

HUMAN RESOURCES MEMORANDUM 9

JOB EVALUATION AND GRADING SUPPORT

Scope and Purpose: Human Resources Memoranda

1. This Memorandum replaces PM9 dated February 2006. Human Resources Memoranda set out procedures for managers to follow or give guidance or information on human resources related or people management issues. Managers are expected to make themselves aware of the content of HRMs and use them for future reference, whenever necessary.
2. FDMs, Conservators, Directors, Silvan House/Business Units should ensure that their managers see new HRMs. This HRM, and the accompanying FC Grading Guidance, should also be made available to all staff.

Scope and Purpose: HRM9

3. The purpose of this memorandum is to inform managers of the procedures to be followed for the operation of the Job Evaluation and Grading Support (JEGS) programme. This information is available on eConnect ([Human Resources content area, Job Evaluation folder](#)), which also contains full details of the Forestry Commission Grading Guidance. Further information on Pay Band structure is contained in Staff Handbook 12009 -12010.

Background

4. Job evaluation is a management tool which is used to assist decisions on relative job weights of posts in an organisation and is a critical factor in maintaining pay consistency and equal pay principles.
5. During the Staff Unification exercise JEGS was adapted to cover the full range of jobs undertaken in the Forestry Commission which means we have a job evaluation system in place to evaluate all jobs up to and including Pay Band 1. In recognising that job content may change in line with our business requirements the FC's Job Evaluation Maintenance Procedures have been introduced to ensure that such changes are identified.

Contact

6. Please contact Oriana McArthur on direct line 0131 314 6400, Staff Inspector in Human Resources if you need further advice about any aspect of this memorandum.

Jean Lindsay
Acting Director Human Resources
12 March 2008

HUMAN RESOURCES MEMORANDUM 9

FORESTRY COMMISSION JOB EVALUATION MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

The Need for Maintenance Procedures

1. To ensure that posts are properly and consistently graded throughout the Forestry Commission, a mechanism is needed to help managers assess and review the quality and grading of posts. The maintenance procedures set out below will be used to evaluate posts in the Forestry Commission up to and including posts at Pay Band 1 level.
2. The information and score produced as a result of job evaluations will not solely determine the grading of posts but will help Senior Managers reach informed decisions on grading issues.
3. The customised job evaluation system used by the Forestry Commission is called FC JEGS and is described in Annex A. Guidance Notes for the postholder and line manager are set out in Annex B with the timescale described in Annex C.

Scope of the Maintenance Procedures

4. The procedures will apply to all posts below the Senior Staff Group in the Forestry Commission excluding posts in Forest Research covered by Research promotion procedures. Posts in the Senior Staff Group are assessed using the Job Evaluation for Senior Posts (JESP) system which is used in all Government Departments.
5. Country Directors, Chief Executives and Directors Silvan House/Business Units as Senior Managers have authority, within budgetary constraints, to create or dispense with posts or to allocate posts to different Pay Bands for all staff below the Senior Staff Group i.e. up to and including Pay Band 1. There is no requirement for proposals for posts in Pay Bands 1 and 2 to be cleared in advance with the Director General. The agreed procedures for consulting the appropriate Staff Council will be followed.

Job Evaluation Requests

6. The evaluation of a post can be triggered by:
 - Director Human Resources on behalf of the Executive Board as part of an agreed programme aimed at maintaining the integrity of the Forestry Commission's grading system by checking that posts in different parts of the Commission are consistently graded;
 - Senior Managers who are proposing to create a new post, change the Pay Band of an existing post or, who wish to check that an existing post is correctly graded; and
 - Post holders who feel that there is clear evidence that they consistently carry out the duties appropriate to the next Pay Band.

The Job Evaluation Annual Maintenance Programme

7. Senior managers will be invited to nominate posts for the annual maintenance programme and the TUS will be invited to nominate posts for inclusion in the programme.
8. In addition to testing the grading of existing posts the programme will also include new posts that we do not have benchmark data for. [Cross reference Section 3 of the FC Grading Guidance].
9. For “new posts”, a job evaluation exercise should only take place when the post holder has been in post for a least 12 months.

Requests Made by Post holders

10. Where a request is initiated by the post holder, they should provide evidence to the unit manager, e.g. FDM, Conservator, Head of Branch that sufficient work of the quality of the next Pay Band is being carried out. The unit manager will consider the request in discussion with the line manager and if persuaded by the evidence presented will make a case to the appropriate Senior Manager e.g. Country Director, Chief Executive, Director Silvan House/Business Units.
11. 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; and
 - The FC Grading Guidance, which is available in the Human Resources content area of eConnect.
12. Before reaching a decision Senior Managers should in cases of doubt request advice from Oriana McArthur, Staff Inspection Branch who can provide appropriate comparators or benchmarks. Staff Inspection Branch can also provide advice on possible implications for jobs in other parts of the Commission.
13. On the basis of the evidence presented to him/her and taking account of comparators, benchmarks or other wider issues the Senior Manager will decide that:
 - There is sufficient evidence to justify changing the grade 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.

14. Where he/she concludes that the post should be moved to the next Pay Band but recognises that this might have implications for posts in other parts of the Commission, he/she will discuss the matter with the appropriate Senior Manager before making any change to the grading of the post.

Outcome of the Job Evaluation

15. The result of the job evaluation will be reported to the Senior Manager. The Senior Manager will consider the outcome along with other relevant issues of the kind described in paragraph 11. He/she will notify the post holder and the appropriate Staff Council in writing of the outcome of the evaluation as described below:

- Where the post scored within the tolerance (± 20 points of the Pay Band boundary) he/she will report that, for example, in the case of a Pay Band 4 post where the upper boundary of the Pay Band is 560, the post scored between 540 and 580 and as a consequence the grading will not change.
- Where the post scored above the tolerance he/she will report that the post scored above the tolerance and either that the post will be upgraded or that (for reasons which he/she will describe) the post will not be upgraded. In the latter case, he/she will also set out the action he proposes to take to bring the duties into line with the Pay Band.
- Where the post scored below the tolerance he/she will report that fact and that there is therefore no case for upgrading the post.
- Where the post scored below the current Pay Band he /she will consider what elements of the job content can be changed to improve the quality of work to meet the Pay Band criteria.

Outcome of Job Evaluation – Access Provisions of the Data Protection Act (DPA)

16. The DPA gives individuals certain rights to access information kept about them. For these rights to apply the information must be “personal data” and, for manual (i.e. paper) records, it must be held as part of a relevant filing system.

17. Job evaluation is a tool that helps to assess the relative quality of jobs, not people. Job evaluation records are not retained on the post holder’s personal file and therefore cannot be defined as personal data as defined by the DPA.

Jean Lindsay
Acting Director Human Resources
12 March 2008

THE JOB EVALUATION AND GRADING SUPPORT SYSTEM (JEGS)

1. Job evaluation is a process whereby posts can be compared with each other against common or accepted criteria and placed in rank order. It is a tool for assisting decisions on the relative job weights of posts in an organisation and a critical factor in maintaining pay consistency, and equal pay principles.
2. The Forestry Commission uses a system called JEGS which stands for Job Evaluation and Grading Support. JEGS is an analytical, job evaluation methodology, which provides a systematic and consistent means of evaluating posts. During the Staff Unification exercise JEGS was adapted to cover the full range of jobs undertaken in the Forestry Commission. The customised system is now known as FCJEGS and this system will be used for all evaluations up to and including Pay Band 1.
3. It is important to note that job evaluation does not take into account workload or performance or personal achievements the post holder. Job Analysts are trained to separate the qualities of the role from that of the post holder. The post holder's ability and their performance are assessed via the Performance Management System (PMS) and are not evaluated by the FCJEGS process.

FC JEGS Factors

4. The evaluation process uses the following 9 factors to evaluate a post:
 - Knowledge and Skills
 - Contacts and Communications
 - Problems
 - Decisions
 - Autonomy
 - Management of Resources
 - Financial Resources
 - Leadership and Team working
 - Nature of Management Role
 - Impact
 - Working Environment
 - Physical Demands

5. The job 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 FC and placed in a rank order as an integral part of the process.

Job Analysts

6. The Human Resources Staff Inspector will carry out the majority of evaluations. Trained Job Analysts from other parts of the Forestry Commission will support the Staff Inspector and will carry out evaluations at regular intervals to ensure that their expertise is maintained. Job Analysts will not evaluate posts within their immediate unit and main area of work. The majority of evaluations they undertake will be outwith their part of the Forestry Commission. The Staff Inspector will approve evaluations undertaken by other analysts.

THE FC JOB EVALUATION PROCESS – GUIDANCE NOTES FOR THE POST HOLDER AND LINE MANAGERS

Notification

1. The post holder will be informed by their line manager that a job evaluation exercise will be carried out.

Job Analysis Form (JAF)

2. A Job Analysis Form (JAF) and covering letter will be sent to the post holder, copied to the unit manager and line manager. The JAF should be completed and returned to the Staff Inspector within 4 working weeks of receipt. If the 4 week timescale cannot be met the post holder should contact the Staff Inspector to agree an extension which will be no more than an additional 6 working weeks.

3. If the post holder does not complete and submit the JAF within the programme year in which the post was nominated the post will not be automatically carried over to the next programme year. The Senior Manager will be required to confirm that the post should be carried forward to the next programme year.

Completing the Job Analysis Form (JAF)

4. As the JAF is designed to capture information on a wide range of FC jobs in Pay Bands 1-7 it is difficult to predict exactly how long it will take the post holder to complete the form. As a general guide, the post holder should allow a minimum of 8 hours to complete the JAF. It is important to note that the analysis of the work of the post is only as good as the quality of information presented via the JAF.

5. The electronic version of the JAF is available on the FC Intranet in the Human Resources content area in a folder called Job Evaluation. The JAF should be copied to the post holders own work area.

6. The Reporting Officer must ensure that the post holder is given sufficient time to complete the JAF. The Reporting Officer and Confirming Officer should work with the post holder to complete Sections 1 to 14 of the JAF and to ensure that the deadline for submission is adhered to.

7. The Reporting Officer and Confirming Officer should add their comments on the work of the post in Sections 15 and 16 respectively.

8. At any stage help and clarification is available from Oriana McArthur, Staff Inspector.

Meeting of Analyst and Post Holder – Discussion Stage

9. The analyst will contact the post holder to arrange a suitable date to meet and discuss the work of the post. This will normally take place at the post holder's workplace so that the analyst can see examples of the main duties of the post.

10. It is not possible to set an absolute timescale within which the meetings will be scheduled but the aim will be to meet the post holder within 8 weeks of receipt of the completed JAF.

11. The analyst will prepare for the meeting by reading the information provided in the JAF, and if necessary also undertake research via a variety of different resources.

12. The analyst will meet the post holder to discuss the information contained in the JAF. Due to the diverse nature of many of the posts within the organisation it is not possible to predict precisely the length of time an analyst will spend with the post holder. On average 3 hours (plus a field visit if appropriate) is usual.

13. During the meeting the analyst will make notes of the discussion which will cover any additions to or clarifications of information contained in the original Job Analysis Form. The analyst will send a copy of the discussion notes to the post holder within 2 weeks of the meeting.

14. The post holder, Reporting Officer and Confirming Officer should sign the notes to confirm that they are agreed and if appropriate provide additional comments. A copy of the signed notes should be returned to the analyst within 2 weeks of receipt. If the notes cannot be agreed within 2 weeks the analyst should be contacted to agree a date when the notes can be returned.

Analysis

15. The analyst will complete the analysis having considered the agreed information contained in the Job Analysis Form and the discussion notes. The post will be scored within 5 working days of receipt of the agreed discussion notes.

Consistency checking

16. The Staff Inspector will consider the findings and ensure that the analysis is:

- To the required standard;
- Consistent across the team of analysts; and
- Fair, by comparison to other relevant jobs using information in the FCJECS database.

17. Additional consistency checking either by further analysis of the database or discussions with the analysts will take place from time to time.

Recommendations

18. Recommendations will be made to the relevant Senior Manager within 3 weeks of the final result.

Job Evaluation Result: Feedback to the Post Holder

19. The Senior Manager will consider the recommendations and will inform the post holder via the line manager whether the post will be placed in the next Pay Band or stay in the current Pay Band.

20. The Senior Manager will inform the Staff Inspector whether or not the recommendation has been accepted.

Further Action

21. If the Senior Manager decides that a post will stay in the current Pay Band, this may result in a re-allocation of responsibilities in a unit or across a group of posts. If the decision is that the post will be regraded to the next Pay Band the normal postfilling procedures will be followed.

JOB EVALUATION - TIMESCALES

Action	Action By	Timescale
1. Job Analysis Form issued	Staff Inspector	2 weeks from request for post to be evaluated.
2. Completing the Job Analysis Form (JAF)	Post holder, Reporting Officer and Confirming Officer	Completed JAF returned to Staff Inspection Branch within 4 weeks of receipt.
3. Arrange meeting of Analyst and post holder	Analyst	The aim will be to hold the discussion within 8 weeks of receipt of the JAF.
4. Analyst meeting the post holder	Analyst and post holder	In general this will be around half a day though occasionally longer is required.
5. Discussion notes	Analyst	Discussion notes sent to post holder within 2 weeks of meeting.
6. Agreeing discussion notes	Post holder, Reporting Officer, Confirming Officer	Contact the Analyst within 2 weeks of receipt of discussion notes.
7. Analysis	Analyst	Staff Inspector informed of emerging results within 2 weeks of discussion notes being agreed.
8. Consistency checking	Staff Inspector	Recommendations made to the relevant Senior Manager within 3 weeks of analysis being concluded.
9. Feedback to post holder	Senior Manager	Within 4 weeks of Senior Manager receiving recommendation.
10. Feedback to Staff Inspector	Senior Manager	Within 4 weeks of notifying postholder.