



RHODES UNIVERSITY

JOB EVALUATION POLICY and PROCEDURES FOR SUPPORT STAFF POSTS

1. POLICY PARTICULARS

DATE OF APPROVAL BY RELEVANT COMMITTEE STRUCTURE: Support Staffing Committee on the 31st of May 2007

DATE OF APPROVAL BY COUNCIL/ADMINISTRATIVE SUB-COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL:

COMMENCEMENT

DATE: 01 July 2007

REVISION HISTORY: Not applicable. First time practice.

REVIEW DATE: At least every 3 years.

POLICY LEVEL: All support staff and their HoDs/managers

RESPONSIBILITY [Person/Division/Committee accountable for]:

- IMPLEMENTATION & MONITORING: HR Director/OD Manager and relevant staff of the HR Division
- REVIEW AND REVISION: HR Division in consultation with managers/HoDs

REPORTING STRUCTURE: Organisational Development → Director of Human Resources → Vice Principal → Vice Chancellor → Council

2. POLICY STATEMENT

2.1 POLICY DECLARATION:

Part of Rhodes University's vision and mission is to attract and retain staff of the highest calibre. The job evaluation process is regarded as key to this process by ensuring fairness and consistency in the evaluation and grading of jobs. This impacts on important people management processes such as recruitment and selection, probation, performance management, training and development and compensation. Job evaluation is however, one of a number of Human Resource (HR) tools that is required for effective people management.

2.2 BACKGROUND:

Job evaluation or job grading is the rating of jobs according to a specific set of factors or attributes which are present in all jobs within the organisation. There are a number of possible job grading systems that can be used by organisations such as Patterson and Peromnes. The University has chosen

to use a job evaluation system called the JE Manager. JE Manager is an acceptable and credible job evaluation system and is applicable to a wide variety and level of jobs within various different kinds of organisations. Specifically JE Manager has been found to be particularly suitable for Higher Education environments. For more information on the JE Manager system, please refer to Appendix 1.

2.3 **POLICY OBJECTIVES:**

All support staff positions that are funded by Rhodes University must be graded to ensure fairness and consistency of grading across all Faculties, Divisions and Institutes of the University. In addition, affiliated institutes, who use the Rhodes University appointments process, are also required to grade their support staff positions.

In its use of job evaluation system, the institution aims to achieve the following:

- 2.3.1 The determination of the “intrinsic” worth and contribution of jobs based on a systematic assessment of the degree of complexity in terms of:
 - job content – i.e. the nature of the job (for example, administrative, technical, management etc);
 - job responsibilities and job relationships – i.e. size of the job and number of people and/or financial resources under the job incumbent’s direct control;
 - job requirements – i.e. education, experience, competencies, skills and attributes required for the job.
- 2.3.2 Ensuring that the “intrinsic” worth of a job is determined independently, without any regard for the competence, skills, experience or attributes of the particular person doing the job, or any preconceived standards of remuneration;
- 2.3.3 The derivation of a rational job hierarchy or structure within the University allowing for the comparison of jobs across various sections, irrespective of the nature of the job e.g. a technical job can be compared to an administrative job;
- 2.3.4 The provision of a basis for an equitable and a principled approach to remuneration (pay and benefits) that is consistent with fair labour practices and sound Human Resource (HR) practice as compensation scales are linked to grades. This will allow the institution to defend its remuneration strategy as regards the allocation of pay scales to particular grades;
- 2.3.5 Allowing for the comparison of jobs and remuneration scales with other organisations. This is essential to any organisation being able to attract and retain staff;
- 2.3.6 Understanding and acceptance of the job evaluation system by staff (and their representatives) and management (for this policy, this term refers inclusively to all Heads of Departments/Division/Sections/Units) of the University; and
- 2.3.7 Ethical use of the evaluation system by the HR Division, management and staff where the use of the system is not motivated by personal gain or self-interest without consideration for the institution as a whole.

2.3 **DEFINITIONS:**

- a) Competencies – the knowledge, skills and attributes needed for a job.
- b) Grading – the comparison of jobs along criteria in order to determine a rational hierarchy of jobs.

- c) Grade inflation – the increase in a grade of a job on false premises, often to increase the salary of the job incumbent or to ensure that a market related salary is paid.
- d) Job Evaluation – the process of looking at jobs using a specific job evaluation tool in order to be able to compare jobs for a variety of reasons, the key one being remuneration. There are different job evaluation tools that can be used e.g. Patterson, Peromnes, JE Manager.
- e) Job Grade – the level at which a job is positioned within the organisation. Rhodes University’s support staff range from grades 1 (e.g. kitchen attendant, cleaner, gardener) upwards to grade 15 (e.g. director posts) and grade 17 (Vice-Chancellor and Vice-Principal).
- f) JE Manager – the name of the specific job evaluation tool currently used by Rhodes University.
- g) Job profile – historically known as the job description but which includes additional information to the typical job description. The job profile describes the purpose of the job, the key responsibility areas and standards, the job requirements/specifications in terms of competencies and functional responsibilities of a job. This document is key to the job evaluation process and the quality thereof directly impacts the quality of the evaluation.
- h) Job Profile Template – a pro forma document which indicates to users what kind of information must be included in the job profile and in what format.
- i) Job Profile Toolkit – a guide on how to write your job profile.
- j) Job requirements – the education, experience and core competencies needed for a job.
- k) Compensation Surveys – these are surveys conducted to obtain market related compensation information, i.e. information about what other organisations are paying their staff.
- l) Benchmarking – this is the positioning of jobs on a pay scale within the institution and being able to make external market comparisons.
- m) Pay scales – a range of salaries within a job grade.
- n) Question trace – the grades of jobs are determined by the responses given to questions. Questions are based on the criteria used to evaluate jobs (see Appendix 1 for more detail). The question trace indicates what these questions were and the responses that were given by the person conducting the evaluation. Since these responses are more often than not based on information in the job profile, it is important that the manager and staff member check these.
- o) RemChannel – this is the name of the company who conducts the compensation survey that Rhodes University currently participates in.

3. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

3.1 PRINCIPLES governing policy implementation:

The grading of jobs within the University will be governed by the following principles: -

3.1.1 *Quality of job profile:* The job profile is the cornerstone of the job evaluation process. Not only does it provide critical information for the evaluation of a job but it is key to the governance process, providing documentary evidence of the determination and authorisation of job evaluations.

3.1.2 *Collaborative approach:* The quality of the job profile is commonly directly proportionate to the perspectives gained from the various stakeholders. The staff member and/or staff in similar posts are viewed as being among the best people to be involved in the drafting of job profiles on the assumption that they have a detailed knowledge of what the job involves.

Managers are also key to this process as they will have a particular perspective about the jobs that report to them as well as the expectations of the job and how that job contributes to the overall work of the area. Managers are also concerned with the job hierarchy or structure within their divisions/departments/sections/units (hereafter referred to as departments). Managers are expected to approve the job profile after consulting meaningfully with the job incumbent and other relevant stakeholders such as those in similar posts and those with whom the job incumbent has to interact.

The HR Division respects this role of managers and staff in the drafting of job profiles for their respective departments. It is with this in mind that HR will seek to engage constructively with both managers and staff in the drafting of job profiles.

3.1.3 *HR's role:* The role of HR in the job profiling and evaluation process is to:

- (i) Ensure that they are knowledgeable professionals as regards this process and its application in the University;
- (ii) Ensure that there is consistency in the approach and results of job evaluation;
- (iii) Provide support and guidance to management and staff where necessary as regards the writing of profiles and even mediation if there are problems between staff members and management with regards to the construction of job profiles;
- (iv) Consult with the manager if there are to be material changes to the structure of the department and/or the job profile;
- (v) Retain the authority to make decisions about job profiles and job grading to ensure that the process is fair and that the job grades are both reliable and valid across the institution. Whilst managers retain the authority to decide what the final job profile should look like and are expected to act in the best interests of the department and institution as a whole, the HR Division retains the right to intervene should circumstances require it such as:
 - a) If a job profile does not support sound practices in terms of productivity, efficiency, quality assurance and general business processes;
 - b) If there appears to be an attempt to manipulate the job profile in order to inflate the grade of the job. This would include fraudulently inflating the job responsibilities to further an individual's self interest or that of the department. It could also include changing job profiles in order to not have to deal with the poor performance of staff;

- c) If the job profile results in an individual being unfairly discriminated against relative to others in similar posts in the department or in the institution; and
- d) If there is evidence of negligence on the part of the manager in the construction of the profile including failure to consult relevant staff.

3.1.4 *Union's role:* The Union's role is to:

- (i) participate in the development and approval of the Job Evaluation Policy;
- (ii) Ensure that officials of the Union have at least a basic understanding of the policy and processes;
- (iii) Ensure adherence to the policy and processes approved; and
- (iv) Bring to the HR Division's attention any concerns that their constituency may have that the policy and process are not being applied properly. If the Union feels that the HR Division is not applying itself to problems brought to its attention, this should be raised with the Support Staffing Committee.

3.1.5 *Focus is on the job and not the person:* The evaluation process concerns itself with the job that is to be done and not the person performing the job. It must be noted that neither performance problems nor performance excellence can be addressed through the job profile and job evaluation process and that these should be addressed through other HR interventions. It will therefore always be assumed when job grading takes place that the job is being performed competently and properly, in accordance with the normal standards for the job. It will also be assumed that all other jobs within the organisation, similar to the job being graded, are performed competently and properly.

3.1.6 *Focus is on typical not exceptional incidents:* The job evaluation process will always consider examples of "typical incidents or typical responsibilities" (i.e. examples of activities or circumstances that occur regularly within the job or the nature of work assumed even where that actual tasks may differ) to illustrate statements about the content, requirements and limits of discretion of a job. Exceptional incidents or responsibilities do not characterise a job and therefore are receive minimal if any consideration in the evaluation process.

3.1.7 *Focus is on the present, not the future:* Jobs will be evaluated on current status of work done and not with regard to ideals or future projections. The only exception to this is where the structure of the departments/section is to change and a new job with a new grading is being created to align with new University and supported departmental strategic imperatives. In this case, the job incumbent's ability to assume these new responsibilities is considered and where necessary, a development plan constructed (with corresponding grades) until the job incumbent assumes all the new responsibilities to the required standard.

3.1.8 *Focus is on the job and not on the remuneration:* While grading assists in determining fair and equitable remuneration for similar jobs and between different jobs, they should be recognised as two separate processes. Remuneration involves two key principles: internal and external equity. Internal equity is ensuring that similar people in similar jobs receive similar pay. Internal equity is critical to notions of fairness amongst staff. External equity is the comparison of what any one organisation or institution is paying relative to other institutions. External equity is critical to notions of market-related pay. Issues of external equity and how the University aims to achieve such equity is the content of a remuneration strategy and not a job evaluation policy. It is not uncommon that individuals and managers try to manipulate the grading system to get a higher grade, resulting in a higher salary. This leads to grade inflation which is problematic. It is not an uncommon practice in organisations to have one grade with two or more salary ranges depending on the remuneration strategy of the organisation and in particular

is strategy to achieve external equity. For example, two jobs both on the same grade may have different pay because the one job is a scarce skill area in the market place and the other is not.

- 3.1.9 *Upgrading of a job is not a route to personal promotion:* The process of personal promotion whereby an individual staying in the same job can be promoted to a higher grade does not exist for support staff at this institution. Consistent with sound HR practise, such a system of promotion is only appropriate for “knowledge workers” such as the academics. Some staff or Managers may seek to use the job evaluation process as a route to personal promotion since if the grade of a job goes up and the individual is doing all facets of that job, then the individual will get the new grade. The motivation for the upgrade is because the department requires that particular job to be done (or that the job is not appropriately graded) and not that the individual should receive a higher grade.
- 3.1.10 *Consistency across jobs:* Similar jobs, irrespective of where they are placed within the institution, should be comparable in terms of grading.
- 3.1.11 *Frequency of evaluations:* Job evaluations should be performed when the job responsibilities change significantly or when new responsibilities, different to those previously assumed, are taken on. Doing more of the same e.g. additional administrative tasks when one’s job is administrative in nature, or gardening a bigger area when one’s job is that of a gardener, is not a job evaluation concern. Doing more of the same is related to performance issues where either the person was under-utilised initially or is particularly efficient such that more work can be assumed. The latter should be addressed through other HR interventions.

Jobs that are newly established and which have never existed in the University before should be evaluated, after a year or 2 of existence, once there has been an opportunity to see how the job has materialised. See point 3.2.5 for more detail.

- 3.1.12 *Recognition that HR processes are not perfect:* The job evaluation process seeks to maximise the degree of objectivity of grading of jobs. However, it must be recognised that no evaluation process is perfect for every single job in every organisation or institution. Rather, the choice of an evaluation system rests on getting the best evaluation system for the majority of jobs within that particular organisation. Therefore, it may be necessary, from time to time, to use professional judgement and alter the grading as determined by the evaluation system. This should be done by a collective such as the Support Staffing Committee.
- 3.1.13 *Integrity and Transparency:* The successful implementation of a job evaluation system relies on the integrity of management to not manipulate the system. The HR Division will make every effort to ward against this. The HR Division also needs to act with integrity, being able to justify decisions taken with regard to the grading of a job. In addition, the HR Division needs to know when to explore additional perspectives in order to gain a more objective decision that is in the best interests of the individual in the job, department and institution.

3.2 JOB EVALUATION PROCESS

There are two different processes for job evaluation: one for when a vacancy arises due or the creation of a new post and two for the re-grading of jobs when the job incumbent is still occupying the post.

3.2.1 Grading of job when job incumbent is still in post

3.2.1.1 *Submission of job profile to the HR Division*

- (i) The relevant Manager and employee must first discuss the need to evaluate the job and agree to the job profile in line with the principles outlined above. If agreement cannot be reached then the HR Division can be called on to mediate. The manager or staff member can ask for this assistance and should notify the other than input from HR has been sought;
- (ii) If a job is to be re-evaluated a written motivation by the Manager must be submitted along with the agreed revised job profile; AND
- (iii) The relevant Manager must ensure that the necessary job profile is signed by the job incumbent as well as the Manager and a hard and soft (electronic) copies are submitted to the HR Division for the purposes of evaluation.

3.2.1.2 *Receipt of job profile by the HR Division*

Upon receipt of the job profile, the HR Division will notify the manager and staff member of when the grading will take place and when they can expect to hear of the outcome of the process. Depending on the urgency of the evaluation and assuming that a quality profile has been submitted, a commitment can usually be made to ensure that the evaluation is done within no more than 10 working days.

3.2.1.3 *Determination of grade*

- (i) Once the HR Division receives the revised job profile grading of the job will take place using the JE Manager evaluation system. There may be instances where as part of the grading process the job incumbent and/or the manager may be interviewed. In instances like this the relevant staff will be notified by HR;
- (ii) Where the grading of a job is not straight-forward (eg. the grading is borderline –see point 3 of Appendix 1) and there are not other similar jobs, the person responsible for job evaluation within the HR Division shall consult with the line manager and/or Director of HR with regards to the outcome. Where necessary, the HR Division may:
 1. Seek advice from an external consultant; and/or
 2. Consult with other Higher Education Institutions.The final decision for a grading will lie with the Director of HR.

3.2.1.4 *Communication/Feedback*

- (i) The outcome of the job evaluation will be communicated in writing to both the job incumbent and the line manager within the time-frame communicated to both; and
- (ii) Where the job has changed, the question trace will be discussed with both the job incumbent and line manager. This discussion will take place verbally with the relevant staff member of the HR Division. In some instances, this discussion may include the Director of HR e.g. where the grading is not straightforward.

3.2.1.5 *Approval*

Should there be agreement on the new job grade; the Director of HR shall approve the new grade and any changes to remuneration if appropriate. In most instances increases in remuneration will not be backdated more than 6 months unless there are extenuating circumstances which can be motivated for by both the HOD and/or HR.

Where an upgrade has taken place, the job incumbent will usually receive either:

- (i) A notch increase OR;
- (ii) The required number of notch increases that ensures that they are placed on the salary scale associated with the new grade. As indicate above where there are extenuating circumstances these will be taken into consideration by HR when determining the appropriate level of remuneration.

3.2.1.6 *Appeal Process*

- (i) Should the job incumbent and/or manager of the job incumbent wish to appeal against an evaluation, an appeal may be lodged on the prescribed appeal form (see Appendix 2. This can also be found on the HR intranet under “Forms and policies”);
- (ii) The appeal must be submitted to the Support Staffing Committee which meets quarterly. However, should there be an urgency to this appeal, a sub-committee of this Committee may be convened for this purpose;
- (iii) An appeal will be considered provided the parties are able to substantiate grounds for appeal. The following could be regarded as valid reasons (but not limited to) to submit a request for appeal: -
 - 1. the agreed procedures as per this policy have not been followed and it is argued that this has affected the grade of the job;
 - 2. the grade allocated does not compare to that of similar position elsewhere in the institution. The manager/employee must be able to explain in detail why the positions are similar;
 - 3. the HR Division person conducting the evaluation was biased or discriminated against a specific individual or department;
 - 4. there are unique circumstances which may have been overlooked or ignored by the HR person conducting the evaluation;
 - 5. there are reasons why the grade as determined by the JE Manager should not be adhered to.
- (iv) If the appeal is not lodged on the correct documentation, does not include valid reasons for the appeal and/or does not substantiate the grounds for appeal, the request for an appeal will be turned down. This shall be determined by the Support Staffing Committee; and
- (v) In some instances an external advisor (e.g. outside consultant) may be asked to contribute to the appeal decision.

3.2.2 **Grading of a job where a vacancy exists**

3.2.2.1 *Submission of job profile to the HR Division*

In the case of a vacancy of an existing post, the Manager must submit the job profile (hard and soft copies) together with an application to fill a vacancy form to the HR Division for approval. Where a new post has been established and approved by the relevant authority, the HR Division will already have the hard copy of the job profile. Upon approval, the HR Division will ask the Manager for a soft/electronic copy thereof. In both instances, the principle of collaboration (see point 3.1.2 above) should be followed in putting together the profile.

3.2.2.2 *Receipt of job profile by the HR Division*

The HR Division will liaise with the Manager about the time-frames associated with the evaluation and approval of the job for recruitment and selection purposes. Where the job has been recently evaluated and has not changed, the approval of the grade should usually take no more than 5 working days. Where the job needs to re-graded, this would usually take no more than 10 working days. Where delays are going to be experienced, this will be communicated with the relevant Manager.

3.2.2.3 *Grading of job*

- (i) If the job profile has not changed since the last grading of the job and it has not been more than 3 years since the grading of the job, then no grading of the job will take place and the recruitment and selection process will continue as per the relevant policy;
- (ii) Where the job profile has not changed significantly but it has been 3 years since the job was graded, the grading will take place as part of the cycle of review;
- (iii) If there has been a material change to the job profile since the last grading exercise as a result of re-structuring or a re-allocation of responsibilities within the department, the HR Division will review and re-evaluate the job; and
- (iv) In the case of a newly created post, this will be graded.

3.2.2.4 *Communication/Feedback*

The outcome of the evaluation will be communicated to the Manager before the job is submitted to Recruitment and Selection Section of the HR Division.

Where the job has changed or the post is a new one or the grade of the job has changed, the question trace will be discussed with the Manager. This discussion will take place face to face with the relevant staff member of the HR Division. In some instances, this discussion may include the Director of HR e.g. where the grading is not straightforward.

3.2.2.5 *Approval and appeal processes:* These shall be as outlined in points 3.2.1.5 and 3.2.1.6.

3.2.3 Linking post at new grade with a development plan for the job incumbent

In line with strategic developments or external imperatives (e.g. labour legislation impacting the work of the HR Division, Credit Act impacting the work of the Finance Division, Higher Education Quality Council requirements), a Manager may revisit the structure and posts within that department. This may lead to the upgrading of certain posts given that new responsibilities are to be assumed by the job incumbent. However, if that individual does not meet all the job requirements e.g. a qualification is required which the incumbent does not yet have or if the job incumbent is not yet assuming all job responsibilities outlined in the new profile i.e., the tasks will be introduced to the job incumbent over a period of time, it will be appropriate to establish a development plan for the job incumbent.

This plan will outline:

- (i) What the individual is currently doing relative to the new job profile and the corresponding grade e.g. if the old job profile was an 8 and the new profile is a grade 11 but the individual is only doing a percentage of the new tasks, the job incumbent may be put on a grade appropriate to the new tasks/responsibilities assumed;
- (ii) If relevant, (a) what tasks still need to be assumed, (b) when this will be done and (c) how the grade will change as these tasks are assumed;
- (iii) If relevant, (a) what job requirements (education, experience and competencies) need to be demonstrated, (b) when these are acquired and (c) how the grade will change;

- (iv) Assessment periods to track progress of points (ii) and (iii) above and who is responsible for this assessment; and
- (v) The frequency of performance reports to the HR Division indicating the assessments completed and the outcomes thereof.

3.2.4 Administration and Management Process

The HR Division shall be responsible for:

- (i) Records of all job profiles and jobs gradings;
- (ii) Advising Managers to also keep copies of all the job profiles for the staff who report to them as such profiles are needed for probationary reports, to deal with performance problems and for merit awards;
- (iii) Keeping an updated list with the following information per department/Section/unit:
 1. Job Title
 2. Job Grade
 3. List of staff per job title and job grade in the department/section/unit;
 and
- (iv) Being able to provide such information, within 72 hours, to Managers when requested.

3.2.5 Cycle of Review of grading of jobs

In line with sound HR practise, every job profile will be reviewed at least once every 3 years. The time periods for review are: -

- (i) Job does not change: evaluation to take place every three years;
- (ii) Change to the job: As soon as possible with a request coming from the manager for this;
- (iii) Newly created post: In the case of grades 1 to 9, at least twelve months after job incumbent is appointed. In the case of grades 10 and above, at least twenty-four months after job incumbent is appointed. In most cases, this has been designed to run concurrently with the probationary report requirements for these posts.

3.2.6 Governance Process

Good governance requires that all changes to the grade of a job are accurately documented and appropriately approved. In line with this, the documentation for approving all job upgrades (whether for a vacancy or with a current incumbent) shall include:

- (i) A brief of the job requiring an upgrade with reasons for the proposed upgrade;
- (ii) The date on which the job will be upgraded from;
- (iii) The cost implication of the upgrade (if a vacancy, this will be costed at the difference between the top of the previous/current grade and the top of the proposed grade until such time as the person is appointed);
- (iv) The new job profile and question trace of the job evaluation done (the latter which is checked against the job profile) by the HR Director; and
- (v) Signature of and approval by the HR Director or designate.

This documentation will be kept such that the upgrading process can be audited. Any documentation related to an appeal shall also be kept for auditing purposes.

An annual budget is made available for the upgrading of posts and it is the HR Director's responsibility to ensure that there are monies available for approved upgrades.

3.3 REVIEW OF POLICY

This policy will be reviewed by the Support Staffing Committee at least every three years.

Appendix 1: The Evaluation System used by Rhodes University

1. Rhodes University is currently using the evaluation system known as the JE Manager. The JE Manager is a computer software system that embodies 6 factors. Each factor has two logically linked dimensions that allow for flexibility and adaptability to suit the organisation's needs. The JE Manager grading system asks questions to explore these factors and dimensions. The questions are constructed in a question tree so that responding in different ways will result in a different question trace being followed. Based on responses to the questions, points are allocated. These points are added up and correspond to the various job grades within the institution. Each job grade has a range of points.
2. The 6 factors and two dimensions are defined and weighted as follows: -
 - 1) *Factor 1: Judgement (1.9) – explores the kind of judgement and decisions taken in terms of the following: -*
 - a) the range, complexity and time scale of the activities involved;
 - b) the extent and level of leadership responsibility in the job.
 - 2) *Factor 2: Planning and Leadership (1.6) – explores the type and extent of planning and co-ordination of activities and/ or the organisation or management of the work of other people in terms of the following: -*
 - c) the range, complexity and time scale of the activities involved;
 - d) the extent and level of leadership responsibility in the job.
 - 3) *Factor 3: Communication (1.6) – explores the nature of communication and the interpersonal skills required in dealing with people outside the direct line management structure # IN-terms of: -*
 - e) the content, range and complexity of the subject matter;
 - f) the content, form and processes of the communication.
 - 4) *Factor 4: Job Impact (2.4) – measures the impact that the job has on the performance of the organisation including its results now & in the future; its capital & information assets; & its relationships, reputation & image; in terms of: -*
 - g) the directness of the job's impact on performance of the organisation;
 - h) the diversity of the job.
 - 5) *Factor 5: Acquisition and application of knowledge (1.4) – explores the specific theoretical knowledge and related mental ability that the incumbent is required to have in order to perform the job effectively, assessed in terms of: -*
 - i) the minimum level of knowledge required in a new appointee;
 - j) the way in which the job requires that knowledge to be applied.
 - 6) *Factor 6: Skill acquisition and practice (1.1) – how quickly the individual can learn the job in order to perform proficiently in the job. These periods are in addition to the minimum theoretical knowledge, and will include:*
 - k) the period of pre-requisite work experience typically required before appointment;
 - l) the period of on-the-job familiarisation typically required by an external appointee before normal supervision is sufficient.
3. Sometimes a grade may be borderline which means that it is very close to the top of the range of points on one grade and the bottom of the range of points on another. Sometimes the difference in the answer to one question will push the grade to either the top of the range on one grade or the bottom of the range on another grade. When this happens, the person conducting the evaluation will consult the Director of HR, the Manager of the relevant department and/or outside consultants, all in an attempt to make a fair evaluation.

4. The benefits of using the JE Manager Evaluation system are as follows, but not limited to:
- a) *Flexibility:* Job evaluation is able to accommodate changes in organisational structure as well as personalise the system for the organisation;
 - b) *Cost Effectiveness:* Jobs can be evaluated quickly and efficiently and in some instances by making use of benchmark positions with previously approved question traces the time taken to evaluate a job can be further reduced;
 - c) *Empowerment and transparency:* The incumbent or line manager plays an active role in putting together the job profile. Staff are able to see the questions that are asked are consistent and logical and the checks and balances built into the system increase transparency, which validates the job grade;
 - d) *Reduced subjectivity:* Whilst no job evaluation system is completely objective the JE Manager system reduces subjectivity because it has consistent probing and logic;
 - e) *Consistency and validity:* The same logic and interpretations apply all the time to ensure consistency. It also has an audit system built into it which cross checks responses to different questions looking for inconsistencies and thereby, increasing the validity of the results;
 - f) *Benchmarking:* The JE Manager system is a database in which all jobs including their critical performance areas and the reasons for the answers can be saved. This enables the organisation to benchmark positions both within and outside the organisation;
 - g) *JE Manager and Unions:* The JE Manager job evaluation system has been endorsed by the following branches (Affiliates of COSATU: NUM, NUMSA, SAMWU, SACAWU, SAFAAWU, NEHAWU, SASBO etc.

Appendix 2:



RHODES UNIVERSITY

Appeal against Evaluation of Support Staff Post

Department: _____ Job in question: _____

Job profile attached. Job grade allocated by the HR Division: _____

Head/Manager/staff member requesting an appeal: _____

Job incumbent: _____

Key reason for appeal against current job grade as per latest evaluation (please tick appropriate block/s):

1. The agreed procedures as per this policy have not been followed and this has affected the grade of the job	
2. The grade allocated does not compare to that of a similar positions elsewhere in the institution. The manager/employee must be able to explain in detail why the positions are similar.	
3. The HR Division person conducting the evaluation was biased or discriminated against a specific individual or department.	
4. There are unique circumstances which may have been overlooked or ignored by the HR person conducting the evaluation.	
5. There are reasons why the grade as determined by the JE Manager should not be adhered to.	
6. Other. Please explain.	

Further evidence/motivation in support of the reason for the appeal:

HoD/Manager

Date