

Honorarium meeting 14 01 24

Minutes taken by Youth Officer David Short

Trish explained reason for calling meeting. A branch officer is reducing hours from five days to three days, so Trish believes that the honorarium should also be reduced. The officer disagrees that their honorarium should be reduced. The branch committee met in December and agreed that it would come to a special meeting. The officer believes that they are entitled to the five days' honorarium as they do work outside of their normal duties, such as with Serco.

Earl – seems like there should be some sort of formula.

Trish – the numbers were pulled out the air by previous secretaries

Earl – there needs to be way to quantify.

Joan – for three days work, it would be fair if it were three days' honorarium.

Earl – if there are no set hours, how can you work it out?

Hashi – none of it makes sense. If someone is working five days and reduced to three, keeping five days honorarium puts us in a difficult position - if someone needs to take over the other days then they will need the honorarium.

David – if the honorarium covers additional hours, then it should be based on additional hours, and doesn't necessarily line up to normal working hours

Hashi – we need to have working group to work this out.

Ron – agrees with working group, however we should resolve this officer's situation now.

Hashi worked out figure by taking current figure and multiplying 0.6. The new amount is £1018.80.

Trish – Blanka needs to get the balance, and Joan should also get more honorarium.

Earl – is this meeting the right forum to make this decision?

Trish wants to note that the officer wanted it to go to committee, and committee decided it should go to branch.

David – can we agree that there should be a mechanism for the officer to appeal the decision made at this meeting?

Ron – the officer should have a right to appeal decision as they have not been at the meeting.

Trish – the officer was invited to the meeting.

David – the officer has been off sick.

Blanka – if the meeting was online, perhaps the officer would have been able to attend.

Ron – let's pay the officer the full amount this February, and the decision can apply for future payments.

Hashi – we are an organisation that is concerned with workers' rights, so we should avoid potential for criticism in how we handle pay disputes. May be best to allow the full honorarium to go through this February.

Earl agreed.

Trish - we need to pay Blanka in the meantime.

David – understood that Blanka would not be paid for six months anyway as per honorarium probation rules.

Blanka - did not even know there was an honorarium with her role.

Ron – six months is a long probation. Is there anything in writing to say this?

Hashi – almost every aspect of this is confusing, lots that needs to be worked out in working group.

N Hamilton- Collins – need to draw up a policy.

Trish – we need to agree who is going to be on the working group.

Mahamad Hashi, Ron Stowell, Earl Richards, Trish Ennis, David Short – provisional members of working group.

Trish wanted to emphasise that she is not asking for more money.

Hashi proposed – in principle we agree that the honorarium is reduced to £1018.80, but the February payment should still be allowed to go out in full to give the member an opportunity to present a counterargument. Appeal process – would appeal to committee, by emailing to Branch president her intention to appeal. Deadline to appeal end of March. Voted unanimously

We agreed that the governance working group will meet on Wednesday 12th February.

Group agreed the officer should not be named in minutes.