

Feedback	Mandatory Unpaid Leave Comments (7 people responded formally)	Category
1	I would like to say how disappointed I am that you are proposing 1.5 days mandatory leave. I thought the plan was to scrap this if there were enough staff taking the voluntary unpaid leave. I have no wish for any extra leave as we already get a very generous allowance. I certainly don't want leave that I don't get paid for as this is no different to a pay cut.	Pay Cut/Impact on provision of service
	The main problem though is the serious knock on effect on our service – Access Trafford. We are front-line customer service & as staff already have a generous leave allowance trying to fit in leave for all my staff is extremely difficult . The knock on effect is then on the service – essentially our customers which I feel should be taken into account. I believe front line staff in a customer service roles should be exempt from this unpaid leave thus ensuring we are able to provide a high level of service at all times.	
	I would be grateful for this to be taken into consideration	
2	Whilst the move to a voluntary leave scheme is the much preferred option, the voluntary leave scheme needs service areas to make adjustments in order to build on its success.	Impact on the service of Mandatory Unpaid and Voluntary Unpaid Leave
	Many of the staff members signing up for voluntary leave have done so in order to cover child care issues during school holidays and bring a better work-life balance for the whole family. Many staff members have embraced the additional leave scheme whilst managers, approving the additional leave requests, have made little or no adjustments to accommodate this leave in the known, predicted, popular periods.	
	Everybody is in agreement that the needs of the service must come first but there must be a recognition that additional leave cannot be accommodated if draconian rules on the number of staff, allowed off at a particular time, remain in place as per prior to the schemes introduction. Service areas should be encouraged to meet leave requests where ever possible and consider a consultation approach with the staff to accommodate leave where possible especially when voluntary leave has been approved. An approach of, “you can have the leave but only when I say so” is not going to work and staff are already considering withdrawing (or reducing days) from the scheme because it cannot meet their needs and expectations.	
	To build on the success and meet the desire to go to a purely voluntary scheme needs commitment from all not just staff members.	
3	I would like to point out that Trafford Council has now effectively legally imposed a pay cut by way of	Pay

	mandatory leave on all its contractual employees for the last 6 years and in my opinion, this has been more than enough time for the employees to be penalised for working for Trafford Council.	Cut/Unfair/Personal impact on leavers/Affect on pension
	Several of my colleagues have bought extra leave for the next leave year on the basis that the mandatory leave would not be happening, perhaps in the, now mistaken, belief that if enough of them did buy the extra leave then the mandatory leave proposal would not be necessary for the 2017 leave year.	
	I personally intend to leave Trafford Council at the end of April 2017 as a full time employee of 20 years. I would have gone part time for the last 10 years before I reached (hopefully!) my pension age of 66 years and 1 month, but the final salary pension basis makes this an impossible option, as I would take too big a hit on my pension.	
	Because I would have only one month of leave entitlement before the end of April, I have not bought any additional leave for 2017/18.	
	I object to signing a mandatory agreement to commit myself for the 1 and a half days because this would mean that I have to go through a tortuous process with Trafford to get back the 1 HOUR that I would be taking the mandatory leave. This would mean a waste of money and time for all concerned.	
	If there should be a more rational and sensible way of sorting this out, I would appreciate it if someone would contact me directly about this, if the mandatory leave should be imposed for 2017.	
	All in all, I am appalled, as a full time employee, to see that Trafford Council is now becoming a council staffed by more and more casual workers.	
	Trafford's few remaining full-time staff are being put under intolerable pressure enough, having to do their job and continuously be training the constant stream of casual workers as well!	
	This new mandatory leave consultation is the final straw for me and many others.	
	I would appreciate a reply to this email.	
4	When this was first proposed in 2014 from April 15 onwards Staff were clearly informed that this would have no impact on their pension	Impact on pension. Is it worth implementing for 1.5 days
	It then transpired, after MUL had been implemented, that it would have an effect on staffs pension and staff would have to make the equivalent contributions for the three days etc to be matched by the Council etc to have continuous service.	
	I recall that the rules had changed in the interim, but it is difficult to believe that these impending changes had been properly researched when staff were informed that their pensions would not be affected. All in all	

	a bit of a PR disaster but it is what it is and obviously staff would rather lose three day's pay then risk losing their job.	
	On a positive side for the majority of staff this 3 days coincides with the Christmas closedown so we get three extra days leave a year and don't have to take any of our regular entitlement at Christmas	
	The proposal now is to reduce MUL by half to 1.5 days, a welcome proposal but still with the impact on staff pension re continuous service etc.	
	Recent information re the Voluntary Unpaid Leave (VUL) scheme shows that almost 60% of the initial MUL of £500k met has been met (£290k/£500k)	
	The present proposal halves the benefits of the 3 days but keeps the process of having to make extra pension contributions etc	
	I realise that staff will be better off financially each month and have to make less contributions but for the sake of 1.5 days I have to question whether it is all worth it	
	Whilst it is admirable that the Council seeks to give half of the MUL back it is an untidy compromise with the pros and cons equally halved	
	My view is that we should either keep the 3 days that we are now used to or scrap the MUL altogether and try to find the £210k elsewhere and if we can't do the latter then stick with the former.	
5	The proposed Mandatory Leave Scheme remains an ill-thought through proposal. It presents as a miserly, apologetic and unimaginative plan that serves only to drive staff confidence and morale ever lower.	Pay cut/Unfair
	The principle that employees are required to subsidise the services they provide for the customer is completely ignored once more. If I buy a product or service, it is at a known price and I either pay that price or I do not buy. Trafford has agreed to buy my labour for an agreed price, but now will not pay that price. I am consequently subsidising the services Trafford provides. Why? I do not use any of Trafford's services but am expected to contribute to them. Again, why? I do not expect the checkout staff in supermarkets to pay 50p towards my bill each time I visit, nor does the meter reader give me £1 towards my gas bill every time he/she visits, yet I am forced to do this for Trafford's residents. Whatever is the cost of providing services to Trafford's residents, the residents should pay it through Council Tax. The people providing those services are not, and should not, be part of that equation. The whole principle and practice is illogical, unfair, inequitable and indefensible.	
	It is noticeable that some members of staff are exempted from this proposal. Why is a full list of exemptions not provided? Are schoolteachers still exempt? If so, some of the Council's best paid employees do not have to contribute, whilst lesser paid staff must. Equitable? Fair? Justifiable? Moral?	
	The principle of offering unpaid leave has consequences too. Your figures show that some £250,000 will be 'saved' through this measure. This is not true. Some £250,000 worth of work will have to be done by someone else - those people who remain at work. The unpaid leave proposal will appeal to the more	

	affluent members of staff, and will leave their less affluent colleagues to do the additional work. The work doesn't go away, it doesn't disappear into the air. It gets done by the people who can't afford to take unpaid leave – the less affluent members of staff. The poor will again be subsidising the rich. Again ask the question: Is this equitable, fair, justifiable or moral?	
	The whole matter must be looked at through the eyes of the people who will lose money - the staff who work here. The same people who are expected to contribute more, show greater commitment, be ever more efficient and act-up in more senior positions are being financially penalised for a fourth year. At what point will the Council Tax payers be asked to foot the bill for the services they receive? At what point will the Council see its staff as an asset and not a cost centre?	
	I have not the faintest doubt that these issues will be ignored in the face of “the incontrovertible proof” of a spreadsheet. The spreadsheet may show the price but it does not show the cost. The Council should abandon this proposal and pay its officers their agreed rate of pay.	
6	I wish to give feedback on the proposal to continue with the Unpaid mandatory leave for a further year from April 2017.	Impact on service/Paycut
	I am very concerned at this and I do not support this proposal in any way and I consider it to be wholly without foundation and contrary to the councils policy of valuing and appreciating its staff.	
	This is a pay cut and demoralising to staff who are continually being asked to do more for less and should be reconsidered.	
	I understand that staff were able to apply to voluntary take unpaid leave and some staff did so having regard to their own circumstances etc that I have no problem with that and that scheme should be reopened with a view to ensuring that those who wish to do that can avail themselves of that opportunity but to force an unpaid scheme on staff again when prices and council tax are starting to rise again is not the way forward.	
	The department I work in Access Trafford has seen significant cuts to staffing and an increase in tasks to be undertaken moreover the leave policy makes it difficult for staff to take their allocation of leave without having additional unpaid leave forced on them.	
7	Please be aware I have accepted this but reluctantly as it has a major effect on our front line customer service	Impact on customer service