



# Job Evaluation Policy

## W60

### Additionally refer to:

NHS Terms and Conditions of Service Handbook  
 NHS KSF Handbook  
 Recruitment and Selection  
 Management of Organisational Change  
 Knowledge & Skills Framework  
 Acting Up Policy

Version:	V1.3
Originally issued	January 2011
Approved by	JNCC, Policy Assurance Group
Date approved	August 2020 (V1.3), September 2020
Ratified by:	SaTH Leadership Committee
Date ratified:	October 2020
Document Lead	Associate Workforce Director - Corporate
Lead Director	Workforce Director
Date issued:	August 2020
Review date:	August 2025 (unless required earlier)
Target audience:	All Trust procedural document leads

## Document Control Sheet

<b>Document Lead/Contact:</b>	Harish Kauldhar, Associate Workforce Director. harish.kauldhar@nhs.net
Version	1.3
Status	Final
Date Equality Impact Assessment completed	July 2020
Issue Date	August 2020
Review Date	August 2025 (Unless required earlier)
Distribution	Please refer to the intranet version for the latest version of this policy. <b>Any printed copies may not necessarily be the most up to date</b>
Key Words – including abbreviations if these would be reasonably expected to be used as search terms	Job Evaluation, rebanding, job descriptions, person specification.
Dissemination plan	This document will be disseminated via policy leads and the management cascade.

## Version history

Version	Date	Author	Status	Comment – include reference to Committee presentations and dates
V1	Jan 2011	Head of HR	Final	Approved.
V1.1	July 2020	H Kauldhar	Draft	Amendment following Workforce comments Section 5.11 - job evaluation request form referenced.
V1.2	August 2020	H Kauldhar	Draft	JNCC Policy Working Group amendments Scope made clearer: “this policy does not apply to colleagues on contracts including Medical, Dental and Very Senior Manager.” Definitions – definition of Job Analysis Questionnaire included. Section 5.1 references discussions will also take place with colleagues to agree backdating, as required. Section 11 – role of Workforce summarised when appeals raised. Section 12 – clarifies grievances can only be raised where it is believed the process of job evaluation has been misapplied.
V 1.3	August 2020	H Kauldhar	Final	Approved by JNCC.

## Policy on a page

This policy sets out the framework for the Job Evaluation policy and process for the Trust.

A single NHS job evaluation scheme has been developed to help deliver equal pay for work of equal value and should be used when reviewing existing posts and when allocating pay bands to new posts.

The policy and procedure set out in this document applies to all employees on Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions, and excludes staff groups on other, non-agenda for change terms and conditions within the Trust.

Decisions and pay will be backdated to the date when the fully completed job evaluation request form for the job role was received by Workforce or the date of appointment(whichever is the latter). Discussions will also take place with colleagues to agree backdating, as required.

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

An appeals process is available to appeal banding decisions. The procedure is summarised in Appendix 1.

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

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 2.

## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
1. Introduction	5
2. Scope	5
3. Definitions	5
4. Responsibilities	6
5. General	6
6. New jobs	7
7. Changed jobs	8
8. Organisational change	8
9. Processes	8
10. Outcome of the job evaluation panel	10
11. Appeals	10
12. Grievance in relation to the process	11
13. Trust review	11
14. Policy monitoring and review	11
15. Training needs	11
16. Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)	12
17. Standards of Business Conduct	12
18. References	12
Appendices	
Appendix 1. Job evaluation appeal procedure	13
Appendix 2. Job evaluation grievance procedure	14

## 1 Introduction

This policy sets out the framework for the Job Evaluation policy and process for the Trust.

- 1.1 A single NHS job evaluation scheme has been developed to help deliver equal pay for work of equal value and should be used when reviewing existing posts and when allocating bands to new posts.
- 1.2 This policy is written in accordance with the Government paper Agenda for Change; Modernising the NHS Pay System (1999) and the nationally agreed NHS Job Evaluation Handbook (2010). Furthermore, this complies with the Equality Act (2010).

## 2 Scope

The policy and procedures set out in this document applies to all employees on Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions only. Therefore, this policy does not apply to colleagues on contracts including Medical, Dental and Very Senior Manager.

## 3 Definitions

*Job Evaluation Process*, whereby a panel of Staff Side and management representatives meet to score a job description against the national profile to determine its banding under agenda for change.

*Internet Job Evaluation System (IJES)*, the electronic system used to support the job evaluation process.

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

*Factor*, each national job profile is created around sixteen different headings called factors.

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

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

*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.

*At Risk*, under the Management of Organisational Change policy, a post holder is at risk if the security of their employment is under threat due to potential redundancy.

*Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ)*, the questionnaire completed by the line manager to outline the job role (that requires job evaluation).

## **4 Responsibilities**

4.1 It is the responsibility of the line manager to:

- Carefully consider the needs of the service when considering a change to a job role;
- To ensure that the design of roles is fit for purpose (e.g. in terms of ways of working, patient care and best use of public money);
- Ensure sufficient budget is available when supporting submission of a changed job for evaluation by working with Finance and gaining approval from the head of service/Director before proceeding with a job evaluation request;
- Ensure completion of the previous steps and approval gained before discussion with job holders;
- Ensure that the job descriptions of post holders fairly reflect the principal duties required;
- 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 when submitting job evaluation requests.

4.2 It is the responsibility of the head of service/Director to:

- Ensure that the service or department has a workforce planning 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 service and the Trust's strategic objectives.

4.3 It is the responsibility of job evaluation panel members to:

- Attend panels regularly/as required;
- To advise of any conflicts of interest e.g. job within their own department or a job they are applying for;
- To undertake training as required to maintain skills for job evaluation;
- To follow the process laid out in this policy including use of the Internet Job Evaluation System (IJES).

## **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, the

line manager must 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, Acting Up Policy 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 the 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 Workforce.
- 5.11 Decisions and pay will be backdated to the date when the fully completed job evaluation request form for the job role was received by Workforce or the date of appointment (whichever is the latter). Discussions will also take place with colleagues to agree backdating, as required.

## **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 head of service/Director.

- 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 Workforce once there has been a reasonable period of time for the new role to embed (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 Workforce for evaluation. All such revisions must be approved in principle by the head of service before submission to Workforce.
- 7.3 The revised job will be evaluated using the Trust's job evaluation processes.

## **8 Organisational change**

- 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 Management of Organisational Change Policy.
- 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 Workforce.
- 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 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 job analysis questionnaire (JAQ) about the role by the line manager and post holder(s), and may require a meeting to finalise the questionnaire prior to submission of the questionnaire as part of the job evaluation process.

#### 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.

## 10 Outcome of the job evaluation panel

- 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 Workforce 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 Appeals

An appeals process is available to appeal banding decisions. The procedure is summarised in Appendix 1.

It may also be appropriate for a member of Workforce to meet those appealing on an informal basis before a decision has been made to formally appeal or during the appeal process itself – the aim of the meeting is to exchange information to help clarify issues and provide an opportunity for discussion and resolution. If requested, a trade union representative, professional body representative or the line manager may accompany the post holder(s).

- 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 There will be no further right of appeal within this policy following this stage of the procedure.

## 12 Grievance in relation to the process

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 2. Please note, this procedure cannot be used where a colleague disagrees with the job evaluation outcome.

- 12.1 Where a grievance is upheld, the Grievance Panel will decide on the corrective action, which may be reference to a new panel.
- 12.2 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 head of service (or nominee) and staff representatives, working in partnership and supported by Workforce, 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 will be referred 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 Policy monitoring and review

- 14.1 The Workforce directorate will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of this policy and will arrange for the process to be periodically audited.
- 14.2 JNCC will be responsible for the periodic review of the policy to ensure it remains appropriate and effective with monthly performance reporting provided to the Workforce Assurance Committee.
- 14.3 Unless there are exceptional circumstances, the Workforce 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.

14.4	Progress reports will be submitted to JNCC on a quarterly basis.
<b>15.</b>	<b>Training needs</b>
	There is no mandatory training associated with this Policy, however, job evaluation training will be facilitated by Workforce for managers and Staff Side representatives.  If there are any queries about its operation, please contact the Workforce team.

<b>16</b>	<b>Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)</b>
	This policy applies to all employees equally and does not discriminate positively or negatively between protected characteristics.
<b>17</b>	<b>Standards of Business Conduct</b>
	The Trust follows good NHS Business practice as outlined in the Managing Conflicts of Interest in the NHS and has robust controls in place to prevent bribery. Due consideration has been given to the Bribery Act 2010 in the review of this policy document and no specific risks were identified.
<b>18</b>	<b>References</b>
	<p>NHS Employers Job Evaluation Handbook</p> <p><a href="https://www.nhsemployers.org/pay-pensions-and-reward/job-evaluation/job-evaluation-handbook">https://www.nhsemployers.org/pay-pensions-and-reward/job-evaluation/job-evaluation-handbook</a></p> <p>NHS Employers guidance on national job profiles - to provide a framework to check the consistency of local evaluations.</p> <p><a href="https://www.nhsemployers.org/pay-pensions-and-reward/job-evaluation/national-job-profiles">https://www.nhsemployers.org/pay-pensions-and-reward/job-evaluation/national-job-profiles</a></p>

## Appendix 1. Job evaluation appeal procedure

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
6. There will be no further right of appeal. Where the post holder believes the **process** has been misapplied, please refer to Appendix 2, the job evaluation grievance procedure

## Appendix 2. 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:
  - Head of service (or nominee)
  - Workforce representative
  - Staff Side Chair (or nominee)
  - Another TUPO or professional 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, professional 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.