

Job Grading and Review Policy and Procedure

October 2020

Policy control

Reference	Job Grading Review and Appeals Policy and Procedure
Date approved	TBC
Approving Bodies	HR Committee, Board Governors
Implementation Date	October 2020
Supersedes	Previous Job Grading and Review Policy and Procedure and Grading Appeals Policy and Procedure
Supporting policy	Market Pay Policy and Procedure
Review date	
Author	Denise Walker, HR Officer
Date of Impact assessment	October 2020
Benchmarking	N/A

Job Grading and Review Policy and Procedure

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This policy applies to those posts at the Glasgow School of Art (GSA) that are subject to the arrangements agreed as part of the local implementation of the National Framework Agreement.
- 1.2 GSA is committed to the principle of equal pay for work of equal value, and rewarding staff fairly whilst eliminating discrimination in pay practices.

As part of this commitment, this policy provides a sound and transparent approach within which to facilitate the grading and regrading of roles in a fair, consistent and equitable manner across GSA.

- 1.3 GSA uses a single job evaluation scheme HERA (Higher Education Role Analysis) to measure the relative value of all jobs. The grading, and therefore the salary range, of all posts subject to the National Framework Agreement are determined by the outcome of job evaluation.

2. SCOPE AND PURPOSE

- 2.1 This policy sets out the procedure to be followed in respect of the grading of new or vacant posts, and the regrading of existing posts up to and including Grade 9.
- 2.2 Job grading and re-grading will be carried out in a transparent and equitable manner, on the basis of matching the job description for the job to the agreed grade profiles, or where necessary by means of a full job evaluation of the job description or job evaluation form.
- 2.3 Roles are evaluated using the HERA scheme, which ensures equal pay for work of equal value by measuring all roles by a single, consistent and fair methodology. Roles are evaluated against 14 HERA elements.
- 2.4 Roles are evaluated by 2 role analysts trained in the use of HERA. This will involve one trade union analyst and one HR analyst.
- 2.5 Where possible, the evaluation should be carried out within four weeks of HR receiving the completed paperwork.
- 2.6 This policy and procedure has been agreed in partnership between GSA and the four recognised trade unions, EIS, UCU, UNISON and Unite.

3. NEW POSTS

- 3.1 As part of the recruitment process, line managers will submit a completed job description or job evaluation form to the HR Department. HR will arrange for the role to be evaluated by a pair of trained role analysts.
- 3.2 The job evaluation process will be completed prior to any action being taken to recruit to the post.

4. DIRECT REPLACEMENT OF VACANT POSTS

- 4.1 As part of the recruitment process, line managers will confirm in writing to HR that the role as previously described and evaluated remains essentially unchanged, prior to any action being taken to appoint to the post.
- 4.2 If this is not the case, the role will be considered a new role, and evaluated accordingly. If the role in question is “generic”, then all other posts matched to that generic role will be reviewed to determine if the changes concerned also apply to these posts.

5. EXISTING POSTS

- 5.1 It is recognised that in some circumstances the nature of the role may change over time and this may result in a change in the range, complexity and/or level of duties and responsibilities.
- 5.2 Any staff may request a review of the grading of their role on an *ad hoc* basis, however the post holder should normally have been in the role for a minimum of 6 months prior to the application being made.
- 5.3 The request should be made in writing to HR at the time it is considered that a role has significantly changed, and should be supported by appropriate evidence in the form of:
 - a revised job evaluation form or an up to date job description;
 - a summary of the changes to the role outlining the justification as to why the job merits an increase in grade;
 - an up to date structure chart.
- 5.4 It should be noted that the job evaluation process is intended to focus on the level of responsibility and duties assigned to the role, and does not seek to consider matters of individual performance or volume of work.

5.5 The additional duties and responsibilities on which the re-grading is based should have been undertaken with the knowledge and agreement of the individual's line manager.

5.6 Any revisions to the job evaluation form or job description should be confirmed as accurate by the relevant line manager.

If the manager does not support the regrading request, the manager will be invited by the HR Department to explain in writing why they do not support the request. HR will then meet with the line manager and the individual (with representation if required) to attempt to resolve the matter. Should the attempt to resolve the matter prove unsuccessful and the individual is dissatisfied with this outcome, then that person may invoke GSA's Grievance Procedure.

5.7 If the line manager has approved the submission and revisions to the job evaluation form or job description are confirmed as accurate, then this will be passed to the relevant role analysts for evaluation.

5.8 The regrading process will result in one of the following outcomes:-

- The role is regraded to a higher grade;
- The grade of the role remains unchanged;
- The grade of the role does not merit a higher level, nor does it meet the current level, in which case it is referred back to the Line Manager for reconsideration.

5.9 The HR Department will communicate the outcome of the regrading within one week of it being evaluated, normally to the Line Manager along with the appropriate feedback and rationale for the decision. It is the responsibility of the Line Manager to advise the role holder of the outcome of a regrading application and to provide feedback in cases where the application has not been successful.

5.10 When a review results in a post being regraded to a higher level, the postholder will be placed on the first spinal point of the new grade. Any salary increase arising from a grading review will not normally be back-dated beyond the date when the request for review was received by the HR Department.

5.11 If the role holder is not satisfied with the outcome, an appeal may be submitted and considered.

6. APPEALS

- 6.1 In the case of a regrading application, the role holder has the right of appeal against the outcome. Possible grounds for appeal could include an error in the way that the information supplied has been interpreted or an error in the way in which business was conducted. Information not previously made available cannot be included, nor can any change in role since the submission for regrading. The appeal must be based on the original submission.
- 6.2 Unless otherwise agreed, staff have 10 working days from the date of being informed in writing of the regrading outcome to lodge an appeal.
- 6.3 During this process, HR will communicate with staff via their GSA email address. Should an employee be absent at the time, a preferred method of communication will be discussed and agreed with the employee.
- 6.4 There are two stages to the appeals process; a first informal stage and a second formal stage.
- 6.5 An appeal will only progress to the formal stage once the informal stage has been completed.
- 6.6 There is no further right of appeal beyond the second formal stage.

7. FIRST STAGE (INFORMAL APPEAL)

- 7.1 If a member of staff is considering appealing against the outcome of the evaluation of their role, they should in the first instance approach either their line manager, a member of the HR Team or their trade union representative to discuss their concerns. At that time, the individual should identify which elements of their evaluation they are considering appealing.
- 7.2 The staff member should then seek to deal with the appeal informally. An informal approach may include meeting with the role analysts concerned with the evaluation of the role, the purpose of this meeting being to explain the evaluation process, check the content of the individual's job evaluation form, and discuss any basis for appeal.
- 7.3 The informal stage of appeal should be completed within two weeks, unless otherwise agreed. If the individual is satisfied with the outcome then no further action will be taken. However, if the individual is not satisfied a formal appeal may be lodged.

8. SECOND STAGE (FORMAL APPEAL)

- 8.1 The appeal will be made in writing to HR within two weeks of the completion of the informal stage, and if the complete original evaluation is not being appealed then the specific elements should be identified along with the reasons for lodging the appeal. The possible reasons are:
- The agreed evaluation process has not been followed;
 - The role was not correctly described on the job evaluation form;
 - The evidence provided has been wrongly interpreted;
 - There has been inconsistent treatment compared to other role holders.
- 8.2 As with the informal stage, the individual should note that as a consequence of an appeal the score for identified elements could go either up or down. Also, the individual should be aware that information supplied for a particular element may impact on other elements.
- 8.3 HR will acknowledge receipt of the appeal in writing, and will advise the individual of the timescales for hearing the appeal, which will normally be considered within four weeks of being lodged.
- 8.4 Any revisions to the job evaluation form should be confirmed by the relevant line manager. If the manager does not support the appeal then the manager will be invited by HR to explain in writing why they do not support the appeal. HR will then meet with the line manager and the individual (with representation if required) to attempt to resolve the matter.
- 8.5 If the line manager supports the appeal, then the documentation will be considered by two trained role analysts (normally one trade union analyst and one human resources analyst) who were not directly concerned with the original evaluation.
- 8.6 If, however, the attempt to resolve the situation proves unsuccessful and the individual is dissatisfied with this outcome, then that person may invoke GSA's Grievance Procedure.
- 8.7 The individual and their line manager will normally be advised of the outcome of the appeal in writing within ten working days of the appeal being considered, along with the reasons for the decision. Possible outcomes are:
- The appeal is upheld, and the role is re-graded;
 - The appeal is not upheld because although there may be an increase in the score, it is insufficient to justify a change in grade;
 - The appeal is rejected.

JOB GRADING REVIEW PROCESS

