



## **Grading and Re-Grading Processes and Principles**

### **1. Introduction**

#### **1.1 Scope**

This document sets out the procedures which will apply to the grading of new jobs and the re-grading of existing jobs with effect from 2nd July 2007. It has been developed by the University's Task Force on Pay Modernisation as part of its efforts to ensure harmonisation of terms and conditions of employment etc across the University.

#### **1.2 Principles**

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 full job evaluation of the job descriptions.

Staff should note that if they are regraded they will move to the Conditions of Employment applicable to their new grade, which may involve a change in pension scheme. Conditions of service can be found at:

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/human-resources/policies-guidance/conditions-service>

#### **1.3 Quality assurance**

In all cases, a full record will be kept including details of all information considered in the matching process, the rationale for the matching decision or, where appropriate, the full job evaluation score. To ensure the process is robust and consistent across the University, Corporate HR will be responsible for co-ordinating an annual quality assurance exercise by checking a random sample of 10% of all job grading decisions made under the procedure set out under Section 2 below.

#### **1.4 Reporting systems**

The full record of all grading of jobs, including the Corporate HR quality assurance check, will be reported quarterly to the Combined Joint Consultative and Negotiating Committee (CJCNC), which will also undertake an annual review of this new scheme, with a full evaluation of it being carried out by CJCNC in August 2009.

### **2. Ongoing / Responsive Grading Procedure (Primarily of New Jobs)**

#### **2.1 Broad definition**

This procedure will be used where a new job comes into existence (as defined below) or where jobs which were red-circled in the 2006 matching exercise and which have subsequently been grown come forward for grading.

### **2.1.1 Detailed definitions**

New jobs are defined as follows:

- a) Jobs where there is no current post-holder and where a grade of the job is required to allow recruitment to proceed;
- b) Jobs where there is a current post-holder, which change as a direct result of changing organisational need and where the new grade is required before any change can be made to the contract of employment, e.g. a successful grant application included a post at a higher grade than the grant an employee is currently working on, organisational restructuring results in the job description for an employee being amended, etc;
- c) Jobs arising as a result of personal fellowships or similar award being made to an existing member of staff through an appropriate, recognised external competitive process such as the Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship Scheme and where a change of grade is required by the conditions of the award.

## **2.2 Grading process**

For new jobs as defined above job grading will be carried out by the local HR team on a responsive basis following submission of a request from the relevant manager

## **3. The Periodic Review of Grades of Existing Jobs**

### **3.1 Definition**

Re-grading of existing jobs is appropriate where it can be objectively demonstrated that a job has grown to the extent that it matches a higher grade than it is currently placed on. Grading reviews will be undertaken on a regular cycle, as set out below.

### **3.2 Grading review process**

Request for a grading review of a particular job may be made by either management or the post-holder. Where a case is submitted by a manager, this must have the explicit agreement of the post holder; where a case is submitted by the post holder, the manager will be required to verify the factual accuracy of the submission.

#### **3.2.1 Panel membership**

Consideration of all cases for re-grading will be by means of review by an appropriately constituted panel. Panels will be set up as follows:

- a) Panel members will be drawn from a pool of staff trained in job matching. For cases where there is a job description, this will also require two panel members to be trained in Hay job evaluation (typically one HR, and one JULC). In addition to management and HR representatives from the College/ Professional Services Group whose staff are being considered panels will normally include one Joint Unions Liaison Committee (JULC) and one management representative from outside the College/ Professional Services Group. Where the nature of the jobs being considered means it would be helpful, additional JULC and management representatives will be co-opted to the Panel.
- b) Panels will be constituted to ensure that there is adequate understanding amongst panel members of the jobs to be considered.

- c) Separate panels will be held to consider Academic and Professional Services cases. A member of staff currently in an Professional Services role who feels their role more closely matches the Academic profiles may submit a regrading application to the Academic panel (and vice versa) In considering such cases panels will ensure that staff in “hybrid” roles are not disadvantaged.
- d) Panels for Professional Services staff will be convened by each College/ Professional Services on a six- monthly basis. Applications for upgrading up to and including grade 8 will be considered on a six-monthly basis. Applications for upgrading to grades 9 and 10 will be considered on an annual basis.
- e) Panels for academic staff will be convened by each College on an annual basis to consider all cases up to and including grade 10.
- f) For academic posts up to and including grade 8 the panel will have the provision to back date the effective date of promotions.
- g) Decisions on regrading up to and including grade 9 will rest with College/ Professional Services panels
- h) An Academic and a Professional Services panel will be convened annually by Corporate HR on a University-wide basis to consider nominations for upgrading/promotion to grade 10 put forward by the College/ Professional Services Group panels
- i) The University level Academic panel will act as the University’s Personal Chairs Committee
- j) The University level Professional Services panel will be constituted so as to ensure that there is adequate understanding of the jobs to be considered and appropriate representation from the Colleges and Professional Services Groups
- k) Panels considering applications or nominations for re-grading to 9 or 10 with the conferment of academic titles of senior lecturer, reader or professor will require supplementary information on academic reputation and impact.

### **3.2.2 Feedback of panel decisions**

Full feedback will be made available on each grading decision to the relevant post-holder and manager.

## **4. Appeals Process**

### **4.1 Appeal scope**

An employee can only appeal against a grading decision pertaining to the post s/he occupies. An appeal cannot be made under this procedure about salary placing within a grade nor about a decision pertaining to the award of an academic title, e.g. Senior Lecturer, Reader, Professor, etc.

### **4.2 Pre-appeal advice**

Before submitting an appeal, the employee may also seek advice from his/her line manager, the relevant HR advisor and/or from the relevant Union.

### **4.3 Time-limit**

An employee must submit the appeal within four weeks of the date of the letter notifying him/her of the decision. In extenuating circumstances, e.g. absence from work on sick

leave, additional time will be granted for submission of the appeal.

#### **4.4 Grounds for appeal**

To be successful an employee will need to show that either

- a) There was a procedural defect which had a detrimental effect on the grading decision, or
- b) There is clear evidence that the job matches better to a different grade than the one allocated.

An appeal will be deemed to be inadmissible when it is made on the grounds that the job has changed since the submission for re-grading; on grounds of exceptional contribution, or where market pay comparisons apply. For policies and procedures on these see:

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/human-resources/policies-guidance>

#### **4.5 Appeals documentation**

The appellant is required to complete the Appeal Form. See

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/human-resources/forms>

The form allows for the appellant to provide a short statement outlining the reason for the appeal, and to provide additional information for the Appeals Panel to consider, e.g. drawing the panel's attention to aspects of the job which the appellant believes were not given due consideration in the original decision or to comparator jobs. The completed form is then submitted to the relevant line manager for counter-signing and onward transmission to Corporate HR. The appellant and line manager will receive confirmation of receipt of the appeal form within two weeks, with the appellant receiving a copy of the complete appeal documentation, as submitted. The appeal will be dealt with as speedily as possible. Where the appeal documentation is incomplete it will be referred back to the appellant with a note of what action is required to submit a compliant appeal. Where an appeal is held to be inadmissible, it will be referred back to the appellant with appropriate advice on the relevant process to follow.

#### **4.6 The appeals panel**

Panel members will be drawn from a pool of staff trained in job matching. For cases where there is a job description, this will also require a subset of panel members to be trained in job evaluation. The Panel shall comprise:

- a) A senior University Manager, normally a Vice-Principal or Assistant Principal
- b) Two management representatives, one of whom will be from outside the College/ Professional Services Group of the appellant.
- c) Two JULC nominated representatives, one of whom will be from outside the College/ Professional Services Group of the appellant
- d) Secretary to the Panel (provided by HR)
- e) In addition, where the nature of the jobs being considered means it would be helpful, additional JULC and management representatives will be co-opted to the Panel, and may include someone co-opted from another HEI.

Panel members shall declare any potential, actual or perceived conflict of interest (see Conflict of Interest Policy - <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/human-resources/policies-guidance> ) to the Secretary to the Panel, and appropriate action taken.

#### **4.7 Consideration of appeals**

All admissible appeals will be submitted to an appropriately constituted appeals panel, for consideration. The Panel will review the employee's appeal submission, the original application for re-grading and the formal statement of rationale for the original decision.

##### **4.7.1 Appeal panel outcomes**

Where a procedural defect is found and the defect has had a detrimental impact on the decision-making process, the Panel will refer the job description for initial re-grading through the appropriate route.

In all other cases, the Appeals Panel may reach one of the following decisions by means of job evaluation (where there is a job description) or job matching (where there is not, i.e. in the case of many academic jobs):

- a) Where there is clear and unanimous agreement in the Panel, *either*
- to uphold the original decision *or*
  - to uphold the appeal

or

- b) Where there is not clear and unanimous agreement in the Panel, (including where the panel members assigned to undertake job evaluation believe the information available to them will not allow accurate evaluation of the post), to require job analysis to be undertaken to elicit additional or clarificatory information in order to provide an accurate and complete description of the job and to facilitate the production of a job description which the post-holder and his/her line manager accept is a true reflection of the job required to be undertaken.

##### **4.7.2 Job analysis to aid panel decision-making**

Job analysis will be undertaken by a team of two trained job analysts, one an HR advisor from an area other than that within which the post is located, and the other a JULC nominated representative, from a Union other than that which would normally represent the individual. The job analysis team will normally be drawn from members of the Appeal Panel.

Job analysis will involve a meeting or meetings of the post-holder and the line manager with the job analysts. These will normally take place in the post-holder's work place, to allow work place observation, etc. where appropriate. The job analysts will assist in the process of preparing a revised job description. They will seek agreement from both the line manager and the post-holder to the description, and will make amendments, in the light of their consultation, that they believe improve the accuracy of the job description. On completion of this process, the job description, signed by the line manager and the post holder, will be submitted back to the Appeal Panel for grading by means of job evaluation.

Where it is not possible to secure the agreement of either post-holder or line manager to the revised job description, this will be reported to Corporate HR, with a view to resolution being achieved through mediation.

#### **4.8 Communicating the outcome of the appeal**

Once the Panel has made its decision, the employee and his/her line manager will receive a copy of the Appeal Panel's decision and rationale and, where an appeal has been successful, the new grade and salary attached to this will take effect from the same date as would have applied had the re-grading application been successful in the first instance without recourse to appeal. The decision on grading made by the Appeals Panel is final.

### **5. Policy Creation and Review**

#### **5.1 Policy creation**

This policy was approved by the Combined Joint Consultation and Negotiation Committee (CJCNC) in July 2007, for immediate implementation. The policy was reviewed and updated in October 2010 to include: a statement clarifying that staff conditions of service may change if they are regraded and; an amendment to the composition of Grading and Appeals Panels in relation to the number of job evaluators required sitting on these panels. The amendments were approved by the Combined Joint Consultation and Negotiation Committee (CJCNC) in September 2010

#### **5.2 Policy review**

The operation of this policy will be evaluated by the CJCNC in August 2009. *Inter alia* the evaluation will assess whether its operation is meeting the requirements of grading and equal pay for work of equal value.

The policy was reviewed in September 2010 to include a statement clarifying that staff conditions of service may change if they are regraded and; an amendment to the composition of Grading and Appeals Panels in relation to the number of job evaluators required sitting on these panels. The amendments were approved by the Combined Joint Consultation and Negotiation Committee (CJCNC) in September 2010.

### **Alternative Format**

If you require this document in an alternative format, including in Word please contact [CorporateHR@ed.ac.uk](mailto:CorporateHR@ed.ac.uk) or telephone 0131 650 6303.