Job Analysis and Job Evaluation Considerations

Stage	Issues
Project purpose	The reasons for undertaking formal job analysis and job evaluation are varied. The main required project outputs should be identified from the outset. They will often determine the best project process. Example purposes could include: • Review or establish new pay arrangements, including any associated grade structures; • Address real or perceived concerns regarding current pay relativities impacting on staff "engagement"; • Audit legislative compliance of pay and consider associated risks of claims; • Implement a proactive approach to equal value pay including establishing a defence against risks; • Externally benchmark pay arrangements for key staff or whole pay policy; • Manage the integration and harmonisation of existing pay arrangements for different staff groups; • Align roles and pay to new or changed ways of working; and • Establish the foundation for a new pay philosophy. • Help design new or changing organisations and roles. These purposes are not mutually exclusive and any project can achieve multiple outcomes and benefits. Job analysis can also be used without job evaluation to help achieve clarity and aid various aspects of people management.
Job analysis	The correct pay for any job requires that the job be properly understood. Debates about relativities and perceptions of "unfairness" often stem from a sense that the job is not properly "recognised" or its requirements are unclear or disputed.

Created 08/10/2010

Job analysis can be achieved by:

- Line managers compiling job descriptions or questionnaires for their staff's jobs;

- Participants compiling job descriptions or questionnaires (usually signed off by line managers);

- Analysis by HR through prior knowledge of roles or additional interviews;

- Specialist consultants undertaking fact finding interviews with job holders or managers; and

- Generic analysis or analysis of multiple occupant roles can be developed in collective interviews/workshops.

A key issue may be the extent and quality of existing job information:

- How up to date?

- How comprehensive and consistent?

- How credible with managers and post holders?

- Does it provide sufficient content (structure and factors) for job evaluation?

- Can existing information be extended or otherwise iterated?

Another key issue is the extent to which the projects outcomes will be enable by post holders participation in the analysis. Such involvement heightens the potential for acceptance of the results by the participants, aligns with a participative culture and can support its acceptance as a valid study. Such participation is also not essential and can be costly in time and other resources. It can also be at odds with designing jobs as they should be and any outputs should ideally be subject to managerial review.

Format of job description or role profile	The organisation needs to agree the format, style and content of the job or role profile description.
	There is also minimum amount of required information to enable any formal job evaluation. This can be enhanced with information to support performance management, introduce behavioural competencies, recruitment process or for other HR purposes.
	Best practice states that descriptions should focus on results (accountabilities). There should be less emphasis on tasks and duties

	(which may be viewed as unnecessary and inflexible).
	It is at this stage of deciding format in particular that the decision should be aligned with overall purpose of any intervention.
Number of distinct jobs/roles	A key issue in modern job definition is the extent jobs/roles are viewed as distinct or can be grouped into common versions often referred to as "generics".
	Organisations (of any size) may have many people doing the same type of work, if not the same job title. It is however, possible to describe the work by a sample of roles or by specific exemplars or the work.
	Modern and recommended job definition promotes the flexibility of having generic role descriptions for jobs that may have different titles and some different aspects of deployment but can extensively be viewed as identical for the purposes of description and measurement. Such approaches are often associated with job or career families. Job definition in this approach is based on broader, more flexible generic profiles with separate specific individual performance plans or to cover detail and specific deployment.
	An organisation needs to consider its overall approach to job definition to help determine the number of distinct jobs/roles to be analysed and evaluated.
Number of roles in study	The number of the roles to be described and measured is also dependent on the project's core purpose.
	An approach based on samples may be appropriate for:
	• An audit of equal value risks;
	• Establishment of an new grade structure; or
	• Benchmarking of an organisation's overall approach to pay with regard to the market (its "pay line").
	A more comprehensive approach to all roles may be more suitable where:
	• A fully compliant job evaluation study for first line equal value defence is required; or
	• There are extensive issues of internal relativities that need to be resolved.

	An organisation's scale will also be relevant to deciding the approach on numbers of roles. There are also specific methods for undertaking large studies which combines the benefits of job families and associated reduced numbers of roles with compliant factor based allocation of individual roles.
Agreement to the job content	It is recommended and common for organisations to have the final say on the content of their jobs. However, it is useful to consider the extent those individual job holders and managers are also involved in "signing off" job content. The process for this agreement and managing any disputes needs to be agreed and reflected in any project.
Jobs as they are or jobs as "should be"?	The main project drivers will usually dictate the extent that jobs should be designed to support efficient and effective practices. Or alternatively the need to reflect actual current operations. When examining issues of equal value and relativities/acceptance of pay a project should be mindful of the job's actual operation. Design of effective structures and processes moving forward will also need to include appropriate changes within roles to help implement planned improvements. It may also be necessary to undertake both and there is methodology to provide a straightforward way of describing the "here and now" and providing a foundation for organisation design and development. The extent a role definition may be new or a change needed should be considered along with any potential contractual issues (which are likely to vary for the change and the organisation's contracts).
Job evaluation approach	Job evaluation can be undertaken in a variety of ways: Analytical schemes • Points rating: the main elements of jobs are analysed according to the level at which they are present. Levels are allocated a points score and the points are totalled to give a job score. • Factor comparison: independent factors are assessed. Points are not allocated. Non-analytical schemes

	• Job ranking: sorted by importance or difficulty, based on scope and autonomy. Without the rigour or consistency of the points factor method.
	• Ranked jobs form a hierarchy, which may be deconstructed further into an arbitrary series of grades.
	• Paired comparisons: jobs are compared with each other and awarded points depending on 'greater, equal or lesser' value.
	• Points added to create a rank order, which can be subdivided into grades if required.
	Analytical schemes would be recommended to ensure equal value compliance. They can also aid external benchmarking.
	Non-analytical schemes can be used to support internal grading decisions.
Which analytical job evaluation method?	There is no definitive scheme to use and there is a wide variety available.

The first decision is whether to use a bespoke or an existing scheme.

Bespoke schemes are:

• Expensive to design;

• Will be untested in terms of results and compliance scrutiny;

• May be the only acceptable method perceived as relevant to stakeholders; and

• Have a danger that they could be viewed as designed to favour an employer's interest or "status quo".

There are many existing job evaluation schemes that will be effective. A large number are associated with specific consultancies or work sectors.

Issue to consider are:

• Technical credibility of the scheme's designers, its factors and associated measures, including compliance with associated codes of practice; |

- The factors' relevance to the roles and organisational sector;

- Costs and any licence restrictions;

- Extent it is tied to particular consultancy intervention (may add to future costs/dependency);

- Ease of use and maintenance;

- Extent that capability is transferred to the organisation;

- Extent the scheme's outputs readily support effective pay scheme design;

- Acceptability to trade unions/staff representatives;

- Flexibility of the scheme and role of local conventions and circumstances;

- Effectiveness of supporting documentation and scoring process;

- Balance of evaluative judgement versus formulaic scoring (i.e. max flexibility versus max consistency);

- How the outputs relate/read across to effective pay benchmarking data; and

- Extent the scheme may reflect or challenge existing values and hierarchies. Whilst potentially all "compliant" it is known some schemes have certain design features that lead to particular likely outcomes.

Independent advice is recommended to help select which method.

Means of evaluating the roles	Evaluation can be undertaken by external consultants, trained staff in an organisation, or through a combination.
	External consultants are most useful when:
	- Expertise and independence is key; - The task needs to be outsourced due to internal work demands;

- The project is largely a distinct or one off project;

- Speed is important (consultants tend to be quicker as more experienced); and

- The task doesn't warrant the initial set up costs involved in skills transfer.

If external consultants are used then it is important that they understand both the culture and context and job analysis information. Outputs are likely to be drafted and subsequently verified in discussion with the organisation and key stakeholders.

Internal evaluations are most useful when:

- Costs need to be minimised on a major project;

- The method needs to be embedded for ongoing use;

- The evaluations would be seen as more credible to stakeholders with considerable input from an internal staff member who understands the roles; and

- Where an inclusive participant based partnership with trade unions/managers/staff is seen as important on process as well as planning and implementing outcomes.

| *Implementation advice* | The outputs of job analysis and job evaluation should be aligned to a project's key purpose. As described these may vary considerably.

It is likely that specialist interpretation and advice from HR professionals and/or consultants will be needed to ensure outcomes that are fit for purpose.

Job analysis and evaluation will likely raise a number of issues and resolving these will enhance effectiveness and efficiency. |