Diocese of Norwich Education and Academies Trust

Job Evaluation Policy

Policy Type:	**Trust Policy**
Date Issued by MAT:	**09/12/2024**
Approved By:	**Executive Team**
Approval Date:	**29/11/2024**
Review Date:	**November 2027**
Person Responsible:	**Human Resources Director**

Our Christian Ethos and Values

All policies within the Diocese of Norwich Education and Academies Trust (hereafter referred to as "the Trust"), whether relating to an individual academy or the whole Trust, will be written and implemented in line with our Christian ethos and values.

We have high ambition for all, and we truly value the wider educational experience.

We walk and talk our Christian values. We put people at the centre of the organisation and want to see them flourish and grow. Our schools are inclusive, welcoming those of all faiths and none.

Overall accountabilities and roles

The Trust has overall accountability for all its academies and staff. Through a Scheme of Delegation for each academy it sets out the responsibilities of the Trust, its Executive Officers, the Local Governing Body and the Principal / Head Teacher. The Principal / Head Teacher of each academy is responsible for the implementation of all policies of the Trust.

All employees of the Trust are subject to the Trust's policies.

Contents

1. Policy Statement 3

2. Purpose 3

3. Principles and Scope 3

4. Job evaluation panels 4

5. Panel members 5

5. Line Managers Guidance 5

6. Line managers 6

7. Evaluation outcome 6

8. Appeals process 7

1. Policy Statement

The Trust is committed to ensuring that all non-teaching roles are correctly evaluated and this policy has been developed to ensure that the process is both equitable and transparent, irrespective of the size or level of job. The CEO has overall responsibility for the application of this policy. The HR Director for DoNESC has responsibility for monitoring and reviewing this policy and will be responsible for its operational delivery.

2. Purpose

The aim of job evaluation is to provide a systematic and consistent approach to defining the relative worth of jobs within an organisation. It is a process whereby jobs are placed in a rank order according to overall demands upon the job holder. It therefore provides a basis for a fair and orderly grading structure and underpins the organisations commitment to equal pay for work of equal value.

Jobs are graded following the submission of a job description questionnaire (JDQ), using the NJC methodology.

It is important to recognise that it is the job that is evaluated, not the performance of the individual fulfilling it.

Job evaluation is a technique of job analysis, assessment and comparison and it is concerned with the demands of the job, such as the skills, qualifications, knowledge and understanding, experience and the responsibility required to carry out the job. It is not concerned with the total volume of work, the number of people required to do it, the scheduling of work or the ability of the job holder.

Job evaluation is a method of comparing different jobs. It is a process that seeks to objectively measure the different elements of a role through scoring each factor, resulting in a total score for each job. The jobs are placed in a rank order according to their overall total score, therefore providing a fair pay and grading structure.

3. Principles and Scope

This policy applies to all roles within the organisation. Each job role will be evaluated through a two stage job evaluation process.

The job evaluation panels will consist of NJC job evaluation trained representatives and there will be a quorum for each panel is detailed in the policy.

Positions within the organisation may need to be evaluated where:

- The post is newly created;
- There has been a significant and permanent change in the work and responsibilities of the position and re-evaluation is sought by the line manager (this applies equally to a reduction as well as an increase to job activity);
- There is a re-structuring or re-organisation of tasks and duties within a team or the whole organisation;
- Where a new job evaluation scheme has been changed and a new one adopted;
- Where posts have not been evaluated for a period exceeding 12 months;
- Where is it has been identified that a job role has not been evaluated under the job evaluation scheme of the organisation;
- Internal restructuring has an impact on the structure of the job;
- There has been an appeal against an evaluation result and a re-evaluation is recommended.

The JDQ will be completed using an up to date job description, in consultation with the job holder and submitted to the HR team for job evaluation. The line manager may seek advice from the DoNESC HR team in relation to the completion of the JDQ. The job holder and the CEO/Headteacher will be expected to sign off the JDQ before it is submitted for job evaluation. The JDQ should be submitted with an up to date organisation chart for the organisation/team to the HR team.

Problems in resolving any dispute over the content of a JDQ should be referred to the HR Director.

Jobs will not normally be re-evaluated within a 12-month period, unless considered under the appeals process or for the purpose of reorganisation.

The evaluation panel records will be retained by the DoNESC HR department.

4. Job evaluation panels

Stage 1 – Scoring Panel

The JDQ will be evaluated at stage 1 by a scoring panel, there will be a quorum of two for the panel to take place. The scoring panel may refer back to the line manager and staff member who completed the JDQ to ask for further information or clarification. Any JDQs submitted that are not completed in full will be returned by the panel.

The panel will score each element of the JDQ independently, prior to meeting as a panel to score the JDQ. They will convene as a panel to discuss the rationale for the scores that they awarded, deliberate and discuss any scores that differ from panel member to panel member. All panel members must agree with the final score awarded. Once all elements of the JDQ are scored, the panel will total the score, return all the documentation including the scoring sheets to the DoNESC HR department.

Stage 2 – Moderation Panel

The scored JDQ will be provided to the chair of the moderation panel for stage 2 of the job evaluation process. There will be a quorum of three for the panel to take place. The moderation panel will review the JDQ, supporting documentation and the scoring sheets presented to them collectively. The purpose of the panel is to ensure quality assurance and to check the NJC methodology has been applied correctly.

The panel will review the scoring documentation, deliberate and discuss the scores and determine whether they agree with the awarded scores. They should consider if any factor assessments or job

roles appear consistently, reviewing any anomalies The moderation panel may disagree with the scores awarded and have the authority to increase or decrease the scores from the stage 1 panel. The panel will record their outcome on a score sheet along with the rationale and reason for the scoring in detail and total up the overall score. All documentation will be return to the DoNESC HR department along with the outcome of the moderation process.

The DoNESC HR department will provide the outcome to the line manager in writing within 10 working days.

5. Panel members

Evaluation panels operate on the basis of consensus decision making.

All panel members are expected to contribute to the evaluation process on equal terms.

In order to avoid conflicts of interest, panel members will not take part in evaluations of their own role or a role that they directly manager or report to.

Panel members are expected to declare any other potential conflict of interest where it may be appropriate not to be involved in an evaluation.

All discussions within panels, and records of these discussions (including scores) will be strictly confidential to HR and the panels.

5. Line Managers Guidance

<u>New posts</u>

Once the need for a new post has been identified, the line manager should develop the JDQ template working with HR as soon as possible in order to expedite the recruitment process.

The JDQ and person specification should be submitted to the HR team together with full supporting documentation, e.g. other related job descriptions and an updated organisational structure.

Once the new post has been evaluated and if approved by the CEO/Headteacher, arrangements can be made to commence the advertising of the new post.

<u>Re-evaluation of existing vacant posts</u>

Changes to an existing job – this is where the responsibilities of an existing job have changed significantly since it was last evaluated in order to meet the requirements of the department. Jobs will not normally be considered for re-evaluation within 12 months of the date of last grading evaluation.

The JDQ and person specification should be submitted to the HR team together with the full supporting documentation, e.g. other related job descriptions and an updated organisational structure.

Once the new post has been evaluated and if approved by the CEO/Headteacher, arrangements can be made to commence the advertising of the new post.

<u>Re-evaluation of existing, occupied posts</u>

Where a line manager significantly changes the duties of an existing occupied post, for instance due to restructure, they should complete the JDQ and person specification which should then be submitted to the HR team together with the full supporting documentation, e.g. other related job

descriptions and an updated organisational structure, for the post to be evaluated prior to the commencement of the new duties. Any such changes or additions should be discussed with the job holder.

The new duties must form part of the job on a permanent basis. Where the scope or specific responsibilities of the job increase temporarily, line managers should contact HR to discuss whether an acting-up or higher responsibility allowance or contribution related pay award is more appropriate.

Additional or new duties at the same level of responsibility and/or complexity will not normally result in the job being graded to a higher level. Advice may be sought from HR where required.

Re-evaluation of applications for existing, occupied posts will not normally be considered for re-evaluation within 12 months of the last evaluation.

It is recognised that jobs develop over time and therefore it is good practice to re-evaluate all roles within an organisation at regular intervals. This is to ensure that the job evaluation process continues to be relevant and applied consistently across the organisation.

6. Line managers

Line managers have responsibility for ensuring that job information used in the evaluation process is fair, accurate and in line with the guidance provided by HR, which includes the requirement to consult with job holders.

Line managers should seek advice from HR in a timely way to allow for their input and response prior to panel submission.

Line managers must submit the complete JDQ pack and provide the required supporting documentation.

Line managers must be prepared to answer questions from the scoring panel and provide clarification where required in a timely way and meet the deadline submission date provided by the panel. Failure to provide any additional information required by the panel on the deadline date will result in the JDQ and supporting documentation being declined by the scoring panel.

Line managers may be requested to attend job evaluation scoring panels when their submissions are reviewed. Line managers will be notified by the chair of the panel if they are required to attend in advance.

7. Evaluation outcome

Vacant posts

The outcome of the evaluation for vacancy posts will be communicated to the line manager who can then submit the role for recruitment authorisation.

Existing posts

The outcome of a re-evaluation will be communicated to the line manager in the first instance. The HR team will be available to discuss the evaluation outcome and consequences with the line manager if required. The current job holder will be informed of the outcome by their line manager and this outcome will also be confirmed in writing.

Job descriptions should be discussed, reviewed and updated as required as part of the annual appraisal process.

A re-evaluation may or may not lead to an increase in score or grade.

The outcome of evaluation will be communicated to the line manager by the moderation panel chair

Increase in score leading to a higher grade

Where an increase in score means the job stays within the score boundaries for the current grade, there will be no change in either grade or salary. Where, however, the increase in score means the job now falls within the score boundary for a higher grade this outcome will be communicated to the line manager by the HR team in the first instance.

For new and established roles this will be a move to the lowest spinal column point of the new grade. Where the established post holder is currently on a spinal column point that overlaps the higher grade, the new salary will move to the equivalent spinal column point in the new grade. Normal incremental progress will then apply to the new grade. The job holder's salary will move to the new grade with effect from the first day of the following month.

Decrease in score leading to a lower grade

Where a decrease to the score means the job stays the within the score boundaries for the current grade, there will be no change in either grade or salary. Where, however, the decrease in score means the job now falls within the score boundary for a lower grade this outcome will be communicated by HR to the line manager in the first instance.

If the current pay of the job holder is higher than the maximum spinal point on the new lower grade, the job holder will have their current salary protected (frozen) for 12 months. Unless there is a change in salary through a pay award which results in the salary meeting or exceeding the job holder's salary prior to the decrease in grade. The job holder will move to the new grade with effect from the first day of the following month.

8. Appeals process

Line managers who wish to appeal will be required to provide written reasons for their appeal within 10 working days of the date of the written notification of the evaluation. In the case of an existing occupied role, if the post holder wants to appeal the decision, they may only do so with the support of their line manager. The reasons for the appeal should take the form of a written summary submitted to the HR Director, signed by the line manager. The HR Director will then provide the appeal to the CEO to review the grounds for appeal and decide whether or to accept or reject the appeal.

Any decisions to reject an appeal at this stage will be notified to the line manager.

Appeals that are taken forward will involve re-evaluation of the role by a different panel from the scoring and moderation panels that originally evaluated the role. An appeal panel will be convened, there will be a quorum of two for the appeal panel to take place. The line manager should be available to attend the appeal panel if requested. The appeal panel's decision will be final, will be notified in writing to the line manager and there will be no further right of appeal.