

Appendix B

EXTRACT FROM COMMITTEE

City of Lincoln Council and Employee Joint
Consultative Committee

16 January 2024

19. Recruitment Policy Changes

Ali Thacker, HR and Payroll Team Leader:

- a) presented a report to request comments from Members on the proposed changes to the Council's recruitment policy
- b) advised that in November 2022, the Council commenced a recruitment trial whereby managers advertised roles internally and externally at the same time, once the roles had been advertised to redeployment, without the need to seek approval
- c) summarised that it was envisaged that this enabled the Council to reach out to a wider market for a larger pool of applicants and ensured that the most suitable candidate was selected for a given role, whether that be internally or externally
- d) added that managers supported the proposed changes which was in line with best practice
- e) highlighted that comments received from Trade Unions with regard to the proposed changes could be viewed at paragraph 5.4, respectively.
- f) invited comments and questions from Members of the Committee.

Question: How much had the recruitment time reduced by on average and had the percentage changed between internal to external applicants?

Response: Prior to the trial, the average recruitment time had been approximately 82 days. After the trial, statistics showed the average recruitment time had reduced to approximately 47 days. In terms of vacancies filled, prior to the trial the external appointment percentage was approximately 50%. After the trial, statistics showed approximately 65% of vacancies which were advertised and appointed were filled externally.

Comment: It was important that potential development or opportunity for staff to further themselves was not weighted towards external candidates.

Response: The proposed changes did not discriminate against internal candidates; all applicants were treated equally. Both internal and external applicants would be expected to meet the essential criteria for a given post and the highest scoring candidate would be appointed to the role. It was important to note that the statistics were dependent on the role being advertised/appointed to at the time.

Question: Would there be a discussion with principal and relevant Unions prior to the advertisement of a post or would it be solely based on a manager's discretion? It needed to be ensured that any discretion was objective and not subjective.

Response: Proposals did not include the provision of consultation with Unions. Instead, the decision remained the responsibility of the recruiting manager of a given role. If there were concerns raised regarding discretion, Human Resources (HR) could look into that on a case-by-case basis. No concerns had been raised.

Comment: It was proactive for the relevant and principal Unions to be consulted and ensured a process of openness and transparency.

Comment: It was important to set the recruitment policy changes in a wider context as a common endeavour was shared. Staff that already worked for the Council should be given the best possible opportunity to progress and it was a retention strategy and a motivator if skills were valued. It was important to strike a balance that ensured the correct and best candidate was appointed which enabled the best equipped work force. The recruitment policy was only a narrow focus. Consultation with Unions with each case could potentially draw the recruitment process out. Consideration should be given to wider HR policies.

Comment: The trail was agreed as there were issues with recruitment and retention. Unions raised concerns that opportunities may be removed from internal employees.

Comment: The recruitment time of 82.4 days would be affected if an internal employee could not be released from their current position without the sufficient notice period. When considered from an internal applicant perspective, the time period would be different when compared to that of an external applicant.

Response: The recruitment time of 82.4 days did not include notice periods as everyone's notice period was different. The recruitment time of 82.4 days was from advert to offer stage.

Comment: Another issue that arose from recruitment was retention. If an internal applicant was not successful in appointment to a role, it may be the case that they looked externally elsewhere. It could then become a position that recruitment was required for two positions instead of one.

Response: It was important to ensure the correct and most suitable candidate was selected for a role.

Comment: Recruitment was a significant issue for all organisations. Members were elected to provide the most effective, efficient and best possible administration. It was important to remain equally fair to individuals that applied for jobs as they had rights also.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) The proposed changes to the Recruitment Policy, as set out in the report, be supported for formal approval of the Executive.
- 2) The Executive be appraised of the context of discussions and concerns be transmitted.