

Requesting a Review of your Job Grade

Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 General Procedure.....	1
3 Appeals Procedure.....	3
4 Procedure A: Job Evaluation Recommendation	3
5 Appeal Procedure A.....	3
6 Procedure B: Job Evaluation Request.....	4
7 Appeal Procedure B.....	5

1 Introduction

1.1

Job Evaluation establishes differences between jobs within an organisation by systematically and objectively analysing posts by their component tasks (in the context of similar posts in the central University) and ranking them into grades. Job Evaluation focuses as objectively as possible on the requirements of the post rather than the personal characteristics of the post-holder to ensure fair treatment and comply with both the University's Equal Opportunities Policy and current statutory equal pay obligations.

1.2

Job Evaluation does not make external comparisons between jobs in the central University and jobs elsewhere and, equally, does not establish accepted similarities and/or allocate levels of pay.

1.3

The central University is currently using Hay Job Evaluation.

2 General Procedure

2.1

The current arrangement for the regrading of posts is that recommendations are made by Heads of Division (procedure A) or by the individual staff member (procedure B) to the Pensions and HR Manager for consideration by the Pensions and HR Manager and/or a Job Evaluation Team or Panel.

2.2

For Job Evaluation to proceed under either procedure there must be broad agreement regarding the content of the job description - in evaluation requests under procedure B, disagreement on the emphasis or nature of the duties involved may be resolved by the Job Evaluator(s) on the relative merits of the documents provided or during an interview (as described below). However, where the duties themselves are under dispute neither party

can make a case for the grade of the job to be reassessed and either may wish to approach the Pensions and HR Manager Officer for advice on the process for resolving the dispute.

2.3

The job evaluation investigation may take two forms - a paper exercise undertaken by a suitable single individual reporting to the Pensions and HR Manager or HR Director, or a panel investigation undertaken by a team convened by the Pensions and HR Manager or HR Director.

2.4 Job Evaluation Exercise

2.4.1

In less complex cases or where evaluation does not require specialist knowledge of technical or professional aspects of the job, an exercise may be carried out by an individual member of staff - usually the Pensions and HR Manager or another suitable member of the HR staff. The results of the paper exercise will then be reported to the Pensions and HR Manager or HR Director as appropriate.

2.4.2

The paper exercise will be undertaken with reference to the Formal Statement, Job Description and any other relevant supporting materials and according to the relevant job evaluation scheme applicable to the proposed grade of the post. Additional supporting materials will not be considered without the knowledge of the Head of Responsibility Centre and the postholder.

2.5 Job Evaluation Investigation

2.5.1

The Pensions and HR Manager or HR Director will select a suitable team to evaluate the job. In establishing membership of the Job Evaluation Panel the Pensions and HR Manager will ensure the following:

- that the provisions of the University's Equal Opportunities Policy are satisfied,
- that the panel members are sufficiently familiar with the level of responsibilities of the post under review,
- that at least one panel member is familiar with the nature of any specialist technical or professional knowledge involved in the job,
- that, as far as is possible and excluding any member included to provide specialist technical or professional knowledge,
- the majority of the panel members have sufficient experience to assess accurately the comparative value of work tasks as prescribed by the Job Evaluation scheme. However, from time to time, inclusion of individuals inexperienced in job evaluation on a panel is essential to provide that experience.

1.5.2

The panel will review the Formal Statement, Job Description and other relevant supporting materials and may, in addition, interview the current postholder and/or the previous postholders or seek additional information from the Head of Responsibility Centre if these would be conducive to an informed decision. Additional supporting materials will not be considered without the knowledge of the Head of Division and the postholder.

3 Appeals Procedure

3.1

An appeals system exists under both procedures and is used when the outcome of the evaluation is in dispute.

3.2

Where disagreement exists between the Head of Responsibility Centre and individual member of staff on the date of any amendment to the grade of a post, either party may approach the Pensions and HR Manager for advice on resolving the dispute. If the matter remains in dispute, the appropriate date will be determined by the HR Director or, in the case of members of the HR Division, by the Director of Administration.

4 Procedure A: Job Evaluation Recommendation

4.1

This procedure occurs when a Head of Division, independently or following a request from the staff member, considers that changes in the regular duties and responsibility of the post are sufficient to warrant a reassessment.

1. A current Job Description will be prepared and agreed by both the staff member and Head of Division.
2. The Head of Division will provide a Formal Statement of the case showing:
 - duties which have changed, indicating where greater complexity or increased responsibility are involved;
 - duties which have been added and the reason for such change, e.g. new work, organisational change, delegations, etc; and
 - the effects of such changes on other posts in the Department, if relevant.

4.2

The Pensions and HR Manager will be able to offer suitable advice to all parties, as required.

4.3

The job will be reassessed by a formal process of job evaluation and the result of this will be communicated to the Pensions and HR Manager or HR Director, who will inform the Head of Division - normally within one week of receipt.

4.4

If an upgrading is recommended, this and the proposed effective date of implementation will be submitted to the HR Director after consultation with the Head of Division.

5 Appeal Procedure A

5.1

Since this job evaluation procedure is based on the mutual agreement of a job description, the sole grounds for appeal are that the evaluator(s) have given inappropriate weight to the relative value of a specific task or tasks.

5.2

In the event of the Head of Division or the Head of Division and staff member being dissatisfied with the recommended grading, the Pensions and HR Manager, on receiving

his/her formal written statement outlining the basis of the appeal, will investigate the matter as follows:

5.3

For Job Evaluation Investigations initially determined by a paper exercise:

The Pensions and HR Manager will review the findings to check whether the points made by the Head of Division were taken into consideration in the investigation. If necessary, the Pensions and HR Manager will arrange for a paper exercise to be undertaken by another suitable member of staff or convene a Job Evaluation Panel to reconsider the case. If the Pensions and HR Manager does not uphold the appeal, (s)he will provide written reasons to the Head of Division within one week of reaching his/her conclusions. Should the Head of Division not agree with the outcome of the appeal, the HR Director may agree that a further evaluation be undertaken by a new panel, the outcome of which will be considered final and may not be subject to further appeal under this procedure.

5.4

For Job Evaluation Investigations determined by a panel:

The Pensions and HR Manager will review the findings of the panel to check whether the points made by the Head of Responsibility Centre were taken into consideration in their investigation. The Pensions and HR Manager will review the matter with the Chairman of the Panel and, if necessary, convene another meeting of the panel, the Division, and the staff member. The purpose of such a meeting will be to identify areas of agreement or disagreement. Should the panel not uphold the appeal after this meeting there may be no further appeal under this procedure.

5.5

Where the Head of Division agrees with the recommended grading but the staff member is dissatisfied, the Appeals Procedure B will apply.

6 Procedure B: Job Evaluation Request

6.1

This procedure occurs when a staff member considers that changes in the regular duties and responsibility of the post are sufficient to warrant a reassessment, but the Head of Division does not agree that the grounds are sufficiently strong to put the case forward.

6.2

The staff member should obtain a current Job Description from the Head of Division or Pensions and HR Manager. Where no current document is available, a suitable job description should be prepared and the content agreed by the staff member and Head of Division.

6.3

The staff member will provide a Formal Statement of his or her claim showing:

- duties which have changed, indicating where greater complexity or increased responsibility are involved;
- duties which have been added and the reason for such change, e.g. new work, organisational change, delegations, etc; and
- the effects of such changes on other posts in the Department, if relevant.

6.4

Advice from a recognised Trade Union or Staff Association representative may be sought, and advice from the Pensions and HR Manager will also be available.

6.5

As cases of this type may arise from some dispute between the Head of Division and staff member concerning the relative weight or value of the listed tasks, the Pensions and HR Manager may request the views of the Head of Division if these have not already been presented.

6.6

The job will be reassessed by a formal process of job evaluation and the result will be communicated to the Pensions and HR Manager or HR Director, who will inform the staff member and the Head of Division - usually within one week of receipt.

6.7

If an upgrading is recommended, this and an effective date of implementation will be submitted to the HR Director after consultation with the staff member and Head of Division.

7 Appeal Procedure B

7.1

This job evaluation procedure is based on the broad agreement of a job description between the Head of Division and staff member. There should be no dispute about the actual tasks undertaken and any disagreement on the relative value of the listed tasks will have been formally documented as part of the case and made available to both sides. The sole grounds for appeal are, therefore, that the evaluator(s) have given inappropriate weight to the relative value of a specific task or tasks or, where that value is disputed, that the evaluator(s) have preferred the evidence of one side without proper cause or reason.

7.2

In the event of the staff member being dissatisfied with the recommended grading, the Pensions and HR Manager, on receiving his/her formal written statement outlining the basis of the appeal, will undertake further investigations as follows:

7.3

For Job Evaluation Investigations initially determined by a paper exercise:

The Pensions and HR Manager will review the findings to check whether the points made by the staff member were taken into consideration in the investigation and that the views of the Head of Division were not preferred without good cause or reason. If necessary, the Pensions and HR Manager will arrange for a further paper exercise to be undertaken by another suitable member of staff or convene a Job Evaluation Panel to reconsider the case. If the Pensions and HR Manager does not uphold the appeal, (s)he will provide written reasons to the staff member within one week of reaching his/her conclusions. Should the staff member not agree with the outcome of the appeal, the HR Director may agree that a further evaluation be undertaken by a panel; the outcome of this evaluation will be considered final and may not be subject to further appeal under this procedure.

7.4

For Job Evaluation Investigations determined by a panel:

The Pensions and HR Manager will review the findings of the panel to check whether the points made by the staff member were taken into consideration in their investigation and that the views of the Head of Division were not preferred without good cause or reason. The Pensions and HR Manager will review the matter with the Chairman of the Panel and, if necessary, convene a meeting with the JE Team, the Head of Division and the staff member. The purpose of such a meeting will be to identify areas of agreement or disagreement. Should the panel not uphold the appeal after this meeting there may be no further appeal under this procedure.

7.5

Where the staff member is satisfied with the recommended grading but the Head of Division is not in agreement the Appeals Procedure A will apply.