

# Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



## Oxford Living Wage Review Group

Date: **Tuesday 17 October 2017**

---

Time: **2.00 pm**

---

Place: **Long Room, Town Hall**

---

For any further information please contact:

**Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer**

Telephone: 01865 252230

Email: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

---

As a matter of courtesy, if you intend to record the meeting please let the Contact Officer know how you wish to do this before the start of the meeting.

# Oxford Living Wage Review Group

## Membership

### **Chair**

Councillor Mark Ladbrooke  
Councillor Angie Goff  
Councillor Dan Iley-Williamson  
Councillor Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan  
Councillor David Thomas – apologies received

### **HOW TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THE AGENDA**

In order to reduce the use of resources, our carbon footprint and our costs we will no longer produce paper copies of agenda over and above our minimum requirements. Paper copies may be looked at the Town Hall Reception and at Customer Services, St Aldate's and at the Westgate Library

A copy of the agenda may be:-

- Viewed on our website – [mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk](http://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk)
- Downloaded from our website
- Subscribed to electronically by registering online at [mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk](http://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk)

# AGENDA

## Pages

### 1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair will open the meeting.

### 2 APOLOGIES

### 3 EXTERNAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The Review Group have asked to invite evidence from large and small employers, business groups, workers who are directly affected by low pay, and agencies, professionals and faith groups in the city that support low paid workers.

The following people have agreed to attend this meeting to speak to the Review Group about issues related to low pay and the promotion of the Oxford Living Wage. The Chair will ask each external guest to speak for up to 5 minutes.

- Matt Padley, Centre for Research in Social Policy, Loughborough University
- Mark Fransham, social researcher (former City Council employee)
- Luke Marion, Finance & Commercial Director, Oxford Bus Company
- Sue Merrell, Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers
- Ed Thomas, Unison Brookes University
- Lamis Hamdi, Oxford University Islamic Society
- Eric Bossward, Church England St. Mary's Barton

### 4 PLENARY SESSION

An open discussion on implementing the Oxford Living Wage across the city in which the Review Group may wish to explore the following lines of inquiry:

- *What are the impacts of low pay on individuals and communities in the city; how widespread is this issue and in which sectors?*
- *What are the barriers to large and small employers in the city adopting a living wage policy?*
- *Would a Kitemarking system for the 'Oxford Living Wage' be workable?*
- *Is the Oxford Living Wage the best and most appropriate living wage rate for the Council to pay and promote more widely?*
- *What more could the Council do to promote the payment of a living wage and make it unacceptable for other employers in the city to not do so?*
- *Are there opportunities to strengthen encouragement to contractors and sub-contractors to pay a living wage? If not, what are the barriers? If so, what are the risks?*
- *What more could the Council do to publicise a living wage through publicity and communications such as Your Oxford, etc.?*

**5 CALL FOR EVIDENCE**

The Scrutiny Officer will provide a verbal update on the progress of the Review Group's call for evidence.

**6 NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The notes of the previous meetings are included for reference.

**7 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Meetings are scheduled as follows:

- 1 November 2017, 5pm
- 15 November 2017, 5pm

## **DECLARING INTERESTS**

### **General duty**

You must declare any disclosable pecuniary interests when the meeting reaches the item on the agenda headed "Declarations of Interest" or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

### **What is a disclosable pecuniary interest?**

Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to your\* employment; sponsorship (ie payment for expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties as a councillor or towards your election expenses); contracts; land in the Council's area; licenses for land in the Council's area; corporate tenancies; and securities. These declarations must be recorded in each councillor's Register of Interests which is publicly available on the Council's website.

### **Declaring an interest**

Where any matter disclosed in your Register of Interests is being considered at a meeting, you must declare that you have an interest. You should also disclose the nature as well as the existence of the interest.

If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest, after having declared it at the meeting you must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

### **Members' Code of Conduct and public perception**

Even if you do not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter, the Members' Code of Conduct says that a member "must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself" and that "you must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned". What this means is that the matter of interests must be viewed within the context of the Code as a whole and regard should continue to be paid to the perception of the public.

\*Disclosable pecuniary interests that must be declared are not only those of the member her or himself but also those member's spouse, civil partner or person they are living with as husband or wife or as if they were civil partners.

This page is intentionally left blank

## MINUTES OF THE OXFORD LIVING WAGE REVIEW GROUP

Tuesday 3 October 2017

www.oxford.gov.uk



**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Iley-Williamson, Ladbrooke (Chair), Lloyd-Shogbesan and Thomas.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Mish Tullar (Corporate Policy, Partnership and Communications Manager), Justin Thorne (HR Resourcing Business Partner), Steph Nichols (HR Business Partner), Andrew Brown (Scrutiny Officer).

**GUESTS PRESENT:** Emma Kosmin (Living Wage Foundation), Paul Medley (Oxford Food Bank), Fred Hanna and Ian Woodlands (Unite the Union).

### 13. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair opened the meeting.

### 14. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Angie Goff.

### 15. EXTERNAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The Living Wage Foundation Programme Manager said that the Foundation operated an accreditation system across the UK with a public kite mark. The Living Wage rate applied to the whole country outside of London, which had a separate London Living Wage rate, and was intended to be a floor. The rate of the Living Wage was calculated annually based on the cost of living and feedback from families about what items should be factored in to the calculation. Accredited employers pledged to pay the Living Wage to all employees aged over 18 and third party contractors. In doing so, employers signed a legal license agreement form. Around 3,000 UK employers had committed to paying the Living Wage. There was also a whistle blowing mechanism. On 6 November the Foundation would be publishing pay data and the newly calculated living wage rates. There was both a moral case and a business case for paying the Living Wage. The Foundation worked with businesses large and small in a number of ways and had lots of tools and resources. These included:

- A database and interactive map of businesses that pay the Living Wage;
- Legal guidance for public and private sector organisations on the Social Value Act 2012;
- A franchise model for accreditation (Scotland, Wales, Jersey, Hong Kong);
- An online shop;
- Digital packs;

- Guidance on applying the Living Wage to grant-funded posts (the 'Friendly Funders' scheme);
- A Living Wage people's movement.
- Social media;
- Mailing lists;
- Negotiation training.

The Review Group heard that 85 local authorities were accredited Living Wage employers but no other councils promoted their own rate that was different from both the Living Wage and the London Living Wage (which reflected the established system of 'London weighting'). The Living Wage Commission, which oversaw the methodology of the Living Wage, could listen to Oxford's case but there were complex factors to consider and the evidence suggested that accrediting one rate (outside of London) was the best and most successful approach. The UK kite marking system was a front runner internationally due to its simplicity. There was a need to listen to employers in the city, many of whom will operate across the UK, and to carefully consider the evidence base in determining which living wage rate was right for Oxford.

The Oxford Food Bank Chair of Trustees explained that his organisation collected surplus food and distributed it to over 80 organisations based in and around the city which were in contact with people experiencing low pay, unemployment and homelessness. Its operations had expanded over the last six months and were expected to continue to do so. Oxford Food Bank was volunteer-led but had a small staff team who were paid above the Living Wage. This was reflective of the cost of living in the city and the charity's wishes to give staff responsibility and to retain them. It was estimated that for every £1 donated, £20 worth of food would be distributed.

The Regional Officer of Unite the Union said that he negotiated on behalf of BMW workers and was proud of their terms and conditions. There were issues in terms of some contractors (not all of which recognised the union) not paying the Living Wage. The employees affected were typically cleaners, caterers and security staff. The Living Wage was built into tenders but it was very difficult to get up to the Oxford Living Wage because multi-year contracts were let at a fixed price. The contracting company would say they were not the employer and were hampered by the contract. This was typical from big employers who made very significant profits and could afford to pay a living wage. He said that in his experience, one of the more effective approaches was to embarrass employers.

The Regional Political Officer of Unite the Union said that the challenges were greatest in the traditionally insecure and low paid professions such as retail, construction, catering, etc., because the outsourcing of these services tended to create a race to the bottom in terms of pay. Since the Council passed its living wage motion there had been significant changes in employment patterns in South East England, in both the public and private sectors, including the rise of self-employment and insecure work. Economic growth had not translated into wage increases. The access trade unions had to potentially vulnerable workers was very restricted. The construction sector was a particular challenge due to the casual and short term nature of employment on particular projects.



## 16. PLENARY SESSION

The Council's HR Resourcing Business Partner said that following the Council motion the lowest pay grades had been removed to ensure that no employees were paid below the Oxford Living Wage (OLW). The lowest salary was currently equivalent to an hourly rate of £9.49 and this would rise to £9.79 from April 2018. It was difficult to enforce the payment of the Oxford Living Wage by contractors. In the case of Fusion Lifestyle it had not been included as a contractual obligation so the Council paid the difference. The Council had no zero hours contracts but did have some casual contracts e.g. for seasonal youth engagement work, and there was no obligation on these workers to accept the hours offered. Casual employees were paid at least the OLW and after 13 weeks they have a right to be paid the equivalent of permanent staff.

The Corporate Policy, Partnership and Communications Manager added that the Council had insisted on the payment of the OLW through large projects such as the Westgate redevelopment and the Barton joint venture. Living Wage Week presented a clear opportunity for the Council to state what it does and promote the OLW. Any wider campaigning would need to be driven by the Council's leadership but it would be possible, although resource intensive, to get the message out there by proactively targeting employers. A powerful campaign was possible but there was a need to be thoughtful and sensitive to the Council's partners. There was no register of employers who pay the OLW. If Oxford decided to move to the London Living Wage it would still be an outlier and this would be a confusing message to get across to employers from a communications perspective.

In discussion the Review Group also noted that:

- Local authorities had no levers to require contractors to pay a living wage to staff who weren't engaged on their contracts.
- One local authority had produced an ethical charter, which was aspirational in nature.
- One local authority had hired a part time officer to promote the Living Wage and co-ordinate a living wage leadership group.
- Some employers had separate minimum standards agreements with their contractors but this was not always an easy fit for sectors such as social care where many workers were self-employed.
- Unite would look at any campaign proposal because addressing low pay was central to their aims; the Regional Officer said he would take responsibility for pushing a living wage in Oxford if the Council committed some resource.
- Some charities may support a campaign but others would be wary of the political dimensions of doing so.
- The reopening of the Westgate Shopping Centre was creating upward pressure on wages as retailers competed to attract employees.

**17. CALL FOR EVIDENCE**

The Review Group agreed to shorten the survey by combining questions 7 & 8 and questions 10 & 11, and by removing questions 17 & 18.

**18. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Agreed.

**19. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Noted.

**The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 7.15 pm**