

In the box below, please provide any other comments you have on the 15 proposals
Any proposals to save money by cuts to wages and sick pay is scandalous. The majority of council workers, work hard under very difficult circumstances as it is, to apply any of these measures shows that Tameside Council has little regard or value for their employees. We have already suffered pay freezes. Do not implement these proposals no good will come of it!
None of the proposals are really acceptable, why are you penalising the loyal employees who have given a lot of good will to enable the council to still be functioning, if you proceed with these proposals I feel it will be the end to good service provisions across the council and end in disaster
1% and 2% pay cuts, 3 mandatory unpaid days leave and 3 unpaid sick days are unfair by targeting the lowest paid workers in our community is not encouraging anyone to work/ find a job.
1% on the lower pay scales would disproportionately affect the staff on these wages
1% pay cut to a lower grade (C - E) is going to be felt a lot more compared to those who are on a higher grade. People are being asked to do more work after people have taken severance and then could be expected to take a pay cut?
a better designed survey would have allowed the range of scores 1-15 to be applied to each item on the survey and thus allowed for more sophisticated statistical analysis.
A cross the board reduction would be fairer to the lower paid . Some lower paid workers rely on payments above their basic pay. Sickness payment reductions should be the very last resort
a further reduction in terms and conditions to staff will impact on good will and motivation in a time that we are relying upon good will and people already working above and beyond.
A large number of staff require their over time pay in order to make a living. Staff should not be expected to work long extra hours or anti social hours without enhancements. Especially those on a lower pay grade.
a lesson on how to demotivate your entire workforce
A pay cut for staff on less than £50 is not really acceptable. Management pay should be looked at. Managers often give themselves new titles to give a pay rise at times when we receive a pay cut
A pay cut of 1% or 2% would disproportionately affect those on a lower grade of pay. The financial impact on those employees on grades just above B would be greater than on those of a higher grade.
A review of the failure to achieve savings targets across the organisation is required immediately. As an employee I would like an explanation as to why the targets are not being met. An urgent thorough review of non-contract spend should be carried out to ensure we are saving all that we can in the organisation before any savings are imposed on our terms and conditions.
AFFECTS THE LOWEST PAID AS USUAL
After losing £1200 with regrading I can't afford to loose any more
all of these proposals will only effect the front line staff who are already paid the least yet we are the ones that are needed if any service is to be upheld. How is this fair or just??
All proposed changes to sickness pay should be avoided at all costs; the current sickness arrangements are already punitive and counter-productive, with people genuinely poorly making decisions to come into work based on fears/concerns about warnings; adding loss of pay into the mix will only worsen things.
All staff should be asked to make an equitable sacrifice. Regarding sickness, removing the first three days pay will ensure that sickness spreads amongst the workforce and will put healthy staff at risk when those who cannot afford to be off pass their illnesses around.
All TA's work hard for their wage and I feel it is unfair that we are having to justify our wage in this manner. Most TA's go above and beyond the call of duty and often work more hours than they should to fulfilling their
Alot of the of the questions do not affect me personally, I have tried to answer the questions based on the best for the authority and not as much for me as an individual - and also taking into account the type of jobs which would be affected by the additional payments ie lower paid staff who who could possibly carrying out front line services to vulnerable members of the community.

<p>Although employees are being asked to rank these proposals in terms of "least" and "most" acceptable, I believe that all employees feel that all the proposals are unacceptable. Staff reductions and increased demand have led to a situation where the remaining Tameside employees are working harder than ever before, and a reduction in pay and/or conditions is a poor way to treat such dedicated and hard-working employees.</p>
<p>Although I have completed the survey, I feel that some of these suggestions are not at all acceptable as the reductions are almost a return to Victorian conditions. Too much money is being spent on the new council buildings.</p>
<p>although some of the cuts do not directly affect me, I have tried to make decisions that are fair, there are some I don't agree on at all</p>
<p>Although some of the elements do not affect me i.e. car user, Weekend Enhancement I do feel that cuts may hinder the services where this is required. I feel the cuts should be fair and equitable to all across the organisation</p>
<p>always the lowest paid workers suffer</p>
<p>Any change should be considered in terms of equity across the entire workforce and then consider the effects of certain proposed changes on specific service areas ie 24/7 services.</p>
<p>Any changes to terms and conditions is a backwards step, I do not agree with any reduction in terms, the Council is already expecting employees to take on extra responsibilities and a lot of goodwill has existed so far, I think any attack on employees such as these will damage relations. The timing of this being sent out and the following days congratulatory e-mail from the chief exec shows either a lack of awareness of a demoralized workforce or lack of respect both of which are appalling in a Labour controlled council. It is all well and good to publically praise staff but then belittle them in this way. The attack particularly on the removal of sick pay for the first 3 days punishes those who have a genuine illness, the problem of short term illness where staff repeatedly take the odd day off can be managed other ways than by forcing genuinely sick people to come into work, potentially affecting other staff and customers.</p>
<p>As a Governing Body clerk, some of the proposals would not directly affect me. However I think that the reduction of night time and weekend pay rates will, yet again, hit the lowest paid (carers, etc) which is unacceptable. Also how is the 3 days' unpaid leave & sick leave to be implemented when on a part-time, term-time only salary? We wouldn't have unpaid leave, we'd just have a reduction in pay again,</p>
<p>As a group of support staff working in a school, we feel that not getting paid for sickness is unfair as we are more susceptible to bugs and viruses on a daily basis. We also come into contact with bodily fluids ie; sickness and diarrhea.</p>
<p>As a labour council I find it hard to believe you are proposing to hit your hard working and valued workforce in this way. You have relied on us to take up the slack from your redundancies already imposed and on our goodwill which has become expected from us. You seem to imply you have no central government funding at all, when it is only the money you received in grants that has been cut not essential funding. All this on top of your proposal to increase council tax by 4%.</p>
<p>As a night worker only working between 10 pm and 8pm I feel it would be unfair to reduce enhancement for these hours as working at these times is unsociable and impacts on your normal day to day life. Unsociable hours should be paid as such.</p>
<p>As an employee that's about to retire I feel aggrieved at agreeing to a pay cut that will have an effect on my pension</p>
<p>As I am a worker in a school I would like to know how you can implement the changes for workers to not be paid for the first 3 days of sickness when we are close workers to children who are always carrying infections plus a child is not allowed into the school for 48 hours when they have had sickness and diarrhoea. If this is the case then you cannot expect workers to come into work. This would be the case in my personal circumstances as I can not afford to go without this pay.</p>
<p>As I am currently already on a low income, I feel that it is highly unacceptable that you wish to lower our income even further.</p>

As I was TUPE'd from the NHS have not been eligible to any pay increases however I will be eligible for any pay reduction!
As usual the underappreciated, already underpaid staff will be forced to take a hit, despite there being large reserves of cash and huge levels of political wastage in the organization...
As usual they are unfair to social care staff on the front line
As we are due a reduction in pay due the change in contracted out in April then a further pay decrease will not be acceptable. We already face a higher increase in Council Tax than the rate of inflation or any proposed pay increase. Plus we have already had reductions in pay due to pay and grading.
By reducing pay you may be hitting, once again, those who lost pay in the job evaluation process.
Changes to sick pay may have a positive effect on behaviour as well as savings. Pay cuts/freezes/reductions will have a negative effect on moral. Also if they are to be considered cant the reductions/mandatory leave etc be recalculated and the % reductions graded downwards along the spinal scales? Cant this be suggested as another proposal, higher earners have a marginally higher % reduction in pay/leave than the person immediately below in the payscales
Can you not consider not paying for the first 1 or 2 days of sickness and not 3? I am assuming there a lot of sickness costs associated with people having random single days off. Secondly I think you need to implement proposals which impact the least number of people. 3. We now operate in a 24 hour society so harsh as it sounds it is becoming increasingly less anti-social to work at weekends and nights.
Careful consideration needs to be taken particularly around those proposals that don't affect the whole workforce as its easy for staff to agree to those options that done apply to them. Hopefully my answers have considered other.
Consideration needs to be placed on those services where the majority of proposals will effect, front line staff in Long term support and managers where we work weekends, Christmas, on calls, bank holidays,waking nights, overtime, use our vehicles and petrol.
Council employees on the whole work really hard so changes to terms and conditions are going to be difficult for everyone. However, reducing pay will be the most hard hitting and I think other benefits should go first.
cutting enhancements for working nights/evenings is not fair, People with children already suffer when working these hours and it will put people in a position where they will just want a Monday to Friday job. it will also put pressure on services as nobody will want to do any overtime so services could end up short staffed
Cutting night time and weekend enhancements will make cover difficult to find
Cutting pay is an insult to staff who have absorbed a massive loss of staff due to severance, whilst running the same level of services and feeling the ensuing stress. We had a pay freeze for years and then a miniscule 1% rise. If you reduce night pay etc then nobody will want to do these shifts or cover them as the incentive is not there, so who will staff the homemaker houses etc? Reduce the mileage rate slightly e.g. around 25p per mile which would reduce costs, but not leave staff out of pocket whilst doing their jobs. Considering staff currently off sick more than 12 weeks are effectively told to come back to work or proceedings are started to finish them, then the sickness proposals are irrelevant. Not being paid for first sick day may discourage people who could work calling in sick, but 3 days is too much and unfair on staff who are genuinely ill.
Disgusting
Don't agree with any reduction in pay whether overtime or freezes for staff below grade G
Dont target staff financially when they are dedicated workers doing more than one job.
Due to pay and degrading I already feel under valued. My counter part in the private sector is paid double my wage. I have continued to work for the council as I felt other benefits such as flexi time and pension scheme were beneficial.
Ensure employees are aware of weekend and Christmas-time rota/roster arrangements before signing employment contracts.
Ensure that school based staff don't get told when they can have mandatory unpaid leave and that it has to be mutually agreed as it would in other services.

<p>Everyone should be paid a living wage. Not paying people for the first 3 days of being ill will only effect front line staff. Managers and a large percentage of office staff will be able to claim that they are "working from home". What would be the point in coming back in after 3 days? You might as well have the full week off.</p>
<p>feel that pay reductions is not realistic with current pay freezes in place.</p>
<p>Feel that some of the proposals unfairly target shift workers and workers who work unsociable hours. Examples being night and weekend workers.</p>
<p>Financially punishing staff who are off sick would add to the stress already caused by being absent, if sickness policies towards pay are altered then so must the Managing Attendance policy, no one would be off sick unless they are sick if there was no pay, it would then be grossly unfair to put people into a process of managing attendance for hitting 3 periods of absence, for which they have already had to accept no pay for. Removing any enhancements or perceived benefits will see skilled and valuable staff leave the authority costing more in the long term in recruitment and training. A pay cut will leave many staff unable to afford to work for the authority myself included forcing us to look elsewhere for employment</p>
<p>For 24 hour workers like myself, I find some of the proposals shocking. I understand we all need to play a part in assisting the council through times of austerity but my colleagues and I feel marginalised. The proposals for Christmas are outrageous - Christmas Day as a normal rostered working day? When 99% of council employees are at home with their families on Christmas Day, management have chosen to pick on essential staff that have to work on that day. Furthermore, I would like to see more detailed consultations on removal of time back in lieu for bank holidays. As I work 7 days a week, I depend on those extra few holidays when booking time off. For example: a monday to friday worker would only need 5 days off for 7 days off (monday to sunday), I would have to take 7 days off to ensure I wouldn't be working! I don't get additional holidays to start with so again, my colleagues and I feel marginalised.</p>
<p>From a managerial perspective and from someone who has had experience in the implementation of the similar and in some cases , identical proposals in two previous authorities, I would give the following recommendations: Reducing ones salary has been by far the least popular proposal and despite the fact that people work in the 'caring services' for a number of reasons; it is well evidenced that money remains a key motivator for the majority of people. In previous authorities, people's salary was not reduced and other proposals were instead implemented. People did get used to reduced mileage costs etc...but it would cause a huge downturn in motivation and in turn, productivity , should wages be reduced or frozen. In my experience, people have appreciated the fact that wages were not reduced/or frozen and though there was a great deal of dissatisfaction regarding proposals such as reduced overtime/enforced leave, these measures did become 'easier to swallow' than any reduction in wages. As a consequence, I did not experience motivation and productivity suffer in the same way that it undoubtedly would if the entire workforce suffered a reduction/freeze on wages. In one previous authority I did experience a wage freeze and this did have a more negative effect upon the workforce than other proposals implemented in a subsequent authority. There was also a general feeling that ,once frozen/reduced, wages would not be reinstated which also caused bad feelings</p>
<p>Fully understand why this is needed and that Tameside aren't the first council to consult on implementing such drastic changes however I am not fully assured nor confident that all other costs have been rationalised and effectively managed in advance of considering workforce costs (I.e. Contract management / the use of casual workers / the use of agency workers and the management of all assignments length and rates)</p>
<p>Given all the cuts we have had I am not willing to accept any more reductions to either pay or conditions I have already essential car pay, if any more is taken I will not use my car for work. I for one would rather be made redundant than take further cuts to terms and conditions.</p>
<p>Given the current economic climate, families are already struggling, and workers have seen no affective pay rises, so any calls to cut wages fails to see the implications for the workforce and moral to carry out challenging work in challenging times. Calls to cut mileage rates fails to recognize that the petrol prices used are outdated and capped at 75p per litre, resulting a loss for any worker that uses their own personal vehicle for work purposes. Loss of sick pay at the rates proposed hits families at time of hardship, again demoralizing the</p>

Having worked in local government for 18 years it is sad the terms and conditions will have a devaluing effect on employees whom have committed loyalty and dedication to public service.
Having worked in local government for over 26 years the demands for cuts are utterly demoralizing
Hit long term sick to stop people abusing the system, don't penalise people for doing a good job by reducing pay grades, get rid of the people that don't want to do the job and employ people that do
How can you expect schools in Tameside to improve when your proposals to cut pay will make good staff leave and encourage lesser trained and lesser qualified staff take these positions.
I actually have no words to describe how unfair this is. It always seems to be the lowest paid that are affected.
I am a competent and qualified member of staff any pay freeze and I would leave and join a better LA
I am a GMPF employee and believe that Tameside subsidise my wage by a small %. So a £200 reduction in my wage would save Tameside £20 if subsidised by 10%
I am a teaching assistant and yet again it is school staff that are the ones targeted for wage reductions. You'll be asking us to work for nothing soon.
I am already struggling to make end meets and a further reductions would be detrimental to me and my family. The issues of sickness and reducing 6 months to 3 months pay is ok depending on how sick you are - what if you have a serious illness and need to be off for 6 months to receive treatment or recover - measures should be in place for different situations.
I am fed up that we have already been through pay and grading and lost money through this yet once again our council is trying to take money away from support staff who are essentials. I work in a school and these are the jobs which are being penalised yet these are the people who work with the children of the future. More and more responsibilities are being put on teaching assistants yet once again we are not respected for the amount of work we actually do. We are already not paid for holidays and bank holidays which I believe is illegal and still you are trying to squeeze our finances even more.
I am not on a lower band but morally I think that you should be paying staff on lower bands a living wage but take into account whether cuts in working unsocial hours will wipe out any benefit of paying living wage!!! Don't give with one hand only to take away with the other. I would not like to see the safety net of pay for those on extended sick leave cut. If for instance an individual is receiving treatment for cancer it is unthinkable that they are facing financial concerns as well. If you remove 3 days pay for the first three days of sick leave then it may increase presenteeism.
I am quite angry about these proposals, I have worked for the Council for forty years, I am an intelligent person and I understand and appreciate the hard choices faced by the organization in balancing budgets - but please do not tell staff how hard they are working, how much they are appreciated, how much loyalty and discretionary effort is given by staff and then put them in a position where they have to chose and rate from a series of very unpalatable options
I am really concerned about the lack of support/care for our vulnerable service users and would not like to see them low paid/under paid for the valuable work they do
I believe a 2% pay cut along with pay freeze and enforced unpaid leave will plunge some workers into poverty. They are already finding cuts difficult to manage with increase in cost of living and pay not matching the rise.
I believe that if there are to be pay cuts it should be considered that those on the highest paid salaries are subjected to a much larger pay cut than those on the medium to lower scales as in a lot of cases it may place families in difficulties in affording the basics, where as those on the higher salary scales would not suffer as much if all salaries are cut at the same rate
I believe that unpaid sick days for the first three days should definitely be implemented. With so many people working or able to work from home, sick days should be very rare especially for a period less than 3 days. I would imagine that the percentage of sick days within the Authority would reduce dramatically if this was implemented.

I disagree with all 15 proposals. I feel you have already asked enough of the workforce. It is unfair that employees always have to loose out financially,staff have had lots of changes and I feel it is always the staff on lower incomes which suffer from financial difficulties. I feel my pay does not reflect the level of work and responsibilities. We have had major changes already to our contracts and I feel we should not have to suffer further. We have had pay cuts, we have had pay freeze,
I do not agree to a pay cut. I think it is unfair to ask this when people are working harder and go over and
I do not agree whatsoever with the pay freeze or reduction or the option for unpaid leave! I don't agree with the minimum hourly rate being increased for those on grades A and B, if were looking at saving why increase this when it costs more money? We should be looking at rewarding staff in these challenging times, not demotivating staff by reducing their terms and conditions
i do not agree with any of the 15 proposed reductions,i have given 20 years of service,and feel along with the rest of my collegues that we have been kicked in the teeth,an absolute disgrace! but there is nothing that we say or do will change anything,it is a done deal.
I do not want you to reduce my terms and conditions, I already buy my own pens, paper and use my own petrol as I do not claim mileage, I feel that I have done enough to reduce costs. It causes me a great deal of anxiety every time you rewrite my contract. I have worked loyally for you for over 30 years and worked extremely hard for all the time I have worked for you.
I don't feel anyone should have there take home pay reduced - terms and conditions should be changed for new staff only as not many people can afford to live on the money they earn now before any reductions to take home pay.
I don't think you can accurately put your view forward based on the format of the questionnaire.
I don't think you should reduce long term sick leave benefits as this effects people when they most need support. If you have been diagnosed with a serious illness the last thing you need is worrying about your
I feel not paying the pay award is the fairest as what you have never had you will not miss as much. However, once Local Government finances are back in order then I feel the pay awards should be awarded.
I feel some of the proposals are biased towards certain parts of the service, any reductions should affect 100% of the workforce and not just a percentage.
I feel that as I am currently already on a very low income it would be highly unacceptable to reduce this further.
i feel that it is essential not to consider having any effect on support for people with long term sickness, how could people cope with cancer etc
I feel that school support staff are already penalised through the pay and grading terms and conditions...not being paid school holidays and bank holidays which I believe is illegal. We also have part time pensions because we are contracted to 30 hours. This is the most we can work a week due to school hours. Stop penalising people who are already on low incommed salaries and already doing a great deal more than what
I feel that the proposals will not suit all but understand that cuts must be made.
I feel that these reductions should be made if applicable on a pro rata basis!!!!
I feel the council needs to adopt a more commercial aspect to its terms and conditions and that some of the proposals are widely seen in other business environments eg hospitals, supermarkets etc. If a person has chosen a career path which involves working unsociable hours then paying an increment would seem unnecessary. The removal of the Christmas closure day would be a definite removal in my view. Peoples annual leave and bank holidays are sufficient to cover this without a 'gifted' day in times of financial restraint. Changes to sick pay are welcomed but I am not in favour of reducing the timeframe on sick pay. People need to feel supported when at their most vulnerable. I am not opposed to a freeze in pay but do not welcome a pay reduction of 1 or 2% when working in a school I will watch staff on grades A & B and teachers pay increase. Paying additional wages to grades A&B but potentially reducing wages for other scales creates a more lateral pay scale and would seem unfair to 'narrow' the gap considering the wide range of jobs and skill levels across
I feel the survey is biased, as a minority of the workforce work unsocial hours, especially night workers. Therefore I feel their best interests may not be represented as a percentage of the whole

I feel these are all unfair proposes to the lowest paid sector, having already suffered the pay and grading process, I do not see how these proposals are fair for support staff again
I HAVE ALREADY LOST £3,500 IN THE LAST PAY AND GRADING I DO NOT WANT TO LOOSE ANY MORE
I have based my answers on what I feel gives me the best chance of maintaining a high level of service delivery and not what would suit me, personally, financially, best. I work with a great team of people that have been hit financially several times but have always given their best to ensure they deliver. However well we strive to manage, we more and more rely on good will, and to this end I would rather give a little more to reduce the impact on the front line staff.
I have had very little time of sick. I would resent being penalized for being genuinely sick because of repeat offenders.
I have heard that the salary reductions if brought in would not affect those at Executive level, can you comment on this? The recommendations are draconian and many savings could be made before these are implemented. Many people choose to work for the council I believe these measures will force them out. It is grossly unfair on people who have chosen to work for the council and whose qualifications leave them no options of other employers such as Social Workers to impose these conditions on them. I think you will find you will be left with a disengaged, unmotivated workforce where those who have a choice will leave. This does not bode well at all for the future of Tameside Council is a short sighted plan which will not be reversed and will ultimately be of great detriment to the Borough.
I have lost 2 days to sickness over 5 years, please challenge those who abuse benefits not the majority of staff like me. Any loss of pay over 7months (2016\17) would cripple me and many others financially.
I have no words for these ridiculous proposals. Utter disgrace yet again from the council. Thank you
I have only one wage currently supporting a family of 5. I have on a low paid wage as it is and further cuts to my salary would force me into leaving a job which I have been committed to for over 12 years. I also find it frustrating that teachers are not affected by this but the support staff are
I object to the terms and conditions being changed. Encourage all those who can afford it to take additional holidays or reduce the working week to 4 days.
I really think the enhancements that people that work unsociable hours get needs to be looked at. In other sectors these enhancements were removed along time ago.
I strongly disagree with the proposed cuts to our pay and terms and conditions. The terms and conditions we currently have are the main reason why people stay employed within the Local Authority and don't work within the private sector, even though the pay is much more competitive in the private sector. I also feel that we have had our fair share of reductions already due to the pay and grading exercise and to the pay freezes we have already been subject to. My pay now is less, in real terms, than it was a few years ago, which should never be the case. Also, I work for the GMPF and do not agree that we should again be included within these cuts because TMBC only pay a fraction of our salaries , so the savings to be made to TMBC from cuts to GMPF employees pay etc. would be minimal at best.
I think a 2% cut is drastic. if people are on long term sick (through no fault of their own), it is not fair to penalize. A cut for people on Grade A and B also not fair.
I think all savings should be made from sick pay and stopping the use of agency staff, as this was the reason used for the changes being made in the first place.
I think at a time when people have applied for redundancy and been refused to reduce people on low earnings when they are already struggling is too harsh
I think changing the long-term sickness pay (from 6 months to 3 months) would adversely affect those who most likely need the help the most. I wouldn't like to see this implemented. The Living Wage is only fair for those on the lowest on incomes, and I would be happy to have three days additional unpaid leave if it would mean that this would happen.
I think ideally, if something has to be cut it needs to affect the whole of the workforce equally and not just target certain areas. It also needs to be something that is temporary and not a permanent change in terms and conditions.

I think if people who work nights lose their enhanced payments it would result in people not wanting to work unsociable hours.
I think it is a disgrace. I am a single person with one dependent in full time higher education, the salary I currently earn does not pay the bills and I am getting further and further into debt. My only hope was that at least we have (or had) a relatively stable set of terms and conditions. I personally have little or no time off and believe once again that the people down the ladder will suffer. These proposals if implemented may well send me over the edge.
I think it is totally unfair to reduce pay any further, especially to those on lower grades because the cut in percentage would prove to be a massive chunk of their pay.
I think its really sad that any changes generally affect the lower paid workers.
I think it's unfair to remove night time enhancements for people who only work hours during the night.
I think some of these proposals target our most vulnerable. I've never been off sick for six months but those who I know who have been off sick for that length of time are very sick receiving treatment for cancer and I would hate to think of the worry of not only their health and family but then finances for mortgage etc. I think the car changes are acceptable and making people take extra leave to make savings is fair as well. I also believe that people working bank holidays should just be paid double and not get an extra day as well - that is like being tripled paid for that day.
I think Tameside Council has already made up it's mind on how they are going to make savings and this survey is to give us the impression we are having a say in how it is done. It's insulting.
I think that making staff choose between these proposals is awful and making it a mandatory acceptance is ridiculous.
I think that some of the proposals are wrong given the fact the staff remaining are all committed and seem to be the ones are going to sufferer with some of the cuts as costs of running our homes is going up are wages are staying the same or could be reduced which in turn could put some staff in financial difficulty
I think that the changes should affect the majority and not the minority. Eg, sickness - not fair to change this as it does not affect the majority. Plus this is one of the few 'perks' of working for a local authority, if the sickness t&c's are changed then I believe that people will leave to go to the private sector and therefore the Council will lose experienced members of staff.
I think that the no sickness pay for the first 3 days , would be unfair for employees that require hospitel treatment. e.g cancer treatment
I think the idea of reducing the wage is a joke and really unfair, with the reduced workforce we are required to undertake more duties which means more work and then if the pay is reduced we are then getting paid less to do more work with less staff!
I think these cuts are affecting lower paid staff more and more. The ways of working and these pay cuts can only have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of the staff left.
I think we need to be mindful that a number of the proposals impact on lower paid staff who work in challenging circumstances, outside of core Council business hours. We need to ensure these workers are not adversely impacted upon. Believe the pay freeze is an easy win as people are not 'losing' pay - they haven't received this money.
I think weekend work is the norm for other areas of business, so I think weekend should be paid at plain. however night work should be kept as it is unsociable hours. I think punishing staff who work hard with a pay cut/freeze is disgusting considering the staff remaining in the council are working twice almost three times harder the years before.
I think what the council is doing is absolutely disgusting especially at the current financial climate.
I understand some of these proposals are not applicable to role.
I understand that there is a necessity for actions to be completed, but careful thought and consideration should be given for all employees and the affects of the reductions.

<p>I understand the need to save money however reducing pay after reducing the head count via one or a combination of these 15 proposals does support a productive or happy workforce. The position I hold within the Council gives me no opportunity to earn extra money either by overtime or by working up scales. Therefore I have no goals to set or pay rewards to work towards which is very un-motivational.</p>
<p>I understand we have to make cuts. It would be good to hear what higher management have been doing towards the cut, will they be taking pay cut. If you take 2% from me it will make a big difference also I have had my wages frozen for the hole of the last parliament. It always feels like the people at the bottom of the ladder are the first to be affected when it comes to making cuts.</p>
<p>I understand why this is happening, but yet again it will be the lowest paid that suffer the most. I thought labour represented the working classes, maybe you have been in power too long or your snouts are too embedded in the trough that you have lost sight of this, is there a timescale on these proposals i.e. if not paying the living wage is implemented, is that forever because we agreed to it under duress or is it short term and will it be written into any new contract. If forcing people into a pay cut, having been under a pay freeze for many years, can i take it that no Councillor will have any pay increase themselves as voted for by themselves. There was a report this morning on the bbc, saying that top executives have already earned the average living wage of £27,000. My pay is half this, ask me how i feel, come and see if i am not worth more than what i am paid. I am underpaid and under rated, even when there wasn't the budget cuts, if you want to save money and you are for the working classes, then take it from the top earners, those that can afford it more. That of course will not happen as the gravy train is too good a thing to give up.</p>
<p>I was led to think that if the 200 people went on the current severance package. That all this would be avoided. Why are you still cutting the loyal employees that have battled us through the last 5 years.</p>
<p>I was subject to the pay & grading exercise which I think took effect from 2008. Whilst I accept the REASON for doing this was equality and avoiding unfair pay claims, the OUTCOME for many of us was a cut in pay. I lost £1000 a year from that point, so have already contributed significantly to your coffers. Any actual pay cut, be it via a % reduction or enforced unpaid leave will lead to very low morale.</p>
<p>I work for GMPF and am aware that TMBC only pay 10% of our costs. I do NOT see why we should have to bear any more 10% of the proposed cost reductions.</p>
<p>I work for the Greater Manchester Pension Fund. A small percentage of our pay is funded by Tameside MBC so I believe that our pay and conditions should be negotiated separately as any changes would affect the council budget marginally. The fund has undergone considerable changes over the last two years and the staff have worked tirelessly to secure an efficient service with minimum impact to our customers. To amend the pay and conditions to GMPF staff is an insult.</p>
<p>I work in a front facing service, with direct client contact and we have not actually moved on to 7 day working, so I feel this survey misses out some of the changes that are about to affect workers in this service. I feel that the proposal to reduce pay by 3 day (purchasing of annual leave), 1% or 2% pay reductions is putting extreme pressure on workers in the front facing services, we are being pushed to the limit, trying to get out to see clients, using our own vehicles (on casual car basis), and trying to see clients in a timely and often crisis situation, and often with immense amounts of 'good will', I have lost count of the times I have worked over my stated hours and not claimed TOIL (we do not get enhanced payments). The prospect of continually DOING MORE and now the prospect of doing this for LESS PAY, is frankly despicable!</p>
<p>I work in a school and put in more hours than I am contracted for without the overtime. These proposals are going to take that good will away from many loyal employers and in effect will affect how things are run and will make more damage.</p>
<p>I would be more than happy to take 3 days mandatory unpaid leave.</p>
<p>I would expect that any changes to terms and conditions apply to all council employees (excluding teachers).</p>
<p>I would not be effected by many of these propsals but I believe the 3 days unpaid leave is one of the best options.</p>
<p>I would prefer to loose the items that are out of date, like the enhanced week-end, night duty, car allowances, the small amounts first, selfishly this will have little impact on me.</p>

I would request the cuts to be made from another way and for our salaries, sick pay and leave as altogether not to be affected as times are already hard financially. We are already struggling to manage our lives and we would not want further stress and depression. Please help us towards this and not make the situation worse.
Thank you

If a pay reduction is agreed then the reduction should be based on salary grade rather than a percentage of your wage. Higher earners can afford a higher reduction in pay than lower paid workers.

If we are looking at reducing costs I think it is completely inappropriate to be increasing the pay of the lowest to living wage. It isn't statutory and so in terms of saving why do it? I understand the morals behind it but I also think it is geared around politics rather than anything else. Plus there is a rise to £7.20 from April 16 anyway. Although I do not have to work nights I do not think you should remove the 1/3 enhancement. Staff need some reward for working unsociable hours and to attract new staff to those posts. I understand that savings need to be made but I wish the Council would consider a redundancy policy. It does not make good business sense in this day and age and is only in place because of local politics. I would prefer this as an option over being forced to take 3 days unpaid leave every year and a pay cut. Why should everybody in the workforce have to suffer to great lengths to keep staff employed that are not needed? Also, we are working harder than ever before and trying to our best in of a bad situation. Morale is low amongst staff and I think that a lot of staff stay because of the benefits of working with the Council. Again, I understand that they cannot all be in place as was but a reduction in pay and enforcement of unpaid leave should not be considered. I think the workforce maybe happier with a pay freeze as a compromise as I know I would. If pay is reduced or unpaid leave enforced I will have to look for other work as there would really be no benefit of working for the Council anymore.

If we go with the pay freeze how long will this last.

If you go into a job that you know has the possibility of working weekends or nights, then you should NOT receive any enhancements what so ever. Therefore the enhancements should be removed.

If you have a life threatening illness you don't want to have the extra stress of how to pay your household bills. Reducing sick pay will put extra pressure on these people.

I'm appalled that you would suggest no sick pay for the first three days. My team all work three days each week and this would mean that they lose a whole weeks' pay. This seems suggestive of an attitude that people are skiving when in fact all it does is penalize part time staff who are often much lower paid. I'm also shocked that the authority does not already use the HMRC recommendations for fuel allowance - this should be implemented immediately.

I'm happy to take a pay freeze as long as the enhancements aren't taken

I'm worried about the direct pay cuts particularly the 2% in each of the next 2 years as I am a single mother and cannot manage on less than I earn now so would have to look for another job elsewhere if that was the outcome of the consultation

In order to ensure that the council retains skilled staff it needs to remain competitive in the market place and therefore I don't agree with the proposals to reduce pay. Savings should be found through service redesign and efficiencies rather than staff terms and conditions.

In principle the no pay for the first three days of any sickness is a good proposal, however, be mindful of unintended consequences. The absence rate might increase because the 'guilt' of throwing a sickie will be less than taking paid sick leave. As a result potential savings could increase but there would be a detrimental effect on service delivery. Working in local government is very different to working in the private sector, yes, the pension scheme is good, terms and conditions are good, generally, but it is limited to that. In the private sector there is often the potential to earn more through bonuses, commissions, profit-share, overtime working and other incentives. Thus taking away the few little add-ons like the extra day at Christmas, which does not cost very much in the largeness of things would I think, have a disproportionate effect.

In relation to pay cuts, I find this very disturbing as with the public sector we have endured pay reductions year on year as we have not had pay rises in line with the country so in effect we have had cuts year on year
This does lead to the reduction of key skilled staff

In the current climate, targeting hard working staff financially should be the last option. Dont demoralise staff ..your best asset.
in work in Long term support. i work unsocial hours 24/7...365 days a yr i want to be paid for my time at work away from family/friends and general rest time, I totally dismiss the suggestions of no enhancements. look at sick pay and reduce,as most big corperates do now anyway. Get rid of car milage and reduce our wages by 1%.
Inappropriate and unfair to penalise hardworking middleclass individuals.
Is it possible to split some of the proposals so that our lowest paid staff do not feel the full brunt. e.g. 1% reduction in pay up to grade H and 2% for senior managers. could their be some discretion built into to sickness for life limiting conditions that require treatment programmers to enable staff to return to work when
Is this exercise being done so then it is easy to TUPE over to another company.
It does not make sense to reduce pay only to increase again with a national pay increase. Similarly to increase lower grades when others are having pay cut seems unethical.
It is unfair and disproportionate to focus the cuts on 7% of the workforce who work weekends/nights and is much fairer for all the workforce to take the hit so they effect 100% of workers fairly.
It is useful having estimated figures of savings however people are likely to vote in favor of savings which in the main do not directly affect them
It just seems like another injustice by Tameside. Staff are once again feeling undervalued.....
It seems obvious that there are some big savings to be made across salaries that would be in line with the rest of the country's working conditions. Payments for Overtime weekend, night and bank holiday working are considerably higher than in other industries. It seems obvious to bring these in line with current practice in other practices would easily save the money needed. In addition to this a car is essential to my work and i use it often, I even pay extra for business insurance. I have never been made aware of any benefits that are mentioned here so they could go! Also on the odd occasion when I have had to make a very lengthy journey of around 100 miles I have claimed mileage at the nationally acceptable rate of 45ppm so not sure why TMBC is set so high - again another big saving to be had here.
It seems unfair and unjust to work in a school environment which is extremely busy and demanding where teachers have their pay regularly increased and those supporting them, already on very small salaries, have their terms and conditions reduced and are still expected to provide the same and if not better service. Support staff have constant demands placed on them, always give more than 100% and work closely with teaching staff and yet these individuals will be the ones that suffer dramatically through these new proposals. The school would not operate properly without support staff. These proposals will undervalue and demoralise support staff.
It would be better if the savings achieved could be done in a way that has a minimum impact of peoples individual finances however still achieves the necessary savings. If unpaid leave is suggested would there be an option in the first year to have the deductions over a longer period than the 7 months suggested. Could it be a flexible arrangement? Overall, I am aware of the need to make the savings and I would rather lose some money each month if needed or have slightly reduced terms and conditions if it meant keeping my own and other peoples jobs.
It would be unjust to charge people to be off sick. If someone is genuinely ill it is to everyone's benefit that they take a day off but they will feel unable to do so if it is going to cost them, say, £100 per day. If certain individuals have a problem with attendance it should be dealt with by their managers.
Item 2 : "No pay for 1st 3 days of sickness absence". This is unacceptable, as it puts pressure on those who are unwell to come in to work, when they may not perform well, be a danger to themselves and their colleagues, and may also spread their illness if contageous.
Living cost go up so there can not be any pay freeze or wage reduction.
LOOKING AT FREEZING PAY IS MORE ADMIRABLE, REDUCING PAY IS PUTTING HARDSHIP ON FAMILIES, ESPECIALLY IF THEY ARE BEING HIT BY ANY OF THE OTHER PROPOSALS

Loss of pay is difficult for staff as whilst most of the workforce are very aware of the financial restraints on the authority these are also present in their personal lives. I do feel staff would tolerate and accept the loss of conditions , kike leave and pay freeze, mileage, sick pay etc rather than a cut in their monthly salary which would be of further detriment to already low morale
LOW PAID GRADES A-C IT IS UNFAIR THAT THEY ARE TREATED THE SAME AS THE HIGHER GRADES, IE CUTTING SALARIES
Many of these proposal do not apply as I am a home worker
Many school support staff have already been through changes to contractual terms and conditions and loss of substantial pay. It is unfair that we continue to suffer due to budget reductions.
Most of these proposals do not apply due to my working in a school, having already taken a pay cut in recent years and only earning £100 more than 15 years ago for a much heavier work load the whole thing is ridiculous.
Most of these proposals have been fought for by our Trade Unions - the Government savings are being paid for at a cost to the working conditions of employees. Proposal re sick pay. The just penalizes the sick. People who are ill do not need the stress of having reduced income. Proposal for Living Wage is all very well - but some workers are only a £1 or so above this already.
most proposals seem unreasonable considering the commitment from all staff
My position does not allow for the opportunity to earn overtime or allow the movement up payscales. Therefore my pay is already frozen. This has lead to being un-motivated with no financial goals available.
Need to implement proposals that effect the whole workforce rather than specific users (ie car users/weekend workers etc)
Nice to haves should be scrapped before essential salaries i.e. salaries shouldn't be reduced if overtime/w/end etc is still paid with an enhancement. Staff morale will be affected.
Night time workers should get the enhancement of 1/3 or there will be no night time workers. The same applies for weekend enhancements as no one will want to work weekends.
No comment
no comment
No further comments at this time.
No pay for the 1st 3 days sick is an excellent proposal.
No pay for the first 3 days of sickness would be particularly difficult for front line staff who are especially vulnerable to sickness. Where services are only open 3 days or staff only work part time, in effect this could constitute one working week and will have a significant effect on personal budget management. I fundamentally disagree with a reduction in pay for staff who are on salaries less than £20,000 as in real terms this would have a detrimental impact on their ability to maintain a reasonable standard of living
Non are good when you have a mortgage and children, it is important we are supported in flexible working - hours and home working and that employee benefits target things we actually use - supermarkets, parking, restaurants.
None
None. What I say doesnt matter.
Not happy about this at all
Offer more than 3 days unpaid leave to those that want it (ie purchase of extra holidays) at least i feel I get something out of it
On some of the questions where I didn't agree with any, there wasn't an option of not picking an order.
on top of a five year pay freeze. target those on more money
Option 2 - No pay for first 3 days of any sickness absence. I think this would encourage people who take advantage of the sickness scheme now to stay off longer than they would do in an effort to recoup the lost pay. Also, it targets people who are genually ill and people who have long-term illnesses, some serious, who return to work but then have to go off again e.g. people undergoing treatment for cancer.

Pay - don't agree with any of the suggestions - had a pay rise last year when not had one for 3 years
Reductions of 1 or 2% let the better paid have a reduction not the poorer paid Enabling to work remotely reduces mileage if thought about when planning work
Sickness - worked for TMBC over 30 years so obviously getting older and possible may need sick leave when not needed it on the whole for most of my career Agree Living wage a MUST Perhaps, once again, the better paid, in some cases extremely well paid with LARGE salaries should take a CUT which would address this
Mandatory leave - one of the better options as long as able to get the leave requested which is increasingly becoming a problem due to so many staff having left the authority maintaining a service is becoming more of an issue

Pay freezes should only be implemented at sum level and above.

Paycuts should be staggered, the more you earn higher percentage taken. The lower payed grades should not be affected.

People will not mind wage freezes so long as other commodities do not go up - rates, rent, heating food etc. It costs a lot to run a car that can be essential for work, if the job cant be done by using public transport then a proper allowance is required to cover the costs.

Personally I work most weekends and all over Christmas I don't see how it's fair taking the weekend and Christmas rate off is when everyone else has these days off with loved ones family and friends unless your willing to make our contracts mon- fri I personally and some other of the girls will not be working them for normal pay I am not sacrificing seeing my children happy Christmas day to come out to work for basic pay you won't see the big Chiefs in work for normal rates at Christmas. It's always the under paid staff that work all the unsociable hours that don't get any better thought off

Please make Members and Senior Managers aware that if you remove overtime and enhancements for weekend working that it will severely impact on the delivery of projects and events. Remembrance Sunday Services rely on Grounds Maintenance and Cleansing staff working on weekends - these are some of our lowest paid staff. Why should they offer to come in and work if they are not going to get a bit of extra pay for it? It's not like Members even bother to thank them for it. Events such as Tulip Sunday and Armed Forces Day run smoothly and have little impact on litter because the GM and Cleansing staff work hard all day setting up, litter picking and providing general assistance all day and then assisting with the closure of these events. If there is no over time available they are unlikely to come in and work. Most of them are not contracted to work weekends. All these proposals will lose a lot of goodwill and hit the lowest paid staff the hardest. The fairest proposals are those ones such as the 1% pay decrease which will affect all staff. Are the Terms and Conditions of Members also being looked at? Will they be taking a similar cut in allowances and the other various perks they get?

please note that I work in children social care and manage and recruit to this difficult area of work. we are already a lower paying authority with a high case load then neighboring authorities. we are currently unable to recruit experienced staff as we are expecting experienced worker to commence at newly qualified rate leaving an inexperienced work force in child protection with over stretched managers overseeing and progressing them through their first year in practice which is mandatory further reduction for sw with be catastrophic for the children. could specific areas in the council be protected?

Please note that my ranking responses to this questionnaire are not a full and true account of my 'preference' or views on the proposed changes to employment terms and conditions. Disappointingly the council have chosen to only consult via online survey with a mandatory ranking order - does not give a true account of employees view on the options being forced to rank several options I do not agree with at all just to be able to continue through the consultation is not acceptable and makes me complicit in agreeing with options for key council decision makers to support their actions. Further, the council in no way indicates what assurances it will make to employees should some of these options be adopted.

Proposal 10 is unmanageable, who will maintain the records of staff absences? Who will cover the work which isn't going to go away for three days! The cost of covering the work exceeds the costs saved.

proposal 13,14,15 suggestions doesn't give you an alternative these are all basically eluding to pay cuts

<p>Proposal to enforce 3 days unpaid leave - I am not against this as a principle but in my current role (clerk to governing bodies) that is just a pay cut unless the number of meetings I have to cover was also reduced by an equivalent amount. I can't do the work in less time so would get no additional time off but would lose pay. Not fair at all unless there is also a review of my contracted hours.</p>
<p>proposal to freeze pay already applies to me anyway as there was not provision for this in my TUPE agreement.</p>
<p>Proposal's to decrease wages by 1 or 2% I think will have a real negative affect on the council as a whole and services are struggling with staff moral at the moment and this will be a real issue. I thin that Overtime paid at plain will help services incredibly I know from working in both Adult and Children's services that staff would love to work over 36 hour per week but are refused and then agency or casual staff are booked so the savings would be a significantly higher amount that the 200k suggested. I think this should be implemented straight away in Jan 16</p>
<p>Question What we pay to Carillion before you start to penalise all of us, Try to audit & check for best value from them if you have the guts to do so!!!! save our jobs pay and conditions first.</p>
<p>Recruitment is currently difficult and further adversely altering employees terms and conditions will ultimately affect recruitment and the level of service provided.</p>
<p>Reduce night time enhancement to 15%</p>
<p>Reducing pay levels should be phased with those earning most having the largest % reduction and those on the lowest grades having a smaller reduction</p>
<p>Removal of weekend enhancements would hit out of hours workers significantly, the rate tops up our wages to account for the unsociable hours worked.</p>
<p>Removing pay for the 1st 3 days of sickness is extremely unfair, staff can't help being sick and should not be effectively forced (due to financial penalty) to come into work when they are unfit to do so as it is unsafe for them and unhealthy for colleagues Reducing monthly pay will result in staff having to look for jobs elsewhere, we all have mortgages and bills to pay and some of us can't afford to have money taken from their already tight monthly budget. Anything that spreads the cost of a reduction in pay over the 12 months would be better i.e. 3 days unpaid leave</p>
<p>salary reduction should be the last resort, some employees are single parents and rely on the income to live daily and still struggle. sickness pay should also be considered as staff coming into work poorly just so they do not lose out financially will not benefit the workforce or the customers.</p>
<p>Scandalous given that we as a council are feeding the profits of carrillion et al.</p>
<p>Sick pay should remain in tact as there are cases where people are genuinely ill and reducing the pay for those in that situation is likely to cause additional stress at a time when they are already dealing with problems. I think the council is already taking measures to reduce the levels of sickness absence and these should help to reduce the levels of sickness absence where people are not genuinely in need of time off due to sickness. Reducing sick pay is likely to mean that people who are genuinely ill cannot afford to take the time off and</p>
<p>Sickness pay changes would dramatically reduce sickness levels having a beneficial effect on providing services. The current council scheme is too generous so some people will go sick as if its their right but wouldn't be so quick to go sick if they didn't get the work or play scheme we currently have.</p>
<p>Since the pay and grading review in 2009 we have been penalized every year, I have personally lost 1/3 of my hours since then and still we are being hit with cuts. We are part time front facing staff who are the face of Tameside and those that are left are the hardcore people who work really hard and care about their job and team they work in. To loose 3 days pay when you are really ill and can't come into work is beyond the pale. This information should have been released before the last severance as it may have put a different outlook on their future with Tameside.</p>
<p>Some of these proposals if they are accepted - loss of pay for example, are going to make life very difficult for us all. I'm only just keeping my head above water as my pay stands now. I worry about our future, especially our children's - the Government want to stop child poverty but by taking away money they will in fact be deepening an already unsettled future.</p>
<p>some of these were equally ranked acceptable or not in my mind, no provision for that</p>

SSP waiting days are served by other large companies along with no additional pay for working weekends, so this would bring the Council in line with the modern 24/7 working world. Also it seems outrageous to be paying more than the average cost for mileage compared to HMRC. To pay bank holiday workers double time and a day in lieu is also extravagant compensation for working this day. I do not agree with a pay cut when so many other bills are increasing; this may cause employees potential financial hardship themselves.

Staff have already had a pay freeze and then minimum pay increase. I think you MUST not subject staff to pay reductions and changes should affect all staff and not just some.

Staff that have to work weekends bank holiday nights. miss out on family life and social events.

Staff that work unsociable should keep the enhancements, working weekends nights and bank holidays has a big impact on family life, children miss out doing things as a family if one of the parents has to unsociable

Stopping weekend enhancement for staff that work on a Saturday as part of their working week will effect the lowest paid members of our workforce (generally Grade B) and will have an impact on the ability to carry out operational duties. On a few occasions throughout the year we pay limited overtime for operational staff to carry out additional duties i.e. civic events, remembrance Sunday etc. and we rely on goodwill. Removal of the overtime will have a serious impact on the success of these events.

Support staff are already at a disadvantage as since the pay and wage equality regs we do not get paid all the bank holidays. All staff have already had wage cuts some of which are not legal.

Taking away the night enhancement would be totally unfair, nobody should have to work through the night for the same rate of pay as a day worker. Also reducing pay for those who are already on the lower end of the pay scale is ridiculous, I could accept this for someone earning over £30, 000 but for someone earning less than that would have a devastating effect.

Tameside is a deprived area, these proposals will put lower paid employees under greater financial strain. In the long term, this could result in the need for more support for them ie extra services and benefits which would cost the council more! The proposals which affect pension are surely morally irresponsible. Why should hard working employees be penalised in their later life by conditions which have been forced upon them? Will these cuts affect higher paid employees and if not, will they be subject to a different set of financial proposals and will these be available to the public? Why are Governing bodies of schools not part of the consultation process when they are responsible for setting school budgets etc.? If terms and conditions are the same for staff employed in and out of schools why are there the following differences 1. school support staff are specifically excluded from some items in the flexible working policy as shown on TMBC website. 2. School support staff cannot work under the flexi time scheme. 3. school support staff cannot work condensed hours 4. school support staff cannot take holidays in term time. 5. most school support staff cannot work all year round 6. School support staff cannot access the severance scheme. Also if the money is already put into a school budget how will much of these proposals benefit the council. The whole proposal structure is morally deficient and badly thought through both on the levels of equality and long term consequences.

Tameside only pays 10% of GMPF's costs, so why should we take the full brunt of the cuts?

Targeting sick pay, penalizes the most vulnerable colleagues at a time of need, when TMBC has always in the past proved itself to be a compassionate employer.

Teaching Assistants have already been through pay and grading and pension reductions. We shouldn't be having further reductions. If this government is for the workers it's not for the workers at the lower pay end. Stop wasting money on bronze monuments. Mps and councillors can afford to pay for their own transport, fancy lunches. They all should have pay cuts at a time like this not families who rely on small amounts of money. We are all hard working people not squandering benefits.

Thanks and a merry Christmas to you too

The 3 day no sick pay proposal is disgraceful for school staff, who are in an extremely vulnerable position given the amount of infections that they are exposed to. The current rule is that if you contract a sickness/ diarrhoea bug you MUST stay off for at least 48 hours. We have no option but to deal with children who are ill, therefore putting ourselves at risk. Are we now to also be financially penalised?

<p>The changes to car use are offering very marginal savings, relative to the impact on workers who need a car for work. I never owned a car before having a job with essential car user status.</p>
<p>The cost of living has increased therefore any pay cut could cause serious issues for many families especially if more than one person works for the council</p>
<p>The council should not be asking staff who have suffered pay freezes for years to have further reductions in pay and conditions</p>
<p>The few of us that remain are and continue to take on additional work consider this to be a step too far and will destroy the good will which enables the Council to survive. This will destroy moral forever. Please think again.</p>
<p>The idea that TMBC is even considering lowering wages and removing hard won benefits is a disgrace. I have put these proposals in order to the best of my ability but it really is choosing between something poor and something very poor. I object and oppose all of these changes and will make this known. As an employer, TMBC should be ashamed.</p>
<p>The implementation of 3 days unpaid leave would be unfair for staff who are term time only and required to work with the schools during their term time weeks. School based, 39 week contracts, have some give in them if staff miss training days, although this would seem a backwards step in terms of developing staff alongside the teaching staff. Those who are on 38 week contracts have no give at all.</p>
<p>The least agreeable is the 2% pay cut, this will effect many people financially and could possibly put people into crisis. I also think that the proposals for sick will encourage people to come into work sick which could then have a major impact on business continuity if more people ended up going off sick due to people coming into work contagious. The drop in sick pay could also impact on people recovering from major surgery or cancer for example, people do not to be worrying about their finances will recovering from serious illness. Not many people in the organisation take long periods of sick leave for trivial things.</p>
<p>The main suggestion I have issue with is the removal of the night enhancement - I only work nights for the third time enhancement which in turn pays for my nursery fees. I would not work nights if it was not beneficial financially as I could get a job closer to home during the day for the same money as I earn on my basic wage at Tameside. Working nights interferes with a night worker's social and family life, especially at weekend and at Christmas - which I would not be prepared to sacrifice for the same money as I could earn in a regular 9-5. Night work also has proven physical effects that impact a worker's health - I do not know many people who would work nights without a financial incentive to compensate for the physical and emotional toll on a shift workers wellbeing. I believe if you do remove the nights enhancement, there will be many workers who will either refuse to work nights or find alternative employment altogether leaving essential services short staffed for night cover, as without the enhancement it would be difficult to fill the night positions.</p>
<p>The mandatory 3 days leave would reduce my wage significantly each month. If a pay reduction was also implemented this would mean my wage would not cover the cost of my living expenses leading me into debt and ultimately homeless. Also the first 3 sick days not being paid would greatly affect me and my colleagues as we work in a school where the occasional odd day off is required due to the nature of the job and the germs passed around. By taking this money off us it would mean we would either come to work ill, ultimately leading to us becoming more ill and meaning a greater expense to the council and our health, or our wages would be reduced once again leading to debt and ill health which leads to more money being spent by the council/</p>
<p>the only people these proposals are going to affect are the front line staff who are actually the back bone holding the services together. where are the councilors cuts?</p>
<p>The only thing that attracts people to work for Tameside is the terms and conditions. Take them away and a lot of staff will leave. Plus as a GMPF member of staff my wage is only subsidised by TMBC by a small percentage. So cutting my salary by £200 will probably only save Tameside MBC £20. How is that a fair way of doing things? Plus why the increase in salary for grades A and B?!!!</p>
<p>The outlook from the questions are aimed primarily at the lower ranks of the day-to-day front line staff. Why? If a cross section of the council cuts are required, why is only a small part of the council asked about in your questionnaire.</p>

<p>The pay freeze would be fairer to all staff, in effect it is a pay cut but your wage will stay the same and not reduce.</p>
<p>The priority in reducing workforce costs should be to protect and enhance the pay of employees paid the least. No pay for the first 3 days of sickness may reduce the number of occasions of employee sickness but will likely result in people who are sick coming to work when they are not well enough to, spreading germs, increasing the time it takes them to get well and reducing productivity.</p>
<p>The process of compulsory ranking the proposals appears disingenuous as it is designed to produce a predetermined result. Those not affected by a proposal (enhanced payments for example) are likely to choose those proposals over those of direct impact. The fact that the proposals must be ranked as a precondition before comments can be made may result in a skewed outcome. On a general point, as a result of several rounds of severance, those who remain are faced with very difficult circumstances of meeting an ever expanding workload with fewer resources. This can result in staff being placed in a very stressful position which is exacerbated by proposed changes to working conditions. Should a vacant post be filled then feel free to advertise it on inferior terms and conditions. In that way people have made a voluntary choice to accept the terms or not. It concerns me greatly that proposals to change sickness arrangements have a greater impact on people with disabilities. If sick pay is removed for the first 3 days, people who are genuinely ill will come into work. If people are not genuinely ill then this should be addressed through the appropriate policy and not as a result of a policy affecting all. People with a disability are often more susceptible to illness and if they become ill are likely to suffer to a greater extent than someone without a disability.</p>
<p>The proposals are very mean to already overworked staff and current cost of living is going to impact on staff lifestyles if implemented and can result in staff getting depressed and reduction in productivity,</p>
<p>The proposal for unpaid 3 days sick is unacceptable for those who have known medical conditions! The 3 days unpaid leave - should you start this in September and therefore make reductions over 7 months - this would be a huge shock to people. For me this would be £45.85 a month which may not sound a lot but is a food shop! If you are doing this - pro rata it! and we should not be told when to take the leave. You have given examples for each proposal and what reduction that is for an individual but not given examples should proposal X,Y and Z happen - understand the impact of that collective cost! I was not happy having to rank the proposals because what I find acceptable is not for another person. It needs to be clear that in effect you are wanting a cheaper workforce and that you can't say 'no more redundancies' and with those already left on VS the ones remaining are doing more work for less.</p>
<p>The proposal of not paying sick pay should stop employees taking time off for the odd day here and there. Totally agree</p>
<p>The proposals implemented need to affect the workforce as a whole and not impact on service delivery. Some of the options are specific to certain areas like adult/children's care and if staff are expected to work weekends and at night then they should be paid for those anti social hours. The options picked have got to be fair.</p>
<p>The proposed changes to statutory sick pay are ridiculous. If these go through employees will drag themselves into work spreading disease rather than loose pay, equally if the first three days are unpaid employees will be make sure that drag out the sickness leave. This is also an awful way to treat employees who have long term health issues or who require a sustained period of leave due to a major medical issue such as treatment for cancer.</p>
<p>The sickness proposals really concern me, I have knowledge from other workforces who impose penalties for being sick and the outcome is not very good. you either end up with people then taking more time off knowing they will not be paid for the first 3 days so think they would take the week off. Or people drag themselves in with the little energy and spread their germs around to those with a poor immunity who in turn end up being poorly and spread the germs even further through the community. unpaid leave could be increased in my opinion from 3 days to 10 days to save money. at least with this option you are able to be off and something with your time. all bank holiday work should cease if you are not able to have your bank holiday time back.</p>
<p>The social care staff seem to be one of the worse to be hit by these cuts. We work 7 days a week 52 weeks of the year and will be quite a lot of money down each month .</p>

The survey format could give results that demonstrate more concern or importance for say enhanced pay or sick pay where it's not of great concern but one of the options has to be voted as a concern
The survey is not acceptable, as all the questions are not agreeable. I feel that all the proposals are disgusting. We work hard for this authority and you expect more from us and want to reduce all out terms and conditions. NOT ACCEPTABLE
The three days unpaid sick leave is ridiculous idea, I'm very rarely ill and if I am off I'm ill and not well enough to be in work. All you will achieve here is staff will come in ill rather than taking the necessary time off to get right and more than likely spread germs etc to other staff so the whole workforce gets sick. I can't afford to lose pay if I'm ill. It feels like we'll be punished for something that can't be helped!
There are a small number of staff who work out of hour I feel the proposals are all aimed at us. we also happen to be the lowest paid
There are some good suggestions but I feel freezing pay and/or decreasing pay will further add to your staffs anxieties particularly with those who have families and are now having to pay for extra care for their children at weekends as well as in the week.
There is a fine balance to be struck between reducing pay and conditions and losing the staff who are fundamental to the long term success of the organization in meeting the considerable challenges we face. Reductions in enhancements should be the first consideration, but with a degree of protection for the lowest paid staff. Unpaid leave has proved to be a 'popular' proposal in most other authorities. Sick pay proposals can disadvantage some of our most vulnerable staff during a vulnerable stage in their life. Reductions in pay and pay freezes are like to be counter-productive and result in a reduction in staff morale, reduced productivity and the loss of key individuals who are the future of the organization. Many of our staff live in Tameside and reducing their wages will have a detrimental on the wider local economy and economic growth in Tameside
There shouldn't be any overtime (at enhanced rates), there should be banks of casual staff for extra hours needed. Changes to sick pay would probably improve attendance rather than save money!
There will never be equality between council staff and school support staff because we cannot decide when to have holidays we have to take them during school holidays.
These changes will affect employees who have caring roles, possibly more women than men, and those with disabilities or long term illness's. This targets marginalised members of society. I feel the highest paid earners should be targeted not the front line workers.
these cuts proposed appear to only effect the lower paid, perhaps it should be a sliding scale of wage cuts with higher paid staff taking bigger cuts ie 100,000 10% cut and 10,000 1% cut this would be fairer as everybody gets a cut but those who are on more money pay a higher reduction
These measures will hit single wage households the hardest, particularly single parents.
These proposals are affecting the people who are already the lowest paid members of staff. I work in a school and I see the time and effort support staff put into their roles every day. Most days working too many hours, doing tasks that are not technically their responsibility and putting children first at all times. Children are the future and they need all the help they can get. The support staff who get verbally, and sometimes physically abused, are already feeling the pressure of being understaffed and unappreciated and what do the council decide to do?? Kick them even lower. I am 23 years of age and this is my first 'proper' job. After working in retail for 6 years I decided to take the leap and get a more rewarding job where I will be making a difference. A job where I can be proud of what I am doing and see the impact I have on young people's lives. How wrong I was! I am outraged that a council I voted for and an area I have lived my entire life, and on rare occasion been proud of, has got to this point where staff who are already underpaid are having a PAY CUT!! Which ever way this comes out we are going to be losing out which is outrageous.
These proposals are very demoralising, especially after going through the recent pay and grading. I am a very conscientious and dedicated worker and feel undervalued.
think decision has already been made any way .
Think it is unfair to take any money off hardworking staff who are dedicated in working for the Council.
Think not paying staff when they are sick for 3 days is unfair. Don't penalise dedicated staff financially.

<p>Think that stopping pay for 3 days sick is dangerous. People will stay off longer or staff will come to work ill. Also inequality issues with this proposal. Don't penalise dedicated hardworking staff financially. Will only demotivate good staff.</p>
<p>This is bad timing when the CEO pay claim is being put forward. This does not show an 'all in it together' attitude for remaining, loyal staff</p>
<p>This survey makes you rate options before giving you chance to make comments. All options may be undesirable to some people but we were not able to state this we just had to rate them between 1 - 15.</p>
<p>To freeze pay but pay enhancements on nights and weekends when you are working unsociable hours.</p>
<p>to reduce the pay of any employee I find unacceptable but for the survey I had to put a number and it had to be different to the rest which I think is unacceptable</p>
<p>unfair that some proposed measures are front loaded as whole year savings to be made in 7 months</p>
<p>Very concerned about the proposal 2. This would punish employees who are genuinely sick and encourages presentee-ism. This could result in employees being in work when they are not fit to be there because they cannot afford not to be. This results in a health and safety risk to the employee, their colleagues and their clients. In addition some employees e.g. school support staff, are in a high risk area for catching the bugs brought in by pupils. Should they be punished if their caring role results in them contracting an illness. This is also very difficult for families to budget for. Suddenly losing 3 days pay could mean a family not eating for a week! At least with other proposals the reduction in pay can be planned for. These proposals risk the good education of the children of Tameside, as good quality teaching assistants will not be able to afford to stay in</p>
<p>very unfair to all concerned !!</p>
<p>We are doing more and more for less and there will be a wide decrease in morale</p>
<p>we have been through a pay and grading to get correct rates of pay i fall into the e brackett as the only wage earner in the household any loss to me would be significant . We have all taken on extra jobs at no extra pay and i think to reduce pay would be a step too far for most employees</p>
<p>We should be paying the Living Wage to the lower earners. Amending sickness benefits may discriminate against people who are genuinely ill. Contacts of employments should be reviewed where enhancements are currently paid to have 7 day / 24 hr working where this is necessary with a reduction in the additional payments as it should just be part of specific jobs and their work patterns. We should not be paying higher rates than HMRC mileage rates Essential user should be removed, as this is not necessary. The option to have 3 days unpaid mandatory leave could be reduced to 1 or 2, which may be more acceptable to employees across the</p>
<p>We should not be voting on reducing any of the terms and conditions that the Unions have fought for over the years.</p>
<p>We work very hard each and every day, with no anual increments or bonuses. i feel that is very very unfair for a pay decrease to even be considerd. It makes me feel asif im not valued as a member of the council, asif im not worth the money i work very hard to earn.</p>
<p>What are politicians doing to tackle the funding issue, we have heard no protests or comment to central gov? The cuts are arbitrary and have no foundation. We are doing the work of those who have left !</p>
<p>what may not impose hardship on higher earners, will have a big impact on majority of staff working for the Authority.</p>
<p>What will this do for staff morale that is at an all time low already? We have had the stuffing knocked out of us in recent years. We have half the staff, double the workload and now you hit us with this.</p>
<p>Whilst changes like this are unfortunate as an employee I do understand why these need to be investigated.</p>

Whilst I appreciate that the cuts imposed by central government are largely responsible for the need to make savings and also that these cuts have disproportionately affected councils like TMBC who administrate in deprived areas, however at some point as a council you have to say enough is enough as the remaining workforce cannot be affected by this for much longer. Not only have they been absorbing massive amounts of additional work of those colleagues who have taken severance but have also been forced to accept below inflation pay rises and for a number of year a pay freeze, which in real terms is effectively a massive pay cut and after all that just when we are being told the economy is turning a corner and on the up what thanks do we get more cuts and potential detrimental changes to our terms and conditions. This cannot go on. Local Councils no longer exist and they should look at more viable ways of providing local administration.

Whilst I appreciate we need to find ways to cut costs, we need to make sure that we have salaries that are competitive enough to attract talented people. Cutting pay and making the wage of certain roles out of line with the market may mean that our good quality/talented individuals leave to a job with a better wage which could have a devastating impact on the quality of our service.

Whilst I understand that in order to get a full year effect of any of the proposal implemented in 2016/17 that you want to deduct the full years deductions over 7 months, this will be a big hit on employees pay packets. I would favour the deductions continuing for a longer period but being no more than 1/12th of any planned

Whilst I understand the need to save more money rather than face redundancies some of these proposals will affect me greatly now that I have to work shifts. I would prefer a pay freeze rather than repay money each month as I am the main wage earner due to my spouse's ill health, as it would provide the largest savings. Although I have in recent years had ill health I also feel this would provide a good amount of savings rather than take money out of our monthly wages.

Why are the lowest paid people being targeted again?

why not keep band A and B at national minimum wage?

Without the overtime some jobs just will not get done, in time or on budget. In addition the emergency out of hours officers may reduce with the current proposals.

working in services that operate and provide a quality 24 hours a day 7 days a week provision removing a night rate would make night workers choose to work days instead of unsociable hours where there is more support available instead of having to use their own intuition and decisions. When we become an ICO will social care staff then be on even less money creating a further wage gap from our colleagues.

Would like none of these proposals to come in: PROPOSALS 13, 14 and 15

You will already know from statistics that people working in schools come into contact with many nasty bugs and have to take time off - health protection agency recommend 48 hours for sickness - how do you expect them to come into work when their vomiting everywhere - this is going to happen if you stop paying sickness for the first 3 days? Also, many employees working in schools do so because they have children and term time working is perfect, these are mostly women, many being single - how do you expect them to manage if you reduce their basis pay? All the discretionary effort which has just returned following pay and grading, will disappear overnight and you'll also find people will work to their job description. In schools this will cause many problems and you will find very experienced employees will leave and schools will find themselves in the same situation that the council have - no one with any knowledge will be left!

