

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

Organisation / Individual	Q1 Having regard to the intended scope of employment groups to be included, which employment groups do you think should be included within, or excluded from, the remit of a Public Services Commission and if so, why?	Q2 Do you support the development of a single Joint Negotiating Committee for employees of a Public Services Commission? If not, please indicate possible alternative arrangements.	Q3 Please indicate your preferred arrangements for determining the terms and conditions of service for manual and craft workers employed by Local Authorities who would not become employees of a Public Services Commission?	Q4 Which particular terms and conditions do you believe should be changed for new starters?	Any other comments	Actions as a result of comments received
Miss T Lyons	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	Blank	
Mrs S E Creamer	None included and all excluded. I oppose this new body.	No Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council. Leave as is.	None. It is unfair.	Blank	
Christine Hughes	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as it is this division of a group shows it is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Blank	
Anonymous	Blank	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None. Same T&C to all	Waste of Gov't money	
John Clague	Blank	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same for all	Waste of the Government's money	
Patrick Parish Commissioners	All public sector staff should be included	There should be a single negotiating committee	There should be universal basic conditions of employment	There should be no pension commitment, particularly in view of the likely transfer of some staff to local authority employment, not all of whom are members of the Local Government Pension Scheme. If there is to be a pension entitlement, this should be a Defined Contribution rather than defined benefit nature.	In years gone by, public sector staff received lower salaries when compared to the private sector, and this was compensated by better social and pension arrangements. It is now the case that public sector staff seem to be better paid than the private sector and yet retain all of these benefits.	
Maughold Parish Commissioners					Maughold Parish Commissioners have considered the consultation document in detail. They are of the opinion that the resultant Commission should include a representative of the Island's local authorities; perhaps nominated through an organisation such as the Isle of Man Municipal Association.	
R M Green	None included and all excluded. I am against the new idea as Whitley Council works extremely well already.	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None it would be unfair on people starting	It's a needless waste of money in a time when money is already tight	
K Johnson	Nothing included and all excluded. Oppose this proposed new body.	Certainly not. Whitley should not be broken	Proposal is no use	None. The whole thing is unfair and discriminatory.		
Marown Parish	No comment	No comment	Consider it important that no requirement for the provision of a pension scheme be included in the	No comment		
J R Slayle	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Malew Parish Commissioners					My Commissioners have read the consultation document and unfortunately feel that they are unable to answer the questions posed, as there is insufficient supporting information. The document refers to the independent review of the Whitley Council that was carried out by Dr Harris, but does not say why the recommendations made in that report were not implemented. There also appears to be a lack of information about the practicalities of changing terms and conditions, for example the legalities of such changes, obligation for pensions etc. And is this the start of a longer consultation process, if so will there be a 'loadmap' produced? The Commissioners agree that change is needed and a joint commission may be the best way forward, but without knowing further details of the future proposals and how local authorities fit in with that, it is difficult to provide meaningful response to the consultation.	
Anonymous	I don't think there should be any changes keep it as it is with Whitley Council	No keep things as they are Whitley Council is working well good terms of conditions	Whitley Council should stay	Keep it the same for all working staff. Do not change the terms and conditions.	Whitley Council should stay for all manual workers. All the changes are a waste of time and money. Please do not change - waste of (money)	
Public Sector Pensions Authority					Public Sector Pensions Authority.pdf	
Anonymous	None - all should be excluded. I oppose this because it opens up to reduced pay & employers to treat staff unfairly - people could end up on the breadline, bad for economy.	No - keep Whitley Council, it's not broken	Keep as it is with Whitley Council - division is no good long term	None - it opens to discrimination and people being treated unfairly	This proposal is bad for workers, families, economy & standard of living - it will be likely to increase job losses & people claiming benefits in long term.	
Prospect / GOA						GOA response was also supplied via survey monkey.
Douglas Borough Council	The Council considers that all Government employees should fall within the remit of the proposed Public Services Commission, including those proposed to be excluded by reason of analogy to UK terms and conditions. In order that the Commission can have oversight of all employment matters within the Government; and further, that the terms and conditions of local authority	The Council supports the establishment of a single Joint Negotiating Committee for employees of Government.	Should the Whitley Council cease to operate, the Council would support, at least as an interim measure pending an alternative being negotiated, the adoption of Public Services Commission terms and conditions for its manual and craft workers. Members felt that the remit of the Public Services Commission should include the terms and conditions of local authority manual and craft workers as the Whitley Council does now and that there should be a representative of local	The Council prefers not to comment in relation to the terms and conditions of civil service staff, in which it has had no previous involvement, but in relation to Whitley Council staff being transferred the Council feels that the principal change desirable would be to introduce a flexible working week enabling any five days out of seven to be worked as required by the employer.	Douglas Borough Council's Executive Committee has considered the consultation document relating to the proposal to form a Public Services Commission and directed me to express its general support for the Government in its efforts to modernise and streamline its processes.	
D Darbyshire	No	No	No	No	None	
Anonymous	None if possible - all in	Yes, as long as my terms and conditions remain largely unaffected	No changes	Blank	1. Sickness policy and pay require revising to combat far more assertively the abuse of the current system. Also an introduction of sick pay for years served. Full pay for minor illness requires review. 2. Government staff who accept redundancy payments should not be allowed to return to their work, such as we see in Social Care - working weekends and such like - happens now. Hours should be used for 'new post holders' or within Government. 3. Disciplinary procedures require urgent review so as to stop the nonsense of suspended staff receiving full pay whilst suspended. I have seen this time and time again and in one case for two years. This was for gross misconduct. All staff were completely demoralised with this. Especially when the suspended staff were in other full time employment as well. This has to stop. The system is crazy.	
J Howell	We do not need the expense of a new body, yet another waste of tax payers money! Why are we changing something which is not broken?	No I do not! We already have Whitley Council	The Memorandum of Agreement - Whitley Council	None, same terms and conditions to all - fair to all. Very unfair to new workers!	Because it is a waste of government money. Civil servants could be put to better use!	
Anonymous	Why do we need the expense of a new body?	No, I am happy with present terms and conditions with Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement, Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all, unfair to new workers	Very happy with Whitley Council, why change?	
Glenda Taylor	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
A Shannon	Why do we need the expense of a new body? Therefore, none	No - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council	Same T&C, make same to all to be fair		
Mrs L A Maddox	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No - Whitley leave as it is	Whitley Council. MOFA leave as it is	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
A Kneen	As stated in the scope - 2 out of 6 bodies to be amalgamated - what's the point if only 3 of employees are broken?	No - too much differences - too much work/money involved when money is to be saved.	Full negotiations and ballots - union and management agreements	None - everyone on same footing	Waste of money & time in this time of financial restraint	
A H Kennough	A new body is not required	No the Whitley Council is doing a good job!	There should be no division	None. Same terms and conditions for all	Seems just another way of grinding down the workforce (MORE FOR LESS!!!)	
Anonymous	I don't think we need a new body. It's just a waste of money which we are supposed to be trying to save. Why change something that is already working?	No I do not - there is nothing wrong with Whitley Council. Leave it as it is.	Whitley Council	None. It would be totally unfair to new workers to be on new terms and conditions.		
S Brew	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Peel Town Commissioners	No comment	No comment	Peel Town Commissioners would favour all manual and craft staff employed by local authorities on the Island forming a single collective negotiating body to determine terms and conditions of employment.			
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	This proposals abiding weakness, is 'No one can say what the eventual aim is'. What makes this proposal fatal is employees and skilled workers both suspect that whatever the AIM might be, it runs directly counter to their own interests and livelihood. Civil servants continue to reject any innovation that does not recognise their majority status.	
DCCL	The Department does not at this stage suggest that any of its employees should be outside the scope of the proposed commission, so long as appropriate mechanisms are in place for employment that is in some ways unusual. This Department has benefited greatly from the use of casual staff, seasonal staff, flexible term time only contracts and various training posts. Unpaid internships are currently being considered. If the proposed commission cannot provide the required flexibility of employment type, a request for large scale exemption may have to be made.	The Department does not support a single negotiating committee for all staff within the sector. It could support such an approach if Treasury were to return to the automatic adjustment of payroll budgets but would want to see improved consideration of Departmental views if central negotiation was to be entertained.	No comment	The Department would suggest that the following changes are essential for new starters: Significantly reduced sick pay entitlement. Elimination of premium pay for weekend or evening work. Flexible rostering without payment of a premium. Confirmation that capability to be progressed irrespective of sick leave. Provision of simplified dismissal procedures, particularly for civil service roles.	DCCL would support the introduction of a single employing body for those employees not linked to off-island pay arrangements. As an employer of a number of different employment groups, moves towards harmonisation of core entitlements for the Department's employees could assist in the overall management of the Department. The creation of a platform for the establishment and implementation of fair and equitable staff policies which could be implemented across not only the Department's different business areas and employment groups, but wherever possible across other Departments Boards and Offices, would be clearly beneficial. Matters such as sick pay, grievances, discipline and other core employment matters should be consistent across the Government. The opportunity should be taken to ensure that whatever policies are adopted by the new Commission are as fair to the employer and taxpayer as they are to the employee. The current lengthy processes probably benefit neither employer nor employee. The current entitlement of some work groups to 6 months full pay sick leave in every 12 month period is unsustainable, as is the retention of Whitley 'plussages' for responsibilities that are no longer part of a role. Improvements in the speed of making of local agreements are long overdue. The creation of this body will require harmonisation of current terms and conditions and great care must be taken in the selection of the approach that will be used going forward if the move is to help create a smaller, simpler and cheaper government. Although the principle is supported, there is a clear need to determine what should be common and under central control and what should be tailored and under local control. As an employer with a number of employment groups whose terms and conditions have evolved to meet the operational needs, this Department should retain the ability for local determination of operational matters. The delegation from the Commission should allow the Department to determine such issues as hours of work, grading and remuneration levels.	

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

DCCL continued						Whilst the consultation paper suggests that pay and terms and conditions should be dealt with on a collective bargaining basis, it is the experience of this Department that such an approach can be unhelpful; it is certainly a concern that pay negotiations can be conducted by officers with no responsibility for individual budgets. The Department would want to link pay to efficiency gains and other measures that reduce the overall employment costs and would suggest that the negotiation of pay and remuneration is the best process for securing these. The Department believes that the experience and concerns of operational management have not been routinely sought by those conducting negotiations under the existing arrangements; whilst it is accepted that there will be and should be areas that are centrally controlled and not delegated, improvements are most certainly required in the approach to understanding and representing the needs of employing Departments. This is especially the case if the scope of the proposed commission is to exceed that of the current Whitley and Civil Service arrangements.
C Johnson	Why change something that works well?	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Why waste tax payers money?	Whitley Council	Memorandum agreement	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all	Wasting Government money	
Anonymous	I don't agree with this new body therefore all groups should be excluded.	I am quite happy with Whitley Council and don't see any reason it should change.	Whitley Council is working perfectly well and should be left.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	It just seems a waste of money to change a service that is fulfilling its needs.	
Anonymous	I do not agree with this proposed new body therefore all groups should be excluded.	No, because Whitley Council works perfectly well.	Whitley Council is working and adequately to support our working needs.	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.		
IOM Chamber of Commerce	The IOM Chamber of Commerce believes it is important that all employees in the IOM Public Sector are governed by a unitary employers' organisation covering all roles and responsibilities. The historic fragmented approach to bargaining, common in the UK also, has created inconsistency across gradings, terms & conditions, pay rates and ultimately created a high cost organisation. The obvious way to remedy this for the future, is to apply consistent standards and approaches across all areas, using the same tools and measurements for all. This should encourage greater flexibility of roles and transferability of skills in line with changing taxpayer needs as well as allowing for greater benchmarking, especially against the private sector on the Island.	Yes - mainly for the reasons given above. Obviously all relevant unions should be involved.	In the interests of fairness and consistency all public sector employees on the Island should have consistent terms and conditions relating to their employment. This should be achieved "by analogy"	Controlling the overall cost and size of the IOM public sector has been identified by COMIN in "Agenda for Change" as a priority, and the full range of employment terms and conditions need considerable review. For new starters, the IOM Public Sector needs to consider its current pay and conditions against those that prevail in the IOM private sector as the Manx labour market is a competitive one. Opportunities to review key areas of: 1. Hours, 2. leave entitlement, 3. pay rates (standard and enhanced) 4. pension contributions should be taken and applied to new starters. The IOM Chamber of Commerce has been campaigning for 4 years to close the current pension scheme to new members, and we would expect this matter to be dealt with at the outset of the life of a new Public Sector employment body.	In principle the IOM Chamber of Commerce supports the creation of a Public Services Commission. The cost and cumbersome nature of our public sector cannot be allowed to impact the competitive advantage of the Island and the ability of our businesses to drive economic growth. We do remain concerned about the disproportionately high costs of providing the Public Sector on the Island and support any government action that enables us to retain a competitive edge in such difficult economic times.	
Mrs T Gardner	None included - I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Helen McMullen	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is, this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None, it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley does a valuable job	Whitley Council MoFA - leave things as they are division shows proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not, Whitley not broken	Whitley Council leave as is this division shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Mrs Maureen Moffatt	Happy the way things are	Always been happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same conditions for all		
Lesley Parker	Leave things as they are	Happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same conditions for all		
Miss Tina Searle	It must cost money to change to a new body, leave things as they are	I am happy with the situation as it is	Whitley Council	Same conditions for all, makes for a better working environment	It would be a waste of government money. Why fix something that's not broken?	
Manx National Heritage	MNH would suggest a single employing authority would be more effective, efficient and user-friendly in assisting us to manage our staffing resources. For MNH this would include Civil Servants and Whitley Council employees. For	We support the development of a single Joint Negotiating Committee, but would request a more transparent communication and feedback opportunity into this process.		For new starters premium/bank holiday payments should be removed.		
Department of Infrastructure					The Department is fully supportive of the proposal to establish a Public Services Commission which will be the employing authority of not only civil servants but also other categories of employees including manual and craft workers employed by Departments and Boards, under Whitley Council terms and conditions, and some other employees across central Government; principally those whose terms and conditions are analogous to the Civil Service or the Whitley Council. Currently the Department of Infrastructure has a number of different structures and mechanisms for employing staff which invariably means that at any one time the Department is dealing with a number of different employing bodies, representatives, differing terms and conditions and also local service agreements. To this end a single employment body would be helpful in ensuring equality in dealing with all employee terms and conditions. Such a proposal does not give the Department concern provided that there isn't a one size fits all set of TR&Cs. There must be a clear recognition and acceptance that some staff do not work Mon-Fri 9 - 5 or 8 - 4.30 and their TR&Cs need to reflect this type of working. The Department also believes that a much stronger provision needs to be made for management representation on the negotiating Committee. A wide ranging structure should be considered such as the establishment of sub-committees with delegated responsibilities from the Main Committee but would allow for more relevant management engagement in the process.	
Department of Infrastructure continued					The sub-committees could be given the remit to develop, implement and monitor the effectiveness of various areas. Examples of sub-committees might include: Pay and Incentives, Disciplinary Procedures, Performance Management General, Capability, Culture, Local Agreement Monitoring and Advice and Guidance on the Setting of Precedent. These sub-committees could be responsible to prepare regular reports that would be published to the commission and to management to help disseminate an understanding of issues and to compare and contrast performance against a broad range of metric in different areas.	
Claire Scott	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	Waste of tax payers money	
Anonymous	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Same	Keep as is	
Sarah Corrin	None	None / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	Waste of resources	
Elizabeth McCann	Nothing wrong with current policy	No, Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Every one should be treated the same	Why change what works. Waste of Gov. money	
Jacqueline Finian	None	No I don't - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None / same conditions for all	Waste of resources	
Anne Mann	None	None / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	Waste of resources	
Tony Hedges	Happy with current situation	No! No need for change. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated equally	Happy with current situation of representation	
Shella Kirby	Why do we need to waste good tax payers money	No I don't / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same terms & conditions to all	Couldn't Civil Servants be put to better use	
Anonymous	The Wildlife Park should be excluded. Any further erosion of terms and conditions would negatively effect animal welfare and indeed the quality of the public service currently provided.	I do not support the single JNC. For me to indicate an alternative, I believe is perhaps above my pay scale. However, it would seem that the existing Whitley Council has been appropriate for a number of years.	For persons not currently employed under Whitley TR&Cs, an agreement based on Whitley but with some negotiation between employers & employees to arrive at mutually satisfactory terms and conditions.	None. If new starters are expected to work alongside existing staff at the same job then surely they should be subject to the same terms and conditions. Level playing field really does spring to mind!	One cannot help but feel when all govt. bodies are 'tightening their belts' the timing is somewhat flawed. It has been apparent over recent years that 'change' really is quite expensive.	
Stephen Stafford	None included & all excluded. I oppose this new body.	No I do not. There is nothing wrong with Whitley.	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	I totally oppose this proposed new body	No I do not support this. Leave as is.	Leave as it is	None	Why fix something that isn't broken, leave it alone everyone know where they stand.	
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Don't want Whitley taken away	
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	n/a	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions to all, fair to all	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair		

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

Patricia Mahoney	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Mrs Julie Crellin	Why do we need the expense of a new body. This is a waste of Tax Payers Money. Why change what works really well?	Why / Whitley Council	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement	Same terms & conditions to be fair to all. Unfair to new workers.	Waste of Government money
Tracy Triggs	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it's discriminatory / and unfair	
Sharon Lee	I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley isn't broken	Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Stephen Oates	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't. Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement.	None	
Anonymous	I don't agree with the new body.	No we don't support it / we stay as a Whitley Council	I want to stay as Whitley Council	None	It's a waste of Government money for me to do this.
Paul Skillen	Why change something that works well already	No I don't support the single Joint Negotiating Committee. Alternative is Whitley Council.	Whitley Council (MOA)	None unfair to new workers	It's wasting government funds when we don't have much already
Gerard Dooley	I oppose this new body	No / I would like Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same for all people	This is a waste of money, trees and time!
Mary Smethurst	None everything to stay same	No I don't agree / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Same terms	
Patricia Halewood	None	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Same terms	
Robert Paton	This is unlikely to reduce bureaucracy and most likely cost the taxpayer more, having to create a whole new structure. A typical government answer to get rid of a thorn in their side. None included all excluded.	I do not support a single Joint Negotiating Committee. How can we expect fair and unbiased treatment from what would basically be another Gov. Dept. Whitley Council	Whitley Council. Fair treatment for all	None	We've constantly told we need to save money. So why spend vast amounts to save civil servants from the same fate as the common man. A total wast of my money as a taxpayer.
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body and hope its not already a done deal	No, Whitley Council isn't broken	Keep with Whitley Council	None	More expense to the taxpayer that isn't needed
Andrew Cowan	Why change something that works well already	No I don't, Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is, this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None, it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of Government money
Sandra Ann Jones	None. Why change something that works well	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should be the same	People up above wasting time and money doing this
E Lee	We don't need it	No stay with Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated the same	This is a waste of time & money. Resources should be saved for other things.
Linda Dulson	None. It should still stay the same	No (Whitley Council)	Whitley Council (MOA)	Everyone should be treated the same	
Anonymous	None - I don't agree with it	No, I don't support. Keep it with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should be the same	
Rebecca McCauley	None, I oppose this proposed new body of change	No I don't, Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No I don't think it's fair for them to be treated differently	
Elaine McBride	None included & all excluded. I oppose this new body.	No happy with terms and conditions I already have	Whitley Council	No it would be unfair to new workers	It's a waste of time & money
Ivan Coates	Management of the Government is top heavy with admin. at least 50% can be cut	No I don't. Whitley Council	Memorandum Agreement. Whitley Council	None, workforce should be treated equally	This Government is wasting yet more of taxpayers money. Too many MKs to run 80,000 people. Had it too good too long at the top.
Anonymous	None	No	None	None	
Tony Watson	None included & all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Ian Corlett	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None. Equality	Happy as things are.
Neil Higgins	No one should be in it	I strongly disagree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated the same	I'm very happy with the way things are
Anonymous	Same terms and conditions for all	No	Whitley Council should be left as is	None as is discriminatory & unfair	
Pat Gilmerin	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No. Conditions fair for all	Lower paid workers are always first to be hit
Rachael Smith	Agree	Yes	We should all work to the same terms and conditions	Everybody should be the same	
Debbie Fergusson	Agree	Yes	We should all work to the same terms and conditions	Everybody should be the same	
Rita Clague	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is, this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Jean Gelling	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No conditions fair for all	Lower paid workers are always first to be hit
Philip Quayle	None	No - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None - should be same for all	Low paid workers always hit first
Anne Beatie	No one.	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None Conditions fair for all	Low paid workers are hit first whenever government mess up and want to change policies.
Helen Quayle	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None - should be the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first
Anonymous	I am totally against any new body, and feel all employment groups should be excluded - none included	Definitely not - Whitley Council is working fine	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is it is this division of a group shows the proposals put forward are no good	None whatsoever, this would be unfair and discriminatory	I don't even see why these changes are being proposed as I don't see why you would want to fix something that isn't broken
Anonymous	I oppose this proposed new body	No - it works	Leave it as it is	None	I don't agree with trying to change something that works well. Just leave it as it is everyone knows where they stand
Margaret Wilson	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	We don't need another group as we have one that works well and I think to have another would be a waste of taxpayers money	Most certainly not - keep Whitley Council	We have an agreement in place already and Whitley Council do a good job	None should be the same for all employees	It would cost too much and be a waste of resources i.e. civil service which could be used better
Susan Taylor	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None the same for all	Waste of Government money
Charles Ian Watson	Leave a tried and tested system alone, manual workers and civil servants will never be the same and should not come under the same PCS	I don't support a single JNC this is just more civil service beauracracy and more expense	Leave the system as it is	None at all, this is unfair for new blood seeking a career in Government	Change for change sake, not needed
David Marsden	You should leave it alone	I don't agree leave it alone	Leave it alone, works well	I don't agree	Leave everything alone it works well
Brett McLinden	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None, it is discriminatory and unfair	How can the Tangerine Emperor unilaterally decide to 'outlaw' what is a national body representing manual workers nationwide?
Terry Corhill	Everybody should be included - to make it fair for all personnel, a government job is a government job and all employees should be subject to the same right.	Yes if all Departments are included as above.	They should be included in the Public Service Commission	I believe that question should be sorted out by the unions with the Whitley Council for new starters if and when needed.	I think the Whitley Council should stay as I don't believe that allowing individual departments setting their own terms and condition would benefit the workforce, all government employees should be subject to the same terms and conditions and rights.
Mark Longwith	I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley isn't broken	Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
Joan Towers	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No. Equality for all	
Andrea Kersall	No one	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first
Susan Horisk	No one	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None - should be the same for all	Low paid workers always hit first
Susan Riley	No one	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first
Janet Maggs	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	No. Conditions fair for all	Lower paid workers are always first to be hit
Sharon Kinin	No one	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Low paid workers hit first
Robert Gilbert	None	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None. Fair for all	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Louise Jordan	None included & all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Catherine Canning	All should be excluded	No I am happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None, should be the same for everyone	Waste of money & time in this time of financial restraint
Anonymous	Same terms & conditions for all	No	Whitley Council should be left as is	None as is discriminatory & unfair	

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

Miss Sonia Powlesland	All	No Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None	No		None	
Jeanette Gelling	None included - I oppose this new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Mrs Denise Foxton	None included and all excluded	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	No changes should be made due to everything as it is ok	No again things are ok	A change would not suit manual workers	Once again nothing should be changed	I feel with all these questions are focussed on getting things changed which is not for me
K C Bridson	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	
Joe Kniveton	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley is not broken. No I do not.	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	I like it the way it is do not wish to change. I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't, Whitley Council is not broken	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	Leave alone!
Anonymous	I don't think any should be included and all excluded. I oppose this new body.	No I do not.	Leave as is this division of a groups shows the proposal is no good	None as I feel it is discriminatory and unfair	I feel it is terribly unfair, service users will lose out.
Mrs C Galster	Leave it as it is. T&Cs surely can not be the same for manual workers and civil servants	No. T&Cs negotiated through Whitley Council	Should stay as Whitley Council	None	If this goes through manual workers will be forgotten. Will unions be listened to?
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is, proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of Government money again always the lowest paid worker gets hit first
Anonymous	Keep the status quo	Continue with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Keep all conditions to be fair to all	Waste of money already have Whitley Council that works well
Anonymous	None. This is a waste of taxpayer's money - the expense of creating a new body is unnecessary. Why change what works well?	No I don't - Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions - needs to be fair to all. Unfair to new workers - very "discriminatory" to treat staff that do same job differently.	This is a total waste of government money - couldn't a civil servant be put to better use? It will make things financially harder for people that are already battling in this recession. Really and truly terribly unfair.
Hayley Hunter	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body. Why do we need the expense of a new body therefore none, this is a waste of taxpayer's money.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Memorandum of agreement Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money!
Julian Doyle	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not, I am happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None the same for all	
Anonymous	All excluded	No I do not I'm happy with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None should be the same for everyone	Waste of government money
Jasmine Louise Quabrough	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	Waste of government money !!!!
Linda Moore	None, should be in there. Everything should stay the same.	No, I don't (stick to Whitley Council)	Whitley Council (M.O.A.)	Everyone should be treated the same	
M Cooke	None - why do we need to change?	No I don't. Keep to Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone treated the same	
Anonymous	None	No stick with Whitley Council	Stick with Whitley Council	No different	
Lisa Wan	None - why we need to change. We happy now.	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should treat same	
Suzanne Kelch	None. Doesn't need change	No - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Everyone should be treated the same	
Sinead McNulty	No one should be in it	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Should be kept the same	
Carolyn Sayle	Why change something what works well and waste tax payed money	No. Whitley Council is working well and we don't want new terms and conditions	Leave us alone in the Whitley Council	None we are all same	The gov is waste of time putting money in things that not important when the front line services are cut
Eva Caine	None	No. Whitley Council	Stay where we are	All treated the same	Total waste of time and money
P M Kinig	None. Why change things that are not broken. A total waste of tax payers money. I oppose the new proposed change.	Yes, Whitley Council works well as it is. Also a lot of workers pay will be affected leaving them a lot worse off financially.	Stay with Whitley Council. Leave Whitley Council as it is.	None. Every employee should be on the same conditions, as a lot of manual workers are skilled and trained to a high standard.	The gov is wasting a lot of TAX PAYERS money if this goes ahead. A LOT of frontline services will suffer if this goes ahead.
Jayne Kneale	None in it and no to change	No stick to Whitley Council	Whitley Council	All treated the same	
Colin Callister	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Unfair to manual workers
Marcus Kinnin	Property maintenance should be excluded as it works very well as it is and with a few administrative tweaks, could be great.	No, I do not. We need to remain separate because blue and white collar workers have totally different working conditions. Whitley Council must remain for the good of the manual staff.	I think Whitley Council functions very well for the blue collar workers and would do for all local authority manual staff so lets keep it, it's not broken so why are we trying to fix it?	I believe they should be entitled to the same terms and conditions as I have worked with for the past 30 years with very little complaint.	The whole concept is a mistake and a disaster waiting to happen. Victorian era working conditions are not welcome here again by any <u>Man</u> workers. Leave us be.
Adam Teare	The Whitley Council must be excluded from the Public Services Commission. It works for the Employer & Employee. Why change something that's not broken and is <u>FAIR</u>	No, solely one negotiating committee cannot decide terms and conditions of a mass workforce which within it has varied skilled and level of responsibility throughout. One body cannot negotiate for the varied workforce.	Leave Whitley alone it works and is <u>FAIR</u>	None. They have the same right to the same terms and conditions as the workers who are employees.	Government at present cannot get what they want from the workers regarding T&Cs. If the Public Services Commission is agreed it will be an easy option to change the fair T&Cs that have been fought for over many years for all workers. Government can make the <u>rules</u> up to <u>suit themselves</u> under this new scheme. * I think MHRs, Ministers and MLCs should be leading by example and change their terms and conditions <u>first</u> .*
Dave Hardinge	I strongly disagree with any changes. When the present committee do a fantastic job.	No, why change something that works well	Changing the current format could only be a disaster for manual workers.	None, they are entitled to the same benefits as the rest.	In my opinion it is a disgrace trying to disband Whitley Council, why change something that works perfectly well for its members.
Gary Skelly	Leave Whitley Council alone it works well as history has proven.	I do not think a single negotiating committee will work. There are always two sides to a negotiation. Whitley have always served us well.	Whitley Council have worked hard for our T&C our time an half, double time, shift, sick, accrued and our well being.	I think T&C should stay it has worked well. Why should the working man lose all his entitlements due to someone else's greed?	Trying to make men work between 4.30am - 11pm for straight time is a joke. Can we join the Seton Group, Private Firm's get what they want.
Nick Turner	Whitley Council represents the working man. Leave it be. We do "not" need another body. At what cost would this all come at?	Whitley Council is the go between we need them. There is nothing wrong with the way Whitley function.	I think proposal is not the advantage of both parties, in the long term.	Things work as they are please leave things alone that are not broken. Terms and conditions must stay the same across the board out of fairness.	If the Whitley Council is abolished the Government will ride roughshod over the workforce.
Anonymous	Things must be left as they are. It works as it is.	A single committee won't work. Whitley Council have done things that work for us.	Terms & conditions were negotiated by Whitley Council for us and in my mind the arrangements must stay as they are.	Nothing must change for <u>anyone</u> . Not even new starters.	Its all <u>take</u> a 04.30 start is a <u>no brainer</u> accrued <u>must stay</u> and the Director should try and get it into his head how it works.
Anonymous	None. Just another way to waste tax payers money	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all	Another waste of public money. Government too top heavy.
Anonymous	None included all excluded. Keep Whitley Council	No. Remain in Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	
Anonymous	None. Keep Whitley Council	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	
Judith Oates	Why change what already works and waste of tax payers cash	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council already, MOA	No all the same	Enough stress with Government, don't need more! Too many trying to run such a small Island!
Mrs K Cottrell	Why do we need the expense of a new body therefore this will be another waste of tax payers money.	No - I'm more than happy with Whitley	Whitley Council	Should be same conditions for everybody old or new	Waste of government money

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

George Cottrell	Why do we need the expense of new body therefore none this is a waste of tax payers money	No I do not. Whitley Council isn't broken	Memorandum of Agreement Whitley Council. Leave as is this Division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money
Sylvia Sloane	No need for change. Whitley Council works well for all employees.	Continue with Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None, it is discriminatory. It should be same terms and conditions for all.	Waste of money, why change what works well and is fair to all
Tracy Chambers	I think that things should stay the way they are, why the need for change?	No I do not support a single joint negotiating committee for employees. Leave arrangements as they are. Whitley Council	Whitley Council leave as it is.	I do not think there should be any changes for new starters it would be discriminative towards them. Same terms and conditions as other staff.	
Paul Kinrade	Having worked for the Department for 30 years I can say the Whitley Council have done a great job and I feel it could be dangerous to our T&Cs should they be done away with.	No it works well as it is	Whitley Council as it works well	None why should they as there is nothing wrong with the current ones	It seems because the Whitley Council is fighting for the rights of working men then the Government want them gone so they can then do what they want.
Anthony Montgomery	I don't think there should be any changes. Committee do a great job.	You shouldn't change something that works	Changing terms and conditions will only cause more problems for manual and craft workers	Should have same terms and condions as it's only fair	Whitley should stay as it works great for its members
Chris Bertham	Whitley Council should be excluded from the new Commission because it works well already and doesn't need changing.	No, I don't think any negotiations would be fair in the future without the Whitley Council	Whitley Council. Changing things will affect a lot of people and probably not for the best	None because you will have employees on different conditions and that's not fair for everyone	I think it's a bad idea and won't be fair for everyone. The Whitley Council works as it is and should not be changed.
Jason Chatwood	No changes should be made, Whitley Council should be left well alone.	No, Whitley do a great job and also ensure that T&Cs are fair and equal.	Whitley Council do a good job on determining our T&Cs, giving each employer groups fair conditions	None, how would it be fair for people under the same employer group name have different T&Cs. Completely idiotic.	It seems like again the manual workers are the ones taking most of the flack. Like normal. It's like bringing back rules that were in place in Victorian Times.
Ian Daw	I think that no changes should be made to the Whitley Council	No I do not support a joint negotiating committee, always should be two sides to a negotiation	Whitley Council have always looked after our terms and conditions. I don't think they need any more interference.	None. Why should the working man lose out to others being greedy.	Just leave alone it has worked well for us the past.
David Partridge	None. I see it as a waste of money for a restructure of something that is already in place and working very well already	Not really I see it as unnecessary and unfair for a single dept to control all. Alternative? - Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoA, shows the proposal is no good	None	Trying to fix something that is not broken is an expense our taxpayers can't afford
Linda Dalton	No one should be in it	I do not agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be same	
Anonymous	I don't think any groups need to be included, a new body will waste more taxpayers' money to become established.	No I do not, Whitley Council has been looking after its workers for a long time, it's already established and works.	I wouldn't like to change any arrangements, keep Whitley Council.	Terms and conditions need to be fair for all new workers, therefore, keep everybody on the same T&C, whether a new starter or not.	I feel whilst trying to establish terms & conditions, new bodies ect. you will be wasting money from the taxpayers' purse. Also whilst short term you think you may save money, long term essential public services will be worse off.
Tracey Moorley	None at all	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Would you like to be paid single pay for Xmas day, Boxing day, New Years Day etc.? Stop picking on least paid & most worked.
Melanie Caple	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None. Equal Opportunities	Would you like to work weekends for single rate? Why always pick on the lowest paid, start at the top.
Anonymous	No groups included. All should stay as they are.	No. Does not seem the need to change what is working at the present.	Whitley Council	New staff to have new terms and conditions.	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None included all excluded total opposition to this body	No Whitley works well	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement leave as is.	None discriminatory to new starters and unfair	Waste of time and money
Ronald Cowley	I oppose this new body as it will not be in the interest of manual workers	No Whitley works well and has stood the test of time	Whitley Council MoA	None its unfair to manual workers	None I believe it's a plan by government to diminish the conditions of manual workers
D Leece	None include and all excluded. I oppose this as your future T&C and income that is under threat	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA leave as is division of group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Ann Glover	Why change something that works well. Why don't you leave the way they are. Should leave things the way they are.	No! Whitley Council works well for everyone, we don't want any to change.	Leave us alone in Whitley Council	There should not be any changes we are all the same	The gov is a waste of money & time that are not important you would have more money in your pot get rid of half of the Managers you will save a lot of money instead of looking at us.
Graham Spencer	The system already in use is more than acceptable. Why waste even more money setting up a new one.	I do not support a single joint negotiating committee and I fully support Whitley Council.	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions for all, to avoid separation as this would be unfair for new starters.	Maintain Whitley Council for fair conditions for manual workers. To avoid separation & a divison for fairer working rights for manual workers.
Sue Skillcom	It works very well, why change it?	Why Whitley Council?	Whitley Council	Unfair to all	Waste of government money
Anonymous	None included or excluded. I disagree with proposed new body.	There's no alternative because you can't fix something that's not broken - i.e. A Cain	Whitley Council	None	
A Cain	No one should be in it	No I don't agree / Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be the same	
Janie Halsal	None included, the current system works well & doesn't need to be changed	No there is no need for such a drastic change to the structure, it works well and shouldn't be changed	Leave the current T&Cs in place, they work well & don't need to be changed	None should be changed, all employees should have the same T&Cs	Giving control to one government body would give too much power over employee T&Cs - there would be no business & negotiation would be non existent!
Paul Moffitt	None included and all excluded. No need for a new body	No. Nothing wrong with Whitley Council	Whitley Council. If it's not broke don't fix it.	None	No need to waste any more money just for the sake off it.
Frederick Klein	The Whitley Council works so why waste the expense of tax payers money and time.	No, as above, it works	Whitley Council, leave it as it is	None	If it fails then it will cost more money to fix it, not all departments are trained the same.
Robert Dooley	None included and all excluded I oppose this new body	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council leave as is this division shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	It is another expense waste of tax payers money to keep Mr Cannan happy
Shaun Callow	None included & all excluded. No need for the proposed new body.	No Whitley Council works fine as it is.	Whitley Council	None changed	No need to waste any more money.
Sonia Killey	Why do we need a new body, it's a waste of money. It works well now, why change it.	No. It should stay as it is (Whitley Council) Whitley Council is our terms and conditions, this will change and maybe not for the better.	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None, it is totally unfair, nothing should be changed for new starters	It is a waste of government money.
Lynne Cox	Why change something that works well already	No I don't / Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement	Same terms and conditions to all	Couldn't civil servant be put to better use
Rubin Crellin	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA, leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	It's a waste of government money. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use.
Arlene Cowin	This is tax payers money (why waste it). When broken fix it, why change when works well	I would prefer to have Whitley Council because our working conditions will change (not for the better)	Division of Group, shows the proposal is no good	None because it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of Government money
Donna Cowan	Why do we need expense of a new body, this is a waste of tax payers money. Why change something that works well already.	No I don't, Whitley Council isn't broken.	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money. Couldn't Civil Servant be put to better use.
Joyce Killen	Why change what works?	No Whitley Council	Whitley Council already.	No - all the same	Enough stress, with too many comovers telling us what to do. Manx for the Manx not foreigners.
Anonymous	Don't agree to any changes why change something that has worked for years.	Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Too many chiefs and not enough indians!!!
Rosemary Beresford	No-one	No Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everybody should be treated the same	
Irene Elson	No I don't agree anyone should be in it	No I don't support it. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be equal	
Donna-Marie Walmley	No one should be in it	No I do not support. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated equally	
Sheena Reynolds	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None	Waste of resources
Mrs L Kavanagh	Nobody should be in it	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Same terms	
Julie Downey	Waste of tax payers cash, should you change what works	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA already	No want all the same	Enough stress with government, do not need more, too many MHKs.
Janette McHullian	Waste of tax payers cash, should you change what already works	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council already. MOA	No want all the same	Enough stress with Government don't need more. Too many MHKs, too many MLCs
Anonymous	I don't agree changing what we already have	No want to keep Whitley Council	I wish to keep Whitley Council MOA	There should be no changes to all	Seems to be too many MHKs, are they needed
Graham Uren	No changes	Stick with what we have	Why fix something that's not broke	Leave as they are	Too many MHK for size of Island, too old, too out of date and too slow to catch a cold
Alison Shipside	Waste of tax payers money	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council already. MOA	It should stay the same and all workers should be treated the same.	Should start by looking after their own instead of handing out work permits and making decisions for the manx residents MHKs should be reduced and start making decisions that will benefit the Isle of Man and not

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

Justine Oates	I don't think any of the groups should be included in the Public Services Commission. As I think it's a waste in tax payer money.	I DO NOT support any single Joint Negotiation. Whitley Council isn't broken.	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreements.	All terms and conditions to be fair including new workers	It's a waste of government money. Civil Servants could be put to better use.
Janet Sayle	I don't think any employment groups should be included in the Public Services Commission. I think it's a waste of tax payers money and a waste of expense.	No I don't support a single Joint Negotiating Committee as I believe that Whitley Council isn't broken and works well.	Whitley Council - Memorandum of agreements.	All terms and conditions should be fair to all including new starters/workers	I think it's a waste of government money. Civil servants could be put to better use.
Anonymous	I don't believe that any should be included & I believe that all should be excluded. I am opposed to this proposed new body.	No I do not support the proposal. I would like to keep the Whitley Council.	Whitley Council MoFA - leave this as is wanting to divide things shows that this proposal is not a good one.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair to the new starters.	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - I would like to keep Whitley Council.	Whitley Council MoFA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - It is discriminatory and unfair.	
Anonymous	I do not believe any should be included and I believe all should be excluded.	No I do not support the development of a single Joint Negotiation Committee. We should retain Whitley Council.	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None as it is discriminatory and unfair.	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I am opposed to this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley Council keep it as it is.	Whitley Council MoFA leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None this is discriminatory and unfair	
Victoria Skillen	No one should be in it	No I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None at all.	
Lorna Carron	No-one	I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone treated the same	
Angela Cowin	No-one should be in it	I don't support it. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	Everyone should be treated the same.	
Tina Adamson	No one should be included	No I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOA	None everybody should be the same	
J Taggart	None at all and I don't agree to this proposal	I do NOT. Leave it the way it is.	Whitley Council MOA	I think it should not be changed	Look elsewhere and leave us alone.
E Bridson	No I don't agree to anyone being in this	No I don't. Stay as we are.	Whitley Council MOA	None at all	Always the manual workers getting hit.
Naada Wicklow	I don't agree with any of this.	No I don't - Whitley Council	MOA Whitley Council	None at all	Why change what works well.
Joanne Cain	I don't agree with it.	No I don't. Stick to Whitley Council	Stick to Whitley Council	None	This is wasting time and money and civil service should be of better use.
Mrs M Pownall	No need to change something that works well	No I don't!	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all	Waste of Government money
Anonymous	No need to change.	No problem with Whitley	Prefer Whitley	None discriminate and unfair	
Bryan Shepherd	Why change something what works well already	No I don't	Memorandum of Agreement	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all	Waste of Government money. Another layer of management. Take a look higher up the ladder to save money.
Paul Corrin	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body!	No I do not! Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	<u>None it is discriminatory and unfair.</u>	
Vivien Kelly	No need to change something that works well	No I don't!	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions for all.	Waste of Government money
Philip Cowin	Why do we need the expense of a new body? Therefore this is a waste of tax payers money. Why change something that has worked perfectly well for years.	No I do not. Whitley Council as only alternative.	I prefer the Memorandum Agreement Whitley Council	All terms and conditions should be equal so to be fair to all workers.	I feel that it is a waste of tax payers / government money. And the Civil Service could be put to better useful use.
Mandi Dentith	No new body needed	No problems with Whitley as it is not broke still working for all workers	No changes to be made	No discrimination as this would cause this.	No changes needed.
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
Timothy Meyers	No inclusion to other bodies, we are OK as we are.	There is nothing to accomplish with changes	Whitley Council is not broken, I wish to stay in Whitley Council	No change the terms and conditions are excellent	
Anonymous	Why do we need to go to the expense and waste of taxpayers limited money to set up a new body	We already have functioning JNC and it works	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all and fair to all	
Kendrick Shaw	More expense to tax payer why change it	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council any other proposal will not work	Same terms and conditions fair to all	No money in Government. Why waste what they have out.
Richard Collier	No need for any to be included in a remit. Totally no need for this remit - waste of public money.	Stg - not at all. Why break whats not broken other than to waste public money.	Whitley Council obvious answer no need to waster time rewriting a new T&C system, high expense for no benefit. Best left all separate.	None! These questions are wrote in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken!	This is a total waste of money. This Government seem to be just determined to waste public money on breaking up things that aren't broken and giving our money away to consultants and creating problems rather than saving money - * look at cost incurred from the MPTC conversion
Anonymous	None included and excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No should stay the same. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discrimination and unfair	
Paul Hoffart	Exclude all, why change for the sake of things	I support the development of things that need changing but not a single Joint Negotiation Committee	Whitley Council, maybe we change T.C. ourselves to meet today conditions	None	Instead of wasting all this public money can we see if T&C can be brought up to date, instead of scrapping both and redo in a new one?
Anonymous	Why change something what works well already	No leave well alone	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions which are fair to all	Couldn't Civil Servants be put to a better use
Anonymous	Why change something that works well	No I don't	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions fair for all	Why try to fix something that's not broken
Wendy Christian	All, as it should not be going ahead	No - nothing wrong with Whitley Council	Maybe look at Whitley Councils terms	None - everyone should have same terms and conditions	Just another waste of money, spending on a committee, that in the long run, probably, will never come to fruition.
G Hannay	None - the body's that are in place have proven that they have coped with change. Therefore keep what we have and negotiate fairly on both sides.	Whitley Council has worked very well in the past. Why change and waste money.	Keep to the arrangements that are already in place Whitley Council etc.	None - These have been built up over many years and should be kept the same.	
Stephen Boland	I do not think any employment group. Leave as is. Waste of taxpayer money	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Should be same terms and conditions for everyone. To maintain fair equal rights for each employee.	If it ain't broke, don't fix it.
David MacDonald	None included. I don't agree with this proposed new body	No. I think things should be kept as they are	Whitley Council	None. I don't agree with it, as it's unfair	
Paul Candaris	I oppose this proposed new body within Government	No I do not support this. Whitley is "not" broken leave alone	Whitley Council - leave as is this proposal is no good	None. Why?? This is unfair	Stop punishing the manual workers and leave alone
Anonymous	I oppose this new body	I do not	Leave Whitley Council alone!	None	You won't save a blind bit of noise!
Anonymous	I oppose this new body as I think Whitley Council are doing a good job for the manual and craft workers.	No as Whitley Council isn't broken	I prefer Whitley Council as it works for the manual workers	None	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No. Whitley is fit for purpose	Stay with Whitley Council	No changes, it is unfair	This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers while protecting terms & conditions of civil service and management
Anonymous	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No. stay with Whitley it works	Stay with Whitley	None it is unfair	It's all about attacking terms of manual workers whilst protecting civil servant
Anonymous	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No Whitley is fit for purpose	Stay with Whitley Council	No changes it is unfair	This Commission is about attacking terms and conditions of manual & craft workers.
Anonymous	No need for new body	No I see no problem with Whitley	Division can only lead to problems	Not fair to discriminate	
Anonymous	All should be excluded. Don't see the need for a new body!	I don't see the need to create a new committee when the one we have still works	I prefer what I know (Whitley)	It would be unfair to new starters to be treated differently, they could be working alongside someone who has different T&Cs within the same role. Surely this would be discriminatory.	
Anonymous	Things should stay the way they are	I see no problem with Whitley	No changes to be made	None	No changes needed.
Anonymous	I do not think any employment groups should be included & excluded as I think things should stay the way they are.	I do not support the development of a single Joint Negotiations Committee.	Non. No changes to be made.	None, any changes would cause low morale	I have no comments. No changes should be made.
Denise Lenehan	No change	No problem with Whitley	No changes	None	No changes
Anonymous	No exclusions all should be the same	See no reason to change from Whitley	No need to change	None to be fair to all staff members	No change
Anonymous	None and all excluded I don't want this new body	Whitley has been good up until now if it's not broken don't fix it?	Whitley has worked ok it should be left alone	None at all the same for everyone across the Board	Nooooo!
Jan Watson	I oppose the new proposed body within Government	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Leave it alone	None it works well as it is	
Daniel Aulton	There is NO need for a new body	I do not see any problems with Whitley Council. It should stay.	Leave Whitley Council as it is.	None. It should be the same for everyone.	
Debra Leaver	None were included and all were excluded I oppose this new body.	Whitley as fine as it is.	Whitley as is	None it is discriminatory and unfair to new members	
M O'Callaghan	None should be included I am against losing the Whitley Council	No. keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Keep every thing as it is	Waste of money leave alone
Wayne Robinson	I oppose the proposed new body, and feel it is unwarranted and not needed and a waste of my tax payers money	No. I have worked under the current Whitley structure for over 10 years, and in that time I feel it has aided employees and employers alike, and without it I feel the government would change the rules/working conditions as and when they saw fit.		None equality has always been and should always be available to all work colleagues and to discriminate would be unjust and unfair	I feel the government should be looking closer to home for money saving ideas as many civil servants, MHC etc. seem to reap the rewards whilst us the hard working members of the government always seem to be out of pocket, yet without us the Island would in fact grind to a halt!
Robert Keenan	No need for change	No	Whitley Council	No	Waste of time
Herta Kelly	None included and all excluded. I do not want this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley is just fine	Whitley Council MOFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is unfair and discriminatory	
Mrs C King	Don't agree with changes	No. To keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council already MOA	No all the same	Too many MHCs for a small Island
Pamela English	Don't agree with changes	No. To keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council already MOA	No want all the same	Seems to be too many MHCs, are they all needed?
Anonymous	Don't agree with changes	No. To keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council already MOA	No want all the same	Seems to be too many MHCs, are they needed?
Barny Knize	Don't agree with changing what we already have	No! Want to keep Whitley Council	I wish to keep to Whitley Council MOA	Should be no change. Thankyou	Can you look into how there seems to be too many MHCs for a small island?
Anonymous	I don't agree of changing what we already have	Keep Whitley Council the same	No! Want to keep Whitley Council MOA	There should be no changes.	Too many bosses are they needed
Anonymous	No oppose	No. Whitley is good	None of them keep as is.	None stay as one	
Brian Appleton	We do not need a new body especially one that seems to have no idea of the work involved in the different groups	No. That's what Whitley Council does already	Whitley Council	We should not offer the younger generation a poorer start than what we have had	It appears that you are after an elite of management who will have no manual workforce. But deal only with contractors. The tax payer will be paying for the contractors profits.
Harry Homer	No oppose	No Whitley is ok	Leave as is	None leave, conditions	
Colin Tate	Totally against employment groups being included or excluded and oppose this proposed new body.	No I don't support the development of a single Joint Negotiating Committee - leave alone as it's not broke. Whitley	No do not want any preferred arrangements or new terms, conditions - Whitley Council is fine as it is	None terms, conditions should be changed. It is unfair and wrong	I am totally against this proposal to try and establish this public services commission. We have our terms, conditions within Whitley Council - they are ours to represent and protect us - the employees

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

Heather Dale	I don't think a public services commission could work with such a varied workforce doing very different jobs you could not harmonise it, so none.	I don't as above there are too many varied workers for one single negotiating commission	Whitley Council MoA	None	Any proposals should have figures and facts shown or it is pointless and time wasting
Margaret Phoenix	I don't agree with the changes.	Stay with Whitley Council	Stay with Whitley Council MOA	None they are ok as they are	Too much input from MHKS
Anonymous	I don't agree changing what we already have	No want to leave Whitley Council	Keep it as is, Whitley Council	I wish to keep Whitley Council MOA	Seems to be too many MHKS are they needed
Anonymous	Why change something that's not broken	No, we should keep the Whitley Council	Keep Whitley Council	No changes	Too many MHKS messing with peoples lives
Anonymous	Why change something that works well already	No I don't	Whitley Council	None. Unfair to new workers	No comment
Sidney Callow	Keep it as it is	Keep it as it is, Whitley Council	Keep it as it is, Whitley Council	Waste of government money, couldn't civil servant be put to better use	Waste of our/government money and a foot in the door of total control, for Herr Bell and his cronies
Mark Clayton	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not / Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA	None. It is discriminatory and unfair	Couldn't civil servant be put to better use
Anonymous	None. What is wrong with the Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None. Unfair to new workers	Waste of Government money
Vivienne O'Meara	Why change something which already works well	No. Whitley Council	No. Whitley Council	None. Everyone should be on same T&C	Waste of Government money
Joanne Rea	Why change something that's NOT broken	No I don't. Keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same for all	Waste of Government money
Heather Rea	Why change things that work well	No I don't / keep Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None. Same for all	Waste of Government money
John Cain	Like we get a choice. Do not see any need to bring other groups in. We have enough problems with what we have, why bring more to the table	Support Whitley as it is. No need for alternative arrangements. Simple - leave it	Whitley Council MoA	None at all. We should be on the same level, no need to be unfair to others	Why do we need any change. Do Government not have work to do. It just seems to be a waste of money.
Garry Corish	No waste of money. Do not need new body	Nothing wrong with Whitley. Just more waste of time and money.	Whitley Council works well so leave well alone	None at all	It's kids for the boys
James Cooper	None included and all excluded I oppose this new body	No I don't	Whitley Council. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None I feel it's unjust to treat new starters any different	This is just a waste of tax payers money that could be used elsewhere
Denk Shimmin	None I oppose a new body. Waste of money	No. Nothing wrong with Whitley	Memorandum of Agreement Whitley	None it would be discriminatory	Waste of tax payers money. Why change something that works well
Joseph Toomey	None. Whitley Council	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoA	None. All the same	Whitley Council MoA
C Frearson	I oppose all this new body	Whitley Council all the way	Whitley Council MoA	Everyone the same, would not want or ever want to work with people and not be given the same treatment pay or conditions as the next person. It would be a ***** like to those anyone would. There's still	We want the Whitley Council all the way. Don't want change. Don't need change. Just giving other people something to do if you ask me.
Michael Collins	There is no need for a new body	I don't see any problems with Whitley Council. It should be kept!	Leave Whitley Council as it is.	None I should be the same for everyone.	
Cristen Teare	I oppose this proposed new body within Government	I do not support this. Whitley is not broken	Whitley Council MoA. Leave as it is. This proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	Stop punishing the manual workers.
I Hearn	I oppose this new body	Whitley isn't broken	Leave it as it is!	None. It is discriminatory and unfair	It's just another expensive cost cutting exercise. It will take away working mens rights! (Back to slave labour?)
A Wilson	None included leave as it is	No - there's not a problem with Whitley why alter things	Terms and conditions should be run by Whitley. Why change it for the sake of a change.	New starters should have the same benefits I've had for 27 yrs it is not fair to change it for them.	If these changes are for the better fair enough but they are clearly not going to be, dictatorship comes to mind
Anonymous	None. I oppose this proposed new body	No. I do not support	Whitley Council MoA	None	I was under the impression that the IOM was a democratic country not a dictatorship
G.Jenner	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair.	It seems clear Mr Bell & his Ministers (Turkeys) don't vote for Christmas when it comes to saving money when it really matters.
P Stevin	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley Council is not broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of groups shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Mr Bell & his well paid Ministers & MHKS are sitting pretty while all the lower paid manual workers get **** on once again. Perhaps they should lead by example and take considerable pay cuts themselves.
Anonymous	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA leave as it is this group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	The Government should start at the top to save money and not always at the bottom
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Management cannot be trusted and feel although information is withheld from us. The government should not roll back to save P&L.
Anonymous	Whitley Council. Manual Workers	Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None. All the same	
M Holmes	None	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoA	None. Equally	Things ok as are.
D Clarke	I totally oppose this proposal	Don't buy and fix when it's not broken!!	Leave it as it is	None whatever. Unfair. Discriminatory	Public Services Commission is a cover for (we will change your hours and your pay and you have no say in this matter)
D Partridge	I oppose this new body	No I do not, Whitley Council have done us proud!!!	Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer.	None that would be unfair	
R Moore	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I don't - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair!	This is just another expensive cost cutting exercise. It will take away working mens rights! (Back to slave labour?)
B Walmsley	None included/all excluded - I do not want things to change	No - I am fine with Whitley	Whitley Council	None	
M McMahon	Exclude Whitley Council	Exclude Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	
M Dean	Exclude Whitley Council	Support Whitley Council	In Whitley Council	None	
Anonymous	I remain unconvinced that my position regarding terms & conditions would improve, therefore I disagree with the inclusion of Whitley Council	I cannot see a single Joint Negotiating Body being impartial when all types, sectors are included. Whitley works well as is.	Whitley Council Memorandum has continued to be amended in a fair & balanced way through negotiations and is fit for purpose.	Sounds like a suggestion for discrimination against a new employee, should be rejected and is fit for purpose.	This is going to be expensive to establish. Waste of money?
Anonymous	Whitley Council and its associated Memorandum of Agreement should be included in the remit of a Public Services Commission and the ethics should remain intact as it lays down universal working regulations that are recognised by both employers and employees.	I do not support the development of a single Joint Negotiations Committee as I believe the present structure of Whitley Council serves a valuable purpose in the protection of jobs and employment	My preferred arrangements for determining the terms and conditions for manual and craft employees employed by Local Authorities is under the umbrella of Whitley Council and its associated Memorandum of Agreement	I believe that the terms and conditions should be fair to all employees. The terms and conditions in place should be universal, so as to avoid an element of unfairness in the workplace.	The establishment of a Public Services Commission on the Isle of Man seems a giant leap in employment structure. The proposal to introduce this employment structure will potentially bring financial hardship to many families.
S Teare-Kermeen	I feel that the group of staff employed at the Carraghis Wildlife Park should be excluded from the re-jig and PSC. Our learn and conditions are already being changed and further changes may compromise animal welfare and public service	In my view a single Joint Negotiating Committee will not work. There should be one committee for civil servants and one for manual workers & then split on the ones in place.	The terms and conditions set up by Whitley Council in agreement with managers and staff work well and are fair.	I do not believe that the terms and conditions should be changed for new starters as this would likely lead to awkward and unfair working conditions.	The idea of a new PSC appears to me to be a waste of time and money - not good in this day and age.
Anonymous	The Wildlife Park should be excluded due to any major structural changes may affect animal welfare.	No I do not support this single JNC. Nothing wrong with Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement served me well for the past 25 years.	Whitley Council	None. New starters should be on same terms and conditions to be fair.	This whole process is a waste of tax payers money which could be spent where it's needed most
Anonymous	I do not agree with this proposed body, therefore, no groups should be included at all excluded.	No. Whitley Council have been perfectly suitable for purpose and I have especially been very well represented for the past 25 years.	Whitley Council Memorandum of Agreement has been negotiating terms and conditions for many years and has had to be fair and equal	Discriminating against 'new starters' should not sit right with any fair minded person	This proposal concerning 'more proactive approach to people management issues' is open to abuse serious initiatives to aggressive and unrepresentative managers.
K Combe	None I oppose this proposed new body	No Whitley Council is not broken	Whitley Council leave as is.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
A Leadley	None included & all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory & unfair	
M Stevens	None included & all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory & unfair	
S Gentry	None included & all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory & unfair	
D Kissack	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
I Williamson	None included & all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
D Newsham	None included and all excluded. I oppose this new body	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It's discriminatory and unfair	
R Pitts	None included & all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None	
P Hughes	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
I Frazer	I oppose this proposed new body	Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
I Birdson	We do not need a new body. Waste of tax payers money.	No I don't Whitley Council	Memorandum of Agreement	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all	Waste of government money
T Horton	We do not need a new body. Waste of tax payers money.	No do not support Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement / Whitley Council	Same terms & conditions	Another waste of government money
R Harris	We do not need a new body. Keep as it is.	No. Keep Whitley Council	Memorandum of agreement	Same for all	General money on topic needed thing for the Island
D Kelly	We do not need a new body. Waste of tax payers money	No do not / Whitley Council	Memorandum of Agreement / Whitley Council	Same terms & conditions for all	Waste of government money
I O'Neill	Why change what works well	No I don't / Whitley Council	Memorandum of Agreement Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all	Waste of government money
Anonymous	None. A new body what? Whitley isn't broken	No I don't agree. Whitley Council	The Memorandum of Agreement Whitley Council	None. Same terms for all. Isn't that discrimination??	Put in tax to better use not more net wage
A Campbell	None included all excluded. Do not need a new proposed body	No. Whitley is not broken	Whitley Council MoA. Leave this division as it is proposal is no good	None. It is unfair and discriminatory	Why change something that is working well for Whitley and other workers just to suit the government & civil servants
H Campbell	None included all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body. Waste of money.	No I do not Whitley is not broken	Whitley Council MoA leave this division of a group the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	Waste of government money waste of time. Couldn't civil servants be put to better use.
S Oliver	Why do we have to change when it works alright now	No I don't. Everyone move to Whitley Council	Keep Whitley Council for them maybe	Everyone should have the same terms & conditions	Why waste money on this consultation when things are working ok as it is. I oppose this proposed new body.
C Thomas	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	Why change something what works well already. No I do not.	Whitley Council MoA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No. Whitley Council isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	Everyone should have same working conditions unfair to change just some.
Anonymous	None included no need for new body, old system works well	No Whitley works well	Whitley Council Memorandum of agreement, division of group shows how flawed the proposal is	None totally discriminatory against new starters	Have MHKS and civil servants get nothing better to do
Anonymous	None included and excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	It's unfair to change our terms and conditions when government is not changing civil servant's terms and conditions
Francis Dooley	I oppose this new body	No I do not	Leave as is	None	Leave Whitley Council as it is
Anonymous	All groups including current protected staff who work under UK terms & conditions	Agenda for change NHS as standard Terms and Conditions for all Government workers, civil servants & manual workers within IOM Government	As above	None	
Anonymous	Complete waste of money. How to ask why?	Leave well alone!	Leave as is. Dividing is not the answer.	Same for all staff	Don't we need to save gov money? If it's not broken don't fix it.
D Ward	Nobody should be in it, again another costly exercise at taxpayers expense, when we have in place something that works already	No I do not support it. Whitley Council works well.	Whitley Council, Memorandum of Agreement	None of them, I would be unfair	A waste of government money, we have a negotiating body that works well
S Bridge	Nothing wrong with Whitley Council as it is	No I don't agree with this. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoA	None! These questions are wrote in a fashion to force one to an answer that would waste public money for no reason! Not broken!	I think this is a waste of gov money, T&C ok as they are
E King	Keep everything the way it is no need for change	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoA	None - everyone should have the same terms & conditions	I never went to the meeting and I never had any information on these matters but I wouldn't agree to anything that would make us worse off than before - people have Bills to pay
S Dooley	None should be in it. Nothing wrong with present terms & conditions	No I don't support. Whitley Council	Whitley Council & MoA	None	I think this is a waste of government money & resources
Anonymous	None do not need a new body. Waste of tax payers money	No I do not Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as it is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
Anonymous	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not. Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA. Leave as is.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
B Cooke	None should be in it	No I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoA	Everyone should be the same	
Anonymous	None should be in it	No I don't agree. Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoA	Everyone should be the same	
D Watt	All should stay the same	No. Whitley Council works and always has done!	Whitley Council MoA	Everyone should be treated the same, disgusting to think anything different :(No real reason to change over but just hassle and people in top jobs never seem to get all this hassle. Leave well alone.
V Oates	None, all should be the same and not excluded	No stick with the Whitley Council	Whitley Council MOFA	None and it's not fair	Why would people want to change the Whitley Council works for all so leave it that way, too many people in higher places sticking their nose in to things that already are good.
Mes J Phair	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory & unfair	
D Halsall	None. There is no rationale as to why?	No I do not support development of PSC. There should be no alternative. Why should there be?	Whitley Council	None - why would you want to discriminate against new employees?	
Anonymous	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Eric Holmes	It is important that all established groups remain involved due to the specialist knowledge they have acquired, which could circumvent unseen repercussions any changes to T&Cs could involve. Therefore none should be excluded.	No. One size fits all approaches to problems always causes contention to some part of the establishment. Therefore leave as is.	Here is clear evidence that the concept has already failed because groups covered by Whitley in Local Authorities can't be included. Keep Whitley Council MoA.	None, to disadvantage prospective employees is creating a vessel for future unrest and invites a race to the bottom culture that will have repercussions on the local economy.	The sole purpose of establishing a PSC is to dismantle Whitley Council based on misconceived ideas within CoMNH and Tynwald and managers who can't be bothered following the MoA guidance. This is expensive overkill.
B Sharp	None. Think it should stay the same.	No I do not. Whitley Council is fine.	Whitley Council MoA	None at all	I don't want for any changes. I am happy the way things are.
R Collister	No change	No change	No change	No change	No need for change
C Betttridge	No change	No change	No change	No change	No need for change

Public Services Commission Consultation Responses

K Cowin	No should stay the same	No	Whitley Council MoFA	None. Discriminatory & unfair	Should stay as we are.
H Anonwirth	None. I think it should stay the same	No I do not. Whitley Council is ok	Whitley Council MoFA	None	I do not wish for any changes. I am happy the way things are.
Anonymous	None. Why change something what works well already.	No. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None. Same terms and conditions to all - fair to all.	Waste of government money.
Anonymous	None included and all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I don't. Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all fair to all.	Waste of government money.
M Gallini	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is the division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	I don't wish for any changes. Very happy with the way it is now.
D Maddrell	None leave it alone	No. It's not broken	Leave Whitley alone	Unfair if you start people like that	Don't take any notice anyway
Anonymous	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Anonymous	None	No I don't - Whitley Council	Whitley Council	None - same condition for all	Waste of resources
McLean	No	No	Whitley Council	None	Stay with W Council
Anonymous	No and it should stay the same.	No	Whitley Council MoFA	None	We should stay as we are.
G James	No, it should stay the same	No I don't. stick to Whitley Council	Whitley Council MoFA	None. I don't	That should stay as it is.
Anonymous	None	No. I am happy with present terms and conditions in my contract.	Whitley Council MoFA	None. All should be the same as all do the same job.	I don't wish any changes. Very happy with the way it is now.
Anonymous	Excluded from remit - social care workers & health care workers.	No. I am happy with present terms and conditions in my contract.	Whitley Council MoFA	None. All should be the same as all do the same job.	I don't wish for any changes. I am happy the way things are.
Gene	None. think it should stay the same.	No. I do not. Whitley Council is fine.	Whitley Council MoFA	None at all.	I don't wish for any changes. I am happy the way things are.
Anonymous	None	No. I feel that I am quite happy with my terms and conditions as they stand.	Whitley Council MoFA	I do not believe any terms and conditions should be changed. I am quite happy as they are.	No further comments.
V Cowley	I do not think any should be. I am not in favour of the proposed new body.	No I do not support it.	Whitley Council MoFA	None - it is discriminatory.	I am happy with things the way they are. I do not wish anymore changes.
D Cromwell	I oppose this new body	No	Leave as is	None	
J Arkell	All excluded, none included	No. Whitley Council serves its purpose	Whitley Council is perfectly good as is for local authorities	None	Public Services Commission would be undemocratic. As Whitley has joint statutory rights and employee side inst. Whitley works.
C Convery	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not Whitley is not broken.	Whitley Council MoFA. leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory and unfair.	Waste of govt money.
Anonymous	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None it is discriminatory & unfair	
D Ryan	None included and all excluded - I oppose this new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken at all	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None it is discriminatory and unfair	
M Wilson	None included and all excluded I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
E Galster	None included and all excluded - I oppose this new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
K Sharkey	None included & all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None - it is discriminatory & unfair	
R Paton	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair	
G Kelly	None included and all excluded - I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken	Whitley Council MoFA - leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair.	
H Kenna	I don't want new body.	No. Whitley is ok	Whitley is ok	None	None
D Corhill	None. oppose proposed new body.	No. Why change?	Leave as is. This is not the answer.	None	
Anonymous	Why change something what works well already.	No / Whitley Council	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions to all.	Waste of government money.
Anonymous	None included & all excluded I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not - Whitley isn't broken.	Whitley Council MoFA - leave this division of a group shows the proposal is no good.	None - it is discriminatory and unfair.	
Anonymous	None included all excluded. I oppose this proposed new body.	No I do not. Whitley works good it is not broken.	Whitley Council MoFA. Leave as is this division of a group shows the proposal is no good	None. It is discriminatory and unfair.	
G Hart	Doesn't need altering as works well now.	No I don't support. Whitley Council should be kept.	Whitley Council	None	Why change something that is fine and works well.
Mrs C Kneale	I don't see the need to change something which is already working well.	Again, Whitley Council is a very good working system - no need to change it would be too costly.	Surely all Government workers should be the same therefore Whitley Council.	None.	
B Corhill	I think it's a waste of money to change at all but if we do have to change all should be included.	No Whitley Council is working well	Whitley Council	None.	
Mrs G Barnett	I am satisfied with the running of Council. no need to change anything.	Why fix something that isn't broken	Whitley Council	No change as I think it is fair to all.	Just a waste of time & money (government) when it could be put to better use.
S Williams	Why pay for a new body if the old one works properly	No Whitley Council seems fair to me	An independent body like Whitley Council	None	
S Kneale	Everyone needs to be treated equally no matter what & why change something that is already working.	Whitley Council is working so why change it	All Government workers should be treated the same.	None	
DEFA, Antony Boyd	There is broad agreement within this Department that the concept of a single employing authority for all public servants, being subject to the same basic requirements, is appropriate. It would be easier if all public servants came under the umbrella of one authority. That should minimise the likely ongoing need for differing terms and conditions depending on the profession, local circumstances and level of employee (e.g. notice periods for termination of employment, access to the flexi system, or the requirement to sign the Official Secrets Act). Greater homogeneity and consistency of staff policies across the Department's workforce, manual workers and civil servants alike, would assist with overall management, and would help ensure the fair and equitable treatment of all employees, regardless of employment group, and help to promote a fully inclusive team culture. The change would also assist with improving efficiency and effectiveness of key staff management processes such as payroll and absence management.	It is agreed that there should be a single Joint Negotiating Committee for all employees of Public Service Commission, provided that it is established properly with clear terms of reference and if there is a genuine clarity over terms and conditions which have been negotiated clearly and fairly.	As many local authority workers undertake the same or similar tasks and responsibilities as Whitley Council workers within Government, it would make sense to seek to arrange for the terms and conditions to be analogous to those within the proposed Public Service Commission. Ideally it would add far more clarity if they were combined as it would minimise the scope for misinterpretation and conflict.	This is a significant question, requiring a detailed scrutiny and comparison of all terms and conditions for Civil Servants, Whitley Council and others if any implementation of a new body is to be successful. As a Department with both manual workers and civil servants, the following comments are offered: - There is the need to review "blissages", substitution pay, acting up and variations over sickness and disciplinary/grievance procedures. Disagreements over these are demoralising and time wasting for all concerned. We should be seeking to pay people for what they do and when they do it, rather than risk having to pay an increased rate throughout someone's career, because on a very occasional basis they may do something higher than their normal grade or working hours. - A new structure for standardised grievance/disciplinary procedures should be established to speed and simplify the process. - Performance related pay or piece rate opportunities may be effective in some areas (for both employer and employee) and should be considered. - Flexibility needs to be built into all role descriptions to avoid concern over requests to do work that appear outside of what is written down, though this is already a matter for Departments to address. - The reduction or removal of premium pay for evening or weekend working, and greater use of annualised contracts, would better align pay to private sector practices and achieve many of the financial savings which would typically be achieved by outsourcing. Overtime, annual leave allowances, Flexible working and the concept of set break times should similarly be reviewed.	The proposal represents a significant step forward from the current position which appears to have arisen from an imbalance in negotiating skill/style between employers and employee side. We are left with a Memorandum of Agreement which is too grey in key specific areas, is not always clear and transparent in its use, and leaves the potential for inconsistent interpretation. Workforce flexibility is increasingly paramount and hopefully a combined employing body will reduce the risk of a culture of mistrust between manual workers and civil servants. The current terms and conditions with set breaks, etc., risks giving public sector workers a poor public image as they are sometimes seen to be 'all set in their ways doing nothing' whilst taking their break during the working day. More flexibility where possible could help with this. Hopefully the proposal would also help create a more corporate approach and reduce silos further. The current manual worker arrangements do not appear to properly protect those that should be protected, risking demoralising the good staff that are performing, yet do not see action being taken by management to pull their weight. The Memorandum of Agreement is perceived to make it extremely difficult for management to tackle those who are not performing. As a consequence many managers shy away from taking action, risking demoralising the good staff that are performing, yet do not see action being taken by management to rectify the situation. It should allow Departments greater flexibility to try to offer development for all staff without seeking approvals from either Whitley or the Civil Service Commission. In conclusion, the Department fully supports the proposal which if carried out correctly would help to foster a better team culture and facilitate better efficiency and productivity across the workforce, whilst at the same time allowing greater flexibilities to suit the needs of both employer and employee. The proposals would also seem to support Agenda For Change's push towards creating a simpler, less bureaucratic and more transparent Government.

Full Name	Are you representing yourself or an organisation?	Organisation	Q1 (Q9) Having regard to the intended scope of employment groups to be included, which employment groups do you think should be included within, or excluded from, the remit of a Public Services Commission.	Q10 Why have you chosen these groups to be included or excluded?	Q2 (Q11) Do you support the development of a single Joint Negotiating Committee for employees of a Public Service Commission?	Q3 (Q12) Please indicate your preferred arrangements for determining the terms and conditions of service for manual and craft workers employed by Local Authorities who would not become employees of a Public Services Commission?	Q4 (Q13) Which particular terms and conditions do you believe should be changed for new starters?	Other Comments (Q14) Please provide any other comments or observations you may have regarding this proposal to establish a Public Services Commission.		
	Self		If an organisation, what is the name of the organisation?		Yes	No	If no, please indicate possible alternative arrangements.			
Sally Brookes	Self			Included should be: Civil servants and those that are on terms and conditions which are analogous to Civil Service (There are some posts within my Division which are analogous and there are others in other Divisions) Manual Workers Excluded: Teachers Lecturers Education Support Staff Youth Service	Excluded: Teachers are already excluded in the TOR and this is correct in my opinion. I would be concerned if they were subsequently included as I feel that this would cause even more problems with recruitment. Lecturers should be treated the same as teachers as these are specific education roles Similarly for the Education Support staff and Youth Service. These are very specific roles not suitable	Yes	This would be a matter for the Local Authorities to arrange	Terms and conditions should be kept under regular review as they are here at DEC. This means that all can ensure that they remain fit for purpose alongside changes in legislation, current best practice etc.	Currently any negotiations with staff in DEC are education focussed and enable the Department to be proactive re educational needs of children. Negotiations are then held with the relative educational representatives from professional associations, unions and broader staff groups. If a Public Service Commission included education staff, education specific changes would be more problematic in the future. I presume that consultation/negotiation would have to be across wider staff groups than just education.	
Anonymous	Self			The need to be able to recruit from the UK for certain groups, and for them to be able to move between positions and have pension transfer rights is understood. However what reason could there be to exclude any other group of IOM Government Department, Board or Office employees?	If this exercise is to create an efficient and cost effective structure this would surely be achieved with the least number of groups being excluded. That said it is difficult to see how the very diverse employment terms and conditions of all the groups could be fairly represented by one body.	No	Whilst realising the need for efficiency savings the working practices and needs of the two main groups being considered are different. Office and manual workers are not the same and should be represented by the people who have the experience of doing so, and have done for many years. It is only two main negotiating bodies, the issue here is surely the wide range of terms and conditions and employing bodies within each of the two groups which lead to administrative difficulties and increased costs.	Whitley Council are a body which represents both IOMG and Local Authority employees. This should not change. Disbanding Whitley to suit IOMG leaving Local Authority workers without a representative body is not right. Nor would it be right for IOMG to be in a position where they were setting T&Cs through a new negotiating body for Local Authority workers who they do not employ.	None - I think it is unfair for the employer to be asking a prospective employee to accept different T&Cs to those of an employee already employed in the same position.	Civil servants and manual workers, alongside professional staff, are all required to deliver and support IOMG services. If the differing T&Cs of like for like workers, established over the years, need to be harmonised to facilitate a more flexible workforce, the skills and experience of Whitley Council could assist in identifying how this could be achieved for manual workers. Such work is already underway in DoI where DoEC and Health workers are being brought into what is, in effect, the beginnings of a new shared service. This is happening under the current negotiating structure so why is this change necessary? Assuming the underlying reason for this change is to deliver savings, where are the details of how these will be achieved. Is there really that much administration saving when time and absence management and payroll are computerised? Or is this in fact just a way of eroding the workers' means of resisting unfavourable changes to T&Cs.
Anonymous	Self									
Siobhan Gail Meredith	Self									
Anonymous	Self			Civil Service, Whitley Council. Perhaps Prison Officers?	Same reasons given in your summary above	Yes	A 'by analogy' basis would be a starting point.	I'm not fully aware of the ins and outs of the T's & C's of all employment groups, so can't really comment here. It think the broad pay and conditions of Civil Servants shouldn't really change much, but 'local agreements' would be the place to look first for any savings.	It must be born in mind that in the last few years of high inflation, pay awards have been negligible, and staff pension contributions are increasing substantially. This proposal makes sense, but in my opinion should not be used as a way to hit staff with further pay cuts. Whilst some 'local agreements' raise an eyebrow and need reviewing, particularly in Whitley Council, I don't think there's much scope for further cuts to the broad terms and pay of ordinary Civil Servants, including shift and weekend pay. The Civil Service still needs to attract talented and dedicated staff at all levels, so there is a limit to how much pay can be cut.	
Frances Mary Butler	Self			It is sensible to include all workers in public service who are not subject to UK regulations	It is a matter of common sense mainly. I am in favour of streamlining processes as long as that supports the philosophy and direction of well-managed public services and is not used as an inflexible rule book.	Yes	Only if this were able to freely express the views of all members. It is interesting that you are attempting to harmonise groups where some voices are very strong and who refuse to budge from their position. How would it help to have a single group for workers who have very different types of work and who are not all as vocal as others. Your voting and negotiating systems are going to	I don't know enough about it to comment.		I think that total centralisation of things like this leads to the same kind of problems you see in the EU. I think that overall the government thinks that this will help but I think that they need to be very careful how they go about it.
Anonymous	Self			As identified in consultation doc plus non-teaching DEC staff. Potentially other groups could be included as I do not believe a single employment authority precluded inclusion of groups whose pay is based on UK comparators eg education or health; the PSC could take these linkages into account when determining pay.	See comments above	Yes	To be determined by LA's who may choose to negotiate similar terms to those determined by a PSC if they wish.	Sick pay - in particular - reduction in entitlement on appointment for certain groups Overtime and premium rates eg for weekend working Recruitment and retention allowances if found to be no longer appropriate. Pay scales - where these have no basis on current pay norms and local recruitment pool Conditioned overtime unless this can be justified by efficiency of working patterns	It should be a principle of a PSC that anything which can appropriately be done at local level should be delegated eg dismissals, establishment of new posts (although some mechanisms to ensure consistency of pay for similar posts may be required), approval of special leave requests, appointments and whether these are made by open recruitment or not, early retirements, extensions of service, relocation grants and interview expenses. All subject to appropriate policy framework and guidelines.	
Kate Alexander	Self									
Simon Pontee	Self									
Rod Evans	Self				Yes				The management of standards of individual performance, which is to be improved, still appears to focus on addressing poor practice. I don't disagree with this but feel it should be better balanced with acknowledgement of & encouragement for good practice. I also feel that 'good' management should be a working practice rather than a formulated process. Managers are being potentially deskilled by imposed 'formulated processes'. The current system does not appear to address commitment, loyalty & a sense of responsibility. This has a counter effect of eroding these qualities.	
David Boulton	Self			Anyone paid from the public purse should be included.	The public purse is funded by tax payers.	Yes	Local authorities should be left to negotiate with their employees but could use terms and conditions of a Public Services Commission if they chose.	The terms and conditions in civil service regulations are satisfactory.	I believe everyone paid from the public purse is a public servant so all should be treated equally.	
Geoffrey Hicklin	Self									
Anonymous	Self				Yes					
Sharon Ingham	Self									
Anonymous	Self									
Frank Harrison	Self									
Anonymous	Self			Any public servants whose terms and conditions are not dictated to by external agencies / regulatory bodies etc.	Where possible, there should be equity of terms and conditions across public service for all workers.	Yes	"Alternatively, terms and conditions for central government manual and craft workers, determined by a Public Services Commission, could be adopted for local authority workers on a 'by analogy' basis." This one. The closer the Government can get to harmonising all Public Sector workers, the better.			
Anonymous	Self									
Anonymous	Self			I believe the PSC should include all Civil Servants, Whitley Council, NHS Whitley, MPTC and Port Services Group staff.	Their terms of conditions are broadly similar but they are currently covered by separate agreements with slightly different procedures for things like disciplinary, grievance, bullying & harassment, capability, etc. There would also be scope to rationalise various allowances for overtime, on-call, standby payments, etc, if they were all covered by one set of terms and conditions of employment. Ultimately, there could also be a move to one job evaluation and grading system covering all roles in these areas which would tidy up the current mess of different grading systems, skills allowances and local agreements - many of which have been in place for years and are in dire need of review and benchmarking against one common system of job evaluation/grading.	Yes	The simplest solution would be for local authorities to adopt whatever T's & C's are agreed by the PSC. The current method of negotiating with Unite representatives for manual workers followed by the involvement of another "union" Whitley Council as the negotiating body is time consuming and wasteful. With civil servants negotiations are carried out with one union (Prospect) who are represented at the relevant JNC. With manual workers there is too much duplication of effort in agreeing/negotiating with UNITE, then further negotiations/agreements required with Whitley - there is no logical reason why negotiations cannot be concluded with UNITE representatives on a JNC, thereby negating the need for the continuation of a Whitley Council.	Weekday overtime should be paid at flat rate or time of in lieu. Weekend overtime call-out overtime should either be at flat rate or a maximum of time and a half i.e. no weekend premiums. Staff should be subject to capability dismissal at any time - not until all sick pay entitlements have expired, which could be after 12 months - as is the current practice for Whitley staff. Sick pay should be reduced to three months full pay, three months half pay. Only statutory annual leave should accrue (as per Employment Legislation) when staff are off long term sick. New staff in all areas to be on a revised all encompassing grading system - irrespective of whether current staff are moved over to a revised grading system	The greatest saving in time and effort will be the abolition of Whitley Council which is archaic, cumbersome, duplicitous and of no purpose when national Unions can provide the required input at JNC level.	
Andrew Brammall	Self									
Christine Anne Cringle	Self			None included - All excluded	I oppose this new body	No	Whitley Council	Same terms and conditions for all - why be unfair to new workers and new terms and conditions for new workers is just a way of sneaking changes past current employees.....	Surely just another waste of Government time and funds -Funds which could be better spent elsewhere maybe on the pensioners or homeless .	
Anonymous	Self									
Eric Whitelegg	Self									
Department of Education and Children		Organisation	Department of Education and Children	Included: Civil Servants + those where ALL terms and conditions are analogous to Civil Service (there are some Education Improvement Service posts where terms and conditions are analogous to C.S. other than the pension scheme, which is the Teachers' Pension Scheme due to the difficulties in recruiting to these roles). Manual Workers Excluded: Teachers Lecturers Education Support Staff including Education Support Staff 3P (protected posts) NIC staff (small number of historic posts not recruited to anymore) Youth Service	Excluded: Teachers are already excluded in the terms of reference - with which the Department wholly agrees, given that these roles are specific to Education. The Terms and Conditions of Service for Teachers are subject to regular review and indeed the Discipline, Capability and Grievance procedures were recently re-written in conjunction with the unions concerned in order to provide greater clarity, streamline, speed up processes and thereby achieve indirect cost savings. Many other aspects of the terms and conditions mirror those for teachers in the UK. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below. Lecturers - should be treated the same as teachers given that these roles are specific to Education. They too have their own JNC, terms and conditions of service and salary scale, they are members of the Teachers' Pension Scheme and many aspects of their terms and conditions are specific to the HE/FE sector.	Yes	DEC supports the development of a single JNC subject to the PSC incorporating ONLY employing civil servants and manual workers. See answer to question 10.	Suggest this is a matter for DoI and Local Authorities.	DEC believes that all terms and conditions should be kept under regular review in order to ensure that they comply with legislation, reflect best practice, are improved in light of experience, enable the employer to meet its service delivery needs and are generally kept fit for purpose. Indeed, this is what DEC itself endeavours to do, in conjunction with the relevant unions and staff representatives, in the interests of all concerned. Without knowing the final scope of staff groups to be included in a PSC, it is difficult to comment on which terms and conditions should be changed for new starters.	Currently, the collective bargaining arrangements in place in DEC are education focussed and enable the Department to be pro-active in relation to educational drivers for change in negotiation/consultation with unions and staff representatives working mainly in the educational field. A PSC which included any educational staff groups would inevitably mean that such education specific changes would not be as straight forward to achieve in future as such changes would have to be consulted upon/negotiated across a wider non education focussed group. Hence, issues on which the Department can be pro-active at present and which can currently be achieved within a very tight timeframe may take many months in future which would be of considerable detriment in a service subject to frequent change.

				The Terms and Conditions of Service for Lecturers are also subject to regular review and indeed the Discipline, Capability and Grievance procedures were recently re-written in conjunction with the unions concerned, again in order to provide greater clarity, streamline, speed up processes and thereby achieve indirect cost savings. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below. Education Support Staff & Education Support Staff 3P - these roles are specific to education. This group has its own JNC and the Terms and Conditions of Service for Education Support Staff have also subject to review and indeed the Discipline, Capability and Grievance procedures were recently re-written in conjunction with the representatives concerned, are now very similar to those of teachers. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below. NJC staff - there are a small number of colleagues who remain protected on these terms however as and when these colleagues leave, they are replaced by Education Support Staff. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below.					
				Youth Service - these roles are specific to education with links to the UK for many aspects of their terms and conditions. See comment about Redeployment and Redundancy below. Redeployment and Redundancy The Department has its own collectively agreed Redeployment and Redundancy Policy and Procedure which applies to all DEC staff, other than manual workers. Civil Servants do, of course, have their own policy and procedure. DEC's structures regularly change given budgets, pupil number fluctuations, priorities in supporting children/young people with special needs and services being reviewed and rationalised etc. The DEC Policy and Procedure has been very successful in enabling the Department to implement these changes whilst maximising redeployment opportunities and minimising redundancies.					
Department of Education and Children	Organisation	Department of Education and Children		At present, the Department can act rapidly under the aforementioned Policy and Procedure which is vital bearing in mind the dates budgets are known, the need to implement any required re-structure in time for the next academic year and for teachers and lecturers when their last contractual notice date is 31 May to leave at the end of an academic year. Such changes can be effected speedily as the whole process is within the Department's control and we work in close partnership with the relevant unions. However, should any of the aforementioned groups be included in a PSC, the Department would lose such control, a Redeployment and Redundancy Policy tailored for education is unlikely and therefore the Department's ability to achieve the required staffing structures in time for the start of each academic year would be compromised. Indeed, in the Department's experience, it has been far easier to redeploy its directly employed staff rather than those for whom the Department is not the employer ie civil servants.					
Lonan Parish Commissioners	Organisation	Lonan Parish Commissioners	the Board of Commissioners believes that it is appropriate given the size of Government that all employees are covered by the same umbrella scheme. This will be more cost effective and create a more flexible workforce. The pay and conditions should reflect the benefits received at the higher rather than lower scale.	Yes			Their arrangements should be the same as all of the others to create a fair and level playing field.	The same as current holders.	
Andrew Shipley	Organisation	Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)	The ATL is pleased to see that Teachers are specifically mentioned as one group outside of the consultation at this stage. The ATL believes that Education Support Staff, of which we have some 70+ members should also be outside of the remit of a PSC.	Education Support Staff (ESS) are not spread across different government departments and set in the context of the wider government workforce, do not have a significant role. The DEC have worked closely with employee representatives and the unions over the years to develop terms and conditions specific to this group of employees. The DEC already manage staff directly and have developed robust mechanisms to redeploy staff when necessary in situations of falling roles or when needs within the service change. The ATL believes that this facility to be		For ESS their pay is determined as a result of negotiations outside of the JNC and the only issue around this has arisen out of an agreed previous position which incorporated an average outcome of Whitley Council negotiations and Civil Service negotiations. This has subsequently been revised to be the same as the outcome of Civil Service pay rises. The ATL would envisage that this would continue under a PSC.	N/A	T & C for ESS are constantly under review and are updated as and when necessary. The current t&c are applicable to new starters for ESS. This is another reason why the ATL believes that ESS should not be included in a new PSC as there is a risk that we end up with another set of t&c to consider alongside current ones within education. The current arrangements allow changes to t&c, which could be determined by a PSC, to be readily incorporated following discussion within the JNC. Bringing ESS within a PSC would potentially involve negotiations removed from education which involve more unions, such as the ATL, whereas at present changes to t&c are discussed directly with employee representatives with unions having observer status.	The ATL is a specialist union and Professional Association. We work in education and represent education workers, whether Teachers, Head Teachers and Education Support Staff. While we recognise that a PSC may seem to be a way to streamline negotiations and operations for the majority, the ATL believes that there may be risks and the little, specialist voice may be lost in the discussions with much larger employee representatives. The ATL believes that a PSC, if it represents a significant portion of the government workforce, could become embroiled in disputes more readily and a problem in one area could spill out into other areas.
Andrew Shipley cont.	Organisation	Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)		Due to aspects of work which are specific to education being undertaken by ESS, managers within education are already familiar with these. Having a PSC would potentially introduce another layer of complexity in that there would need to be a narrative to potentially explain the why's and wherefores of the situation. Performance Management (PM) is more effectively managed closer to the point of delivery rather than being removed to another, more distant body such as a PSC. It seems non-sensical to introduce another layer of bureaucracy when this presents an opportunity to simplify matters and keep PM within education.					
ADAM TEARE	Self				No				
Robert Holden	Self		Teachers, Health professionals & IOM Fire Service should be included.	The IOM's economy has historically been different to the UK's so why should the UK be dictating T & C's to this group of workers?	No	I have no confidence this process will be fair to manual workers and will greatly advantage civil servants T & C's.	As long as it's fair I don't care. The impression is that the manual worker will have their T & C's greatly affected and civil servants will have improved conditions.	Preferably none as it could be one of my kids taking a job within Government.	
D.Cripps	Self		All employment groups that are not directly linked to pay arrangements with the UK should be covered by the new PSC. Local Authority, Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and all Government related staff, be it Central Government of Local Government, should be included.	The purpose of the new PSC is to streamline the process and, in the long run, cheaper for the tax payer. If you do not include Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and Local Authorities you will have the position where staff doing a particular job under the PSC will earn more, or less, than staff in Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and Local Authorities who are doing exactly the same job. This cannot be fair or right. Also, if Independent Regulatory Bodies, Statutory Boards and Local Authorities are not included they will all require their own negotiating bodies for establishing their own employment terms and conditions. This would be an extra cost which could easily be avoided by these staff all being covered by the PSC. Government should be making the process simpler not including unnecessary levels of bureaucracy.	Yes		I think Local Authority staff should be covered by the new PSC and am disappointed that politicians feel unable, for some reason, to include them within it. As a next best alternative Local Authority staff should be by analogy to the PSC. This would remove the need for separate negotiating bodies and the costs and administration associated with them.	Looking at a recent advert for a Civil Service job I can see that salary, hours of work, annual leave, sick leave, retirement age, pension rights and qualifications are all included within the terms and conditions document. I see no reason why all of the above should not be reviewed for new starters. The review of salary should not just cover basic pay it should cover all the 'added extras' including overtime, guaranteed overtime, shift allowance, on-call payments, dirt money etc. and work out what is considered fair in the modern world. I know of staff that are paid an on-call retainer 52 weeks of the year, even if they are abroad on holiday when they can't possibly turn up for work in the case of an emergency - this is a ridiculous situation. The whole financial package needs to be reconsidered as part of the review. Also, a chart showing gross pay (including a breakdown of 'added extras') for every type of job should be available to the public so that we know what all staff earn. Our taxes and rates pay their wages so why shouldn't this information be available to us? This chart of gross wages should encompass ALL Government related staff, not just those within the PSC. Qualifications required for particular jobs should also be reviewed. In recent years there has been a steady increase in qualification and experience requirements for some jobs within Government but not for others. In the current job market it would be possible to ask for higher requirements and experience without going short of job applicants.	This is an opportunity to make the current system much simpler and fairer as well as providing a chance to give better value for money to the general public. We need openness about what staff are earning, including 'added extras', so that all staff are accountable to the public who pay their wages. Things cannot go on as they are. In recent years the Civil Service Commission has created a standardisation of terms and conditions for Civil Service jobs but the Whitley Council's negotiating format has caused major imbalance across other public service staff dating back many years. Local agreements, including different agreements within the same department, have created a real inequality amongst Whitley Council staff and this needs to be evened out. All wages, for both Civil Servants and Whitley Council staff, should be reviewed. Inequalities will surely be found but the knee-jerk reaction of increasing the pay of the lowest paid staff should not automatically be taken. Wages will have to come down for those who might be considered to currently be 'over paid'. This may not be a popular decision within some areas of the public sector but it is necessary. Going forward, during annual pay negotiations, the PSC should look into fixed price wage increases e.g. a set sum of money or a fixed amount of pence per hour increase.

D.Cripps cont.	Self				It is very important to include all Whitley Council staff within the new PSC. The Whitley Council has been shown to be an out of date body that has helped, with the assistance of weak Government management, to create the unequal, and often inflated, wage situation that we have today. Whitley Council has also helped create the situation where staff within different divisions of the same department, who are doing the same job, are earning different wages. There needs to be a fairness brought in which is currently lacking for both employees and employer. Simpler, standardised terms and conditions would be easier to understand and therefore easier and cheaper to manage.						At the moment the preferred option is a percentage increase. This system favours those who earn more by increasing their pay at a greater rate than those on lower wages. It perpetuates the myth that those higher up the management ladder work harder and therefore deserve a greater pay increase than those who carry out lower level jobs. This leads to a situation where, over time, the gap between those on the lowest wages and those on the highest wages grows bigger. This results in a round of extra pay negotiations every few years to increase the pay of those on lower wages in order to remove the increased pay gap created by the percentage pay increases. Giving a fixed price wage increase would ensure that all staff increase by the same amount each year which is fairer and better value for the tax/rate payer.
D.Cripps cont.	Self				Politicians need to be bold and include as many Government related staff as possible. They need to do this in order to make the management of staff terms and conditions more workable and to give greater value for money. All Government workers, be they Local or Central Government, work for the same employer - the general public. The new system needs to be as efficient as it can be and ensure that all unnecessary levels of administration and expense, that will be paid for by the general public, are removed.						
Anonymous	Self					Yes			In my opinion, local authority workers terms and conditions should definitely match those of central government workers.		
Graham Higgins	Self			I believe the Airport Fire Service be excluded from the remit of public services commission. We recently had our terms and conditions revised to remove any outdated local arrangements. This I'm sure saved the department money.	Compared to other departments. The fire section is totally different. We have so many responsibilities. Whether we are required to patrol the airfield for birds or treat casualties with a defibrillator. We are an emergency service. A legal requirement at a licensed aerodrome. One minute we could be detailed to marshal an aircraft, the next we could be told to man the rescue boat for an aircraft ditching in the sea. We work shifts which includes weekends and other unsociable hours. We are also expected to attend training courses sometimes off the island. I am unaware of other departments that do this. I believe because the fire section is so different, we cannot be included in the remit with the other departments.		No	I do not support the development of a single joint negotiating committee. Civil servants and manual workers perform different rolls. Their salaries and working times differ greatly. Civil servants tend to work 9 til 5 and manual workers work unsociable hours. I believe Whitley Council should be solely responsible for manual workers terms and conditions. Whitley Council have the best interests of the manual workers at heart. I would also predict that the civil servants who make up the minority of government would make all the decisions affecting the manual workers who happen to make up the majority.	I believe the airport fire service and Whitley Council be responsible for determining its own terms and conditions.	So as not to split a workforce. The new starters would have to be on the same terms and conditions.	There are certain departments in government that work differently to others. They cannot all be treated the same.
Anonymous	Self			I am not sufficiently informed to make a comment. I do feel that the Isle of Man should always consider employment separately to the UK as we are an entirely different market, with different needs, different tax framework, different cost of living and different economic environment. It makes no sense at all to adopt UK standards of salaries, benefits etc.	No groups chosen.	Yes		I think so. Difficult to say without better understanding the current arrangements and how they affect the employees.	There should be fewer local authorities in the Isle of Man - we are a small island and the overheads of retaining Commissioners in all the parishes is unsustainable and makes no sense. They should all have their terms and conditions determined by one Commission and economies of scale should be made.	They should be closer to private sector; less pension, no "jobs for life", there should be performance related elements, and strong systems in place to deal with poor performers. Salaries should be at market rates or we will continue to find that the jobs go to those unable to find work in the private sector rather than to the best performers. For example I would rather see a few excellent, well paid leaders rather than more mediocre managers. The Isle of Man needs to compete at an international level and can only do so with the right people in strategic positions. The Isle of Man should continue its work with entrepreneurs who can bring ideas and bring work to the island and maybe seek voluntary contributions from retired successful business people to assist with the development of the Island.	Seems reasonable and it is certainly time to update the attitudes within the civil service and government without making the costly mistakes they have been making in the UK with PFI initiatives and expensive IT projects which fail to achieve the intended outcomes.
Anonymous	Self										
Anonymous	Self										
Yvette Mellor		Organisation	Department of Social Care	I feel that all the statutory boards should be included.	They have no direct links to the UK. Whilst they may contain specialist staff, so do the civil service, so they should be included to allow more freedom of movement for succession management purposes, negotiation of pay, control of headcount etc.	Yes			I think to ensure consistency over terms and conditions, leave etc that the "by analogy" arrangement would be best.		I can't think of any reason not to establish the Public Services Commission. It will reduce the number of negotiating bodies for pay and terms and conditions, improve the ability to move staff, remove anomalies between pay groups doing similar tasks and remove spanish practices.
Anonymous	Self										
Tim Craig		Organisation	Onchan District Commissioners						Onchan District Commissioners would prefer that all local authorities employing manual and craft staff form a single negotiating body to offer analogous terms to those determined by the Public Services Commission, but with flexibility to negotiate local agreements where necessary.		
Peter John Prosser	Self			Nothing should change it should stay the same as before with the Whitley Council in control	Not Applicable		No	I don't think there needs to be alternative arrangements and we should stay with the Whitley Council	The Whitley Council	None	I don't agree with a public services commission it would give the government too much control and all they are interested in is saving money and decreasing the deficit, why should they do that by interfering in my wages and pension. We should stay with the Whitley Council.
Andrea Barker	Self										
Anonymous	Self			Included - Civil Servants (+ analogous staff) Whitley Council Staff (+ analogous staff) Excluded - IoM Constabulary; Teachers; Health Professionals; Fire Staff	Those included - staff are widely represented across Government and many T&Cs overlap. Those excluded - staff pay levels are linked closely to UK.	Yes			T&C developed by PSC adopted for LA workers by analogy	It is not easy to comment on all the T&Cs which could be changed, as I am not aware of any definitive list or details of current T&Cs. However, from some of the T&Cs which I understand are in place, which I would like to see changed: Conditioned overtime (e.g. staff being paid for hours they don't work); Paid lunch hours (if still in place anywhere); Receiving extra pay (e.g. double time) for being on a rota to cover a bank holiday and then not working due to sickness; Excessive pay for person(s) cleaning buses; Any other outdated / excessive	
Anonymous	Self			All employment groups should be included	The major benefits will come from eventually having one central body with no exclusions.	Yes			The most cost effective arrangement would be to link to similar workers within the PSC.	1 Removal of final salary pension schemes 2 Realistic notice periods and compensation for termination of employment in line with private sector	
Anonymous	Self			Whitley Council MPTC	Because I don't think it is fair on the employees who accepted terms and conditions to have them removed		No	they should be split determined by present terms and conditions and specific work arrangements, one body could not vary or manage conflicting areas of employment	Local authorities should give up their responsibilities and such staff and responsibilities should be amalgamated to shared services, local authorities should only be elected members and administrative staff, who manage/liaise on behalf of clients/users and elected members decisions. There are too many property/maintenance/land management teams in a small island, working against each other or not uniting resources, validating management roles. This is not cost effective or efficient use of resources on such a small island.	to divide new starters and current employees in such a way can only lead to a new generation of resentment, lack of team focus and potential lack of moral for equal workers with less equal terms and conditions. Could also promote constructive dismissal to current employees due to lack of moral and lack of equality in a team. engineering conflict	For info I am not a WC employee, am a civil servant but I foresee potential conflict
Anonymous	Self			I think the target should be to include all groups at some time.	Because for the process to be fair all those who serve the public should broadly speaking have the same terms and conditions. Otherwise the exercise is somewhat wasteful.	Yes			Retain current arrangements	Without some idea of what the employer is planning it's hard to say. As an existing employee I'd be reluctant to lose any T&Cs. I do see however that some things may need to be negotiable. My only worry would be recruitment & retention moving forward.	I believe that it is a sensible way forward
Anonymous	Self			All employees of the government should be under 1 employment contract.	Centralised administration, single employer and standard terms and conditions is the only sensible cost effective approach. It is well overdue for all the ridiculous concessions that have been made to be cleared out. Staff should earn a fair wage for a fair days work and standard terms and conditions should govern this.	Yes			Local authorities should be responsible for their own employees. Negotiation should be between employer and employee.	Final salary pension scheme should be closed to new entrants. Totally agree that one set of fair terms and conditions should be established based on a wage per annum or hour with agreed overtime rates for lower paid staff. All other benefits should cease. Holiday allowance should be linked to average holiday in private sector.	It is essential that this body is established. All terms and conditions should be harmonised and simplified.
Anonymous		Organisation									
Anonymous		Organisation		All employees engaged by government or statutory boards of government.	A single unifying body should be the most cost effective and efficient solution.	Yes			Individual authorities should be allowed to negotiate T & C's independently, subject to their being made public and therefore, the authority members become accountable to the rate payers.	Every aspect of their T & C's should be reviewed and tested against free market rates.	
Anonymous	Self						No				
Anonymous	Self			all to be within		Yes		I would hope that with one body, the JNC they would have a far better grasp for PAY across the board! on	the terms and conditions should be the same/ similar just administered by different bodies	Annual Leave entitlement - it does not take long to build up the maximum annual leave allowance of 30 days and when the majority of staff have 30 days, plus bank holidays etc, most are here for 221 working days - it is sometimes difficult in small teams for all staff to take their 30 days balancing the business needs.	Would the new terms, conditions and pay result in established staff having to reapply for their posts, or would they automatically 'shift' over to these ?
Anonymous	Self			Apart from the groups named above I think anyone working for the government should be included or it will just be the lower paid workers.	If we are going to have a PSC it makes sense that as many government workers as possible are included as this will be a fairer and more consistent way of dealing with people.	Yes			I think they should be included. If terms and conditions for PSC workers are to be adopted by local authorities then they should be included and counted as PSC workers	New starters should be on an assessment linked pay increases until they can prove they are competent enough to do the job they are being paid to do.	Existing pay and conditions of employment shouldn't change for staff who have 5 years or less to work. Please issue some reassurances about pay/conditions, some staff I have spoken to think they will have their pay cut by as much as half and will no longer be paid enhancements for weekend & bank holiday work.
Mark Higgins	Self			All government workers should be included in the proposed commission.	It is only fair that if this is going to take place, then all government workers are considered.		No	There are distinct differences between the two work groups. Civil servants have fairly routine hours and a main salary. Manual workers normally have to work extra hours and are not salaried. There needs to be a completely different approach to these two distinct groups.	All manual workers should be subject to the same terms and conditions. Keep them together but separate from civil servants.	Don't change any conditions, this would cause ill feeling between co workers. Negotiate properly and openly to alter terms using unions and work groups. Don't steam roller terms because it has been proved it doesn't work even with a small group.	Don't combine groups just for the sake of it. Look carefully at why they should be grouped together if at all. Since most of the civil servants are management above the manual workers, I can see any changes being slightly more sympathetic to them. Although it was encouraging to see pension provision standardised.
Alan Smith	Self			None		Yes					

Anonymous	Self		The Whitley Council employment groups should be excluded from the Public Services Commission. They should remain as Whitley Council and not be lumped together with the Civil Service. If this can happen for so-called Health Professionals, Teachers etc. why not the Whitley Council?	I feel that this whole performance of linking groups together is simply to cut costs via the revising of existing employment contracts. This means that on a personal level I have every confidence that I will be losing money.	No	Simply leave the Whitley Council alone.	Perhaps they should consider joining the Whitley Council	None	I resent the fact that this government is trying to save money by reducing the workers wages. I feel that they should be looking at themselves first - set an example.
Anonymous	Self		all groups should be covered including all those listed above. The government should be able to arrange a proper recruitment drive for health PROFESSIONALS and not be dictated to by other countries.	Everyone should be treated fair without prejudice and discrimination.	No	no i do not support this. Leave them as they are separate.	remain as they are unchanged!!		I don't think it is fair that the government are looking to unify everyone. Some areas have different terms & conditions. In some cases these may be more beneficial than others and why should be loose these. These are part off are terms and conditions which we signed up for when taking up our posts and now government want to change them!! If we have The Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006, this would and could not happen!!
John David McDonough	Self								
Anonymous	Self								
TIM NORTON	Self								
Andrew Bertie	Self								
Anonymous	Self								
Sonia Faragher	Self		All public service personnel should be considered really. However I do think specialist work such as for example hospital employees would be difficult to amalgamate as these are specialist workers and cannot be 'redeployed' to other areas of government and therefore would be limited progression to professionals as indicated in the report and I think there will be a lot of pools of people like this.	As above really, there will be a lot of experienced/qualified staff who will be unable to be re-deployed as indicated in the report.	Yes		No reason why they cant be similar terms and condition to whatever is determined by PSC, just under different regulations.	Probably hours and such 'perks' as in DOI as accrued time - it should just be straight hours worked and not time off in lieu for overtime worked. All overtime should be paid for if needed.	In principal the idea should good but I foresee lots of unqualified staff on inappropriate grades - for example a manual DOI worker could not be on a Civil Service Admin Assistant grade (i.e. no formal qualifications) so the grades would need looking into.
Paul Harper	Self		The term "Health Professionals" is very wide ranging and arguably has in the IOM a different context to UK NHS health professionals. There are many staff in the IOM health services who, if they were in the UK NHS would not be Civil Servants e.g. Med Secretaries, IT, health informatics staff, FHS staff, Hosp Manager. Therefore if the term "Health Professionals" is an encompassing term to include "clinical" ie at the bedside - hands on staff but not the others who we also need to attract from the UK NHS, then either include said staff with "Health Professionals" or exclude all of them. In other words, create a level the playing field and make meaningful comparisons with what actually happens elsewhere.	for the reasons outlined above.	No	Professionals and non-professionals are being 'lumped' into one JNC and potentially will be treated similarly. At least have a split for those that hold by virtue of their post need to have professional qualifications and those that do not. The question being asked does not give much indication as to how the harmonisation would work but the potential for the "lowest common denominator" by virtue of those with the biggest number of staff getting more representation on the new JNC, exists.	I have no experience of Local Authority Employees and therefore do not feel I can comment	Create a single pay spine which reflects current pay should be early on the agenda Phasing in the new T&Cs over a period of time say 3 years should also be a consideration for existing employees with said T&Cs being mandatory for all new recruits from a set a date.	Over the years who should be a CS or non-CS in Health Services appears to have been a rather arbitrary affair with the result being some groups are paid more than their UK counterparts e.g. Nurses as non-CS, but other senior health officials (all CS) e.g. Hospital Manager being paid significantly less than their UK counterparts. However, other Health Service Groups e.g. Consultants are tied into the UK rates of pay which are geared to looking after a much larger health population than the IOM has. Equally the move by the UK Govt to regional pay for CS makes comparisons even more difficult. These differences need to be considered and by creating a "Health Professional" group and leaving them out of the PSC only accentuates the inequity.
Marie Obrien	Self		If it was to change we all should be involved, and will the groups you intend to put under the new remit get what the nurses got when they went through the agenda for change big payouts at the expense of the taxpayer. The tax payer is under the impression that government needs to save money, this to me seems like a waste of the tax payers money sending out all this paper work and can government afford all this I dont think so I say leave what is working alone stop wasting money.	As we all should be equal as that is our right	No	leave well alone	as it is	None we all should be equal	Stop wasting the tax payers money
Anonymous	Self								
Anonymous	Self		All public service employees should be within the remit of a PSC. Restricting it to Whitley Council and Civil Servants is nonsense when at least half of all public servants will still be excluded. If you draw a salary from the public purse then it should fall under the remit of the PSC. This exercise isn't worth doing unless it covers all government employees.	At present it isn't possible for anyone to give a definitive answer as to how many Government employees there are. Too many Departments, Boards and offices are engaging staff directly and some are ignoring the normal payroll arrangements. Until we can say with certainty that all staff are engaged properly through the normal payroll arrangements, we will never know how many there are and more importantly how much they cost. IOM Government can't function unless it knows its true operational costs.	Yes		That is a matter for each local authority to determine in accordance with its operational needs.	Not possible to say. Civil Service Terms and Conditions are transparent and available to view on the OHR website. Whitley council arrangements are much more opaque and even secretive. Publish all the details and I'll consider them side by side. until I've seen all the data, I can offer no comment.	It has to be fit for purpose. Current OHR arrangements under the new shared services are not, or at least give the impression that they're not. Examples 1 A sheet of working hours being sent in from an office outside of central Douglas and being returned with a note saying it was sent to St Andrews House 2nd Floor when it should have gone to 3rd Floor 2 The recent snow advice on 22 March was neither use nor ornament. Make a decision one way or the other. Managers in other offices were waiting for some direction and got none!
Anonymous	Self		All groups who are not linked to the UK for terms and conditions.	Linking groups whose T&Cs are set in the UK will be complex and may have negative effects upon our attractiveness as an employer	Yes				Long overdue
Neil Davidson	Self		All groups should be included and as an absolute minimum Civil Service and Whitley Council must be included.	If all groups are included the outcome will be inclusive, equitable and fair for all. As a minimum Civil Service and Whitley Council must be included as they represent the majority of the workforce and it would be (and currently is) divisive and inefficient to maintain the status quo.	Yes		A by analogy' basis, would be the fairest approach.	In general terms inequity should be addressed. Where terms and conditions are considered to be over generous when compared with the majority, consideration should be given to 'leveling the playing field' for new starters.	The new approach must be fair and transparent and provide equity across the public service.
Anonymous	Self								
Anonymous	Self								
Natasha Whitaker	Self		All employment groups with the exception of those groups closely linked to UK terms (i.e. MPTC, HMD, Education, Police, Fire etc)	The employment groups linked to the UK need to remain so that the Island remains competitive and attractive in recruiting these specialist posts.	Yes		Analogy to PSC	All T&Cs that are included in the PSC should be changed for new staff.	Long over due, will simplify, reduce bureaucracy and improve consistency in the management of staff due to the harmonisation of policies, i.e disciplinary, capability etc.
Anonymous	Self		None	I retain concerns as to how such diverse services/staff can be brought together under one set of T&Cs	No	See q10	See Q10	See q10, also I do not have enough information to be able to answer that question	See q10, also I do not have enough information to be able to answer that question
Paula Beattie	Self								
Paul Moffatt	Self								
Anonymous (duplicate entry)	Self								
Juan Turner	Self		Include all but retain links to UK T&Cs where necessary eg doctors, school teachers etc bearing in mind a linkage to net pay and not gross pay		Yes		This is a matter for local authority employers and should not be a consideration for central government.	I do not have sufficient knowledge to answer this	
Kelly Wilson	Self								
Trevor Hussey	Self		None		No	I agree that the Public Service Commission should be the single point of negotiation for public service employees. The separate sub-committees proposed as an interim measure should be retained as a longer-term fixture. The T&Cs of civil servants and manual and craft workers are different and pay negotiations can be complex matters in which the position between the staff association and the Commission can be wide. I do not think that introducing further complications into this negotiation is helpful. What is now a two-way discussion could become a three-way discussion, at least, and this would not be conducive to settling disputes or concluding negotiations in a timely matter. A single negotiating body on the employer side will provide the benefits required. Negotiating with all associations representing civil servants and manual and craft workers at the same time does not, in my opinion, add any value.	I cannot see any sensible solution other than the proposed Commission setting these terms and conditions on the behalf of local authorities - and being empowered to do so.	This is a matter for the Public Service Commission to bring forward for negotiation.	This move is long-overdue and, in principle will enable all public sector employees to be treated equally and will give the employer the opportunity to achieve objectives across the public sector. As a long-term objective, a Public Services Commission should be able to simplify negotiations processes and to develop more consistent terms and conditions and this should provide the opportunity for simpler employee representation arrangements. All this is precluded by the need to have constructive relationships between staff and employees; policies that are consistently and fairly applied; management and leadership training; decisions on what services Government actually provides (by following through the Scope of Government review) and crucially, determining the number of staff actually required. The Commission is merely the mechanism for applying what falls out from this and is the answer to nothing, in itself.
Anonymous	Self		In addition to those stated in the Consultation document, I would suggest that the staff of local authorities ought to be included.	This would streamline the costs to those local authorities. It would also encourage best practice amongst local authorities, who would "buy in" the services on a cost basis, not on a per worker basis. Services could be much more easily shared between local authorities, at a time when Central Government is seeking to streamline the whole local authority structure. For example, one experienced Chief Executive could run 2 or 3 small authorities, with the PSC being the employer, and this would enable cover 5 days per week for all those local authorities if something untoward occurred suddenly. The same is true if a service was provided - e.g. gardening. This could be more efficiently provided on an all island basis with individual authorities buying the service in from the cheapest contractor - either PSC or privately. It would also encourage PSC services to be	No	Some of the Whitley Council grades of worker are so complicated and specific that it would be totally unfair on them individually to "lump them in" with the more general grades or civil service. That said, I do think that a largely unified approach (with acceptable safeguards for negatively impacted workers) may be a better/cheaper way of doing it. As a Civil Servant, it does feel unfair when one part of the public sector gets a greater or smaller pay rise than another.	I think that Local Authority workers should become part of the PSC staff. If that definitely is not to happen, their pay should be rigidly linked, by analogy.	I do not think Terms and Conditions should be changed for new starters. I do not think that pension provision should be tampered with again. I do not think that the final salary pension scheme should close. I think it is wrong to single out new starters for punishment. I have never heard of a scheme yet which was changed for new starters, and which wasn't subsequently back-applied to all remaining staff. I do not trust the current employer in this regard (and my suspicions have been well founded) and I will not trust any new employer who may replace them in this regard. It is my clear experience that politicians like to meddle. They like to unpick the good work of their predecessors, and politicians should not be let loose on people's livelihoods.	It appears to me that several decisions have already been taken regarding the PSC and its remit, and this leads me to suspect that the PSC is something of a "done deal". To be fair, it might be an essentially good idea, but Government Consultations are at risk of losing all credibility if too many self fulfilling prophecies are consulted upon. Some evidence in the reviews of consultees comments (which should be automatically supplied to all consultees who responded) that comments have impacted upon thinking and how, and not just steamrollered over would be reassuring in this regard.
Anonymous	Self		If you exempt groups as outlined above because there are linkages to the UK then it would be discriminatory to force the rest of us into one group. We are either all in or all out there should be no exemptions.	As mentioned there should be no discrimination. If you are asking for us all to be included in PSC it does not seem fair that certain groups will still be excluded on matter what the reason.	No	To remain as they are Civil Servants and manual workers separate.	No interest in local government workers either way.	I don't believe any terms and conditions should be changed.	I do not agree with the principal to establish a PSC. I feel there is a wider agenda here, similar to what happened in the UK and do therefore not support this.
Rebecca Dooley	Self		If introducing a unified body then surely should include all groups of staff - Whitley, Civil Servant, MPTC, NIC, teachers, police etc	Should include all government workers. I have managed an area which had 4 different sets of terms and conditions, this required time consuming and difficult interpretation of labyrinthine and archaic terms and conditions and also led to discontent between staff on different terms and conditions - each as different procedure for	Yes		Analogous terms and condition much the same as Tynwald employees currently	"Spanish Practices" such as paying people for working unsocial hours when they don't in fact work them (annual leave or sick). Paying people different rates for working at weekends in the same area - eg MPTC staff get plus 1/3 for Saturday working and plus 2/3 for Sunday working whereas Whitley get plus 1/2 for Saturday working and plus 1 for Sunday working. Travel allowances payable when relocated to a new workplace.	Only equitable if includes all staff not just Whitley and Civil Service.