

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.

1.3.2 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. PROCEDURE

2.1 Cases supported by line managers

2.1.1 An application for a job grade review can be submitted during April to July of each year by the line manager using the job grade review form, only exceptional cases will be considered outside of this window.

2.1.2 Managers should consider as part of the SPRE process if there has been a significant and indefinite change to the level of duties and responsibilities of an individual post and there is a case to review the grade.

2.1.3 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 can contact a member of the [Employee Relations team](#) at any point during the process.

2.1.4 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.

2.1.5 All applications will ordinarily be considered in October of each year by Staffing Review Group. Following cases being considered, decisions will be shared with line managers and those that are supported will be subject to evaluation carried out by HR.

2.1.6 HR will confirm decisions of the evaluation process to line managers and Staffing Review Group and will issue paperwork accordingly with effective from 1st November.

2.1.7 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.

2.2 Personal Cases

2.2.1 Where an individual initiates a discussion about their job grade and the line manager supports the case, the line manager is responsible for producing the application documentation in consultation with the individual post holder in accordance with section 2.1.

2.2.2 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.

2.2.3 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.

2.2.4 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.

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

2.3 Application Documentation

2.3.1 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.

2.4 The Evaluation

2.4.1 All applications will be reviewed by Staffing Review Group in the first instance. Once agreed in principle Human Resources will complete the evaluation process.

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

2.4.3 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.

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

2.4.5 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.

2.5 Notification of Outcome

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

2.5.2 Following notification of a successful job grade review Human Resources will confirm the regrading in writing.

2.5.3 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).

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

2.5.5 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.

2.6 Timescales

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

2.7 Appeals

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

2.7.2 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.

2.7.3 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.

2.7.4 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
- b) Academic Promotions Procedure
- c) 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	1.2
Equality Analysis Form Submission Date	24 May 2023
Approval Date	14 May 2024
Approved By	University Executive Committee
Date of Commencement	February 2016
Date of Last Review	17 June 2024
Date for Next Review	17 June 2027
Related University Policy Documents	a) Rewarding Excellence Framework b) Academic Promotions Procedure c) Progression Procedure
<i>For Office Use – Keywords</i>	