U of L Job Evaluation Manual

**Introduction**

The purpose of this manual is to serve as a reference guide for the Hay Job Evaluation Methodology used to evaluate AUPE positions at the University of Lethbridge. This manual is not intended to be a training manual to prepare individuals to be job evaluators or to be a definitive resource on job evaluation methodology.

As the organization continually changes, the information in this manual may become outdated or new information may be added. Information in this manual will be updated as necessary.

For additional information, users of this guide may contact Human Resources at the University of Lethbridge at (403) 329-2274.

**Job Evaluation System**

Job evaluation is the analysis and evaluation of work for the purpose of determining the relative value of jobs within an organization. Job evaluation may also provide valuable information for organizational analysis and for human resource planning and management strategies such as succession planning, performance management, compensation, etc.

For a job evaluation system to be effective, care must be taken in ensuring the system is as objective as possible. It is important that each job be evaluated on the basis of **current, regular and on-going work conditions and job content**. It is also essential that the focus of the evaluation process be on the purpose, scope and responsibilities of work assigned to the position, and not an incumbent's personal qualities or performance. In other words the focus is on the position and not the individual(s) in the position.

As jobs are very often affected in some way by organizational change, maintaining the job evaluation system requires that departments periodically review their organization design and structure to determine if significant changes have occurred. Any change in an organization's structure may alter the content of a job, which may result in an adjustment in the evaluation of the job. Ideally the position description should be updated every time there is a substantial change to a position’s purpose, scope, and/or responsibilities.

**Joint Committees**

The Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) shall meet to jointly evaluate AUPE positions. Membership on this committee is confined to management (Human Resources) and union (AUPE) ranks. Ideally, the JEC will be a representation from a cross-section of job classes to every extent possible. The JEC will evaluate all AUPE jobs in the workplace, as well as maintain the integrity of the Hay Plan. Job evaluation decisions shall be unanimous and deemed final and binding upon the Parties, subject to appeal procedures.

**Job Evaluation Procedures**

The following general procedures will be used to evaluate jobs:

1. All incumbents will complete the Job Evaluation Questionnaire (either individually or as a group if they choose). The Incumbent, Manager and Dean/Director will sign the Questionnaire, and submit to Human Resources.
2. Where further documentation is required, the JEC will determine how that information will be obtained. This may include having members of the JEC interview the incumbent and manager. Any additional information will be gathered in such a manner as to minimize any disruption to the workplace.
3. The JEC will evaluate the position using information from the completed questionnaire and any additional interviews (if necessary). The JEC will evaluate positions based on comparisons with other AUPE evaluated positions.

# Overview of the Hay Method

Job Evaluation methods provide a systematic approach and framework to sort positions in an equitable manner. The Hay method works because it is a dynamic process that organizations adapt and apply in ways that meet their needs. It is based on the notion that jobs can be measured on the basis of their relative contribution to the overall objectives of the organization. By considering core aspects of content and context that are common to all jobs, it provides a clear, understandable and systematic basis for defining and comparing the requirements for all kinds of jobs at all levels.

The Hay Method is based on the idea that jobs can be assessed in terms of;

* the **knowledge** required to do the job;
* the **thinking** needed to solve the problems commonly faced;
* the **responsibilities** assigned, and;
* the **working conditions** associated with the job.

These four factors are often referred to as “compensable factors”.

The Hay approach ranks jobs by level of accountability they carry in setting and achieving organizational goals and objectives. The focus of the job evaluation process using the Hay Method is on the nature and the requirements of the job itself, not on the skills, educational background, personal characteristics, or the current salary of the person holding the job.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Equal Pay Legislation**  | **Hay Method Compensable Factors**  |
| Skill  | * Know-How
 |
| Effort  | * Problem Solving
 |
| Responsibility  | * Accountability
 |
| Working Conditions  | * Physical Effort, Environmental Factors, Sensory Attention, Mental Stress
 |

The four compensable factors (Know-How, Problem Solving, Accountability, and Working Conditions) are measured using a series of charts referred to as the “Hay Guide Charts”. Each of the four compensable factors has a Guide Chart outlining the dimensions of each of the factors and their respective point levels. Each job is given a ranking in accordance with the four factors in relation to other jobs in the organization, resulting in a total point level.

**Working from documentation which describes the content of the job (the Job Evaluation Questionnaire) and the environment in which it is performed, plus the definitions and qualitative measures provided (by the Hay plan), each job is given a ranking on the four factors in relation to other jobs in the organization.**

**Key job functions and major responsibilities of the job are compared to the definitions of degree levels in order to determine the most appropriate level. The corresponding points for that level are then assigned to the job and are combined for all factors to derive a total score.**

**Hay Guide Charts provide the standard tools used to systematically evaluate all UofL jobs. Guide Charts were tailored by Hay to suit the University of Lethbridge organization and the jobs to be evaluated.**

# Overview of the Four Compensable Factors

# 1. Know-How

This Guide Chart measures the total knowledge, skills and competencies required in a job to realize its accountabilities and to perform the job in an acceptable manner. It consists of three dimensions:

* Cognitive: Practical procedures and knowledge, specialized techniques, and learned skills;
* Managerial: The real or conceptual planning, coordinating, directing, and controlling of activities and resources associated with an organizational unit or function; and,
* Human Relation: Active, practicing, person-to-person skills in the area of human relationships.

**Cognitive Know-How**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level**  | **Explanation**  |
| **A. Basic**  | Work of this kind is extremely simple, short cycle in nature, and typically involves manual effort. Familiarity with simple work routines; work indoctrination. |
| **B. Elementary**  | Capable of carrying out uninvolved, standard procedures **AND/OR** using equipment or machines which are simple to operate. |
| **C. Intermediate Skill And/Or Knowledge**  | Experienced in applying methods or procedures, which generally are well defined and straightforward, but with occasional deviations. Skill in the use of specialized equipment may be needed. |
| **D. Extended Skill And/Or Knowledge**  | Accomplished in implementing practical procedures or systems, which are moderately complex **AND/OR** specialized skills, which require some technical knowledge (usually non-theoretical) to apply. |
| **E. Diverse or Specialized**  | A sound understanding of and skill in several activities which involve a variety of practices and precedents **OR** a basic understanding of the theory and principles in a scientific or similar discipline. |
| **F. Seasoned, Diverse or Specialized** | Extensive knowledge and skill gained through broad or deep experiences in a field (or fields) which requires a command of EITHER involved, diverse practices and precedents **OR** scientific theory and principles **OR** both. |
| **G. Broad or Specialized Mastery**  | Mastery of theories, principles, and complex techniques OR the diverse, cumulative equivalent gained through broad seasoning **AND/OR** special development. |

**Managerial Know How**

This is know-how required to integrate and harmonize diversified functions involved in managerial situations (operating, supporting and administering). It is practiced directly in "line" assignments, consultatively in "staff" assignments or both ways. This factor reflects the knowledge and skill required for integrating and harmonizing activities, resources and functions involving some combination of planning, organizing, integrating, coordinating, evaluating, staffing and/or controlling. Managerial Know How is reflected on the guide charts as the values "T" (task, which is essentially “none”), "I" (minimal), "II" (diverse), "III" (broad), and “IV" (total).

Managerial Know How is a continuum like all other factors in the ranking process. **Evaluators must always compare what levels apply to a job being evaluated relative to other positions in the organization**. For example, Directors and Maintenance supervisors both plan but there is a significant difference in difficulty, scope and time frames. The organizational structure in which a job exists must be considered so that the job above the one being evaluated and its impact is considered. The next layer above the job being evaluated is there because the job being evaluated cannot "do it all" on its own. The level above brings added value from the standpoint of planning, organizing and coordinating activities. Layers of management cannot be ignored with respect to their impact on the positions below both in managerial know how and freedom to act.

Explanations for the levels follow.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level**  | **Explanation**  |
| **T.** | Performance of a task(s) highly specific as to objective and content, and not involving the leadership of others.  |
| **I.** | Performance or direction of activities, which are similar as to content and objectives with appropriate awareness of other activities. |
| **II.** | Direction of an important unit with varied activities and objectives **OR** guidance of an important subfunction(s) or several important elements across **several** units. |
| **III.** | Direction of a major unit with noticeable functional diversity **OR** guidance of a function(s) which significantly affects all or most of the organization. |
| **IV.** | Management of all units and functions within the organization. |

**Human Relations Skills**

Human Relations Skills are the active, face to face skills needed by a job holder for various relationships with other people within and outside of the organization. Human Relations Skills range from "1" (basic), to "2" (important), to "3" (critical). It must be kept in mind that "1" is not a "0". It is assumed that all jobs require a minimum of common politeness. At the opposite extreme, a job that requires the ability to motivate, convince or sell others to gain results is a "3". Human Relations skills are not synonymous with being a nice person and they are not necessarily interchangeable. Level descriptions follow.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level**  | **Explanation**  |
| **1. Basic**  | This is the base level of interpersonal skill utilized by most individuals in the course of performing the job. Maintaining courteous and effective working relationships with others to request or transmit information, ask questions or get clarification.  |
| **2. Important**  | This level of interpersonal skill is required in jobs in which understanding and influencing people are important requirements in the job. Skills of persuasiveness or assertiveness as well as sensitivity to the other person's point of view are often required to influence behavior, change an opinion, or turn a situation around. The requirement for public contact does not necessarily demand this level of human relations skills, particularly if the purpose is to provide or solicit information. In addition, positions which assign work and/or monitor and review work of other employees (generally supervising AUPE positions), usually require at least this level of skill.  |
| **3. Critical**  | The highest level of interpersonal skill is usually required by positions in which alternative or combined skills in **understanding and motivating people** are important in the highest degree. Jobs which require negotiating skills are often found at this level, but consideration has to be given to the power bases being utilized.For example, In negotiations between buyers and sellers of products, services, concepts, or ideas, less Human Relations skill may be required by the "buyer" who has the latitude to say "no" than by the seller who must turn the "no" to "yes". This level of skill is usually required for positions accountable for the development, motivation, assessment and reward of other employees. |

* Know-How points are derived from the matching of the three dimensions described above. For example, a Cognitive scoring of “D”, combined with a Managerial scoring of “I” and Human Relation skills of “3” provides a total Know-How ranking. Often the notation used to display the Know-How factor is written as, “DI3”.

# 2. Problem Solving

This Guide Chart measures the thinking required in the job by considering two dimensions:

* The environment in which the thinking takes place; and,
* The challenge presented by the thinking to be done.

Problem Solving is the amount and nature of the thinking required in the job for analyzing, reasoning, evaluating, creating, exercising judgement, forming hypotheses, drawing inferences, arriving at conclusions and the like. To the extent that thinking is limited or reduced by job demands or structure, covered by precedent, simplified by definition, or assisted by others, then problem solving is diminished and results are obtained by the automatic application of skills rather than by the application of the thinking processes to knowledge.

Problem Solving measures the extent by which Know-How is employed or required. "You think with what you know." Therefore Problem Solving is treated as a percentage of Know-How.

**The evaluation of Problem Solving should be made without reference to the job's freedom to make decisions or take action; these are measured on the Accountability Chart.**

**Thinking Environment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level**  | **Explanation**  |
| **A. Highly Structured**  | Thinking within very detailed and precisely defined rules and instructions AND/OR with continually present assistance. |
| **B. Routine**  | Thinking within detailed standard practices and instructions AND/OR with immediately available assistance or examples. |
| **C. Semi-Routine**  | Thinking within well-defined, somewhat diversified procedures. There are many precedents covering most situations AND/OR readily available assistance.  |
| **D. Standardized**  | Thinking within clear but substantially diversified procedures. There are precedents covering many situations AND/OR access to assistance.  |
| **E. Clearly Defined**  | Thinking within a well-defined frame of reference and toward specific objectives. This is done in situations characterized by functional practices and precedents. |
| **F. Generally Defined** | Thinking within a general frame of reference toward functional objectives. This is done in situations characterized by nebulous, intangible or unstructured aspects |
| **G. Broadly Defined**  | Thinking within concepts, principles and broad guidelines towards the organization’s objectives or functional goals. This is done in an environment that is nebulous, intangible, or unstructured.  |
| **H. Abstract**  | Thinking within business philosophy AND/OR natural laws AND/OR principles governing human affairs. |

**Thinking Challenge**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level**  | **Explanation**  |
| **1. Repetitive**  | Identical situations requiring resolution by simple choice of known things. |
| **2. Patterned**  | Similar situations requiring search for solutions within area of known things. |
| **3. Varied**  | Differing situations requiring search for solutions within area of known things |
| **4. Adaptive**  | Variable situations requiring analytical, interpretative, evaluative, and/or constructive thinking. |
| **5. Unchartered** | Novel or nonrecurring path-finding situations requiring the development of new concepts and imaginative approaches. |

* Problem Solving points are derived from the matching of the two dimensions described above. For example, a Thinking Environment scoring of “D”, combined with a Thinking Challenge scoring of “3” provides a percentage. To find Problem Solving points, match the Know-How total score and the Problem Solving %. This provides the total Problem Solving ranking.

# 3. Accountability

This Guide Chart measures the relative degree to which the job, performed competently, can affect the end results of the organization or of a unit within the organization. Accountability is related to the opportunity which a job has to bring about some results and the importance of those results to the organization. Tied closely to the amount of opportunity is the degree to which the person in the job must answer for (is accountable for) the results.

It reflects the level of decision-making and influence of the job through consideration, in the following order of importance, of:

* FREEDOM TO ACT - the nature of the controls that limit or extend the decision-making or influence of the job;
* JOB IMPACT ON END RESULTS - the immediacy of the influence of the job on a unit or function of the organization; and,
* MAGNITUDE - the magnitude of the unit or function most clearly affected by the job.

**Freedom to Act**

Freedom to act measures the nature of the controls that limit or extend the decision-making or influence of the job. It is measured by the existence or absence of personal or procedural control and guidance (supervision and guidance). Limitations on freedom to act are largely organizational (relating to both organizational placement and control as well as the nature of the activity in terms of end results and can differ between seemingly equivalent jobs in different departments). Freedom to act in a job is constrained to the degree that it is more circumscribed or limited by external factors or is defined by others and/or is limited by organization or functional policies. The Freedom to Act can be evaluated in a range from R to G. Quantitatively it is the most important dimension of accountability.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level**  | **Explanation**  |
| **R** | These jobs are subject to explicit, detailed instructions **AND/OR** constant personal or procedural supervision.  |
| **A** | These jobs are subject to direct and detailed instructions **AND/OR** very close supervision.  |
| **B** | These jobs are subject to instruction and established work routines **AND/OR** close supervision.  |
| **C** | These jobs are subject, wholly or in part, to standardized practices and procedures, general work instructions and supervision or progress and results.  |
| **D** | These jobs are subject, wholly or in part, to practices and procedures covered by precedents or well-defined policies, and supervisory review.  |
| **E** | These jobs, by their nature and size, are subject to broad practices and procedures covered by functional precedents and policies, achievement of a circumscribed operational activity, and to managerial direction.  |
| **F** | These jobs, by their nature or size, are broadly subject to functional policies and goals and to managerial direction of a general nature.  |
| **G** | Subject to the guidance of broad organization policies, community or legislative limits, and the mandate of the organization.  |

 **MAGNITUDE**

Magnitude represents the size of the unit or function most clearly affected by the job. Every position in every organization has a role to play in helping to achieve the objectives of the organization; however the importance of this role is better understood in the context of a department, or a faculty.

The underlying notion in order to score the magnitude component is to recognize that Impact and Magnitude judgments must be made in tandem. There are some organizations that use dollars (budget) as a useful quantitative measure of size; however, the University of Lethbridge scores the Magnitude component by fitting Magnitude and Impact together.

Instead of using static dollars as a quantitative measure of size, the task is to (1) identify the magnitude of the area most clearly impacted by the job (i.e. across the University for several unrelated functions, or within one unit, etc.), and (2) measure the job’s impact at that point.

The question to be answered is: Does the position’s magnitude impact within one unit, or does it impact across the University for one function, or perhaps across the University for several unrelated functions? This would differentiate the Magnitude scoring.

Another check is to look at the Problem Solving scoring. Positions where accountability tends to be greater than problem solving (i.e. owner of a business) would have a higher accountability score. The assumption is that a position is balanced (i.e. problem solving = accountability), unless actions or activities in the position prove otherwise.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Explanation**  |
| M (Minimal) | Results usually affect an individual or are usually non-quantifiable in terms of department budget responsibility, revenues and expenditure authority.  |
| 1(Very Small)  | Results are internally focused and affect a unit of the department or may be externally focused and affect a limited segment of clients outside the department. |
| 2(Very Small)  | Results typically affect an entire department and may have some impact on other departments and/or are externally focused affecting a large clientele within a program or functional area. |
| 3(Medium)  | Results achieved primarily affect other departments, the University as a whole and significant client groups external to University operations. Work performed may affect provincial or territorial clientele within a variety of programs or functional areas.  |

 **IMPACT**

Impact: The degree to which the job affects or brings about the results expected *of the unit or function being considered.* This is the influence of the job on a unit.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level**  | **Explanation**  |
| **A**  | **Ancillary** One of several/many positions, which contribute to the end results expected of the unit or functions OR informational, recording, or other facilitating services for use by others in achieving results.  |
| **C**  | **Contributory** One of few positions which contribute significantly to the end results expected of the unit or function OR interpretive, advisory, or other important supporting services for use by others in achieving results.  |
| **S**  | **Shared** Equal and joint control, with one other position, of the activities and resources which produce the results OR control of what are clearly most (but not all) of the variables which are significant in determining results.  |
| **P**  | **Primary**Controlling impact - the position has effective control over the significant activities and resources which produce the results and is the sole position (at this level of Freedom to Act) which must answer for the results.  |

* Accountability points are derived from the matching of the three dimensions described above. For example, a Freedom to Act scoring of “D”, combined with a Magnitude scoring of “1” and an Impact scoring of “C” provides a total Accountability ranking of D1C.

# Working Conditions

This Guide Chart measures the conditions under which the job is performed by considering:

* **Physical Effort**, which measures the degree of physical fatigue that results from the combination of intensity, duration, and frequency of any kind of physical activity required in the job.
* **Physical Environment**, which measures the physical discomfort or the risk of accident or ill health which results from the combination of intensity, duration, and frequency of exposure, in the job, to unavoidable physical and environmental factors.
* **Sensory Attention**, which measures the intensity, duration, and frequency of the demand, in the job, for concentration using one or more of the five senses.
* **Mental Stress**, which measures the degree of such things as tension or anxiety which result from the combination of intensity, duration, and frequency of exposure to factors, inherent in the work process or environment, which would typically cause stress to someone reasonably suited to the job.

By focusing on the important aspects of the content of each job, the end results which each is expected to achieve, and the conditions under which the work is performed, the Hay Method provides a vehicle for systematically assessing the relationships among the various positions and determining their relative value.