



HUMBERSIDE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

People and Development

Job Evaluation Procedure Policy

Owner	Executive Director of People and Development
Responsible Person	Head of Human Resources
Date Written	December 2022
Date of Last Review	December 2022
Date of next review	December 2025
EIA Completed	December 2025



What we must
do well



How we support our
communities



We value and support
the people we employ



We efficiently manage
the Service

CONTENTS

1. Introduction
 - Core Code of Ethics
 - National Guidance
2. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
3. Aim and Objectives
4. Associated Documents
 - Equality Impact Assessment
 - Legal References
 - National Guidance
5. Job Evaluation Panel Members
6. Procedure
7. Requests initiated by Post Holders
8. Effective Date of Changes
9. Appeals
10. Requests Initiated by Management
11. Pay Protection Arrangement

1. INTRODUCTION

Job evaluation is the process by which we grade Green Book posts. The job description by which the job is evaluated is a management document that reflects the tasks that the organisation needs the post to carry out.

The existing post holder, their level of performance, volume of work and even market considerations are not part of the job evaluation process and are therefore not considered during the grading process.

The grading process is concerned only with the content of the actual post, not the post holder.

Core Code of Ethics

Humberside Fire and Rescue Service (HFRS) has adopted the Core Code of Ethics for Fire and Rescue Services. The Service is committed to the ethical principles of the Code and strives to apply them in all we do, therefore, those principles are reflected in this Policy.

National Guidance

Any National Guidance which has been adopted by HFRS, will be reflected in this Policy.

2. EQUALITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

HFRS has a legal responsibility under the Equality Act 2010, and a commitment, to ensure it does not discriminate either directly or indirectly in any of its functions and services or in its treatment of staff, in relation to race, sex, disability, sexual orientation, age, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief, gender reassignment or marriage and civil partnership. It also has a duty to make reasonable adjustments for disabled applicants, employees and service users.

3. AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The job evaluation procedure aims to provide a systematic, consistent and fair approach to defining the relative worth of jobs within the Service which are subject to Green Book conditions of service.

4. ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS

- [Equality Impact Analysis](#)
- Legal References:
 - [The Greater London Provincial Council Scheme \(GLPC\)](#)
 - [Local Government Terms and Conditions \(Green Book\)](#)

- National Guidance:
There is no specific National Guidance relevant to this policy.

5. JOB EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS

Periodically, expressions of interest will be sought from across Green Book members of the organisation to become trained in Job Evaluation. Applications must be supported by the line manager, will be reviewed by the Head of Human Resources (HR) and those individuals who are regarded as being representative and suitable will be invited to undertake training. Individuals who have live disciplinary sanctions or performance issues will not be permitted to express interest in becoming a trained evaluator.

Expressing an interest does not confer any right to be selected to be a job evaluation panel member, there is no right of appeal if you are not selected and grievances regarding not being appointed as a job evaluation panel member will not be accepted.

The grading of jobs is a highly sensitive issue for many staff and managers, and job evaluation panel members must ensure objectivity and complete confidentiality when undertaking job evaluations.

All panel members will be expected to sit on a minimum of three job evaluation panels a year to maintain their knowledge and skills.

A panel will consist of a minimum of five members including one member of HR and where possible, one Green Book union representative. Sufficient prior notice will be issued to all panel members to allow for attendance at the meeting. In the event that there are no trained union representatives available, an approach will be made for a regional representative to attend, however, the job evaluation panel will not be unduly delayed if a trained union representative or regional representative cannot be available and in exceptional circumstances, the panel will go ahead in order to meet organisational need.

6. PROCEDURE

Managers and employees may not normally request that a job description is submitted for a grading review within 12 months of a previous evaluation outcome, except where changes occur that fundamentally alter the duties and responsibilities of the job.

The Greater London Provincial Council Scheme (GLPC) is the agreed scheme used for Green Book posts within the Service. This scheme applies to all posts evaluated from grades 1 to 13. Any posts evaluated above Grade 13 will be assessed using an external professional job evaluation consultancy service or similar provider.

The evaluation of a job is carried out by a trained panel comprising of a minimum of four evaluators using the job description agreed by the manager in that area. The factors considered for evaluation purposes are separated into 11 different areas which include supervision and management of people, creativity and innovation, contacts and relationships, discretion for decisions, consequences of decisions, resources, work demands, physical demands, working conditions, work context and knowledge and skill.

A comparison may be made of factors allocated for other jobs in the Service and posts benchmarked against other similar posts to maintain consistency in the application of the scheme.

The evaluation panel will 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 any conflicts of interest, panel members will not take part in evaluations of their own role or a role within their respective teams. Panel members should also declare any other potential conflicts of interest where it may be appropriate not to be involved in an evaluation.

All discussions within panels and records of these and the grading results will be strictly confidential and held within HR.

7. REQUESTS INITIATED BY POST HOLDERS

Applications must be made in writing and addressed to the relevant Executive Director/Area Manager. Staff may seek the advice of their line-manager, the relevant HR Service Partner or trade union representative if they need help in compiling their application.

Executive Directors/Area Managers (or their nominated Head of Function) will review the application for regrading with the post holder having regard to the Job Evaluation Policy. They must communicate their decision of whether or not they support the application within one month of an application being received.

If it is felt that a job evaluation assessment of the post is not appropriate, the Executive Director/Area Manager (or nominated Head of Function) should communicate that decision to the post holder and the rationale behind the decision. If the Executive Director/Area Manager concurs that there is sufficient cause for examining the level of responsibility of the post, the application will be forwarded along with an agreed, amended job description and employee specification to the Head of HR.

Executive Directors/Area Managers are responsible for ensuring any costs arising from a regrading can be met from within their budgets.

Applications and agreed job descriptions and employee specifications sent to HR will normally be evaluated within four weeks of receipt of the documentation.

The panel will either invite the employee's manager to the job evaluation meeting or ask for a written submission to provide further explanation on the post to support the evaluation and ensure the panel fully understand the requirements of the role.

In the event of a disagreement between the employee and line manager regarding the responsibilities of the role, it will always be down to the manager to determine what the legitimate duties of the post are and to specify the tasks that the organisation require the post to carry out. The evaluation panel must therefore always be guided by the manager's view of what is genuinely required of the role.

The evaluation panel will arrive at a recommendation on the grading of the post. If there is an increase in the grade of a post, any increase in salary will be paid on the lowest spinal column point of the new grade.

The provisional results of the panel's evaluation will be notified to the Executive Director/Area Manager concerned (or nominated Head). If the Executive Director/Area Manager disagrees with a panel recommendation, a meeting will be arranged with the chair of the panel to explore the areas of disagreement. If necessary, this will be discussed further with the other panel members concerned.

The final decision of the panel will be communicated to the Executive Director/Area Manager.

If the disagreement persists, the Executive Director/Area Manager may take up the matter with the Executive Director of People and Development who will make the final determination.

At no point should a post holder be informed of a recommended grade until it has been agreed by the panel and the Executive Director/Area Manager, especially if it is the subject of ongoing debate.

Within one week of the Executive Director/Area Manager communicating approval, the HR Team will notify the post holder of the outcome in writing.

Line managers will be consulted throughout the evaluation process to ensure that the details of the job under evaluation reflect the genuine needs of the organisation and actual work practice.

8. EFFECTIVE DATE OF CHANGE

The effective date of change will normally be the date that the letter of application for regrading was received by the Executive Director/Area Manager.

9. APPEALS

If a post holder is dissatisfied with the recommendation of a job evaluation panel as approved by the Executive Director/Area Manager, an appeal may be made in writing to the Executive Director of People and Development, within one month of the decision being communicated. The grounds for appeal are limited to:

- A belief that the scheme has been wrongly applied, e.g., certain factor levels have been wrongly allocated or the evaluation panel has failed to follow the guidance.
- A belief that an equivalent job is more highly graded and paid.

The employee's written submission should include enough detail for the appeals officer to understand the factors of the evaluation process which need reviewing or comparative posts which need considering.

The appeal meeting should, if at all possible, take place within 30 working days of the appeal being submitted. At the appeal meeting the employee will be entitled to be represented by their Trade Union representative or a work colleague.

The Executive Director of People and Development, as the appeals officer, will ask for further clarification/questions on why they feel the re-evaluation has not been applied correctly or for details of similar posts more highly graded.

If required, the appeals officer may request the employee's line manager to attend the appeal meeting to provide any clarification on the points raised by the employee.

Once the appeal meeting has been concluded, the appeals officer will make a decision which will be communicated in writing within 5 working days of the appeals meeting, giving rationale for their decision. There will be no further right of appeal.

An employee may not subsequently raise a grievance regarding the grading process or grading appeal outcome as these are already intrinsic in the grading appeal process.

If the decision of the job evaluation panel is overturned and results in the grade being increased, then any pay adjustments will be backdated to the date of receipt of the original application by the Executive Director/Area Manager.

10. REQUESTS INITIATED BY MANAGEMENT

If a manager believes that there have been changes which affect the level of responsibilities of a post, they may request a job evaluation assessment following approval from the relevant Executive Director/Area Manager.

Such instances would include jobs where there are no current post holders undertaking the duties, for example:

- a vacant post

- the creation of a new post
- an organisational restructuring/review

Alternatively, there may be proposed changes in duties of roles that are currently occupied which could include:

- additional supervisory responsibilities.
- greater range or type of services managed.
- technological changes affecting the level of skill required.
- greater delegated decision making.
- other organisational changes such as combining roles, removal of a management level, reduction of responsibilities or integrating separate functions.

A job description and employee specification should be prepared by the manager, in consultation with the relevant HR Service Partner. This should be signed by the line manager to indicate that it is an agreed and accurate description of the job and authorised by the relevant Executive Director/Area Manager.

The information should then be sent to the Head of HR who will arrange for the post to be evaluated.

11. PAY PROTECTION ARRANGEMENTS

In exceptional circumstances the evaluation of a post may result in a reduction in the grade. This would usually only be in the following circumstances:

- An organisational restructure
- Where there have been significant changes to the role over a long period of time

If an evaluation results in a reduction in grade, the normal pay protection arrangements of two years (in accordance with the Pay Protection Policy) will apply.

**If you require any further guidance in relation to this policy,
please contact Human Resources**