

## APPENDIX 1A



Stockton on Tees  
UNISON  
2 Nolan House  
Stockton on Tees  
Cleveland  
TS18 2AX

Tel: 01642 528685  
Fax: 01642 528236

Branch Secretary  
Philip Johnson

Our Ref.:

Your Ref.:

When telephoning

please ask for:

Derek Ross

Julie Danks  
Corporate Director of Resources  
Municipal Buildings  
Church Road  
Stockton on Tees

23 October 2006

Dear Julie,

### **PROPOSED REDUNDANCY/EFFICIENCY SCHEME AND DISCRETIONARY POLICY STATEMENT**

In response to your letter dated 2 October 2006, I wish to submit the following comments on behalf of the UNISON Branch.

1. We do not agree with the proposed scheme and proposed policy statement regarding redundancy and the award of extra LGPS membership to contributing members (augmentation) [Regulation 52]. We propose that this should be changed so that the employee would receive either a compensation payment of up to 66 weeks' pay according to age and service in accordance with Table 1 or the statutory compensation payment plus augmentation of up to 6 $\frac{2}{3}$  years added service. Employees who are over 50 should also receive basic pension as earned.

We note that the proposed policy of Tees Active Limited has these provisions and we believe that the same opportunity for added service should be available to Council staff.

2. We do not agree with the proposed policy in relation to the release of employees in the interests of the efficiency of the service. We propose that the policy should be changed so that it is the same as the policy on redundancy, as stated in point 1 above, i.e. a compensation payment of up to 66 weeks' pay or the statutory compensation payment plus augmentation of up to 6 $\frac{2}{3}$  years added service.

Again we note that this is the Tees Active proposal, and we think the same policy should apply in the Council.

Your proposal that the Head of Service would assess the benefit to the service of releasing the employee seems too subjective. We think there could be inconsistencies and that it would tend to be managers and higher paid staff who would receive compensation payments based on the maximum or higher percentages. We therefore believe it is preferable for the compensation payments to be in accordance with Table 1 and Table 2.

Yours sincerely,

Derek Ross  
**ASSISTANT BRANCH SECRETARY**

c.c. John McDade