

REGRAIDING PROCEDURE FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES POSTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The University is committed to the principle that the pay and conditions of employment of all members of staff are non-discriminatory and free from bias. In this respect, the University will ensure that the pay and conditions of employment are determined fairly and equitably to ensure equal pay for work of equal value.

2 OBJECTIVES OF PROCEDURE

This procedure reflects the University's recognition that the role to which an employee is appointed does not remain static. There may be a significant change in the range, complexity and level of duties, accountabilities and responsibilities. Such change may require a review of the grade of the post. This procedure lays down the principles and process to follow where:

- a) It is considered that the grading of a current post may no longer be appropriate as a result of a significant and permanent qualitative change to the level of duties and responsibilities. It should be noted however, that an increase in the volume of work (i.e., a quantitative change) undertaken by the postholder will not necessarily entail an increase in the level of responsibilities, e.g., Checking 100 invoices entails no higher a level of responsibility than checking 10 invoices.
- b) A new post has been created which requires to be graded.

This procedure applies to all Professional Services and Senior Management Staff. Separate processes are in place for Academic & Research staff.

3 PRINCIPLES

- Job descriptions and Grade descriptors form the basis for grading posts.
- The grading of a post results from the Job Grading Process, underpinned by Hay Job Evaluation as adopted by the University.
- Any regrading request must be based on significant and permanent change(s) to the level of duties and responsibilities that have an impact on the majority of key elements within the Grade Descriptors.
- Focus will be on the content of the job description and not on the personal capabilities, qualifications and characteristics of individual job holders.
- The Job Grading Panel will follow the Job Grading Methodology (Appendix 2) to analyse each key element of the job description against the corresponding key element in the Grade Descriptor to determine a "best fit" overall (>75%).
- The Grading assessment will always be based on the assumption that the full remit of the job is being carried out at a fully acceptable level of performance.

4 RESPONSIBILITY AND SUPPORT

- It is the responsibility of the Line Manager and Dean/Director to submit a regrading application although it can be initiated by the Line Manager, Dean/Director or the post holder.
- An application for regrading must be supported by the Line Manager and Dean/Director **and approved by the VCEG Lead**, prior to submission to the Reward Adviser in the Department of People and OD via human.resources@uws.ac.uk.
- Budget implications must be discussed and agreed with the Finance Business Partner and VCEG Lead.

5 PROCEDURE

5.1 Application

An application for grading/regrading can be submitted at any time to the Reward Adviser in the Department of People and OD via human.resources@uws.ac.uk.

All applications for grading/regrading must be accompanied by the following documentation:

- Original job description (if relevant)
- Revised/new job description signed by the job holder(s), Line Manager and Dean/Director to confirm that it is an accurate reflection of the post.
- An organisation chart indicating the hierarchy of posts above and below the post under review.
- For regratings, completion of the Regrading form (Appendix 1)

5.2 Consideration of Application

The Reward Adviser in the Department of People and OD will convene a local Job Grading Panel, consisting of:

- Reward Adviser
- HR Business Partner
- Director/Dean of School
- Line Manager

The Job Grading Panel will match the job description to the most appropriate Grade Descriptor which provides “best fit” in accordance with the Job Grading Methodology (Appendix 2), taking into account the information provided.

Where it is clear from the initial job grading preparation and discussion that there is agreement between all parties as to the grade outcome, the Job Grading Panel is not required to meet. In this case, validation of the grade outcome will be carried out by:

- Reward Adviser
- HR Business Partner

If there is any lack of clarity or a requirement for further information, the line manager and Dean/Director will be contacted to provide any supplementary information.

Recognised Trade Union Branch representatives will be permitted to observe job grading panels of posts out with their own department/school.

If the job description cannot be graded because the panel is unable to reach agreement on the grade allocation, the job description will be referred for full job evaluation using the University’s Job Evaluation Protocol and a grade will be established from the evaluation score.

5.3 Validation and confirmation of grade

All regrading outcomes will be subject to validation and quality control procedures to ensure consistency across the University.

The employee and Director/Dean will be advised of the decision of the Job Grading Panel (or Job Evaluation Panel, if necessary) after validation and quality control procedures have been completed.

The effective date of implementation of the new grade and associated salary will normally be the date the new grade was established by the job grading/job evaluation panel.

5.4 Appeals

Employees have the right to submit an appeal against the grading decision to the Department of People and OD who will convene a Job Grading Appeal Panel.

The Job Grading Appeal Panel consists of a Chair and at least 5 members of the University's Hay Job Evaluators pool, including an appropriate HR Representative, who are trained and experienced in both evaluating the University's jobs using the Hay Job Evaluation scheme and also in grading the University's jobs using the Job Grading Methodology.

Panel members of a particular School/Department whose posts are being matched or evaluated will not participate in the appeal panel process of such posts.

Appeals must be made by employees in writing to an appropriate senior member of People & OD and Dean/Director within **10 days** of receiving written confirmation of the re-grading outcome.

The Appeal Panel will:

- i) Grade the job description in accordance with the Job Grading and Methodology Process, taking into account the information provided by the employee, line manager and Dean/Director in the original regrading application.
- (ii) If the job description could not be graded for one of the following reasons:
 - The Appeal Panel was unable to reach a unanimous decision
 - The Appeal Panel match was within the range of 72% to 75% 'best fit'.

the job description will be fully job-evaluated and a grade established from the evaluation score.

The Job Grading Appeal Panel has the authority to confirm the existing grade or to agree a new one, subject to validation.

Following validation, the employee will be notified of the outcome of the appeal.

The decision of the Job Grading Appeal Panel is final and there can be no further appeal.

Official Use

Procedure Author – Reward Adviser

Procedure Owner – Director of People and Organisational Development

Parent Policy Statement – People and Organisational Development

Public Access or Staff Only Access – Public

Version – Version 2 Approved June 2021

Changes and Reason for Changes – Annual People & OD Procedure Update

Professional Services Staff
Regrading Application Form

Section 1 - Personal Details

Current Job Title:

Job Holder(s):

Department/School:

Current Grade:

Proposed Grade:

Proposed Job Title (if applicable):

Section 2 - Documentation

Please confirm the following documentation is included in the application:

- Original Job Description
- Updated Job Description (agreed by job holder(s), line manager and Director/Dean of School)
- Organisation Chart (indicating the hierarchy of posts above and below the post under review)

Section 3 - Statement of Support and Regrading Justification

1. Please outline the new responsibilities, supported by examples, as well as any additional qualifications, experience, skills and knowledge requirements, which have been added to the post since the previous review which may result in a match to a higher Grade Descriptor. Please confirm the date from which the new duties took effect.

Effective date of new responsibilities: _____

2. Please provide the context for the changes to the role, including any relevant historical information in evolution of the job. Clearly set out the key business drivers for the changes.

Section 4: Consent and Authorisation

Job Holder(s)

By signing this form, you are confirming that the information provided is an accurate reflection of your revised role.

Signature(s):		Date:	
---------------	--	-------	--

Line Manager

By signing this form, you are confirming that the information provided is an accurate reflection of the revised role.

Name:			
Signature:		Date:	

Dean of School / Director

By signing this form, you are confirming that you are in agreement with the information provided and support the application for regrading.

Name:			
Signature:		Date:	

VCEG Lead

By signing this form, you are confirming that you are aware of the application and support the application for regrading.

Name:			
Signature:		Date:	

Once fully completed, this form and accompanying documentation should be submitted to human.resources@uws.ac.uk.

Job Grading Methodology

This document is designed as a guide for grading jobs to the Grade Descriptors at the Job Grading meetings.

For each job description, the Job Grading Panel should:

1. Read the **Grade Outlines** and choose which one(s) offer a broad match. This will eliminate the majority of Grade Descriptors and narrow down the choice to 1 or 2 (or 3 at the most).
2. Assess the **Dimensions** of the job, i.e., the financial and staffing responsibilities. The financial responsibilities of the job are only key to Grade allocation if they are the fundamental purpose of the job's existence. The relevance of the dimensions increase as the grades become higher.
3. Assess the **Key Result Areas** – which of the provisional grades provide “Best Fit”? This area is linked into the factors outlined at 2. – the postholder can't carry out their key result areas if they don't have the required knowledge, skills and experience. Therefore, the logic would dictate that the Grade determined here should be no higher than the Grade determined at 2. Within this section you will need to assess the level at which this job performs within the University in terms of areas such as:
 - Reporting structures
 - Level of autonomy
 - Level of responsibility

Consider what this job is there to do - What it is achieving and why it exists.

4. Assess the **Planning, Organising and Working Relationships** elements of the job and determine the “best fit” grade. It should be noted that these elements are again dependent on the job's requirement in terms of qualifications, skills and experience. Within this section you will need to assess the level at which this job performs within the University in terms of areas such as:
 - Planning periods – Is it over days, weeks, months, or years?
 - Decision making responsibility and authority
 - Boundaries and frameworks the job works within, e.g., legal procedures, etc
 - Communications necessary to get the job done, e.g. At a low level a job may be about information exchange and as the level increases it may be about advising, persuading & influencing, etc. At the highest level the job will be about communications involved with changing behaviour, negotiating, etc.
5. Assess the **Qualifications, Skills and Experience** required for the job (not what the postholder has) and compare with the provisional Grade Descriptors identified. These are the crucial factors in determining the “best fit” grade match.
6. You should now have an agreed job match. You should summarise your rationale and assess the overall impact of each of the key elements on the University to ensure that you have made an appropriate match.
7. You should compare the results of the job match against other gradings within the School/Department to ensure that a logical grading allocation has been made.

NB Some statements within a Grade Descriptor will not apply to the job you are grading and you should ignore those aspects which are not relevant to the role, e.g., if there are no Dimensions relevant to the role then this should not form part of your “best fit” assessment. You are looking for the best fit in terms of complexity of the job and the level at which the job adds most value. As a rough guide, a job and a Grade Descriptor should be some three-quarters the same overall, and adequately cover each of the key elements, to be regarded as “matched”.

Agreement

It is important to remember that discussion and debate around the table is a vital part of the job grading process. Things to bear in mind for this discussion include:

- You are grading the job as it would typically be expected to be done – not the performance of the person in the job now.
- The Grade Descriptors are intentionally generic, so some discussion to agree interpretation is to be expected. A Reward Adviser within People and OD will be able to guide the Panel in this respect.
- The aim of the discussion is to reach agreement and then record the result.