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## Introduction

Job evaluation and matching is the process of comparing the relative size of jobs on a consistent basis and establishes the appropriate salary band.

It is a tool used by trained staff to enable judgements to be made on the job content and complexity which are logical, systematic, factual and as objective as possible. It is concerned solely with assessing the job as performed by a fully competent job holder and not the individual currently in the role. It has been tested in regard to equality and should be read in association with the Equality in Employment Policy.

The NHS job matching and evaluation scheme was developed as part of the Agenda for Change: Modernising the NHS pay system. As part of this process, which was carried out in partnership with Trade Unions, a set of National Profiles were written covering all types of jobs across the NHS. These were ‘tested’ by early implementer sites and amended as necessary to develop the set of National Profiles now in use.

## Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that there is a fair and equitable process to establish the pay banding for staff employed in the organisation.

## Scope

3.1. This policy applies to all Integrated Care Board (ICB) employees engaged
 on Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions of Service.

## Definitions

* **Job Matching** - comparing and scoring jobs using national profiles
* **Job Evaluation** - evaluation of jobs using the job analysis questionnaire, job analysis interview and evaluation panel
* **National Profiles** – a nationally agreed template against which jobs can be compared and scored.

## Roles and Responsibilities

### Integrated Care Board

* + 1. The ICB Board is accountable and responsible for ensuring that the ICB has effective processes for regarding pay and pay banding in accordance with NHS national terms and conditions of service.

### Chief Executive

* + 1. The Chief Executive is accountable for the policy and procedure being in place to ensure fair and equitable approach to pay for employees.

### Policy Authors

* + 1. Policy authors are responsible for ensuring that this document is updated when any changes are made to the NHS Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions for Service or the NHS Job Evaluation Scheme.

### Executive Chief People Officer

* + 1. The Executive Chief People Officer oversees the implementation of this policy and is responsible for ensuring that managers take action to meet the organisation’s obligations to ensure equity and consistency.

### Line Managers

* + 1. Line managers are responsible for creating job descriptions/specification. They must ensure that any new roles created or amended are passed to the HR Team for matching/evaluation before advertising or appointment. Line managers must response promptly to questions asked by the Panel and concerns raised by employees regarding their job description or pay banding.
		2. Managers must follow this policy and act on concerns or issues raised in a sympathetic, sensitive and supportive manner.

### Employees

* + 1. Employees are responsible for raising any concerns that they may have regarding their job description or pay banding with their line manager.
		2. Employees have a responsibility to familiarise themselves and act in accordance with this policy.

## Policy Detail

### Process – what is required?

* + 1. For either a new job or revised job the following are required:
* Job Evaluation Authorisation Form (published on the staff intranet HR Forms).
* New Job Description and Person Specification
* For re-grading requests, the current Job Description and Specification showing tracked changes where the role has evolved.
	+ 1. Any other supporting information e.g., organisational chart, rationale for changes such as changes to service provision being made if revising a current role.
		2. Where there is a current job holder, they should be involved in the process of updating and reviewing the job description where this is required as the job evolves or changes significantly.
		3. Managers are responsible for ensuring that all members of their teams are provided with current job descriptions and the maintenance and review of these as the need arises.

### New Job

* + 1. The responsible manager should produce a Job Description and Person Specification using the current template (available from the intranet HR Forms).
		2. The new/revised JD should then be sent to the HR Team for review and evaluation. Additional information, clarification or amendments may be requested from the manager prior to submitting to a job matching panel.

### Revised Job

* + 1. If there is a need to revise a current job in the structure an amended job description and person specification should be produced using the current template. Changes and amendments should be clearly marked on the revised Job Description and/or Person Specification. The revised Job Description should be forwarded to the HR Department for review along with a signed Job Evaluation Authorisation Form.
		2. Job descriptions should be part of the standard discussions between employees and their line managers during their annual appraisals to ensure that the documents are up-to-date and reflective of the role. If an individual believes that their job description and/or person specification requires significant updating at some point throughout the year, they should discuss this with their line manager in the first instance and provide evidence to show how skills and/or responsibilities applicable to the post have changed. These changes should be agreed by the line manager who will then forward all relevant documentation to the HR Department if the changes appear significant enough to warrant a re-match/evaluation of the role.
		3. The job descriptions will be reviewed by HR to determine the extent and significance of the amendments and whether or not job matching panel should be convened. A member of the HR team will make an initial assessment of the job description to determine whether or not the changes may result in a change to the current banding. Additional information, clarification or amendments may be requested from the manager to enable this assessment to be made. If the changes are not significant and it is not considered that these will result in any change to the current band this will be confirmed as unchanged.
		4. If the changes are significant or if there is any doubt about whether or not the changes will impact on the job band the job description will be reviewed by a second trained evaluator.

### Job Matches

* + 1. Ideally a job will be matched by one trained matcher/evaluator and one trade union representative. The process can either be carried out by panel members meeting and matching/evaluating together or by corresponding and agreeing an outcome electronically having reviewed all of the documentation separately. As there are currently no trained trade union representatives within the ICB, an arrangement has been agreed with the trade unions whereby roles are matched/evaluated by either 2 members of the HR team who are all appropriately trained. Alternatively, ICB will forward to an appropriate external provider who conduct job matching and who are fully independent and aware of NHS Agenda for Change Job Matching criteria. A full description of this process can be found in Appendix B. In the event that a trained trade union representative is available in future, the process will be amended to include them as a panel member wherever possible.
		2. If there are any areas of the job description that need further clarification the relevant manager will be contacted to provide ‘expert witness’ information to enable the panel to complete their matching.

### Frequency of Job Matching

* + 1. Job matching will take place wherever possible within 2 (two) weeks of the paperwork being received by the HR Department. Where the organisation is undergoing major reviews or restructures and there is an increased need for job matching, this will be arranged to fit in with the timescales for the restructure.

### Matching Factors

* + 1. A series of National Profiles were matched and evaluated by the Department of Health using 16 core factors. These national profiles are used as a ‘benchmark’ to size jobs within the ICB. These profiles can be viewed on the NHS Employers website.
		2. The panel will review all jobs, against the core factors, listed below:
* Communication & Relationship Skills
* Knowledge, Training & Experience
* Analytical Skills
* Planning & Organisational Skills
* Physical Skills
* Responsibility for Patient/Client Care
* Responsibility for Policy & Service
* Responsibility for Financial & Physical
* Responsibility for Staff/HR/Leadership, Training
* Responsibility for Information Resources
* Responsibility for Research & Development
* Freedom to Act
* Physical Effort
* Mental Effort
* Emotional Effort
* Working Conditions
	+ 1. Wherever possible, posts will be matched to a National Profile. It may occasionally be the case that it is not possible to satisfy all of the set criteria for a specific profile, but the role is still of a very similar nature. In this case, on the condition that the Knowledge and Freedom to Act Factors match the profile being used, a ‘hybrid’ match can be carried out whereby the individual factor scores are added together to reach a Banding outcome.

### Consistency Checks

* + 1. The current interim matching process has an in-built consistency checking mechanism as the documentation is reviewed independently by two members of the HR Team or is undertaken by an external provider who undertakes job matching and is compliant to NHS Job Matching criteria. In the event that traditional job matching panels be convened in the future when trained trade union representatives are available, a random number of jobs will be put forward to a second matching panel for consistency checking to validate the process and outcomes.

### Recording Outcomes

* + 1. All job matching outcomes will be recorded electronically and retained by the HR Department, information retained will include all relevant details of the panel members and the matching results and outcomes.

### Communicating Outcomes

* + 1. All job matching results will be confirmed by HR in an email to the manager submitting the job description. If the outcome is an increase in banding for an existing job holder a Change Form should be completed by the manager and submitted in the usual way. The effective date of the change should be the date that the Job Description was submitted to the HR team for matching.
		2. Should budgetary constraints mean that the organisation is unable to meet this uplift in salary then the manager will need to review the job description and look at removing and reallocating tasks, where the higher banding applies.

### Job Evaluation

* + 1. If a panel is unable to match a job to a current National Profile the job holder may be requested to complete a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) which will then be evaluated. The system is now sufficiently developed and comprehensive to necessitate this process only being used in exceptional circumstances and for unique jobs that cannot be matched to any National Profile.

### Dissatisfaction with Matching or Evaluation Outcome

* + 1. There is no appeal procedure against the outcome of a job match or evaluation. If an employee wishes to discuss the outcome of the process, they should request a meeting with a member of the HR team in the first instance. They will be able to explain the process and the rationale behind the outcome and why the banding may not have changed (in the case of a revised job description).
		2. If, as part of these discussions, any omissions or aspects of the job description come to light that require a further revision of the post or more clarification, the documentation should be returned to the manager who submitted it for further update and resubmission for matching, if appropriate.

## Monitoring Compliance

Job matching will take place wherever possible within 2 (two) weeks of the correct paperwork being received by the HR Department.

Consistency checking will be carried out within the HR department.

## Staff Training

Those working on Job Matching/Evaluation panels must have undertaken training to the national standard via a recognised course.

## Arrangements for Review

This policy will be reviewed no less frequently than every two years. An earlier review will be carried out in the event of any relevant changes in legislation, national or local policy/guidance, organisational change or other circumstances which mean the policy needs to be reviewed.

If only minor changes are required, the sponsoring Committee has authority to make these changes without referral to the Integrated Care Board. If more significant or substantial changes are required, the policy will need to be ratified by the relevant committee before final approval by the Integrated Care Board.

## Associated Policies, Guidance and Documents

#### [Associated Policies](https://www.midandsouthessex.ics.nhs.uk/publications/?publications_category=icb-policies&page_no=2)

* Equality in Employment Policy

## References

* NHS Job Evaluation Handbook (produced by the NHS Staff Council), any reference is to the latest edition.

## Equality Impact Assessment

The EIA has identified no equality issues with this policy.

The EIA has been included as Appendix A.

## Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment

**INITIAL INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of policy:** Job Matching and Evaluation **Version number (if relevant): 1.0** | **Directorate/Service**: Human Resources  |
| **Assessor’s Name and Job Title:** Carolyn Druce, HR Business Partner  | **Date:** March 2022 |

|  |
| --- |
| **OUTCOMES** |
| *Briefly describe the aim of the policy and state the intended outcomes for staff*  |
| The purpose of this policy is to ensure that there is a fair and equitable process to establish the pay banding for staff employed in the organisation.  |
| **EVIDENCE** |
| *What data / information have you used to assess how this policy might impact on protected groups?* |
| The NHS Job Evaluation Scheme, seventh edition issued September 2018 (latest edition available at this time).  |
| *Who have you consulted with to assess possible impact on protected groups? If you have not consulted other people, please explain why?*  |
| The NHS Job Evaluation Scheme was consulted on nationally with the implementation of Agenda for Change. The scheme is reviewed nationally by the Job Evaluation Group at NHS Employers.  |

**ANALYSIS OF IMPACT ON EQUALITY**

The Public Sector Equality Duty requires us to **eliminate** discrimination, **advance** equality of opportunity and **foster** good relations with protected groups. Consider how this policy / service will achieve these aims.

N.B. In some cases it is legal to treat people differently (objective justification).

* ***Positive outcome*** *– the policy/service eliminates discrimination, advances equality of opportunity and fosters good relations with protected groups*
* ***Negative outcome*** *–**protected group(s) could be disadvantaged or discriminated against*
* ***Neutral outcome***  *–**there is no effect currently on protected groups*

Please tick to show if outcome is likely to be positive, negative or neutral. Consider direct and indirect discrimination, harassment and victimisation.

| ProtectedGroup | Positiveoutcome | Negativeoutcome | Neutraloutcome | Reason(s) for outcome |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age | x |  |  | No impact as the job evaluation process is based on standard competencies and is ‘blind’ to the individual affected by the outcome  |
| Disability(Physical and Mental/Learning) | x |  |  | As above |
| Religion or belief | x |  |  | As above |
| Sex (Gender) | x |  |  | As above |
| Sexual Orientation | x |  |  | As above |
| Transgender / Gender Reassignment | x |  |  | As above |
| Race and ethnicity | x |  |  | As above |
| Pregnancy and maternity (including breastfeeding mothers) | x |  |  | As above |
| Marriage or Civil Partnership | x |  |  | As above |

|  |
| --- |
| **MONITORING OUTCOMES** |
| Monitoring is an ongoing process to check outcomes. It is different from a formal review which takes place at pre-agreed intervals. |
| *What methods will you use to monitor outcomes on protected groups?* |
| It is anticipated that any issues in respect of the implementation of the policy will be identified as a result of staff exercising the ICB’s Grievance procedure.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **REVIEW** |
| *How often will you review this policy / service?*  |
| This policy is due for review in 18 months or earlier if there are any significant changes in legislation, policy or good practice. |
| *If a review process is not in place, what plans do you have to establish one?* |
| N/A |

## Appendix B – Job Evaluation Process

**BACKGROUND**

Since the inception of the ICB it has been difficult to access trade union sign off for job evaluation. Primarily this is due to a lack of trade union representatives within the ICB. Currently there are no trade union representatives across the ICB who are trained in job evaluation.

It should be noted that both the ICB and Trade Unions have tried to increase trade union representatives with minimal success.

It is recognised that the time of trade union representatives is precious and there is considerable pull on their time with a significant change across the health system.

It is also recognised that there is a considerable time pressure on employees within the ICB at the moment, with significant agendas to achieve.

**PROCESS**

Job evaluation will be undertaken by 2 members of the HR team who have been job evaluation trained.

The process for this would be twofold:

1. Initial evaluation undertaken and recording sheet completed.

2. A second member of the team reviews the evaluation for consistency.

Although it is recognised the HR team are employees of the ICB, part of their role is to ensure fairness and equity across their respective organisations. This requires a degree of independence and challenge which form a normal part of the HR function.

Due to work pressures in HR and lack of staff trained in Job Evaluation an external organisation has been identified to undertake job matching. As an external provider this has created independency and consistency complying with the criteria for job evaluation.

**FAILURE TO AGREE EVALUATION OUTCOME**

Where there is failure to agree the job evaluation between 2 members of the HR team, the post will be referred to either another member of staff who is job evaluation trained or a trade union representative who is also job evaluation trained, (fielded by the trade unions) to undertake a further evaluation of the post. The post will then be discussed by the 2 HR representatives and the 3rd member of staff or trade union representative to find a resolution and agree an outcome.

**CHALLENGE TO AGREED JOB EVALUATION OUTCOME**

Where a member of staff raises a formal challenge to the outcome of a job evaluation a trade union representative who is job evaluation trained will be fielded by the trade unions to be involved in the resolution of the dispute with the relevant HR representative, line manager and employee.

**REVIEW**

This process will be reviewed and amended as job evaluation trained trade union representatives within the organisation increase. The ICB and the Trade Unions will continue efforts to increase the number of trade union representatives.

## Appendix C – Frequently Asked Questions

**Q1 Can I insist that a job is put forward for evaluation?**

No, if a job description is revised it is reviewed against the previous job description to determine if the changes/amendments are significant. If they are not, then the job will not be put forward for a full evaluation. Members of the HR Team are skilled job matchers and evaluators and will discuss the job with the relevant manager prior to confirming the decision whether or not to match the job.

**Q2 Are the Trade Unions involved in this process?**

The Trade Unions have agreed the interim job matching/evaluation process described in Appendix A. In the event that trained Trade Union representatives become available to participate in job matching/evaluation in the future, the process will be amended to incorporate their involvement.

**Q3 Will I receive a salary increase if my job is re-banded?**

Your salary may be reviewed if a matching panel results in an increase in the salary band for your job. The usual rules will apply for any move to a higher band (please refer to the Agenda for Change Handbook). Any increase in salary will be effective from the date the Job description and authorised Job Evaluation Approval form was sent to HR for evaluation.

**Q4 Can I request to complete a Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) rather than have my job matched?**

No, a JAQ will only be requested to be completed if it is not possible to match your job to any National Profile or through the hybrid matching process described in this policy.

**Q5 I have been in my role for 3 years and have increased my competency and skills levels in the job. Can I request a review of the job description?**

No, the job matching process is concerned solely with assessing the job and not the competency of the individual currently in the role.

**Q6 What should I do if I think my job has grown?**

You should discuss the matter with your manager to determine whether or not this is the case. If it is agreed that the job has changed significantly and now includes work at a higher level that would not have been evaluated then the process outlined in this policy should be followed.