10. MSDC PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2017/18

REPORT OF: Simon Hughes, Head of Digital and Customer Services

Contact Officer: Tim Martland, HR Manager

Email: tim.martland@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477251

Wards Affected: None
Key Decision: No
Report to: Council

29th March 2016

Purpose of Report

 The purpose of this report is to ensure Members are aware of the statutory Pay Policy Statement for this Authority as required by Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011.
 Members should note that the Statement for Mid Sussex simply reflects our current practice. It does not introduce anything new. The statement has been updated following its initial introduction in March 2012, when Council agreed the document.

Recommendations

2. Council Members are recommended to agree the Pay Policy at Appendix A, to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act.

Background

- 3. The Localism Act 2011 received Royal Assent on 15th November 2011. Section 38 of the Act placed a new requirement on local authorities to publish a Pay Policy Statement by 31st March each year. The Statement must set out the Council's policies relating to:
 - Remuneration of its senior officers
 - · Remuneration of its lowest-paid employees and
 - The relationship between the remuneration of its senior officers and the remuneration of its employees who are not senior officers.

Senior officers have been defined as the posts of Chief Executive, Assistant Chief Executive and the three Heads of Service, together with the Head of CenSus.

This Statement has been put together taking into account the relevant sections within Chapter 8 'Pay Accountability' of the Localism Act 2011. In its development, consideration has also been given to the guidance produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) entitled 'Openness and Accountability in local pay – guidance under section 40 of the Localism Act'. Additionally, consideration has been given to the Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency published by the DCLG in September 2011.

Several recommendations for promoting pay fairness in the public sector by tackling disparities between the lowest and the highest paid in public sector organisations were made in Will Hutton's report on fair pay in the public sector. This was published in March 2011. Hutton was asked to consider whether a public sector pay multiple, in which no manager could earn more than 20 times the lowest paid person in the organisation would be helpful as the core of a fair pay system in the public sector and to tackle pay disparities.

The aims behind Hutton's recommendations are not really aimed at authorities like Mid Sussex as we already publish the relevant information and our pay ratios are significantly below that threshold stated above. This is still achieved with the introduction of a new Apprenticeship grade.

It is a statutory requirement to publish a Statement and as such, the Council is complying with its obligations.

Policy Context

4. The proposed Pay Policy Statement 2017-18 is attached as Appendix A to this report. The Statement sets out the Council's policies in relation to the pay of its workforce, particularly its senior officers, and sits alongside the policies on pay that the Council has already adopted and published in its Pay Policy.

Financial Implications

5. There are no direct financial implications arising from this report as the Pay Policy Statement sets out the Council's policies relating to remuneration. It does not serve to set or agree specific rates or numerical amounts.

Risk Management Implications

6. The risks of not having a clear policy include being unable to recruit and retain staff, and being unable to demonstrate value for money to the taxpayer.

Equality and Customer Service Implications

7. An equality impact assessment has not been carried out, as it is not expected that any of the protected groups are affected by this report.

Other Material Implications

8. There is a statutory requirement to comply with the Localism Act and agree a Pay Policy by 31st March 2017. There are no environmental, human rights or community safety implications

Background Papers

9. There are no background papers.