

JOB GRADE REVIEW PROCEDURE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The University recognises the contribution of all staff to its effective operation and has adopted pay and grading structures which appropriately reward knowledge, experience, and responsibilities, whilst providing for salary and career progression.

1.2 Job roles do not always remain static and changes to the range, complexity and level of duties, accountabilities and responsibilities may necessitate a review of the grade of the post. The growth of roles should be management led and be the result of planned job development or organisational structural change. It is therefore expected that cases for job grade reviews will normally be requested by the line manager.

1.2 Purpose

1.2.1 This procedure defines the principles and process to follow where it is considered that a role has changed substantially and appears to meet the criteria of a higher level. Job grade review requests must be based on significant and substantive changes to the level of duties and responsibilities driven by business needs. Where there have been no substantial and sustained changes to the level of work, however the volume of a particular work activity has increased within the overall requirements of the role, this would not normally result in an increase in the job size in line with grading criteria.

1.2.2 This procedure is not intended to reward outstanding performance or recognise and reward one-off or temporary contributions of exceptional and significant performance. The Rewarding Excellence Framework makes provision for rewarding such performance.

1.2.3 This procedure provides a mechanism for the review of job grades through full job evaluation. Information regarding job evaluation and the Hay Job Evaluation Methodology, along with Keele University Job Families can be found on the [HR Webpages](#).

1.3 Scope

1.3.1 This procedure applies to all staff on Keele Spine Grades 2-9 excluding those covered by the Academic Promotions / Progression Procedures.

2. PROCEDURE

2.1 An application for a job grade review can be submitted whenever a significant and indefinite change to the level of duties and responsibilities of an individual post is required.

2.2 Applications will normally be initiated by the manager, however where the line manager does not support a case, an individual may submit a personal application.

2.3 Where a job grade review request results in a change of grade for a member of staff who requires permission from UK Visas and Immigration (UKVI) to work at Keele, the University must ensure that proposed changes are permissible before the regrade can be confirmed.

2.4 Cases supported by line managers

2.4.1 In the majority of cases, the formal review of a job grade will be the conclusion of planned job development and/or organisational structural change and will be budgeted for in advance.

2.4.2 Line managers are expected to produce the application documentation in consultation with the individual post holder and ensure that all documents are agreed. Line managers should contact a member of the [Employee Relations team](#) before preparing and submitting a case.

2.4.3 Where an individual initiates a discussion about their job grade and the line manager supports the cases, the line manager is responsible for producing the application documentation in consultation with the individual post holder.

2.4.4 Faculties and Directorates are expected to meet the full costs of successful applications for job grade review. Managers should identify the funding source before making or supporting any proposal.

2.4.5 Managers can contact a member of the [Employee Relations team](#) for advice and guidance throughout any stage of this process.

2.5 Personal Cases

2.5.1 Where an individual initiates a discussion about their job grade and their line manager does not support their case, the individual will be given an explanation as to why the changes in duties and responsibilities are not sufficient to warrant a grade reassessment.

2.5.2 Following discussions, should the staff member still wish to pursue an application for a job grade review, without their line manager's support, they may do so. The individual is responsible for producing the application documentation (see section 2.6) and must ensure that all documents are reviewed and signed by their line manager prior to submission. The line manager should confirm they are in agreement

with the revised job description and provide an explanation as to why they do not support the case.

2.5.3 A personal case for a job grade review cannot be submitted without an agreed job description. Any disagreement on the content of the job description should be resolved between the job holder and line manager. Where agreement cannot be reached, the next senior manager should become involved to reach a decision on the matter.

2.5.4 Should a member of staff have any questions regarding this process, they can contact a member of the [Employee Relations team](#) for guidance.

2.6 Application Documentation

2.6.1 Applications should be submitted to Human Resources and consist of the following documentation:

- Agreed revised job description and person specification;
- Supporting statement (no more than 2 pages) detailing the elements of the job description which have changed;
- Revised organisational structure indicating the hierarchy of posts above and below the post under review.

2.7 The Evaluation

2.7.1 The receiving Human Resources Manager/Advisor will check the application documentation to ensure it is fully completed. Any queries or missing documentation will be requested prior to the case being taken forward for evaluation.

2.7.2 Cases are evaluated by a panel of at least two trained job evaluators from Human Resources.

2.7.3 The University's grading structure categorises roles into job families and is underpinned by the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme. Using the Hay methodology the panel will undertake a full job evaluation.

2.7.4 Should it not be possible for the panel to complete the evaluation based on the information submitted, they will adjourn to request further information.

2.7.5 The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the process is carried out in a consistent and fair manner and that all members of the panel have an opportunity to fully understand the role before being asked to participate in the evaluation.

2.8 Notification of Outcome

2.8.1 The appropriate line manager will be informed of the evaluation outcome and the line manager will arrange to meet with the individual to provide feedback on the case.

2.8.2 Following notification of a successful job grade review, the line manager must complete a Contract Variation Form (CVF). Human Resources will then confirm the regrading in writing.

2.8.3 The individual's salary will increase to the minimum point of the new salary grade with effect from the month following the date on which the regrading is confirmed (subject to UKVI requirements where applicable).

2.8.4 An individual will only receive increments in their new grade after a minimum of six months in that grade.

2.8.5 In the case of an unsuccessful application, Human Resources will confirm this in writing and provide details of the staff member's right to appeal.

2.9 Timescales

2.9.1 The outcome of a job grade review application will ordinarily be communicated to the applicant, in writing, within 4 weeks of Human Resources receiving the application. Where this timescale cannot be achieved, Human Resources will contact the line manager or individual to notify them of this.

2.10 Appeals

2.10.1 A member of staff has the right to appeal if they feel there has been a procedural irregularity.

2.10.2 Appeals should be lodged, in writing, within ten working days of the date on which the letter confirming the outcome of the job grade review request is sent and must specify the grounds for appeal.

2.10.3 The member of staff will be notified of the date of the appeal meeting within ten working days of the submission of the appeal (the meeting itself will not take place within this timescale although every effort will be made to hold the meeting as soon as possible). This timescale may be extended by mutual agreement.

2.10.4 A member of staff will be given at least five working days written notice of the date of an appeal meeting.

3. RELATED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- a) **Rewarding Excellence Framework**
Academic Promotions Procedure
- b) Progression Procedure

4. REVIEW, APPROVAL & PUBLICATION

4.1 As a general principle, this procedure will be reviewed by the Human Resources Department, in consultation with recognised Trades Unions after three years or where operational and/or legislative requirements change.

4.2 This procedure is not contractual and is not intended to be incorporated into individual terms and conditions of employment. It may be subject to review, amendment or withdrawal.

4.3 The University is committed to ensuring that the effect and application of this procedure accords with the commitments set out in its Equality and Diversity Strategy and will monitor this as appropriate.

5. ANNEXES

Not Applicable.

6. DOCUMENT CONTROL INFORMATION

Document Name	Job Grade Review Procedure
Owner	Chief People Officer, Human Resources
Version Number	1.1
Equality Analysis Form Submission Date	24 May 2023
Approval Date	19 December 2023
Approved By	Chief People Officer (minor edits)
Date of Commencement	February 2016
Date of Last Review	20 December 2023
Date for Next Review	20 December 2026
Related University Policy Documents	a) Rewarding Excellence Framework b) Academic Promotions Procedure c) Progression Procedure
<i>For Office Use – Keywords</i>	