

# Job Evaluation

## 1. Introduction

Job evaluation is a process whereby posts can be compared with each other against common or accepted criteria and placed in a rank order. It is a tool for assisting decisions on the relative job weights of posts in an organisation and is a critical factor in maintaining pay consistency and equal pay principles.

Job evaluation does not take into account workload or personal achievements of the post holder. Job Analysts are trained to separate the qualities of the role from that of the post holder. The post holder's performance is assessed via the Performance Management System and is not evaluated by the job evaluation process.

## 2. Job Evaluation Requests

The evaluation of a post or group of posts can be requested at any point in a year by:

- Senior Managers who are proposing to create a new post, redesign an existing post or, who wish to check that an existing post is correctly graded; or
- Post holders who feel that there is clear evidence that they consistently carry out work appropriate to the next Pay Band level.

### 2.1 Job Evaluation Requests Initiated by the Post Holder

A post holder can initiate a request for their post to be evaluated by submitting a case to their unit manager, e.g. FDM, Conservator, Head of Branch to provide evidence that they consistently carry out work at a higher Pay Band level. The unit manager will consider the request in discussion with the post holder's line manager. If the unit manager is persuaded by the evidence presented they will make a case to the appropriate Senior Manager e.g. Country Director, Chief Executive, Director Silvan House/Business Units.

The Senior Manager will consider the request in the context of wider issues such as:

- the amount and quality of work that the unit does and will do in the future;
- how that work is or could be organised and the number of staff in the different Pay Bands needed to support this;
- comparison of job quality with similar jobs - in the unit and in other units;
- budgetary implications of any resulting salary changes;
- wider organisational implications.

Having considered the supporting evidence the Senior Manager will decide that:

- there is sufficient evidence to justify changing the grading of the post; or
- the post is properly graded at its present level; or
- there is insufficient evidence to make a decision and that the grading of the post should be formally evaluated and a request made to the Staff Inspector, Silvan House.

## 3. The Job Evaluation System and Process

### 3.1 FCJEGS Factors

The evaluation system is FCJEGS which uses the following factors to evaluate a post:

- Knowledge and Skills
- Contacts and Communications
- Problem Solving
- Decision Making
- Autonomy
- Management of Resources:
  - Financial Resources
  - Leadership and Team working
  - Nature of Management Role
- Impact
- Working Environment
- Physical Demands

### 3.2 Main Stages in the Job Evaluation Process

#### **Collect Evidence:**

- The post holder completes Job Analysis Form which is signed off as agreed by post holder, Reporting Officer and Confirming Officer;
- The analysts undertakes any research or background information;
- The analyst meets post holder for the discussion stage; and
- The analyst writes up discussion notes which are signed off as agreed by post holder, Reporting Officer and Confirming Officer.

#### **Analysis:**

- The analyst uses the agreed information about the post to assess the work using the JEGS factors and software, including challenger reports and benchmark data.

**Quality Assurance:**

- The Staff Inspector ensures consistency between roles and analysts.

**Report recommendation to Senior Manager:**

- The Staff Inspector makes a recommendation to Senior Manager.

**Decision by Senior Manager:**

- The Senior Manager considers the recommendation, makes a decision and informs the post holder and Staff Inspector.

## 4. Outcome of the Job Evaluation Exercise

Appendix 1 details the Forestry Commission Pay Band boundary point ranges for Pay Bands 1 – 7.

It is Forestry Commission practice to recommend a regrading when the score exceeds the minimum of the higher level Pay Band + 20 points margin. The 20 points margin is applied to avoid grade drift. If the score is within the minimum of the higher level Pay Band and 20 points margin this is reported as a borderline score with a recommendation on what elements of the post require development to sustain the higher level Pay Band.

If the post scores below the minimum for the posts' current Pay Band level the recommendation will identify the elements of the post that require development to sustain the current Pay Band level.

The Staff Inspector will report the job evaluation recommendation to the Senior Manager who will consider the outcome along with other relevant issues of the kind described in paragraph 2.1. The Senior Manager will notify the post holder and the appropriate Staff Council in writing of the outcome of the evaluation as described below:

- Where the post score is above the minimum of the higher level Pay Band + 20 points margin they will report that the post scored within the higher level Pay Band point range and either that the post will be upgraded or that (for reasons which they will describe) the post will not be upgraded. In the latter case, they will also set out the action required to redesign the post to meet the criteria for the Pay Band.
- Where the post score is within the minimum of the higher level Pay Band + 20 points margin they will report the outcome as a borderline score and explain that they will either develop the post to meet the higher level criteria or that the grading will not change.

- Where the post score is within the minimum and maximum of the current Pay Band point range they will provide this information and explain that there is no case for upgrading the post.
- Where the post score is below the minimum of the current Pay Band they will consider what elements of the job content can be changed to improve the quality of work to meet the Pay Band criteria or downgrade the post.

The score is not the only determining factor in the evaluation process and cannot be considered in isolation of wider organisational implications. The outcome is compared with other similar posts and their weighting within the Forestry Commission and placed in a rank order as an integral part of the process.

## 5. Regrading Procedure

When a regrading recommendation is accepted by the Senior Manager, the postholder will be promoted to the higher level Pay Band without the need for competition provided that the post holder has received a GP performance mark or better.

## 6. Promotion Pay and Effective Dates

The pay increase will be the normal promotion increase effective from the date that the Senior Manager nominated the post for the current job evaluation programme.

If a post holder does not submit the Job Analysis Form to HR in the programme year that the post was nominated, and the Senior Manager agrees that the post may be carried over to the next programme year, the promotion payment will be effective from 1 April of the current programme year only. In exceptional circumstances the Senior Manager may decide that it is appropriate to backdate the payment to the programme year in which the post was nominated.

## Appendix 1

# Forestry Commission Pay Band Boundaries

Pay Band	Min	Max	Range
1	716	750	35
2	631	715	85
3	561	630	70
4	476	560	85
5	411	475	65
6a	341	410	70
6b	261	340	80
7	100	260	160