Scottish Terms and Conditions Committee

_____

29 August 2019

To: Chief Executives,
        Directors of Finance,
        Directors of Human Resource:
        NHS Boards and Special Health Boards,
        NHS National Services Scotland (Common Services Agency), and
        Healthcare Improvement Scotland.

CC: Members, Scottish Partnership Forum
        Members, Scottish Terms and Conditions Committee
        Members, Scottish Workforce and Governance Committee

Dear Colleague

JOB EVALUATION ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

In order to ensure our policies and procedures remain robust and comply with both Equal Pay legislation and NHS Scotland's Staff Governance Standard, it has been agreed by STAC that an annual job evaluation assessment is undertaken.

All Boards are therefore asked to complete the attached template report for approval by their Area Partnership Forum, and to submit this to STAC once it has been signed off by the APF Co-Chairs. The report should be submitted by 30 September each year, but the first return is not due until 2020.

A reminder will be sent out to all Boards at the appropriate time. However, Boards will wish to use the intervening time to ensure that robust record keeping and reporting procedures are in place which will allow the information requested in the report to be easily compiled when required.

An editable "Word" version of the attached template for Boards to download and use will be available on the Circulars and Guidance section of the STAC website - www.stac.scot.nhs.uk/circulars.

Yours sincerely

Calum Campbell   Colin Poolman
Chief Executive   Senior Officer
NHS Lanarkshire   Royal College of Nursing
STAC Management Side Co-Chair **STAC Staff Side Co-Chair**

NHS [insert board]

Committee Title: **Area Partnership Forum**

Presented By:

JOB EVALUATION ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

1   **Purpose of the Report -** The purpose of this report is to highlight to the Area Partnership Forum that the governance of job evaluation is maintained, enabling all staff to be treated fairly and consistently in accordance with the Staff Governance Standard. The report will highlight areas of improvement, areas of concern and issues in the relevant sections detailed below.

2   **Recommendations**

        The Committee is invited to:

3   **Discussion of Key Issues**

4   **Key Risks**

5   **Risk Register**

6   **Impact on Inequality, Including Health Inequalities**

        6.1   As this paper relates to the delivery of a national system, no local rapid impact assessment has been undertaken.

7   **Involving People**

        7.1   The issues contained in this report do not require any public involvement as it is a staff related matter.

8   **Resource Implications**

     Job Evaluation Leads

APPENDIX 1:

	Issue:		
1.	Activity Period [to be inserted]		Number
		New Posts:	
		Revised Posts:	
		Postholder Re-evaluation Requests (see below for breakdown of results):	
		Total Job Evaluation Cases Submitted:	
		Informal Feedback Requests (if applicable to Board area process):	
		Formal Review Requests:	
		Local Evaluations – (completion of Job Analysis Questionnaire):	
		Number of Job Matching Panels:	
		Number of Consistency Panels:	
		Re-evaluation Process Results:	
		Up-banding Following Re-evaluation Request:	
		Band remains the same:	
		Down-banding Following Re-evaluation Request:	
		Other:	
		Grievances raised against application of process:	
		Outcome of grievance process and any lessons learned:	
		Average length of time taken to process requests for re-grading:	
		How many re-grading requests take more than 3 months to process and detail the reasons for the delay:	

2.	Job Evaluation Capacity:	Availability of Job Matchers/Evaluators/Analysts	Management Matchers	
			Staff side Matchers	
			Management Analysts	
			Staff side Analysts	
		Frequency of Panels		
		Panels Cancelled in Period	Reason:	
		Any backlog issues:	Cause:	
			Solution:	
			External Involvement:	
3.	Training:	Undertaken in review period:		
		Scheduled:		
		Barriers to achieving training delivery:		
		Do you have sufficiently trained JE matchers/evaluators/analysts to undertake robust job evaluation? If not, please describe what measures have been put in place to resolve the issue?		
		Are matchers/evaluators undertaking refresher training on a regular basis?		

4.	Job Evaluation Involvement in Service Redesign / Reconfiguration:	5
5.	Review of Job Evaluation Policy and Procedure:	
6.	Equal Pay issues:	
7.	Other issues of concern e.g. banding of roles in other Board areas leading to recruitment and retention difficulty:	