



East Herts Council

Job Evaluation Policy

Policy Statement

Policy Statement No 24 (Issue No. 3)

March 2015

Contents

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Scope

3.0 Situations requiring posts to be evaluated

4.0 Constitution and Role of the Panel

5.0 Evaluation process

6.0 Moderation process within the evaluation process

7.0 Effective date

8.0 Appeal process

9.0 Protection

10.0 Policy review and amendment

Appendix 1

Appendix 2

Appendix 3

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Council uses the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme to determine a fair, open and equitable method for evaluating all posts across the organisation.
- 1.2 It is not possible to measure scientifically the importance of one post relative to another. Therefore, trained evaluators are required to apply judgement to identify and measure differences between posts. The Hay Profile Method of Job Evaluation provides a framework in which consistent judgements can be made. The evaluators, as a Panel, will review the post (not the post holder) and its contribution to the organisation taking into account the job purpose; dimensions; accountabilities; skills; knowledge; experience; main challenges and structure and within the wider context of the Council's purpose, the financial structure, the Governance structure and the culture and history.
- 1.3 Responsibility for administering and coordinating the scheme will rest with the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development.
- 1.4 Human Resources will be responsible for ensuring that a masterfile of all posts, their Hay score and grade within East Herts District Council is maintained and updated.

2.0 Scope

- 2.1 This procedure applies to all employees of East Herts District Council, except for Chief Officer level and above, where procedures set out in the Constitution are used.

3.0 Situations requiring posts to be evaluated

- 3.1 The particular duties and responsibilities attached to posts are sometimes difficult to define and may vary from time to time without changing the general character of the duties or the level of responsibility. Such variations are a common occurrence and cannot, themselves, justify reconsideration of grading. However, it is recognised that posts may change significantly and new posts be created. The purpose of this policy is to cover such situations.

- 3.2 **New posts:** where new posts are formally added to the approved structure of the council, the appropriate Head of Service will be responsible for submitting the job description and person specification for evaluation prior to advertising the post.
- 3.3 **Significant changes to job description:** re-evaluation will only be carried out in situations where there has been a permanent, significant/substantial increase or decrease in duties and responsibilities; the evaluation will take place six months after the change and only in situations where evaluation or re-evaluation has not occurred in the preceding six months.
- 3.4 This change in an employee's duty may have resulted from the gradual addition of a new feature over a period of time or as a result of restructuring or following the introduction of a new type of work at a higher level of responsibility. The employee and the line manager must agree that there has been a permanent and significant change in the post, which must then be approved by the Head of Service. In the event that the employee, his manager and the Head of Service fail to agree there has been a significant change, the employee may wish to raise this matter with Human Resources for further advice.
- 3.5 **Post created or changed as part of a restructure:** will be evaluated in accordance with the Redundancy Policy. If new job descriptions are required, these will need to be drafted by Heads of Service/line managers, with support and advice from HR. The new job descriptions will be evaluated and an indicative grade given.

4.0 Constitution and Role of the Panel

- 4.1 The Panel will consist of three members; one Human Resources representative, one Unison representative and one person from Human Resources, Unison or an independent evaluator. The Panel members will have been trained in the Hay evaluation methodology and are provided with the most up to date copies of the methodology. The Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development is responsible for ensuring there are sufficient numbers of trained evaluators, drawn from across all Directorates. Evaluators will receive refresher training every three years, if required.

- 4.2 It will be the responsibility of all evaluators to treat information provided to them confidentially both prior to and after the Panel has met. A private invitation will be sent to the Panel to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Evaluators on the Panel will not discuss the outcome of the Panel with anyone (the employee, the line manager or the Head of Service). All enquiries regarding the outcome of an evaluation panel should be directed to Human Resources for response. Human Resources will communicate the results of the Panel to the Head of Service/line manager who has requested the evaluation. It is then the Head of Service/line manager's responsibility to communicate it to all relevant parties.
- 4.3 It will be the responsibility of the Panel to read all the information before attending the evaluation meeting and to bring the relevant documentation, as listed below, to the meeting:-
- Old Job description
 - New Job description
 - Organisation/structure chart/Establishment list
 - Background information/Rationale
 - Supporting statement from Head of Service/line manager/employee
 - Job Evaluation submission form

The Panel may request further information if they believe the documents provided are not adequate.

- 4.4 There may be occasions when the Panel may take the option to ask for posts to be evaluated externally.
- 4.5 Evaluators will not be permitted to evaluate posts within their own section or where they have a close relationship e.g. they are related to the post holder or have a close personal relationship outside work with them. In the case of posts within Human Resources three non HR evaluators should attend or in the case of a Unison officer post being evaluated the panel will consist of non Unison members.

5.0 Evaluation process

- 5.1 Head of Service/line manager/ employee will identify the changes to the post holder's role. Head of Service agreement must be

obtained before submission of the new or amended job description.

- 5.2 The Head of Service/line manager will produce a job description and person specification in conjunction, where appropriate, with the employee to identify and agree the changes to the role. The line manager will need to discuss this with the employee holding the post, in advance of the evaluation meeting, to ensure that it reflects the job content. If training to write a job description is required the line manager should contact Human Resources.
- 5.3 The employee may consult with their union, employee representative or Human Resources on the preparation of this document. Where a number of employees are in a post which is to be evaluated only one document needs to be completed.
- 5.4 The Head of Service/line manager will email Human Resources with the following, referring also to Appendix 1, 2 and 3:-
 - Job Evaluation submission form
 - Old job description and specification
 - New job description and specification
 - Current organisation structure chart identifying posts and grades (names are not required)
 - Proposed organisation chart identifying new post(s)
- 5.5 On receipt of the completed documentation, Human Resources will convene the Panel to evaluate the post(s).
- 5.6 The line manager/employee can attend the evaluation meeting to present their case and give greater context to the job description.
- 5.7 The Panel should evaluate the post as it is presented in the job description. It is intended to deal with the evaluation with the written evidence as presented in the job description.
- 5.8 The Panel should compare and contrast the old and the new job description and make reference to the old and proposed structure charts, where applicable. Comparisons with similar posts across other departments/service should be made using the Establishment list.

- 5.9 At the end of the evaluation meeting, the Panel will produce a Rationale document detailing the outcome of the job evaluation.
- 5.10 The Panel will reach a decision where all are agreed. However, if there is no unanimous agreement then the majority consensus will be taken and detailed in the rationale. Once agreed or a consensus reached, the Panel will moderate the evaluation, as in 6.1 below, to ensure that the evaluation scheme has been applied fairly and consistently.
- 5.11 Substantial change will not automatically lead to a higher grade and it is possible that the post maintains the same grade or may even be allocated a lower grade.
- 5.12 Human Resources will notify the Head of Service/line manager of the result. The Head of Service/line manager will email Human Resources to confirm agreement of the new grade.
- 5.13 HR will draft the letters for managers to sign and give to their employees informing them of their new grade, remuneration and any other changes effected by the evaluation, if applicable.
- 5.14 The panel members will not discuss an evaluation outside a panel meeting with either the post holder or manager before or after an evaluation. Any lobbying of panel members will result in cancellation of the scheduled Panel and a new Panel being drawn together.

6.0 Restructure evaluations only

- 6.1 In the case of a restructure it is advisable for the Panel to evaluate all the posts in the proposed structure at the same time.

7.0 Moderation process within the evaluation process

- 7.1 At the end of each evaluation the Panel should make comparisons between the proposed post score and existing council posts within the department/service organisation and within the Council's overall structure, for all posts evaluated i.e. compare the grade to other posts in the team and the service; compare grade to other posts in the Council with the same or similar job titles or

specification across departments/services. The use of structure charts and/or the Establishment list will aid this.

- 7.2 Evaluators will meet quarterly to discuss issues arising, to ensure the evaluation process is consistent and fair and to preserve the integrity of the scheme.

8.0 Effective date

- 8.1 Any impact on grade will be effective from the date that the request for evaluation and all the supporting documents, agreed by the post holder and signed by the Head of Service/line manager, are received by the Human Resources department.

9.0 Appeal process

- 9.1 The appeals process applies to all posts, with the exception of new posts.
- 9.2 If the employee/line manager is dissatisfied with the outcome, they have the right to lodge an appeal.
- 9.3 The appeal must be submitted in writing to the Head of Service and a copy given to the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development within 10 working days of the date the result notification was given. Should the employee request an extension to this timeframe, this will be reviewed by the Head of Human Resources and Organisational Development.
- 9.4 The appeal should clearly state the reason for the appeal and identify any comparator posts if applicable. If appropriate, the appeal must also identify where the employee considers the scheme was incorrectly applied to their post and what factors do not accurately reflect the demands of the job. The appeal can only be based on the information available at the time of submitting the original job evaluation request. Employees may also appeal on the grounds that another employee is carrying out work of equal value on a higher grade. The employee should put forward the case for the band they consider most appropriate for their post.
- 9.5 Unison members should seek a view from their Branch officers before submitting an appeal.

- 9.6 Appeals will be heard by the Panel, none of whom will have been involved in the evaluation, where possible. It is intended to deal with appeals on written evidence. The employee/line manager can attend the Appeal meeting to represent their appeal. They have the right to be represented by a work colleague, union or employee representative, should they wish.
- 9.7 In the case of a group appeal, the group may nominate two people to address the hearing, with a work colleague, union or employee representative, if requested.
- 9.8 The Panel will receive a copy of the written submission and comments at least 5 working days before the appeal hearing.
- 9.9 The Panel will consider the reasons for the appeal and whether factors which the employee has identified have been incorrectly evaluated. The appropriate manager/ Head of Service may then be consulted for their comments on the factors concerned. The Panel may seek clarity about content of the job description and the requirements of the post being looked at from the employee/line manager/Head of Service. The Panel may also wish to discuss the outcome with previous Panel to understand their rationale. These consultations should take place during the appeal hearing. If this is not possible, the appeal hearing may be adjourned to enable further consultation. A report will be available from the Panel as to why they recommend any changes to the scores.
- 9.10 Appeals will normally be heard within 15 working days of receipt of the notice of the appeal.
- 9.11 The result of the hearing, with the rationale behind it, will be issued to the employee within 5 working days after the conclusion of the hearing.
- 9.12 Where appropriate, the evaluation assessment form will be amended and the new score will be notified to relevant parties. Any change in grade/remuneration will take effect from the date of the original submission of information.
- 9.13 The chair of the Panel will notify the Head of Service/line manager of the result. HR department will draft the letter, confirming the outcome, for the manager to sign and give to the employee

informing them of their new grade, remuneration and any other changes effected by the evaluation, if applicable.

9.14 There is no further line of appeal after this process.

10.0 Protection

10.1 Where a post is graded at a higher grade the post holder will be placed at the lowest SCP of the new grade band, unless the grade overlaps and then the post holder will move to the next SCP.

10.2 Where an evaluation results in the post being downgraded, the post holder's salary will be protected in accordance with the Council's Redeployment Policy.

11.0 Policy review and amendment

11.1 This policy shall be reviewed after three years or sooner in line with legislation or best practice.



JOB EVALUATION SUBMISSION **FORM**

This form should be completed by the line manager requesting to have a job evaluated, & submitted with the documents detailed in the Checklist (Appendix 2)

Job Title: _____ **Job No.** _____
Reports To: _____ **Service:** _____

The following bullet points should be used as a guide and are not an exhaustive list.

Why does this post need evaluating?

- Recruiting to a vacant post
- The post holder requested evaluation
- There has been a substantial change in place for at least 6 months
- The service is being restructured

What is the history of this post?

- It is a new post
- It is a combination of posts
- The service requirements have changed since it was last evaluated

What are the substantial changes to this post?

- Additional / fewer duties or responsibilities

When should the substantial change take effect from?

- Include explanation

Does this post have any managerial responsibilities?

Does this post have any budget responsibilities? Evidence the budget from discussion with Finance

Date:

Signed:



JOB EVALUATION SCHEME CHECKLIST

This form should be completed by the Head of Service/line manager and /or employee requesting a post should be evaluated. The checklist must be submitted with the Job description & person specification, the organisation structure chart and the Job Evaluation Submission form

Checklist	Tick box
Old Job description and person specification	
New job description and person specification	
Old Organisation/Structure chart (with grades)	
New/Proposed Organisation/Structure chart	
Background/Rationale	
Supporting statement from line manager/ employee	
Job evaluation submission form	

Job Evaluation Flow Chart

