

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**



## **JOB EVALUATION**

### **FORCE REFERENCE DOCUMENT**

FRD Reference Number	J1
Quality Auditor	Human Resources
First Issued	14.9.98
Last Updated	1.7.09
Version	8

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

# NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

## POLICY

1. Northern Constabulary is committed to the principles of equal pay for work of equal value and has a grading structure underpinned by the Hay Job Evaluation method.
2. The evaluation of all Police Staff posts will be determined through job evaluation with the consultation and involvement of the trade unions throughout.
3. Northern Constabulary recognises that employees have an individual right of appeal against the outcome of the evaluation of their job. This procedure can be initiated by post holders who believe, on the basis of the stated grounds of appeal, that their post has been incorrectly evaluated.
4. This procedure fulfils the requirements of the ACAS Code of practice.

## STANDARDS

1. All Police staff posts within the Force must be evaluated using the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme.
2. **NEW POSTS**
  - 2.1 Where a new post is identified and approved, a job description must be drafted. The format for this description is contained in the Police Staff Job Description Form (AD/18/39) with accompanying guidance notes for completion.
  - 2.2 It is the responsibility of the Line Manager to complete all the elements of the job description accurately and as comprehensively as possible with reference to the guidance notes available in the Police Staff Recruitment and Selection Manual available in the G drive. This will ensure the contents are a true reflection of what that particular job entails and provide the Job Evaluation Panel with the relevant information on which to evaluate the role.
  - 2.3 Completed job descriptions signed off by the Line Manager should be passed to the Director of Human Resources. Human Resources will hold copies of all approved job descriptions and ensure corporate format and standards are maintained. Where a post is held by more than one individual across Divisions or Service Units HR will co-ordinate the production of a generic job description. In the event that a generic job description cannot be agreed the Director of Human Resources will submit the job description to the Executive Advisory Group members who will determine the final version.
  - 2.4 The job description will then be put to the Job Evaluation Panel for grading. For the purpose of setting the post in context and to provide evidence to support the proposed grading, Service Unit Managers ("SUMs") will submit a written report

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

## **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

with the application. SUMs or Line Managers may be requested to attend the Job Evaluation panel in person or via video conferencing when additional information is required to assist the panel.

- 2.5 The Job Evaluation Panel is responsible for assessing the job description and scoring it against the Hay model. The score received is then linked to the grading structure, which in turn determines the salary level at which the new post will be advertised.
- 2.6 Where additional assistance is required to ensure there is external consistency between the grade and the salary of a post with other similar posts within the market, Hay Management Consultants will be asked to provide additional advice. This will ensure that Northern Constabulary remains a competitive employer in the market place.

### **3. RE-GRADING EXISTING POSTS**

- 3.1 Where there has been a significant change in the duties and/or responsibilities, then the post holder will be required to undertake the additional duties for a 6 month period before a re-evaluation can be submitted for consideration. This will ensure the clarity of the new duties required by the re-graded post. A revised job description will be completed, detailing all the changes, at the end of the 6-month period and agreed between both parties. Revised job descriptions must be forwarded to the Director of Human Resources for collation. Where a post is held by more than one individual across Divisions or Service Units, HR will co-ordinate the production of a generic job description. In the event that a generic job description cannot be agreed, the Director of Human Resources will submit the job description to the Executive Advisory Group members who will determine the final version.
- 3.2 Re-evaluation will not be undertaken within 18 months of an initial grading being set.
- 3.3 The Job Evaluation panel will then be responsible for evaluating the revised job description. For the purpose of setting the post in context and to provide evidence to support the proposed grading, Service Unit Managers ("SUMs") will submit a written report with the application. SUMs or Line Managers may be requested to attend the Job Evaluation panel in person or via video conferencing where additional information is required to assist the panel.
- 3.4 Where an existing post is re-graded upwards, the post holder will be entitled to receive any enhanced salary and associated allowances, backdated to the date on which he/she took up the new duties (subject to a maximum of 12 months).
- 3.5 Where a post is re-graded, a Line Manager will have the discretion to award an increase of no more than 2 scale point increments within the new salary scale.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

## **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

- 3.6 Where a post is regraded downwards, the post holder will be entitled to receive one year's protection of salary at existing level before being transferred to the appropriate grade for the role.

### **4. THE JOB EVALUATION PANEL**

- 4.1 The Job Evaluation Panel ("the Panel") has the responsibility for ensuring consistency of scoring of all job descriptions for Police Staff in Northern Constabulary. The Panel also ensures the Hay evaluation process is implemented fairly and transparently which will result in a grading able to withstand external scrutiny.
- 4.2 The Chair of the Job Evaluation Panel is responsible for Quality Assuring during the process. Once a number of jobs have been evaluated it is necessary to review the overall pattern of evaluations in its totality. At this point it may be necessary to make modifications to remove any anomalies and recognise that a wider perception can show original judgements were made in error.
- 4.3 The HR Advisor is responsible for completing the Job Evaluation rationale for each post evaluated. This is a one page summary of the evaluation judgements reached by the panel and the reasons on which each separate judgement is based.
- 4.4 The Job Evaluation Panel will comprise of:
- a) The Chairperson (Appointed by the Head of Support Services)
  - b) An HR Advisor (Secretariat)
  - c) A police officer of at least the rank of Sergeant
  - d) Two Police staff representatives nominated by the Director of Human Resources
  - e) UNISON Representative

A quorum will consist of the Chairperson, Member of the Human Resources, UNISON representative, and one other representative.

All members of the panel must have undergone the appropriate job evaluation training and Diversity training.

- 4.5 The Panel will conduct business in direct response to the demands for evaluation. The Panel will endeavour to undertake a meeting at the earliest opportunity after receiving an Evaluation request. However this will be determined by the availability of panel members.
- 4.6 The Director of Human Resources will arrange for notification to the relevant SUMs of the outcome within 5 days of the panel meeting. This is essentially a provisional outcome until all the evaluations are completed. SUMs will be provided with the grade at which the post has been evaluated, not the actual score given by the panel as this may be subject to change following Quality

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

## **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

Assurance. It will be the responsibility of the Line Manager to notify the member of staff of the outcome from his/her own re-grading application.

### **5. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL**

5.1 Appeals against a Job Evaluation outcome may be made where:-

- a) The appellant believes that there was a procedural error which adversely affected them at the time of the Job Evaluation process relative to their post  
Or
- b) The appellant believes that significant and relevant information was unknown or omitted from the original job description when an assessment was made.

### **6. PROCESS FOR APPEAL**

6.1 The appeal process will be followed where a member of staff indicates in writing their dissatisfaction with the outcome of the Job Evaluation process. The member of staff must submit a Job Evaluation Appeal Form to the Director of Human Resources along with a valid and up to date Job Description (original or revised) for the post, stating the grounds for appeal. The appeal must be discussed with the Line Manager prior to submission. This form must be submitted within 15 working days of receipt of the outcome of the Job Evaluation.

6.2 The Line Manager will discuss the appeal submission with the member of staff and submit comments with the Job Evaluation Appeal Form to the Divisional Commander/Service Unit Manager, who will, if necessary, add commentary before forwarding to the Director of Human Resources.

6.3 An initial check will be made by Human Resources to ensure that the evaluation outcome was not due to an administrative error and, should this be the case, the error will be rectified immediately and without recourse to the appeals process.

6.4 Applicants will be advised within 2 weeks of the submission of the appeal, of the date of the Appeal Panel, and will be available to provide further information to the panel if sought or as necessary.

6.5 In the event that a generic job description has been developed and covers multiple job holders advice will be sought from HR on how best to progress the appeal process. Each and every post holder would not be expected to submit an appeal.

### **7. APPEALS BASED ON GROUND A**

7.1 The Appeal form will have details of the alleged procedural error. Any additional information gathered at the time of the evaluation along with the

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

## **NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

appellant's submission will be submitted to the Appeals panel for reconsideration.

### **8. APPEALS BASED ON GROUND B**

8.1 The Appeal form will give details of the significant and relevant unknown or omitted information. Where a revised job description is required this will also be provided in the agreed format and signed by the appellant and the Line Manager as a complete, fair and accurate representation of the role. To ensure consistency of approach an HR Advisor will review this information providing advice and guidance as necessary. Any additional information gathered at the time of the evaluation along with the appellant's submission will be submitted to the Appeals Panel for reconsideration.

### **9. THE APPEAL PANEL**

9.1 The Appeal Panel will consist of the following trained members:

- a) Director/Deputy Director of Human Resources
- b) 1 Trade Union representative
- c) 2 Evaluators from the internal trained pool.

9.2 Wherever possible the Panel will consist of different evaluators from the original Evaluation Panel.

### **10. OUTCOME OF THE APPEAL**

10.1 There are three possible outcomes of the Appeal:

- a) the grade of the post is confirmed as correct
- b) the grade of the post is confirmed as incorrect and will be upgraded accordingly
- c) the grade of the post is confirmed as incorrect and will be downgraded accordingly. A reduction in the original pay rate for the post will be protected in line with the agreed preservation policy.

10.2 The appellant will be notified in writing of the outcome of the Appeal within 1 week of the date of the Appeal Panel. Notification will also be sent to the Line Manager and Divisional Commander/Service Unit Manager.

10.3 Where the appeal results in a change of grade level of a post any changes of salary will be backdated to the date of the original Job Evaluation.

10.4 It is important to note that there is no recourse beyond the Appeal Panel. The Grievance Procedure cannot be utilised in relation to pay and grading matters.

**NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED**

# NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

## GUIDANCE

### JOB EVALUATION APPEALS

1. A post holder may wish to consider appealing the outcome of a Job Evaluation for the following reasons:

- a) Doesn't think that the Hay factors are relevant
- b) Wants more money
- c) Has changed job since the evaluation was done
- d) Disagrees with the job description
- e) Doesn't accept his/her job is the same as others on a general job description
- f) Doesn't think the panel took account of all key information
- g) Wants to place greater emphasis on certain information
- h) Thinks the grade is too low in respect of a comparable job within the Force

2. **Factor 1**

This is not valid. The organisation has chosen to use the Hay methodology and believes it covers all relevant factors of the work undertaken in Northern Constabulary.

3. **Factor 2**

This is not valid to job evaluation.

4. **Factor 3**

This is not valid to job evaluation and is to do with the person and not the job.

5. **Factors 4 & 5**

These are not valid. The job belongs to the organisation and not the individual. In the majority of cases the individual and the Line Manager should agree the job description but ultimately it is for the Line Manager to determine the job role.

6. **Factors 6 to 8**

These factors form the main types of appeal and should be the focus of any submission made.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED