Ref: STAC(TCS01)2026

Date: 25 February 2026

To: **NHS Scotland Directors of Human Resources**

c.c. **NHS Scotland Board Chief Executive**
Management Steering Group
Scottish Terms and Conditions Committee Members

Dear Colleague,

JE SUB-GROUP (STAC) – JE GENERAL REVIEW SHORT TERM ACTIONS

As you will be aware from your own national networking groups, there have been ongoing discussions at the Scottish Terms and Conditions Committee (STAC) and the Management Steering Group (MSG) on a range of Job Evaluation issues.

These discussions are taking place in the context that the national staff side, MSG and Scottish Government agree on the need to ensure that JE is applied as per the UK Staff Council JE Handbook, in accordance with our mutual commitment to Once for Scotland.

As part of these discussions, it has become apparent that there are a number of local practices and ways of working which are not wholly consistent with the UK Staff Council JE Handbook, and that in some instances they are creating tensions locally and nationally.

In order to provide interim clarity to boards and local partnerships whilst we work on reviewing JE in Scotland, NHS Boards are required to note and implement as follows.

Pre Panel Stages (sometimes referred to as stage 1 or admin panels)

There is no requirement within the UK Staff Council JE Handbook for such panels. Although there is guidance in the handbook in the chapter that deals with consistency checking.

JE Handbook - Consistency checking chapter

The most common source of poor quality and inconsistency in local matching and evaluation is inadequate or inaccurate job information, whether in the form of a job description and any additional input for matching, or a completed and analysed JAQ for local evaluation. Possible steps to minimise problems arising from such job information include:

- In advance of the post going to panel, joint quality assurance (by job evaluation leads or their nominees) of the written job information to identify obvious omissions or inaccuracies.

Quality checks should help to ensure there is sufficient job information available for evaluation. In practice, this means checking:

1. All sections of the job description (JD) have been completed
2. Job details are correctly listed
3. An organisation chart is included

_____

4. The JD content includes straightforward phrases and sentences, avoids abbreviations and jargon/technical/clinical terminology explained (**use of JE jargon, phrases and profile language should be avoided**)
5. Content is non-discriminatory and not gender specific.

To avoid delays in processing JDs submitted for matching, Boards should ensure:

1. Advice on developing, updating and revising JDs is readily available and accessible to postholders and managers.
2. Support and guidance are available from Human Resources and Job Evaluation teams.
3. Where there are minor or administrative issues with JD content (e.g. unfinished sentences, missing words) Boards should resolve these without undue delay. All changes must be agreed between the postholder and line manager as they will be included in the final JD used for evaluation.

Action: **Where pre-panel quality checking processes exist, they MUST stay true to the terms of the scheme (points 1-5 above). Boards should not use pre panel stages for:**

1. **Pre-assessing/matching JDs to estimate the potential pay band.**
2. **Pre-scoring the JD and/or recommending the national profile the post should be matched to.**

Authorisation or sign of JD's

The JE Handbook clearly advises (Para 4.1) that where a post holder and their manager agree that the demands of the post have changed significantly, then a re-match or re-evaluation of the post needs to be carried out.

Therefore, the designated line manager is responsible for agreeing job descriptions.

When jobs change, are updated or when new roles are being introduced, the line manager is generally expected to authorise or sign off on job descriptions when these are revised and updated.

Action: **Boards should ensure that the practice locally is consistent with para 4.1 of the UK JE Handbook.**

NHS Boards should note that the requirement for financial oversight and governance is not in itself an appropriate reason to delay or reject a bona fide JE request or outcome.

Effective Date

It is recognised that boards will have developed their own approaches and precedents concerning the effective date of an agreed re grading. Particularly where the process of reaching agreement has been lengthy.

The UK Staff Council JE Handbook deals with this at para 4.5, confirming that the date of backdating should be the date at which it was agreed between the staff member and the manager that the job had changed.

Boards and local staff side are reminded that JE requests should be dealt with in a timely manner.

Action: **As a minimum, Boards should ensure that backpay dates are consistent with the date at which it was agreed that the job had changed.**

Use of Track Changes and other documents to support a JE request

It is recognised that Boards and local partnerships have developed their own forms and admin systems to support the JE work. As an example, some boards require a tracked change JD to be submitted alongside the final, agreed JD. There is no requirement within the scheme for the provision of a tracked changed JD.

The requirement of the scheme is that the panel receives an agreed/amended JD for evaluation.

Action: **Boards must take care to ensure that local processes and mechanisms do not add additional layers of complexity to the application of the scheme. Administrative convenience should not be a reason to reject or refuse a JE claim that meets the minimum requirements of the scheme**.

Yours sincerely

Sybil Canavan
Director of People & Culture, NES
Co-Chair, STAC Job Evaluation Group

Matt McLaughlin
Regional Organiser, Unison
Co-Chair, STAC Job Evaluation Group