

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE – 11th January 2012

Report of the Head of Strategic Support Lead Member: Councillor Stephen Hampson

Part A

ITEM 6 JOB EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Purpose of Report

To present the proposed arrangements with Leicestershire County Council (LCC) for carrying out the job evaluation, (JE), process for Charnwood Borough Council (CBC).

A report was presented to the Joint Consultative Committee, (JCC), on 14 September 2011. The Committee endorsed the proposed procedure subject to holding a further meeting with the trade unions to discuss and agree a number of specific details. This meeting has now taken place and agreement was reached on all points with the exception of the composition of the Moderating Panel (further information is given in section B of this report).

Recommendation

That the Committee approve the proposed JE procedure attached as Appendix A with a view to its adoption for CBC jobs at the earliest opportunity.

Reason

To ensure there is a consistent job evaluation process to minimise the risk of equal pay claims being lodged against the authority.

Policy Justification and Previous Decisions

Job evaluation is a key process in ensuring that statutory equal pay arrangements are in place.

Implementation Timetable including Future Decisions and Scrutiny

Once approved the new process will be implemented as soon as is practicable.

Report Implications

The following implications have been identified for this report.

Financial Implications

None.

Risk Management

The risks associated with the decision the Committee is asked to make and proposed actions to mitigate those risks are set out in the table below.

Risk Identified	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Management Actions Planned
The trade unions have not agreed the composition of the Moderating Panel, and this could lead to difficulties in agreeing JE results.	Possible	Moderate	Further discussions will be held with the trade unions, and the proposed composition of the Moderating Panel as set out in Appendix A will be operated on a trial basis for a year, and will be regularly reviewed.

Key Decision: No

Background Papers: None

Officer to contact: Adrian Ward, (01509) 634573
adrian.ward@charnwood.gov.uk

Part B

Background

1. The provision of HR services to CBC by LCC, which commenced in December 2010, included the job evaluation process. As both authorities use the Hay Scheme, evaluations of CBC jobs have now been carried out for some time by LCC but there are some variations between the actual procedures of each authority. Therefore, it is proposed that the procedure used by LCC be adopted for CBC but with the minor modifications which have been agreed between CBC and their trade union side (with the exception of the composition of the Moderating Panel as previously mentioned).

Work Undertaken

2. CBC implemented the Hay Scheme for job evaluation in 2008 but with backdating to 2006. Briefly, CBC's je procedures involved:
 - Management requests for evaluation. Directors were required to submit a copy of the job description and person specification for a job to Human Resources (HR) for initial evaluation and allocation of a grade. The Director of Change Management, a post which is no longer part of CBC's staffing structure, was responsible for signing off the outcome. If a Director did not accept an outcome, the job description and person specification could be amended and resubmitted. In addition to this a case for paying a Market Supplement could be made, or more information could be supplied to enable a review of the original outcome.
 - Employee requests for re-grading. This involved the employee providing a written submission to HR. HR was responsible for producing a summary of the position, including the employee's submission, for the Head of Service to uphold or reject a request for re-grading. If rejected, the employee could proceed to an appeal hearing which involved members and an Independent Officer. The employee could provide additional written evidence and be accompanied by a trade union representative or a work colleague. Service Managers, Strategic Directors and the Head of Service could also submit views and attend the hearing. The decision of the panel was final.
3. The JE Procedure which is being recommended at Appendix A comprises of the following:
 - Management requests for evaluation. Managers will submit a job description and person specification to HR for evaluation and allocation of grade. Outcomes will be referred to the Job Evaluation Moderating Panel (comprising of the LCC HR Business Partner and a trade union representative) for sign off. If a manager does not accept the outcome, the job description can be amended and resubmitted. (Requests for Market Premia would only be accepted if evidence of recruitment/retention difficulties were provided. This is a separate process to the job evaluation procedure.)

- Employee requests for re-grading. Employees will submit a revised Job Description Questionnaire (agreed with their manager) and attend a job evaluation panel, which comprises of HR Advisers, with their manager and a trade union representative if applicable. The panel evaluates the grade of the post. This could result in the grade going up, down or remaining unchanged. If an employee is dissatisfied with the outcome, they may complete a written submission and attend an appeal panel (which includes a trade union representative) with their manager and trade union representative if applicable. The decision of the panel is final.
4. Specific points to note about the proposed procedure are as follows;
- Pay protection – where jobs are downgraded as a result of the JE process, the jobholder’s salary level will be frozen for a three year period from the date of implementation of the new grade. This is in line with the Council’s salary protection arrangements. (Currently the arrangement for salary protection is for four years which was put in place initially when the new job evaluation process was introduced.)
 - Members will no longer be required to sit on grading appeal panels.
 - The introduction of a Disputes Procedure – this will provide a mechanism to resolve any disagreement between a manager and employee over the content of a job description.
 - The introduction of a Moderating Panel – this panel will check evaluation outcomes for consistency and it is proposed that the panel comprise of a senior LCC HR representative, (HR Business Partner), a CBC trade union representative and a Job Evaluation Technical Adviser. This panel composition has worked successfully in LCC for a number of years. The trade union side, however, would prefer to have two trade union representatives on the panel (which in turn would require a further HR representative to balance the panel numbers – it should be noted that the technical adviser is purely an advisory role and does not take part in the evaluation process). This, in their view, would bring more stability and consistency and continuity and a wider breath of experience and judgement. Further discussions will take place with the trade union side on this issue, and it is proposed that a trial period of one year will be undertaken with regular monitoring.

Next Steps

5. Once Committee approval has been received, the guidance will be made available to managers and employees by way of the Charnwood Intranet and CBC trade union representatives will be trained in the operation of the Moderating Panel.

Appendices

Appendix A: Job Evaluation Guidance

Job Evaluation Guidance

Contents

Purpose	<u>2</u>
Scope	2
Principles	3
Roles and Responsibilities	3
Background	3
The Make Up of Evaluation, Appeals and Moderating Panels	4
Review of Procedures	4
Employee Procedure	4
Job Evaluation Outcomes	4
Registration of Re-Evaluation Requests	5
Re-Evaluation Process	6
Notification of Outcomes – Employee Procedure	7
Management Procedure Key Principles	7
Downgrading	8
Grounds for Evaluation	8
New Jobs	9
Evaluation Panel – New Jobs	10
Substantial Change in Duties and Responsibilities	10
Effective Dates	10
Preparation for Evaluation – Substantial Change	10
Challenge to Exclusion/Inclusion	11
Evaluation Panel – Substantial Change	12
Notification of Outcomes – Management Procedure	12
Need for Grade Review Identified	12
Restructuring	12
Preparation for Evaluation – Restructuring	13
Appeals	13
Appendix 1 - Re-Evaluation Request Registration Form Employee Procedure	14
Appendix 2 - Response to Employee Request for Re-Evaluation (Exclusion)	15
Appendix 3 - Response to Employee Request for Re-Evaluation (Inclusion)	16
Appendix 4 - Comparator Form Employee Procedure	18
Appendix 5 - Registration Form Management Procedure	19
Appendix 6 - Job Dimensions Sheet Management Procedure	20
Appendix 7 - Dispute Procedure	21
Appendix 8 - How the Evaluation/Re-Evaluation Panel Will Be Run	23
Appendix 9 - Notification of Outcome (Example)	25
Appendix 10 - Appeal Submission to Evaluation Panel	26
Appendix 11 - Appeal Submission to Evaluation Panel (Example)	27
Appendix 12 - How an Appeal Panel will be run	28
Appendix 13 - Downgrading	30
Appendix 14 - Moderating Panel Terms of Reference	34

Purpose

The purpose of this guide is to help employees and managers understand more readily the procedure for evaluating jobs.

This guide sets out the principles and procedures whereby an employee or a manager can request a job to be evaluated / re-evaluated. The guide also explains the implementation rules that apply when a change in grade has been agreed.

Scope

The procedures apply to all permanent and fixed term posts covered by the conditions of service of the following bodies:-

- National Joint Council for Local Government Services Employees;
- Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Officers of Local Authorities;

The Employee Procedure does not apply to casual workers.

The Management Procedure does not normally apply to casual workers as these usually cover substantive jobs where there is already an evaluated grade. Where this is not the case, managers must consult their HR Team for advice on the most appropriate grade or rate of pay.

If you require support with completion of documentation or for attendance at an evaluation or appeal panel due to a disability, the following organisation could assist:-

Mosaic
2 Richard III Road
Leicester
LE3 5QT
Tel: (0116) 251-5565
Fax: (0116) 251-9969
Text direct: 18001 0116 2515565
Email: enquiries@mosaic1898.co.uk

Website: www.mosaic1898.co.uk Insert text here.

Information on the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme is available on CBC Intranet together with all other documentation associated with this procedure.

Principles

- The Council's commitment to equality of opportunity will be observed at all times during the operation of this policy and procedure. This will ensure that employees are treated fairly and without discrimination on the grounds of race, nationality, ethnic or national origins, sex, marital status or civil partnership, disability, age, sexual orientation, trade union membership or activity, political or religious belief, maternity or pregnancy, gender re-assignment and unrelated criminal conviction.
- Reasonable adjustments will be made for employees with a disability at any stage of this procedure.
- Through the application of the procedure, it can be demonstrated that job evaluation is conducted in a fair, lawful and consistent manner.

Roles and Responsibilities

Line managers	Are responsible for ensuring jobs are submitted for evaluation without delay following the agreement of a new or changed job profile, and in accordance with this procedure.
LCC Employee Service Centre	Act as the first point of contact for providing advice on job evaluation queries.
LCC HR Corporate Support	Are responsible for organising job evaluation panels, liaising with Line Managers and employees, and providing information on the progress of individual cases. Arranging job analyst's assistance where requested.
LCC HR Services	Are responsible for acting as job analysts to advise/assist with the completion of Job Description Questionnaires (JDQ's). Acting as evaluators on evaluation and appeal panels. Providing more detailed advice on the job evaluation process.
Trade Union or other Representative	Sit on Appeal Panels and Moderating Panels. Support their members to progress re-evaluation requests and appeals.

Background

The HAY Scheme was implemented in June 2008. This guide has been agreed with the recognised Trades Unions.

If you have any queries with regard to the operation of the procedures outlined in this document please contact the Employee Service Centre (Tel: 0116 3058815).

All the documents referred to are available from the CBC Intranet.

The Make Up of Evaluation, Appeal and Moderating Panels

Evaluation panels will comprise of representatives from Corporate HR Services who are trained evaluators – assisted by a Technical Adviser.

Appeal panels will comprise of two HR representatives and a Trade Union representative, all of whom must be trained evaluators. If sitting in an appeal capacity none of these must have been involved in the previous evaluation. A Technical Adviser will also be present.

The Moderating Panel will comprise of a Senior HR representative (usually the HR Business Partner), a Trade Union Representative and a Technical Adviser.

Review of Procedures

The operation of these procedures will be reviewed on an on-going basis

Employee Procedure

An employee or group cannot normally apply for re-evaluation if:-

- (a) their job has been evaluated or been to appeal in the previous 12 months, or
- (b) until 6 months after appointment to a job¹, or
- (c) if they are a casual worker

In exceptional circumstances, an employee will be able to apply for re-evaluation within 6 months of appointment if the content of the job has changed significantly since the offer of appointment, due for example to legislative changes or departmental restructuring.

Job Evaluation Outcomes

For the purpose of this procedure, if a re-evaluation or subsequent appeal results in a job being upgraded, the new salary will be paid with effect from the date of registration (i.e. the date the Re-evaluation Request Registration Form, is received by the Corporate HR Business Support Team.

Under this procedure jobs can be upgraded, remain the same or be downgraded.

Appendix 13 explains the implications of downgrading for an employee, the assistance a manager should provide to enable an employee who is downgraded to return to their former grade if this is possible and the support that is available for the employee.

Implementation of changes to grade will be deferred until the employee / group or management has had an opportunity to submit an appeal and the appeal panel has reviewed the evaluation. If no appeal is submitted within the specified timescale, then implementation will proceed.

¹ If the appointment is to a job within a group undergoing re-evaluation, the outcome will apply to the new employee.

Where a downgrading is implemented, the employee / group will be issued with the appropriate notice to terminate and re-engage (see Appendix 13) and protection will apply for a period of up to 3 years from the date of the new contract.

Associated terms and conditions of employment which are grade dependent, e.g. annual leave, periods of notice, disclosure of relationships, politically restricted jobs, overtime, etc. will also apply from the date of registration (upgrades), agreed backdating or end of protection (downgrades). In the case of overtime, this may entail recovery of overpayments if an employee is upgraded to SO1 or above.

Registration of Re-evaluation Requests

Each employee (including those forming part of a group request) must complete a Re-evaluation Request Registration Form and send it to the Corporate HR Business Support Team. Forms are also available on CBC Intranet

The grounds for re-evaluation are as follows:-

- (a) I believe there has been a substantial increase in the duties and responsibilities of my job**
- (b) I believe that a comparable job is more highly graded.**

A substantial increase is concerned more with the degree of responsibility attached to a job than the quantity of work. For example, if a supervisor became responsible for 1 or 2 additional staff, it would only be regarded as a potential case for re-evaluation of the supervisor's job if these staff also brought a new function with them. If they were only recruited to deal with an increased workload, this would not be regarded as a substantial change.

A job which has some element of financial responsibility added to it where none previously existed could be a case for re-evaluation, e.g. a clerical job undertaking reception, telephone and typing duties assuming responsibility for an Imprest account. However, an increase in a manager's budget due to inflation, increased staffing costs etc is unlikely to affect the grade of their job.

A comparable job on a higher grade may be in the employee's own service area or within another service in the Council. The employee will have to demonstrate their belief that their job is comparable in terms of the level of duties and responsibilities they carry out to those attached to the comparator job.

It is recommended that if an employee / group has Trade Union representation that they should be included in discussions re: the pros and cons of submitting a Re-evaluation Request Registration Form.

When the Re-evaluation Request Registration Form is received by the Corporate HR Business Support Team it will be checked to ensure that the employee or group submitting it is not excluded as described in the Employee Procedure. If they are excluded they will be notified accordingly.

Re-Evaluation Process

If the employee or group is not excluded, the Corporate HR Business Support

Team will notify them of the requirements for processing their re-evaluation request, including the submission of a completed Job Description Questionnaire (JDQ) and other relevant information as given in Appendix 3. (A JDQ enables employees to provide more detailed information about their job than is contained in a job description.) The HR Advisory Team will be sent a copy of the notification letter.

Grounds for re-evaluation – (a) – where an employee believes there has been a substantial increase in the duties and responsibilities of their job.

The employee or group will be asked to complete a JDQ and highlight on it precisely what the significant changes in requirements and duties are. The JDQ must be signed off by their line manager and counter-signed by their Head of Service to confirm accuracy and returned to the Corporate HR Business Support Team. For group appeals management must also indicate the names / job numbers of all those they deem to be included in the group.

Grounds for re-evaluation – (b) – where an employee believes that a comparable job is more highly graded.

The employee or group will be asked complete a JDQ, to ensure the information about their job is up to date, and a Comparator Form providing full details of the grounds for comparison and the comparator job being used.

If the comparators are within the employing service area then management will be asked to comment and sign off the Comparator Form in addition to the JDQ.

Guidance notes on the completion of the JDQ are available on CBC Intranet whilst trained Job Analysts will be available to offer guidance to both managers and employees.

The JDQ must be agreed by all the signatories in order to proceed to re- evaluation. If the employee / group and service management cannot agree on the content of the JDQ then the Dispute Procedure will apply. Where there is no disagreement, management should sign off the JDQ within 20 working days of receipt from the employee.

Agreed JDQs must be returned to the Corporate HR Business Support Team within 6 calendar months of submitting the Re-Evaluation Request Registration Form. Where the Dispute Procedure is invoked, a further 3 calendar months will be allowed. If these timescales are not met, employees still wishing to pursue a re-evaluation request will be required to submit a new Re-evaluation Request Registration Form. Any subsequent upgrading will be applied from the date of receipt of this Registration Form, not the date the original Registration Form was received.

The agreed JDQ and Comparator Form (where applicable) will be submitted to the job evaluation panel for re-evaluation. The employee / group, their representatives (where applicable) and management should attend the panel to explain the job in more detail and answer questions from the panel. In a group situation, no more than 4 job holders (plus TU representative, where applicable) can attend the evaluation. At least 10 working days' notice will be given to the employee / group and management of the arrangements for the panel and both parties provided with copies of all documentation submitted. Further information is available on How the Evaluation/Re-Evaluation Panel Will Be Run in Appendix 8.

If an employee has submitted a JDQ to their manager for agreement but

subsequently leaves the Council's employment, their request for re-evaluation may still be considered under this procedure.

Notification of Outcomes – Employee Procedure

The employee / group and service management will be notified in writing of the outcome – this will include reasons and an overall score. Notification will be within 10 working days of the re-evaluation panel meeting (unless paragraph (g) in Appendix 8 applies)

An example of an 'Notification of Outcome' is provided. A covering letter will also be sent, detailing the appeal process (see sub heading 'Appeals') and enclosing an Appeal Form.

If no appeal is registered by either side within 20 working days, the Corporate HR Business Support Team will notify the manager that any change in grading can now be implemented. The manager must then complete a Variation to Contract form and submit this to the Employee Service Centre.

Management Procedure Key Principles

In order to maintain the integrity of the Council's JE Scheme and to ensure consistency and fairness of application it is imperative that all jobs identified as being covered by the Grounds for Evaluation are submitted for evaluation as speedily as possible.

When preparing documentation managers must consider the requirements of the job rather than the qualifications / experience or performance of the job holder(s). This is particularly important where the job profile or JDQ is applicable to more than one job holder.

All jobs need to be considered in the context of the wider structure – managers need to think about where and how the job fits into the hierarchy (both vertically and horizontally), the job's role in service provision, and any foreseeable changes which will affect the job.

NB The creation of new jobs or any change in grading has an impact on section budgets – both upgrades and the cost of protection for downgraded employees.

Unlike new jobs, existing jobs submitted for re-evaluation are likely to have job holders in place. Managers must, therefore, be mindful of the need to inform job holders about the procedure and the potential implications for job holders, and involve them, and their representatives (if appropriate) at all stages.

Managers must be mindful of equality issues and fairness when amending the duties and responsibilities of jobs, particularly where more than one person could be affected. If a re-evaluation results in an upgrade / downgrade of more than one grade, this suggests a significant change to the job role. The manager must discuss with HR and senior management how to proceed, i.e. consider dealing with the job as a new job open to competition rather than slotting in the existing job holder.

All potential grade movements at Head of Service level will be reported to Senior Management Team at an early stage.

Downgrading

Under this procedure jobs can be downgraded as well as remaining the same or being upgraded.

Managers may be concerned about the impact on morale of potential downgradings, but this should not delay submitting the job(s) for re-evaluation. However, prior to submitting a job(s) the manager should

consider whether it may be possible to take positive action to enhance a job. This should not be at the expense of appropriate structures / duties. Suitable opportunities for enhancement could be due to:-

- A vacancy existing – presenting the opportunity for a redistribution of the duties of that job
- A new set of duties / new type of work is available
- Another job has excessive duties which could be redistributed without affecting the grade of that job

In considering whether it is possible to enhance a particular job, issues to take into account include:-

- Whether the employee is competent to undertake the duties concerned
- Fairness – where there is more than one employee affected. It could not be considered where a job occupied by a group of employees is likely to be downgraded.
- Where action to enhance would be to the detriment of other employees in the department/Council.

Once the options have been explored and implemented, where appropriate, the enhanced job must be submitted for re-evaluation.

Appendix 13 explains the implications of downgrading for employees, the assistance managers should provide to enable employees who are downgraded to return to their former grade and the support that is available to them.

Grounds For Evaluation or Re-evaluation - Managers

There are 4 grounds for a manager to request an evaluation or re-evaluation:

1. The creation of a New job
2. A Substantial Change in duties and responsibilities
3. The need for a Grade Review has been identified and
4. A Restructuring.

New Jobs:

Where, subject to appropriate approvals, a new job has been created.

Substantial Change:

Where a change in the duties and responsibilities of a job (increase or decrease) has been identified.

A substantial change is concerned more with the degree of responsibility attached to a job than the quantity of work. For example, if a supervisor became responsible for 1 or 2 additional staff, it would only be regarded as a *potential* case for re-evaluation of the supervisor's job if these staff brought a new function with them. If they were only recruited to deal with an increased workload, this would be not regarded as a substantial change.

A job for example which has some element of financial responsibility added to it where none previously existed could be a case for re-evaluation, e.g. a clerical job undertaking reception, telephone and typing duties assuming responsibility for an Imprest account. However, a

manager's budget being increased due to inflation, increased staffing costs etc is unlikely to affect the grade of the job.

Need for Grade Review Identified:

This will usually arise due to concerns management have as to the appropriateness of the current grade of the job. The need for review may also be identified by a JE Panel when a job has been put forward as a Comparator under the Employee Procedure. In both cases, management will review the duties of the job and submit it for re-evaluation within 3 months of the need for the review being identified.

Restructuring:

This will usually be where part or all of a team / group is being reviewed and which may include the creation of a new job(s) and / or changes to existing job(s).

For ease of reference the 'Grounds for Evaluation' are now explained in more detail. In all cases, a Registration Form must be completed by the Manager before passing documentation for evaluation to the Corporate HR Business Support Team.

New Jobs

This procedure does not apply where the new job is **identical** i.e. job profile (job description and person specification) to an existing job which has already been evaluated, e.g. Environmental Health Officer, Street Warden. Corporate HR will be able to provide advice.

Effective Date

The grade will apply from the date of appointment to the job

Preparation for Evaluation

In all cases a structure chart must be submitted with the other documentation requested.

The Manager can either submit the new job profile and Job Dimensions Sheet or complete a JDQ.

The Job Profile/Dimensions Sheet and/or the JDQ must be counter-signed by a Head of Service to confirm accuracy before being submitted to the Corporate HR Business Support Team together with a completed Registration Form

Evaluation Panel – New Jobs

The Manager should attend the evaluation panel to explain the job in more detail and answer questions from the Panel.

The Manager will be notified by email of the outcome within 10 working days of the panel meeting, unless paragraph (g) in Appendix 8 applies. Jobs will be referred to the Moderating Panel as appropriate

An example of a Notification of Outcome is provided. A covering email will also be sent, detailing the appeal process, attaching an appeal form.

Substantial Change in Duties and Responsibilities

In the majority of cases where Managers identify substantial changes there will be job holders in place. Managers must, therefore, be mindful of the need to inform job holders about the procedure and the implications for those job holders, involving them, and their representatives (if appropriate) at all stages.

Effective Dates

If the job is **upgraded** and there is a job holder in the job the new salary will be paid with effect from the date identified by management when the substantial change occurred, i.e. the implementation date can be retrospective. Where the job is vacant, the new grade will apply from the date an appointment is made.

If the job is **downgraded**, and there is currently a job holder, implementation will be deferred until the employee / group has had an opportunity to submit an appeal and the appeal panel has reviewed the evaluation. If the outcome remains the same following appeal, the employee / group will be issued with the appropriate notice to terminate and re-engage (Appendix 13) and protection will apply for a period of up to 3 years from the date of the new contract. Where the job is vacant, the new grade will apply from the date of appointment.

Preparation for Evaluation – Substantial Change

In all cases a structure chart must be submitted with the other documentation required.

The Manager can either submit a revised job profile and Job Dimensions Sheet or complete a JDQ and highlight the significant changes in requirements and duties.

Where the Manager(s) identifies the potential for downgrading they should ensure they consider the measures available to enhance the current job prior to submitting the paperwork for evaluation.

The Manager(s) will indicate the names / job numbers of all those they consider the re-evaluation will apply to. This may not be a particular issue if the numbers of job holders are small but can be more complicated for jobs covering larger numbers of staff. The employees affected can initially challenge their inclusion / exclusion (see below).

The Job Profile / Dimension Sheet and/or the JDQ and list of job holders, where applicable, must be counter-signed by the job holders and then by a member of the service Management Team to confirm accuracy before being submitted to the Corporate HR Business Support Team together with a completed Registration Form.

The JDQ must be agreed by all the signatories in order to proceed to re-evaluation. If the employee / group and service management cannot agree on the content of the JDQ then the Dispute Procedure will apply. This will be amended as appropriate if the dispute relates to Job Profile / Dimensions Sheet.

Challenge to Exclusion/Inclusion

If a Manager has identified a substantial change which could result in an upgrading of the job a challenge may come from employees who have been excluded from the list of those covered.

If a Manager has identified a substantial change which could result in a downgrading of the job a challenge may come from employees who have been included in the list of those covered.

In both cases, the procedure is the same. In order to ensure that employees who have been excluded / included are able to challenge their exclusion / inclusion, the draft list of Job Numbers / Designations will be

circulated within the department and also provided to the Trade Unions (with names). The employees involved must write stating their reasons why they feel they should be included / excluded from the list. This must then be submitted to a nominated Service Management Team representative who will liaise with the appropriate person in HR to determine whether the original list submitted by management is correct or whether it should be amended on the basis of the challenge. This will be undertaken within 20 working days.

The employees who have submitted the challenge will be notified of the decision by the Senior Management Team representative within 10 working days. There will be a right of appeal to the Corporate HR Manager.

Evaluation Panel – Substantial Change

Where there are no job holders, the Manager should attend the evaluation panel to explain the job in more detail and answer questions from the panel.

Where job holders are identified they, their representatives (where applicable) and management should attend the panel to explain the job in more detail answering any questions. In a group situation, no more than 4 job holders (plus TU representative, where applicable) can attend the evaluation. At least 10 working days' notice will be given to the employee / group and management of the arrangements for the panel and both parties provided with copies of all documentation submitted. Further information about how the session will be run is detailed at Appendix 8.

Notification of Outcomes – Management Procedure

Management and the job holders affected will be notified by email or in writing of the outcome – this will include reasons and an overall score. Notification will be done within 10 working days of the panel meeting unless paragraph (g) of Appendix 8. Jobs will be referred to the Moderating Panel before the outcome is released in accordance with the agreed process.

An example of a Notification of Outcome is provided. A covering email or letter will also be sent, detailing the appeal process and enclosing an appeal form.

If no appeal is registered by either side within 20 working days, the Corporate HR Business Support Team will notify the manager that any change in grading can now be implemented. The manager must then complete and submit a Variation to Contract Form

Need for Grade Review Identified

Management may identify the need to review a job(s) because of changes that may have occurred which may have implications on the current grade. The need for review may also be identified by a JE Panel when a job has been put forward as a Comparator under the Employee Procedure.

In both cases, it may be the case that jobs have been under or over-graded. Management will be required to review the duties of the job and submit it for re-evaluation within 3 months of the need for review being identified.

The processes and implementation rules detailed for **Substantial Changes** will apply but there will not be a need to identify the changes, provided the documents submitted accurately reflect the duties undertaken and requirements of the job.

Restructuring

Corporate HR should be informed in the early stages of any restructuring in order to discuss and advise on potential implications changes may have on jobs, grades or structures.

Effective date - the effective date for both upgrades and downgrades will be consistent and will be determined by management, subject to member agreement and appropriate notice provisions, where applicable.

Preparation for Evaluation - Restructuring

In all cases a structure chart must be submitted with the other documentation required. It may be appropriate to provide both pre-restructuring and post-restructuring charts to assist the evaluation panels.

Employees appointed following a restructuring of their team/section/unit will have no right to request a re-evaluation or appeal against the grade of their job until such time as six months has elapsed. Any successful re-grading after this time will be backdated as appropriate.

Appeals

If the employee / group or Manager is not satisfied with the outcome, they have the right to ask for a review of the decision. The deadline for submitting an appeal is within 20 working days of receipt of the Notification of Outcome. See the Submission to Appeal Panel form. Both parties (where applicable) will be able to respond in writing within 20 working days of receipt to the other party's submission before the appeal is arranged.

The appeal panel will consider the employee / group's or Manager's written submission of evidence which supports their view that one or more of the factors detailed in the Evaluation - Notification of Outcome has not been fully taken into account.

The employee / group (except in the case of new jobs) and their representatives (where applicable) and Manager should attend the panel to explain why they believe that one or more of the factors has not been fully taken into account and to answer questions from the appeal panel. In a group situation, no more than 4 job holders (plus TU representative, where applicable) can attend the appeal. At least 10 working days' notice will be given to the employee / group and management of the arrangements for the appeal panel and both parties provided with copies of all documentation submitted (See Appendix 12 – How The Appeal Panel Will Be Run).

The appeal will be heard within 2 months of receipt of the complete appeal submission. However, if the outcome of the re-evaluation is a down-grading then the appeal must be heard as a priority within that period. Implementation of protection will be postponed until the outcome of the appeal is known. Where the outcome remains the same, i.e. a down-grading, the employee / group will be issued with the appropriate notice to terminate and re-engage and protection will apply for a period of up to 3 years from the date of the new contract.

The employee / group and manager will be notified in writing within 5 working days of the appeal panel's decision. Where the appeal panel decides to change the evaluation their amendments to the Notification of Outcome form will be highlighted.

It is the manager's responsibility to notify the Employee Service Centre to implement any change in grading by way of termination and re-engagement.

There will be no further right of appeal.

I wish to register a request for my job to be re-evaluated:

I am / am not registering as part of a group (delete as appropriate)

(for group appeals – each person must complete and sign a form)

(PLEASE COMPLETE IN BLOCK CAPITALS)

FULL NAME/TITLE (Mr/Mrs/Ms):

HOME ADDRESS:

PAYROLL REFERENCE NO:

JOB TITLE (if known)

EMPLOYING SERVICE AREA:

GROUP/SECTION/TEAM:

WORK ADDRESS:

WORK EMAIL (if available):

CONTACT TELEPHONE NO:

Please give details of your grounds for requesting re-evaluation by ticking the one that applies:

I / we believe there has been a substantial increase in the duties and responsibilities of my job, or

I / we believe that a comparable job is more highly graded.

Signed:

Date:

I understand that by signing this form I am accepting the fact that the Panel may decide that the grade for my job could be downgraded, remain the same, or be upgraded. I also understand that my salary and associated terms and conditions could change dependent on the outcome.

To be completed by Corporate HR Business Support Team:

Date received: Date of Previous Evaluation:

Excluded: Yes/No Evaluation No:

Appendix 2 – Response to Employee Request for Re-Evaluation - Exclusion

Dear

RE-EVALUATION REQUEST

I acknowledge receipt of your re-evaluation request registration form.

Unfortunately I am not able to progress your request at present for the following reason:-

Either

Your job has been evaluated within 12 months of the date of this request

Or

You have been in this job for less than 6 months of the date of this request and your job is not part of a group awaiting an outcome to a previously submitted request for re-evaluation.

You will be able to re-submit your request when these grounds for exclusion no longer apply.

Yours sincerely

Human Resources Adviser

Appendix 3 – Response to Employee Request for Re-Evaluation - Inclusion

Dear

RE-EVALUATION REQUEST

I acknowledge receipt of your re-evaluation request form.

Either

You have indicated that you are requesting a re-evaluation on the grounds of substantial change in the duties and responsibilities of your job. You are now required to complete a new or revised Job Description Questionnaire (JDQ), detailing precisely what the changes are.

This must be agreed and signed off by your line manager and counter-signed by a member of your Service Management Team to confirm accuracy. If you are appealing as part of a group, please attach a list of the names of employees deemed to be included in the group.

A blank JDQ and guidance notes on how to complete it are enclosed. These documents are also on CBC Intranet and additional paper copies are available from LCC Corporate HR Business Support Team.

Or

You have indicated that you are requesting a re-evaluation on the grounds that you believe a comparable job is more highly graded. You are now required to complete a new or revised Job Description Questionnaire (JDQ), and a Comparator Form, providing details of the grounds for comparison and the comparator being used.

The JDQ must be agreed and signed off by your line manager and counter-signed by a member of your Service Management Team to confirm accuracy. The Comparator Form must also be signed off by your line manager, who will be required to comment on any comparator job(s) you put forward within your own department.

A blank JDQ and guidance notes on its completion, and a Comparator Form are enclosed. These documents are also on CBC Intranet together with information on the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme and additional paper copies are available from the Corporate HR Business Support Team.

Trained Job Analysts are available to offer guidance to employees and managers on the completion of the JDQ. Please contact the Corporate HR Business Support Team if you wish to be put in touch with a Job Analyst.

Should you and your Manager be unable to agree the content of the JDQ then the Dispute Procedure detailed under Appendix 7 of the JE procedure will apply.

The agreed JDQ and Comparator Form (where applicable) should be returned to me byI will then contact you about arrangements for you to attend the job evaluation panel meeting where your job will be considered.

Please note if you do not return the agreed JDQ by the above date, then you will need to submit a new re-evaluation request registration form. Any subsequent upgrading will be applied from the date of this registration form and not the original.

If you have any questions or would like any further information, please contact the Corporate HR Business Support Team.

Yours sincerely,

Human Resources Adviser

Appendix 4 – Comparator Form Employee Procedure

JE Ref No:

Please provide details of the job(s) that are being used as comparator(s).

Please provide details of the grounds for comparison:

Signed:.....Job Title:.....

Date:.....

Manager’s comments (please use a continuation sheet if necessary)

Signed:.....;Job Title

Date:.....

Appendix 5 – Registration Form Management Procedure

This form must accompany any JDQ or job profile / dimensions sheet requiring evaluation. All documentation should be sent to the Corporate HR Business Support Team.

A DETAILS OF JOB TO BE EVALUATED

Ref No: <i>(leave blank)</i>			
Department		Section	
Job Title		Existing Grade	
Job Holder(s)			
Please tick the box to confirm JDQ / job profile etc has been agreed by the department and any job holder(s)			

B REASON FOR EVALUATION (tick one box only)

New Job	<input type="checkbox"/>	Substantial Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Re-structuring	<input type="checkbox"/>	Need for Grade Review	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------	--------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------	----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

C JOB(S) SUPERSEDED OR MADE OBSOLETE BY THIS JOB (continue overleaf)

Job Title & Ref. Number		Grade	
-------------------------	--	-------	--

D IS MANAGER (AND JOBHOLDER WHERE APPLICABLE) TO ATTEND? (tick box if Yes)

If Yes, please give name(s) and contact number(s)

Contact details of Manager submitting job:-

Name:	
Designation:	
Telephone No:	
Email:	
Contact Details of HR Adviser (where applicable):	

Appendix 6 – Job Dimensions Sheet Management Procedure

This sheet should be part of the documentation submitted to the evaluation panel in all cases where a JDQ has **not** been completed.

JOB TITLE:.....

SERVICE:.....

BRANCH/SECTION:.....

No. of employees supervised directly

Total no. of employees responsible for

Budgets managed (average pa)

Revenue

Capital

External (grants etc)

Annual value of other financial responsibility e.g. contracts, imprest account

Working conditions – other than normally acceptable office environment

- extent and type of physical effort required to perform job
- frequency and type of work environment encountered

Please attach structure chart highlighting job's position within department/service/branch/section.

Appendix 7 – Dispute Procedure

- 1 This sets out the process to follow in the event of there being a failure to agree the content of a JDQ. The procedure will be modified as appropriate for disputes in relation to Job Profile / Dimension Sheet and Comparators.
- 2 All JDQ's need to be signed off by the employee(s), their line manager and then the senior service manager (usually member of Management Team) before being evaluated. The JDQ is an important part of the JE process and should be an accurate reflection of the job being presented for evaluation. There are guidance notes available on how to complete a JDQ plus there are resources available to employees to complete the form.
- 3 The job profile should be available as a reference tool. If these have changed then the employee(s) and their manager should ensure they are updated as part of the process.
- 4 Where a JDQ is agreed by the employee(s) and the line manager but not the senior manager then the measures detailed below can be put in place quickly to facilitate discussion and consideration of the issues.
- 5 The employee / group of employees should be advised within 15 working days of the dispute clarifying what the issues of disagreement are or where the JDQ is not thought to be accurate.
- 6 A meeting may help to go through the JDQ and the information in the job profile in detail. This should involve the employee or the group of employees and their representative.
- 7 There are trained job analysts available to all employees who need to complete a JDQ. The role of the analyst is to help the individual think about all aspects of their job role and to make sure they complete the form correctly in line with the guidance all employees have to adhere to. Analysts will also help with teasing out key duties and presenting information in an appropriate and clear way to help and assist the panel to properly evaluate the relative size of the job. If an analyst is required because the senior manager disagrees with some aspect of the JDQ, then it is helpful for the analyst to participate in a three way meeting between the employee and their representative, the analyst and the senior manager (usually not the line manager). As best practice, it is recommended that this takes place within 15 working days of the dispute being notified to the employee / group of employees.
- 8 If the job analyst involvement does not achieve an agreement on the JDQ and other communication channels have been exhausted then both JDQs (management's and the appellant's) should be submitted to the panel for evaluation and both sides will be asked to expand on the reasons for the differences at the re-evaluation panel.
- 9 In many cases, the issues of concern may not have a material effect on the outcome of the grade and this will be reflected on the Notification of Outcome form.
- 10 Where the issues are deemed to be the difference between one grade and another then the panel must refer the JDQs back to the employing service area and ask for clarity on the specific issues influencing the grade differential. Examples of specific issues are duties undertaken, supervision given / received, financial dimensions, qualification level or level of experience required.

- 11 If there is still a difference in grade when the panel has taken into account the specific issues then management's JDQ will determine the grade and the reasons in the Notification of Outcome will make this clear.
- 12 Where there is a difference in grade and the employee decides to pursue an appeal they can only use the rationale from management's JDQ as the appeal panel will not consider the rationale for the employee / group(s) JDQ.

Appendix 8 – How the Evaluation/Re-evaluation Panel Will Be Run

1 Format of Panel

- 1.1 Where applicable, the employee / group (or manager under the Management Procedure) will be invited to attend and may be accompanied by a Trade Union representative or work colleague.
- 1.2 A representative from management will also attend. If she/he is not the employee's / group's line manager, they may be accompanied by the line manager or another manager who is familiar with the job. **It is important that both sides plus their representatives, where applicable, attend the re-evaluation panel.**
- 1.3 It is recognised that attendance at a formal meeting of any kind can cause an employee / group / Manager to feel anxious or unsure. The re-evaluation panel will therefore be conducted as informally as possible (within the constraints of the procedure) to enable those present to feel comfortable and reassured. The Chair of the panel will give careful consideration to the layout of the room in which the panel is held and ensure that the tone of the proceedings is courteous and non-threatening.
- 1.4 At the beginning of the session, the Chair will introduce the panel members and outline the procedure to be followed. Either the employee / group (or their Trade Union representative / work colleague) or management's representative may ask the Chair for a brief adjournment at any time during the session e.g. to consider new or complex information or to restore composure.
- 1.5 The order of the session will be as follows:-
 - (a) The Chair will invite management's representative to provide an overview of the departmental context of the job and any specific local information relevant to it. The Panel may ask questions for clarification.
 - (b) The Chair will invite the employee / group and Trade Union representative / work colleague to expand on the overview, JDQ and other relevant paperwork. The Panel may ask questions for clarification.
 - (c) The Chair will ask management's representative or the line manager if there is any further information on the JDQ, etc. that they feel is relevant. The Panel may ask questions.
 - (d) The Chair will then ask if there is anything further either the employee / group or management wish to raise which has been prompted by the Panel's line of questioning.
 - (e) The Chair will then ask if there is anything further either the employee / group or management wish to raise which has been prompted by the Panel's line of questioning.
 - (f) The employee / group, Trade Union representative / work colleague, management's representative and the line manager (if applicable) will all withdraw.
 - (g) The Panel will evaluate the job on the basis of the information provided and prepare reasons for their decision to be included in the Notification of Outcome.
 - (h) If following the submissions the Panel feels that there are areas which require additional clarification they can choose to adjourn and reconvene when the information is available. In

this case, the employee / group and management will be notified that a decision has been deferred and the timescale within which it will be reviewed.

Appendix 9 – Notification of Outcome Example

JE Ref Number CE/1/E

Job Title Administration Manager

Evaluators John Smith (Chair)

Job Holder Ann Black

June Brown, Sheila White

Service Housing Services

Date of Evaluation 1/1/11

Service Representative Tony Morris

Prepared By Pet Rose

Current Grade/Job Family Level

Grade P0 3

HAY LINE and Points Score		Factor Level Description
KNOW HOW	E I+ 3 264	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requires a thorough combination of applied and theoretical knowledge probably gained by a degree and substantial relevant experience ▪ Co-ordinating provision of 3 sub-functions – admin, IT and HR, timescales up to and sometimes beyond 1 year ▪ Managing large team, some negotiating skills required
PROBLEM SOLVING	D+ 3 87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reviewing procedures and revising where necessary. ▪ Formulating departmental IT strategy within corporate framework ▪ Dealing with differing situations requiring identification and selection of solutions through the application of acquired knowledge
ACCOUNTABILIT	D I+ P 115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Job is substantially covered by established procedures, but has considerable freedom in choice of action to take. Subject to managerial control, makes contribution to annual/longer term determination of resources ▪ Accountable for section budget of £300,000
Additional Work Elements		▪ N/A
Total	466	Grade P0 3

Appendix 10 – Appeal Submission to Evaluation Panel

Name:
Job Title:
JE Ref Number:
Date of Evaluation:
Evaluation Outcome:
Current Job Family level (where applicable):

Please identify below the Factor Level Description(s) shown on the Job Evaluation Notification of Outcome with which you disagree. Please state your views on why you consider the job evaluation has not fully taken into account these aspects of the job.

Signed:.....Job
Title:.....

Date:.....

Response (please use a continuation sheet if necessary)

Signed:.....Job
Title:.....

Date:.....

Appendix 11 – Appeal Submission To Evaluation Panel Example

Name: Ann Black
Job Title: Administration Manager
JE Ref Number: CE//E
Date of Evaluation: /////
Evaluation Outcome: No change to current grade PO 3
Current Job Family level (where applicable): N/A

Please identify below the Factor Level Description(s) shown on the Job Evaluation Notification of Outcome with which you disagree. Please state your views on why you consider the job evaluation has not fully taken into account these aspects of the job.

KNOW HOW – I feel insufficient credit has been given to the planning and co-ordinating elements of my job. I have to manage teams of people working in three different disciplines, each of which provide support services vital to the efficient operation of the department. I accept that some of the timescales I work to are annual ones, in particular with regard to my budgetary responsibilities. However a key part of my job is to plan, develop and deliver an IT strategy to ensure that information technology efficiently supports the Department in the delivery of its services. This requires me to be looking at what the Department's requirements are likely to be some two or three years ahead and planning how these requirements will be met. I therefore feel I should score at least one level higher than the current evaluation.

Signed ...Ann Black... Job Title: Administration Manager

Date

Response (please use a continuation sheet if necessary)

I agree with the contents of this submission.

Signed:...John Brown Job Title: Head of Service

Date:.....

Appendix 12 – How an Appeal Panel will be Run

1 Appeal Panel

- I.1 The manager and the employee / group (where applicable) will be invited to attend and may be accompanied by a Trade Union representative or work colleague.
- I.2 It is important that where there is disagreement between both sides then they (plus their representatives, where applicable) should attend the appeal panel as there is no further right of appeal.**
- 1.3 It is recognised that attendance at a formal meeting of any kind can cause an employee / group/manager to feel anxious or unsure. The appeal panel will therefore be conducted as informally as possible (within the constraints of the procedure) to enable those present to feel comfortable and reassured. The Chair of the panel will give careful consideration to the layout of the room in which the panel is held and ensure that the tone of the proceedings is courteous and non-threatening.
- 1.4 At the beginning of the session, the Chair will introduce the panel members and outline the procedure to be followed. Either the employee / group (or their trade union representative / work colleague) or management's representative may ask the Chair for a brief adjournment at any time during the session e.g. to consider new or complex information or to restore composure.
- 1.5 If an employee / group has initiated the appeal, they will go first and management will respond, if there is any disagreement. If management have initiated the appeal they will go first and the employee / group (where applicable) will respond, if there is any disagreement. If both parties are in agreement on the submission then step b) can be omitted.
 - a. The Chair will invite the initiating party to expand on their written appeal submission. The Panel may ask questions for clarification.
 - b. The Chair will invite the responding party to expand on their written response to the appeal submission (if applicable). The Panel may ask questions for clarification.
 - c. The Chair will then ask if there is anything further either the employee / group or management wish to raise in case the Panel's questions have made them think of anything further.
 - d. The employee / group, Trade Union representative / work colleague, management's representative and line manager (if applicable) will all withdraw.
 - e. The Appeal Panel will re-evaluate the job on the basis of the information provided and prepare reasons for their decision to be included in the Notification of Appeal Outcome.
 - f. The outcome will be released within 5 working days unless, following the submissions, the Appeal Panel feel that there are areas which require additional clarification. If the Panel choose to adjourn and reconvene when the information is available, the employee / group and management will be notified that a decision has been deferred and the timescale within which it will be reviewed.

Appendix 13 – Downgrading

1 What it means

- 1.1 Your job is downgraded if the maximum salary point of your new grade is below your current salary point.

2 Red-circling explained

- 2.1 Red-circling means that your salary level, and associated terms and conditions, are 'frozen' for a three year period from the date of implementation until the substantive salary overtakes the 'frozen' salary or the end of the three year period, whichever is the soon. At that point the substantive salary and associated terms and conditions will apply.

3 Termination and Re-Engagement

- 3.1 It is necessary to terminate the existing Contract of Employment in these circumstances, and offer re-engagement on a new contract which includes the revised substantive grade of the job and protection arrangements. This is because to change the existing contract without agreement would be likely to be regarded by the courts as a breach of contract.
- 3.2 The authority recognises that termination and re-engagement can be distressing for employees but has to comply with the law and will ensure full support / communication is provided whilst going through the process.

4 Pensions Implications

- 4.1 The Local Government Pension Scheme is a final pay scheme and under normal circumstances pension benefits are calculated on the best of the last three years pensionable earnings, each year ending on either the last day of employment or the anniversary of that day.
- 4.2 When an employee's change of contract requires a reduction in pay, the Pension Regulations provide two options:
- **To opt to have your benefits based on the average of any three consecutive years in the last 10 years (ending on a 31st March).**
 - **To opt out of the Pension Scheme** whilst on the higher pensionable pay and preserve those benefits, index linked, until retirement age. You can then commence your second period of pensionable service, on the lower earnings, and continue contributing to that second pension until either retirement age or when your circumstances change and you return to your former grade level when you could elect to combine your two periods of employment.

YOU DO NOT NEED TO CHOOSE NOW – WE WILL WRITE TO YOU AGAIN TOWARDS THE END OF THE PROTECTION PERIOD.

If you do want to discuss your options in the meantime then contact the Pensions Section on:-

0116 305 8374 or
0116 305 7654 or
0116 305 6944

5 Sources of Advice and Assistance

- 5.1 Advice, assistance and support in dealing with being downgraded is available from a number of sources:-
- Your line manager
 - LCC Corporate HR
 - Amica (Employee Welfare Support)
 - Trade Union
 - Pensions Section (as detailed above)
- 5.2 In particular, your immediate **line manager** will know most about your circumstances and be able to provide support in coming to terms with the situation and taking action to address it (see paragraphs 6 and 7 below).
- 5.3 Alternatively, the **Employee Welfare Service** enables you to talk to someone, in strictest confidence, outside of the immediate situation. This service is available to all employees and offers one to one counselling, information and advice. The service can also put you in contact with a range

of other specialist agencies such as money advice, health and welfare advisory services.

Employee Welfare Service Tel no/contact details

5.4 Your **Trade Union** is a further source of advice and assistance.

6 Assistance to Enable Employees whose Jobs are Downgraded to Return to their Former Grade

6.1 Meetings to Discuss Support

6.1.1 Each employee whose job has been downgraded will be offered the opportunity to discuss the support measures outlined below with her/his line manager. This discussion will take place during routine one-to-one meetings e.g. appraisal, performance development review, supervision, or by the manager arranging a meeting specifically for this purpose.

6.1.2 It is not considered appropriate that Trade Union representatives should be present at the meetings referred to above, as these are confidential one-to-one sessions. However, if there are still unresolved issues arising out of these meetings, an employee may request a special meeting with their manager and may ask for their trade union representative to attend this.

6.1.3 There are two possible ways for an employee to return to her/his former grade (or move closer to it):-

- a) Through redeployment to another job.
- b) Through enhancement of her/his current job, sufficient to justify upgrading. This would need to be re-evaluated.

6.2 Redeployment to Another Job

6.2.1 An employee whose job has been downgraded, who applies for a permanent or temporary CBC job on a grade up to the equivalent of her/his former grade, will be guaranteed an interview if she/he meets the essential requirements of the job. The interview will be in open competition with other applicants.

6.2.2 This will continue for three months from the date that protection ceases.

6.3 Review of Current Job

6.3.1 Jobs do change and develop in the normal course of events. Where there has been a significant change in the requirements of a job since it was evaluated, it will be referred for re-evaluation.

6.3.2 It may be possible, in a very few cases, to take positive action to enhance a job (permanently or temporarily). This should not be at the expense of appropriate structures/duties. Suitable opportunities for enhancement could be due to:

- A vacancy existing – presenting the opportunity for a redistribution of the duties of that job
- A new set of duties/new type of work is available
- Another job has excessive duties which could be redistributed without affecting the grade of that job

6.3.3 In considering whether it is appropriate to enhance a particular job, issues to take into account include:

- Whether the employee is competent to undertake the duties concerned
- Fairness – where there is more than one employee who could benefit. It could not be considered where a group of employees are in jobs being considered for downgrading.
- Where action to enhance would be to the detriment of other employees in the department

6.3.4 Once the options have been explored and implemented, where appropriate, the job must be submitted for re-evaluation.

7 Training and Development

7.1 It is recognised that an employee's prospects of being in a position to take on increased responsibility in her/his current job, or of achieving redeployment, are likely to be improved by training and development. However, this cannot be at the expense of other employees or of training necessary to improve service delivery.

7.2 The needs of employees whose jobs have been downgraded, will be identified as part of existing departmental arrangements for identifying training and development issues (e.g. appraisal, performance development review, supervision etc.). Although the priority will continue to be meeting the requirements of the current job, consideration will be given to meeting any training / development needs in respect of the employee's ability to take on increased responsibility in her/his current job or to apply for a new job.

Appendix 14 - Moderating Panel (MP) – Terms of Reference

General:

- To approve Job Evaluation (JE) Panel outcomes (management and employee initiated) to:-

- ensure Panel outcomes are consistent across Charnwood Borough Council, and
 - avoid, so far as is possible, any equal pay claims and any subsequent litigation.
- As the purpose of the MP is to consider evaluated outcomes and ensure their consistency, MP members must be Hay trained and have substantial experience of both Panel Evaluations and Appeal Hearings.
- The MP will comprise:-
 - 1 senior HR representative (This will usually be the HR Business Partner and
 - 1 Trade Union Representative

NB The composition of the Panel will ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

- Given the role of the MP members, it is important that a Technical Adviser also attends, who will be responsible for convening the meetings.
- The JE 'Rationale' sheets from the relevant evaluations are to be made available to MP members as well as information on any 'Comparator' jobs / job families as appropriate.
- In the event of the MP members being unable to reach agreement on the grade to be applied to a referred job(s), the Assistant Director for People and Transformation on the advice of the Technical Adviser, will make the final decision based on all relevant technical factors in order to uphold the integrity of the scheme.
- Any proposed change to an evaluated job by the MP will be notified to the original evaluation Panel members by way of an amended rationale for the job(s) in question and their endorsement/views sought. In the interests of efficiency this may be by email.
- In the event that the originating Panel is unable to agree to any proposed change(s), their observations will be reported back to the MP. The MP having considered the responses will recommend an appropriate grade for the job. The Assistant Director for People and Transformation on the advice of the Technical Adviser will decide the final grade, on the basis of upholding the integrity of the scheme at all times.

Moderating Panel Meetings:

The MP will meet on an 'as required' basis subject to need – meetings will be arranged by the Technical Adviser.

Records:

A record will be kept of the following:-

- Names of MP Panel members

- Details of job(s) referred for moderating
- MP outcome
- Details of job(s) referred back to originating JE Panel
- Response from originating Panel
- Final decision
- Date employee / Manager notified

Reporting Arrangements:

A report will be presented as follows to:-

- The Joint Consultative Committee (JCC) on both the work of the MP and the impact this has had, if any, on evaluated outcomes – annually
- The Personnel Committee on an annual basis

Pre – Reporting Meeting:

- Prior to each JCC meeting MP members and the Technical Adviser will meet to discuss any issues.

Review:

- This procedure to be reviewed after twelve months of operation.

October 2011