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1. **Introduction**

1.1 This policy sets out the framework for Job Evaluation policy and process within Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust.

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

1.3 All employees of the Trust should have an up to date and agreed job description and person specification that describes the role and tasks required of them in carrying out their job.

1.4 This procedure and policy is written in accordance with the Government paper Agenda for Change; Modernising the NHS Pay System (1999) and the nationally agreed NHS Job Evaluation Handbook (2010). Furthermore, this complies with the Equality Act (2010).

1.5 Where there is a merger or reconfiguration required of a healthcare service / organisation, the Trust’s organisational change policy should be followed with guidance from the national job evaluation handbook.

2. **Scope**

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

3. **Definitions**

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

   **IJES**  
   Internet Job Evaluation System, the electronic system used by the Trust to support the JEP.

4. **Duties / Responsibilities**

4.1 **Managers**

   - Every Line Manager and member of staff should review the job description at least annually, appraisal may be considered an appropriate time to do this to ensure that the job description accurately reflects the responsibilities and demands of the role.

   - Before proposing any change via JEP the Line Manager must ensure that they have budget in place to pay for any proposed increase in banding.
• The Line Manager is expected to have discussed changes where these are significant with HR before and throughout the process of re-writing the job description, person specification and organisational chart in order to ensure organisational consistency and avoid band drift across the organisation.

• The Line Manager must ensure that all wording is reflective of the job required by the service and not an individual post holder

4.2 **Job evaluation panel members**

• Attend panels regularly

• To advise of any conflicts of interest e.g. job within their own department or a job they are applying for

• To undertake training as required maintaining skills for job evaluation

• To follow the process laid out in this policy including use of IJES

4.3 **Job evaluation administrative support**

• To manage flow of work through IJES

• To book panels as required meeting the needs of the business

• To ensure panel members are trained appropriately on the process and IJES

• To set up user accounts for IJES

5. **Procedure**

5.1 **Creation of a New Post**

• A new post will be submitted by a Line Manager for evaluation with the relevant job description, person specification and structure chart to IJES.

• Jobs received are checked that they are in the correct format using the current standard template and that all necessary information has been received. Where information is missing the request will be returned to the originator and the missing information requested. The Line Manager will then need to re-submit all paperwork for processing.

• Evaluation will be carried out using the IJES system.

• Some roles may require a period of time for the role to be “bedded down.” Once the full demands of the post are clear the JD should be reviewed and if necessary resubmitted for future evaluation.

• When a job description is going to panel there should be a designated Line Manager available who can answer authoritatively any questions the panel may have on the job role.
5.2 Changes to Existing Roles

- If a member of staff feels their role should be re-evaluated / re-graded they should discuss this with their Line Manager in the first instance. It is, therefore incumbent on Line Managers to recognise their responsibility to ensure staff are not consistently asked to undertake responsibilities beyond those appropriate to their band.

- It is important to ensure that individuals who are undertaking additional qualifications are doing so within an agreed personal development plan and in response to service need and that this will not necessarily result in a rebanding.

- The rebanding of a post is determined by the level of responsibility contained within the role. It is not determined by the volume of work undertaken.

- It must be agreed by the Line Manager, staff member and supported by a Senior Manager / Area Director that a role has been requested to be significantly changed in order to be submitted for job evaluation. For clinical posts, relevant clinical leaders should be involved in agreeing changes to ensure consistency and to prevent ‘band drift’

- Where the staff member feels there have been significant changes to their job role and these are not being reflected in their job description, and that management do not feel the job role has changed significantly, HR Advice should be sought. Staff members may also wish to take advice from staff side representatives.

- The Job Description and Person Specification must demonstrate that the knowledge, training and experience has increased and the level of autonomy and responsibility attached to the role has changed in line with the needs of the service.

- Other cumulative changes within a job role would also indicate that re-evaluation may be appropriate.

- The Job Description and Person Specification will be submitted by the Line Manager for evaluation with the relevant job description, person specification and structure chart to IJES.

- Jobs received are checked that they are in the correct format and that all necessary information has been received. Where information is missing the request will be returned to the originator and the missing information requested. Managers will then need to re-submit all paperwork for processing.

- Evaluation will be carried out using the IJES system.

- Staff cannot submit their own job description for evaluation; it must be agreed and signed off by the Line Manager. Where there is not agreement between staff and their Line Manager this should be raised with the Line Manager’s manager in the first instance. HR or staff side representative advice may be sought.

- Where Line Managers are agreeing significant changes to job roles which may increase banding, they should have an awareness of the impact this will have on their establishment and budget. Line Managers should ensure they have adequate budget to action any changes which may result from job evaluation process.
5.3 **Outcome of the Job Evaluation Panel**

- Employee Resourcing Team will confirm the outcome to the Line Manager who submitted the job for evaluation.

- If the outcome results in a band increase for an employee, the Line Manager is responsible for implementing the increase through a variation to contract form [http://www.southernhealth.nhs.uk/workday/pay/contract/](http://www.southernhealth.nhs.uk/workday/pay/contract/).

- The effective date will be no earlier than the date of the panel, as changes to job roles should not be introduced prior to job evaluation. However it is recognised where there may be occasions where changes are applied retrospectively. HR Advice should be sought around effective date of the change; generally it should be no more than 6 months retrospectively. The increase will be in line with the agreed Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions.

- If the outcome results in a band decrease, the implementation should be in line with HR advice under relevant policy, which may be Organisational Change, Performance (Capability) or Conduct policies.

5.4 **Appeal Process**

- In the event that a member of staff is dissatisfied with outcome of the Job Evaluation Panel, and wishes to request a re-evaluation, written reasons must be submitted to their Line Manager’s Manager. This Manager will arrange a meeting with the post holder to discuss and clarify with the post holder the reason(s) they have requested a review. HR may be involved at the meeting if required.

- The Line Manager’s Manager can agree either to re-evaluate the post or confirm that the original decision stands in light of departmental expectation, resources or constraints.

- If the decision is not to agree a review, the Manager will write to the employee confirming the outcome and the reasons why.

- If the decision is that there is evidence that was not submitted for the original evaluation, the request should be resubmitted with the updated information and additional information should be re-submitted for evaluation.

- A new Job Evaluation panel will evaluate the role.

- There will be no further right to review or appeal once this procedure is exhausted.

5.5 **Consistency Checks and Monitoring Compliance**

Consistency Checks form an important part of the evaluation process. Staff side and HR representatives who are appropriately trained will carry out consistency checking after each JEP.
Consistency checks should incorporate review of evaluations:

- Ensure job description is in up to date format
- Changes are in line with organisational knowledge and flag any issues of potential band drift to senior HR colleagues and Line Managers
- Ensure that the national profile selected is in line with the job role and purpose and that only information provided in the job description is used to support the banding.

Where there is a mis-match between the first panel and the consistency panel, these will be highlighted to Senior HR Manager and Chair of Staff side for discussion on way forward, which may include discussion with Line Manager about the job role and/or advice to the original JEP on how to score elements and/or hybrid job matching to reach an overall banding in line with guidance in Agenda for Change handbook.

6. Training Requirements

6.1 Please refer to the Job Evaluation Toolkit on the staff intranet and includes Guidance for managers, template letters and details of the Appeal process.

6.2 The IJES User Guide and IJES Quick Start Guide can also be found in the Toolkit on the staff intranet.

7. Policy Review

7.1 The Policy and Procedure will be in place for three years following approval of a review and amendments. An earlier review can take place should exceptional circumstances arise resulting from this procedure; in whole or in part, being insufficient for the purpose and/or if there are legislative changes.

8. Associated Documents

- Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions of Service Handbook
- NHS Job Evaluation Handbook

9. Supporting References

  - Job Evaluation Decision Tree
  - Job Evaluation Process Flow Chart
  - Job Evaluation Request Form (for submission alongside JD)
  - Job Description (JD) Template

Appendix 1

Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust: Equality Impact Analysis Screening Tool

Equality Impact Assessment (or ‘Equality Analysis’) is a process of systematically analysing a new or existing policy/practice or service to identify what impact or likely impact it will have on protected groups.

It involves using equality information, and the results of engagement with protected groups and others, to understand the actual effect or the potential effect of your functions, policies or decisions. The form is a written record that demonstrates that you have shown due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations with respect to the characteristics protected by equality law.

For guidance and support in completing this form please contact a member of the Equality and Diversity team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of policy/service/project/plan:</th>
<th>Job Evaluation Policy &amp; Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Number:</td>
<td>SH HR 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead officer for assessment:</td>
<td>Ricky Somal: E&amp;D Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Assessment Carried Out:</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Identify the aims of the policy and how it is implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Answers / Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefly describe purpose of the policy including</td>
<td>This document sets out the policy and procedure for the evaluation / grading of job descriptions under Agenda for Change. It provides guidance and templates for writing job descriptions in line with Trust format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How the policy is delivered and by whom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intended outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Consideration of available data, research and information

Monitoring data and other information involves using equality information, and the results of engagement with protected groups and others, to understand the actual effect or the potential effect of your functions, policies or decisions. It can help you to identify practical steps to tackle any negative effects or discrimination, to advance equality and to foster good relations.

Please consider the availability of the following as potential sources:

- **Demographic** data and other statistics, including census findings
- Recent **research** findings (local and national)
- Results from **consultation or engagement** you have undertaken
- Service user **monitoring data**
- Information from **relevant groups** or agencies, for example trade unions and voluntary/community organisations
- Analysis of records of enquiries about your service, or **complaints** or **compliments** about them
- Recommendations of **external inspections** or audit reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Data, research and information that you can refer to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong> What is the equalities profile of the team delivering the service/policy?</td>
<td>The Equality and Diversity team will report on Workforce data on an annual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong> What equalities training have staff received?</td>
<td>All Trust staff have a requirement to undertake Equality and Diversity training as part of Organisational Induction (Respect and Values) and E-Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong> What is the equalities profile of service users?</td>
<td>The Trust Equality and Diversity team report on Trust patient equality data profiling on an annual basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2.4** What other data do you have in terms of service users or staff? (e.g. results of customer satisfaction surveys, consultation findings). Are there any gaps? | The Trust is preparing to implement the Equality Delivery System which will allow a robust examination of Trust performance on equality, diversity and human rights. This will be based on 4 key objectives that include:  
  1. Better health outcomes for all  
  2. Improved patient access and experience  
  3. Empowered, engaged and included staff  
  4. Inclusive leadership |
| **2.5** What internal engagement or consultation has been undertaken as part of this EIA and with whom? What were the results? Service users/carers/Staff | |
| **2.6** What external engagement or consultation has been undertaken as part of this EIA and with whom? What were the results? General Public/Commissioners/Local Authority/Voluntary Organisations | |

In the table below, please describe how the proposals will have a positive impact on service users or staff. Please also record any potential negative impact on equality of opportunity for the target:

In the case of negative impact, please indicate any measures planned to mitigate against this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive impact (including examples of what the policy/service has done to promote equality)</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Action Plan to address negative impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees. It will help to ensure that the Trust fulfills its statutory duty to promote equality of opportunity and to eliminate unlawful discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees. It will help to ensure that the Trust fulfills its statutory duty to promote equality of opportunity and to eliminate unlawful discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Reassignment</td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and Civil Partnership</td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and Maternity</td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or Belief</td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees. It will help to ensure that the Trust fulfils its statutory duty to promote equality of opportunity and to eliminate unlawful discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td>It provides a clear and objective process and guidelines and the process for managers to follow in grading and regrading job roles.</td>
<td>None identified, as the impact is expected to be positive in providing a fair; consistent; transparent and accessible process for all employees. It will help to ensure that the Trust fulfils its statutory duty to promote equality of opportunity and to eliminate unlawful discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>