a second conference on the subject. At this point it is therefore difficult to take the project forward for all staff, as UNISON members de facto are not in agreement with it. However, groundwork like finalising job descriptions and information gathering and modelling must be done regardless of the UNISON and AMICUS position.

Sara Adams, Senior HR Advisor

## **Background/introduction**

Agenda for Change (AFC) is a national NHS initiative linked very closely with the Government's political agenda for modernising the NHS. The implementation date is 1<sup>st</sup> October 2004 - and implementation will be closely monitored by the Strategic Health Authority.

In overview, the project introduces a new set of pay scales and terms and conditions of employment for all NHS staff other than the most senior managers and medical staff. These will be implemented through a national NHS job evaluation system requiring the evaluation of all jobs in the Trust in order to place them on the most appropriate pay band.

Additionally, the project introduces a national NHS competency framework (the Knowledge & Skills Framework) with which we are required to describe all of our jobs. All job descriptions will ultimately need to be competency-based, and individual performance must be measured using the same competencies. Training and development must be targeted to enable individuals to develop the competencies required for the job, in order that they can progress up the pay band. In this way, the project links individual performance with development, reward and business objectives, making a clear statement on performance management.

Describing jobs in terms of competencies also allows greater staff flexibility and movement between roles at similar competency levels, thus breaking down barriers between professional groupings and again linking to the Government's modernisation agenda. This is an opportunity to link individual development to organisational needs, and to develop job design in line with service modernisation.

## **Description of issues including any financial implications**

### **Project Implementation**

The Trust is required to develop a project plan for the implementation of the AFC project – please see Appendix 1. In summary, the project plan structures the work required into six strands:

- Communication & Public Relations
- Job Descriptions, Person Specifications and Organisation Charts
- Information, Finance & Performance Indicators
- Local Agreements/ AFC Policies
- Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation
- Knowledge & Skills Framework

Each strand will require a project group to undertake the work; each project group should be an equal proportion of management and staff side representatives. Although we are unable to commence work on the job matching, analysis and information strand until after the UNISON and AMICUS second ballots, feedback from the pilot sites indicates that the more high quality preparatory work is done, the faster the job matching, analysis, evaluation and transfer to the new terms and conditions.

### **Job Descriptions and Person Specifications**

The Trust employs approximately 5000 staff. Before we can commence work on job matching etc., every post within the Trust will require an up to date job description and person specification signed off by the line manager and employee. The higher the quality these documents, the faster and more accurately job matching etc can be completed – and consequently, the fewer appeals against job evaluation decisions we will receive.

### Matching, Analysis and Evaluation

The job evaluation process requires that individual jobs/job types must be assessed against nationally developed job profiles (job matching). Those jobs which do not match are then locally analysed and evaluated. Feedback from the pilot sites indicates that approximately 80% of the total number of job types within an organisation can be matched; the remainder require analysis and evaluation.

The process for matching or evaluation is to convene a panel of four - two staff and two management side representatives to consider each job/job type. Job analysis requires a panel of two – one staff and one management side representatives. Feedback from the pilot sites indicates that job matching and evaluation panels can match or evaluate five jobs/job types per day; analysis panels can analyse two.

The Modernisation Agency has just released a draft tool for estimating the number of days required to carry out this part of the project, and consequently how long the individual stages will take. It assumes that job analysts can also be job evaluators – although feedback from pilot sites indicates that keeping these roles separate allows greater flexibility and speed. The Modernisation Agency tool completed for this Trust is attached at Appendix 2. In summary, the tool estimates

Type	No. panellists	No. jobs per day	No. panel days required	No. days panel meets per week	No. weeks required
Matching	24	5	55.7	3	18.6
Analysis	12	2	34.8	3	11.6
Evaluation	24	5	83.6	3	23.2

Once analysis and evaluation have been combined, the Modernisation Agency tool estimates these stages should be completed in 34.81 weeks.

After all jobs have been matched, analysed and evaluated, they can be placed against the pay band and the pay and terms and conditions changes can be introduced.

Where staff are not happy with their placement on the new pay band, they can appeal locally for a second job matching or analysis and evaluation. In this case their job is reconsidered by a totally new panel, following the whole process through again. There is only one level of appeal; the decision of the second panel is final.

Where staff are not happy that the process has been applied fairly, they can appeal against the process application using a locally agreed appeal mechanism. This does not allow appeal against band placement.

Those staff who are involved in this matching, analysis and evaluation stage are required to undertake training prior to commencement – for job matching, the training is 3 days; for job analysis 2 days and for job evaluation 3 days.

### Local Agreements

As part of the project, the Trust is required to agree locally a number of policies and terms and conditions of employment including contracts of employment, special leave, removal expenses, recruitment and retention premia, out of hours and on call payments for certain groups, appeals procedures for AFC etc. Some will be short, and some more complex. As a minimum, there are 25 new agreements which need to be reached with Staff Side for AFC – in addition to the new Trust's schedule for revised policies and procedures following merger.

### Information, Finance and Performance Indicators

AFC is not purely a HR project. Payroll, Finance and information services are all involved to gather information for implementation, identify and finalise performance indicators, ensure that the change to the new pay arrangements is smooth and not least, model the implications to the pay bill and identify the funding to support this.

### **Knowledge & Skills Framework**

Once the terms and conditions have been introduced, we are required to introduce the national NHS competency-based system for personal development, performance management, pay progression and role redesign. This must be implemented at the latest by 2006.

Initially this involves the redesign of every job description using the national competency framework, along with the associated training for staff and managers in the use of competencies.

In relation to pay progression, staff must be assessed at two 'Gateways' on their pay band and can be held back in their incremental pay progression if they have not achieved the competence required for the job. Staff must be allowed the resources (time, backfill, funding etc) to achieve work related development to enable them to reach that competency level required, which will have been identified at appraisal. Hence an integrated appraisal system is crucial. If an employee is not achieving the required competency level, they can be prevented from passing the Gateway on their pay band – as long as their poor performance has been managed, documented and support given to improve. Hence an effective individual performance management process is essential. Conversely, if employees can prove that resources for their development have not been provided, they can pass the Gateway anyway.

On role redesign the competency framework will make it easier for service modernisation projects to identify the skills they require and therefore to plan their workforce more appropriately. Additionally it is intended to enable more movement between the 'professions' breaking down the current professional boundaries to create a more generic health worker.

### **Communication and Public Relations**

This project changes terms, conditions and pay for every member of staff individually. They will all need letters confirming the changes for them personally. Additionally, the Trust must be able to communicate general information about the project and regular updates from steering and working groups regularly – at least monthly – through as many mechanisms as possible. Finally the project has the possibility to provide bad publicity for the Trust in relation to potential protected pay situations for staff groups. It may be of benefit to manage the publicity through a public relations programme to minimise risks of bad press locally.

### **Project Management**

A project of this size and complexity requires a full time Project Manager and a Project Officer who are able to oversee all of the parts of the project and ensure that key milestones are achieved. A Staff Side Lead is also essential to co-ordinate the Staff Side parts of the project.

At current salary rates, project management costs (Project Manager and Project Officer) for this project will be approximately £57,000 including on costs at 15%. Although a single Staff Side Lead has not yet been nominated, possible costs could be approximately £41,000 including on costs at 15%.

### **Administration and Logistics**

If this project is to succeed it is essential that an adequate level of resources is built in for administration. Each stage will require overall co-ordination and administration to ensure the correct paperwork is completed, copied and sent to panels, rooms are booked, timetables run seamlessly, minutes and agendas are completed and distributed etc.

At current salary rates, and A&C 3 administrator costed at midpoint on the scale would cost approximately £15,000 including on costs at 15%.

### Estimated Costs of Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation

At this stage, it is impossible to put an accurate price on the costs of this project. Taking an indicative average salary per person of £25,000, plus on costs at 14%, we have an overall cost to the Trust of 1 person of £28,500. This equates to £109.31 per day (divide by 52.143, divide by 5 days per week). A very rough calculation of costs for the job matching, analysis and evaluation part alone gives the following:

Type	No. panellists	No. panel days required	No. people days required	Estimated costs (£109.31 per day)
Matching	24	55.7	1,336.8	£429,457.13
Training	24	3	72	
Analysis	12	34.8	417.6	
Training	12	2	24	
Evaluation	24	83.6	2,006.4	
Training	24	3	72	
			3928.8	

The cost identified above is in relation to the job matching, analysis and evaluation parts of the project alone. It does not include line management time, project management and administration time, meeting time or preparatory work done outside meetings.

In addition, there will be a requirement for funding of the project management, staff side lead and administration aspects at approximately £113,000 p.a.

All costs are estimated at this stage. Once details are clearer and they have been fully costed, proposals will be brought back to Trust Board for onward submission to the PCT.

### Available Funding

The Workforce Confederation released £100k badged for Agenda for Change earlier this year, allocated on a per capita basis; this Trust received £13,383. This is badged for project management and administration time.

There will shortly be a further release of funding of similar size.

### Operational Implications

The first part of this paper is concerned with the costs associated with the management of this project. However there will be significant costs associated with its operation post implementation; at this stage not all of these are obvious.

Costs will arise initially in relation to staff members who will require a protected salary as a consequence of their placement on the new pay bands. Feedback from pilot sites indicates that around 2% of staff require protection (i.e. their salaries fall) as a result of implementing Agenda for Change.

If only 2% of staff receive a reduction in salary, 98% of staff remain on the same pay or receive a pay increase. This is currently an unquantifiable cost but has the potential to require anywhere between £2 - £5 million of recurrent funding from the Trust.

Consolidating the working hours of all staff groups to 37.5 will bring operational implications for the service where previously staff worked more (or less) hours – it may be difficult to staff the service as in cases where hours are reducing, the same number of employees will in future be working less hours – yet the Trust will be expecting the same level of service provision.

Increasing the annual leave for all staff groups to 27 + 8 on appointment, 29 + 8 after 5 years service and 33 + 8 after 10 years service will have the subtle effect of removing staff from the workplace for longer.

Significant implications will arise in relation to those staff groups currently on local Trust contracts paid at rates well below Whitley (e.g. Healthcare Support Workers) who opt to take up the new terms and conditions.

Currently, the Trust makes a significant number of non-Whitley payments to staff. It is not clear from the Agenda for Change guidance whether or not these payments will remain or be subsumed into the new pay system. If the payments are to remain, it is possible that the Purchasers will not fund these fully, causing the Trust a further shortfall in revenue.

Additionally, there are many questions surrounding the operational detail for the new pay system which are not contained within the published national guidance. Without these answers, Trusts will be forced to make their own local decisions, in effect retaining an element of local pay in a programme designed to return us to a set of uniform national terms and conditions.

All of these implications are drivers for improved workforce planning and service redesign – and possibly ultimately an increase in the size of the workforce.

Until we have answers to some of these scenarios, it will be impossible to produce any accurate costing for the operational implications of Agenda for Change. NHS Personnel has been asked to develop a formula, to be tested with the pilot sites, to identify the additional operational costs. Once this has been agreed, the additional funding required for the increased pay costs should be included in the allocation to Trusts - PCTs have been provided with funding for the pay increase at 0.8% in 2004/2005 in addition to the 3.225% pay rise, and further guidance on funding is being issued shortly by Richard Douglas, Director of Finance for the NHS. Financial increases will be available through the allocation process in subsequent years. However, if implementation leads to greater increases than the formula, these will have to be met by individual Trusts.

### **Expected benefits (including for patients)**

The project provides an integrated framework for improving individual performance standards across the NHS through the introduction of the competency framework linking in to appraisal, development, performance management pay progression and modernisation of the NHS.

It will also harmonise many of the current variations in terms and conditions between staff groups, making it easier for staff to move between staff groups. It raises the standard of basic NHS terms and conditions to match those of an employer of choice, theoretically making it easier to recruit and retain staff.

Improving performance standards and reducing staff vacancies can only impact positively on patient care.

### **Risks/Challenges**

The project will be performance managed on its implementation by the Strategic Health Authority as part of its Key Performance Indicators.. Additionally delays in implementing the project will mean the Trust will be out of step with other NHS employers, potentially disadvantaging itself in the labour market for future recruitment and retention of staff and impact negatively on the Trust's status as a good employer in the area.

## **Implementation Plan**

Please see draft Project Plan attached.

## **Recommendations**

The Hospital Executive Group and the Trust Board are asked to make the decisions listed on page 1 of this paper following consideration of the issues set out below:

The HEG/Trust Board is asked to:

1. Accept that Agenda for Change is an essential part of NHS modernisation
2. Agree the Project Structure set out in the attached Draft Project Plan
3. Agree that progress on the project will become a standing item on the Board agenda
4. Identify an Executive Director and Non-Executive Director to lead this project, and agree to the involvement of the Chief Executive
5. Agree that Sara Adams – Senior HR Advisor - act as operational project manager
6. Agree that the whole project must be approached jointly with the Staff Side
10. Recognise there will be significant resource implications for the project – approximately £543,000 for the job matching, analysis, evaluation and project management alone, plus anywhere between £2 - £5 million on a recurring basis - as set out in this paper and the Draft Project Plan
7. Recognise the need for provision of backfill wherever possible for staff involved in this project
8. Agree to the approach of the PCTs and other agencies for resources

# Draft Project Management Structure

## The Implementation of Agenda for Change

Sara Adams  
Senior Human Resources Advisor

January 2004

## Contents

Project Board	3
Working Groups	4
Administration & Logistics	5
Local Agreements Working Group	6
Information, Finance & Performance Indicators Working Group	9
Job Descriptions Working Group	12
Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation Working Group	13
Knowledge & Skills Framework Working Group	15
Communication & Public Relations Working Group	17

## **Project Board**

The Project Board will set the direction for the implementation of Agenda for Change within the Trust. It will provide leadership and vision ensuring the delivery of the project through the working groups. Where necessary its decisions will be ratified by the Trust Board.

### ***Remit***

The remit of the Project Board will be:

- Providing leadership and vision.
- Setting the direction for the project.
- Establishing priorities, agreeing and clarifying objectives.
- Commissioning work within the working groups and “strands” of the project, including agreeing terms of reference.
- Managing the project and delivering project priorities.
- Monitoring and evaluating of overall work specific project plans, ensuring timescales met and learning shared.
- Including modernization and service/role redesign developments into the project.
- Making staff and stakeholder involvement happen in the day-to-day work of the project.
- Identifying monthly issues to be communicated to staff from the working groups.

### ***Membership***

The membership of the Project Board will be:

- Chief Executive
- Director of Finance
- Director of Corporate Services
- Head of HR
- Project Lead
- Staff Side Lead
- Project Administrator/Secretarial support
- Working group leads
- Best Practice Facilitator (from WDC)
- and by invitation, others to support and advise from time to time

### ***Frequency of Meetings***

The Project Board will meet monthly to hear and direct progress from each working group.

## **Working Groups**

It is proposed to have six broad areas which are interdependent. Progress on targets will be reported to the Project Board on a monthly basis.

### ***Remit***

Each working group will be tasked with:

- Developing detailed robust project plans.
- Developing Terms of Reference and identification of roles and responsibilities.
- “Road testing” ideas and assumptions.
- Generating options.
- Conducting diagnoses and analysis of issues.
- Making staff involvement happen.
- Sharing good ideas and getting early feedback.

### ***Working Groups***

The proposed groups are:

- *Local Agreements*  
This working group needs expertise on terms & conditions from staff side and management side so that agreements can be reached quickly and with the minimum necessary discussion. Core size 7/8 people including payroll and finance representatives.
- *Information, Finance & Performance Indicators*  
This working group needs expertise in finance, payroll, information systems and information analysis for PRISM, ESR, data manipulation, report writing and financial implications/projections etc with representation from staff side and management side so that information can be gathered and plans and processes can be made for financial planning and necessary information for implementation and future DoH reporting. Core size 5/6 people including Will Mountford, Dave Hardy Kevin Gittins and Jonathan Harper.
- *Job Descriptions, Person Specifications and Organisation Charts*  
This working group needs expertise in training and competency based job descriptions to assist managers in finalising new job descriptions for all roles. Overall size 15 people
- *Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation*  
This working group needs expertise in job evaluation and matching roles to national profiles, with equal representation from staff and management side on the Matching Panels. Overall size approx. 100 people
- *Knowledge & Skills Framework*  
This working group needs expertise in service modernisation (some clinical people maybe?), job evaluation, competencies, training and development with members from staff and management sides. Core size 5 people including Gill Clements and Jacqui Williams.
- *Communication & Public Relations*  
This working group needs representation from staff and management side to ensure that communication is made relevant to what staff want to know. Core size 3 /4 people including Phil Hipkiss.

## **Administration & Logistics**

In order to assist the working groups in operating at maximum capacity there is a behind-the-scenes requirement for administration and logistics.

Each working group will need:

- meeting dates setting in advance
- venues
- minutes
- agendas
- copying etc

In particular, once job matching, analysis and evaluation commences there will need to be a smooth process for ensuring optimum capacity:

- Setting up panels of 4 (2 Staff Side, 2 Management Side) to Job Match and Job Evaluate
- Setting up panels of 2 (1 Staff Side, 1 Management Side) to Job Analyse
- Ensuring all job information is available
- Ensuring individuals asked to talk about the roles are available
- Setting up timetables for job matchers, analysts and evaluators
- Ensuring correct mix of staff side and management side, and core panel members, on each panel
- Rotating members between panels for QA reasons (e.g. Matchers rotate between all Matching panels but not between Matching, Analysis and Evaluation)
- Recording results etc

## Local Agreements Working Group – Draft Work Area

*This working group needs expertise on terms & conditions from staff side and management side so that agreements can be reached quickly and with the minimum necessary discussion. Core size 7/8 people including payroll and finance representatives.*

Activity	Indicator	Evaluation	Assumptions
Local Agreements developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working groups set up to finalise local agreements including financial &amp; payroll input</li> <li>List of local agreements agreed</li> <li>Agreements finalised by working groups</li> <li>Agreements signed off by Trust Board</li> <li>Agreements communicated to staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TJNCC papers</li> <li>TJNCC papers</li> <li>Working group papers, TJNCC papers</li> <li>Trust Board papers</li> <li>Communication briefings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TJNCC are able to agree and finalise the numbers of agreements required in the time available</li> <li>Financial consequences of agreements are made clear</li> <li>Agreements can be discussed and agreed at Trust Board in the time available</li> </ul>

Risk is risk to success of overall project if target not achieved? Or Risk to Trust??? – 1= low, 10 = high

Local Agreement	Work required	Risk	Impact
New contracts of employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compile legal basics immediately</li> <li>Add in local agreements when finalised</li> <li>Issue to all staff</li> <li>Issue to new starters/promotions</li> </ul>	7	8
Recognition of non-NHS relevant service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current regs</li> <li>Discussion</li> <li>Policy statement produced</li> <li>Policy signed off by TJNCC</li> <li>Policy signed off by Trust Board</li> <li>Communication</li> </ul>	1	1
Expenses on appointment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Recognition</li> </ul>	2	2
Removal expenses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Recognition</li> </ul>	5	3
Phone expenses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Recognition</li> </ul>	5	6
Special leave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Recognition</li> </ul>	5	7
Employees elected to parliament	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Recognition</li> </ul>	1	1
Membership of local authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As Recognition</li> </ul>	1	1

VERSION 4 – JANUARY 2004

<b>Local Agreement</b>	<b>Work required</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Flexible return to work after sick leave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> <li>• Inclusion in new Absence Management Policy</li> </ul>	2	2
Recruitment & Retention Premia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of local labour market to establish:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ pay rates for professions</li> <li>○ competition</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Discussion and development of overall reward strategy by TJNCC and Trust Board</li> <li>• Discussion and negotiation of Premia rates by TJNCC and Trust Board</li> <li>• Agreement by TJNCC and Trust Board</li> </ul>	8	10
Unsocial hours pay % if less than 5 hours unsocial per week	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> </ul>	2	3
Off duty planning for out of hours – to avoid paying the fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> </ul>	5	5
Out of hours pay scheme for self-rostering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> </ul>	2	4
Out of hours pay scheme for annualised hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> </ul>	2	4
On call payments if on a rota less than 1:12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> <li>• Review of on call processes and rotas across Trust</li> <li>• Inclusion of staff groups not previously paid (e.g. some nurses, senior managers...)</li> <li>• Financial consequences</li> </ul>	2	4
On call payments if on a resident, mostly rest rota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> <li>• Review of on call processes and rotas across Trust</li> <li>• Inclusion of staff groups not previously paid (e.g. some nurses, senior managers...)</li> <li>• Financial consequences</li> </ul>	2	4
On call travel expenses if called in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> </ul>	2	4
On call whether to pay prospectively or claim retrospectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Recognition</li> </ul>	1	1
Checking & reviewing progress up the pay spine using KSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion and agreement on how, who, when and what to monitor</li> <li>• Set up admin processes to deliver necessary information</li> <li>• Set up review panels and review</li> </ul>	8	8

VERSION 4 – JANUARY 2004

<b>Local Agreement</b>	<b>Work required</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Overall review of assimilation system by Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion and agreement on how, who, when and what to monitor</li> <li>• Set up admin processes to deliver necessary information</li> <li>• Set up review panels and review</li> </ul>	8	8
Individual appeals processes for assimilation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion</li> <li>• Policy statement produced</li> <li>• Policy signed off by TJNCC</li> <li>• Policy signed off by Trust Board</li> <li>• Communication</li> </ul>	10	10
Performance management policy linked to KSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current regs vs. KSF</li> <li>• Discussion</li> <li>• Policy statement produced</li> <li>• Policy signed off by TJNCC</li> <li>• Policy signed off by Trust Board</li> <li>• Communication</li> </ul>	10	10
Training Policy linked to KSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Performance Management</li> </ul>	10	10
Appraisal scheme linked to KSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Performance Management</li> </ul>	10	10
Procedure for calculating annual leave entitlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New statement drafted using rules given in AFC</li> <li>• Possibility of claims/queries relating to current leave calculations</li> </ul>	5	6

**Information, Finance & Performance Indicators Working Group– Draft Work Area**

*This working group needs expertise in finance, payroll, information systems and information analysis for PRISM, ESR, data manipulation, report writing and financial implications/projections etc with representation from staff side and management side so that information can be gathered and plans and processes can be made for financial planning and necessary information for implementation and future DoH reporting. Core size 5/6 people*

Activity	Indicator	Evaluation	Assumptions
Information, Finance & Performance Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working group set up to manage process.</li> <li>• Information necessary for assimilation to new scheme identified, validated and provided.</li> <li>• Information necessary for future performance indicators and reporting identified.</li> <li>• Discussion and agreement with TJNCC and Trust Board on information reports and Performance Indicators required, timescales and processes for these</li> <li>• Processes and reports set up to produce agreed information.</li> <li>• Working group set up manage process.</li> <li>• Implications of AFC system clarified for payroll purposes and plans put into place for transfer.</li> <li>• Implications of AFC system clarified for ESR purposes and plans put into place for ESR amends if necessary.</li> <li>• Cost projections and implications of AFC system clarified for financial purposes.</li> <li>• Financial plans made for new systems – e.g. implication and timing of costs for new out of hours system etc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working group papers</li> <li>• TJNCC papers</li> <li>• Trust Board papers</li> <li>• Communication briefings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessary information is available and validated</li> <li>• Trust Board and TJNCC are able to identify their own performance indicators in addition to the national ones for local measurement of success</li> <li>• All implications of new system are able to be identified, mapped, impact assessed and planned for.</li> </ul>

VERSION 4 – JANUARY 2004

Activity	Indicator	Evaluation	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion and agreement with Trust Board on financial planning and impact.</li> <li>• Information on timings of financial changes (e.g. delays on assimilation) communicated to staff</li> <li>• Information and performance indicators communicated to staff</li> </ul>		

Risk is risk to success of overall project if target not achieved? Or Risk to Trust???

– 1= low, 10 = high

Information, Finance & Performance Indicators	Work required	Risk	Impact
Identification of every staff member's base salary in accordance with criteria set down in AFC as at 30/9/04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering on salaries and current allowances</li> <li>• Consolidation according to AFC rules to base salary</li> </ul>	10	10
Identification of who is on national and who is on local terms & conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> </ul>	10	10
Identification of who is currently on protection and at what rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> </ul>	10	10
Identification of who will be 5,4,3,2,1 years away from retirement as at 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> <li>• Projections of implications</li> </ul>	10	10
Once JE is complete and pay is being matched across, identification of who will be on protection and the relevant length	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> <li>• Projections of implications</li> </ul>	8	8
Those who currently work over 37.5 hours per week and what phasing will apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> <li>• Projections of implications</li> </ul>	10	10
Those who currently work less than 37.5 hours per week and what phasing will apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> <li>• Projections of implications</li> </ul>	10	10
Those who currently have less annual leave than AFC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> </ul>	6	6
Those who currently have more annual leave than AFC and what protection will apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> <li>• Projections of implications</li> </ul>	10	10
Identification of all part timers and what % of their staff group full time hours they work in order they can be transferred to new hours in proportion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Info gathering</li> <li>• Projections of implications</li> </ul>	10	10

VERSION 4 – JANUARY 2004

Information, Finance & Performance Indicators	Work required	Risk	Impact
A way to pick up new starters between report run and go live to make sure we have everyone		10	10
Liaising with the JE group to identify the numbers being evaluated, and the use of the national profiles for reporting to DoH		9	9
Information gathering and reporting on use of unsocial hours system for DoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be split by:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• occupational group</li> <li>• age</li> <li>• pay band</li> <li>• ethnicity</li> <li>• disability</li> <li>• gender</li> <li>• full time</li> <li>• part time</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	9	9
Information gathering and reporting on use of Recruitment & Retention Premia for DoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As unsocial hours</li> </ul>	9	9
Information gathering and reporting on Development Reviews for DoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As unsocial hours</li> </ul>	9	9
Information gathering and reporting on support for training & development (funding, time etc) for DoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As unsocial hours</li> </ul>	9	9
Information gathering and reporting on support for progression of staff through KSF Gateways for DoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As unsocial hours</li> </ul>	9	9
Projected take up - implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information gathering</li> <li>• Reporting</li> <li>• Planning for implications</li> </ul>	5	5
Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	9	9
R&R premium (long-term, short-term modelled)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	9	9
ESR/payroll redesign??	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	9	9
Payroll coding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	9	9
Funding flows	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	9	9
Briefings for Finance/Payroll/HR and IT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	6	6
Costing projection on matching issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	9	9
Costing projection on protection issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	9	9
Forward modelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As projected take up</li> </ul>	8	8

**Job Descriptions, Person Specifications and Organisation Charts Working Group– Draft Work Area**

*This working group needs expertise in training, facilitation, job descriptions, person specifications and organisation charts to assist managers in finalising new job descriptions for all roles. Overall size 15 people*

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
Job Descriptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working group set up to manage process.</li> <li>Job Description format agreed by Trust Board</li> <li>Job descriptions for all roles in Trust agreed by deadline</li> <li>Job descriptions gathered into families and submitted to Matching Panels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working group papers</li> <li>Trust Board papers</li> <li>Agreed job descriptions produced and catalogued for all roles in Trust</li> <li>Communication briefings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All roles can be identified</li> <li>Job descriptions can be agreed between managers and staff</li> </ul>

Risk is risk to success of overall project if target not achieved? Or Risk to Trust??? – 1= low, 10 = high

<b>Job Descriptions, Person Specifications &amp; Organisation Charts</b>	<b>Work required</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Ensure agreement of job descriptions for all roles in Trust including those where there are current vacancies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree job description format with Trust Board</li> <li>Awareness sessions for managers and staff in job description format and timetable</li> <li>Provision of facilitation to enable managers and staff to agree job descriptions</li> <li>Supply each Division/Department with PRISM print of job titles to facilitate work on new job descriptions for all roles</li> <li>Provide access and interpretation of national Matched job roles to aid agreement of new job descriptions</li> <li>Monitoring of agreed job descriptions to ensure all are completed – Divisionally? Departmentally?</li> <li>Ensure managers (and staff?) sign off job descriptions as agreed before submission to Matching Panels</li> </ul>	10	10

<b>Job Descriptions, Person Specifications &amp; Organisation Charts</b>	<b>Work required</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Gather job descriptions for all roles into job families for submission to Matching Panels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of job families</li> <li>• Development of one Trust job description and one person Specification for job families?</li> <li>• Submission of job descriptions and person specifications to Matching Panels</li> </ul>	9	9

**Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation Working Group– Draft Work Area**

*This working group needs expertise in job evaluation and matching roles to national profiles, with equal representation from staff and management side on the Matching Panels. Overall size approx. 100 people*

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working group set up manage process</li> <li>Job matching and job evaluation completed in line with project plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working group papers</li> <li>Training in job evaluation and matching completed for all working group members</li> <li>All job roles matched or evaluated in line with project plan</li> <li>Communication briefings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This many staff can be identified to take part</li> <li>Staff can be released from their day jobs for this commitment</li> </ul>

Risk is risk to success of overall project if target not achieved? Or Risk to Trust??? – 1= low, 10 = high

<b>Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Work required</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Job Matching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training of working group members in Job Matching</li> <li>Shadow matching (each panel matches the same jobs for quality assurance purposes)</li> <li>Using job descriptions provided by the Job Descriptions working group, match these job families or individual job roles against the national job profiles</li> <li>Use AFC Matching process to match as many as possible</li> <li>Feedback information to staff and managers at times agreed in project plan</li> <li>Seek additional information for any problem roles/families</li> <li>Where roles/families cannot be matched submit for Job Analysis and Evaluation</li> <li>Where staff/managers are unhappy with result set up second Matching Panel</li> <li>Hear appeals</li> </ul>	10	10

<b>Job Matching, Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Work required</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Job Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of working group members in Job Analysis</li> <li>• Shadow analysis (each panel analyses the same jobs for quality assurance purposes)</li> <li>• Analyse all roles/families which cannot be matched to national role profiles, interviewing all groups</li> <li>• Hear appeals</li> </ul>	10	10
Job Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of working group members in Job Evaluation</li> <li>• Shadow evaluation (each panel evaluates the same jobs for quality assurance purposes)</li> <li>• Use AFC Job Evaluation process to locally evaluate roles/families submitted by Matching Panels which cannot be matched to national job profiles.</li> <li>• Seek additional information for any problem roles/families</li> <li>• Where staff/managers are unhappy with result set up second Job Evaluation Panel</li> <li>• Hear appeals</li> </ul>	10	10

**Knowledge & Skills Framework Working Group– Draft Work Area**

*This working group needs expertise in service modernisation (some clinical people maybe?), job evaluation, competencies, training and development with members from staff and management sides. Core size 5 people*

Activity	Indicator	Evaluation	Assumptions
Knowledge & Skills Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working group set up manage process</li> <li>Link to Job Descriptions working group re KSF</li> <li>Link into modernisation projects Trust wide re role redesign using KSF</li> <li>Local competency frameworks are identified and assimilated into KSF</li> <li>Appraisal and performance management processes are finalised and agreed with TJNCC and Trust Board</li> <li>Training is provided in new appraisal and performance management processes</li> <li>Appraisal and performance management processes are rolled out across the Trust</li> <li>Staff understand KSF – link to Job Descriptions working group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working group papers</li> <li>Roll out of appraisal policy</li> <li>Roll out of performance management policy</li> <li>Communication briefings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources can be identified to support the training required</li> </ul>

Risk is risk to success of overall project if target not achieved? Or Risk to Trust??? – 1= low, 10 = high

Knowledge & Skills Framework	Work required	Risk	Impact
Appraisal Policy linked to KSF devised – link to Local Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy writing</li> <li>Policy negotiation through TJNCC and Trust Board</li> <li>Training &amp; awareness sessions</li> <li>Policy implementation</li> <li>Admin and information gathering systems – link to Information, Finance &amp; Performance Indicators (cont'd)</li> </ul>	8	8

<b>Knowledge &amp; Skills Framework</b>	<b>Work required</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Appraisal Policy linked to KSF devised – link to Local Agreements (cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devise quality assurance systems</li> </ul>	8	8
Training & Development Policy linked to KSF devised – link to Local Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As appraisal policy plus:</li> <li>• Establish mechanisms for monitoring the distribution of training &amp; development for all staff groups and correcting any imbalances which may occur (e.g. Trust-wide Training &amp; Development Forum??)</li> </ul>	8	8
Performance Management Policy linked to KSF devised – link to Local Agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As appraisal policy</li> </ul>	8	8
Modernisation and Organisational Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify service modernisation projects underway</li> <li>• Ensure all projects are aware of the KSF and its uses in role redesign</li> </ul>		
Application of KSF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure all staff are aware of the KSF – at induction for new staff? How to get current staff? Mandatory training?</li> <li>• Ensure all staff understand how KSF can be used to develop and measure their performance</li> <li>• Train all managers in the use of competency-based performance management, appraisal, training needs analysis etc</li> <li>• Establish and manage a mechanism to ensure all managers are applying KSF consistently – quality assurance</li> </ul>		

**Communication & Public Relations Working Group– Draft Work Area**

*This working group needs representation from staff and management side to ensure that communication is made relevant to what staff want to know. Core size 3 /4 people including Phil Hipkiss???*

Activity	Indicator	Evaluation	Assumptions
Communication & Public Relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working group set up manage process</li> <li>• All avenues of communication are explored and used to broadcast the AFC messages and progress</li> <li>• Communication is produced on a monthly basis from summary actions etc reported to the Project Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working group papers</li> <li>• Communication briefings</li> </ul>	

Risk is risk to success of overall project if target not achieved? Or Risk to Trust???

– 1= low, 10 = high

Communication & Public Relations	Work required	Risk	Impact
Background information on AFC is made available to all staff through a variety of media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial information sifting and decisions on how to make this available to staff</li> <li>• Making it available using:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Maildrops</li> <li>○ Posters</li> <li>○ Letters</li> <li>○ Video?</li> <li>○ Intranet</li> <li>○ Chat rooms</li> <li>○ Email</li> <li>○ Open meetings</li> <li>○ Briefing notes</li> <li>○ Newsletters</li> <li>○ etc</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	9	9
Progress information is made available to all staff through a variety of media on a monthly basis		9	9
Staff are given opportunities to ask questions through a variety of media		9	9