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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **Purpose**
This policy sets out the Trust’s local arrangements for job evaluation under the national framework of Agenda for Change.

1.2 **Policy Statement**
The Trust is committed to the operation of a fair, consistent and equitable job evaluation scheme based on the job required by the Trust, not the person doing it or the number of hours required..

2. **SCOPE**

2.1 This policy applies to all posts within the Trust except Directors, medical and dental posts, or the posts of workers not employed by the Trust.

2.2 In implementing this policy, managers must ensure that all staff are treated fairly and within the provisions and spirit of the Trust’s Policy HR01 ‘Equality and Diversity’. Special attention should be paid to ensuring the policy is understood when using it for staff new to the NHS or Trust, or by staff who may have an essential skills need in literacy or those whose first language is not English or for persons with little experience of working life.

3. **DEFINITIONS**

3.1 **National Job Profile** – the outcome of a job evaluation process for a commonly occurring and recognisable NHS job, published by the NHS Staff Council.

3.2 **Factor** – Each national job profile is created around sixteen different headings called factors.

3.3 **Match** – the job role broadly corresponds to a national job profile.

3.4 **New role** – a role which does not already exist in the department or Trust.

3.5 **Significant change to a job description or person specification** – the changes are great enough to:

   - considerably increase or decrease the Knowledge, Training and Experience necessary for the job; or
   - considerably increase or decrease the Freedom to Act of the post holder(s); or
   - change the band of the role.

3.6 **At Risk** – under Trust policy HR38: Management of Organisational Change, a post holder is at risk if the security of their employment is under threat due to potential redundancy.
4 RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 It is the responsibility of the line manager to:
- carefully consider the needs of the business when considering a significant change to a job role;
- to ensure that the design of roles reflects a modern NHS and safe and cost effective healthcare delivery;
- ensure that funding is available when supporting submission of a changed job for evaluation;
- ensure that the job descriptions of post holders fairly reflect the principal duties required of them;
- ensure that new job descriptions and person specifications are written in line with the Trust standard template;
- ensure all relevant information (including as a minimum the job description, person specification and organisation chart) are provided to the HR Information Systems (ESR) team when submitting jobs for banding;
- obtain approval in principle from the Divisional General Manager/Head of Service for any proposed changes to banding before discussion with job holders.

4.2 It is the responsibility of the Divisional General Manager or Head of Service to:
- ensure that the Division or Service has a process in place to assess all significant changes to job role;
- consider the bandings of both jobs affected when a change of responsibilities for one job affects the responsibilities of another;
- ensure the quality of the job descriptions, person specifications and supporting documentation being presented for banding;
- ensure congruence of changed job roles with the needs of the business and the Trust’s strategic objectives.

5 GENERAL

5.1 In order to identify any obvious omissions or inaccuracies and speed up the evaluation process, it is recommended that job descriptions and person specifications are checked by a member of the relevant HR team prior to submission for evaluation.

5.2 Where a job has responsibilities added to it, resulting in a significant change, it is expected that the line manager will also consider whether these additional features are completely new to the department/Trust or have been removed from a second job role. If the latter, the second job should also be updated by the line manager and post holder(s), and submitted for evaluation.

5.3 Where existing responsibilities are no longer required in a role, resulting in a significant change, the line manager should submit an amended job description for banding, based on the revised needs of the service.

5.4 Where a job is changed it is expected that the line manager will also consider whether the principal responsibilities of that role are now the same as those within another existing banded job. If so, the job description of the changed job does not require submission for further evaluation.

5.5 The outcome of any evaluation process on a current job role may result in a decision to increase or decrease the banding.
5.6 Where a post holder is required to cover a post in a higher pay band for at least one month and normally no more than six months, Trust policy HR54: Acting Up should be used. Where a post holder is unable to cover the entire role, a revised job description for the post being covered should be submitted for job evaluation. Managers requiring guidance should refer to their HR advisory team.

5.7 Where a project or an objective is set for a post holder(s) which is new but does not significantly increase responsibility, it is not appropriate to submit the updated job description for evaluation.

5.8 Where changes to a role are classed as significant, the role will be classed as a New Job under this policy.

5.9 Where there are multiple post holders sharing a job role, it is expected that all will be involved by the line manager in any discussions concerning changes to that job role. Should a post holder be required to attend a panel or review as part of the evaluation process, one post holder should be chosen to represent the views of all. Where the proposed change will affect one post of the group only, advice should be sought from the HR Advisory team.

5.10 Any job evaluation requests that are not accompanied by the relevant supporting documentation (as a minimum, the job description, person specification and organisation chart) will not be evaluated until all the correct information has been received by the HR Information Systems (ESR) team.

5.11 Decisions and pay will be backdated to the date of the letter submitting the job role for evaluation to the HR Information Systems (ESR) team or the date of appointment (whichever is the later).

6. NEW JOBS

6.1 Where a job description, person specification and organisation chart have been created for a new role, these must be submitted for evaluation by the line manager via the Divisional General Manager/Head of Service.

6.2 Where the job description for a new job is similar to an existing job within the Trust, the manager should include the job description and person specification for the similar post to assist the evaluation panel.

6.3 The job description and person specification may be amended and resubmitted to the HR Information Systems (ESR) team once there has been a reasonable period of time for the new role to ‘bed down’ (typically six months). Any subsequent change to banding will be effective from the date of the resubmission.

7 CHANGED JOBS

7.1 All jobs change over a period of time; aspects may be removed as well as added. The Trust requires that job descriptions and person specifications are updated where necessary, normally as part of the annual appraisal process.

7.2 Where the job required by the Trust changes significantly and those changed requirements continue for six months, it is expected that the line manager will discuss these changes with the post holder(s) and submit the revised job description, person specification and organisation chart to the HR Information Systems (ESR) team for evaluation. All such
revisions must be approved in principle by the Divisional General Manager/Head of Service before submission to the HR Information Systems (ESR) team.

7.3 The revised job will be evaluated using the Trust's job evaluation processes.

8 ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE AND RECONFIGURATION

8.1 When a service or department is being redesigned in order to support better service delivery, the Trust considers that all posts included in the organisational change are new posts. This does not imply that all existing post holders are “at risk” under Trust policy HR38: Management of Organisational Change.

8.2 If posts have been significantly changed, they will require rebanding. It is helpful if the line manager indicates which of the new roles is the same as or similar to an existing post within the Trust in order to assist the HR Information Systems (ESR) team.

8.3 The job descriptions and person specifications will be evaluated using the Trust's job evaluation processes.

9 PROCESSES

9.1 The following processes have been jointly developed in partnership with TNCC Staff Side representatives and following the guidance in the NHS Job Evaluation Handbook.

9.2 All job information available for a role is submitted to a panel of staff side and management side job evaluators. The panel will question the line manager and assess the information provided before making a decision on the banding for the role.

9.3 The panel may match the role to a national job profile. If the role does not match to a national job profile, the panel may:

• allocate a banding based on a points score; or
• carry out a Hybrid Matching/Evaluation process; or
• refer the role for local assessment.

9.4 Allocating a Banding based on a Points Score

9.4.1 Where a role cannot be matched to a national job profile, the panel may use their experience to score each factor and thereby allocate a banding if they are satisfied that the resulting banding fairly reflects the overall responsibilities of the role.

9.5 Hybrid Matching/Evaluation

9.5.1 Where a role can almost be matched to a national job profile, the panel can choose to partially match the role and refer particular factors back to the post holder and line manager for further information using the guidance set out in the NHS Job Evaluation Handbook. The additional information is considered by a panel on a subsequent date, added to the partial match completed by the original panel and used to make a decision on a banding for the role. The second panel does not re-match the entire role provided that the panel feels the resulting banding fairly reflects the overall responsibilities of the role.
9.6 **Local Assessment**

9.6.1 Local assessment must be used where a role is unique, unusual or very specialist and there is not an appropriate national job profile.

9.6.2 It may also be used where it has not been possible to match a role to a national job profile, or following a request for a review where an initial banding was allocated based on a points score.

9.6.3 Local assessment involves full job analysis and evaluation. It requires the completion of a detailed job analysis questionnaire (JAQ) about the role by the line manager and post holder(s), a meeting with two job analysts to finalise that questionnaire and then the submission of the questionnaire to a panel for a decision on the banding for the role.

9.7 **Quality Assurance (QA)**

9.7.1 The banding decision for every role is quality assured by an independent panel prior to release to managers and job holders.

9.7.2 A QA panel may:

- confirm the banding decision; or
- re-match the role to a different national job profile within the same band; or
- where a banding has been allocated based on a points score, alter the distribution of scores between factors within the same band; or
- allocate a suitable profile if there is one; or
- refer the role back to a panel with detailed queries or comments.

9.7.3 Changes to factor scores which do not affect the banding will not be referred back to a new panel.

9.7.4 If it becomes apparent during the QA process that a role may be allocated a different banding, it must be referred back to a panel.

9.7.5 Once all consistency checking is complete and any apparent inconsistencies are resolved, the banding results will be published.

10 **PUBLISHING RESULTS**

10.1 The banding results for new jobs and jobs which are part of organisational change or reconfiguration will be made available to the line manager.

10.2 The banding results for all other jobs will be made available to the line manager and post holder(s).

10.3 The HR Information Systems (ESR) team will provide:

- a letter setting out the banding decision; and
- the rationale for the banding decision; and
- the national job profile (if appropriate); and
- details of the QA process followed; and
- details of the process to be followed to request a review of the outcome.
11 RIGHT OF APPEAL

11.1 For new jobs and jobs which are part of an organisational change or reconfiguration, the line manager may appeal the banding decision within three months of the date of issue of banding results.

11.2 For all changed jobs, an appeal must be agreed by both the post holder(s) and the line manager and be submitted by the line manager within three months of the date of issue of banding results.

11.3 The issue of a new national profile cannot be used as a valid reason to appeal a banding result.

11.4 An appeal does not have to be made on the basis of the whole job; it can be based on specific factors if appropriate.

11.5 All appeals must:
   - be in writing; and
   - contain details of where those appealing disagree with the outcome; and
   - set out clear evidence to support the case; and
   - indicate whether an informal discussion may be helpful or whether a formal appeal is requested.

11.6 Informal Discussion

11.6.1 It may be appropriate for a member of the HR team to meet those appealing on an informal basis. If requested, a union representative or the line manager may accompany the post holder(s).

11.6.2 The aim of the meeting is to exchange information to help clarify issues and provide an opportunity for discussion and resolution.

11.7 Formal Appeal

11.7.1 Where those appealing would prefer a more formal process, or where an informal discussion has failed to address any concerns, a formal appeal can be held.

11.7.2 All job information available for the role (including previous panel information and results) is submitted to a panel of staff side and management side job evaluators. The panel will question the line manager and assess the information provided before making a decision on the banding for the role.

11.7.3 Using the guidance set out in the NHS Job Evaluation Handbook, the panel may:

   - confirm the original outcome; or
   - confirm a match to a different profile; or
   - exceptionally, refer the role for local assessment.

11.7.4 Where the outcome of the appeal panel is a confirmation of the original banding decision, there is no need to submit the outcome for quality assurance.
11.7.5 Where the outcome of the appeal panel is a different band or a match to a different profile, the outcome must be submitted for quality assurance.

11.7.6 The outcome of a formal appeal is final. There is no further right of appeal in relation to the banding decision.

12 GRIEVANCE IN RELATION TO THE PROCESS

12.1 Where it is believed that the process of job evaluation has been misapplied, the post holder(s) may pursue a grievance using the Job Evaluation Grievance Procedure set out at Appendix 1.

12.2 Where a grievance is upheld, the Grievance Panel will decide on the corrective action, which may be reference to a new panel.

12.3 The results of a Grievance will be made available in writing to the line manager and post holder(s).

13 TRUST REVIEW

13.1 Where common problems arise for a group of staff, the Divisional General Manager or Head of Service (or nominee) and staff representatives, working in partnership and supported by Human Resources, should review the problem in order to try to identify a common solution which can be applied to as many of the cases as possible.

13.2 Where an issue appears to have implications beyond the Trust, and in particular where the issue is the interpretation of the NHS Job Evaluation Handbook, the matter should be referred by the Head of Human Resources to the NHS Staff Council.

13.3 Where a matter has been dealt with by Trust review no further right of appeal will exist unless the staff member concerned can show a material difference in their case that was not considered by the review.

14 STRATEGIC HEALTH AUTHORITY REVIEW

14.1 Where a local agreement cannot be reached the matter can be referred to the Strategic Health Authority Agenda for Change leads for assistance in accordance with the NHS Job Evaluation Handbook.
15 POLICY MONITORING AND REVIEW

15.1 The Head of Human Resources will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of this policy and will arrange for the process to be periodically audited.

15.2 TNCC will be responsible for the periodic review of the policy to ensure it remains appropriate and effective.

15.3 Unless there are exceptional circumstances, the HR Information Systems (ESR) team will strive to give an outcome for all:

- job banding requests within 1 month of receipt of the full information;
- requests for review within 1 month of receipt of the full information;
- grievance requests within 7 days of the Grievance Panel meeting.

15.4 Progress reports will be submitted to TNCC on a quarterly basis.
Appendix 1

Job Evaluation Grievance Procedure

1. A Grievance request must be made in writing **within four weeks of receipt** of the written banding decision. The Grievance request document must contain:
   
   1.1 Details of where the post holder(s) feel that the Matching or Evaluation process was misapplied and evidence to support the case;
   
   or
   
   1.2 Details of why the post holder(s) is/are unhappy with the local application of the national agreement and evidence to support the case.

2. Receipt of the grievance will be acknowledged in writing and a Grievance Panel will be convened as soon as practicable and within 2 months of receipt of the Grievance documentation.

3. The Grievance Panel will consist of:
   - Divisional General Manager/Head of Service (or nominee)
   - Head of Human Resources (or nominee)
   - Staff Side Chair (or nominee)
   - Another TUPO representative nominated by the Staff Side Chair

4. No member of the Grievance Panel will have been involved in the banding process as a Panel member.

5. The Panel hearing will be attended by both the post holder and their line manager. The post holder has the right to be accompanied by an accredited trade union representative or work colleague employed by the Trust. If the grievance is a collective one affecting several staff, one post holder should be chosen to represent the views of all.

6. The decision of the Grievance Panel will be confirmed in writing to the post holder(s) and their line manager.

7. The decision of the Grievance Panel is final and concludes the grievance procedure.