

Job Family Re-grading Procedure

1. Introduction

1.1 The aim of this document is to inform staff and Heads of Schools/Departments of the procedure to be followed for re-grading a role within one of the job families.

2. Scope

2.1 The Re-grading Procedure is applicable to all roles within the Technical Services Job Family, the Administrative, Professional and Managerial (APM) Job Family and the Operations and Facilities (O&F) Job Family. Staff in the Research and Teaching (R&T) Job Family are covered by the Promotions Process.

3. Timing

3.1 The Re-grading Procedure will run three times a year. This will give Schools/Departments flexibility to apply to have a role considered for re-grading, when the role appears to “best fit” an appropriate higher level in the job family.

3.2 The Human Resources Department will publish the relevant three dates for submission of re-grading applications on the HR web site. See:

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/hr/guidesandsupport/promotionandregrading/regrading/index.aspx>.

4. Principles

4.1 This Re-grading Procedure should be used where a role has changed substantially e.g. when a role has increased in size, responsibility, complexity or in some other significant way and it appears to meet the criteria of a higher level within the appropriate job family, as set out in the relevant level descriptors.

4.2 In order to ensure transparency of each stage of the procedure, a case for re-grading a role may only be made through a School/Department. An individual may initiate the discussion about re-grading with their line manager but a role will not be considered for re-grading unless it is supported by the School/Department. Thus, once a case for re-grading is put to the re-grading panel, individual members of staff can be assured that their case for re-grading has the full support of the School/Department representative attending the panel.

4.3 Rewarding the consistent and/or exceptional performance of individual staff should be done through the Performance Review Process and/or the award of an Exceptional Performance Bonus or a Special Contribution Bonus. See:

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/hr/guidesandsupport/rewardpayandallowances/recognitionandawards/index.aspx>.

4.4 If a case for re-grading is unsuccessful, then a re-submission cannot be made in the next two rounds of re-grading e.g. in 2016-17 if a case is submitted and is unsuccessful in the first round effective from the 1 December 2016 then a re-submission cannot be made in the next two rounds effective from the 1 April 2017 and the 1 August 2017.

4.5 There will be exceptions to 4.4 above. For example, where a member of staff has been red circled the School/Department can make a case for re-grading more than once during any 12-month period. Another exception is where, due to a restructuring exercise, the role of an individual has significantly changed since the last application for re-grading.

4.6 Where a case for re-grading is successful, the effective date of the change in job family level and salary will be from the first of the month after the Re-grading Panel has met. The dates of effective level and salary change will be established in accordance with the timing of the Re-grading Panels.

5. The Re-grading Panel

5.1 All members of the Re-grading Panel must be trained in carrying out the job matching process.

5.2 A re-grading panel will be convened three times a year and the dates will be published on the HR web site at: <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/hr/guidesandsupport/promotionandregrading/regrading/index.aspx>. Other than for exceptional circumstances these dates will follow a regular pattern.

5.3 Membership of the Re-grading Panel will be as follows:

- Chair - Senior University Manager (the Registrar or nominee);
- 2 University representatives (1 Human Resources Business Partner or nominee, and 1 Senior Manager nominated by the Registrar or Chair and independent from the School/Department for the role being considered for re-grading);
- 2 Trade Union representatives* (nominated by the Secretary of the appropriate Trade Union). If the Trade Union representative(s) are from the same School/Department as the role being considered for re-grading, then the Chair should be made aware of the potential conflict of interest and should make the decision regarding whether the representative(s) should be independent from the School/Department for the role being considered for re-grading;
- 1 Head of School/Department (or nominee) or line manager for the role being considered for re-grading.

All the above panel members will contribute equally to the decision making process.

Also in attendance, but **not** part of the decision making panel may be:

- Additional member of the Human Resources Department, in the capacity as note taker only;
- Additional member from the School/Department, who may be the Head of School/Department (or nominee) but will normally be the line manager for the role being considered for re-grading.

*For the Technical Services Job Family there will be two representatives from UNITE. For the APM Job Family there will be one representative from UNISON and one representative from UCU. In exceptional circumstances and only with the agreement of the Human Resources Department, if either a UNISON or UCU representative is not available then there may be two representatives from the same Trades Union on the panel, e.g. two UNISON members. For the Operations and Facilities Job Family there will be two representatives from UNISON.

5.4 There must be a quorum of at least four panel members including the following: - Chair, 1 Human Resources Business Partner (or nominee), the representative from the School/Department and 1 Trade Union representative. A member of the Human Resources Department may also attend (in addition to the HR Business Partner/nominee) in the capacity of note taker but who will not participate in the panel.

5.5 The Re-grading Panel will carry out a job matching exercise in consideration of the re-grading case, using the details supplied on the Re-grading Role Profile Form (JM07), clarified by information provided by the Head of School/Department and/or line manager for the role being considered.

5.6 The School/Department representative should verbally put forward their case for re-grading to the panel, summarising the main changes to the role since the role was assigned its current level. This should include reference to the current and proposed new organisation structure (if applicable), detailing what the relevant changes are and how the role fits in to the organisation chart and to the overall structure of the School/Department.

5.7 The Re-grading Panel will be able to seek clarification of any detail on the Re-grading Role Profile Form from the School/Department representative.

5.8 The Chair will ensure the process is carried out in a consistent and fair manner and that all the members of the panel have an opportunity to fully understand the role before being asked to give their opinion as to the job family level.

5.9 The Re-grading Panel must reach a unanimous decision regarding the appropriate job family level. If the panel does not reach a unanimous decision or is undecided, it can refer the re-grading application to a Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel, which will carry out a Hay job evaluation of the role, to determine the appropriate job family level.

5.10 The panel may reach one of four decisions which are:

- 1) the role is re-graded to a higher level;
- 2) the level of the role remains unchanged;
- 3) the level of the role does not match the higher level, nor is the panel persuaded that it meets the current level, in which case it is referred back to the School/Department for reconsideration;
- 4) or that the role be referred to a Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel as the panel could not reach a consensus agreement on the appropriate level.

5.11 The Head of School/Department (or nominee) may verbally inform the line manager of the role holder of the decision reached by the Re-grading Panel and the reasons for the decision.

6. Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel

6.1 The Re-grading (Hay) Review panel will be convened as and when required, by the Director of Human Resources (or nominee), normally to consider cases that the Re-grading Panel felt to be borderline or where they could not reach a consensus agreement on the appropriate level. The Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel will use the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme to establish the size of the job, which in turn will inform the level in the job family.

6.2 All members of the Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel must be trained in carrying out the Hay job evaluation process.

6.3 No member of the original Re-grading Panel may participate in the Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel as a panel member.

6.4 Membership of the Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel will be as follows:

- Chair - Nominee of the Director of Human Resources;
- 2 University representatives; (1 Human Resources Business Partner or nominee and 1 Senior Manager nominated by the Registrar or Chair and independent from the School/Department for the role being considered for re-grading);
- 2 Trade Union representatives * (nominated by the Secretary of the appropriate Trade Union). If the Trade Union representative(s) are from the same School/Department as the role being considered for re-grading, then the Chair should be made aware of the potential conflict of interest and should make the decision regarding whether the representative(s) should be independent from the School/Department for the role being considered for re-grading;

All of the above panel members will contribute equally to the decision making process.

Also in attendance, but **not** part of the decision making panel or Hay job evaluation process:

- Head of School/Department (or nominee) for the role being considered for re-grading;
- Additional member of the Human Resources Department, in the capacity of note taker only.

* If the roles are in the Technical Services Job Family the Trade Union representative(s) will be from UNITE. Where the roles are from the APM Job Family, the Trade Union representative(s) will be from UNISON and/or UCU. In exceptional circumstances and only with the agreement of

the HR Department, if either a UNISON or a UCU representative are not available then there may be two representatives from the same Trade Union on the panel e.g. two UNISON members. For the Operations and Facilities Job Family there will be two representatives from UNISON.

6.5 There must be a quorum of at least three core panel members: - Chair, 1 University representative (who will normally be a Human Resources Business Partner) and 1 Trade Union representative *.

*If the roles are in the Technical Services Job Family the Trade Union representative will be from UNITE. Where the roles are from the APM Job Family, the Trade Union representative will be from either UNISON or UCU. Where the roles are in the Operations and Facilities Job Family the Trade Union representative will be from UNISON.

6.6 The Head of School/Department (or nominee) who is invited to attend the Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel will not take part in the Hay job evaluation of the role. Their role will be to verbally put forward a case for re-grading to the re-grading panel, summarising the main changes to the role since the role was assigned its current level. The panel will also be able to seek clarification of any detail on the Re-grading Role Profile Form from the Head of School/Department (or nominee). Once the panel have agreed that they have a full and thorough understanding of the role, the Head of School/Department (or nominee) will be asked to leave whilst the Hay job evaluation process is carried out. At this point the trained panel members will be issued with the Hay scores for the job family level/s in question. This information will be collected at the end of the panel with the other panel papers.

7. The process prior to the panels

7.1 The Human Resources Department will publish on the HR web site the relevant dates by which re-grading cases have to be sent to the Human Resources Department – see: <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/hr/guidesandsupport/promotionandregarding/regrading/index.aspx>. It will be the responsibility of the Head of School/Department to ensure their staff are aware of the details and timescales for submission. Late submissions will be carried forward to the next scheduled Re-grading Panel.

7.2 The process for submitting a case for re-grading will be through the completion of a **Re-grading Role Profile Form** available at: <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/hr/guidesandsupport/promotionandregarding/regrading/index.aspx>. This form requires a description of the changes to the role since the current job family level was established, (as well as a full description of the current role which incorporates and highlights any changes/additional or enhanced responsibilities to the role in bold.)

7.3 Completion of the Re-grading Role Profile Form should be an active partnership between the line manager and the role holder, involving discussion and agreement about the role and how the role has changed. An individual may initiate the discussion about re-grading with their line manager but a role will not be considered for re-grading unless it is supported by the School/Department. If the School/Department do not support a case for re-grading, the line manager or Head of School/Department should explain clearly to the individual the reasons for this.

7.4 The line manager should complete the 'Comments by your Line Manager' section on the Re-grading Role Profile Form. This will be the most appropriate individual who has the knowledge and awareness of the main duties and responsibilities of the individual's role. This section should detail how the role has increased in size, responsibility and complexity as well as provide any further information to clarify the details of the role and the significant change(s). It should **not** be a statement on the candidate's abilities and performance.

7.5 The Head of School/Department (or nominee) must complete the Head of School/Department supporting statement on the Re-grading Role Profile form, providing details of how the role fits in with the overall School/Department plans. The Head of

School/Department will sign off the Re-grading Role Profile Form and send the completed form to the [HR Central Support Services Team](#) by the due date.

7.6 The Re-grading Role Profile Form **must be** accompanied by a current organisational chart provided by the Head of School/Department or nominee, which clearly shows where the role being re-graded fits into the organisation of the relevant School/Department. The organisation charts should include job titles and levels but not role holder's names.

7.7 If an individual feels that they have a reasonable case for re-grading but this is not supported by their line manager, the individual should discuss this with the next level of management. If a line manager believes there is a reasonable case for re-grading but this is not supported by the Head of School/Department, the line manager should discuss this with an alternative member of the School/Department management team or the most appropriate senior staff member.

8. The process after the panels

8.1 The School/Department will be responsible for informing the individual of the outcome of the re-grading application as well as giving the appropriate feedback.

The Head of School/Department (or nominee) who participated in the Re-grading Panel may immediately inform the line manager of the role holder, verbally, of the decision reached by the Re-grading Panel. The Human Resources Department will then prepare the letter, which will confirm the outcome and any changes in salary. These letters will be sent to the Head of School/Department (or nominee) for signature. Once signed the letter can be given to the role holder by the Head of School/Department (or nominee) or line manager.

Where a role is referred to the Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel, the Head of School/Department or nominee (who will not have been part of the Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel) should discuss the outcome and reasons with the Human Resources Business Partner (who will usually have been on the panel). This will enable the relevant person in the School/Department to give feedback to the member of staff. Letters will be sent out as above.

8.2 Where a case for re-grading is successful, the individual will move onto the appropriate job family level, with effect from the 1st of the month following the date on which the Re-grading Panel considered the role, or as in the case of summer re-gradings the re-grading will be effective from 1 August each year. Individuals will normally move across to the minimum point on the salary band for the relevant job family salary band.

For APM/TS roles, where the salary prior to the re-grading of an individual is in the salary advancement range, and is higher than the minimum salary point of the job family level into which the role has been re-graded, the role holder will move across onto the next salary point above their current salary in their new job family level.

NB: Individuals who have been red circled and whose role has been re-graded will move across to the nearest salary point on the 51 point pay spine, above their current salary in the new job family level.

8.3 Where a case for re-grading is successful, the individual and their line manager should agree new goals for the role, as part of the Performance Review Process.

8.4 The only criterion for requesting a review of the decision of these panels will be on the grounds of a procedural irregularity, which could reasonably be considered to have affected the outcome of the re-grading request. Any request for such a review must be made in writing by the Head of School/Department, stating the reasons for requesting a review and giving evidence of the procedural irregularity, to the Director of Human Resources. The deadline for receipt of such a request for review will be indicated in the letter to the Head of School/Department regarding the outcome of their re-grading case.

The Director of Human Resources will decide whether or not a request for review will be considered. Reasons for not putting forward an application will include:

- a) any vexatious or frivolous applications or;
- b) where there is not sufficient evidence for the review to go forward based on procedural irregularity.

If an application is put forward for review, a Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel will be convened to Hay job evaluate the role to establish the appropriate job family level. Members of this panel must not have been involved in any of the Re-grading Panels or the Re-grading (Hay) Review Panels in that re-grading round for the role in question. The decision of this Re-grading (Hay) Review Panel is final.

8.5 The Human Resources Department will carry out equality and diversity monitoring with regard to all aspects of the re-grading procedure and will report annually the outcomes to the Staff Equality & Diversity Committee.