

## UNISON BRIEFING PAPER:

### QUALITY ASSURING GLPC JOB EVALUATION SCHEME (JES) OUTCOMES

	<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	Introduction	90
2	Procedural Considerations	90
3	Terminology	91
4	Features of the GLPC JES	91
5	Initial Checks	91
6	Formal Quality Assurance Checks	92
6.1	Usage of Factor Levels	92
6.2	Overall Distribution of Factor Evaluations	93
6.3	Specific Factor Checks	94
6.4	Factor Correlation	95
6.5	Overall Range of Total Weighted Scores	96
6.6	Specific Checks of Total Weighted Scores against Jobs	96
6.7	Checks Against Historic Grades	97
7	Conclusions	97
	Summary Checklist	98

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Job evaluation is a technique for comparing the relative demands of jobs within a job population as the basis for organisational grading and pay structures. The objective is usually to put the jobs in rank order.
- 1.2 Most job evaluation systems, including the Greater London Provincial Council (GLPC) Job Evaluation Scheme (JES), involve measuring each job separately against the scheme's rules, factor by factor, and then placing it in rank order on the basis of the total weighted score. Nevertheless, it is still necessary to check the outcomes to ensure fair and sensible comparisons across jobs.
- 1.3 Sometimes those carrying out the evaluations, especially trade union panel members, believe that the outcomes must automatically be correct **because** they have carried out the exercise in accordance with procedures and with the best of intentions.
- 1.4 However, experience shows that even a single evaluation panel with the same members on each occasion can change its thought processes and thus its outcomes over a number of evaluation sessions. The risks of inconsistencies creeping in are obviously greater with multiple panels or job analysts undertaking and reviewing evaluations. The longer the period over which the evaluations are undertaken, the greater the risk.
- 1.5 Thorough quality assurance procedures are therefore essential if consistent outcomes are to be achieved, to minimise appeals and to provide a sound foundation for the grading and pay structure. This briefing paper considers how consistency can best be achieved by users of the GLPC JES. In accordance with good JE practice it assumes that job titles and descriptions have been reviewed and are up to date for the JE exercise.

## 2. Procedural Considerations

- 2.1 Ongoing consistency of evaluations can be maximised and the burden of quality assurance at the end of the exercise minimised by building checks into the procedures for the grading review:
  - Evaluate a representative benchmark sample of jobs and thoroughly consistency check these before moving on to the remaining evaluations. Local Government Services Job Evaluation Scheme Technical Note 3: *The Role of Benchmark Jobs in Implementing Job Evaluation*: April 2004 [available on the Local Government Employers' Organisation website at: [www.lge.gov.uk](http://www.lge.gov.uk) ] provides advice on the selection of a representative benchmark sample. Although written in the context of the NJC JES, it equally applies to the GLPC JES (and, indeed, to implementation of any other job evaluation system). There is also specific UNISON guidance for London negotiators on the position in relation to benchmarking in London boroughs. This is available from the London Region or the Local Government Service Group.
  - Require analysts and evaluation/review panels to check their provisional evaluations for all subsequent jobs against the consistency checked benchmark sample evaluations. The test is: Does this evaluation seem reasonable by comparison with relevant jobs from the benchmark sample – both those likely to fall into a similar level in the rank order and those with similar job features? If not, is there an obvious explanation linked to either the demands of the new job or the historical pay structure for any differences?

- Undertake regular formal consistency checks during the course of the evaluations. This could be done by the steering group for the exercise or by a specially constituted quality assurance panel. Their role is not just to review individual evaluations, but to compare these with the benchmark and all other checked evaluations, raising queries over apparent inconsistencies to be referred back to the analysts/evaluators. This paper describes some techniques for the overall quality assurance panel to use.
- 2.2** The above procedures are most easily applied where the exercise commenced with a benchmark sample. However, if it did not, all is not lost. Even quite late on in the exercise, it is possible to identify a representative benchmark sample of jobs which are authority wide to be consistency checked first, so that all subsequent checks can more easily be made against this sample. This also allows the grading and pay structure modelling team to commence their work on the basis of the consistency checked benchmark sample, provided the sample is representative and large enough.
- 2.3** It makes little difference whether the scheme is used in its paper-based or computerised form. The same consistency checking procedures and processes are required for both; and they should be carried out at similar stages of the exercise.

### **3. Terminology**

- 3.1** This paper uses the phrases ‘quality assurance’ and ‘consistency checking’ for the process of ensuring that the evaluation process achieves fair and sensible outcomes across the relevant job population as well as against the scheme factor plan. Other terms commonly used for this process include:
- Moderation
  - Validation
  - Verification
- 3.2** Whatever the terminology used, the process is one of raising queries, where jobs do not bear the expected relationship to other jobs. The answer to the query could be:
- Defective information used for the evaluation: In this case it is much more sensible to review the information and revise the evaluation before publication of results if necessary, rather than wait for the jobholder to appeal after publication
  - Error of evaluation: This should be corrected (this should not happen with the computerised version of the GLPC JES)
  - A feature of the job evaluation scheme giving an unexpected result: This will occur from time to time and should be accepted, but it may be helpful if the reason is recorded in order to answer any subsequent queries from jobholders and their line managers
  - A job is more, or less, demanding than anticipated (or than its historic position in the hierarchy): Again the outcome should be accepted, but it is useful to record which job features may have been under or over-valued in the past, to assist in responding to post-publication queries from managers and/or jobholders.

#### 4. Features of the GLPC JES

There are two specific features of the GLPC JES which impact on the consistency checking process:

- The scheme was an amalgam of the previous GLWC JES for APT&C employees and the national Manual Worker JES of 1988. The two historic schemes came from different job evaluation approaches, so some aspects of the amalgamation are 'uncomfortable', notably the GLPC JES Resources factor, which derives from the Manual Worker JES and was originally not intended to cover financial resources other than cash handling, but has been modified in some local authorities to do so. This obviously affects evaluation outcomes under this factor heading and is further considered under the relevant headings below.
- Unlike the NJC JES or the Scottish Councils JES, for example, the GLPC JES has an associated points to grade matrix, which relates total evaluation scores to a modified version of the APT&C grading structure (with 3 grades covering old scale 1) and which is commonly used by London boroughs and by some, but not most authorities outside London. Market and other factors within London have resulted in upward pressures and what might be described as 'generous' evaluations. In contrast, in Northern Ireland, where the points to grade matrix is also used, but market and other factors are quite different, evaluations are notably less generous. In these cases, the patterns of evaluation can be similar, but the factor levels quite different for similar jobs. This feature is also referred to in the relevant sections below.

#### 5. Initial Checks

- 5.1** A useful basis for both the informal checks to be undertaken by job analysts and/or evaluation/review panels and for formal checks by the quality assurance panel is a comparison across related jobs from the same job family or organisational unit within the local authority. This process is made easier if either jobs are coded by the desired units, or by inserting alternative jobs titles with the job function first and the level second. For example, Accountant Principal and Accountant Senior would be better than Principal and Senior Accountant, so that jobs can be sorted by title.
- 5.2** It is then possible to identify those factors where the evaluation would be expected to be the same and those where there should be differences at different levels of the job family. Take the following example:

Job Title	SMP	C&I	CRE	Dis	Cons	Res	WD	PE	WC	WX	KS	Total
Payroll Assistant	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	1	1	2	3	338
Payroll Assistant Senior	3	2	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	350
Payroll Team Leader	4	2	3	2	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	386
Payroll Supervisor	4	3	3	4	3	1	3	1	1	1	4	474
Payroll Manager	5	4	5	4	3	1	3	1	1	1	5	554

- 5.3** Once the jobs are sorted in this manner (note that without the amendment to the Senior Payroll Assistant title, this job would have been excluded from the jobs grouped together through the job title sort), it is possible to see that the factor levels generally bear a sensible relationship to each other. For example, note the increasing levels for the Supervisory and Management Responsibility and Knowledge and Skills factors, same scores for the physical effort and working conditions factors. However, there are some individual queries arising from diversions from the expected pattern. These are highlighted in the table. The check also raises a wider issue over how the Work Demands factor has been scored (see 5.3 below).
- 5.4** There may be acceptable reasons for the queried assessments. For example, if the Payroll Assistants regularly handle cash, but no other members of the payroll department do, then this would explain the Resources factor assessments (unless other forms of financial responsibility are being taken into account by local convention). However, it would then be important to ensure that this was clear from the evaluation rationales.

## **6. Formal Quality Assurance Checks**

Formal quality assurance is best carried out systematically. The following sections describe and explain a series of systematic checks, which can and should be undertaken once the benchmark evaluations are complete and again at the end of the exercise:

1. Usage of factor levels
2. Distribution of evaluations
3. Specific factor checks
4. Factor Relationships
5. Overall range of total weighted scores
6. Specific checks of total weighted scores
7. Checks against historic grade/pay

These are summarised in checklist form at the end of this paper.

### **6.1 Usage of Factor Levels**

- 6.1.1** The GLPC JES factor levels were developed to represent discrete levels of demands over the range of local government jobs. Over a properly representative sample of jobs, therefore, all factor levels should be used, although not necessarily to the same degree. Where this is not the case, there should be an obvious explanation.
- 6.1.2** In particular, failure to use intermediate factor levels between the top and bottom, might be indicative of either a misunderstanding of the system by evaluators or a seriously unrepresentative job sample.
- 6.1.3** Level 1 may be used less than some other levels, but there should always be some jobs at this level in a representative sample of local authority jobs. A possible exception is provided by London boroughs and other generous scoring local authorities, where level 1 may not be used on all factors, but this should be matched by greater use of the higher factor levels.

- 6.1.4** There may be explanations for the instances where the highest factor levels have not been used, usually depending on the range of jobs within the scope of the exercise, for example:

**Supervision/Management of People: level 7 (and possibly 6)**

These levels are designed to cover major managerial roles, so if senior managerial grades are excluded from the exercise, the levels are unlikely to be used.

**Creativity and Innovation: level 7; Contacts and Relationships: level 8 (and possibly 7)**

These apply to jobs with major policy and service development responsibilities and associated contacts and relationships, so if senior managerial grades are excluded, again these levels may well not be used.

**Decisions, Discretion: level 6; Decisions, Consequences: level 5**

These levels are designed to cover primarily major managerial roles, so if senior managerial grades are excluded from the exercise, the levels are unlikely to be used.

**Physical Demands: level 4; Working Conditions: level 4**

These levels are intended to apply to the most physically demanding jobs in local government, for example, refuse collectors, grave diggers, possibly sewerage operatives. So, if the exercise does not cover these or similar groups of former manual worker jobs, these levels may not be used.

**Knowledge and Skills: level 8**

This level was designed primarily for professional managerial jobs showing great breadth of knowledge requirements. If the exercise excludes such jobs, then the level will probably not be used, as it requires in-depth knowledge in a range of disciplines, which is not frequently required in the local government (or most other) sectors.

**6.2. Overall Distribution of Factor Evaluations**

- 6.2.1** The expected distribution of factor evaluations over the relevant levels will vary according to the factor in question. The distribution can be checked by sorting the scores from highest to lowest for each factor on a spreadsheet of results, or using the Link system reports options, then by visual inspection or by creating a histogram of the results. More details about the shape of the distribution of factor level outcomes are given below.
- 6.2.2** The following observations on expected factor distributions using the GLPC JES apply where all jobs evaluated are distinct from each other. If samples have been taken of several versions of a large population job **such as** Home Carer or Administrative Assistant, to check whether they evaluate similarly, then the distributions may be different. The range of jobs employed by an individual local authority may also affect distributions.
- 6.2.3** As explained above, the outcomes may be affected by use of the GLPC JES points to grade matrix. In these cases, the distribution pattern should remain as described below, but the starting and finishing levels for the majority of jobs may vary and this should be taken into account when reviewing outcomes.

**6.2.4** Statistical analysis of distributions also depends on having a relatively large data sample. For a pilot or benchmark evaluation exercise, caution must be exercised because the distributions may be affected by the sample of jobs selected. In particular, the bulk of jobs such as those that are likely to evaluate towards the bottom of a skewed distribution factor or the middle of a more normal distribution factor, may be under-represented in the pilot sample. So, the same pattern should emerge, but in a less exaggerated form than with larger numbers of jobs.

**Supervision/ Management of People:** The expectation is of a sharply skewed distribution with most jobs at level 1 or 2 and declining numbers through each of the higher levels to match the organisational hierarchy. If this is not the case, the local conventions should be checked. However organisational hierarchies vary. For example the positioning of team leader jobs might cause a small rise and decline in the middle levels.

**Creativity and Innovation:** Again the expectation is for a skewed distribution with declining numbers of jobs through each of the levels above 2 or 3, If this pattern is not observed then it is wise to review the local conventions.

**Contacts and Relationships:** Again a skewed distribution is to be expected, but in this case the peak of the distribution is likely to be at level 2 or 3 rather than level 1, because of the 'provision of services' aspect of most roles.

**Decisions, Discretion and Decisions, Consequences:** Skewed distributions are to be expected with both sub-factors, with declining numbers of evaluations from level 2 or 3 upwards although in the case of consequences because this factor should score the same or less than discretion the peak should be at 2.

**Resources:** If this factor is applied as was intended by the designers of the GLPC JES, most jobs, including those with high level scores on most other factors, will evaluate at level 1 with small and declining numbers of jobs at levels 2 and above. These will be mainly former manual jobs. If the local conventions have been modified to take into account budgetary and/or other forms of responsibility for financial and physical resources including information systems, then this will be reflected in a distribution with larger numbers of administrative and managerial jobs at higher factor levels.

**Work Demands:** Most jobs should come at levels 1 and 2, with declining numbers above this. This is usually a more hierarchical factor than it appears at first glance.

**Physical Demands, Working Conditions:** Expect sharply skewed distributions, with the great majority of jobs assessed at level 1 and steeply declining numbers at the higher levels.

**Work Context:** Expect the same pattern as for Physical Demands and Working Conditions, with the majority of jobs in both level 1 and 2.

**Knowledge and Skills:** There will be a slightly skewed distribution with most jobs at levels 2 to 4 or 5 and declining numbers above this.

### **6.3 Specific Factor Checks**

**6.3.1** The construction of any job evaluation scheme gives rise to specific factor checks. These are best made using the sorted level assessments for each factor so that the rank order of levels and list of job titles can be scanned for specific points to be checked against the scheme and agreed local conventions. (See 5.2 above)

**Supervision/ Management of People:** This is inevitably a hierarchical factor, which means that the factor levels will broadly follow the levels of the organizational hierarchy. If they do not, queries need to be raised. Manager and supervisor jobs should normally be assessed at a higher level than the jobs they manage or supervise.

**Creativity and Innovation:** Some jobs exist for their ability to apply knowledge using creative and innovative or developmental skills and these jobs should have been assessed towards the higher levels on this factor, even if they do not score particularly highly in some other areas. This category of jobs includes policy, research, statistical and some finance jobs.

For other jobs, the factor is more hierarchical and manager and supervisor jobs normally score at least one level higher than those they manage or supervise, on account of their greater problem solving, decision-making and probably innovative skills.

**Contacts and Relationships:** This is a relatively hierarchical factor, certainly from level 4 to 8, because of the increasing emphasis on committing the Council to courses of action.

**Decision, Discretion and Decisions, Consequences:** This is an overtly hierarchical factor, so supervisor and manager jobs should normally be assessed one level higher on each of the sub-factors than the jobs of those they supervise or manage. Any jobs that do not fit this pattern should be checked.

**Resources:** Budgetary and formal accountancy responsibilities were intended by the designers of the GLPC JES to be taken into account under the contacts and relationships or knowledge and skills factors so jobs assessed above level 1 should involve responsibility for handling cash or equivalent, use of equipment or vehicles, or security of premises. These are likely to be non-managerial clerical and former manual worker jobs. Reference to financial considerations is also found in the Decisions, Consequences sub factor. However measurement under this factor would contravene the implicit GLPC JES rule that the Consequences sub factor should not be higher than the discretion sub factor level.

This leaves a potential under-evaluation of jobs which have neither budgetary nor formal accountancy nor cash handling responsibilities, but whose main responsibilities are financial. Examples will include the Payroll Assistant jobs in the table above or Finance Assistant jobs more generally. There could be an argument for reviewing the Resources local conventions to accommodate such roles.

Where the local conventions have been modified to take into account other forms of financial responsibility, this will obviously be reflected in the evaluation outcomes, which should be checked accordingly.

**Work Demands:** This sub-factor covers three distinct aspects of mental demands – interruptions, deadlines and conflicting priorities. All three elements should be taken into account in the assessment.

For instance, in the job family check example in paragraph 4.2 above, it looks as though all the payroll jobs have been assessed in relation to deadlines, without taking into consideration interruptions and conflicting priorities. Taking into account these two features, generally favours managerial roles, so the factor becomes hierarchical.

**Physical Demands:** administrative and managerial jobs should normally have been assessed at level 1. Most of the jobs at levels 3 and 4 are likely to be former manual worker jobs. Jobs involving sitting in a constrained position (e.g. data input, word processing) or standing as a norm (e.g. school crossing patrols) should be at level 2.

**Working Conditions:** As with Physical Demands, administrative and managerial jobs should normally have been assessed at level 1 and many of the jobs at level 3 and above are likely to be former manual jobs.

However, in this sub-factor, front line service providing jobs, where the work involves going out into the community, to homes or on site visits or inspections, should have been assessed above level 1, even where they are at level 1 for Physical Demands. Jobs that are primarily outdoor jobs should be at level 3 or above.

**Work Context:** The definition for this sub-factor, (although not explicit in the level definitions) refers to emotional demands, abuse and aggression as well as environmental hazards, so social care jobs as well as former manual jobs should have been assessed above level 1.

**Knowledge and Skills:** Check that 'standard' qualified practitioner jobs from all occupational groups are assessed at the same level, either level 5 or 6, depending on local conventions, and that there is justification for jobs scored above or below this level.

#### 6.4 Factor Correlation

It is useful to check the scores for factors where a relationship may be expected, either alongside the specific factor checks described in (3) above, or as a separate subsequent check. This is not to say that unusual relationships are not possible, but they do require explanation. Factor relationships can be examined by sorting first by one factor, then by the second factor, then either by a third related factor or by total score. These factor relationships apply even in the relatively 'generous' scoring London boroughs.

**Knowledge and Skills, and Creativity and Innovation:** The second of these factors clearly relates to the application of the first. So the normal expectation is that a job with high Knowledge and Skills requirements will also have relatively high Creativity and Innovation requirements.

However, there are more Knowledge and Skills levels than for Creativity and Innovation, so it would be very unusual for jobs to be assessed at higher levels on Creativity and Innovation than on Knowledge and Skills. Any apparent exceptions should be queried and investigated.

**Decision, Discretion and Decisions, Consequences:** It is a convention of the GLPC JES that the Consequences sub-factor level should be no higher than the Discretion level; it may be the same or one level lower. Any exceptions should be investigated.

**Physical Demands, Working Conditions, Work Context:** It is worth sorting these three sub-factors together to check the relationships between the three. Most jobs should have been assessed at level 1 on all three sub-factors.

Some jobs will be assessed at level 2 on only one sub-factor, but it would be unusual for a job to be higher than level 2 on one sub-factor and not to be assessed at higher than level 1 on either of the others, by virtue of the nature of local government services. Exceptions should be queried and investigated.

## 6.5 Overall Range of Total Weighted Scores

As all jobs must be assessed at least at level 1 on each factor and because no job is likely to score at the lowest level on all factors, the minimum possible total weighted score on the GLPC JES is around 200 points.

Taking into account that managerial and most professional jobs are likely to be assessed at level 1, or at maximum level 2, on the Resources factor (except where the local convention have been amended) and the Physical Demands, Working Conditions and Work Context sub-factors, the maximum realistic score is not the theoretical 948, but more likely to be 800 - 850 points.

A realistic range for the full spread of jobs is from around 220-240 to 750-800, with a lower maximum if more senior managerial jobs are excluded from the exercise. The points range should emerge from a representative benchmark or pilot sample as well as from evaluation of all jobs.

A range from 220 to 770 is very reasonable by comparison with the outcomes of local authorities that have completed their evaluation exercises and should allow for the development of a sensible grading structure (550 points allows for 11 grades of average 50 points, for example).

If a narrower range of scores has emerged or there is excessive 'bunching' of jobs in some parts of the overall range, then these should be investigated, taking into account the representativeness of the range of jobs evaluated.

## 6.6 Specific Checks of Total Weighted Scores against Jobs

Sorting the overall rank order of total weighted scores by department or job family allows for additional checks, for example:

**Manager Jobs:** These should normally score higher overall than the jobs they manage, even where the manager job is office based and the managed job is a front line service providing job.

The manager job is likely to have scored at least one level higher than the job managed on – Knowledge and Skills (32 points); Creativity and Innovation (12 points); Decisions, Discretion (16 points); Decisions, Consequences (12 points); Supervision/ Management of People (12+ points, depending on numbers). These greater scores (over 80 points) should outweigh the managed job's higher score(s) for Resources, Effort and Environment actors.

Any exceptions should be investigated. If there are no problems over either information or evaluation, then this is indicative that the manager job is not what it appears from the job title. This is not an impossible situation as, with the development of jobs over the years, job titles and descriptions may not have kept up with changes, for example, there may have been greater devolvement of responsibilities than the title indicates.

**Colleague Jobs:** Where a sample of jobs with the same or a similar job title have been evaluated, then these should evaluate similarly, although not necessarily identically, but the range should normally be less than around 50 points for genuinely similar jobs. Greater differences than this should be investigated. If there are no problems over either information or evaluation, then this is indicative of a misleading job title and suggests that

there is more than one job within the group. There may well be a need to de-cluster jobs from the group.

**Same Organisational Level Jobs:** Although less exact than the above two checks, it is also worth checking jobs which are considered to be at similar levels in the organisational hierarchy, but in different departments. Other things being equal, these should come out with similar overall total weighted scores, albeit by different routes in terms of which factors they score highly on. So, for example, third and fourth tier management jobs should each come out with similar total scores (say, within 50 points). Standard professional jobs should normally also have similar total weighted scores. Variations from these generalisations may be legitimate, but they should be explicable in terms of their job content.

#### **6.7 Checks against Historic Grade**

Only when all other checks have been completed and amendments made as necessary should the overall rank order of jobs be checked against historic grades. As most anomalies will have been identified and where appropriate rectified through the previous checks, the normal expectation is that changes in relative rank order are justified by the relative demands of the roles. Where jobs appear in a different relative position in the hierarchy, the reason should already have been noted as part of the previous consistency checks. So at this stage there should be very few apparent inconsistencies which do not already have explanations.

### **7. Conclusions**

The above checks may seem like a lot of work on top of the initial evaluations. They will be much less work if consistency checks have been undertaken during the course of the exercise. They are a worthwhile investment of time to reduce the number of successful appeals and the associated negative credibility impact.

They are also essential to ensure that grading and pay structure modelling is conducted on sound foundations.

Negotiators are also reminded that the Local Government Service Group provides a training course on getting the best out of the GLPC Job Evaluation Scheme. For further details please contact Phena Symons on 020 7551 1410.

## SUMMARY CHECKLIST

These questions should be modified as necessary by users to take into account the particular local conventions in place in their authority, by reference to the explanations above.

### 1. Have all factor levels been used?

- Have all the intermediate factor levels been used? If not, why not?
- Have all top levels been used for factors other than physical effort and environmental conditions? If not, is this because some senior jobs have been excluded from the exercise? If not, have evaluations been unduly compressed?
- Have all the top levels been used for the Physical Demands, Working Conditions and Work Context sub-factors? If not, is this because the range of jobs to be evaluated excludes the most physically demanding former manual jobs (e.g. Refuse Collectors, Sewerage Operatives, and Gravediggers)? If not, have evaluations been unduly compressed?
- Have all bottom levels been used for a reasonable proportion of jobs? If not, have evaluators been unduly generous, either at the bottom end or across all jobs?

### 2. Are the distributions of factor level assessments as would be expected with the GLPC JES?

- Are the distributions for most factors skewed towards levels 1 and 2 with declining numbers of jobs evaluated at each higher level? If not, why not?
- Is the distribution for the Knowledge and Skills factor skewed towards levels 2 to 4 or 5? If not, what is the explanation?

### 3. Have the factor rank orders been checked?

- Supervision/ Management of People: Have manager and supervisor jobs been assessed at a higher level than the jobs they manage or supervise?
- Creativity and Innovation: Are policy, research, advisory and statistician jobs assessed at relatively high levels on this factor? Otherwise are manager and supervisor jobs assessed at a higher level than jobs they supervise or manage?
- Contacts and Relationships: Has this been assessed relatively hierarchically, especially from levels 4 to 8?
- Decisions, Discretion and Consequences: Have manager and supervisor jobs been assessed at a higher level than the jobs they manage or supervise? Are the Consequences levels the same or lower than the Discretion levels?
- Resources: Are the jobs assessed above level 1 those that involve handling cash or financial documents, use of equipment, or security of premises?
- Work Demands: Do the assessments take into account interruptions, deadlines and conflicting priorities?
- Physical Demands: Are most of the jobs assessed at level 3 or 4 genuinely physical jobs (probably former manual jobs)?
- Working Conditions: Have primarily outdoor jobs been assessed at level 3 or 4? Have jobs involving making regular home or site visits been assessed at level 2 at least?

- Work Context: are the jobs assessed at least level 2 or above either former manual jobs with risks environmental hazards or social care or similar jobs with people related demands?
- Knowledge and Skills: Are all the standard qualified practitioner jobs at the same level, either 5 or 6, depending on local conventions? If not, is there clear justification for any variations?

**4. Are There Sensible Relationships Between Associated Factors?**

- Is there an observed relationship between the Knowledge and Skills levels and the Creativity and Innovation levels? Are the former levels generally higher than the latter? Is there good reason for any exceptions?
- Is the Decision, Consequences level for each job the same or one level lower than the Decisions, Discretion sub-factor? If not, what is the explanation?
- Is there a sensible relationship between the Physical Demands, Working Conditions and Work Context factor levels above level 1?

**5. Is the overall range of total weighted scores between 220-240 and 750-800?**

- If the highest total weighted score is less than 750, is this because managerial jobs have been excluded from the exercise? If not, have evaluators been too conservative in their assessments?
- If the lowest total weighted score is more than 250, is this because the authority does not employ jobs likely to fall at the bottom end of the range? If not, have the evaluators been too generous?
- Is there excessive bunching of scores in some parts of the overall range?

**6. Have the total weighted scores been analysed by department or job family?**

- Do manager jobs score higher overall than the jobs they manage? If not, why not?
- Do colleague jobs score similarly to each other, or at least within a range of 50 points? If not, is this because there have been some inconsistent evaluations? If not, is this indicative that the jobs are actually significantly different from each other?

**7. Do jobs at the same level in the organisation score similarly or within a range of around 50 points? If not, is there a clear explanation for this?**