



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
14 April 2016

Report of the Chief Executive

ITEM 5

Re-grading Procedure 2016

SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following the implementation of the Equal Pay Review on 1 June 2016 and consideration of all associated appeals there is a need to revert to 'business as usual' re-grading. This requires a revised Re-grading Procedure to reflect the Hay methodology.
- 1.2 Implementation of equal pay has been achieved using the Hay process. The process used Job Information Questionnaires (JIQ) which were analytically assessed using a review panel. All re-grading applications will need to be analytically assessed using the same method.
- 1.3 In order to apply for a re-grade, employee's will need to complete a JIQ to show how their role has substantially changed. There are no other grounds for a re-grading request. Trained evaluators will form a review panel to analytically assess the JIQ and inform the employee(s) of the outcome.
- 1.4 An appeal against a re-grade outcome will only be allowed where the employee(s) have further substantial evidence of a change in their role. Appeals will need to be heard by trained evaluators in the form of a review panel.
- 1.5 The training required to become an evaluator is two full days but competence must be maintained with evaluators conducting reviews on a regular basis throughout each year. As this is a substantial on-going time commitment it is recommended that appeals be heard by employees rather than Elected Members.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 To agree the use of the revised Re-grading Process.
- 2.2 To agree a change to the appeals process for re-grading, allowing appeals to be heard by internal evaluators rather than Elected Members.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Following the implementation of Equal Pay the old re-grading procedure is no longer

fit for purpose, as it does not match the Hay process.

- 3.2 The time commitment required to become and maintain competence as an evaluator for the scheme is substantial. It is anticipated that many Elected Members would find it difficult to allocate the time needed meet the initial training requirement and the subsequent competence requirements.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 4.1 While the Equal Pay Review was being implemented, re-grading of roles was suspended. The process used to implement Equal Pay was Hay. This is an analytical approach which uses trained evaluators to make sure decisions are consistent.
- 4.2 Evaluators undertake two days of training and take part in a number of review panels in order to qualify. Their competence must be maintained by regular participation in review panels. If an evaluator does not maintain their competence they will be required to undertake re-training before participating in a review panel.
- 4.3 For re-grading applications a panel of three evaluators will normally be required to assess each application. A panel will be able to hear a number of re-grading applications each session.
- 4.4 The Hay method is analytical and consistent in its results when applied by competent evaluators. It is unlikely that two panels assessing the same JIQ would generate a significantly different outcome. The on-going quality assurance provided by Hay will further guarantee the validity of panel results.
- 4.5 This analytical approach with its consistency affects the appeals process. An appeal that had no new evidence, showing an increase in responsibility or accountability would not generate a significant difference in the outcome. Therefore appeals will need to show what has changed from the original re-grading application. Hay concur that having a different panel assess a re-grading application, without additional evidence would not be a suitable option. Appeals will need to be allowed only on grounds of additional evidence of a change in duties or level of responsibility that had been missed out, or not detailed the original application.
- 4.6 The old re-grading procedure stated that appeals would be heard by Members. If we were to maintain this system in the new re-grading process, Members would need to become trained evaluators and maintain their competence. This is not an insignificant commitment of time which Members would need to fit in with existing duties.

- 4.7 We currently have 20 evaluators who will be responsible for grading new posts and re-grading requests. This is sufficient to facilitate any re-grading appeals. We would have to increase this number by at least seven Elected Members in order to provide an Elected Member Appeal Panel. As we would need to cover holidays, sickness and other availability issues. We therefore recommend that all appeals are heard by a different panel that will assess the additional evidence along side the original re-grading application.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 Do not allow any appeals to a re-grading application. This was not felt to be a fair option for employees.
- 5.2 Keep Elected Member Panel appeals. The likely number of appeals would not maintain competence for those Elected Members who were trained as Evaluators. Elected Member evaluators could attend several normal grading panels throughout the year, but this would be a substantial time commitment. Or we would need Hay to facilitate additional training every year with additional on-going costs attached to this. Financially this was not felt to be a viable option.

This report has been approved by the following officers:

Legal officer Financial officer Human Resources officer Estates/Property officer Service Director(s) Other(s)	Paul McMahon Diane Sturdy Janie Berry
For more information contact: Background papers: List of appendices:	Tina Holmes 01332 643894 tina.holmes@derby.gov.uk None Appendix 1 – Implications Appendix 2 – Re-grading Procedure

IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money

- 1.1 Using the evaluators already trained to carry out Hay evaluations will be more cost effective than paying for additional training for Elected Members.
- 1.2 Maintaining the integrity of the Hay process is essential to ensure we do not incur costly equal pay claims.

Legal

- 2.1 Unless we maintain the competence of the evaluators carrying out re-grading and appeals we will be opening ourselves to potential equal pay challenges. This could result in Employment Tribunal proceedings with the associated legal costs involved in this.

Personnel

- 3.1 A robust re-grading and appeals procedure will provide security to employees on the validity of re-grading outcomes.

IT

- 4.1 N/A

Equalities Impact

- 5.1 As this is a procedure an EIA is not required. The procedure has been discussed with the Equalities Lead. As this procedure is part of the on-going process of maintaining equality in pay it is important it is robust. Initially Hay will carry out quarterly audits of Panel decisions to check consistency. This will eventually become an internal quality check. This will ensure consistency in the future and reduce the likelihood of equal pay challenges.

Health and Safety

- 6.1 N/A

Environmental Sustainability

- 7.1 N/A

Property and Asset Management

8.1 N/A

Risk Management

9.1 Unless all evaluators maintain their competence it will expose the Council to equal pay challenges.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

10.1 The re-grading policy will support 'A safe and pleasant place to live and work.