

### HR Transformation – phase 3

#### Transport for London – based on discussions and informal feedback with TfL TU representatives

Resources limited and minutes often late

Weekly meetings compromised quality of dialogue in consultation. Often the business didn't have the time to turn around information requested and therefore consultation always started on the back foot, repeating requests, confirming that previous questions has been answered. When proposals were shared frequency of meetings also meant that reps weren't able to go out to staff to thoroughly consult – this was more of an issue where there were large workforces in scope or across multiple locations.

Reps not being from business area meant that time was needed to invest in business familiarisation, reps weren't always clear about the representations they were making on behalf of staff and didn't know the right questions to ask. Meant that often dialogue in consultation became very transactional rather than meaningful.

Final decisions and escalation – no understanding of consultation and how and where decisions are made.

Clarity on what matters are subject to consultation and what information can aid understanding of a particular issue.

Length of consultation is not a measure of its meaningfulness. The complexity of the change and the relative different impacts on different groups of people will determine the length of discussion required.

There needs to be a collective understanding of what meaningful is.

Consultation not negotiation. The role of the union is to listen and represent.

Consultation should be a working partnership in which our people are supported through change. Route to collaboration is trust. If our people understand the rationale for decisions being made and management treat people like adults then they will be more likely to engage.

Need to explain what proposals mean in reality. Black and white to technicolour. Reps couldn't see how the new models would work in reality and this in turn made it difficult for them to engage meaningfully with staff.

The case for change needs to describe how it will work not just what it is.

Business owners who are accountable leading consultation is critical.

Employees supporting consultation as subject matter experts. Identify SMEs within the workforce to help the unions make informed representations.



No clarity on timescales the business was working towards.

Business were comfortable making commitments in writing however then didn't stay true to those commitment.

Perceptions that proposals were developed on the hoof – some misunderstanding of what a proposal actually is and what it is not.

Manage expectations of what information will be shared in advance and what will be shared during the consultation meetings.

Some lack of consistency in being prepared for meetings. Paperwork often incorrect and questions to answers not responded to in a reasonable time.

Tension re: workstreams offering EVS and some not.

Information sharing with staff and consistency across workstreams. Sharing job descriptions indicates confidence in the model – this needs to be balanced with indicating that your consultation is a fait accompli.

Some business areas just explained the proposals rather than explaining why they have been formed in the way they have.

Staff briefings worked well when they detailed what proposals meant to particular groups of staff.

Variability in capability and experience of reps particularly on policy issues.

Timing of comms is critical – often if they were done shortly after meeting with the reps it meant that a lot of questions staff had could be answered by the business meaning that questions to the reps could be more focussed.

Prepare your people for change – some have not been through organisational change for a number of years and so are unfamiliar with selection and assessment/the change process.

Often as disparate teams across HR contribute to the change process information can often be inconsistent.

Lack of willingness in some areas to give consideration to mutually agreeable solutions.

Deadlines often more important than the quality of the output.

Standardisation across workstreams in some of the administrative elements e.g. templates for action logs/agendas/formation of minutes. As the same reps were supporting different workstreams this meant that there was variability in the information they had available.

Statements rather than discussions on explaining proposals. Often these were just read out in consultation which meant there was a perception that genuine discussion could not take place.



CAP process not clearly communicated which meant that where H&S reps were involved they focussed on the procedural elements either being followed or not being followed rather than discussions taking place on the content.

Unclear about the role of the central transformation team post consultation launch. Some workstreams continued to reference questions being outstanding with the central team which meant that discussions were often put on hold.

Some areas continued to use NPL throughout the change without an explanation provided about what they were doing and whether roles would be suitable as an alternative to some at risk of redundancy.

## **London Underground - based on discussions and informal feedback with LU MATS Functional Council TU representatives**

Clarity on the use of grievances and appeals during and after consultation.

Precedents being set in some workstreams having an impact on others. Breakfast meetings were incredibly useful and still not sure why they stopped.

Some workstreams too rigid – fixed rather than responsive responses being provided.

- 'happy to provide a written response to that question'.... 'moving on...' unions felt at time their questions or representations were being dismissed or not taken seriously.

Workshop drop-ins not focussed. Often some changes were complex and different groupings had conflicting or competing priorities, this meant collective representations were difficult.

- 'if you have an issue speak to your rep...' meant that the business weren't taking accountability where staff had particular issues, line managers not understanding or taking accountability where groups of staff were disgruntled.

Agendas and structure of consultation meetings not shared. Often management dictated the dialogue rather than it be responsive to the issues important for people in scope – meant that it become increasingly frustrated in drop-ins as staff didn't feel listened to.

Accountable leaders – where workstream leads were detached from the business areas it meant that they led consultation like a process.

Errors with paperwork.

Briefings – positive that reps were invited however without foresight of what would be discussed it meant that the reps were on the back-foot from the start. No clarity on why individuals were actually invited as they were out of scope – meant that for weeks they wondered whether they were in or out of scope of the change – understand that the business wanted to be transparent with all however it meant those at risk didn't get the chance to have a focussed discussion on impact.

Briefings should have been structured to allow union section at the end.



Drop-ins should be focussed/concentrated on those with the biggest impact. Often those who were just impacted on the periphery took over.

Pre-engagement would have been useful – talk about ways of working/business familiarisation and explaining what the actual issue the proposals were seeking to resolve were.

Information shared too disparate – difficult when a number of workstreams were being consulted upon in tandem. In previous changes workstreams have provided binders which were updated with hard copy information.

Continued battle for information – some workstream leads didn't want to provide it as they didn't understand its relevance to the process.

Value in an independent Chair who invites business representation.

Business owners were key

Evident in some workstreams that pre-meets had not taken place, often observed management to be disagreeable in what they said, was evident in the way that adjournments were called about simple things such as being asked questions about the process or how a proposal had been formed. Unions would have expected adjournments to consider the representations they made rather than just to agree an answer to a simple question.

Without a 'day in the life of' discussion it meant that there wasn't really clarity on what the end goal was – meant that there wasn't focus to the discussion as couldn't understand the end point.

Issues with trust – what information would and wouldn't be shared, observed that the management teams in some workstreams didn't want to share information as they wanted to have the upper hand.

Facilities to support unions not sufficient – made it difficult for unions to have effective pre-meets as a collective which meant that often each union would work independently of the collective and focus on representing their own members rather than the collective.

No consistency in competency across the rep community – as different groupings were pulled together from different parts of the machinery in the initial stages there were some very different working styles to get used to.

Would have been value in management being available for staff drop ins – management could present and clarify any questions of fact and then leave to allow the unions to obtain feedback.

Business continued to confuse 'consultation' – in one breath they said that they didn't need to agree however then said to staff 'the unions have agreed' – it isn't the unions that want to negotiate but the business as they want someone to blame when staff are disagreeable about a particular issue.

Pools based on job descriptions which were already out of date – would have been useful to do a wholesale update in advance to genuinely understand what people are doing. Judgements on pooling were often made based on 20 year old information.



Counter-proposals – need to manage expectations. Were unions had good feedback on counter-proposals in consultation these were often dismissed after they were presented to Directors outside of the room. Unions can only believe this was about a power struggle rather than the content.

### From employee relations

Accountable leaders confirmed in advance of consultation launching. Even when they were confirmed they weren't familiar with the business change.

Allaying the fear of triggering consultation. Need to consider what we can do in advance of consultation to ensure that leaders lead.

Continued framing of change with a negative focus – assumes that the change will be complex and difficult which in turn affects our confidence in the proposals we make.

Business leads should use change as an opportunity to get to know the business areas, its challenges and its people. Instead this transformation has been seen as an addition to BAU.

Perception that proposals have been established during consultation rather than adequate preparation taking place in advance. Consultation should be an opportunity to refine rather than establish.

Roles and responsibilities across the teams have been variable and there hasn't been a collective view of the contributions each group should be making.

Reservations about responding to issues of contention in the room – fear of being caught out or making decisions which might have a wider impact. This has meant that engagement has been very transactional rather than discursive.

Need to consider the theory v reality of consultation and the demands it has upon the resilience of our management teams.

Consider the value offered to consultation from the LU central teams and associated steering groups – perception that these caused delays in decision making or removed the accountability of business leads in actually making decisions.

Continued reliance on legal advice and framing responses in consultation as such didn't enable meaningful dialogue e.g. 'the legal advice is X so this is our decision'.

Take the advice provided.

Using pauses in consultation to reflect, reconsider and replan rather than just pause.

Project plans focussed on outcomes rather than the activity needed to drive decisions.

Flow of consultation was clearly defined however the resources attached to inform decision making wasn't always available e.g. if we know that S&A will be discussed in week 8 why do we wait until week 7 to decide on a proposal.



Perception that delivery of the consultation was pushed back to employee relations.

Preparedness in advance of consultation commencing – some anxiety to dedicate resources to preparedness at the risk that it puts to the consultation being meaningful.

Mechanisms/infrastructure of consultation encourages it to be transactional rather than just a dialogue.

Positives with employee relations coming together and working more effectively to contribute with one voice.

