



Public and
Commercial
Services Union

MOTIONS BOOK

**Standing Orders Committee SOC
Report No.1 Conference Agenda**

DWP Group Conference 2026

Contents

<u>MOTIONS BOOK.....</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION TO THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE (SOC) REPORT NO. 1.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>CONFERENCE AGENDA.....</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>MOTIONS FOR DEBATE (CATEGORY A).....</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>OTHER MOTIONS (CATEGORIES B, C, D, E & X).....</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>NOTES.....</u>	<u>102</u>
<u>APPENDIX 1.....</u>	<u>103</u>
<u>APPENDIX 2.....</u>	<u>106</u>

Introduction to the Standing Orders Committee (SOC) Report No. 1

1. Duties

The duties of the SOC are set out in rule 31 of the PCS DWP Rules and Constitution

The SOC received 116 motions electronically. Of the motions received 66 have been marked "A", to be debated, 17 have been marked "X" (X = motions which are out of order).

The creation of Composite motion A at the DLM section, adds an extra motion which in essence makes the total 117 motions, albeit that branches only submitted 116 motions to the Standing Orders Committee for deliberation, to be included in the SOC1. The remaining motions have been allocated "B", "C", "D", or "E" markings as per standing order A34.

A = Motions for debate, grouped under subject headings

B = Motions which confirm existing policy

C = Motions which seek to reverse policy as determined by Conference in the past two years.

D = Motions capable of being dealt with by correspondence with the Group Secretary.

E = Motions covered by composite motions in Category A.

X = Motions which are out of order.

3. Duration of Conference

The duration of Conference will be one and a half days and while the SOC do not believe that there will be sufficient time for all motions marked "A" to be debated, we have taken steps in time tabling which we believe will maximise the number of motions considered.

We hope that all participants at Conference will co-operate in progressing business as far as possible.

4. References back

Motions online allows branches to submit emergency motions (EM) and reference back (RB) once the conference agenda has been published.

The motions online facility will reopen on Tuesday 14th of April 2026, at 10:00 and remains open until, Thursday 14th of May 2026, at 12 noon.

5. Emergency Motions

A branch wishing to submit emergency motions for consideration by the SOC, must do so online only to the SOC Secretary, to arrive no later than 12 noon on, Thursday 14th of May 2026.

6. Representations to SOC

The SOC will be available between 4.00pm to 6.00pm in the West Bar of the Brighton Conference Centre to meet with delegates, to discuss reference back of this report and any further SOC reports, on Sunday 17th of May 2026, by appointment only. PCS Digital contains information regarding the reference back process.

If the details of the reference back sessions were to change, DWP Group will notify branches by bulletin.

7. The guillotine shall, subject to the President's discretion, be operated so that when the quota of time fixed by the timetable for any section, or subsection is expended, no matter what stage the debate may be, the vote shall be taken as if the motion. "the vote now being taken" has been carried

8. We recommend that in the order to manage business of Conference the following time limits shall apply: Movers of motions, 4 minutes Seconders, rights of reply and all other speakers, 3 minutes

9. All ballots and card votes conducted at Conference shall be overseen by the Group Scrutineers.

10. Guillotined motions

It is the intention of the SOC to bring some guillotined motions back onto the agenda in a short session prior to the close of Conference.

Branches requesting that a motion be included in the "Guillotine Section" should contact the Standing Orders Committee at Conference. A proforma will be available for this purpose from the Standing Orders Committee.

11. The SOC wish to record it's thanks to the PCS staff in the PCS Northwest Office for their accommodation and support to the SOC in the preparation of this report, and general support to the PCS DWP SOC Committee

Ian Bartholomew - SOC Secretary

John Livingstone - SOC Chair

Mark Edwards (SOC)

Nicola Wild (SOC)

We have given a total of 17 motions an “X” marking, for the reasons shown below:-

X69 Factually Incorrect

X71 Beyond the remit of DWP Group Conference

X72 No instruction to Group Conference

X86 No instruction to Group Conference

X87 No instruction to Group Conference

X88 No instruction to Group Conference

X94 No instruction to Group Conference

X95 Unclear in intent

X97 Factually incorrect date

X98 Beyond the remit of DWP Group Conference

X99 Improper instruction

X101 Beyond the remit of Group Conference

X105 Conference can't instruct the DTUS

X112 No instruction to Group Conference

X113 Beyond the remit of DWP Group Conference

X116 Conference can't instruct the DTUS

X117 No instruction to Group Conference

Motion A14 (Composite A), (DLM section), will be moved by the GEC.

The timetable for PCS DWP Conference 2026 is likely to change from the one contained in this SOC1 report, if/when Emergency Motions are received.

These revised timetables/running orders will be reflected in SOC2, SOC3 reports in May 2026

Conference Agenda

Mon, May 18

09:00 – 09:15	Opening of Conference & Presidential Address Angela Grant
09:15 – 09:17	Appointment of Tellers
09:17 – 09:30	Adoption of Standing Orders Reports
09:30 – 09:45	Presentation of Group Annual Report - Group Secretary Kim Lowes
09:45 – 10:25	Pay
10:25 – 10:55	Campaigning
10:55 – 11:05	Employee Relations
11:05 – 11:25	Guest Speaker - PCS General Secretary, Fran Heathcote Fran Heathcote
11:25 – 12:00	Welfare Reform
12:00 – 12:30	Distinguished Life Membership
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch Break
13:30 – 15:15	Conditions of Service
15:15 – 15:30	Break
15:30 – 16:10	Equality
16:10 – 16:40	Grading
16:40 – 17:10	Staffing
17:10 – 17:30	Health & Safety Close of day 1

Tue, May 19

09:00 – 09:05	Presentation of Group Accounts, Group Treasurer
09:05 – 10:15	Operations
10:15 – 10:30	Guest Speaker
10:30 – 10:50	Employee Deal
10:50 – 11:05	Union Organisation
11:05 – 11:15	Privatisation
11:15 – 11:45	Guillotine Section
11:45 – 12:00	Vote of Thanks
12:00 – 12:00	Close of DWP Conference 2026 Close of Conference

Motions for Debate (category A)

Pay

A1

Seconded by HQ Sheffield branch

Covers E68

Group Executive Committee
DWP Sheffield (047008)

This Conference Notes:

- That the DWP's application of the treasury remit guidance resulted in the GEC rejecting the pay offer in 2025.
- That for the fourth consecutive year, DWP pay at the AA, AO grades are set to be overtaken by the National Living Wage, effectively turning the DWP into a minimum-wage employer and leaving DWP pay at crisis point
- That despite clear recruitment and retention risks and significant transformation, DWP management refused to submit a business case to HM Treasury for additional pay flexibility.
- Delegated pay bargaining has failed, creating unfair disparities between departments and leaving DWP staff at the bottom of the civil service pay ladder.
- The Treasury Pay Remit Guidance is not fit for purpose. The DWP needs significant investment in pay and staffing to lift members wages above the National Living Wage.
- The staffing structures in DWP and the numbers of members at AA, AO and EO level mean that the remit guidance simply cannot deliver pay improvements for DWP members.

Conference further notes that

- Talks have been taking place nationally with PCS and the Cabinet Office around pay.
- The remit guidance for 26/27 will be published in the coming weeks and initial pay talks will commence with the employer.

This conference calls upon the GEC to continue with its campaign on pay in the department. Any pay deal in the coming year must ensure that:

- All members receive an above inflation, cost of living increase.
- An element of pay restoration is included to account for previous years of real terms pay cuts and the lack of business cases being submitted in previous years by DWP
- The lowest paid staff in the department are paid significantly above the real living wage to move DWP away from being a minimum wage employer
- A significant differential is built in between the grades to end continuous pay compression across the department, created by the yearly National Living wage uplift.
- It is sufficient to address the inequity of the pay awards between staff who opted into ED and those that remain on legacy terms and to stop staff being punished for decisions made many years ago.
- It delivers proper pay rises for all staff who have previously TUPE'd into the department
- No element of pay is linked to performance or capability
- Pay for DWP staff will not be linked to reductions in staffing or increased workloads

Conference finally instructs the GEC:

If DWP continue to distribute the pay remit in a manner that fails to address chronic low pay, leaving PCS members again at the bottom of the Civil Service pay ladder, the Group must consider moving again to ballot DWP members to take action on pay, or support any national industrial campaign if such a ballot has been called by the NEC.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A2

DWP Fylde(047139)

Conference notes that one of the better elements of the 2016 Employee Deal was the introduction of spot rates for AAs, AOs and EOs; bringing the scale minimums up the scale maximums and solving the problem of a lack of pay progression that had existed for years.

Conference further notes that for the HEO grade a spot rate wasn't achieved even though HEOs were part of the Employee Deal and it was calculated at the time that it would have taken a further 4 years of Employee Deal payments for the HEO scale to reach the point of a spot rate.

Since 2020 there has been no further tangible pay progression for those on the HEO scale (which consists of a scale minima and scale maxima).

Conference believes that this isn't acceptable and calls upon the incoming GEC to ensure that the lack of pay progression for HEOs since 2020 be picked up in the 2026/27 pay negotiations.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A3

DWP Forth Valley Scotland(047077)

Conference notes:

1. Group Conference 2025 unanimously passed Motion A2 calling for eligibility for the Blue Light Discount Scheme to be extended to DWP staff and for the GEC to press to secure agreement from the scheme administrators.
2. Despite regular requests by the moving branch for updates on progress, the stock response from the GEC has been that they have asked the DWP to pursue it with the scheme administrator but have received no outcome.
3. No attempt has been made by the GEC, in line with the terms of Motion A2, to contact the scheme administrator directly, to add some pressure and urgency to secure a positive outcome for members.
4. The GEC has provided no briefing or update for members since Group conference 2025.
5. On 11th February 2026, at an all-colleague call with Barbara Bradley and in answer to a direct question about securing access to the Blue Light Discount Scheme, DWP confirmed "There is no further progress, but our P&C colleagues are actively trying to progress this. Please look at our own 'Reward Works' for some fab discounts etc."

Conference believes:

- ☒ Notwithstanding the unacceptable pay offer in DWP and the campaign we need to lift members out of poverty, DWP staff deserve the same recognition and access to national support schemes as other public-facing services, and that the continued failure to deliver progress is unacceptable.
- ☒ During the Covid pandemic, DWP staff were classed as “emergency workers”, many of whom worked onsite, despite the risks associated. If we were “emergency workers” then, PCS & DWP should be doing more to secure eligibility and access for our member to the benefits of the Blue Light Discount Scheme.

Conference therefore censures the GEC:

1. For failing to meet the terms of 2025 Conference Motion A2.
2. For failing to press DWP sufficiently to secure eligibility and access for our members to the benefits of the Blue Light Discount Scheme.
3. For failing to put direct pressure on the scheme administrators to secure eligibility and access for our members to the benefits of the Blue Light Discount Scheme.
4. For failing to provide any written updates to members.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to:

1. Provide a full written report to branches within two months of Conference.
2. Contact the Blue Light Discount Scheme administrator directly in line with the terms of Conference Motion A2.
3. Urgently escalate within DWP the lack of progress they have made.
4. Provide quarterly updates to all members until resolved.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A4

DWP North and Outer East London Branch(047033)

This Conference notes

- 1) PCS circulars announcing new pay scales did not mention London pay rates
- 2) PCS press articles rarely feature London pay issues
- 3) PCS has a significant number of members affected by London pay rates inside and outside the M25
- 4) EOs still receive an Inner London weighting of just less than £5000, but AOs receive a London weighting of just £1878 (and this has been reduced a few hundred pounds this year). Trust for London estimated in 2022 the minimum London weighting should be £6,549. In contrast to DWP staff, Metropolitan police constables get over £8000 in London allowances and their London weighting went up 4.2% in September. Even if DWP only gave a £5000 London weighting for AOs, it would be worth a £3122 pay increase.
- 5) AOs are officially low paid! AOs in London receive only £13.61 per hour doing a 42 hour week at a peak yearly salary of £29722. This is below the London Living Wage of £14.80 per hour. If DWP paid AOs the London Living Wage their salary would increase to £32323. Thus DWP needs to pay AOs £2601 more per year to bring them out of the category of officially low paid. Only 17.5% of workers in London are paid below the London Living Wage London's problem with in-work poverty.

This Conference believes

- 1) Increasing London pay rates can drive up the pay rates of all DWP staff
 - 2) London staff should all receive at least the London Living Wage and a London Weighting of at least £6549
- This Conference instructs the GEC to promote these demands in its pay campaign, literature to members and publicity/press releases

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A5

DWP Bucks & Oxon(047108)

Conference notes the carrying of motion A9 at DWP conference 2024.

This motion instructed the GEC to:

Negotiate for an extension of London Weighting to the areas that the SLPZ used to cover and to consider whether to extend it further

Since then, there has been no indication that the GEC has attempted to negotiate for the extension of London weighting. Despite requests for updates, none have been forthcoming.

There, conference instructs the GEC to carry out the terms of the motion and to report back to members on their progress.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Campaigning

A6

General Debate with A7

DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders(047063)

Conference notes:

1. The disappointing 37.5% turnout in the recent industrial action ballot.
2. 19,655 DWP staff (or around 22% of staff) are currently paid below the announced minimum wage, and the employer will be forced to increase their pay in April to yet again cover the bare statutory minimum.
3. All London-based AAs and AOs are paid between £1,446 and £3,394 less a year than the London Living Wage.
4. All London based staff in all 3 grades who opted out of the Employee Deal are paid less than the London Living Wage.
5. Nationally employed AOs who have to work weekends and earlier and later in the day as part of the Employee Deal, are only paid £45 more a year for the privilege.

Conference believes we need to take a strategic approach to winning what is likely to be a multi-year fight on both pay and ways of working.

Conference instructs the GEC to initiate a multi-year campaign supported by thorough and meaningful consultation with BECs minimally based around the following demands:

1. Pay restoration to pre-2008 levels.
2. AAs to be on a real living wage, with real pay differentials between AAs, AOs, and EOs.
3. Reinstitution of in-band pay progression .
4. End the multi-tier work force: Insourcing of all FM contracts; Coherence of pay and T&Cs across ALL bargaining units, harmonising upwards; and return to pre-modernised Ts & Cs.
5. Job security agreement.
6. 4-day week with no loss of pay.
7. Ending arbitrary and unnecessary office attendance requirements.
8. 35 days' starting annual leave.
9. No compulsory Saturday or late-night working, with overtime or alternative working patterns always on offer for those choosing to work those hours.

Conference further instructs the GEC that when other disputes arise relating to ways of working, they should be integrated into this campaign around the slogan of "Our Work, Our Way", seeking to put members in control of their own working life. This may include, but is not limited to, disputes around workplace attendance, rotas and the use of AI.

Conference further believes that for this campaign to succeed, we need an ambitious organising and campaigning strategy to ensure we become a majority union which is not only ballot-ready, but remains always strike-ready as a key metric of our union power. Conference therefore finally instructs the GEC to provide all necessary support to BECs to support those proposing to initiate disputes and campaigns aimed at achieving and/or making progress towards any of the above national demands. This should include supporting discussions in every workplace to identify possible disputes in ways of working, including but not limited to workplace attendance, rotas, and the use of AI.

A7

General Debate with A6

DWP West Hampshire(047104)

Conference recalls Motion A1, passed at group conference 2025 which instructed the GEC to:

- work closely with branches and regions/nations to coordinate campaigning to meaningful national pay bargaining and sliding scale wage structure and to popularise PCS demands amongst DWP members about the need to stand up and fight for 10% pay rise [and] mobilises to ballot our members on pay.

Conference notes the DWP pay ballot of 19th January - 23rd February, which did not demand a 10% pay rise or a set minimum wage. Conference also notes that no work has been done to coordinate campaigning to meaningful national pay bargaining and a sliding wage structure to stop our wages falling below cost of living increases.

Conference further notes: -

- the passing of motion 2025/EM3, which called for a campaign leading up to and including industrial action if the employer did not rescind the 60% office attendance mandate and the lack of regular updates on this issue including on progress with the hybrid pilots in jobcentres.
- office closures, which will lead to job losses in Lincoln, London, St. Helens, Warrington, and Dover - not to mention the other "Transitional Sites" that still remain open.
- The Department's plan to cut the administrative budget by 15% by the end of the decade.
- The staffing levels of DWP are still significantly below where they need to be to deliver a quality public service, despite conference policy from 2022 to fight for 30,000 extra staff.
- Compulsory late and Saturday working still being in effect, despite 2022 conference policy to campaign for its end.

Conference believes that the whole raft of issues above must form the basis of a group wide campaign, and instructs the GEC to: -

- Build a campaign on the widest possible basis, designed to defeat the attacks on our members in the DWP, and to spare no effort in preparation for the launch of a statutory ballot in the absence of national industrial action.
- Table demands with the employer for: -
 - A DWP pay claim for pay rises of at least 10%, for £18ph minimum wage, for a minimum London pay element of £5,000, and pay restoration to cancel the disastrous austerity of the last 16 years.
 - The implementation of genuine hybrid working for all staff and genuine flexibility for our members on office attendance and the withdrawal of imposed 60% office attendance for back of house staff
 - At least 30,000 additional staff to reduce workloads and provide a quality public service.
 - Shortening of the working week to 4-days with no loss of pay.
 - Withdrawal of extended opening on Saturdays and after 5pm
 - A job security agreement that protects jobs, workloads, services, offices.
- Work closely with branches and regions/nations to keep maximum pressure on the DWP senior management and keep members updated and actively involved in what needs to be an ongoing campaign against all

the attacks on our working conditions, staffing levels, offices and pay.

- Use a strong campaign against cuts in DWP to build more coordination between groups and the national union to fight the common attacks across our union and mobilise our members behind our demands for national pay bargaining and sliding scale wage structure to prevent members falling back onto the minimum wage year on year.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A8

Seconded by DWP Cheshire

Covers E70

Group Executive Committee

DWP Cheshire (047014)

Conference notes the magnificent campaign of industrial action taken by members working in Lincoln City Hall in response to the DWP decision to close the back of house area of the office, a decision that put over 100 jobs at risk. Members in Lincoln have conducted an exemplary campaign to keep their office open, firstly by beating the 50% turnout threshold in their strike ballot as stipulated by the anti-trade union legislation, then by showing up at picket lines in huge numbers in the depths of winter during the 42 days of strike action.

The branch have kept up their campaign during the course of the dispute by having an ongoing dialogue with their local MP and by submitting a series of Freedom of Information requests which have exposed the rhetoric of DWP as having little factual base.

Conference notes that the GEC has also recognised the threat to hundreds of jobs posed by the closure announcements of Dover, Warrington, St Helens Service Centres and DWP HQ at Caxton House.

Conference acknowledges that as a result of the Government pursuing a severe cost cutting strategy across the Civil Service it is likely that the DWP Group will face more office closures that could result in thousands more job losses.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to:

- Continue to pursue the policy that the DWP group will not accept the closure of offices where those office closures will result in a reduction of DWP jobs in the communities that those offices are based in.
- Continue to campaign to fight all office closures that will result in job losses in their communities with every tool at PCS's disposal, including media, the PCS Parliamentary Group, activist allies, raising issues in local communities and by industrial action if necessary.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Employee Relations

A9

Seconded by DWP Essex

Covers E73, E74

DWP Fylde(047139)

DWP Essex (047050)

This conference notes: -

- The most effective bargaining with the employer takes place when there are good coordination and communication across the union at all levels to ensure that maximum pressure is brought to bear on all tiers of management.
- The vital role that branches, regions and Regional Trade Union Side teams play in keeping pressure on management, supporting branches so that issues can be tackled at the lowest possible level but escalated as necessary
- The growing frustration from branches across the group about the escalation route to Departmental negotiators which is not working as it should
- The frustration of branches and members in hearing that Senior management keep failing to consult and do not see the need to consult with PCS
- Often Branches find out about negotiations that have taken place is when management inform them about changes rather than getting the details provided to our union.

This conference therefore instructs the DWP GEC to: -

- Improve the escalation route for branches and trade union sides with clear guidance for group negotiators that responses must be provided to branches and Departmental Trade Unions Sides on what is being done with the escalation and what progress is being made
- Ensure branch bulletins are issued for all the negotiations that are taking place at Departmental level to keep Branches updated but also to ensure that branches can feed in issues and what is being dealt with at branch and regional level.
- Ensure Departmental and Business Unit negotiators recognise the key role the trade union sides play below Departmental and Business Unit in tackling poor implementation of DWP policies and decisions and identifying issues that are causing problems for our members and the public and why DWP policy decisions will not work at delivery level.
- Regularly review at least quarterly with branches to check that measures to improve coordination and sharing of information between all bargaining tiers are working and take action to address any problems.
- Develop the response to tackle senior management's failures to consult utilising the campaigning and organising strength of the whole union.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Welfare Reform

A10

Group Executive Committee

Conference Notes:

- The Department for Work and Pensions is moving to transform the whole of the Social Security service and its estate.
- That the mission for DWP under the transformation is to implement government's vision of a leaner civil service, with benefit delivery changes that will support economic growth.

Conference further notes:

- The long held policies of this group for a fairer, properly resourced Social Security system that places dignity and respect as core values of future provision.
- That existing policies such as Universal Credit, the five-week wait, benefit caps, two-child limit, sanctions, and harsh work capability assessments have resulted in poverty and stigma for claimants.
- That our members continue to be forced to implement policies that harm the communities we serve.
- That chronic underfunding, reduced staffing, office closures, centralisation of work, and automation have reduced access, increased error, and damaged the morale of our members.

Conference reaffirms our belief:

- that social security provision is a fundamental human right, that should be available to all at the time of need.
- that any future social security system should have the fundamental aim of eliminating poverty and provide security to the most vulnerable in our communities.
- that conditionality and sanctions are incompatible with a fairer empathetic system and must be abolished.
- that digital-by-default systems exclude the most vulnerable and must not replace accessible, face-to-face public services provided in the heart of our communities.

Conference welcomes:

- the latest edition of PCS' alternative vision for social security provision
- the GEC's ongoing commitment to co-ordinating our campaigning activity with DPAC, Unite Community, and others
- the PCS written submissions to the Pathways to Work: Get Britain Working draft policies and the oral evidence GEC officers gave to the DWP Select Committee.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to build on the work already undertaken by publicly campaigning for the transformation of DWP services and for real social security provision that brings:

- the abolition of sanctions and punitive conditionality;
- the immediate end to the five-week wait;
- the removal of the two-child limit and benefit cap;
- benefit levels set above the poverty line as a legal minimum;
- opposition to all job cuts, office closures, automation-driven redundancies, and outsourcing

The GEC is further instructed to continue to campaign for:

- a fully staffed, publicly delivered service;
- autonomy for members to make bespoke decisions that meet the genuine needs of the claimant not the political direction of the government;

- the insourcing of all contracted work

Finally, the incoming Group Executive is instructed to develop a campaign strategy that:

- explores industrial leverage where reforms increase harm to claimants or threaten jobs
- expands alliances with anti-austerity, disability rights, and community campaigns
- organise a national members' consultation about the DWP's transformation plans and to develop our future strategy
- challenges any government that continues austerity, conditionality, or privatisation in social security

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A11

Group Executive Committee

Conference is aware that s2A of the Employment and Training Act 1973 (ETA), prohibits the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) from making "arrangements in respect of employment for sexual purposes".

Conference has extreme concerns that the DWP considers OnlyFans creators to be in regular 'self-employment', no different to a plumber or hairdresser. This means that OnlyFans creators are held under the standard rules for self-employment and are not protected by the rules of the ETA.

This perversely means that whilst Jobcentres are prohibited from advertising or arranging jobs in the sex industry, despite many OnlyFans creators selling sex online, their work sits under Universal Credit rules and is therefore subject to those rules.

Where all should be protected by the ETA, there is a gaping loophole in legislation that has the possibility of pulling vulnerable people into, or further into perilous sex work.

As government and the DWP move to force claimants to increase their hours and so their income, it is highly probable that OnlyFans creators will be forced to do the same. It is again probable that this will force creators to produce more explicit and degrading pornographic content to attract more paying 'fans'.

As it is predominantly women that sell sex, this process will impact women in the main but will affect all claimants of working age. OnlyFans exposes women and other claimants to serious risk.

Welfare policy must not create pathways to exploitation, to predators, to violence against women and girls; must not provide opportunity for vulnerable people to be propositioned for in-person sex.

DWP must not give pimps the opportunity to financially abuse women, coerce them into prostitution, to cash in on monies earned.

DWP must not promote pornography and fill the Treasury coffers with the income from online sexual activity of vulnerable people.

Unless legislation is created or the ETA is amended to protect all claimants, then all claimants are at risk of being forced by the DWP to take up OnlyFans as self-employment.

This is far too easy a way to clear numbers from the benefit books.

Conference demands that DWP immediately stops allowing sexual content that is sold online to be considered acceptable self-employment; that it takes responsibility and accountability for its role in public service and public protection.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

Demand that the employer stops treating OnlyFans and similar platforms as acceptable forms of self-employment under Universal Credit and any other DWP programme.

Demand that Work Coaches are prohibited from encouraging, normalising, or allowing online sex-related content creation to be used as an appropriate employment pathway under Universal Credit or any other DWP programme. Demand that DWP creates a clear policy that opposes the promotion of all forms of sex work as self-employment.

Conference further instructs the GEC to:

Develop a campaign aimed at Work Coaches and all PCS members to raise awareness of the risks and exploitation associated with sex work.

Create literature and online materials to aid members in safeguarding vulnerable claimants, particularly women, girls, and marginalised groups.

Challenge any practice within the DWP that pushes or pressures claimants into sex work.

Work with the PCS Parliamentary Group to use parliamentary channels to press the Minister to bring sex-related self-employment under the protections of the ETA or new legislation; to ensure that sex-related work is regulated, scrutinised, and subject to safeguarding standards, and no longer accepted as ordinary self-employment.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A12

DWP Bolton & Bury(047027)

This Conference notes DWP encourage the use of Flexible Support Fund in order to remove barriers to work for UC & Legacy Customers. This can be used to support customers various areas such as training, certificates, identification, clothing, childcare or travel to work costs, particularly whilst waiting for their first wage.

Payments are awarded based upon actual costs of items or public transport and receipts are requested, however, the mileage costs for calculating fuel when travelling by car is still set at 25pence per mile despite significant increase in fuel over recent years.

It should be noted that DWP have increased the business travel mileage for staff for staff to 45pence per mile over two years ago.

Conference instructs the GEC to enter into urgent negotiation to discuss an increase relative to 45pence per mile for customers when paying flexible support fund in line with DWP staff policies.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A13

DWP Greater Manchester Branch(047023)

This conference has grave concerns regarding the inconsistent treatment of times spent in custody under the rules of universal credit, specifically, the use of AP dates for claim closures and the removal of the work capability decisions from closed claims regardless of medical assessment

Which leads to homeless customers losing premiums after one month but customers liable for housing costs keep the decisions for 6 months

This conference is very concerned for the safeguarding of vulnerable customers who have no one to speak for them.

This conference is also aware that the arbitrary seemingly inconsistent nature of these rules is a major cause of aggression towards staff and has triggered a number of incidents.

This conference instructs the GEC to work with MP's, disability groups and other interested parties to campaign for a change in the legislation for 2 changes that would bring consistency and fairness

1. To ensure that the closure date for all single UC claims without complex needs or housing costs is 28 days of incarceration
2. To preserve to preserve live work capability decision on all cases where the customer spends less than 6 months in prison

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Distinguished Life Membership

A14

Composite Motion "A" is SOC1 motion A14.

This motion will be moved by the GEC, as per SOC1 booklet introduction.

Covers E75, E76, E77, E78, E79, E80, E81, E82, E83, E84, E85

DWP Wigan Area(047015)

DWP North and Outer East London Branch (047033)

Conference agrees to award a Distinguished Life Membership Award to Lorraine Birkett formerly of DWP Wigan Area Branch.

Lorraine was a tireless and tenacious as a personal case and health and safety rep at the Makerfield site and was also a member of the Branch Committee and NW England Regional Health and Safety TUS's for many years.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Conditions of Service

A15

DWP Cumbria and Lancashire(047020)

Conference notes that the rollout of the 60% office attendance policy has been inconsistent, poorly communicated, and unevenly applied across teams. The requirement to attend the office 60% of the time is an arbitrary figure with no real practical grounding. It is purely political in nature.

Reports from members indicate :

- A lack of clear, consistent guidance from management on how the 60% requirement should be monitored.
- A disparity in interpretation, with some managers applying reasonable flexibility where staff can only achieve around 56%, while others are rigidly monitoring to the minute and directing staff to “make up” minor shortfalls such as 12 minutes.
- Staff feeling unfairly scrutinised, pressured, and confused due to the absence of a standardised, proportionate, and practical approach.

These inconsistencies demonstrate a failure by management to provide a workable framework and a lack of common sense application that respects operational realities.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

1. Open formal discussions with senior management to challenge the current monitoring arrangements.
2. Seek an agreed, fair, and consistent approach, ensuring that:
 - o Flexibility is applied where 60% cannot be met exactly for legitimate reasons.
 - o Monitoring is proportionate, supportive, and transparent—not punitive or overly prescriptive.
 - o Managers receive clear written guidance to avoid inconsistent or arbitrary decision-making .
3. Report back to members with a clear summary of outcomes, guidance, and agreed monitoring procedures.
4. Ensure that any process adopted protects members from unreasonable micromanagement and reflects practical realities within teams.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A16

Seconded by DWP Cumbria and Lancashire

Covers E90

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

DWP Cumbria and Lancashire (047020)

Extended trigger days:

This Conference notes:

1. That the current DWP Attendance Management (AM) policy sets a short term sickness trigger of 8 working days within a rolling 12 month period, or 4 periods of absence in the same timeframe. That these trigger points are among the strictest in the Civil Service, and we have repeatedly seen them used in a disciplinary manner rather than as part of a supportive wellbeing framework.

2. That DWP staff face high workloads, performance pressures, customer facing stressors, safeguarding responsibilities, and complex case management, all of which contribute to increased levels of stress related and short term sickness absence, as well as being susceptible to pick up coughs, colds & infections.
3. That other major public sector organisations operate more supportive systems, including:
 - o NHS England: typically, 14 day short term sickness thresholds before escalation.
 - o Local authorities: many uses 10–14-day triggers with broader discretion.
 - o HMRC – trigger days are the same trigger days as DWP but not customer facing.
4. That DWP’s rigid 8 day trigger:
 - o Drives loss of productivity, particularly in Jobcentres and Service Centres.
 - o Disproportionately impacts staff with disabilities, neurodivergence, chronic conditions, and caring responsibilities, & awaiting a new diagnosis’s.
 - o Forces staff to return to work before full recovery, increasing relapse and long term sickness episodes.
 - o Undermines DWP’s stated commitments on wellbeing, reasonable adjustments, and inclusion.

This Conference believes:

1. That the DWP AM policy should prioritise support, not punishment, in line with PCS DWP Group policy and our long-standing opposition to harsh attendance procedures.
2. That raising the short-term trigger to 14 days is consistent with:
 - o Modern occupational health guidance.
 - o Sector wide best practice across the UK public sector.
 - o The operational reality of DWP work.

This Conference resolves:

To instruct the DWP GEC to:

- o Seek urgent negotiations with DWP to negotiate the AM policy.
- o Press the department to implement a 14 day trigger as standard.
- o Ensure wellbeing conversations, support plans, and reasonable adjustments are prioritised over formal warnings.
- o Demand explicit protections for disabled members and those with long term or fluctuating conditions.
- o Challenge any penal uses of attendance management through escalation and disputes where necessary.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A17

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

Conference is pleased that auto-immune diseases are discussed more freely in the media and are becoming more understood by most people. Conference notes that there is no specific advice for managers dealing with attendance management cases where an auto-immune disease is involved, and misunderstanding the basic principles of an auto-immune disease is common.

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate a new section in the Attendance Management policy, with basic information on auto-immune diseases. The GEC is free to agree the wording, but it should cover, as a minimum:

- That auto-immune diseases affect people at a genetic level, and each case will be unique
- That people with the same auto-immune disease are likely to have completely different flare triggers, symptoms, and medication side-effects

- That many of the medications used have an immune suppression effect and the risks from this must be considered
- That there are likely to be common generic symptoms such as fatigue, joint pain, and brain fog
- That comorbidity is very common, and the individual is likely to be diagnosed with more than one auto-immune condition

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A18

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

Conference recognises that the Attendance Management informal discussion/cause for concern process is rarely used but can be used to impose upon someone a decision to aggregate all future part day absences and count them towards an individual's trigger point. Conference also recognises this removal of something that ordinarily all DWP staff are entitled to, a flexi credit for sickness absences of less than half their conditioned hours, is the most extreme decision that can be applied using this process, used primarily in cases where there may be suspicion the part day absence rules are being abused. However, conference is concerned that there are no checks and balances in this process to protect staff who have more frequent part day absences because of a disability.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to re-negotiate the wording of the informal discussion/cause for concern process in paragraphs 22,23 and 24 of the Attendance Management Procedures. The GEC are free to agree the wording, but the re-negotiated policy wording should ensure that where the part day absences are because of a disability that the process should be formalised if the individual wishes. This should include, as a minimum, advance notice in writing, the right to representation, an opportunity to request specific OHS advice and a requirement for proper meeting minutes.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A19

DWP East London(047030)

In 2024, A13 was carried unanimously, however we have not had any updates on what steps were taken to negotiate with the department regarding the instructions set in the motion.

The instructions for the GEC were:

- "Send an updated briefing to members advising them of their right to ask for full disclosure of the referral form when being referred. This can involve options like making the referral in the presence of the member. Or having a template/stencil that is completed before the online referral so member can see and agree to reasons mentioned. The briefing must make clear that members can request all information held on them from PAM via a SAR request, this includes transcripts of pre briefing and debriefing calls. The briefing must advise members to ensure these calls are transcribed otherwise it is very likely they will be made using a standard phone/mobile and there would be no record of the conversation.
- To negotiate for the consent form to be reviewed and updated to include details of pre briefing and debrief calls. Currently the form doesn't include these so technically there is no reason to assume members have permitted such calls.
- To negotiate for pre briefing call transcriptions be available prior to the OH consultation so members are aware of the discussion had between the line manager and the clinician.
- To negotiate the right to have an independent manager to raise the OH referral for members where the member feels they are being bullied, discriminated against or harassed by the line manager.
- Negotiate to get a more transparent complaints process with PAM where things have gone wrong."

An updated briefing was sent out in May 2025.

Regarding pre and post briefing calls, the briefing states:

"Your Line Manager may request a pre-briefing and/or post-briefing call in the referral if they feel they need it. This means that your Line Manager must inform you for any such request to be in the referral and you have the right to withhold your Informed consent DWP has clarified in response to PCS that:

- no additional consent is required for a pre and/or post call, as the employee has already provided their consent for the OH referral.
- PAM offer the Pre (Briefing) calls so that the referring manager has the opportunity to discuss with the clinician adjustments that can and cannot be accommodated. Nothing that hasn't already been disclosed on the referral form can be discussed, to ensure the consent of the colleague remains valid.
- The purpose of the debriefing call is to discuss the findings and for the clinician to discuss with the manager any recommendations they are going to make, having gained the verbal consent of the colleague to do so. These calls should only be conducted with the referring manager and are normally only 2-3 minutes in length and are held immediately before and after the employees OH appointment."

Conference notes:

- that the signing of a consent form doesn't automatically mean they will be provided with the referral form
- that the majority of members do not get to see the referral form before the OH Referral
- that 2-3 minutes before the consultation with the line manager to discuss adjustments that can and cannot be accommodated is questionable since the consultation hasn't taken place yet and so recommendations haven't been made
- 2-3 mins for a post referral call where they discuss with the manager the findings and recommendations they are going to make, also is questionable since, they would have discusses this with the member and the manager would be getting the report either way after the appointment.

In addition to this it is also noted that:

- Members are likely to get a more comprehensive report if they are referred to a doctor over a nurse or other clinician and that this request option is not made clear to members
- It is also not made clear to members that they have the opportunity to have sight of the report before their line manager. PAM Consultation policy states:

"Where a Consultation Report is provided by an occupational health physician who is regulated by the General Medical Council. An employee has the right of prior sight, to view the report before it is provided to their employer. This is part of the consent process. The employee has the right to review the report before it is sent to their employer and ensure that the report is accurate and there are no false statements in the report. Once the report has been viewed then the employee should provide their consent and the report is released to their employer. Prior sight consent is the right to verify and does not extend to the right to challenge or change the professional opinion of

the physician. The employee has the right to refuse consent in which case the report will not be provided to the employer and a factual report will be sent to the employer “The employee has refused their consent for this report to be released this matter is referred back to the employer as an employment matter.” No health information will be sent to the employer where consent is withheld. Prior sight rights do not apply to reports written by all occupational health nurses who are regulated by the Nursing Midwifery Council.”

The majority of members do not know that prior sight rights only apply where the appointment is booked with clinicians regulated by the GMC.

- When members disagree with a report, usually a second referral is made, members are still not clear about the complaints process

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Negotiate with DWP to include every aspect of the referral in the consent form, i.e, have you had sight of the referral form? Do you agree with the reasons noted on the referral form? Do you agree to the additional questions noted? Do you agree to pre and post referral calls with your referring manager? Do you want a recording of these? Do you agree to the report being sent directly to the referring manager, waving any prior sight rights?

- Revise the briefing sent in May 2025 –

1 - informing and encouraging members to request OH appointments with clinicians regulated by the GMC for:

a more comprehensive report (where required)

for prior sight of the report with rights to amend any inaccurate information (as per PAM Consultation Policy)

- 2 – giving further details regarding the complaints process, either the link to the PAM Consultation Policy or share the information provided there for easy access

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A20

Seconded by DWP Sheffield Branch

Covers E91, E92

DWP Barnsley, Doncaster & Rotherham(047009)

DWP Sheffield (047008)

This conference recognises that Domestic Abuse occurs across society regardless of age, disability, gender, race, religious belief sexuality, wealth and geography.

It has extreme consequences for victims including physical and mental health issues homelessness and in extreme cases murder.

The Domestic Abuse Act 2021 contains a statutory definition of domestic abuse.

‘Any incident or pattern of incidents of controlling, coercive, threatening behaviour, violence or abuse between those aged 16 or over who are, or have been, intimate partners or family members regardless of gender or sexuality. The abuse can encompass, but is not limited to psychological, physical, sexual, financial, emotional.’

Domestic abuse can take many forms such as physical assault, bullying, economic abuse, sexual abuse, rape and threats. In addition, it may include coercive and controlling behaviours such as destructive criticism, pressure tactics, disrespect, breaking trust, isolation and harassment.

The Domestic Abuse Act 2021 recognises that an abuser is a person personally connected to the individual and can be a partner, relative, neighbour, or friend and acknowledges that not all domestic abuse is contained within a relationship with a partner.

Diversity among victims and how a person may have multiple characteristics can make it more challenging for them to come forward. In addition, stereotypical representations of domestic abuse victims can make it more difficult for individuals to identify themselves as victims and what is happening to them as domestic abuse

Domestic abuse frequently extends into the workplace itself, with different surveys showing that between 36% to 75% of employed victims are harassed by abusive partners while at work. Some abusers stalk and harass their victims during the working hours, using mobile phones, emails, social media and showing up unexpectedly at workplace. These behaviours are often detrimental on individual's ability to concentrate and perform at work and too often, the underlying reason for poor performance, absence, and disciplinary meetings, and sometimes it is only then that the abuse is disclosed.

Conference believes:

That the DWP domestic abuse policy is not fit for purpose and does not set out any clear instructions for managers when dealing with staff members who are victims domestic abuse.

The policy is not clearly signposted, visible or up to date

There is not appropriate signposting, including the specialist services to support victims of black, Asian and ethnic minority background, migrants, LGBT people disabled people and men

Not enough is done in DWP to support staff members who are victims of domestic abuse.

Conference instructs the GEC:

To negotiate a clear, robust and visible domestic abuse policy with DWP that puts the victims first and foremost. Which is regularly checked to keep up to date with changes in legislation.

To negotiate with DWP and agree a clear policy setting out roles and responsibilities for managers to sensitively support victims of domestic abuse.

To campaign for dedicated training for all managers on how to sensitively manage and support victims of domestic abuse.

To provide clear support and training for reps and members.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A21

Falls if Motion A6 is carried.

DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders(047063)

Conference notes that:

- Within DWP colleagues receive 30 days Annual Leave after 10 years' service.
- Within DWP leave is frozen depending on length of service on entry to either 23 days (for colleagues up to HEO) or 25 days (SEO to Grade 6) in year 1, 25 from year 2 and 26 days from year 6 then remaining on 26 days Annual Leave for the next 5 years
- In comparison to DWP, HMRC increase their staff's Annual Leave by +1 Annual Leave day each year for five years so that by the time HMRC staff have worked for 5 years they have 30 days' holiday rather than the 25/26 days

a DWP Colleague with 5 years' service, someone who has transferred government departments before completing 5 years total service across government, would be stuck on;

- In the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) which is part of the DWP family, Annual Leave for their staff is frozen at 25 days as standard and then increased to 30 days after 5 years;
- OFGEM offer their staff 30 days Annual Leave from Day 1.

This system creates disparities between Civil Service Departments and for those who transfer into DWP, for example from HMRC or HSE.

- This is an unfair and inconsistent and is a consequence of the lack of alignment/ collective bargaining and uniformity/ inconsistency on terms and conditions across government departments which lead to a two tier civil service for staff when it comes to terms and conditions
- DWP staff work in jobs of high stress and responsibility, and they require suitable terms and conditions to aid their wellbeing which must include 30 days' Annual Leave from day one of employment or transfer in. This would also aid retention and prevent staff shortages in business areas e.g. Work Coaches some of whom DWP Is losing to HMRC due to more beneficial terms and conditions and a lack of parity/alignment across government due to a lack of collective bargaining power across the Civil Service.

Conference instructs the Group Executive Committee to negotiate and agree an improvement within our terms and conditions in relation to Annual Leave and Civil Service transfers into DWP to progress to 30 days holiday far more quickly than after 10 years at DWP or total service across government.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A22

Group Executive Committee

Conference Notes:

That there is currently no statutory right in UK law to paid time off for IVF or fertility treatment appointments, either for the person undergoing treatment or for their partner.

That DWP currently has no publicly available, dedicated fertility treatment leave policy that explicitly protects the right of a partner to attend IVF appointments with paid special leave.

That under current arrangements, a partner wishing to accompany their wife or partner to IVF appointments is entirely dependent on managerial discretion under the general special leave provisions, with no guaranteed entitlement and no consistency of application across the Department.

That the Equality and Human Rights Commission Code of Practice recommends employers treat requests for time off for IVF treatment sympathetically, but that this recommendation is not binding and is inconsistently applied.

That IVF treatment involves a demanding, time-sensitive, and emotionally gruelling series of medical appointments, procedures, and interventions, which frequently cannot be scheduled outside working hours.

That the presence of a supportive partner at key IVF appointments is recognised medically and psychologically as a

significant factor in the wellbeing of the person undergoing treatment, as well as the relationship and family unit. That other public sector employers, including several universities, already provide explicit paid special leave entitlements for partners supporting a person through fertility treatment.

Conference Believes:

That DWP staff should not face the additional anxiety of needing to use annual leave, or rely on the goodwill of individual managers, in order to support their partner through one of the most stressful medical processes a family can experience.

That the current position creates an unfair and inconsistent patchwork where a member's ability to support their partner through IVF depends entirely on which manager they happen to have, creating inequality across the Department.

That a refusal to grant time off to a partner attending IVF appointments has a disproportionate impact on women and would be mitigated with a clear departmental policy.

That DWP's aspiration to be a family-friendly, inclusive employer committed to equality and wellbeing rings hollow while no such protection exists for staff navigating fertility treatment.

That this is an issue of workplace dignity, equality, and basic human decency, and that PCS, within its role as a national union, has a responsibility to lead where the law has failed to provide adequate protection.

Conference Resolves:

- To instruct the PCS DWP Group Executive to raise formally with DWP management at the earliest opportunity the need to introduce a dedicated fertility treatment leave policy that explicitly provides paid special leave for the partners of staff undergoing IVF or other fertility treatment.
- That any such policy should provide a minimum guaranteed entitlement of at least two days' paid special leave per treatment cycle for a partner to attend IVF or fertility treatment appointments, without the need for managerial discretion to be exercised on a case-by-case basis.
- That the policy should apply regardless of gender, sexual orientation, or relationship status, recognising the diversity of family structures across DWP's workforce.
- That pending the introduction of such a policy, branches should be advised to raise any refusal of partner IVF leave with their Group Officer, and to consider whether a grievance or Equality Act complaint may be appropriate in the circumstances.
- To urge PCS nationally to campaign for a statutory right to paid time off for fertility treatment appointments for both the person undergoing treatment and their partner, and to include this demand in any relevant negotiations with Government.
- To circulate guidance to DWP branches advising members of their current rights and the arguments available to them when requesting time off to support a partner through IVF treatment.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A23

DWP North and Outer East London Branch(047033)

This Conference notes that

- 1) In misconduct cases, an alleged offender often only receives an invite letter to an Investigatory meeting with a short summary of allegation against them
- 2) Investigating managers often misrepresent the case against an alleged offender in their summary of the

allegation

3) In security breach cases, members are not always sent the audit report prior to a meeting

This Conference believes

1) In the interest of natural justice and transparency, the alleged offender should be able to see any complaint against them (and witness statements) prior to a meeting so they can prepare their defence and can properly respond at the meeting to any allegation against them

2) In a security breach case, the same principles should apply and members should be provided the audit report and accompanying letter prior to a meeting.

3) Through this approach some unnecessary Investigatory meetings can be avoided and parties are clearer prior to a meeting what an Investigation will cover. This should improve the quality of Investigatory meetings.

This Conference instructs the GEC

1) To seek to negotiate with DWP improvements to DWP's Investigations in these areas so alleged offenders are provided complaints (witness statements) and audit reports before any investigatory meeting.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A24

Seconded by Brent Harrow & Hillingdon

Covers E93

Group Executive Committee

DWP Brent Harrow & Hillingdon (047028)

Conference welcomes the on-going work of the Group Executive Committee for the introduction of improved DWP disciplinary guidance, for information security gross misconduct offences for unauthorised access, as reported in PCS Briefing DWP/MB/026/25.

Conference notes that this outcome of consultation with PCS provides improved guidance for circumstances, under current strictly limited options for information security related penalties, where a Decision Maker should conclude that a Final Written Warning would be the appropriate penalty, rather than Dismissal, on the basis that: Decision Makers must consider a proportionate penalty (Please see Paragraph 7.29 within the Discipline Procedures). In information security cases and where the level of the offence is gross misconduct category, dismissal is expected as it usually causes a breakdown in the employment relationship due to lost trust in the employee's honesty, judgment, integrity, etc. It follows that a Final Written Warning, rather than dismissal, would apply instead where the Decision Maker concludes that a breakdown in the employment relationship has not occurred. These will be cases where all the following mitigate the case:

- The employee did not use the information, or facilitate someone else's use of it, for their own or someone else's gain, or to falsify claims for benefits; and,
- There is no suggestion of malicious or suspicious intent; and,
- There is no known harm or distress caused to any party, or it is unlikely that harm or distress would have resulted; and,
- There has been no reputational damage, or the matter is unlikely to have caused reputational damage; and,
- The employee can provide some reasonable explanation as to why they may have accessed the records or some other relevant mitigation

Conference agrees that this revised guidance should be used as a platform for more significant disciplinary policy and procedural changes. The Group Executive Committee is instructed to negotiate for:

- disciplinary procedural guidance to be improved for 'No Case to Answer' scenarios
- incidents where employees are simply browsing their own records to be declassified as 'gross misconduct'
- disciplinary decision options for all disciplinary cases to be improved to include a 'No penalty' option so that Decision Makers are able to give truly fair and proportionate outcomes for certain offences in the particular circumstances of an individual case

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A25

DWP North and Outer East London Branch(047033)

This Conference notes

- 1) An inordinate number of staff are subject to investigation/disciplinary meetings for browsing records
- 2) DWP policy means staff browsing their own record more than once or more than one record are usually sent letters stating they have committed gross misconduct.
- 3) Although guidance says managers should consider the impact of the browsing before deciding on a penalty, often managers give more weight to the number of accesses made by a staff member rather than their impact in determining a penalty for the security breach
- 4) The British legal system recognises that attempted offences are less grave than actual offences and penalties are less severe. DWP guidance should reflect this difference and make clear that attempted accesses should be typically treated less severely than actual accesses.

This Conference believes

- 1) DWP focusses too much attention on this type of security breach over more serious breaches
- 2) DWP places too much emphasis on the number of accesses made by a staff member in these cases and DWP should judge them more by the impact of the browsing
- 3) Guidance should be clear that attempted accesses should not be treated the same as actual accesses.

This Conference instructs the GEC

- 1) To negotiate with DWP changes to the security policy so that less weight is put on the number of accesses to a record/records when determining the level of misconduct and penalty in browsing cases and more emphasis is put on the impact of the browsing.
- 2) To negotiate with DWP a change to the security policy so it states an attempted access should not be treated the same as an actual access and may result in no penalty or a lesser penalty.
- 3) To negotiate with DWP a change of policy so no one is dismissed for browsing as a first offence where their accesses have had no impact or minimal impact
- 4) To request changes to the DWP security matrix in line with the above.
- 5) To update PCS members on these demands and the progress of negotiations by issuing circulars on this matter.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A26

DWP North and Outer East London Branch(047033)

This Conference notes

- 1) the DWP grievance policy is a mess and is difficult to follow for Managers, TU reps and employees
- 2) The removal of the guidance that says a G1 is optional
- 3) Some managers don't deal with grievances timeously and seek to sweep under the carpet very serious allegations
- 4) DWP Surveys show a complete lack of confidence by staff in the handling of grievances by DWP Managers.

This Conference believes that

- 1) The Investigation of a grievance should not be delayed because a G1 hasn't been completed. It should be sufficient for members to raise a grievance via an email.
- 2) DWP policy should be completely rewritten so it is easier for staff to comprehend how to take forward a formal grievance.
- 3) Guidance should be clear that Managers should deal with cases timeously and properly. Also they may be penalised if they unnecessarily delay hearing a grievance or attempt to frustrate complaints relating to serious allegations
- 4) It should be the norm that Managers dealing with serious grievances have no connection to the business unit (e.g Jobcentre District) where the complaint has been raised

This Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate with DWP changes to the grievance policy that addresses the above issues

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A27

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

Conference Notes: This conference acknowledges the increasing pressures faced by DWP staff and the critical importance of mental health and wellbeing in sustaining a productive and supportive workplace.

Conference Believes:

- Staff wellbeing is a fundamental right and should be embedded within workplace policy.
- Allocating dedicated time for wellbeing activities will help reduce stress, prevent burnout, and improve overall morale.
- An individual approach to wellbeing demonstrates an employer's commitment to staff welfare and equality.

Conference Resolves:

- To call upon GEC to negotiate with DWP to implement a policy guaranteeing all staff a minimum of 1 hour

per month specifically for wellbeing purposes.

- This hour should be paid time, separate from annual leave or breaks, and used for activities that promote mental and physical health.
- Managers must ensure this hour is scheduled fairly and consistently, without detriment to service delivery.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A28

DWP Sheffield(047008)

Conference notes Operations management originally planned to open some Jobcentres on Saturday 27/12/25 and therefore Employee Deal planning was completed with some PCS members volunteering to work. Approximately one month prior to 27/12/25 management communicated that the decision had been reversed. Cancellation of Saturdays has taken place before with flexi credits awarded for those for are contracted to work. For 27/12/25 the decision was made to cancel their contracted working day but without a flexi credit for those who were due to work, instead members were informed to make the hours up at a different time.

Conference believes this approach breaches the Employee Deal Collective Agreement and in particular section 16 sub section B – “A minimum of three-months’ notice is standard when notifying a change to an employee’s regular working pattern, including contractual working patterns.”

It is important to state that Conference agrees that DWP workers should not be working on Saturdays between Christmas and New Year and are pleased with the cancellation, however the members directly impacted should have been awarded with a flexi credit.

Conference instructs the GEC

- to enter early negotiations to ensure that Saturday working around Bank Holidays are not part of the Employee Deal working patterns going forward.
- hold wider consultation with DWP on the value of Saturday working in general.
- negotiate for members who were due to work on 27/12/25 to be awarded the appropriate flexi credit retrospectively (including for those who have left the DWP).
- to issues members information on potential breach of contract related to notice periods within the Employee Deal Collective Agreement within 3 months of conference so members understand their position if DWP act in similar way again.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A29

DWP Essex(047050)

In March 2004 the GEC agreed a settlement to the Collar and Tie dispute that began talks that implemented the Dress Standards from 5th October 2004.

These were based on the requirement for people to dress to a “professional and business like” standard.

It has a few simple rules, with a list that is not exhaustive on what can’t be worn –

- Denim clothing
- Lycra leggings
- Shorts – although in hot weather a local decision might be made to allow knee length tailored shorts.
- Cropped tops
- Clothing with inappropriate logos
- Trainers – unless smart and because they look like shoes or are medically requirement.
- Baseball Caps.

It is managers who judge whether a person’s dress complies with the “professional and business like” standard.

It is 22 years since these standards were implemented. Fashions and societies attitudes have changed.

This conference instructs the GEC to begin talks with DWP to update and amend the dress standards to reflect a modern society.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A30

DWP Sheffield(047008)

At my Jobcentre we are being told that the Smoking Policy in DWP changed a couple of years ago to prevent both Smoking and Vaping in outdoor areas of DWP premises.

We ask that Conference instructs the PCS GEC to seek to re-open negotiations with DWP about this Policy to provide more scope for local Managers and PCS to negotiate policies that protect staff from the harmful effects of passive smoking, but balanced with the need to keep those that do smoke free from unnecessary potential risks of violence.

I am sure my Jobcentre is not so unusual, the front of the building is on a main road. The back of the building neighbours a redlight area known for street walkers. We are told we can’t use the front of the building because it looks unprofessional. Instead we are supposed to use the narrow side streets, where we have seen drug dealing.

Staff working in Jobcentres accept and understand the risks we face in local communities because of the jobs we do. Fortunately these encounters off the premises on buses, in shops and on the street are usually no more than awkward, but they have the potential to be worse especially if the encounter is after they have just been ejected

from the building or sanctioned. Many of us have suffered physical or verbal assaults in the workplace because of the jobs we do, we should not be unnecessarily put at risk.

Many NHS sites allow vaping in areas that were previously designated for smoking. The DWP Policy is more restrictive than it needs to be, preventing site based decisions. What harm would it do to allow smoking or vaping in an area of a car park away from the doors and building?

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate a sensible Policy on this that allows local decisions to be made based on the risks to protect staff from both passive smoking and from acts of violence.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Equality

A31

DWP Fylde(047139)

Conference acknowledges that since the change to 60% office attendance hybrid our disabled members are under stronger attack in the workplace.

Many disabled workers are forced out of the workplace because managers fail to make 'reasonable adjustments' that are not following a standard script. This has escalated since the increase in office attendance came into effect 1 Sept 2025.

This is a known problem in DWP as senior management are aware of the number of cases on disability discrimination that they lose at tribunals.

Rights for disabled people have been achieved through struggle. This is important to know because our differently abled members still face the same barriers as 40 years past. They are still struggling for workplace rights in the DWP that are more than pretty words.

Disabled, and non-disabled, workers need worker's control of the workplace. The employer biased concept of 'reasonable adjustments' could be replaced by a trade union centric concept of necessary adjustments.

Many disabled workers face a dilemma about disclosing their disability when applying for a job or promotion. They believe disclosing a disability means they are less likely to be employed. This could be overcome if trade union reps had oversight of recruitment and promotion. It is not impossible. There is civic precedent. Liverpool City Council used this system for a time.

As DWP Group, we should be on the cutting edge, proactively championing disabled rights in the workplace.

Strongly. Without equivocation. And holding that line hard. This isn't merely about members' rights: this is human rights work and it must start locally.

Disabled staff need workplaces which meet their needs. This means workplaces designed with intense consultation with the neurodiverse and disabled rather than these needs being an 'add on'.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

1. Support branches to ensure they all have equality officers elected. It's not a luxury position: it is a must have position and should be considered as vital as a branch secretary.
2. Negotiate for all staff to undertake mandatory equality training which must include disability training and neurodiversity awareness. Also negotiate training for all managers on how to prevent disability discrimination and promote zero tolerance of discrimination in the workplace. The content and delivery of training to be overseen by elected shop stewards and PCS.
3. Develop understanding disability and neuro-diversity training courses for reps
4. Negotiate a disability and neurodiversity agreement with DWP management
5. Lobby for fair reporting systems, free from judgement. Any disability discrimination, verbal or physical, needs to be reported and acted on by management immediately. All incidents must be recorded, reviewed by elected branch officers, and reported to Regional/Nation committees. Regular public data must be made available showing the number of staff experiencing grievances or facing disciplinary by disability.
6. Ensure trade union oversight of recruitment and promotion processes.
7. Negotiate with management material to raise awareness and promote rights of disabled staff in DWP at all grades to be displayed in all DWP workplaces.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A32

Seconded by DWP Durham & Tees Valley Branch

Covers E96

DWP Glasgow(047066)

DWP Durham Tees Valley Branch (047122)

Neurodiversity Training - Group

Conference notes:

- That neurodivergent individuals, including those with autism, ADHD, dyslexia, dyspraxia, and other neurological differences, face unique challenges in the workplace.
- That the DWP serves a diverse population, including many neurodivergent claimants, and employs a significant number of neurodivergent staff.
- That current training for DWP staff does not sufficiently address the specific needs, communication styles, and support strategies relevant to neurodivergent individuals.

Conference believes:

- That all DWP staff, both new and existing, should receive comprehensive training on neurodiversity to ensure inclusive service delivery and workplace practices.
- That such training should be developed and delivered in consultation with neurodivergent individuals and subject matter experts.
- That fostering neurodiversity awareness will improve staff wellbeing, reduce discrimination, and enhance the quality of service provided to the public

Conference instructs the GEC:

- To campaign for the mandatory inclusion of specialist neurodiversity training in all DWP induction and ongoing training programmes.
- To lobby DWP to co-produce this training with neurodivergent staff, external experts, and relevant advocacy organisations.
- To continue supporting regions, branches, and activists to champion Neurodiversity in the workplace.
- To encourage branches to raise awareness of neurodiversity and support neurodivergent members through local initiatives and networks

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A33

DWP Fylde(047139)

Conference Notes:

- The DWP acknowledges its responsibilities under the Equality Act and provides guidance to ensure disabled employees are not disadvantaged in attendance management.
- Current policy allows line managers to grant additional reasonable adjustments through Disabled Employee Trigger Points (DETP) to offset disability-related absences.

Conference Concerns:

- Management continues to apply a rigid “use it or lose it” rule, removing unused DETPs if they have not been needed for the last 12 months.
- This approach ignores individual circumstances and has led to unnecessary grievances and appeals.
- Existing guidance (e.g., Question 31) outlines what should be considered during reviews, but this is often disregarded.

Example Case:

- An employee lost 4 DETP days despite explaining they were a mental health safety net.
- After removal, the employee experienced a 3-month absence and requested a managed move.
- The appeal reinstated the days, but only after significant effort from PCS and DWP—effort that could have been avoided.

Conference Instructs:

- The incoming GEC to:
1. Negotiate with the employer to strengthen disabled employees’ rights to retain DETPs even if unused in the previous 12 months.
 2. Support campaigns advocating for stronger legislation on this issue.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A34

DWP Bucks & Oxon(047108)

Conference notes with concern that job centre managers are increasingly asserting that any form of working from home, from full time through to hybrid, as a long-term or short-term requirement, even in extreme cases refused as a temporary adjustment to avoid sick leave or when returning from sick leave is becoming too common to ignore. Conference notes PCS current policy to press for flexible working across all directorates but branches and members need a quick response to an urgent situation. Reps and members have reported the following

- * Staff feeling bullied to leave the dept after productively working at home in a job carved role for many months
- * Staff being forced to take sick leave rather than wfh for a few days
- * Staff with genuine reasons for some home working or job carving being refused but no alternative adjustments put into place
- * Managers ignoring the requirements to protect vulnerable immune-suppressed staff when staff and customers attend the site with respiratory illnesses and refusing temporary WFH.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC:

To identify how prevalent this situation is, by a meeting of reps or a survey of branches .

To provide a route to allow branches to raise individual cases for urgent escalation, members often cannot wait for a grievance procedure to complete.

To raise the issue urgently with the employer to ensure DWP policies are correctly applied and a message sent to all district managers to ensure policy is applied correctly.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A35

DWP Cumbria and Lancashire(047020)

Conference notes that the current departmental approach to workplace adjustments, which often forces disabled staff to re justify or re evidence their needs every time they move role, team, or department, is not fit for purpose:

- Members report that workplace adjustments are frequently reset or withdrawn when they change positions.
- Disabled workers are required to undergo re-assessment, repeat medical evidence submissions, or repeated disclosure of sensitive information.
- This approach treats disability as something requiring continuous “proof” rather than a stable, lived reality.
- The absence of a consistent, portable system causes delays, unnecessary stress, and periods without appropriate support.

This conference believes there is a need to establish a consistent, portable, and rights based system of adjustments that prevents discriminatory resets and ensures disabled workers maintain the support they need throughout their employment journey.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

1. Formally challenge management on the inconsistent and harmful practice of resetting adjustments during internal moves.
2. Enter negotiations to secure a PCS negotiated Adjustment Passport, ensuring:
 - o Adjustments travel with the worker across roles, teams, and departments.
 - o No requirement for re justification, reassessment, or re medicalisation unless initiated by the employee.
3. Protect continuity of support, ensuring no disabled member loses their adjustments when transitioning to a new role.
4. Embed union oversight in the creation, review, implementation, and enforcement of Adjustment Passports.
5. Seek written confirmation from management that Adjustment Passports will be recognised as binding documents across the organisation.
6. Report back to members with outcomes, agreed processes, and any further actions required.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A36

DWP West London(047036)

This conference is concerned about the numbers of staff who are awaiting an equality act move. The position is particularly acute in London where we have no benefit processing centres and the Department is busy reducing roles at Caxton House. A significant number of members have been awaiting a move for well over a year. Members who are waiting for a posting have to wait for the next vacancy for the location/role they have applied for.

We call on the GEC to raise these concerns with management and seek to negotiate a change in the rules so staff requesting an equality act move that meet the criteria are moved regardless of the vacancy position within 3 months.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Grading

A37

Seconded by DWP Forth Valley Scotland

Covers E100

DWP East Sussex & CMG Hastings(047103)

DWP Forth Valley Scotland (047077)

Conference believes that AO caseworker roles in the Child Maintenance Service (CMS) must receive a full, formal Job Evaluation and Grading Scheme (JEGS) review. It is widely recognised by CMS staff and senior leaders that the CMS AO caseworker role is exceptionally complex and arguably the most demanding AO role within DWP, if not across the entire Civil Service.

Conference notes:

- DWP Group Conference 2023 passed Motion A5 on grading in DWP Operations, with explicit reference to the CMS AO caseworker role. Twelve months later, Conference 2024 again had to debate a motion simply to chase progress on the agreed policy.
- The Group CMG Advisory Committee (CMGAC) has repeatedly pressed the GEC to secure a JEGS review for these AO roles. In October 2024, DWP again refused to agree to a JEGS exercise, claiming that although the role had “matured,” it had not changed “sufficiently” since the last evaluation in 2017.
- Only after sustained pressure from the CMGAC did the GEC agree in Autumn 2024 to conduct an internal PCS “soft” JEGS evidence-gathering exercise. CMS AO members completed and submitted JAFs by 31 January 2025.
- In April 2025, the CMGAC was informed that no progress could be made until Group Officers were granted access to the JEGS scoring tool, which DWP refused to provide. Despite assurances of escalation, no practical progress followed. The July 2025 member briefing (DWP/MB/040/25) simply restated this position, with no advancement.
- Over the next seven months, and despite multiple written approaches from DWP Forth Valley Scotland branch offering:
 - ☐ a coordinated member email campaign to the Permanent Secretary to secure access to the scoring tool, and
 - ☐ a call for the GEC to begin clerical scoring, consistent with past practice—the GEC undertook neither action nor delivered any visible progress. More than a year has passed since the JAFs were submitted, and nearly three years since Motion A5 was agreed.

Conference acknowledges that some JEGS trained officers experienced unavoidable long-term absence, however this cannot reasonably explain:

- ☐ the failure to involve members in campaigning for access to the scoring tool
- ☐ the failure to commence clerical scoring
- ☐ or the complete lack of progress for over 12 months.

Conference believes that the GEC has failed our AO caseworker members in CMS.

Conference further notes that the 2025 DWP Group Annual Report repeats the same generic language used in April and July 2025—that “access has still not been granted... we will update members once we have resolved the issue”—and, most concerningly, expresses the view that “we are unable to progress any exercise until this function is provided by the department,” implying members should simply accept this lack of progress and accountability.

Conference therefore censures the outgoing GEC for failing to treat this vital issue with the seriousness or urgency required to deliver for AO members in CMS.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to:

1. Immediately launch a coordinated campaign, including member mobilisation, to demand access to the JEGS scoring tool from DWP.
2. Begin clerical scoring of the JAFs without delay, following established historical practice, unless and until

digital access is secured.

3. Provide progress reports every two months to branches and the CMGAC—first report due by 31 August 2026—and continue until all JAFs have been scored and the evidence is ready for submission to DWP.

4. Escalate industrially and politically if the employer continues to refuse a formal JEGS review for the CMS AO caseworker role.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A38

DWP Leeds(047006)

Background

PCS has committed to fair pay, fair reward, and coherent grading across all departments.

Staff across CFCD — including but not limited to investigators, intelligence officers, digital specialists and enforcement staff — undertake duties involving criminal casework, evidence gathering, statutory interviews under caution, case preparation, safeguarding responsibilities, digital examination, intelligence development, and enforcement activities.

Many of these duties align with, or exceed, responsibilities undertaken by higher-graded staff in comparable civil service areas.

Previous JEGS assessments within CFCD have been inconsistent, have left long-standing grading disparities unresolved, and have failed to fully reflect the operational and investigative duties carried out across the directorate.

A recent legal case has reinforced member concerns about systemic weaknesses in how previous grading exercises were conducted.

Civil Service policy clearly states that where staff undertake work equivalent to a higher grade, this should be formally recognised by the employer.

This Motion Believes

- Staff throughout CFCD undertake duties comparable to, and often exceeding, those performed by higher-graded colleagues in other departments.
- Concerns about the adequacy and accuracy of past grading exercises are well-founded.
- A clear, updated and transparent JEGS evaluation is essential to ensure fairness, accuracy and consistency across the directorate.

This Motion Justifies

- Grading disparities across CFCD continue to undermine morale, retention and fairness.
- A full directorate-wide review is overdue and necessary to align grading with the risk, complexity and operational responsibilities carried out by staff.
- A transparent review is essential to ensure all CFCD staff are valued, retained and recognised for the full range of

duties they perform.

This Motion Resolves

- To instruct the GEC to formally challenge the DWP position and demand a new, transparent and comprehensive JEGS review covering all CFCD roles, ensuring the process accurately reflects the full range of operational, investigative, intelligence, digital, enforcement and preparatory duties performed.
- To require that any future grading review fully recognises criminal and operational responsibilities, including interviews under caution, evidence gathering, digital examination, safeguarding responsibilities, intelligence work, case building and prosecution preparation.
- To require the GEC to engage with members throughout the process and provide clear updates, timelines, expected outcomes and next steps.
- To mandate that the GEC reports all discussions and outcomes to DWP members and escalates through Group and National structures until a fair and consistent grading outcome is achieved across CFCD.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A39

DWP Forth Valley Scotland(047077)

Conference notes:

1. DWP Group Conference 2023 passed Motion A5 on grading in DWP Operations, with reference to the Administrative Officer (AO) role in Jobcentres.
2. The AO role within Jobcentres, particularly the AO Service Delivery Support role has continued to evolve significantly and no longer reflects the traditional administrative scope associated with the grade.
3. AOs are now routinely undertaking duties equivalent in complexity, risk and accountability to Executive Officer (EO) roles, without corresponding recognition, remuneration or grading.
4. In many Jobcentres, AOs manage front of house functions that require rapid decision making, complex customer handling, operational judgement, and risk awareness at a level directly comparable to EO colleagues.
5. These duties are often reactive, undefined, and essential to service delivery, demonstrating that the AO role has expanded beyond its original profile.

Conference further notes:

6. Identity Verification and Fraud Prevention: AOs are routinely responsible for verifying claimant identities, assessing whether documentation meets eligibility requirements, identifying forged or suspicious documents, and keeping up to date with evolving fraud methods. These actions have significant operational and financial implications and mirror responsibilities normally falling to EO graded staff.
7. Financial Handling Responsibilities: AOs manage key financial tasks, including processing Flexible Support Fund (FSF) receipts, pursuing missing evidence, taking action on unreconciled claims, and initiating write off procedures. In some cases, AOs also accept and account for cash within the Jobcentre environment. These duties require precision, accountability, and adherence to financial controls aligned with EO level expectations.
8. Fairness and Role Alignment: There is a growing disparity between the AO grade and the actual work performed. AO duties now overlap significantly with those of Work Coaches and other EO colleagues within Service Delivery. Correcting this imbalance would improve fairness, recognition, morale, development and retention.

Conference believes:

- ☑ Grading must accurately reflect the scope, complexity, risks and responsibility associated with the work staff perform.
- ☑ The continued use of the AO grade for duties equivalent to EO roles represents a misalignment that undermines fairness and undervalues staff.
- ☑ A formal JEGS grading evaluation review is necessary to restore consistency, ensure transparency, and prevent continued grade drift within Jobcentres.

Conference therefore instructs the incoming GEC to:

1. Demand that DWP conducts an urgent JEGS grading evaluation of the AO roles in jobcentres.
2. Demand and ensure that any JEGS review DWP conducts is carried out in partnership with PCS.
3. Ensure transparent communication to members throughout.
4. Pursue national consistency, ensuring that Jobcentres across all districts apply grading and job design in a uniform and equitable manner.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A40

DWP Fylde(047139)

Conference notes that grading of certain functions within the Department has been contentious over the years in several areas.

Conferences believes that Decision Making functions can fall into this category and this has been highlighted in the CA-VEP (Carers Allowance – Verified Earnings and Pensions) area of Retirement Services when members moving into that area during January 2025 have been asked to undertake roles as Decision Makers at the AO grade when the grading would have been EO in the areas where they used to work (Carers Allowance Unit).

Conference believes that JEGS exercises can be helpful in resolving such matters, especially where members are prepared to back up the claim with action.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to raise the issue of grading in of AO's in the Retirement Services and lodge a claim for this to be re-graded to EO, using JEGS as a lever as necessary and engaging with the Branches concerned (CA-VEP Teams are based in Dundee, Motherwell, Newcastle, and Blackpool) in terms of action to back up the claim.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A41

DWP Greater Manchester Branch(047023)

This conference believes that being the officer in charge in a jobcentre when it is open on a Saturday brings with it the primary responsibility for the health and safety of staff and customers in the office on that day.

This conference believes that to maintain consistency the role should be graded at HEO

This conference notes with concern that inconsistencies in approach have led to EOs in several offices being expected to take on the responsibility without the commensurate increase in salary

This conference instructs the GEC to hold immediate negotiations to ensure that person completing a day as officer in charge in an open jobcentre is paid at the relevant HEO rate at a minimum

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Staffing

A42

DWP HQ London(047039)

Conference notes:

- The planned closure of Caxton House and the relocation of DWP staff currently based there to the Sanctuary Building.
- Ongoing concerns regarding the capacity of the Sanctuary Building to safely and suitably accommodate all Caxton House staff, particularly in the context of the 60% Hybrid Working policy.
- The Places for Growth programme, launched by the previous government and continued by Labour, which aims to move 22,000 civil service roles out of London by 2027.
- The impact of Places for Growth on job security and career progression in London, including the continuing freeze on recruitment and promotions in London based Corporate Centre directorates.
- That while this conference supports recruiting across the UK, this must not come at the expense of London jobs. London is the most ethnically diverse region in England and contains some of the highest levels of deprivation. Relocating Corporate Centre roles away from London restricts opportunities for citizens and DWP staff from disadvantaged communities, and risks reducing the diversity of the Department.
- That DWP has stated the move will occur in phases but has not clarified or agreed the order or timetable for those phases.
- That despite rumours of a delayed move to the Sanctuary Building, DWP has neither confirmed nor communicated any delay to staff.

Conference therefore instructs the DWP GEC to:

1. Request and scrutinise the Site Occupancy Assessment, including analysis of how the Hybrid Working policy will affect occupancy and capacity ratios in the Sanctuary Building.
2. Share this assessment with the DWP Caxton House Branch, and provide regular updates while working collaboratively with the Branch BEC on all developments.
3. Defend the future of DWP Corporate Centre jobs and opportunities in London, and oppose any reduction in roles currently based at Caxton House.
4. Reaffirm its commitment to flexible working, and oppose any increase in mandated office attendance requirements.
5. Seek assurances that reasonable adjustments will be protected, ensuring:
 - No existing adjustments are lost or reduced as a result of the move;
 - All reasonable adjustment needs are met in the Sanctuary Building.
6. Request clarity from DWP on any planned delays, and on the sequencing and timing of all phases of the move to the Sanctuary Building.
7. Provide an update on the demands of Motion A37 carried at the 2025 Conference, including progress on:
 - Securing and publishing an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) on:
 - a. the closure of Caxton House, and
 - b. the ongoing recruitment and promotion freeze within London Corporate Centre Directorates.
 - Investigating potential legal challenges to the Department's current recruitment strategy.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A43

DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders(047063)

Conference notes with alarm the Department's recent announcement of the Enabling Functions Review, which will result in the merging of multiple directorates, and the stated rationale of efficiency savings through merging certain teams and roles.

Conference further notes that while the Department is currently maintaining the position that any reduction in headcount would only be achieved through attrition - hiring freezes and no backfilling – and that any affected staff would be redeployed, not offered Voluntary Exit Schemes (redundancies), many affected staff would still be put through selection exercises and forced to reapply for their own jobs.

Conference believes that the Department is not fully honest and that redundancies remain a real threat. Conference further believes that regardless of any departmental restructuring, the DWP remains understaffed for the workload it possesses, and any reductions in headcount only exacerbate existing problems and overwork staff.

Conference instructs the GEC to be vigilant against job cuts in all guises, to fully consult all affected members on these changes, and better communicate with affected members (with respect to problem of the unjust embargoes that the Department has placed on union announcements and properly informing staff).

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A44

Seconded by DWP Sheffield

Covers E102, E103

DWP HQ Sheffield(047012)

DWP Sheffield (047008)

This conference notes the victory in getting permanent jobs for the 5 CMPD based in Sheffield that were made unassigned in April 2024. It recognises that it took far too long with the last staff member only getting a permanent assigned job in January 2026.

This conference instructs the GEC to review the DWP processes in dealing with unassigned staff with a view to improving resolution time and including improving how the DWP considers staff who need reasonable adjustments being in place with any new job.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A45

DWP HQ Sheffield(047012)

Conference notes the increasing impact of the DWP's professionalisation agenda. Although this may be essential in some roles, members in the Corporate Centre in particular (though not exclusively) have reported an increase in job roles, previously considered generalist, now requiring specific skills and qualifications. This is a move away from recruiting/promoting on the basis of potential and offering training and support to acquire the appropriate skills and qualifications, restricting the ability to move between different areas of work within the department.

This conference instructs the GEC to review the changes across the DWP recruitment process, and campaign for a return to the generalised nature of a civil service career where appropriate.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Health & Safety Close of day 1

A46

Group Executive Committee

Conference notes that Jobcentres remain amongst the most unsafe working environments in the Civil Service with members working in them reporting violent and potentially violent incidents every working day.

With the transfer of the security guarding contract from G4S to Mitie in October 2025 the responsibility for assessing security guarding requirements passed from the former contractor G4S to DWP. This effective insourcing of the security guarding risk assessment process gave negotiators grounds for optimism as the methodology used by G4S lacked transparency and often resulted in guard numbers that did not seem adequate.

However it has become clear that since DWP became responsible for the Security Guard Risk Assessment (SGRA) there has been a concerted effort to cut security guard numbers exposing members working in Jobcentres to ever greater risk. This has been particularly apparent in Sudbury and Mildenhall Jobcentres where security guards were completely removed and when Tonypandy jobcentre closed and staff and claimants were moved to Porth the initial SGRA concluded that from the previous 6 security guards required after the merger none would be required. Another consequence of the strategy of cutting security guard numbers is redundancy for our security guard members.

Conference therefore instructs the incoming GEC to:

- Campaign for at least one security guard in every Jobcentre
- Negotiate an improved SGRA
- Support security guard members by providing local representation in potential redundancy scenarios.
- Campaign and build the appetite for industrial action in every Jobcentre where cuts to security guard numbers are being proposed
- Continue to monitor the DWP's guard cutting strategy with a view to building a national campaign including a national industrial response should the Department persevere with the systematic reduction of security guard numbers.
- Campaign publicly with through the PCS Parliamentary Group, in the press and with allies to draw attention to the constant violence and threat of violence experienced by members working in Jobcentres and to maintain the core control measure that security guards provide against this violence.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A47

DWP North and Outer East London Branch(047033)

This Conference notes that

- 1) DWP Health and Safety guidance has no mention of electric powered personal vehicles (EPPVs) including e-bikes, e-scooters, and other similar modes of transport.

- 2) It appears signage for the outside of Jobcentres has not been updated for over 10 years. Offices are not being provided additional signage which costs about £15 to state 'no scooters allowed'
- 3) The use of EPPVs is increasing and so too are the number of fires they are involved in. In 2018 the London Fire Brigade (LFB) recorded five fire related incidents involving EPPVs. In the first six months of 2023 LFB attended 73 e-bike and 18 e-scooter fires.

4) The LFB has issued Guidance and principles for the charging and storage for electric powered personal vehicles which states 'Fire risk assessors should ensure any of the following areas are identified and recorded within the fire risk assessment, and appropriate action is taken:

- That EPPVs are not stored/charged in common areas or escape routes and any storage or charging within the common areas including corridors, stair enclosures, riser cupboards, communal store cupboards, electrical intake rooms, under stair cupboards and refuse chutes, is immediately brought to the attention of the responsible person for rectification.
- Any bike storage areas and their location in relation to the means of escape, and whether charging facilities are provided or not

5) It appears our fire risk assessments are taking no account of the hazard of EPPVs
This Conference believes

- 1) DWP should have a zero tolerance approach to EPPVs being brought into our offices
- 2) DWP should provide signage to ensure customers are aware that they should not bring EPPVs onto our premises. Signage will also reduce the risk of incidents between customers and security/staff over this issue.
- 3) DWP should ensure its fire risk assessments take account of the risks posed by EPPVs

This Conference instructs the GEC

To negotiate changes to DWP Health and Safety policy so

- DWP has a zero tolerance approach to EPPVs in offices
- DWP fire risk assessments take account of the risk from EPPVs and identify/record action taken in respect of EPPVs
- DWP provides external signage for all offices stating EPPVs are not allowed inside DWP premises

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Operations

A48

Seconded by DWP Ty-Taf

Covers E106, E107, E108, E109, E110

DWP Glasgow(047066)

DWP Ty Taf (047144)

People Deployment Advisory Group's (PDAGs) - Group

Conference notes motion A44 that was supported at DWP Group Conference 2025. This motion about CMS PDAG's highlighted the very real concerns of members and activists about the oversight of these so-called "advisory groups" and despite assurances from CMS management there have still on-going legitimate concerns about their usage.

This motion seeks to build on A44, as following last DWP Group Conference that has been a rampant increase in usage of PDAG's across the Department with RSD, UC and Debt Management areas now operating them and this is likely to continue. However, there is a lack of consistency with how they operate with the original intention of them to be only looking at Changes to Working Patterns and Reasonable Adjustments. For example, the trial of PDAG's in UC is heavily focused on reasonable adjustments to the 60% hybrid and contractual homeworking; RSD have previously advised their PDAG's wouldn't be looking at the mandatory office attendance.

Examples of bad practices or outcomes include management advising line managers (our members) that these are mandatory however when challenged the decision remains with the line manager. Another example is an appeal having to be a rehearing of the case as there was influence of PDAG throughout the original meeting with discussion focusing on Equality Act nuances rather than addressing the support the member required.

We instruct the DWP GEC to:

- Continue to oppose PDAG's when they arise in other areas of DWP.
- Continue to oppose all perverse or disproportionate decisions that arise and escalate these through appropriate channels.
- Continue to ensure all reps and members (including line managers) know their rights under the Equality Act in relation to dealing with PDAGs.
- Negotiate with the department an escalation route for reps to raise concerns like DWP/BB/071 Escalation Route for RA 2025

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A49

Seconded by DWP Cheshire branch

Covers E111

DWP Bolton & Bury(047027)

DWP Cheshire (047014)

Conference notes the high number of trials currently being conducted in DWP. Within UC these 'trials' encompass a huge amount of territory including: Saturday closure of Service Centres, working from home in Jobcentres, the use of video appointments, the frequency of appointments, the introduction of welcome desks in Jobcentres and changes to the UC build. Although trialling new methods is not in itself a negative thing, there are serious issues with the way DWP handles trials that need to be addressed. Trials in DWP always seem to be seen in terms of success and failure, and changes are often made to encourage a certain outcome. The jobcentre channels trial is a good example as when it became clear that take up of video appointments was well below what was expected for the trial, instead of taking this data away to consider, the organisers simply made video appointments mandatory for staff. On the ground, managers push a specific line to ensure a trial 'succeeds', but a properly conducted trial cannot succeed or fail, it can only produce data to inform decisions. There is also rarely a clear end date for any trial, because of the push to ensure trials 'succeed' they often simply bleed into a new BAU process, with no real evaluation outcomes ever revealed. In the NW, the Jobcentre home working trial officially 'ended' for Chester, Hyde & Oldham Jobcentres months ago, but staff continue to work from home on the same basis. North-West regional negotiators requested details of this trial, amongst others, along with an indication of the end date and findings but were told by Group office that they did not have this information.

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate an agreement with DWP covering:

- Consultation prior to the introduction of trials with clear objectives.
- Clear time-frames for all trials taking place inc start & end dates.
- Regular updates for relevant TU Side committees on the progress and findings of trials.
- Criteria and processes for expanding or extending trials.
- Consultation on the data produced by trials and proposals stemming from such, prior to any decisions being made.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A50

DWP Forth Valley Scotland(047077)

Conference notes:

1. Saturday working was introduced into "business as usual" operations within larger Jobcentres, despite evidence from members that footfall is consistently low and Fail to Attend (FTA) rates are significantly higher than on Monday to Friday weekdays.
2. Saturday working creates disproportionate pressure on staff with caring responsibilities.
3. Annual leave approval for Saturdays is inconsistently applied across workplaces.
4. Members have repeatedly raised concerns regarding:
 - ☐ The lack of operational justification for Saturday opening.
 - ☐ The negative impact on work life balance.
 - ☐ The inequity between Saturday working in Jobcentres and working patterns in other areas of Work & Health (W&H) and other DWP directorates.
5. That previous DWP group conference decisions instructed the GEC to campaign to end Saturday working across Jobcentres.

Conference further notes:

6. Despite the conference mandate from members, Saturday opening continues across many jobcentres.
7. Members report little visible progress on negotiations with the Department, and inconsistent messaging across regions about the future of Saturday working.
8. Members report Non Working Days (NWDs) taken on weekdays in lieu of a Saturday have a far greater impact on their office than if staff worked a standard Monday to Friday pattern with no Saturday opening. This includes:
 - ☐ Reduced staffing on days when customer footfall, safeguarding activity and operational demands are highest, increasing pressure on remaining staff, who face larger caseloads, heavier appointment schedules and higher levels of public contact.
 - ☐ Disruption to team-based work such as team meetings, case conferencing, complex case handling, safeguarding, and workflow planning.
 - ☐ A lack of consistency, as staffing levels can fluctuate unpredictably depending on when and how many staff take their weekday NWD and additional strain on Team Leaders and managers who must reorganise resources to compensate for avoidable weekday gaps in staffing.
9. Staff with reasonable adjustments often have to work on a Saturday on the ground floor of the jobcentre, meaning they may have to move equipment the day before and then back to their allocated seat after working on a Saturday.

Conference therefore reaffirms its opposition to Saturday working in Jobcentres.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC:

1. Reaffirm that motions passed at Group Conference are binding on the GEC and must be acted upon fully, transparently, and within a reasonable timeframe.
2. To intensify the campaign to end Saturday working in Jobcentres.
3. To set a date by which, if negotiations haven't secured an end to Saturday working, members should be consulted about industrial action.
4. To publish, within 8 weeks of the close of Conference, a full written summary report to all branches detailing:
 - ☐ The progress made with the employer to end Saturday working in Jobcentres.
 - ☐ All actions taken to date to end Saturday working in Jobcentres.
 - ☐ Communications with the employer
 - ☐ Planned negotiation steps and timeline for delivery.
5. To provide quarterly updates to branches on progress until an end to Saturday working in Jobcentres is achieved.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A51

DWP West London(047036)

This conference is concerned that the Department promised a review into Saturday opening of jobcentres, shortly after it introduced this policy in December 2020 as part of the Employee Deal. We believe after five and half years such a review is long overdue.

This conference calls on the GEC to press DWP management to launch a review of Saturday working with full Trade Union involvement to see if there is any actual requirement for Jobcentres to be open on a Saturday. A non-exhaustive list of the issues that need to be looked at are the following:

- What claimant appointments are undertaken on a Saturday and can these be scheduled for during the week.
- The impact of staff who work a Saturday taking a day off in lieu usually a Monday or Friday. Is it more beneficial for the Department for them to be in during the week and have the Saturday off.
- The costs of heating and lighting offices and providing Security cover and cleaners on a Saturday
- The impact on the Department's carbon footprint of opening 6 days a week instead of 5
- The impact of Saturday working on staff's personal lives etc particularly those with caring responsibilities or have a disability
- The impact on morale of regular Saturday working

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A52

DWP Bolton & Bury(047027)

Conference notes that the original expectation of UC WC was that a full time WC would have maximum 100 Intensive Work Search customers and undertake 200minutes of customer interviews. For several years caseloads have far exceeded this leading to unreasonable pressure on work coaches and detrimental customer service.

Admin time has been eroded year on year and is no longer considered as 'productive time' by many leaders despite being funded for all areas of work. DWP have become fixated on customer appointments only being the only meaningful work despite local TUS at District & Regional meetings highlighting this. In many areas, this has led to diaries being open for appointments for 330-400minutes daily. The WCTL dashboard on Power BI is a tool that shows being productive as customer appointments AND clearance of 'to do's' which reinforces our view that dedicated time is required for work coaches to complete work other than appointments.

Although Senior leaders are now reporting recruitment based upon IWS caseloads being 110 and demand being significantly lower than forecast, we are aware of the manipulation of ABM to produce these figures. Furthermore, the introduction of Jobcentre Activity Review in June 2025 has only meant that not only do sites still need to meet all CFE targets, they now have more shorter length appointments in order to bring in more LCWRA customers for longer, voluntary appointments.

Having brought in the majority of Move to UC work, the amount of admin work such as PRS and childcare costs has significantly increased but as many of these current customers are not in the Intensive work group, sites are not being resourced to account for this work and no additional time is given to complete it.

This conference instructs the GEC and its negotiators to:

- Immediately following conference request an urgent meeting with the UC Director to negotiate:
 - a) a max of 240mins diary time for a full time work coach per day;
 - b) At least 1hour to-do time per day for all work coaches in additional to the start up and closedown time in the Collective Agreement and any meeting time

- Ensure that a briefing is issued to all JC members to remind them of the rights in the collective agreement – including Front of house staff that see customers face to face.
- If improvements are not achieved as above, an urgent campaign is started no later than 1st October 2026, involving all JC members regardless of grade including the consideration of industrial action.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A53

DWP Bucks & Oxon(047108)

Conference agrees that work coach diary management is a cause of stress amongst coaches. Managers change diary structures in response to senior managers' newest priority with little or no consultation, often reducing admin time, daily diary start and finish times and taking away benefits such as learning hours. Work coaches report that they already feel under pressure with back-to-back 10 minute appointments and little admin time, plus covering other appointments for absent colleagues. When negotiating as a member or for branches in industrial relations meetings managers refer to the 'jobcentre offer', or its latest iteration, and the lack of defined admin time outside of that in the Employer Deal.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC:

To issue an all-members circular urgently to advise members on how to argue their case when diaries are changed without consultation.

To negotiate a clear indication of an acceptable daily admin time (outside of claimant appointments and 45 minutes daily ED time and reading time) to be incorporated into the intranet policy.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A54

DWP Liverpool & St Helens(047017)

Conference notes:

1. Persistent Work Coach shortages continue to undermine service delivery, with DWP employing around 2,100 fewer Work Coaches — approximately 11% below requirement — in the first half of 2024–25, leading to reduced claimant support in 57% of Jobcentres.
2. Work Coach turnover remains high, with an 8.5% exit rate, described by the National Audit Office as evidence that DWP “struggles to retain staff in critical frontline roles.”

3. Flexible and hybrid working demonstrably improve retention, with CIPD (2025) reporting that 1.1 million UK workers left a job in the previous year due to lack of flexible working, while UK and international evidence consistently show improved retention among remote friendly roles.

4. Productivity evidence is clear:

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2024) finds higher productivity growth in industries with increased remote work.

FDA civil service surveys show mandatory office attendance reduces productivity, with 75% of civil servants spending office time on virtual meetings that could be done remotely.

Global productivity studies show that hybrid/remote models deliver measurable gains.

5. Video based public services are already proven. Telehealth evidence shows that video appointments:

- reduce no show rates,
- improve scheduling predictability, and
- deliver equal or improved service quality compared to in person provision.

6. Cost saving evidence from UK and international government bodies shows telework reduces estate costs, travel expenditure, and unproductive office time.

7. Hybrid and remote working significantly improve wellbeing, reduce stress, and support staff with caring responsibilities or disabilities. Surveys show mandatory in office working particularly harms the productivity of disabled civil servants.

8. Many Work Coaches already deliver high quality digital appointments; what is missing is the ability to deliver them from home, which aligns with working practices already normal across the Civil Service and wider public sector.

Conference believes:

a. The DWP's ongoing staffing crisis will not be resolved without modern, flexible working practices that support retention.

b. Allowing Work Coaches to conduct video appointments from home is safe, productive, cost effective, and evidence based.

c. Denying Work Coaches home based digital work is inconsistent with:

- Civil Service workforce policy trends,
- government wide digital transformation goals, and
- employer obligations on equality and wellbeing.

d. Home based video appointments provide clear benefits to claimants, including improved attendance, reduced travel barriers and better continuity of service.

Conference instructs the GEC:

1. The GEC urgently seek negotiation with DWP to introduce a Home Based Video Appointment Model for Work Coaches, allowing staff to conduct digital appointments from home where operationally suitable.

2. To demand that DWP:

- o recognise home based digital delivery as core Work Coach activity,
- o enable staff to undertake a defined portion of appointment based work from home,
- o provide appropriate equipment and secure remote working tools, and
- o ensure equality impact assessments protect disabled and carer staff.

3. To develop a PCS campaign strategy—public, industrial, and legal where necessary—to secure remote working flexibility as a retention, wellbeing, and service quality measure.

4. To require GEC to report progress to members regularly and escalate where DWP fails to engage or act in good faith.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

Opposition to the Use of Mobile Units for Jobcentre Service Delivery

This Conference notes:

- That communities, particularly rural ones, are being left behind due to:
 - the closure of Jobcentre estates;
 - failure to repair or maintain existing sites (e.g., Shirebrook in Derbyshire);
 - long-standing issues with public transport and internet infrastructure.
- That it is not the role of Work Coaches to bridge these systemic gaps by delivering services from mobile units, particularly where this places them at increased personal risk.
- That the current mobile-unit initiative places staff in unacceptable working environments, requiring them to:
 - operate generators;
 - deploy disabled ramps;
 - manage the physical unit;
 - and do so without a Site Responsible Officer, which falls outside normal Work Coach responsibilities.
- That these units display clear Jobcentre/DWP signage, making colleagues highly visible in isolated or uncontrolled community settings and increasing the risk of verbal and physical attacks.
- That colleagues working in these units have:
 - no on-site security presence;
 - no immediate security response;
 - and no safe space or escape route in the event of an incident.

This Conference believes:

- That the use of mobile units represents an unacceptable erosion of safe and appropriate working conditions.
- That the initiative fails to address the real causes of unequal service access, which stem from decisions on estates, funding and infrastructure, not from Work Coach practice.

This Conference instructs the incoming GEC:

- To condemn the deployment and use of mobile units for Jobcentre service delivery.
- To demand the DWP immediately withdraw these units from use.
- To ensure meaningful consultation with PCS negotiators on safe, permanent, community-based models of service delivery that do not place staff at risk.
- To campaign for investment in:
 - permanent, properly staffed Jobcentre locations;
 - and the repair or restoration of sites wherever possible.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A56

Group Executive Committee

Conference recognises the work carried out by the GEC following the passing of motion A51 at DWP Group Conference 2025. Group Officers have met with reps from UCR sites, and continue to raise concerns with management at meetings and via correspondence.

Conference notes, however, that issues continue to crop up, including

- changes to working practices without consultation,
- increasing workloads and expectations,
- a focus on quantity rather than quality, and
- ongoing cultural problems with local management.

Conference notes that the ongoing issues are resulting in high stress levels, with members afraid to take breaks, use their annual leave, or finish after working their contracted hours. When members complete stress reduction plans, they are told that their workloads cannot be reduced.

Conference notes that the focus on quantity over quality can lead to shortcuts, resulting in additional work for colleagues in other areas of the organisation, eg Case Managers having to respond to enquiries from claimants, cases not noted correctly, members working in DRS having difficulty understanding the case when looking at Mandatory Reconsiderations.

Conference also notes that there has been miscommunication and different messages delivered to staff as to what their roles entail.

Conference accepts that, while senior management have taken on board some of these issues, there remains a lack of this understanding at local levels.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to:

- Continue the work carried out from motion A51
- Meet with members in UCR to hear their views and build a campaign
- Continue to promote the Stress at Work Policy, and work with local reps to challenge any barriers put in place by local management

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A57

DWP Devon(047095)

Conference notes:

- Motion A51 (Conference 2025) identified systemic problems within UCR and instructed the GEC to pursue engagement and consult members regarding a potential campaign, up to and including industrial action.
- Since Conference 2025, two Employee Relations meetings have taken place, yet no measurable improvements in workload, training, management culture or operational pressure have been delivered.

- Members continue to report excessive caseloads, inadequate training, micromanagement, and the operational impact of outsourcing to Teleperformance.

Conference believes:

- The absence of demonstrable progress represents a failure to implement the intent of Motion A51.
- Current working conditions indicate potential breaches of the HSE Management Standards on work-related stress, particularly in relation to Demand and Control.
- Continued reliance on engagement without escalation risks further deterioration in members' wellbeing.

Conference therefore instructs the incoming GEC to:

1. Publish within three months a written report detailing:
 - o Actions taken under Motion A51;
 - o Outcomes achieved;
 - o Outstanding unresolved issues.
2. Conduct a national survey of UCR members to gather evidence on workload, stress, training and management practices.
3. Formally raise identified stress risks and potential HSE breaches with the Department and demand remedial action within a defined timeframe.
4. Develop and consult on a clear industrial strategy for UCR, including preparation for statutory industrial action ballots where members indicate readiness to act.
5. Where members vote in favour of industrial action, provide full organisational, financial and political support to sustain that action.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A58

DWP Ty Taf(047144)

This conference notes: -

- The continuing issues with rigid target driven micromanagement on our members working in UC reviews.
- The new process introduced of splitting the work into start-up and progress teams with no consultation with PCS.

The poor working environment in UCR is entirely as a result of how it is managed as the flow of work should be directly related to what is a reasonable workload for staff and not relentless pressure to cut UC claims.

This conference instructs the GEC to negotiate improvements to -

- Manage workflow and ensure it is adjusted and paused to take into account backlogs, bottlenecks, available staffing levels, rather than just allocating set level of cases to sites.
- Ensure team leaders take into account workload and time off of team members before allocating new work to staff and pause or reduce allocating new work as necessary to ensure our members are able to keep casework up to date.
- Properly assess with the work study team what is a manageable caseload that our members can actually keep on top of at the same time as delivering work to a high quality.
- Upskill managers and team leaders on DWP workplace adjustments policies and procedures to ensure full compliance and support for our members.
- The resourcing of the quality teams with a focus on improving quality of the work on UCR teams and

ensuring reviews focus on getting the awards correct whether it is to increase, decrease or maintain the award.

- Improve the training and guidance so it is clear what processes to follow. Ensure support is available to support our members do the complex work and recognise that this takes more time.
- Stop the constant switching of management “priorities” which is disruptive to how members manage workloads and genuine priority of work.
- Fully resource UC CM teams to help DWP get the cases right at the outset and correctly grade this work at EO level.
- Improve coordination between UCR and the Work Coaches so that the best solutions can be found to obtain information/evidence without increasing pressure on staff in Jobcentres and utilise the knowledge and expertise of work coach members supporting vulnerable claimants.
- Gather information on the poor performance and increased workloads and pressure created by the private sector and press for the work to be brought back into DWP with extra staffing to do the work to a better standard. Conference further instructs the GEC to campaign to: -
- Put pressure on management to withdraw the new division of work into start up and progress teams which creates more pressure and double handling for our members.
- Unite our membership to put blame for poor working conditions and unbearable pressure squarely onto management to cut across DWP fostering divisions and blame between our members.
- Involve our members and branches to improve working conditions in UCR with regular updates, campaign material and members meetings.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A59

DWP Sheffield(047008)

Conference acknowledges that both Service Centre Case Managers and Jobcentre Work Coaches often have high caseloads when working on Universal Credit. Higher caseloads impact negatively on stress levels and wellbeing of PCS members as well as impacting service for the claimants. Conference recognises that caseload numbers are directly related to staffing levels and that DWP poor pay impacts on ability to recruit and retain Case Managers and Work Coaches.

PCS believes that DWP needs to manage caseload sizes to protect services and staff wellbeing, to help achieve this strict maximum caseload sizes should be introduced with clear guidance for managers about what actions to take when numbers are exceeded to get the caseloads within the maximum number timeously. The specific numbers requires consultation with branches to ensure wide consideration of factors are taken into account.

Conference instructs the GEC to hold consultation with a representative from each PCS branch in DWP within three months of conference. Following this consultation with reps and within one month the GEC is instructed to issue demands to DWP on maximum caseload sizes for Case Managers and Work Coaches on Universal Credit within one month and publicise to PCS members in the Group. Once the consultation with reps have taken place the GEC is also instructed to contact claimant organisations to see if they wish to work together on the PCS caseload demands.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A60

DWP HQ Sheffield(047012)

Conference notes that a variety of AI products have already been trialled across DWP. In the Corporate Centre, for example, members have reported that Microsoft Co-Pilot has been tested at summarising complex reports, data manipulation and producing Management Information, while cross government learning One Big Thing was focussed on “AI for All”.

Whilst Conference welcomes the NEC’s announcements on AI, including the commitments made in Briefing BB-068-23 that PCS is seeking “agreements with the relevant employers to safeguard jobs and processes”, the incoming GEC must get up to speed quickly with the detail, opportunities and risks posed by AI in DWP.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Take an urgent stocktake of all AI trials that the Department has carried out so far, including what conclusions the Department reached in each case, and share these results with branches.
- Demand all new trials and licenses are subject to consultation with the Trade Unions.
- Confirm our commitment that AI should only be used to support our members and should not be used to cut jobs and services.
- Develop and promote a strong campaign, championing that anything AI generated needs verification by a human, especially in the contexts of developing policy or interactions with customers

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Employee Deal

A61

DWP Sheffield(047008)

Conference notes that the DWP Employee Deal, introduced in 2016, significantly changed pay structures, working patterns and contractual hours for staff in AA–EO grades.

Conference further notes that, despite its stated aim of providing structured pay progression, the deal has contributed to continuing long-term issues including:

ongoing pay inequalities between grades, particularly AA and AO

widening gaps between pay and the rising cost of living

disparities between staff who opted into the deal and those who remained on legacy arrangements

Conference recognises that the changing pay environment, sustained cost-of-living pressures, and feedback from members across DWP demonstrate that the Employee Deal no longer meets the needs of staff or reflects the realities of DWP operational demands.

Conference believes that maintaining the current structure perpetuates pay inequality, restricts meaningful progress in collective bargaining, and undermines morale and retention within the department. Conference further believes that PCS must position itself to secure a fairer, more sustainable framework for DWP pay.

Conference therefore instructs the Group Executive Committee (GEC) to:

Undertake an assessment of the current impact of the Employee Deal on pay, progression and contractual arrangements across AA–EO grades, and report findings to branches.

Develop a DWP-wide negotiating claim seeking improvements to fairness, progression and pay alignment, and to use the outcome of the assessment to inform the case for substantial reform of the existing arrangements.

Press the employer to enter negotiations on these issues, making clear that any new agreement must:
address grade compression and restore clear differentials

ensure equitable progression opportunities for all staff

reduce disparities between those on and off the 2016 arrangements

reflect real-terms cost-of-living pressures

Consult members fully on priorities for reform, and organise a targeted campaign supporting these bargaining objectives.

Escalate appropriately—including to the National Executive Committee where required—should the employer refuse meaningful engagement on reforming the Employee Deal.

A62

DWP Forth Valley Scotland(047077)

Conference notes:

1. Assumed Consent is an established entitlement since 2016 in DWP intended to provide staff with reasonable flexibility to self manage non fixed arrival and departure times as a standard element of the working day.
2. Despite its long standing status, significant numbers of members remain unclear about their entitlements, and there continues to be inconsistent application across the department.
3. Branches have dealt with numerous cases, particularly, though not exclusively, within Jobcentres where staff have been denied Assumed Consent or given incorrect information by managers.
4. While procedural guidance exists, including “Assumed Consent - How This Should Work” gaps and ambiguities remain. These continue to lead to misinterpretation, inconsistent practice, and unnecessary conflict.
5. There is a lack of clarity in the guidance about arrangements for using Assumed Consent at the non-fixed start of the day which has caused managers to make unnecessary staff welfare checks.
6. Branches and the Group have had to issue or re-issue multiple briefings clarifying what should already be clear entitlements, demonstrating that current guidance is insufficient and not uniformly understood.

Conference believes:

- ☑ Assumed Consent should be applied consistently, transparently, and in accordance with its intended purpose, promoting trust, reasonable autonomy, common sense and fair treatment for all staff.
- ☑ Clearer departmental guidance would help reduce conflict, minimise avoidable grievances, reduce unnecessary welfare checks and support both managers and staff.
- ☑ PCS has a responsibility to ensure policies affecting members’ daily working lives are applied accurately and fairly across all business areas.

Conference therefore instructs the incoming GEC to:

1. Demand DWP undertakes a full review of the Assumed Consent procedural guidance, ensuring clarity, accuracy, and removal of ambiguous or contradictory elements.
2. Seek to strengthen DWP procedural guidance, particularly in areas of current silence or inconsistency, ensuring clear expectations for both staff and managers.
3. Seek to implement measures to guarantee consistent application across all DWP sites.
4. Seek to provide improved training and direction to managers to reduce misapplication and ensure adherence to national guidance.
5. Ensure DWP properly involves PCS throughout the process of revising, updating, and communicating strengthened guidance.
6. Produce communications so all members clearly understand their entitlements and how Assumed Consent should operate in practice.

A63

DWP East London(047030)

Whilst assumed consent has been in place since 2016 and provides great flexibility when applied correctly, a lot of members continue to be prevented from taking advantage of this.

It has come to light:

- That many members are still not being given the opportunity to select their tent poles themselves for each rotation
- members do not know what their tentpoles are, and are not being informed of them with each rotation
- members are being issued with warnings for being late when their fixed tentpole is in the PM
- Members are being forced to work at both ends of the day
- Managers are not completely familiar with Assumed Consent guidance, which is disadvantaging our members
- There is also a culture of reps differentiating between members in JCPs and service centre, when guidance doesn't do this
- The introduction of the 60% return to work has in many cases further restricted members from invoking assumed consent during days they go to the office

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- hold an all-members consultation to find out how widespread these issues are:
 - 1) in writing, (via a questionnaire/survey with questions like – Do you know what assumed consent is? Do you know what your tent poles are? Do you have the flexibility to invoke assumed consent? What are the challenges/barriers you are facing in taking assumed consent? The questionnaire/survey does not need to be limited to these questions.)
 - 2) by arranging all members meetings across the country
- demand the department put adequate steps in place to ensure managers are fully aware of the Employee Deal process and Assumed Consent guidance
- send a briefing out to members specifically on the issue of lateness and asking for them to report these issues as a priority to branch secretaries and the GEC or both if their tent pole is in the PM
- The same briefing should address assumed consent on days in the office and how this must not be limited because of expectation of a certain amount of attendance at the office
- To work on ensuring reps understand that DWP guidance applies to all staff equally that they must not feed an incorrect narrative on assumed consent, i.e. only applies to service centre staff and not JCP staff

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

A64

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

Conference notes that a motion at DWP group conference 2025 calling for a joint PCS and Management Side re-launch of Employee Deal was lost. Conference understands that there is a great deal of ill-will towards Employee Deal amongst PCS activists and ordinary members, caused in part by widespread non-compliance with the collective agreement amongst managers in all sites. Conference agrees that there is a risk the many positive aspects of employee deal may be lost, and that blaming the policy rather than the managers who fail to implement it properly would be, to coin a phrase, 'throwing the baby out with the bathwater'. Conference feels that the views of activists and members on ED non-compliance should be gathered so they can be presented to the management side. Conference instructs the GEC to undertake a survey of all members to gather examples of non-compliance and so gauge the depth of the problem, the GEC are free to decide the type and wording of the survey questions.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Union Organisation

A65

Group Executive Committee

Conference notes that this group's most recent statutory pay ballot returned a strong 85% YES vote for action but did not meet the 50% turnout threshold required under anti-trade union legislation.

External factors, particularly Royal Mail delays, backlogs, and late delivery of ballot papers and replacements, had a negative impact on turnout, with some members receiving their papers as the ballot closed or not receiving them at all.

Other factors including a delayed start to the planned timetable due to a last-minute challenge by DWP which meant the ballot period was shortened to 5 weeks also impacted on the turnout.

However, despite these issues conference notes the ballot campaign demonstrated clear organisational strengths, including:

- The production of engaging and effective member leaflets, widely circulated and well-received.
- The successful and extensive use of the Movement telephone-banking system, enabling reps to speak directly with thousands of members.
- Strong workplace participation involving reps, branches, and members across DWP.
- Effective use of PCS social media to promote the group's message to members.

Conference believes our organisational strengths are more needed now than ever, with the employer, as well as continuing to face structural pay issues, also implement damaging changes across the department such as the enabling functions review, reduced Jobcentre security, increased stress in UC, and distressing telephony pressures. These challenges for our group reinforce the need for effective industrial leverage.

Conference believes that members have demonstrated a clear willingness to act, and PCS DWP group has the tools, experience, and organising capacity to exceed the statutory threshold if needed in future ballots.

The strengths shown during the recent campaign—effective communications, phone-banking, and strong rep engagement—all form a solid foundation for future organising work. A positive and continuous approach to member engagement, improved contactability, and early preparation will help overcome external challenges such as postal disruption.

Building consistently strong turnout requires systematic preparation, accurate data, confident reps, and well-supported branches. The 2026 campaign highlighted both the strength of member sentiment and the organisational vulnerabilities that must be addressed well in advance of any future statutory ballot.

Conference notes that improved membership data, workplace mapping, and branch organising capacity are essential to overcoming external and internal barriers to a successful ballot and:

- That the Movement telephone-banking system, when integrated into every ballot campaign, can significantly increase turnout.
- That robust communication—digital, printed, workplace-based, and rep-led—is key to engaging members early and often.
- That branches with lower engagement must receive targeted, structured support.
- That the GEC must embed a culture of continuous organising, not campaign-only activity.

Conference therefore instructs the incoming DWP GEC to strengthen the Group's ability to secure statutory mandates by:

- Promoting Movement phone-banking as a core turnout tool by integrating its use into every campaign plan at every level of the group.
- Maintaining an updated list of trained phone-bank volunteers across all branches for deployment during ballot periods.
- Monitoring feedback from reps and users to make improvements to the system.

- Scheduling regular refresher sessions for reps before each ballot.
- Providing standardised scripts, FAQs, and short briefing videos for volunteers.
- Co-ordinating regional or national phone-banking days to maximise member contact.

Conference further instructs the incoming GEC to refresh the group organising plan, and to:

- Continue to produce clear, accessible digital and printed organising materials, ensuring all ballot and organising campaigns are supported by high-quality, consistent materials, in conjunction with PCS Comms.
- Support branches to maintain confident workplace conversations all year, not only during ballots, producing materials to aid this work
- Promote workplace “organising days” for co-ordinated activity.
- Encourage branches to map workplaces and identify organising opportunities.
- Continue to develop and run organising events to embed key organising principles in regions and nations
- Embed the use of PCS Digital as the central organising, data, and communication tool in every branch, encouraging branches to target engagement through the tool
- Support branches to maintain accurate postal addresses, emails, and mobile numbers on PCS Digital
- Produce and share QR codes on posters and emails linking members to update-their-details pages.
- Encourage reps to verify member details during conversations and site visits.
- Ensure workplace and site information is accurate and standardised on PCS Digital, reducing the risk of future challenges from the employer
- Complete the update of workplace naming conventions and provide guidance to reps on recording changes to workplaces promptly
- target branches with low participation and provide targeted support, combining real data with info recorded on PCS Digital.

This conference supports the DWP Group Executive Committee to continue to develop and implement a flexible group organising plan in conjunction with the PCS national organising strategy that incorporates the above instructions.

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Privatisation

A66

Seconded by DWP Cheshire

Covers E115

DWP Greater Manchester Branch(047023)

DWP Cheshire (047014)

Conference notes that an increasing number of branches are reporting difficulties representing outsourced workers, usually due to the lack of facility time for this. The current policy for branches struggling to provide representation is to write to their regional committee. If the regional committee is unable to provide representation, then they write to the GEC to refer the case.

This system works for complex cases, but it does not resolve the facility time issue for representing outsourced workers. If reps simply hide, or fail to mention, that they are representing outsourced workers this leaves them open to disciplinary action from the employer. Some reps do conduct representation in their own time, but this can hardly be incorporated into policy and still leaves members facing uncertainty and inconsistency.

Outsourced members currently sit in limbo within DWP Group. Seemingly no one really has the time to represent them, and the weight of juggling this difficult position is left with already overworked branches. Providing representation is not our primary purpose as a union but if we are unable to do so properly, we cannot expect to make good on our intent to organise and gain recognition for these workers.

Conference instructs the GEC to conduct a full review of how the Group provides representation to outsourced workers, which should consider potential improvements to the current arrangements. Branches, regional committees and affected members should be consulted as part of this. A report should be provided to branches in time for motions to be submitted to Group Conference in 2027

Carried Lost Remitted Fell

Other Motions (categories B, C, D, E & X)

Pay

E67

DWP HQ Sheffield(047012)

This conference recognises that pay in DWP is still not addressing the cost-of-living crisis with some members having to use food banks, claim universal credit and struggle to heat their homes. It also recognises that other Depts are paying more to their staff across the grades and that there needs to be pay restoration.

This conference recognises a business case is a necessity in seeking extra funds from the treasury to address this where any pay remit falls short in terms of funding.

This conference agrees there is a need to popularise demands and work closely with branches and regions/nations to coordinate campaigning to mobilise members in support of a collective approach to secure agreed demands. This should involve our PMA members in drafting specific campaign material for our higher grades. In negotiating with the employer, it agrees that a mandate from the members is essential to ensure the employer takes our demands seriously.

This conference instructs the GEC to negotiate:

- A fully consolidate pay rises not less than previously claimed with a fully consolidated pay rises of at least 10%, for £18p/h minimum, and pay restoration for money lost since 2010.
- Genuine pay progression to get the rate for job
- That the employer puts in a business case to meet any shortfalls in pay remit sent out by the treasury.

It also instructs the GEC to

- popularise PCS demands amongst DWP members about the need to stand up unify all our membership to fight together for all members to have a pay rise, pay restoration and genuine pay progression.
 - Oppose any attempts by management to sacrifice jobs for pay
 - Work with the national union and coordinate support to ensure that DWP members are fully involved in the national campaign.
-

E68

Covered By A1 Identical To E67

DWP Sheffield(047008)

X69

Factually Incorrect

DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders(047063)

Conference notes that

- The cost of living for those living and working in Edinburgh as a civil servant is between 15%-20% higher than the rest of the UK
- Someone working in DWP Liverpool will have 19% lower housing costs than a colleague working in an equivalent DWP office in Edinburgh.
- London is estimated at being 23%-26% more expensive than Edinburgh but the fact London is grossly extortionate does not make the cost of living for an Edinburgh Civil Servant less valid as

Edinburgh bills and essentials still cost up to 1/5 more than the rest of the UK yet someone doing the same job in a DWP Office in another UK town or city receives the same wage. This pay gap needs to be tackled.

Conference instructs the Group Executive Committee to:

- discuss and negotiate with DWP for the receipt of an Edinburgh weighting for all its staff working within the Edinburgh area;
 - explore the feasibility of an increased wage/weighting for DWP employees living within capital cities (Edinburgh/Cardiff/London)
-

Campaigning

E70

Covered By A8

DWP Cheshire(047014)

Conference notes that DWP have announced multiple office closures in 2025. Members at Lincoln Service Centre have already taken industrial action to protect their jobs with no realistic alternative workplaces being offered to them. In October DWP announced further office closures in Dover, Warrington and St Helens. Staff in Dover face relocation to either Ramsgate or Canterbury, while those in Warrington and St Helens have been told their jobs are moving to Ashton-in-Makerfield. Many members say they cannot relocate to these new sites, including around 100 in Warrington for whom the new commute would exceed the mobility policy.

Sites receive support locally, as shown by the agreement of industrial action in Lincoln, but we lack a group campaign to keep jobs in local communities. The employer's estates agenda has been public for many years, and yet we seem to wait for sites to reach the point of no return before taking any action. Branches themselves have a responsibility here too to fight their corner, but they cannot be expected to battle the full machinery of DWP estates on their own.

The current DWP estate strategy will strip many British towns of stable, professional jobs, and upturn the lives of many of our members, setting out a firm challenge to it is imperative.

Conference instructs the DWP GEC to:

- Launch a group wide campaign to challenge the current DWP estate strategy.
- Oppose all office closures where staff cannot be redeployed into suitable local offices.
- Support branches affected by office closures to negotiate with DWP or to take industrial action where necessary.

Negotiate with DWP so that members faced with redeployment can instead opt to become contractual home workers if they wish.

X71

Beyond remit of Group Conference

DWP HQ London(047039)

In September 2025, the largest far-right gathering in Britain in living memory marched through London, while anti-asylum protests have spread throughout the country.

A Reform-led government would likely mean an unprecedented assault on working conditions and living standards – draconian clampdowns on the right to organise in unions, the end to any pretence at seeking equality of opportunity and outcomes and cuts to our jobs, pay and benefits.

In the face of this threat, trade unions will become critical as workers self-defence organisations. Over the past two decades, however, anti-far right activity has been outsourced to external groups that by their nature and size are not able to offer structural responses to the far right's rise or to provide the necessary stewarding to keep demonstrators safe.

We believe that the TUC and union leaderships should be leading antifascist activity. We must therefore support rank-and-file efforts by trade unionists in both self-organising and pushing the TUC to action, and support becoming active participants in this struggle ourselves. This will include not only mobilising for counter-demonstrations, but actively fighting the political arguments in our workplaces as trade unions, and pushing our national leaderships to action through democratic and external pressure.

We must present an alternative not just to the existing anti-fascist movement, but to fascism itself. Our campaign material should present a socialist response based on workers' unity across racial and national lines, for jobs, homes, and healthcare, while refusing to give an inch to prejudice - against migrants, trans people, or any minority.

Conference therefore instructs The GEC to:

1. Conduct or co-host a Group-wide educational series on opposing the far right, including practical steps for members to support and build anti-far right campaigns in their local areas and providing campaign materials;
 2. Encourage affiliation to Trades Councils, mandating delegates to submit motions calling for local worker-led antifascist organising;
 3. As Public Sector employers develop a 'Day 1' strategy for a Reform-led Department, to be presented for vote at a members meeting or the next AGM;
 4. Identify and support any members affected by new visa restrictions, backing anti-deportation campaigns;
 5. Mobilise for upcoming far right counter demonstrations in trade union blocs, recruiting stewards, offering protest and 'know your rights' guidance and training;
 6. Become active participants in regional or national grassroots anti-far right trade union initiatives, including by joining Trade Unions Fighting the Far Right
-

X72

No instruction

DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders(047063)

This motion notes/considers :

- The industrial dispute between PCS and DWP nationally
- The undertaking of a national ballot by PCS for all its staff working within DWP Group
- Previous tactics by PCS nationally and within various departmental groupings (e.g. DWP/HMRC) of targeted action and 1 day strikes failed because they showed questionable commitment to winning serious gains and weak intent from PCS national leadership.
- These tactics delivered underwhelming gains of 5% increase (instead of between 10-15% as was national policy) upon the succession of the current Labour government and an even lower figure at the last pay negotiations. These 'gains' have been swiftly swallowed up by the increased cost of living for PCS members at DWP and civil servants across the UK.
- That solidarity is about sticking together and acting as a collective unit and remaining united, not supporting a policy that means whilst some staff working in one DWP or other government departmental business area on one floor go on strike whilst another business area in e.g. DWP working on another floor on that same day turn up for work and don't have to fight the same battle. That is the weakness of targeted action it displays a lack of serious intent, a hollow willingness to only go so far and only act as a smaller less cohesive and committed unit. Without collective action and strength and unity in numbers and serious commitment to take action collectively industrial action is vulnerable to failure or meagre gains.
- 1 day strikes do not deliver significant gains for civil servants as showcased by previous disputes with the last Conservative government , as opposed to consistent and multiple days strike action taken by the BMA for Junior Doctors or Unite for its Bus Drivers which delivered inflation busting pay rises for their members as opposed to previous tactics deployed by PCS of targeted action and 1 day strikes that delivered a measly 5% rise which is still

behind what our pay should be if considering real terms pay progression/inflation increases and disregarding the pay freeze brought in by the 2010 coalition government.

- Edinburgh and Liverpool Bus Driver pay is greater than DWP Executive Officer pay in part because workers in the transport sector have displayed a willingness to take prolonged strike action based on the principle of 'one out, all out'.

Proposal/Actions

- For PCS DWP Group to reject the meek tactic of targeted action and to commit to moving beyond occasional 1 day strikes by instead proposing and supporting members with a program of multiple days strike action if/whenever DWP members and other civil servants across the UK democratically vote 'yes' to taking appropriate strike action.

Employee Relations

E73

Covered By A9 Identical To A9
DWP Essex(047050)

E74

Covered By A9 Identical To A9
DWP West Hampshire(047104)

Distinguished Life Membership

E75

Covered By A14

DWP North and Outer East London Branch(047033)

Following her retirement, this Conference agrees to award Distinguished Life Membership to Teresa Power. Teresa was London Regional Chair and Branch Secretary for NOEL Branch. Teresa was a rep for over 20 years and was greatly respected by members and reps for the excellent work she did in all her roles.

E76

Covered By A14

DWP Wigan Area(047015)

Conference agrees to award a Distinguished Life Membership Award to Graham Thompson formerly of the DWP Wigan Area Branch.

Graham held many positions during his long service to the Union including Branch Organiser, Health and Safety Officer, District Health and Safety Chair and as a member of the DWP NW Regional Health and Safety TUS.

He was fundamental in the branch achieving sign-up rate of over 97% following the end of check-off and achieved a great many successes when representing members in personal cases.

E77

Covered By A14

DWP Wigan Area(047015)

Conference agrees to award a Distinguished Life Membership Award to Lorraine Birkett formerly of DWP Wigan Area Branch.

Lorraine was a tireless and tenacious as a personal case and health and safety rep at the Makerfield site and was also a member of the Branch Committee and NW England Regional Health and Safety TUS's for many years.

E78

Covered By A14

DWP Glasgow(047066)

Distinguished Life Membership - (DLM):- (Elizabeth MacIntyre)

This Conference notes:

Liz MacIntyre retired from DWP and PCS TU duties in early 2025, after many loyal years of service to both organisations.

Liz was a constant aid to Glasgow PCS DWP branch, in her years in the branch, through her mobilisation and organisational skills for the branch and PCS DWP Group in Scotland. She digitalised contact with her members at Springburn DWP office, an essential requirement at all times, but especially in times of campaigning. Liz was an integral part of Glasgow DWP branch reaching required thresholds for the branch in campaigns, and in PCS DWP Scotland at a regional level. Liz in essence was a fantastic rep in our PCS DWP Group.

Liz was always a big part of our campaigning and brought new members into the PCS DWP Glasgow branch with her persuasive discussions on joining our TU, but also in the help she gave to members facing challenges in the workplace. This encouragement and help given to newer reps, or reps wanting to tap into her organisational processes.

Liz especially, teased out issues in our JC sites and brought them to the attention of DWP SLTs in Glasgow, for the joint informal meetings held between the branch and District management whether those issues were of an operational or H&S nature. A forum in which she participated also.

Again, this promoting negotiations on behalf of the branch with DWP Management.

Therefore, this conference instructs our PCS DWP GEC to consider awarding a Distinguished Life Membership, to Liz MacIntyre.

E79

Covered By A14

DWP Tyneside & Northumbria(047120)

DWP Conference agrees to award a distinguished life membership for Glen Hatwood (DWP Tyneside and Northumbria). He has been a member of the DWP GEC, DWP NE England Regional Chair and Chair of DWP Tyneview Park and DWP Tyneside and Northumbria branches. He has been an active union rep for 20 years representing members tirelessly in branch and across the wider DWP. His wealth of experience has inspired reps to step up and embolden them.

E80

Covered By A14

DWP Ty Taf(047144)

Conference agrees to award distinguished life membership to the following former colleague Jason Lawrence

Jason was a dedicated and valued PCS workplace rep for several years, serving 2 Welsh branches. He had an excellent record of supporting members in often very complicated personal casework.

He always tried to look for new and innovative ways to positively promote PCS within the workplace. Working

tirelessly to represent members, helping them to resolve workplace issues and supported fellow reps both professionally and personally, during increasingly challenging times, and even when in poor health himself. Jason was a member of PCS for over 30 years and is sorely missed. Because of his years of committed service in the previous branch of Eastern Valleys before being posted to DWP Ty Taf branch we propose distinguished life membership.

E81

Covered By A14

DWP Ayrshire Dumfries & Galloway(047062)

This Branch notes:

- Brian Dixon has stepped down as Branch Secretary having retired at the end of 2024.
- He has been a stalwart servant of CPSA/PCS for many, many years.
- Brian joined CPSA, in July 1987. He was a member of the branch executive committee from 1991 and has served as Branch Health & Safety Officer for 25 years. He became Assistant Branch Secretary in 2015, Acting Branch Secretary 2021/22 and Branch Secretary from 2023.
- Brian, along with Ian Lamont, helped pilot the branch through the extremely difficult years of the Covid pandemic. Then, with the Branch Chair obliged to take a far less active role, due to ill health, Brian and Ian, as the only two serving branch officers, held the branch together for several years, essentially on their own.

This Branch believes:

- Without Brian's tireless efforts, the branch would have ceased to function. Instead, in solid shape and with firm foundations on which to grow and develop, Brian has passed the baton on to the next generation of branch officer.

This Branch resolves:

- The branch members, advocates, representatives and officers would like to express their sincere gratitude to Brian for his years of service, and the energy, enthusiasm and humour with which he has conducted his duties.

This Group Conference agrees:

- To award Brian Dixon Distinguished Life Membership for his outstanding service to both Ayrshire Dumfries & Galloway branch and the wider union.
-

E82

Covered By A14

DWP Ayrshire Dumfries & Galloway(047062)

This Branch notes:

- Ian Lamont has stepped down as Treasurer, having retired at the end of July 2024.
- Ian joined the Department of Health and Social Security on 15th February 1976 and joined CPSA at the same time.
- He joined SCPS when promoted in 1981 and then NUCPS from 1988.
- Ian was a workplace Rep and a member of the BEC. He then took over as Branch Treasurer in 1990, when the branch's previous Treasurer, Norman Love, retired.
- Ian, along with Brian Dixon, helped pilot the branch through the extremely difficult years of the Covid

pandemic. Then, with the Branch Chair obliged to take a far less active role, due to ill health, Ian and Brian, as the only two serving branch officers, held the branch together for several years, essentially on their own.

This Branch believes:

- Without Ian's tireless efforts, the branch would have ceased to function. Instead, in solid shape and with firm foundations on which to grow and develop, he has passed the baton on to the new branch treasurer.

This Branch resolves:

- The branch members, advocates, representatives and officers would like to express their sincere gratitude to Ian for his years of service, and the energy, enthusiasm and humour with which he has conducted his duties.

This Group Conference agrees:

- To award Ian Lamont Distinguished Life Membership for his outstanding service to both Ayrshire Dumfries & Galloway branch and the wider union.
-

E83

Covered By A14

DWP City of Sunderland(047118)

City of Sunderland branch would like to put forward Amanda Wilson for Distinguished Life Membership. Amanda retired during covid due to ill health but served many years in our branch, finally as our Chair.

Amanda has retained contact and is still a support since her well earned retirement and we thank her for all that she done in our union for our members.

Thankyou Mandy.

The Branch asks Conference to agree to award the DLM to Amanda Wilson in recognition of her service to PCS.

E84

Covered By A14

DWP City of Sunderland(047118)

City of Sunderland Branch are proud to ask Conference to consider the award of Distinguished Life Membership to Christine Oliver.

Christine has recently retired from the Civil Service after more than 48 years.

Christine had been a dedicated union representative in various roles of our union at local, regional and national level in both CPSA and PCS for most of her 48 years service.

Her commitment to her union and members has been outstanding and commendable and she fully deserves the award.

Christine has continued her membership within ARMS.

The Branch would like to thank Christine for her dedication to our union.

The branch asks Conference to agree to award the DLM to Christine Oliver in recognition of her service to PCS and its predecessor unions.

E85

Covered By A14

DWP Coventry & Warwicks(047055)

Conference agrees to award Distinguished Life Membership to Ian Devoy (formerly DWP Coventry and Warwickshire Branch Organiser) for his dedicated service to PCS.

X86

No Instruction to Group Conference

DWP Highlands, Islands and Grampian(047070)

Highlands, Islands and Grampian Branch would like to nominate Pauline Crawford, for Distinguished Life Membership. Pauline retired from DWP in 2023, and she dedicated 28 years' service as a BEC member, Inverness Local Rep and Equality Representative.

She also held the following additional roles: Scottish Regional Treasurer, Scottish Equality Officer, DWP Group Equality Committee and DWP Woman's Committee, Lay Tutor for PCS.

Therefore, Pauline's experience and knowledge is greatly missed by all her PCS colleagues at Branch and Regional level.

X87

No instruction to Group conference

DWP Birmingham North(047054)

DWP Birmingham North Branch wish to nominate Steve Franks former Branch Chair for Distinguished Life Membership in recognition of his many years of service both in PCS and CPSA.

X88

No instruction to Group Conference

DWP Highlands, Islands and Grampian(047070)

Highlands, Islands and Grampian Branch would also like to nominate Roddy MacKay for Distinguished Life Membership.

Roddy retired from DWP in 2019 and had been nominated for his Distinguished Life Membership in 2020, but as Conference was cancelled, he did not receive his DLM.

Roddy served as a Local Rep for over 40 years and was the Branch Organiser for more than half of this time, even managing to also squeeze in the role of Scottish Regional Organiser over many years too.

Conditions of Service

D89

DWP Birmingham South(047053)

This Conference notes that the current DWP Policy, Procedures and Advice make no specific reference to the practicalities of how leave is currently requested and what specific action should be taken if leave in any given period is oversubscribed.

Paragraph 19 of the Annual Leave Policy currently states: “ Where all requests cannot be accommodated, managers will determine a fair solution, taking account of business needs, work commitments, office cover, leave already taken, previous applications and approvals.”

The current protocol is the Annual Leave chart is opened approximately 11 months in advance with staff invited to plot leave over a set window before the leave chart is closed and decisions made.

It should not be a “first come, first served” process and the window to chart annual leave requests should remain open for an agreed set period of time to give staff sufficient and reasonable time to chart their Annual Leave requests.

It’s become apparent that some staff are not being given the opportunity to chart Annual Leave with the Leave Chart locked at the point the threshold is reached even if still within the initial set window for charting leave.

Where staff have charted leave and it’s not been agreed we are aware Reserve Lists have been established, but there’s no criteria for determining who is selected from the list and it’s currently the case that “First Come First Served” is the methodology in place.

Staff with pressing and specific time bound requests that could not have been known about when the leave chart was opened are being refused leave because they cannot take precedence over the existing Reserve List and all those on the list should be approached in date of request order if leave were to become available.

This Conference instructs the incoming GEC to enter into negotiations with DWP to expand the Annual Leave Advice Section to incorporate the following:

. When the Annual Leave chart opens to allow staff to chart Annual Leave it should remain open for a set period and not closed at the point the threshold is reached. If oversubscribed managers should follow the existing Paragraph 19 of the DWP Annual Leave Policy in reaching an informed decision.

. In the eventuality a reserve list is established the granting of the leave should also be based on the principles set out in the existing paragraph 19 of the Annual Leave Policy and it should be overtly stated that decisions on approving leave in these circumstances should not be based on first come first served basis.

E90

Covered By A16

DWP Cumbria and Lancashire(047020)

Conference believes that the current procedure for attendance management trigger points is not fit for purpose in relation to the way in which disability related absences are handled. Conference notes that:

- The existing process relies on managerial discretion, creating inconsistent and sometimes discriminatory application.
- Disabled members experience uncertainty, unequal treatment across teams, and avoidable stress.
- The current system fails to provide structural, rights based protection.

This conference believes there is a need to replace discretionary decisions with a structural safeguard, ensuring that disabled staff are consistently and fairly protected within the attendance management system.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

1. Enter formal negotiations with management to challenge the current attendance trigger framework.
2. Demand the introduction of automatic exclusion of all disability related absences from attendance management triggers, removing reliance on case by case discretion.

3. Secure union oversight within the process, ensuring transparency, consistency, and protection for disabled members.
 4. Seek written confirmation that any revised process fully aligns with equality legislation and does not place disabled employees at risk of discrimination.
 5. Report back to members with outcomes, progress updates, and any agreements reached.
-

E91

Covered By A20 Identical To A20

DWP Sheffield(047008)

E92

Covered By A20 Identical To A20

DWP HQ Sheffield(047012)

E93

Covered By A24

DWP Brent Harrow & Hillingdon(047028)

Conference welcomes the on-going work of the Group Executive Committee for the introduction of improved DWP disciplinary guidance, for information security gross misconduct offences for unauthorised access, as reported in PCS Briefing DWP/MB/026/25.

Conference notes that this outcome of consultation with PCS provides improved guidance for circumstances, under current strictly limited options for information security related penalties, where a Decision Maker should conclude that a Final Written Warning would be the appropriate penalty, rather than Dismissal, on the basis that: Decision Makers must consider a proportionate penalty (Please see Paragraph 7.29 within the Discipline Procedures).

In information security cases and where the level of the offence is gross misconduct category, dismissal is expected as it usually causes a breakdown in the employment relationship due to lost trust in the employee's honesty, judgment, integrity, etc. It follows that a Final Written Warning, rather than dismissal, would apply instead where the Decision Maker concludes that a breakdown in the employment relationship has not occurred.

These will be cases where all the following mitigate the case:

- The employee did not use the information, or facilitate someone else's use of it, for their own or someone else's gain, or to falsify claims for benefits; and,
- There is no suggestion of malicious or suspicious intent; and,
- There is no known harm or distress caused to any party, or it is unlikely that harm or distress would have resulted; and,
- There has been no reputational damage, or the matter is unlikely to have caused reputational damage; and,
- The employee can provide some reasonable explanation as to why they may have accessed the records or some

other relevant mitigation.

Conference agrees that this revised guidance should be used as a platform for more significant disciplinary policy and procedural changes so that the Group Executive Committee is instructed to negotiate for:

- disciplinary procedural guidance to be improved for 'No Case to Answer' scenarios
 - unauthorised access scenarios currently classified as gross misconduct to be reclassified as Serious Misconduct so that a Final Written Warning would be the normal penalty rather than Dismissal
 - disciplinary decision options for all disciplinary cases to be improved to include a 'No penalty' option so that Decision Makers are able to give truly fair and proportionate outcomes for certain offences in the particular circumstances of an individual case.
-

X94

No instruction to Group Conference

DWP North Merseyside(047018)

Conference will note that Employee Deal was introduced with no directorate differences. It was literally a 'collective agreement'. Sadly, although not part of ED, we continue to see directorate differences across DWP, the main part of this is the allowance of some staff in DWP to work hybrid and others who are badged as 'front facing' not being allowed this luxury.

Conference will also note because of this, Jobcentre plus is haemorrhaging staff at an alarming rate to other Government departments who do allow a more relaxed and family friendly Policy. We note the usual comment from Jobcentre management when there are IT failures or problems in Jobcentres. In these situations, and when closing the office is the only option, then DWP Jobcentre Plus managers encourage staff to work from home to maintain business continuity.

We are aware of recent trials across the country for practices such as Video appointments from Home and home working and call upon DWP to release their findings and enter meaningful dialogue with Jobcentre Plus in seeking Hybrid working as viable working option form all DWP staff and not those luckily not be badged as front facing.

DWP Hybrid policy states 'The Department for Work and Pensions is committed to supporting managers and employees to deliver a truly inclusive working environment whether in a workplace, remotely or a mixture of the two'. Conference, all that Jobcentre staff request, is to be treated under the one framework as our colleagues in other directorates and to be seen as equals under the one DWP banner.

X95

Unclear in intent

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

This conference notes that in 2024 we passed Motion A23 on the Dress Code. At that time we agreed that society had moved on since the dress code was last looked at.

The Civil Service Dress Code was last updated in 2004.

There have been significant societal changes since then, prejudice has succumbed to progress. Except in the Civil Service.

This Conference believes that this item needs to be revisited and brought into line with contemporary standards.

It is also noteworthy to point out that many DWP sites are exceptionally cold in winter and stiflingly hot in summer. Staff comfort is not a priority for the DWP, and combined with the dress code forces staff into being uncomfortable at work.

The Civil Service Dress Code states that a heterosexual male, would be forced to adopt women's clothing such as a skirt or dress in order to be comfortably cool at work in summer as shorts are not permitted, unless senior management issue temporary permission for staff to wear shorts in heatwave conditions and even then approval has to come from senior management. Should senior management decline this, thus the choice is between being uncomfortably hot or coming to work in a skirt. Under this policy, a skirt is acceptable but shorts are not. Utter madness and embarrassingly outdated. Staff have been allowed to wear shorts for certain periods of the warmer months over the years, but this feels very much like the scene from *Oliver* where the child asks his master "Please, Sir, can I wear shorts at work so I don't melt in to my work station or faint at my desk?". It feels like a privilege that can be revoked at any time, depending on the whim of management or a slight dip of a degree or two in Celsius. In winter, it is very difficult to achieve comfort at work particularly at co-located sites where the heating is inadequate for the premises. The Civil Service dress code states no hoodies, which represent some of the warmest clothing available for indoor use. Would it look more professional to ask staff to wear their outer jackets and coats at their desks? Hardly. This projects the image that the DWP does not provide sufficient heating to maintain comfort, and contrasts with the effort from staff to meet operational demand and professionalism.

This conference accepts that as a government organisation, staff representing it need to be seen in a positive light-but to also reflect the community that our workforce represents and serves. Staff should avoid large, garish logos or political slogans on clothing whilst at work. So few of the communities, if any, we serve would wish to see us in shirt and trousers, or blouse and skirt, or whatever smart non-binary outfit currently associated with doing our jobs. In today's modern age, we could move a step closer to the communities we serve in our front-facing roles by being allowed to dress more casually at work. Why shouldn't we be able to wear jeans, shorts, hoodies, t-shirts or other similarly classified relaxed dress standards? What purpose does maintaining a policy that is two decades since its most recent update serve?

There is no purpose, other than a "because I said so" rhetoric. It will not effect the service we deliver. It would only help to close the gap between DWP staff and the communities they serve. Those who wish to dress smartly may continue to do so if they so choose, but it should not be expected in an age where everyone else in today's society is encouraged to express themselves and be their true selves. We on the other hand, must adhere to a strict policy or face disciplinary proceedings.

The policy needs to change and be brought in line with modern standards to accommodate all individuals, and allow them to be comfortable whilst at work. Regardless of which gender our staff identify as, regardless of their sexual orientation or any other protected characteristic, all staff must be allowed to be comfortable at work and be their true, comfortable, authentic selves.

This conference instructs the GEC to update this conference on their progress in negotiations with DWP.

Equality

E96

Covered By A32

DWP Durham Tees Valley Branch(047122)

Conference notes:

- That neurodivergent individuals, including those with autism, ADHD, dyslexia, dyspraxia, and other neurological differences, face unique challenges in the workplace.
- That the DWP serves a diverse population, including many neurodivergent claimants, and employs a significant number of neurodivergent staff.
- That current training for DWP staff does not sufficiently address the specific needs, communication styles, and support strategies relevant to neurodivergent individuals.

Conference believes:

- That all DWP staff, both new and existing, should receive comprehensive training on neurodiversity to ensure inclusive service delivery and workplace practices.
- That such training should be developed and delivered in consultation with neurodivergent individuals and subject matter experts.
- That fostering neurodiversity awareness will improve staff wellbeing, reduce discrimination, and enhance the quality of service provided to the public.

Conference instructs the GEC:

1. To call on the PCS Union to campaign for the mandatory inclusion of specialist neurodiversity training in all DWP induction and ongoing training programmes.
 2. To lobby DWP to co-produce this training with neurodivergent staff, external experts, and relevant advocacy organisations.
 3. To support the establishment of a Neurodiversity Champion or Lead within each DWP business area to promote best practice and act as a point of contact.
 4. To encourage branches to raise awareness of neurodiversity and support neurodivergent members through local initiatives and networks.
-

X97

Factually incorrect date contained in motion.

DWP Greater Manchester Branch(047023)

Conference acknowledges that since the change to 60% office attendance from 1st September 2026, disabled members are under stronger attack in the workplace.

Many disabled workers are forced out of work because managers are failing to make 'reasonable adjustments' that are not following a standard script.

This is a known problem in DWP as senior management are aware of the number of cases on disability discrimination that they lose at tribunals.

Rights for disabled people have most often been achieved through great struggle. This is important to know because our differently abled members are still facing the same barriers.

Disabled, and non-disabled workers need control of the workplace. The employer biased concept of 'reasonable adjustments' could be replaced by a trade union centric concept of necessary adjustments.

Many disabled workers face a dilemma about disclosing their disability when applying for a job or promotion. They believe disclosing a disability means they are less likely to be employed. This could be overcome if trade union reps had oversight of recruitment and promotion. It is not impossible. There is civic precedent. Liverpool City Council used this system for a time.

As DWP Group, we should be on the cutting edge, proactively championing disabled rights in the workplace.

Strongly. Without equivocation. And holding that line hard. This isn't merely about members' rights: this is human

rights work and it must start locally.

Disabled staff need workplaces which meet their needs. This means workplaces designed with intense consultation with the neurodiverse and disabled rather than these needs being an 'add on'.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

Support branches to ensure they all have equality officers elected. It's not a luxury position: it is a must have position and should be considered as vital as a branch secretary.

Negotiate for all staff to undertake mandatory equality training which must include disability training and neurodiversity awareness. Also negotiate training for all managers on how to prevent disability discrimination and promote zero tolerance of discrimination in the workplace. The content and delivery of training to be overseen by elected shop stewards and PCS.

Develop 'understanding disability and neuro-diversity' training courses for reps

Negotiate a disability and neurodiversity agreement with DWP.

Lobby for fair reporting systems, free from judgement. Any disability discrimination, verbal or physical, needs to be reported and acted on by management immediately. All incidents must be recorded, reviewed by elected branch officers, and reported to Regional/Nation committees. Regular public data must be made available showing the number of staff experiencing grievances or facing disciplinary by disability.

Ensure trade union oversight of recruitment and promotion processes.

Negotiate with management material to raise awareness and promote rights of disabled staff in DWP at all grades to be displayed in all DWP workplaces.

X98

Beyond the remit of Group Conference

DWP Greater Manchester Branch(047023)

This Conference notes:

1. That in many areas of DWP, including Compliance, there is currently no consistent, structured induction training package for newly appointed HEOs or new leaders, although work on such a package is ongoing.
2. That new leaders are frequently placed into post without adequate preparation for managing diverse teams, complex casework environments, or colleagues with additional workplace needs.
3. That colleagues who are neurodivergent continue to report inconsistent experiences regarding support, understanding, and reasonable adjustments when line-managed by leaders who have not received appropriate training.
4. That inclusive leadership is essential for staff wellbeing, retention, confidence, performance, and equality of opportunity.
5. Those existing leaders, many of whom have been in post for years, have not received structured, mandatory neurodiversity training aligned to modern understanding, best practice, or the department's stated commitments on inclusion.

This Conference believes:

1. That all leaders in DWP — new and existing — require robust, high-quality training that equips them to support neurodivergent colleagues effectively and confidently.
2. That inconsistency in leadership knowledge and capability is detrimental to staff welfare and undermines the department's commitment to being an inclusive employer.
3. That training must be practical, grounded in real workplace scenarios, and created in consultation with staff, experts, recognised unions, and neurodivergent colleagues themselves.
4. That retrospective training is essential to ensure long-standing leaders are not excluded from vital learning.

This Conference therefore resolves to:

1. Instruct the GEC to press the DWP and Civil Service leadership to ensure that all newly appointed HEOs and leaders receive a comprehensive, mandatory induction training programme that includes:
 - a. neurodiversity awareness

- b. reasonable adjustments
 - c. inclusive leadership behaviours
 - d. casework and decision-making impacts
 - e. practical skills for supporting colleagues
2. Call on DWP to develop and implement a retrospective, mandatory training programme for all current leaders at every grade, ensuring that those already in post receive the same level of training and understanding as new leaders.
 3. Ensure that PCS is formally consulted on the content of both the induction and retrospective programmes, with representation from:
 - a. neurodivergent staff
 - b. equality networks
 - c. workplace reps with casework experience
 4. Require the GEC to issue guidance to branches on how members can expect to be supported by leaders who have completed the training, and how to challenge situations where support falls short.
 5. Seek annual reporting from DWP on the rollout, uptake, and impact of the training, ensuring transparency and accountability.
-

X99

Improper instruction

DWP Ty Taf(047144)

Conference notes:

- That neurodivergent individuals, including those with autism, ADHD, dyslexia, dyspraxia, and other neurological differences, face unique challenges in the workplace.
- That the DWP serves a diverse population, including many neurodivergent claimants, and employs a significant number of neurodivergent staff.
- That current training for DWP staff does not sufficiently address the specific needs, communication styles, and support strategies relevant to neurodivergent individuals.

Conference believes:

- That all DWP staff, both new and existing, should receive comprehensive training on neurodiversity to ensure inclusive service delivery and workplace practices.
- That such training should be developed and delivered in consultation with neurodivergent individuals and subject matter experts.
- That fostering neurodiversity awareness will improve staff wellbeing, reduce discrimination, and enhance the quality of service provided to the public

Conference instructs conference

- To campaign for the mandatory inclusion of specialist neurodiversity training in all DWP induction and ongoing training programmes.
 - To lobby DWP to co-produce this training with neurodivergent staff, external experts, and relevant advocacy organisations.
 - To continue supporting regions, branches, and activists to champion Neurodiversity in the workplace.
 - To encourage branches to raise awareness of neurodiversity and support neurodivergent members through local initiatives and networks
-

Grading

E100

Covered By A37

DWP Forth Valley Scotland(047077)

Conference believes that AO caseworker roles in the Child Maintenance Service (CMS) must receive a full, formal Job Evaluation and Grading Scheme (JEGS) review. It is widely recognised by CMS staff and senior leaders that the CMS AO caseworker role is exceptionally complex and arguably the most demanding AO role within DWP, if not across the entire Civil Service.

Conference notes:

1. DWP Group Conference 2023 passed Motion A5 on grading in DWP Operations, with explicit reference to the CMS AO caseworker role. Twelve months later, Conference 2024 again had to debate a motion simply to chase progress on the agreed policy.
2. The Group CMG Advisory Committee (CMGAC) has repeatedly pressed the GEC to secure a JEGS review for these AO roles. In October 2024, DWP again refused to agree to a JEGS exercise, claiming that although the role had “matured,” it had not changed “sufficiently” since the last evaluation in 2017.
3. Only after sustained pressure from the CMGAC did the GEC agree in Autumn 2024 to conduct an internal PCS “soft” JEGS evidence-gathering exercise. CMS AO members completed and submitted JAFs by 31 January 2025.
4. In April 2025, the CMGAC was informed that no progress could be made until Group Officers were granted access to the JEGS scoring tool, which DWP refused to provide. Despite assurances of escalation, no practical progress followed. The July 2025 member briefing (DWP/MB/040/25) simply restated this position, with no advancement.
5. Over the next seven months, and despite multiple written approaches from DWP Forth Valley Scotland branch offering:
 - a. a coordinated member email campaign to the Permanent Secretary to secure access to the scoring tool, and
 - b. a call for the GEC to begin clerical scoring, consistent with past practice—the GEC undertook neither action nor delivered any visible progress.
6. More than a year has passed since the JAFs were submitted, and nearly three years since Motion A5 was agreed.

Conference acknowledges that during parts of 2025 some of the JEGS trained officers experienced unavoidable long-term absence however this cannot reasonably explain:

- the failure to involve members in campaigning for access to the scoring tool
- the failure to commence clerical scoring, or
- the complete lack of progress for over 12 months.

Conference believes that the GEC has failed our AO caseworker members in CMS.

Conference further notes that the 2025 DWP Group Annual Report repeats the same generic language used in April and July 2025—that “access has still not been granted... we will update members once we have resolved the issue”—and, most concerning, expresses the view that “we are unable to progress any exercise until this function is provided by the department” implying members should simply accept this lack of progress and accountability.

Conference therefore censures the outgoing GEC for failing to treat this vital issue with the seriousness or urgency required to deliver for AO members in CMS.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to:

1. Immediately launch a coordinated campaign, including member mobilisation, to demand access to the JEGS scoring tool from DWP.
2. Begin clerical scoring of the JAFs without delay, following established historical practice, unless and until digital access is secured.
3. Provide progress reports every two months to branches and the CMGAC—first report due by 31 August 2026—and continue until all JAFs have been scored and the evidence is ready for submission to DWP.

4. Escalate industrially and politically if the employer continues to refuse a formal JEGS review for the CMS AO caseworker role.
-

X101

Beyond remit of Group Conference

DWP Barnsley, Doncaster & Rotherham(047009)

Conference notes:

1. That members working in Debt Management (DM) at AO grade are carrying out work that has increased substantially in complexity, technical requirement, and responsibility.
2. That DM staff are now expected to make high level decisions, manage vulnerable customers, apply detailed guidance, and handle cases that have significant financial and safeguarding implications.
3. That despite this clear shift in the nature and scope of the work, the AO grade has not been reviewed, leaving members under graded and undervalued.
4. That this situation is contributing to stress, high turnover, and difficulties in maintaining service standards.

Conference believes:

1. That the duties currently done by AO members in Debt Management are no longer compatible with AO level grading.
2. That comparable work across DWP and other government departments is being undertaken at higher grades, creating inequity and inconsistency.
3. That PCS must challenge the employer's failure to recognise the true level of skill, judgement and responsibility DM AOs are required to demonstrate.
4. That members deserve to be fairly graded and properly rewarded for the work they do.

Conference resolves:

1. To instruct the Group Executive Committee to demand an immediate, full and transparent job evaluation of all AO roles within Debt Management.
 2. To ensure this review includes benchmarking against similar and higher graded administrative roles across DWP and the wider Civil Service.
 3. To campaign for the regrading of DM AO roles where the evaluation confirms that members are carrying out work above their grade.
 4. To report regularly to members on progress and to escalate the campaign, including through industrial means where required, if the employer refuses to act.
-

Staffing

E102

Covered By A44 Identical To A44
DWP Sheffield(047008)

E103

Covered By A44 Identical To A44
DWP Barnsley, Doncaster & Rotherham(047009)

Health & Safety

D104

DWP Cheshire(047014)

Health & Safety Executive guidelines are clear that UK employers must provide hot water in bathrooms. Based on this an office should be closed and business continuity implemented until facilities are restored. This does not happen, usually when the site in question is a Jobcentre. When pressed on this management provide advice obtained from HSBP which states that the HSE guidance is silent on the topic of temporary interruptions to hot water, and as such they can keep a site open for a period of time so long as appropriate hand washing alternatives are provided. They state that if hot water is not restored within 5 days then a temporary solution should be installed, but remarkably allow 10 further days for this to be implemented. Hot water failures are usually coupled with heating failures, especially in older sites, and this can leave members sat in 17C rooms without even hot water to wash their hands.

Conference asserts that 15 days is an unacceptable amount of time for our members to be forced to go to work without hot water.

This conference instructs the GEC to negotiate an improvement to the current H&S procedures for temporary interruptions to hot water. This should incorporate a significant reduction in the number of days a site can be without, as well as guarantees for staff with health conditions.

X105

Conference can't instruct the DTUS

DWP Fylde(047139)

This Group Conference notes:

1. The opening of the Fylde View building in Blackpool in March 2025, which has experienced ongoing health and safety issues, including:
 - o Heating system failures.
 - o Plants rotting due to poor environmental controls.
 - o Metal panels falling from the sixth floor, posing serious risks to staff safety.
2. The building was opened without key health and safety documentation in place, including a completed fire risk assessment.
3. Before staff moved into the building, members had raised several health and safety concerns with the local trade union, including safety risks, lack of parking, and accessibility issues.
4. Members also raised concerns about moving into a town centre location with significant socio-economic problems, including:
 - o High levels of anti-social behaviour and crime.
 - o Increased risk of verbal and physical abuse towards staff.
 - o Poor transport links and limited secure parking, creating additional safety risks for staff commuting.
5. Local trade union representatives have had to chase management and work intensively to ensure essential health and safety documentation is completed post-occupation.
6. These documents should have been in place before staff moved in and should have been overseen by the project board as part of the transformation programme, rather than left to local Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) teams.
7. Fylde View is not an isolated case. Similar health and safety concerns have been reported at other new sites, including Ty Taf, Birmingham Hub, and emerging concerns around the Newcastle Hub.

8. The branch acknowledges the hard work of the Group Executive Committee (GEC) in supporting branches on these issues but believes management has significant lessons to learn.

9. There appears to have been no single accountable person for health and safety within the transformation programme, leaving critical issues to local business streams with minimal support.

This Group Conference believes:

1. Staff safety must be the highest priority in any building programme.
2. Opening buildings without completed health and safety documentation is unacceptable and places staff at risk.
3. Lessons must be learned from these failures to prevent recurrence in future transformation projects.

This Group Conference resolves:

1. To call on the Department to conduct a full review of health and safety processes in the transformation programme, including accountability and sign-off procedures.
 2. To demand that no building is opened to staff until all required health and safety documentation, including fire risk assessments, is complete and verified.
 3. To instruct the Departmental Trade Union Side (DTUS) to raise these concerns formally with the Department and seek assurances on improved governance.
 4. To report back to members on progress at next year's Group Conference.
 5. To continue campaigning for safe, compliant workplaces across all new and existing DWP sites.
-

Operations

E106

Covered By A48

DWP Ty Taf(047144)

People Deployment Advisory Group's (PDAGs)

Conference notes motion A44 that was supported at DWP Group Conference 2025. This motion about CMS PDAG's highlighted the very real concerns of members and activists about the oversight of these so-called "advisory groups" and despite assurances from CMS management there have still on-going legitimate concerns about their usage.

This motion seeks to build on A44, as following last DWP Group Conference that has been a rampant increase in usage of PDAG's across the Department with RSD, UC and Debt Management areas now operating them and this is likely to continue. However, there is a lack of consistency with how they operate with the original intention of them to be only looking at Changes to Working Patterns and Reasonable Adjustments. For example, the trial of PDAG's in UC is heavily focused on reasonable adjustments to the 60% hybrid and contractual homeworking; RSD have previously advised their PDAG's wouldn't be looking at the mandatory office attendance.

Examples of bad practices or outcomes include management advising line managers (our members) that these are mandatory however when challenged the decision remains with the line manager. Another example is an appeal having to be a rehearing of the case as there was influence of PDAG throughout the original meeting with discussion focusing on Equality Act nuances rather than addressing the support the member required.

Conference instructs the DWP GEC to:

- Continue to oppose PDAG's when they arise in other areas of DWP.
 - Continue to oppose PDAG's when they arise in other areas of DWP.
 - Continue to oppose all perverse or disproportionate decisions that arise and escalate these through appropriate channels.
 - Continue to ensure all reps and members (including line managers) know their rights under the Equality Act in relation to dealing with PDAGs.
 - Negotiate with the department an escalation route for reps to raise concerns like DWP/BB/071 Escalation Route for RA 2025.
-

E107

Covered By A48

DWP Tyneside & Northumbria(047120)

DWP Conference notes motion A44 that was supported at DWP Group Conference 2025. This motion about CMS PDAG's highlighted the very real concerns of members and activists about the oversight of these so-called "advisory groups" and despite assurances from CMS management there have still on-going legitimate concerns about their usage.

This motion seeks to build on A44, as following last DWP Group Conference that has been a rampant increase in usage of PDAG's across the Department with RSD, UC and Debt Management areas now operating them and this is likely to continue. However, there is a lack of consistency with how they operate with the original intention of them to be only looking at Changes to Working Patterns and Reasonable Adjustments. For example, the trial of PDAG's in UC is heavily focused on reasonable adjustments to the 60% hybrid and contractual homeworking; RSD have previously advised their PDAG's wouldn't be looking at the mandatory office attendance.

Examples of bad practices or outcomes include management advising line managers (our members) that these are mandatory however when challenged the decision remains with the line manager. Another example is an appeal having to be a rehearing of the case as there was influence of PDAG throughout the original meeting with discussion

focusing on Equality Act nuances rather than addressing the support the member required.

DWP Conference instructs members of the DWP GEC to:

- Continue to oppose PDAG's when they arise in other areas of DWP.
 - Continue to oppose all perverse or disproportionate decisions that arise and escalate these through appropriate channels.
 - Continue to ensure all reps and members (including line managers) know their rights under the Equality Act in relation to dealing with PDAGs.
 - Negotiate with the department an escalation route for reps to raise concerns like DWP/BB/071 Escalation Route for RA 2025.
-

E108

Covered By A48

DWP Brent Harrow & Hillingdon(047028)

Conference notes motion A44 that was supported at DWP Group Conference 2025. This motion about CMS PDAG's highlighted the very real concerns of members and activists about the oversight of these so-called "advisory groups" and despite assurances from CMS management there have still on-going legitimate concerns about their usage. This motion seeks to build on A44, as following last DWP Group Conference that has been a rampant increase in usage of PDAG's across the Department with RSD, UC and Debt Management areas now operating them and this is likely to continue.

However, there is a lack of consistency with how they operate with the original intention of them to be only looking at Changes to Working Patterns and Reasonable Adjustments. For example, the trial of PDAG's in UC is heavily focused on reasonable adjustments to the 60% hybrid and contractual homeworking; RSD have previously advised their PDAG's wouldn't be looking at the mandatory office attendance.

Examples of bad practices or outcomes include management advising line managers (our members) that these are mandatory however when challenged the decision remains with the line manager. Another example is an appeal having to be a rehearing of the case as there was influence of PDAG throughout the original meeting with discussion focusing on Equality Act nuances rather than addressing the support the member required.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to:

- Continue to oppose PDAG's when they arise in other areas of DWP.
 - Continue to oppose all perverse or disproportionate decisions that arise and escalate these through appropriate channels.
 - Continue to ensure all reps and members (including line managers) know their rights under the Equality Act in relation to dealing with PDAGs.
 - Negotiate with the department an escalation route for reps to raise concerns like DWP/BB/071 Escalation Route for RA 2025.
-

E109

Covered By A48

DWP Cheshire(047014)

This conference notes the emergence and spread of so-called "PDAGs", People Deployment Advisory Groups. PDAGs were introduced in CMS around two years ago and are an additional process beyond those laid out in DWP policies

and procedures to be used when a member of staff makes a request involving working patterns or workplace adjustments. They have since been introduced to RSD in late 2025, and a trial has been announced in National UC Operations.

Where PDAGs are in place, when a manager receives a request relating to working patterns or workplace adjustments they are expected to gather the details of the request and then present it to a panel including senior managers and HR representatives. Ostensibly the line manager retains the final say, however reps and members report that those involved often feel that they cannot make a decision counter to the PDAG's recommendation.

The stated intent of this process is to standardise decision making and produce more consistent outcomes. Unfortunately they raise serious questions about the independence of decision making, confidentiality and rights of challenge against incorrect decisions. If DWP want to provide better and more consistent decisions then they should invest in training for managers instead of adding pointless bureaucracy.

PDAGs are a bolt-on addition to agreed and established policies and procedures and must be challenged before they spread further.

This conference instructs the GEC to:

- Challenge the roll-out of PDAGs in all areas of DWP.
 - Demand an immediate halt to the use of PDAGs until proper department-wide consultation has been completed.
 - Seek an agreement that this type of wide-ranging addition to established procedures is not appropriate for local introduction.
-

E110

Covered By A48

DWP Greater Manchester Branch(047023)

This conference notes the emergence and spreads of so-called "PDAGs", People Deployment Advisory Groups. PDAGs were introduced in CMS around two years ago and are an additional process beyond those laid out in DWP policies and procedures to be used when a member of staff makes a request involving working patterns or workplace adjustments. They have since been introduced to RSD in late 2026, and a trial has been announced in National UC Operations.

Where PDAGs are in place, when a manager receives a request relating to working patterns or workplace adjustments, they are expected to gather the details of the request and then present it to a panel including senior managers and HR representatives. Ostensibly the line manager retains the final say, however reps and members report that those involved often feel that they cannot make a decision counter to the PDAG's recommendation.

The stated intent of this process is to standardise decision making and produce more consistent outcomes. Unfortunately, they raise serious questions about the independence of decision making, confidentiality and rights of challenge against incorrect decisions. If DWP want to provide better and more consistent decisions, then they should invest in training for managers instead of adding pointless bureaucracy.

PDAGs are a bolt-on addition to agreed and established policies and procedures and must be challenged before they spread further.

This conference instructs the GEC to:

- Challenge the roll-out of PDAGs in all areas of DWP.
- Demand an immediate halt to the use of PDAGs until proper department-wide consultation has been completed.

· Seek an agreement that this type of wide-ranging addition to established procedures is not appropriate for local introduction.

E111

Covered By A49

DWP Cheshire(047014)

Conference notes the high number of trials currently being conducted in DWP. Within UC these 'trials' encompass a huge amount of territory including: Saturday closure of Service Centres, working from home in Jobcentres, the use of video appointments for UC claimants, the frequency of appointments for UC claimants, the introduction of welcome desks in Jobcentres and changes to the UC build. Although trialling new methods is not in itself a negative thing, there are serious issues with the way DWP handles trials that need to be addressed. Trials in DWP always seem to be seen in terms of success and failure, and changes are often made to encourage a certain outcome. The jobcentre channels trial is a good example as when it became clear that take up of video appointments was well below what was expected for the trial, instead of taking this data away to consider, the organisers simply made video appointments mandatory for staff. On the ground, managers push a specific line to ensure a trial 'succeeds', but a properly conducted trial cannot succeed or fail, it can only produce data to inform decisions. There is also rarely a clear end date for any trial, because of the push to ensure trials 'succeed' they often simply bleed into a new BAU process, with no real assessment or outcomes ever revealed. The Jobcentre home working trial officially 'ended' for Chester Jobcentre months ago, but staff there continue to work from home once a week while the trial assesses other sites. North-West regional negotiators requested details of this trial, amongst others, and an indication of the end date and findings but were told by the group office that they did not have this information.

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate an agreement with DWP covering:

- Consultation prior to the introduction of trials.
 - Clear time-frames for all trials taking place.
 - Criteria and processes for expanding or extending trials.
 - Regular updates for relevant TU Side committees on the progress and findings of trials.
 - Consultation on the data produced by trials and proposals stemming from such, prior to any decisions being made.
-

X112

No instruction to Conference

DWP Nottinghamshire(047042)

This conference is concerned about the increase use of AI in DWP.

DWP are encouraging staff to use AI in their roles as Work Coaches, and it may be useful in writing CV's, but is it replacing our jobs?

We feel that it is often not correct, biased and can't be trusted. The use of co-pilot in MS Teams, how is this stored? Who has access to it? Will it result disciplinary meetings for our members when co-pilot wrote the offending article and our staff didn't have time to check it 100% due to workloads. Am I being over cautious – yes I am as a rep of many years I have risk assessed this and feel there should be a lot of mitigation in place before we use it –

Thus the GEC should look into this as a matter of urgency and if they agree with the moving branch they should draw up a policy to safeguard our members.

Union Organisation

D113

DWP Coventry & Warwicks(047055)

Conference notes the statement issued by PCS on the 4th August 2025 relating to PCS's decision to ballot security guards working in the DWP. It states that a TUC Disputes Committee found that PCS had acted in breach of several TUC principles.

This statement made it clear that we have no intention of seeking recognition to collectively bargain for these workers. Despite this, GMB internal guidance has been sent out to PCS representatives in DWP by group officers to use in pursuance of representing security guard members in Mitie.

It is without doubt that guards are in poorly paid, insecure, and dangerous work. Guards, and by extension, DWP staff, will be safer if guards are properly organised, and represented in the workplace.

Conference notes that guards, now working for Mitie, but formerly G4S, are often also contracted to work across different departments and for private businesses. It also believes that using DWP facility time to support Mitie guards is likely to be a breach of our facilities agreement.

Conference does not think it appropriate to expect PCS representatives to support members without paid time, clear guidance, and the legal protections implicit in being a recognised trade union representative.

It has been suggested that these cases, which are often complex, can be managed before and after shift, without proper access to up-to-date guidance, and without a support network of reps who understand every part of the guard role. Conference feels that this approach is likely to fail to provide the level of support that guards require, and also fails to respect the time of our own reps and advocates.

Conference instructs the GEC

1: to identify guards who have joined PCS in circumstances where representation boundaries may not have been fully understood, write to them, reiterating the statement of the 4/8/25 and explain any limitations in how we represent them in the workplace, whilst also pointing out the non-workplace benefits of PCS membership.

2: Identify all the recognised unions of the major employers on DWP sites, and ensure PCS reps are signposting guards and other tertiary staff to the union which is recognised by their employer for workplace representation.

Conference instructs the GEC to refer the issue of any PCS-member Mitie guards to National Organising and the Commercial Sector Group, with a view to ensuring that any workplace representation required is delivered through structures that have the correct recognition and facility-time arrangements, without placing DWP reps at risk of breaching agreements.

X114

Beyond the remit of Group Conference

DWP East London(047030)

Conference notes:

- that branches across the country have had strike/hardship funds set up by reps from several years or even decades ago
- these accounts are funded by one off donations and direct debit payments of local members and supporters
- issues have arisen where previous officers have not completed handovers of these accounts, ensuring

signatories have been changed

- these accounts have not always been accounted for and are held in alternative banks/building societies
- a case where one branch is struggling to recover money and its very likely that this money is now lost

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- consult branches regarding locally held hardship funds accounts, finding out how common this issue is
 - ensure branches hold such accounts with Unity Trust
 - ensure that such accounts are accounted for and managed by current Treasurers with at least two signatories
 - to support such branches in recovering these accounts/money so members can be supported during strike action
 - To take all possible action against ex officers who refuse to facilitate the handover of such accounts
-

Privatisation

E115

Covered By A66 Identical To A66

DWP Cheshire(047014)

X116

Beyond the remit of Group Conference

DWP Fylde(047139)

This Group Conference notes:

1. The continued awarding of government contracts to private companies for services that could be delivered by civil servants.
2. The commitment of the new Labour Government to review outsourcing and bring services back in-house where possible.
3. The work undertaken by the Group Executive Committee (GEC) and Group Officers in defending members' interests and campaigning for public service delivery.

This Group Conference believes:

1. Public services delivered by civil servants provide better quality, accountability, and value for taxpayers than outsourced contracts.
2. Outsourcing often results in fragmented services, reduced standards, and poorer working conditions.
3. Bringing services back in-house strengthens the Civil Service and ensures fair treatment for workers.

This Group Conference resolves:

1. To recommend that the Department begins a clear pathway to bring outsourced services back in-house.
 2. To instruct the Departmental Trade Union Side (DTUS) to meet with the Department to discuss this pathway and agree timelines.
 3. To ensure that any services currently outsourced are reviewed before being put out to tender again, with a strong case for in-house delivery.
 4. To report back to the membership on progress at next year's Group Conference.
 5. To continue campaigning for a Civil Service that delivers better services and better value for the taxpayer.
-

X117

No instruction to Group Conference

DWP Sheffield(047008)

Conference recognises that the TUC has made a judgement in regards to then G4S (now employed by Mitie) workers on the DWP contract.

Since this judgement reps have been left without a full understanding of how to handle issues for these members, this includes during a difficult time as they transferred over on TUPE between employers. As an organising union PCS needs to be able to collectivise and consult with members whatever their employer.

Conference censures the GEC for the lack of communication and support for reps on this issue since the TUC judgement.

Notes

Appendix 1

Glossary of conference terms

Agenda

Motions tabled for debate listed in priority order together with the timetable in the Booklet of Motions. It is also known as standing orders committee report no. 1 and is issued to members and delegates not later than 4 weeks before the start of conference.

Briefings (also known as fringe meetings)

Briefing meetings on a wide range of subjects are held at lunch time or after conference.

Card vote

A card vote is called either by the conference chairperson or can be demanded by at least 25 delegates. A card vote allows each branch to cast a number of votes equivalent to the number of members in their branch (as opposed to a 'show of hands' vote whereby each branch can only cast one vote per branch delegate).

After a card vote has been called a bell is sounded and after two minutes the stewards will see that the doors to the conference hall are closed. The chairperson will then clarify the card vote procedure.

Credentials badge

This should be worn at all times in order to gain access to the conference hall.

Conference chairperson

The person chairing the conference. Usually the union president or, in their absence, one of the vice presidents.

Delegate

Someone who attends conference as a representative of their branch who has been instructed on how to vote by those they are representing. At PCS Annual Delegate Conference branch delegates are instructed by branch members on which way to vote on motions to be debated at conference at a mandating meeting held prior to conference.

Emergency motions

Motions concerning issues that arise after the closing date for receipt of ordinary motions, which must have been received by the standing orders committee by 12 noon on Thursday 14th May before conference in accordance with standing order A6. Further information is contained in the introduction to standing orders committee report no. 1.

Guillotine

When the guillotine falls this indicates that time has run out (according to the timetable adopted by conference) for debating a particular section of the agenda. A note to this effect will appear on the big screen behind the President. A 'guillotine section' is also inserted into the timetable after the last conference section to debate some of the motions 'guillotined' earlier in the conference. Branches can suggest which motions should be in this section on the appropriate form (SOC B) available from the standing orders committee located at the front of the conference floor and included at appendix 2 of this booklet.

Lights

System of 'traffic lights' located on the top table and each speaker's rostrum to indicate how much time a speaker has left.

- I. A green light comes on as the speaker commences
- II. An amber light comes on when they have only one minute left
- III. A red light comes on when they have used up all their time (four minutes allowed for speakers who are movers of motions and three minutes for all other speakers).

Mandate

Instruction to branch delegate(s) on which way to vote on motions decided by branch members at a mandating or general meeting held prior to conference when the Booklet of Motions and timetable has been received and

distributed: e.g. 'for', 'against', 'abstain' or 'listen to the debate and decide for yourself which way you think the branch members would want you to vote'

Motions

Subjects of debate submitted by branches and the national executive committee. Motions are 'marked' in the Booklet of Motions as follows:

- A. Motions requiring debate to establish union policy on an issue
- B. Motions which confirm existing policy (and so do not require debate)
- C. Motions seeking to reverse existing policy as determined within the last two years (and so which cannot be debated)
- D. Motions which can be dealt with by correspondence with the general secretary (and are thus not debated)
- E. Motions covered by composite motions in category A above (delegates from branches where these motions originated are normally called in the debate on the covering 'A' motion if they indicate they wish to speak although due to time constraints it may not be possible for the President to call in all those indicating).
- X. motions which are ruled out of order (a brief reason is indicated against the motion number in the Booklet of Motions).

NB In addition, some motions submitted by branches are not printed if the standing orders committee has decided, after taking legal advice, that the wording of the motion could lead to legal proceedings against the union per rule 6.22(g).

Mover

The first person to speak after a motion is called for debate by the conference chairperson. They will be a delegate from the branch listed at the bottom of the motion set out in the Booklet of Motions or a representative of the national executive committee.

National Executive Committee (NEC)

The NEC is the governing body of PCS elected annually and responsible for implementing policy decided at national conference and formulating policy between conferences.

Opposition

Speakers voicing opinions against the ideas or instructions contained in a motion.

Points and motions of order

As well as speaking on motions, delegates can also come to the rostrum at anytime – even while another delegate is speaking during a debate on a motion – to raise a point or order (see standing order A13), but only in order to prove either that:

- a) Current speaker is using sexist, racist or abusive language or
- b) One of the union's rules is being broken.

A 'motion of order' (see standing orders A9 – A12) can be made in a similar way but only at the conference chairperson's discretion and to achieve one of the following aims:

- I. That the debate be adjourned
- II. That the vote in a debate be now taken
- III. That conference proceed to the next item of business on the agenda
- IV. That conference do now adjourn

Once moved by a speaker, these motions of order are voted on by conference without any further discussion.

Quorum

The minimum number of delegates that need to be present in the conference hall in order for conference legitimately to be able to vote on a motion and thus establish a union policy. Rule 6.8 states "The quorum shall be a majority of delegates entitled to attend."

Reference back

Procedure by which branches can seek to change the marking of motions or the order in which they are debated at conference.

Standing orders A14–A16 apply and the introduction to standing orders committee report no. 1 contains further guidance on this procedure.

Remission

Instead of going to the vote on a particular motion, the national executive committee (NEC) may seek to remission. If conference agrees to remit a motion its terms and instructions will be considered by the NEC but they are not bound to carry out those specific terms and instructions.

Rostrum

This is where delegates make their conference speeches. A raised platform (one at either side at the front of the conference hall) equipped with microphone, illuminated document-rest and lights indicating how much time delegates have left to speak.

Seconder/withdrawal as seconder

The first speaker in a debate on a motion after the mover. The conference agenda identifies seconding branches for some motions. Where there is no such identification delegates may 'request to second' by completing a simple form (SOC A) available from the standing orders committee which can also be used to withdraw as seconder to a motion.

Right of reply

Where there have been speakers calling for opposition to a motion, the mover has the right to reply to that opposition in a further three minutes speech just before the vote is taken.

Standing orders

The terms used to cover the agenda and timetable (and any alterations made to it in subsequent standing orders committee reports issued to delegates between the publication of the motions and timetable booklet and the start of conference sessions).

Standing orders committee

The conference-elected committee which publishes recommendations on the progress of conference business in the motions and timetable booklet and subsequent standing orders reports.

Standing orders committee reports

Publications produced by the standing orders committee to notify delegates of the proposed agenda and conference timetable and to notify delegates of any subsequent recommended changes.

Suspension of standing orders

Once standing orders have been 'adopted' (agreed) by conference they can be changed by the agreement of conference if either a delegate requests in writing to the conference chairperson (who shall decide if the suspension is admissible under the union's rules) that standing orders be 'suspended' (standing order A19) or if suspension is proposed by the conference chairperson (standing order A20). In both instances this has to be supported by "not less than two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by delegates present" (standing order A17).

Timetable

The order in which motions are debated as recommended by the standing orders committee and published in the Booklet of Motions.

Voting

Usually by 'show of hands' whereby each branch only casts the same number of votes as they have delegates present on the conference floor at the time of vote is taken (but see also card vote above).

Withdrawal

Branches may withdraw any of their motions from the agenda at any time but only by writing to the standing orders committee who will put to conference on your behalf that the motion should be withdrawn. A motion can only be withdrawn with the consent of conference. Delegates can obtain form SOC A from the standing orders committee for this purpose.

Appendix 2

Index of motions

Book No.	MOTION NO:	MOTION ID	BRANCH
E81	M055	ID6736	DWP Ayrshire Dumfries & Galloway (047062)
E82	M056	ID6737	DWP Ayrshire Dumfries & Galloway (047062)
A20	M041	ID6593	DWP Barnsley, Doncaster & Rotherham (047009)
E103	M040	ID6592	DWP Barnsley, Doncaster & Rotherham (047009)
X101	M039	ID6591	DWP Barnsley, Doncaster & Rotherham (047009)
X87	M088	ID6960	DWP Birmingham North (047054)
D89	M018	ID6331	DWP Birmingham South (047053)
A12	M006	ID6293	DWP Bolton & Bury (047027)
A52	M008	ID6301	DWP Bolton & Bury (047027)
A49	M007	ID6302	DWP Bolton & Bury (047027)
E108	M090	ID7072	DWP Brent Harrow & Hillingdon (047028)
E93	M091	ID7073	DWP Brent Harrow & Hillingdon (047028)
A34	M074	ID6866	DWP Bucks & Oxon (047108)
A53	M071	ID6796	DWP Bucks & Oxon (047108)
A5	M070	ID6794	DWP Bucks & Oxon (047108)
E70	M113	ID7059	DWP Cheshire (047014)
E111	M115	ID7061	DWP Cheshire (047014)
D104	M116	ID7062	DWP Cheshire (047014)
E115	M117	ID7063	DWP Cheshire (047014)
E109	M114	ID7060	DWP Cheshire (047014)
E83	M085	ID6881	DWP City of Sunderland (047118)
E84	M086	ID6880	DWP City of Sunderland (047118)
E85	M107	ID7152	DWP Coventry & Warwicks (047055)
D113	M106	ID7149	DWP Coventry & Warwicks (047055)
E90	M062	ID6759	DWP Cumbria and Lancashire (047020)
A15	M061	ID6757	DWP Cumbria and Lancashire (047020)
A35	M063	ID6760	DWP Cumbria and Lancashire (047020)
A57	M047	ID6709	DWP Devon (047095)
E96	M017	ID6352	DWP Durham Tees Valley Branch (047122)
A19	M001	ID6211	DWP East London (047030)
X114	M002	ID6212	DWP East London (047030)
A63	M003	ID6213	DWP East London (047030)
A37	M118	ID7264	DWP East Sussex & CMG Hastings (047103)
A21	M043	ID6574	DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders (047063)

Book No.	MOTION NO:	MOTION ID	BRANCH
X72	M042	ID6573	DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders (047063)
X69	M044	ID6575	DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders (047063)
A43	M046	ID6580	DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders (047063)
A6	M045	ID6579	DWP Edinburgh, Lothian & Borders (047063)
A29	M004	ID6228	DWP Essex (047050)
E73	M005	ID6229	DWP Essex (047050)
A62	M104	ID7148	DWP Forth Valley Scotland (047077)
A3	M100	ID7143	DWP Forth Valley Scotland (047077)
E100	M101	ID7145	DWP Forth Valley Scotland (047077)
A39	M102	ID7146	DWP Forth Valley Scotland (047077)
A50	M103	ID7147	DWP Forth Valley Scotland (047077)
A9	M022	ID6430	DWP Fylde (047139)
X116	M020	ID6427	DWP Fylde (047139)
A2	M019	ID6424	DWP Fylde (047139)
A40	M025	ID6436	DWP Fylde (047139)
A31	M024	ID6433	DWP Fylde (047139)
A33	M023	ID6432	DWP Fylde (047139)
X105	M021	ID6428	DWP Fylde (047139)
A32	M036	ID6528	DWP Glasgow (047066)
E78	M038	ID6531	DWP Glasgow (047066)
A48	M037	ID6529	DWP Glasgow (047066)
E110	M066	ID6804	DWP Greater Manchester Branch (047023)
A13	M069	ID6808	DWP Greater Manchester Branch (047023)
A41	M068	ID6806	DWP Greater Manchester Branch (047023)
A66	M067	ID6805	DWP Greater Manchester Branch (047023)
X98	M064	ID6802	DWP Greater Manchester Branch (047023)
X97	M065	ID6803	DWP Greater Manchester Branch (047023)
X86	M109	ID7170	DWP Highlands, Islands and Grampian (047070)
X88	M110	ID7171	DWP Highlands, Islands and Grampian (047070)
A42	M111	ID7038	DWP HQ London (047039)
X71	M112	ID7212	DWP HQ London (047039)
E92	M049	ID6714	DWP HQ Sheffield (047012)
E67	M052	ID6715	DWP HQ Sheffield (047012)
A45	M050	ID6716	DWP HQ Sheffield (047012)
A60	M051	ID6717	DWP HQ Sheffield (047012)
A44	M048	ID6712	DWP HQ Sheffield (047012)

Book No.	MOTION NO:	MOTION ID	BRANCH
A38	M089	ID7090	DWP Leeds (047006)
A54	M108	ID7183	DWP Liverpool & St Helens (047017)
E75	M016	ID6323	DWP North and Outer East London Branch (047033)
A23	M014	ID6321	DWP North and Outer East London Branch (047033)
A4	M015	ID6322	DWP North and Outer East London Branch (047033)
A47	M011	ID6318	DWP North and Outer East London Branch (047033)
A26	M013	ID6320	DWP North and Outer East London Branch (047033)
A25	M012	ID6319	DWP North and Outer East London Branch (047033)
X94	M084	ID6882	DWP North Merseyside (047018)
A16	M033	ID6429	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
A18	M030	ID6426	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
X112	M031	ID6435	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
X95	M032	ID6434	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
A55	M028	ID6422	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
A27	M029	ID6425	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
A17	M034	ID6431	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
A64	M035	ID6437	DWP Nottinghamshire (047042)
X117	M094	ID7076	DWP Sheffield (047008)
A30	M092	ID7081	DWP Sheffield (047008)
A59	M093	ID7075	DWP Sheffield (047008)
A28	M095	ID7077	DWP Sheffield (047008)
E68	M096	ID7078	DWP Sheffield (047008)
E91	M097	ID7079	DWP Sheffield (047008)
E102	M098	ID7080	DWP Sheffield (047008)
A61	M099	ID7082	DWP Sheffield (047008)
E80	M057	ID6727	DWP Ty Taf (047144)
E106	M060	ID6734	DWP Ty Taf (047144)
X99	M058	ID6729	DWP Ty Taf (047144)
A58	M059	ID6731	DWP Ty Taf (047144)
E107	M053	ID6719	DWP Tyneside & Northumbria (047120)
E79	M054	ID6726	DWP Tyneside & Northumbria (047120)
A7	M072	ID6797	DWP West Hampshire (047104)
E74	M073	ID6798	DWP West Hampshire (047104)
A51	M026	ID6346	DWP West London (047036)
A36	M027	ID6347	DWP West London (047036)
E77	M010	ID6338	DWP Wigan Area (047015)
E76	M009	ID6337	DWP Wigan Area (047015)
A14	M119	ID7280	DWP Wigan Area (047015)
A8	M105	ID7155	Group Executive Committee
A11	M082	ID6874	Group Executive Committee
A1	M081	ID6873	Group Executive Committee
A46	M079	ID6871	Group Executive Committee

Book No.	MOTION NO:	MOTION ID	BRANCH
A56	M078	ID6870	Group Executive Committee
A65	M076	ID6868	Group Executive Committee
A24	M075	ID6867	Group Executive Committee
A22	M087	ID6963	Group Executive Committee
A10	M083	ID6876	Group Executive Committee