



**RHODES UNIVERSITY**

Grabamstown • 6140 • South Africa

# Job Evaluation Policy

<b>Policy Volume</b>	HR: General Institutional Policies & Protocols
<b>Policy Chapter</b>	
<b>Responsible Committee/Unit/Division/Faculty</b>	Used to be Staffing Committee
<b>Responsible Chairperson/Director/Manager</b>	Director: HR
<b>Dates of First and Subsequent Council Approvals</b>	08 June 2007, 20 September 2012 and 13 September 2018
<b>Policy Approval Pathways (e.g. committee, Senex, Senate, Council)</b>	Deans, HoDs, Unions, Equity and Institutional Culture Committee, Faculty Boards, Senex, Senate, Institutional Forum and Council
<b>Revision History: Approved Reviews</b>	2007, 2011 and 2016
<b>Review Cycle (e.g. every 2/5/7 years etc.)</b>	5 or as and when a need arises
<b>Next Review Date</b>	2024



## 1. POLICY PARTICULARS

<b>1.1. Policy Title</b>	Job Evaluation Policy
<b>1.2. Policy Statement</b> (State in a single paragraph the policy mandate and how this relates to the University Mission and Vision)	The University is committed ensuring that significant attention is given to the evaluation and grading of jobs as it impacts on important people management processes such as recruitment and selection, performance management, training and development and remuneration.
<b>1.3. Reason for Policy</b> (What this policy aims to achieve)	To uphold fair and consistent evaluation and grading of jobs in accordance with relevant legislation and codes of good practice.
<b>1.4. Policy Objective/s</b> (What are the measurable objectives of this policy)	The policy is intended to outline the job evaluation process and the associated parameters and processes with regard to the grading and upgrading of jobs.
<b>1.5. People affected by this Policy</b> (e.g. All units of the University)	All units of the University
<b>1.5. Who should read this Policy</b> (People who need to heed this policy to fulfil their duties)	All Units of the University
<b>1.6. Implementers of this Policy</b> (Who will manage the implementation of this policy)	Human Resources and the Job Evaluation Committee
<b>1.7 Website address/link for this Policy</b>	<a href="http://www.ru.ac.za/humanresources/">http://www.ru.ac.za/humanresources/</a>

## 2. RELATED DOCUMENTS FORMS AND TOOLS

(University Policies, Protocols and Documents (such as rules/policies/protocols/guidelines related to this policy))

<b>Relevant Legislation</b> (Legislation/Regulatory requirements/Organizational Reports – name these)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Labour Relations Act, No. 66 of 1995 (as amended)</li> <li>• The Employment Equity Act, No. 55 of 1998 (as amended)</li> <li>• The Basic Conditions of Employment Act, No. 75 of 1997</li> <li>• The Employment Services Act, No. 4 of 2014</li> <li>• Promotion of Equality and the Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, No 4 of 2000 (pending input from the Institutional Forum)</li> </ul>
<b>Related Policies</b>
<b>Related Protocols</b>
Standard Operating Procedures and Guidelines: -
1) Toolkit on how to write a job profile

2) Job Profile Templates 3) Appendices to the policy
<b>Forms and Tools</b> (documents to be completed in support of this policy implementation)
Policy on Restructuring and Reorganization of Work  Toolkit on how to write a job profile  Job Profile Template

### 3. POLICY DEFINITIONS

(Technical or Conceptual terms used in the policy)

No	TERM	DEFINITION
3.1	<b>Academic Staff</b>	Staff involved in directing the teaching and learning, research activities and community engagement of the University.
3.2	<b>Benchmarking</b>	Matching job profiles and grades that are similar to those of another job profile either internally or externally.
3.3	<b>Competencies</b>	The requirements for the job in terms of the knowledge, skills and attributes needed to do the job.
3.4	<b>Decision Tree</b>	The particular grading methodology that the JE Manager (the job evaluation system used by Rhodes University) uses to evaluate/grade job profiles.
3.5	<b>Executive Management</b>	The Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Academic and Student Affairs, Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Research and Development, Registrar and the Executive Director: Infrastructure and Operations.
3.6	<b>Grade and Grading</b>	The outcome of the job evaluation process is a grade and where evaluating a job profile this is also known as a grading a profile.
3.7	<b>Grade Inflation</b>	The tendency to increase responsibilities for staff in roles progressively with a view to increasing the grade of the post, for posts that have historically been at lower grades.
3.8	<b>Institutional Planning Committee</b>	The University's main strategic and operational committee responsible for planning and resource allocation, subject to the approval of the Senate and Council.
3.9	<b>JE Manager</b>	The job evaluation system specifically used by Rhodes University.
3.10	<b>Job Evaluation</b>	The process of looking at jobs using a specific job evaluation tool/system in order to be able to compare jobs. Part of job evaluation includes the review of the job profile.
3.11	<b>Job Evaluation Committee (JE Committee)</b>	The committee responsible for approving the upgrading and downgrading of jobs and upgrading and downgrading of jobs where there has been the reorganization of work and where there is no increase in the current staff costs. The JE Committee is chaired by the Director: HR or her/his

No	TERM	DEFINITION
		<p>nominated delegate. The JE Committee shall comprise the Director: HR (Chair), the Deputy Director HR, 1 representative from HR, 1 representative from Finance, 1 Academic representative (a Dean), 1 Support Staff representative (a Director), 1 Head of Department (HoD), 1 member of the Middle Management Forum, 1 member of the Executive Committee of NEHAWU and 1 member of the Executive Committee of NTEU. The Job Evaluation Committee meets quarterly. In the case of HR jobs being reviewed, the HR representatives shall recuse themselves from voting.</p> <p>In order for decisions to be taken a quorum is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 5 members of the Committee need to be present;</li> <li>• Where the Director: HR is not present, the Deputy Director shall Chair.</li> <li>• Where the position(s) being tabled are HR positions the HR representatives shall recuse themselves from voting.</li> </ul>
3.12	<b>Job Grade</b>	The level at which a job is positioned within the organization. Rhodes University's support staff job grades range from grade 1 (being the lowest) to grade 25 (being the highest). Academic job grades are matched to the PWC RemChannel data and are denoted by letters: Junior Lecturer (JL), Lecturer (L), Senior Lecturer (SL), Associate Professor (AP) and Professor (P).
3.13	<b>Job Profile</b>	Describes the key responsibility areas and key performance indicators, the job requirements and competencies required for a post.
3.14	<b>Job Requirements</b>	Qualifications, experience and competencies required for the post.
3.15	<b>Line Manager</b>	The person to whom the incumbent reports directly.
3.16	<b>Pay Scales</b>	A range of salaries associated with a job grade.
3.17	<b>Performance Management</b>	People management processes concerned with the articulation of what an individual is required to do and to what standard (expectations), processes related with providing feedback on the execution of expectations, processes related to acknowledging contributions that exceed expectations and processes related to contributions that do not meet expectations.
3.18	<b>PWC RemChannel</b>	The company that conducts the remuneration survey that Rhodes University participates in.
3.19	<b>Question Trace</b>	Grades of jobs are determined by the responses given to questions. These questions are based on the criteria used to evaluate jobs (See Appendix 2 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide). The question trace

No	TERM	DEFINITION
		indicates what these questions are and what the responses to the questions are.
3.20	Remuneration Surveys	Surveys conducted to obtain market-related remuneration information, i.e. information about what other organizations' are paying their staff.
3.21	Senior Management	Deans, Directors and staff on grades 18 and above.
3.22	Standard Operating Procedures Guide	A guide that supports this policy and can be obtained from the HR website or from the HR Division upon request.
3.23	Support Staff	Staff who are not directly involved with teaching and/or research, including those staff who support the academic staff in their teaching and research activities.
3.24	Vacancy Committee (VAC Committee)	The Committee responsible for the approval to fill vacant post and the creation of new posts within the current institutional staff cost budget.

#### 4. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THIS POLICY

OVERVIEW
Rhodes University strives to carry out the following, as far as is reasonably practicable:
<p><b>4.1 Opportunity for the review of job content</b></p> <p>It is important to review job profiles and job grades from time to time and as the need arises from an operational point of view. The review of job profiles should be undertaken in conjunction with all the relevant stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>4.2 Guidelines regarding Job Evaluation</b></p> <p>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 grades. It is critical that management are committed to providing quality profiles and/or to seeking assistance in this regard, in the interests of representing the job fairly and accurately. Ultimately, this is in the best interests of the staff member and the institution.</p>
<p><b>4.3 Job Evaluation Application process</b></p> <p>Line Managers are responsible for ensuring that job profiles in their area are up to date and correctly reflect the work that is required. Line Managers may request that a job profile be reviewed and graded. HR will be responsible for deciding whether or not the request to review a job profile and its grade will be granted.</p>
<p><b>4.4 Key areas of focus are: -</b></p> <p><b>a) The job, not the person</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>b) The typical, not the exception</b></p> <p>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 <u>or</u> the nature of work</p>

assumed even where 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 receive minimal if any consideration in the evaluation process.

**c) The job, not 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 are 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, this can be a 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 marketplace and the other is not.

**d) 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 department/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 until the job incumbent assumes all the new responsibilities to the required standard.

**e) Not a route for 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 Rhodes University. 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 a particular job or additional job to be done (or that the job is not appropriately graded), and not that the individual should receive a higher grade.

**f) Consistency across jobs**

Similar jobs, irrespective of where they are placed within the institution, should be comparable in terms of grading.

**g) Frequency of evaluation**

Job evaluations should be performed in line with changes in the strategic direction of the division/department, which results in the needs of the department changing significantly, which then results in job responsibilities changing significantly. They should also be performed when new responsibilities that are materially and significantly different to those previously assumed are taken on. In instances such as this the capacity of the incumbent to take on different work will also be reviewed, and the impact of moving work out of a job profile elsewhere in order to allow the change in the job profile will also be reviewed. Doing more of the same kind of work is unlikely to impact the grade of the job. 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. It must be noted that increases in the volume of work are not a job

evaluation concern. It is up to the Line Manager to determine how to manage work volumes, e.g. through reassigning work, overtime, or an application for a new post to the VAC Committee in the first instance and the IPC (Size and Shape).

**h) Recognition that HR processes represent a 'best-fit'**

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 the JE Committee for grades 1 to 17 and by Executive Management for grades 18 and above.

**i) Integrity and transparency**

The successful implementation of a job evaluation system relies on the integrity of management not to 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 whether these decisions are taken by HR, the JE Committee or Executive Management. 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, the department and the institution. When HR jobs are being reviewed in the JE Committee, the HR representatives shall recuse themselves from voting.

**4.5 Governance**

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 new post, a vacancy or a post with a current incumbent) shall include:

- (i) In the case of a vacant post and posts that have incumbents in them, the application to have a post reviewed and a graded form to be completed which will include the reason(s) for the proposed review and grading;
- (ii) An up to date job profile;
- (iii) The cost implication of the upgrade/downgrade (If a vacancy, this will be costed at the difference between the previous/current grade and the proposed grade until such time as the person is appointed.);
- (iv) In the case of new posts, the new job profile and question trace of the job evaluation done, assuming that there is one and that the job has not been benchmarked;
- (v) The reasons for the new post, which will be in the application form presented to the VAC Committee in the first instance and the IPC (Size and Shape) and should form part of the record; and
- (vi) Written record of and approval by the HR Director or designate, the JE Committee, Executive Management, the VAC Committee and the IPC (Size and Shape). New posts that created outside of the Council controlled Staff Costs budget ratified by Council must be presented to Council for consideration and approval.

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

**4.6 Administration**

The HR Division shall be responsible for: -

- (i) Recording all job profiles and job grading.
- (ii) Keeping an up to date list with the following information per department/section/unit: job title, job grade and list of staff per job title and grade in the department/section/unit.
- (iii) Being able to provide such information, within a reasonable timeframe, to Managers when requested.



#### **4.7 Standard Operating Procedures and Guidelines**

It is recommended that the Standard Operating Procedures are read in conjunction with the policy.

### **5. DIRECTIVES FOR IMPLEMENTING THIS POLICY**

(Actions and processes by which the objectives of the policy will be achieved.)

#### **Job Evaluation Process for the implementation of this policy**

Processes in accordance with the objectives of Job Evaluation: -

- a) When a new post is approved by the VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape) as well as new posts created outside of the Council controlled Staff Costs budget and approved by Council
- b) When a permanent Council-funded vacancy arises
- c) The review and regrading of jobs where an employee(s) occupies the post(s)
- d) The review and regrading of jobs as a result of restructuring/reorganisation of work, both where there is an increase in staff costs and where there is not an increase in costs, and which may or may not involve the upgrade of posts
- e) The grading of fixed-term contract posts/jobs and externally funded posts (also generally fixed-term contract posts)

#### **5.1. Grading of a new permanent Council-funded post approved by the VAC and IPC (Size and Shape and new posts created outside of the Council controlled Staff Costs budget and approved by Council**

##### **a) Submission of the job profile to the HR Division**

Once the VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape) has approved a new post and in the case of new posts created outside of the Council controlled Staff Costs budget and approved by Council, the Line Manager must submit a final job profile (soft copy) to the HR Division for review and HR approval. Where the Line Manager is not the Director or HoD the Line Manager must ensure that the necessary approval from the Director or HoD has been obtained if required.

##### **b) Receipt of job profile by the HR Division**

HR will liaise with the Line Manager about the time-frames associated with the evaluation and approval of the job profile and grade for recruitment and selection purposes.

##### **c) Grading of a job profile**

New posts will be evaluated and graded and/or benchmarked with similar other jobs in the institution (which have been evaluated and graded and/or benchmarked relative to HE benchmarks). If the grade is different to the grade approved by the VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape), then approvals for upgrades will apply and the JE Committee and/or the Director: HR will approve.

##### **d) Approval**

- i) The final decision for an upgrade will lie with the Director: HR for grades 1 to 14 provided that the upgrade does not increase by more than one grade. These upgrades will serve at the JE Committee for noting.
- ii) Where the upgrade is more than one grade, it must go to the JE Committee for approval.
- iii) The JE Committee approves upgrades for grades 15 to 17 and upgrades that move by more than one grade.
- iv) Executive Management together with the Director: HR and the Deputy Director: HR in attendance considers and approves grades, upgrades and downgrades for grades 18 and above.

##### **e) Communication/Feedback**

The outcome of the evaluation will be communicated by HR to the Line Manager.

**f) Appeal**

Should the Line Manager wish to appeal against an evaluation, an appeal may be lodged on the prescribed appeal form (See Appendix 3 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide).

The appeal must be submitted to the JE Committee. The appeal must be made within 10 working days of the result having been communicated.

Should there be urgency to hearing an appeal, a sub-committee consisting of some of the members of the JE Committee may be convened for this purpose by the Director: HR.

An appeal will be considered provided the Line Manager is able to substantiate grounds for appeal. The following could be regarded as a sample of valid reasons to submit a request for appeal, but valid reasons are not limited to these:

- i) The agreed procedures as per this policy have not been followed and it is argued that this has affected the grade of the job.
- ii) The grade allocated does not compare to that of similar positions elsewhere in the institution. The Line Manager must be able to explain in sufficient detail why the positions are similar.
- iii) There are unique circumstances which may have been overlooked or ignored by HR and/or those involved in the approval process when conducting the evaluation.
- iv) There are reasons why the grade as determined by the JE Manager should not be adhered to.

If the appeal is not lodged appropriately, 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 JE Committee.

At the discretion of the Director: HR and/or the JE Committee an external advisor (e.g. outside consultant) may be asked to contribute to the appeal review.

The outcome of the appeal will be communicated in writing to the Line Manager within 10 working days of the JE Committee and/or a sub-committee having met.

**5.2 Grading of permanent council-funded posts where there is a vacancy**

**a) Motivation to review the job profile and the grade**

The Line Manager must submit the application form to review a job profile and grade it (See Appendix 6 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide to HR with a copy of the revised job profile (soft copy) for review and HR approval. Where the Line Manager is not the Director or HoD, the Line Manager must ensure that the necessary approval from the Director or HoD has been obtained if required.

**b) Review of job profiles with no request to review the grade**

Where the job has been recently evaluated, has not changed materially and/or there is no request to review the grade then no grading of the job will take place and the recruitment and selection process will continue as per the relevant policy once the profile is approved by the Deputy Director: HR.

**c) Receipt of the request to review a job profile and grade**

HR will liaise with the Line Manager about the time-frames associated with the evaluation and approval of the job profile and grade for recruitment and selection purposes.

**d) Grading of a job profile**

HR will consider the grading of a job profile based on the following:

- i) The merits of the motivation submitted in the application to have a profile reviewed and graded;
- ii) The budget parameters that have been approved by Council; and
- iii) If there has been a material change to the job profile since it was last graded as a result of restructuring or a reorganisation of responsibilities within the department, HR will grade the job and the necessary approvals in the case of upgrades will be followed (See point (e) below).

**e) Approval**

- i) The final decision for an upgrade will lie with the Director: HR for grades 1 to 14 provided that the upgrade does not increase by more than one grade. These upgrades will serve at the JE Committee for noting.
- ii) Where the upgrade is more than one grade, it must go to the JE Committee for approval.
- iii) The JE Committee approves upgrades for grades 15 to 17 and upgrades that move by more than one grade.
- iv) Executive Management together with the Director: HR and the Deputy Director: HR in attendance considers and approves grades, upgrades and downgrades for grades 18 and above.
- v) Where a post has been reviewed for an upgrade and a decision was made not to upgrade the post the department/section/division may not resubmit the request within a period of 2 years unless:
  - 
  - There is an appeal in respect of the decision not to upgrade the post.
  - There have been material changes to the job profile since the request to have the post upgraded.
  - There is a vacancy which has resulted in the restructuring and/or reorganising of the work of the department/section/division.

**f) Communication/Feedback**

The outcome of the evaluation will be communicated by HR to the Line Manager.

**g) Appeal**

Should the Line Manager wish to appeal against an evaluation, an appeal may be lodged on the prescribed appeal form (See Appendix 3 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide).

The appeal must be submitted to the JE Committee. The appeal must be made within 10 working days of the result having been communicated.

Should there be urgency to hearing an appeal, a sub-committee consisting of some of the members of the JE Committee may be convened for this purpose by the Director: HR.

An appeal will be considered provided the Line Manager is able to substantiate grounds for appeal. The following could be regarded as a sample of valid reasons to submit a request for appeal, but valid reasons are not limited to these:

- i) The agreed procedures as per this policy have not been followed and it is argued that this has affected the grade of the job.
- ii) The grade allocated does not compare to that of similar positions elsewhere in the institution. The Line Manager must be able to explain in sufficient detail why the positions are similar.
- iii) There are unique circumstances which may have been overlooked or ignored by HR and/or those involved in the approval process when conducting the evaluation.
- iv) There are reasons why the grade as determined by the JE Manager should not be adhered to.

If the appeal is not lodged appropriately, 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 JE Committee.

At the discretion of the Director: HR and/or the JE Committee an external advisor (e.g. outside consultant) may be asked to contribute to the appeal review.

The outcome of the appeal will be communicated in writing to the Line Manager within 10 working days of the JE Committee and/or a sub-committee having met.

### **5.3 The review and regrading of jobs where an employee(s) occupies the post(s)**

#### **a) Motivation to review a job profile and its grade**

- i) The Line Manager must submit the application form (See Appendix 6 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide) to review a job profile and grade it to HR. Where the Line Manager is not the Director or HoD, the Line Manager must sign the application form supporting the request. There should be no discussion with the current incumbent at this point.
- ii) HR will notify the Line Manager in writing whether the proposed review of the job profile and its grade has been approved or not.
- iii) If the proposed review is approved, then the Line Manager may start engaging with the incumbent with regard to the proposed review without creating expectations and/or making promises.
- iv) The Line Manager must endeavour to consult meaningfully with regard to the content of the job profile with the incumbent and attempt to reach consensus with the incumbent by way of the incumbent signing off the job profile. If an agreement cannot be reached, the Line Manager should call upon the HR Division to mediate.
- v) Once the profile has been agreed to, the Line Manager should submit the revised profile (electronically) to HR to review and evaluate.

#### **b) Receipt of job profile by the HR Division**

- i) Upon receipt of the job profile, HR will notify the manager and staff member with regard to the process to be followed and the timelines involved.
- ii) If there is an upgrade, this must go to the JE Committee for approval. It must be noted that the JE Committee meets once a quarter (February, May, August and November).
- iii) If the upgrade has to go to Executive Management, a special meeting has to be called and this is dependent upon the availability of Executive Management. HR will endeavour in all instances to keep Line Managers and staff informed about the progress of their upgrade and the timelines involved.

#### **c) Determination of the grade**

- i) Once the HR Division receives the revised job profile, and provided that the profile is viable, the job profile will be reviewed in terms of its grade by HR. This may be done either by grading of the job and/or by benchmarking the job with similar jobs internally and/or externally (e.g. the PWC RemChannel data).
- ii) There may be instances where as part of the grading process the job incumbent and/or the Line Manager may be interviewed. In instances like this the relevant staff will be notified by HR.

#### **d) Approval**

- i) The final decision for a grading/upgrade will lie with the Director of HR for grades 1 to 14 provided that the upgrade does not increase by more than one grade.
- ii) Where the upgrade is by more than one grade, it must go to the JE Committee for approval.
- iii) The JE Committee approves upgrades for grades 15 to 17 and upgrades that move by more than one grade.
- iv) Executive Management together with the Director: HR and the Deputy Director: HR in attendance considers and approves grades, upgrades and downgrades for grades 18 and above.

- v) HR will be responsible for determining any changes to remuneration as a result of the change in grade after consultation with the Line Manager.
- vi) 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 Director/HoD and/or HR.
- vii) The date of implementation of the remuneration change is usually the month after the JE Committee approves the upgrade.
- viii) Where a post has been reviewed for an upgrade and a decision is made not to upgrade the post the department may not resubmit the request within a period of 2 years unless: -
  - There is an appeal in respect of the decision not to upgrade the post.
  - There have been material changes to the job profile since the request to have the post upgraded.
  - There is a vacancy which has resulted in the restructuring and/or reorganising of the work of the department/division.

**e) Communication/Feedback**

The outcome of the evaluation will be communicated by HR to the Line Manager and the staff member concerned.

**f) Appeal**

Should the job incumbent and/or Line Manager of the job incumbent wish to appeal against an evaluation, an appeal may be lodged on the prescribed appeal form (See Appendix 3 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide).

The appeal must be submitted to the JE Committee, which meets quarterly.

The appeal must be made within 10 working days of the result having been communicated.

Should there be urgency to hearing an appeal, a sub-committee consisting of some of the members of the JE Committee may be convened for this purpose by the Director: HR.

An appeal will be considered provided the parties are able to substantiate grounds for appeal. The following could be regarded as a sample of valid reasons to submit a request for appeal, but valid reasons are not limited to these: -

- i) The agreed procedures as per this policy have not been followed and it is argued that this has affected the grade of the job.
- ii) The grade allocated does not compare to that of similar positions elsewhere in the institution. The Line Manager and/or job incumbent must be able to explain in detail why the positions are similar.
- iii) There are unique circumstances which may have been overlooked or ignored by HR and/or those involved in the approval process when conducting the evaluation.
- iv) There are reasons why the grade as determined by the JE Manager should not be adhered to.
- v) If the appeal is not lodged appropriately, 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 JE Committee.
- vi) At the discretion of the Director: HR and/or the JE Committee an external advisor (e.g. outside consultant) may be asked to contribute to the appeal review.
- vii) The outcome of the appeal will be communicated in writing to the Line Manager and staff member within 10 working days of the JE Committee and/or a sub-committee having met.

**5.4 The regrading of jobs as a result of restructuring (major and minor) and/or the upgrading of a significant number of posts (some of which may or may not be vacant) and/or the regrading of posts as a result of the reorganisation of work**

**a) Restructuring or reorganisation of work that requires new posts and will increase the staff cost for the Division/Section/Department**

- i) All major restructures that involve both the need for new posts and/or a material number of upgrades that will result in the increase in staff costs for the division/department must be considered by the VAC Committee and the IPC (Size and Shape) and must be approved by Council, usually as part of the annual budget process.
- ii) The VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape) will not review any submissions for major restructuring and reorganisation of work that has not been signed off by the Director (Support Departments), Dean and HoD (Academic Departments) and HR (either the Director: HR or Deputy Director: HR).
- iii) In cases where the proposed restructure impacts current staff, consultation with staff and the Union(s) is required. Before the VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape) considers a submission that impacts current staff the Director: HR and/or the IR&EE Specialist must have signed off that such consultations have taken place. As part of this, the consultation process job profiles must have been drafted in sufficient detail to assess the grade of the post so that the cost of the new structure can be determined and presented to the VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape). The revised job profiles must be signed off by the Director (in the case of support staff), the Dean and HoD (in the case of academic departments), the Line Manager, the incumbents (if posts are not vacant) and HR.
- iv) Because major restructuring/reorganisation of work processes can take several months to finalise and formalise, Line Managers need to start working with HR well in advance of deadlines for the annual budget process. The process needs to be appropriately managed. (See Appendix 5 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide.)
- v) In cases where the restructuring and/or reorganisation of work is minor and does not involve new posts, and/or the increase in staff costs as a result of upgrades can be borne by the job evaluation budget, Line Managers must follow the process outlined in Section 5.3.

**b) Restructuring/reorganisation of work that will not increase the staff cost for the Division / Section/Department**

Restructuring/reorganisation of work that will not increase the staff costs of the division/department may be undertaken by the Director/Dean/HoD of the division/department in conjunction with HR, and Line Managers must follow the process outlined in Section 5.3.

**c) Receipt of job profiles and determination of the grades by the HR Division**

- i) The job profiles must be submitted electronically for review by the HR Division.
- ii) HR will grade and/or benchmark the job profiles.
- iii) Where necessary HR will assist the Division/Department with the costing of the revised restructure and/or reorganisation of work.

**d) Approval**

- i) For restructuring/reorganisation of work that requires new posts and will increase staff costs, the VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape) will make a recommendation to Council as part of the staff costs budget.
- ii) The VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape) decision will be communicated to the Director/Dean/HoD prior to the finalization of the annual budget. This decision will be subject to the institutional budget approval process and the approval of Council (usually at its final meeting in December).
- iii) For restructuring/reorganisation of work that will not increase staff costs the final outcome will be tabled at the JE Committee for noting once approved by the Director: HR. Any upgrades will

be subject to the normal approvals by the Director: HR and the JE Committee. (See Appendix 4 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide.)

- iv) For restructuring/reorganisation of work that will increase staff costs the approval process outlined in Section 5.3 will be followed.

**e) Communication/Feedback**

- i) For recommendations made by the VAC Committee and IPC (Size and Shape), should Council approve the new structure, the Division/Department together with HR will be able to implement the new structure within the timeframes that have been recommended by the VAC Committee, IPC (Size and Shape) and approved by Council.
- ii) In all other instances the outcome of the evaluation will be communicated by HR to the Line Manager.

**f) Appeal**

- i) There is no appeal process for the recommendation of the VAC Committee, IPC (Size and Shape) or of the decision of Council.
- ii) If requests for restructuring/reorganisation of work are refused, they may be re-submitted in the following year(s).
- iii) In all other instances the appeal process outlined in Section 5.2 will apply.

**5.5 The grading of fixed-term contract posts/jobs and externally funded posts (also generally fixed-term contracts)**

Fixed-term contracts' job profiles are usually against vacancies and are for a limited duration. Notwithstanding the limited duration of the fixed-term contract, a job profile must be in place and a grade assigned to the job profile for both Council-funded posts and posts that are funded externally. A job profile is required for all fixed-term contracts and a fixed-term contract is required for all contracts longer than three working days.

**a) Submission of the job profile to the HR Division**

The Line Manager must submit the job profile (soft copy) together with an "application to fill a vacancy" form to the HR Division for review and HR approval. Where the Line Manager is not the Director or HoD, the Line Manager must ensure that the necessary approval from the Director or HoD has been obtained if required.

**b) Receipt of job profile, grading and approval of the job profile by HR**

HR will liaise with the Line Manager about the time-frames associated with the evaluation and approval of the job profile and grade for recruitment and selection purposes. Once the job profile is approved it is usually graded and approved by the Deputy Director: HR within 10 working days.

**c) Communication/Feedback**

The outcome of the grade will be communicated by HR to the Line Manager.

**d) Appeal**

Should the Line Manager wish to appeal against the evaluation and job grade, an appeal may be lodged on the prescribed appeal form (See Appendix 3 in the Standard Operating Procedures Guide).

The appeal must be submitted the Director: HR and must be made within 10 working days of the result having been communicated.

An appeal will be considered provided the Line Manager is able to substantiate grounds for appeal. The following could be regarded as a sample of valid reasons to submit a request for appeal, but valid reasons are not limited to these:

- i) The agreed procedures as per this policy have not been followed and it is argued that this has affected the grade of the job.
- ii) The grade allocated does not compare to that of similar position elsewhere in the institution. The manager/employee must be able to explain in sufficient detail why the positions are similar.
- iii) There are unique circumstances which may have been overlooked or ignored by HR when conducting the evaluation and/or those involved in the approval process.
- iv) There are reasons why the grade as determined by the JE Manager should not be adhered to.

If the appeal is not lodged appropriately, 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 Director: HR.

At the discretion of the Director: HR an external advisor (e.g. outside consultant) may be asked to contribute to the appeal review.

The outcome of the appeal will be communicated in writing by HR to the Line Manager within 10 working days of the result having been communicated.

## 6 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(Roles and responsibilities of Key personal/Divisions/Faculties/Departments)

ROLE	RESPONSIBILITY
<b>Line Managers</b>	To draft, consult and sign off the job profiles for staff that report to them.
<b>Human Resources</b>	To implement the JE Policy. The Director: HR chairs the JE Committee. HR provides support and advice to all stakeholders.
<b>The Unions</b>	To provide support to staff in respect of queries pertaining to their job profiles and responsibilities.
<b>Staff Members</b>	To provide support to staff in respect of queries pertaining to their job profiles and responsibilities.

## 7 CONTACTS

Direct any questions about the policy to the Employment Equity Committee. These can be channelled through the HR Division via the Senior HR Practitioner or the Deputy Director: HR.

## 8 POLICY REVIEW PROCEDURE

(Actions and processes by which the policy will be reviewed)

The Employment Equity Committee will review this policy every 5 years.
<p><b>Communication of the review process</b></p> <p>The Employment Equity Committee will engage stakeholders through <a href="mailto:toplist@lists.ru.ac.za">toplist@lists.ru.ac.za</a>, monthly HR and Union meetings and the Human Resources website.</p>



## 9 POLICY CONTEXT: RELEVANT DOCUMENTS CITED/CONSULTED/ADOPTED

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	

### LIST OF APPENDICES

**Appendix 1 – Key responsibilities of various stakeholders**

**Appendix 2 – The evaluation system used by Rhodes University**

**Appendix 3 – Appeal against the evaluation of a Support Staff Post(s)**

**Appendix 4 – The Job Evaluation Committee**

**Appendix 5 - Guidelines in respect of re-structuring/re-organization of work where current staff are impacted**

**Appendix 6 – Application to review an existing job profile**

**Appendix 7 – Application to review and grade a new job profile**