

EAST HERTS COUNCIL

LOCAL JOINT PANEL - 11 MARCH 2015

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE - 25 MARCH 2015

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY TO THE EMPLOYER'S SIDE

JOB EVALUATION REVIEW

WARD(S) AFFECTED: NONE

WARD(S) AFFECTED: NONE

---

**Purpose/Summary of Report**

To review the Job Evaluation process and Policy

**RECOMMENDATION FOR LOCAL JOINT PANEL**

**That:**

(A)	the Job Evaluation Policy be recommended for approval.
-----	--

**RECOMMENDATION FOR HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**That:**

(A)	the Job Evaluation Policy be approved.
-----	--

1.0 Background

1.1 The Job Evaluation Policy was last reviewed in July 2011.

1.2 A review of the job evaluation process was completed in November/December 2014 following feedback gained from the Job Evaluation Panel, Unison and ideas/suggestions raised through the Here to Help programme. Consultation was completed with Evaluators of the Job Evaluation Panel, Unison, managers and employees with recent experience of using the job evaluation process and HR.

1.2 The Job Evaluation Policy outlines the structure of the Job Evaluation process and the elements required for a Panel to be able to evaluate a post with consistency, fairness and integrity.

## 2.0 Report

### 2.1 Findings

The main findings from the job evaluation review are summarised below and can be found in **Essential Reference Paper B**.

#### Process

- The process is not as transparent as it could be which leads to the belief that the process is not fair or consistent in approach.
- Issue with confidentiality in that Evaluators have been approached by employees and line managers in order to lobby their position.
- Evaluators need to meet quarterly to discuss issues arising, share evaluations and best practice.
- Evaluators' website to be resurrected so that the results of recent Job evaluations can be posted on the website so the Panel have an overview of past and recent job evaluation outcomes - a moderating forum.
- Comparisons with similar posts across other departments/service were not always made. Inconsistency of approach.
- The establishment list was not readily available and therefore it wasn't easy to complete a sense check and moderation. Establishment list to be sent monthly to Evaluators.
- On rare occasions the Panel have not agreed on the grade of a post. A process to be developed on how to handle this outcome. Suggestions were in this case to go with a majority decision and detail in the rationale or convene another Panel if necessary and both Panels to talk to each other.

- The correct paperwork is not always submitted by the employee/line manager. Check list for paperwork needed.
- The Panel did not always read the paperwork before the meeting or bring the paperwork with them.
- The job description was not always agreed between the line manager and employee before it came to the Panel, therefore causing the process to be invalid. Line manager/employee to present the case as an option.
- The Appeal process worked well when the employee/line manager attended the Appeal meeting. The process should be changed to ensure attendance is required at all appeals. One idea was to have a lead from the original panel and lead from appeal panel to discuss and agree differences.
- There was conflict of opinion as to whether some posts should be sent to Hay to be evaluated but the overriding opinion was that the Panel were fully trained and therefore there was no need to send any post to be evaluated by Hay, unless the Panel recommended it.
- There were varying views around the makeup of the Panel such as Evaluators for the Panel should be chosen; evaluation should be made by a higher graded person than the post being evaluated; a Head of Service should be present. However, the overriding view is that each Assessor is fully trained in the evaluation process and therefore who the Assessor is and the grade of the Assessor, is irrelevant.
- Feedback was received on the number of Evaluators, training of Evaluators, notice of meetings and a need for a rota. It was felt that the administration of the job evaluation process could be improved.

### Training/Support

- More support should be given to employees that request a review of their job. Evaluation is about the post not the person. People will always assume a post will come out a certain level and therefore believe there is a bias.
- Some job descriptions were not well written and therefore

raised issues in the evaluation process. Training in writing a job description.

- The Hay Evaluation Handbooks were current but the Panel could have refreshed versions.

### 3.0 Recommendations

3.1 To support the outcomes of the review the following recommendations are made.

1. The Job Evaluation Policy is reviewed to take into consideration recommendations made. The Policy is followed so that there can be no accusation of misuse and a lack of integrity and confidence is restored in the process.
2. The correct paperwork is sent to the Panel in advance; the paperwork is read by the Panel and the Panel bring the paperwork to the evaluation meeting.
3. That all Evaluators have the most up to date Hay Evaluation Handbooks.
4. Private invitations are sent to the Panel to ensure confidentiality of the Panel so there can be no approach by the employee or line manager, prior to the meeting.
5. The correct channels of communication are used to inform employees/line managers of the outcome of the evaluation process.
6. The line manager/employee should attend the Evaluation meeting to present their case and give greater context to the job description.
7. The Evaluators website on the intranet is re-established for Evaluators to store the master file and the establishment list; this will allow for the moderation process, outlined in the policy, to take place ensuring that the process is seen to be fair, consistent and transparent.
8. That a review of the process takes place quarterly to ensure consistency across departments/services and Council.
9. That line managers are trained/retrained to write effective

job descriptions, as necessary.

10. Hay evaluation retraining takes place every three years or as needed.

11. SMG to be trained in Hay Evaluation process to allow senior management to support and understand the process. This will also develop SMG skills and knowledge in job formulation.

#### 4.0 Job Evaluation Policy

4.1 The revised Job Evaluation Policy can be found in **Essential Reference paper 'B'**.

4.2 The Job Evaluation Policy has been revised to take into account the findings from the Panel, Unison, HR and employees whose roles have recently been evaluated.

#### 5.0 Implications/Consultations

5.1 Information on any corporate issues and consultation associated with this report can be found within **Essential Reference Paper 'A'**.

#### Background Papers

None

Contact Officer: Emma Freeman – Head of People and Organisational Development  
01992 531635  
[Emma.Freeman@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:Emma.Freeman@eastherts.gov.uk)

Report Author: Allyson Williams – HR Officer  
01992 531630  
[Allyson.Williams@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:Allyson.Williams@eastherts.gov.uk)