

# Recruitment and retention

Suzanne Hudson, Workforce Policy and Strategy

Philip Bundy, Employment Law Adviser

# Workforce Productivity and Improvement

- The phasing out of local government grant (£12.4bn gap by 2019/20)
  - Self-sufficiency
  - Changing expectations
  - HR&OD capacity
  - New skills and scarce skills (14.8m skilled jobs vs 11.9m supply)
  - Ageing workforce and population (£400m a year on social care budgets)
  - Virtual working and portfolio careers
  - High dependency on agency usage
-

# 3 key Challenges for 2017

## 1. Social Workers, Planners

## 2. Commissioners

## 3. Transportation and engineering

- £95k cap on public sector exit payments
  - Assessment and Accreditation
  - Living Wage
-

# The environment

## Given the recruitment difficulties...

- Timewise Councils
- Come Back to Social Work Recruitment campaign  
<http://www.comebacktosocialwork.co.uk/>



- Reducing agency spend – regional MOUs
  - Apprenticeships
-

# Market supplements

- Equal pay
  - What is the reason for paying the supplement?
    - Recruitment
    - Retention
  - Is there otherwise a sex taint?
    - Detrimental to larger proportion of women than men?
    - Reinforces 'going rate' which is sex tainted due to social and / or economic factors?
  - Can the supplement be objectively justified as a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim?
-

# Market supplements

- Alternatives to supplements
    - Is job evaluation up to date?
    - Have you promoted the pension and other benefits?
    - Non-pay solutions: changes to role/working patterns/training schemes
  - Evidence the reason
    - Efforts to recruit, retention rates
    - Comparator market and relevant market data
    - Impact on service provision
  - Duration
    - Review regularly
    - Contractual notice of withdrawal
  - [NJC Technical Note](#)
-

# Golden handcuffs/repayment of training costs

- Bonus type payments to lock employees in, repayable if they leave before a certain time: same equal pay considerations apply
  - Does repayment requirement amount to a ‘penalty’? If so it will be void
    - Detriment is out of proportion to employer’s legitimate interest
    - Sum due is “extravagant and unconscionable”
  - Sliding scale repayment obligation should work
  - Is it an unlawful restraint of trade?
    - Will it discourage employee to leave?
    - Does it go further than is necessary to protect employer’s legitimate interest? Sliding scale repayment should help
-

QUESTIONS?

