

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES JOB EVALUATION SCHEME:

TECHNICAL NOTE NO. 10: MAINSTREAMING JOB EVALUATION

1. Introduction

1.1 This Technical Note covers a number of issues that arise towards the end of and immediately following a major job evaluation exercise, for example:

- Final consistency checking
- Equality checking the results
- Publishing the job evaluation results
- Dealing with jobs which have changed over the course of the exercise
- Dealing with new and changed jobs after the initial JE exercise
- Ongoing monitoring and maintenance

1.2 Each of the above is considered separately in the following paragraphs. Although each is a discrete topic, there are links between these, which are cross-referenced. Cross-references are also provided to relevant other Technical Notes.

1.3 Regular job and pay audits should be carried out.

1.4 This Technical Note accompanies the Local Government NJC JES, but it relates to the use of any job evaluation system.

2. Final consistency checking

2.1 Regular technical consistency checks should have been carried out through the job evaluation exercise [see Technical Note 14 Consistency Checking of JE Outcomes], which is available with other Technical Notes in this series on the Local Government Association's website at: http://www.local.gov.uk/web/guest/workforce-local-government/-/journal_content/56/10180/3702152/ARTICLE

2.2 At the end of any job evaluation exercise, it is essential to undertake additional checks in order to be able to respond to the inevitable queries from employees and line managers and to ensure the credibility of the outcomes. There are a number of possible 'approaches, for example:

(1) Job Type Checks: compare the evaluations for similar jobs or jobs in the same family. This requires a restatement of job title so instead of Senior Planning Officer and Principal Planning Officer use Planning Officer

Senior and Planning Officer Principal respectively, so that when job titles are sorted in alphabetical order, the job group scores fall together and can easily be compared. [Better still use job family type codes, which allow for easy sorting](#)

[Investigate](#) any apparent anomalies (eg. Principal Planning Officer assessed at lower level for Knowledge than Planning Officer). Any evaluation or information errors should be rectified, or reasons for the difference recorded, if not already on [the](#) evaluation record sheet, for future reference.

(2) Checks [against the organisation structure](#): compare the evaluation outcomes with organisational charts or other information on a department-by-department or section-by-section basis, [ensuring the organisational chart is accurate and up to date](#). Coding of jobs to indicate sections/departments also facilitates this type of check. Any apparent anomalies (e.g. lowest tier job from section organisational structure [being](#) assessed at a higher level for Initiative and Independence than jobs higher in the section organisational structure) should be investigated as above.

(3) Existing Hierarchy Comparisons: compare the rank order of total evaluated scores with the current hierarchy of jobs. The purpose of this check is NOT to restore jobs to their current position in the hierarchy, but to be able to explain why particular jobs have changed their relative position either upwards (e.g. historical under-valuation of type of work; job has grown over time) or downwards (e.g. current grading incorporates historical labour market payment, which may or may not still be relevant, reduction in job responsibilities over time). Only where there is no rational explanation for the change of relative position should queries be raised over the evaluation and/or job information.

2.3 For some or all of the above checks, it may be helpful to involve others with knowledge of the relevant jobs or sections of the organisation, for example, line managers and TU reps from the relevant work areas. This should be on a strictly confidential 'need to know' basis until publication of finalised results has been agreed.

2.4 Although such checks may appear very time consuming at a point when there is pressure to produce finalised results for pay modelling, experience indicates that the investment is worthwhile. [This stage is important because](#) inaccuracies in data [subsequently](#) used for pay modelling may lead to [flaws](#) in the resulting grading and pay proposals. More seriously in practice, obvious inconsistencies or errors in outcomes will lead to loss of credibility in the exercise [and equal pay risks](#).

3. Equality checking the results

- 3.1 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) [EHRC: Equal Pay Audit Kit: Checklist 4: Grading and Equal Pay: available on the EHRC website: www.equalityhumanrights.com] recommends that changes to the position of jobs in the organisational hierarchy should be checked by gender (plus ethnicity and other **protected** characteristics). This can be done by flagging male and female-dominated jobs respectively in the evaluation results spreadsheet or by introducing additional columns for gender, ethnicity and any other **protected** characteristic of concern.
- 3.2 **The general** expectation **is** that any moves of female-dominated jobs should be upwards relative to other jobs. If there are relative downward movements of female-dominated jobs in the JE rank order, then the results should be re-checked to ensure that they are correct and to identify the source of the relative movement.
- 3.3 Such an analysis of relative movements by gender and other characteristics is also a useful starting point for an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA). See Green Book Part 4.11.

4. Publishing the job evaluation results

- 4.1 The question is often asked whether **after final consistency checks the** job evaluation results should be published in **advance** of the new grading and pay structure proposals or as part of the proposed pay package. There is no one right answer to this question. Agreement needs to be reached locally, taking into account the advantages and disadvantages of each in the light of local circumstances.
- 4.2 The disadvantages of publishing the JE results in advance of the grading and pay structure proposals can be stated as follows:
- (a) More employees are likely to appeal, because they do not know whether their pay will change and small differences in points between jobs may appear of greater significance than they in fact are.
 - (b) **There may be** delays, sometimes of many months, in publishing the pay proposals, while appeals are resolved.
- 4.3 The advantages are as follows:
- (1) It allows appeals to be based on the evaluation outcomes alone, uninfluenced by matters of pay, so this is the purer approach.

(2) It allows appeals to be resolved before the grading and pay structure proposals are published and thus to be taken into account in the overall costings.

4.4 However, in practice, most but by no means all organisations reject advance publication of JE results and only publish them as part of the overall package. The arguments for this are that it reduces the number of appeals to those who are adversely affected by the grading and pay structure proposals and those who have genuine concerns over the evaluation of their posts.

5. Jobs that have changed over the course of the exercise

5.1 It is inevitable that some jobs will have changed significantly over the course of the job evaluation exercise. The longer the exercise has taken, the more jobs are likely to have changed. Provision needs to be made for dealing with such changes. There are a number of options:

(1) Maintain the previous arrangements for grading appeals and re-grading during the evaluation exercise. This allows for recognition of job changes, but eliminates the need for a completely new evaluation. However, maintaining previous re-grading systems may reduce the incentive on the parties to complete the evaluation exercise as efficiently as possible.

(2) Cease the previous grading appeals system at the commencement of the exercise, but re-evaluate jobs as they change, so that all evaluations are up-to-date at the end of the exercise when the new salary structure is implemented. The common difficulty with this option is keeping up to date with changes.

(3) Cease the previous arrangements for grading appeals, but record all changes to jobs and effective dates. These jobs can then be subject to a new evaluation either immediately before or immediately after the new grading and pay structures are implemented. The evaluation of the changed job, whenever it is carried out, should be treated as an initial evaluation, so that the jobholder(s) has/have the right of appeal if they are unhappy with the outcomes.

(4) Give holders of changed jobs the opportunity to appeal the evaluation of the previous version of the job and get it updated through the appeals process, once the job evaluation results have been published. The problem with this option is that appeals are often regarded as a rather negative process and, if there are many, they may question the credibility of the exercise. Strictly speaking, also, a request for a re-

evaluation of a changed job is not an appeal and the affected jobholders may feel that they have lost their right of appeal.

Of the above options, (3) is the one generally regarded as least unsatisfactory and most commonly adopted.

6. Dealing with new and changed jobs after the initial JE exercise

- 6.1 Use of any job evaluation system should not cease after the initial exercise is complete and the results implemented through new grading and pay structures. One of the recognised advantages of a job evaluation system is that it provides a mechanism for dealing with new and changed jobs for as long as the scheme applies within the organisation.
- 6.2 Using the scheme to update the grading of jobs is important in order to avoid equal pay claims, where jobholders can argue that their new or changed job has not been evaluated under the JES.
- 6.3 It is standard JE practice to agree a procedure for 'desk-top' (or paper) evaluations, preferably by a small joint team of experienced evaluators, of proposed and new jobs on the basis of written job descriptions alone. This allows for a provisional evaluation score and thus grading and pay rate for the proposed job for the purposes of advertisement and recruitment.
- 6.4 It is recommended practice for all new jobs to be automatically put through the full evaluation process (review of job description, completion of questionnaire, Gauge interview) after a suitable 'bedding down' period for the new job, usually after 6 to 12 months
- 6.5 Where significant changes are proposed to jobs, for instance, as part of a re-structuring or job redesign process, then a similar procedure can be adopted – initial 'desk-top' evaluation of the changed job followed by a full evaluation after a suitable time elapse.
- 6.6 Even where a full evaluation of a new or changed job has been undertaken after the agreed time period, this should be treated as an initial evaluation. If a jobholder is unhappy with the outcome, s/he should have a right of appeal in the same way as other employees whose jobs were evaluated as part of the initial exercise [see Technical Note No. 9: *Appeals*]

7. Ongoing monitoring and maintenance

- 7.1 In order to avoid any challenges to out-dated evaluations, the Equality and Human Rights Commission recommends that organisations carry out ongoing monitoring and maintenance for their job evaluation schemes [EHRC: Equal Pay in Practice Checklist 19].
- 7.2 Apart from the initial monitoring by gender ethnicity or other characteristics of relative job movements up and down the organisational rank order, there should be ongoing monitoring of evaluation outcomes for new and changed jobs by gender and of the submission and outcomes of appeals. This is in addition to any regular job and pay audits as stated in paragraph 1.3. Any disparities should be investigated to check whether procedures need to be changed.
- 7.3 In order to avoid grading anomalies, whether gender-based or not, developing over time, it is recommended that organisations carry out regular reviews of evaluations, either as re-structuring exercises are carried out, or systematically, on department by department basis. Remember, those whose jobs increase in overall demand are likely to request a re-evaluation; but those whose jobs decrease in demand terms are unlikely to request any sort of review.
- 7.4 Organisations should also jointly review the local application of the scheme periodically (ideally every 5 to 10 years) to ensure that procedures remain appropriate. Any changes to procedure should be by joint agreement Local conventions should also be reviewed to ensure these remain relevant.
- 7.5 In order to maintain the scheme, it is essential to retain relevant expertise, in particular to have a team of trained job analysts/ facilitators, an evaluation/ validation panel and appeals panel. If there is a need to retrain evaluators or provide refresher training, the LGA holds a list of Consultants who could be called upon to do this.