



a world class African city

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Policy Name	Job Evaluation
Owner	Director: Human Resources Shared Services (HRSS)
Version	Final 12.12.08
Effective date	
Approval date	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. THE DEFINITION OF TERMS	3
3. THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE POLICY	3
4. THE RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES	3
5. THE SCOPE OF APPLICATION	3
6. THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (THE ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK)	4
7. THE POLICY AREAS	4 - 9
8. THE APPROVAL	9
9. THE AMENDMENTS	10
10. ANNEXURE A: THE JE MANAGER JOB EVALUATION REQUEST FORM	11
11. ANNEXURE B: THE HAY JOB EVALUATION REQUEST FORM	12

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This **Job Evaluation Policy** outlines the process that should be followed for the evaluation of jobs within the City of Johannesburg (CoJ)

2. THE DEFINITION OF TERMS

Term	Definition
Grade	The relative value of a particular job as reflected by the job weight, which is linked to a salary range in a salary scale used in the public service
Job	The basic duties, tasks, functions, competency requirements and responsibilities according to which one or more posts of the same grade are established
Job Evaluation	A method of determining the relative worth of a job to an organisation
Job Weight	A numerical value assigned to reflect selected characteristics of a job as measured by a job evaluation instrument
Level	Salary range or grade
Salary Range	A set of salaries that form a part of a salary scale linked to a specific grade and, by extension, a set of job weights
Line Manager	The definition to include all persons at any level of authority, as long as the person oversees a junior position
Job Description	A list of the general tasks, or functions, and responsibilities of a position. Typically, it also includes to whom the position reports, specifications such as the qualifications needed by the person in the job, salary range for the position, etc

3. THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE JOB EVALUATION POLICY

3.1 Any dispute arising from the interpretation and application of this policy will be handled and resolved through the delegations and discretion of the Director: Human Resources Shared Services (HRSS)

4. THE RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES OF JOB EVALUATION POLICY

4.1 The rationale and purpose of the Policy is to assist the City with codification and documentation of jobs/work responsibilities and to ensure that work of equal value is remunerated equally

5. THE SCOPE OF APPLICATION

5.1 The Policy applies to City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality administration and all its employees

6. THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (THE ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK)

- 6.1 The *Mayoral Committee (Mayco)* approves the HR Policies
- 6.2 The *Executive Management Team (EMT)* engages on the HR policies and recommends the approval of the HR policies by Mayco
- 6.3 The *City Manager* is accountable as an Accounting Officer and oversees the development, implementation and maintenance of policies, procedures, processes and system, including those in HR
- 6.4 The *Executive Director: Corporate and Shared Services* is responsible for ensuring the HR Policies comply with the Council resolutions of City of Johannesburg, as well as applicable legislation, and in conjunction with the conditions of service and relevant bargaining council agreement
- 6.5 Other *Executive Director's* are accountable for ensuring strict adherence to prescriptions of HR policies within their Depts, as well contribute to the development, review and evaluation of impact of HR policies
- 6.6 The *Director: Human Resources Shared Services (HRSS)* is responsible for the overall policy implementation, management, monitoring and review, as well as ensuring that the HR Policies comply with the Council resolutions, applicable legislation, conditions of service and relevant bargaining council agreements
- 6.7 The nominated *Deputy Director in HRSS with responsibility of HR policies* is responsible for ensuring that the Policy is reviewed on ongoing-basis
- 6.8 Other *Deputy Directors [Business Process Owners (BPO)] in HRSS* are responsible for researching, recommending the development, maintenance, review and evaluation of their policies dealing with their respective areas and processes in the CoJ, as well as monitoring the implementation of the Policy within the requirements
- 6.9 The *Field HR and HR Transactions* are responsible for ensuring the adherence and compliance to the approved HR policies, as well as providing advise on HR policies
- 6.10 The *Line Manager* is responsible for implementation of and adherence to the approved HR policies
- 6.11 The *Organised Labour (Unions)* are responsible for playing an oversight role on management, implementation and compliance/adherence to approved HR policies, as well as contribute to the evaluation of impact of HR policies and their review
- 6.12 All *Staff* are responsible for complying/adhering to the approved HR Policies

7. THE POLICY AREAS

This section outlines the policy provisions on the management of job evaluation process in the City of Johannesburg (CoJ)

7.1 THE DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF JOB DESCRIPTIONS

- 7.1.1 It is the responsibility of the Management to develop and update a job description in collaboration with his/her employee in accordance with the guidelines and format(s) developed by the Human Resources Shared Services (HRSS)
- 7.1.2 In developing job descriptions, the Management must ensure that individual jobs link to the strategic objectives of the CoJ and are aligned to the CoJ's approved organisational structure
- 7.1.3 It is the prerogative of the Management to design the work responsibilities to ensure that the objectives of the CoJ are met. This should be done in consultation with the employee before finalising the job description and every effort should be made to gain agreement from the employee
- 7.1.4 Both the jobholder and Management must be involved in finalising the job description and there must be mutual agreement on the content thereof
- 7.1.5 The prescribed *Job Description Format* must include job content (job details, purpose and key performance responsibilities) and job specification (qualifications, skill, experience and knowledge)

7.2 THE JOB EVALUATION PROCESSES

- 7.2.1 Job evaluation will be conducted for all bargaining unit employees by the Job Evaluation Committee whereas job evaluation for non-SALGBC (South African Local Government Bargaining Council) employees will be conducted by the external service provider using the approved job evaluation system

7.2.2 INITIATING THE JOB EVALUATION PROCESS

- 7.2.2.1 It is mandatory for job evaluations to be performed in the following instances:
 - a. Before a post for any newly defined job is filled
 - b. Before filling any vacant post unless the specific job has been evaluated previously
- 7.2.2.2 In addition to the mandatory evaluations, jobs may also be evaluated emanating from requests from one of the following role-players, Management/Individual employee
- 7.2.2.3 Requests for the evaluation of jobs should in all cases be directed to the Job Evaluation Manager
- 7.2.2.4 Before the Job Evaluation Committee is requested to perform a mandatory evaluation, the Head of Department must confirm that the relevant post is required to meet the CoJ's objectives and that sufficient funds are available for filling the post
- 7.2.2.5 With regard to requests from individual employees and management for evaluations, the following applies:
 - a. An employee should have the right to request that his/her job be evaluated
 - b. A request should not be denied without good reason - there might be cases where it could be justified not to comply with requests for evaluations
 - c. It must be pointed out to employees that the evaluation of a job could result in its upgrading or downgrading or remaining the same

- d. As a general guideline, once an existing post has been evaluated, at least two (2) years should expire before it is evaluated again unless there is clear evidence that the job contents of a post have changed to such an extent that an evaluation could lead to a regrading of the post
- e. The requests by individual employees should be in writing indicating the reasons for the request to the line manager for approval.
- f. Requests should be submitted to the Job Evaluation Unit through the Head of their Department (at least on Director level) and in consultation with Human Resources Field Services
- g. The Head of the Department should indicate whether he/she supports the request for an evaluation
- h. Requests should be in the prescribed *Job Evaluation Form* (Refer to *Annexure A* and *B* for more details), submitted via the Head of the relevant Unit
- i. All requests for evaluations should be fully motivated and possible reasons could include:
 - i. a significant change in the contents of a job and
 - ii. similar jobs (or more or less the same job) are graded/ evaluated at different levels

7.2.2.6 The Head of Department is required to respond to job evaluation requests within thirty (30) days

7.2.2.7 If a request is refused, the employee has the right to pursue the matter further through the grievance process

7.2.3 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF JOB EVALUATION RESULTS

7.2.3.1 Job evaluation should ideally be conducted and finalized within sixty (60) days of the application having been approved by the Head of Department

7.2.3.2 The results of the job evaluation are to be implemented on the first day of the month following the sixty (60) day period

7.2.3.3 In the event the job evaluation results are not finalised within the prescribed sixty (60) day period, the implementation date should be retrospective with reference to the above (6.2.3.2)

7.2.3.4 The job evaluation results shall be implemented unless any party concerned lodges a dispute to the Appeal Committee

7.2.3.5 The job evaluation results shall be presented in a correlation table that compares different job evaluation system approved by the CoJ

7.2.4 THE PRIORITISATION OF JOB EVALUATIONS

7.2.4.1 In principle, all posts should be evaluated as salaries are determined on the basis of job evaluation results

7.2.4.2 The Job Evaluation Unit will need to prioritise job evaluations and incoming requests, owing to inter alia a limited capacity to perform job evaluation and/or large numbers of requests for evaluations

7.2.4.3 The prioritisation of job evaluation should be as follows:

- a. mandatory evaluations should receive preference, especially in cases where vacancies have to be filled urgently
- b. the next preference should be to those requests where there is clear evidence that a job is incorrectly graded and where employees are disadvantaged as a result

- c. lastly, instances where service delivery and other CoJ priorities and objectives are adversely affected due to posts being graded inappropriately, is the next category of preference
 - d. other requests should be dealt with in the sequence in which they were received and noted in a register for this purpose
 - e. in exceptional cases where it is justified that preference be given to an evaluation or where disputes regarding the sequence in which jobs should be evaluated occur, the matter should be referred to the responsible Senior Manager
- 7.2.4.4 The Job Evaluation Unit will acknowledge receipt of all requests and give written feedback of the timeframe involved
- 7.2.4.5 The Job Evaluation Unit may also indicate that an evaluation is not high priority and cannot be performed at that stage
- 7.2.4.6 A consultative process should be followed in developing a prioritised programme for job evaluation

7.3 RE-GRADING OF POSITIONS

- 7.3.1 In cases where filled posts are upgraded, the incumbent of the post shall be remunerated accordingly
- 7.3.2 In cases of a vacant post being redesigned or upgraded, the post must be advertised according to the *Talent Acquisition Policy*
- 7.3.3 It is important to note that the remuneration adjustment of an incumbent whose post has been upgraded should be effective from the date as contained in the sentence above
- 7.3.4 Where a filled post's evaluation outcome results are downgraded there must be an attempt to redesign the job
- 7.3.5 Redesign of a post may be a difficult and complicated process in which the Human Resource Shared Services (HRSS), the relevant line function department and the incumbent should be involved
- 7.3.6 Should it be possible to redesign the job, the incumbent will have to be informed and his/her job description amended
- 7.3.7 Attempts to redesign a job may delay the regrading process considerably
- 7.3.8 To prevent undue delays, the redesign of a job should be finalised within six (6) weeks from the date of the Job Evaluation Committee recommendation
- 7.3.9 As an alternative to redesign the incumbent may be transferred to a vacant post with an equivalent grading to the incumbent's existing post. Such a decision will have to be taken in consultation with the Head of Department to determine where vacant posts exist, the relevant line function department (the incumbent's own Department and the Department where the vacancy exists) and the incumbent
- 7.3.10 Where a post is downgraded by re-evaluation/reconfiguration of functions, the incumbent of such position will retain his/her salary and benefits on person-to-holder basis
- 7.3.11 In cases of a vacant post, it will be advertised at the new lower level

7.4 THE REVIEW OF JOB EVALUATIONS

- 7.4.1 When the Job Evaluation Committee recommends as a result of the evaluation outcome that an existing post needs to be upgraded/ downgraded, the Department shall be given a fair opportunity to appeal against the grading outcome

- 7.4.2 Only a person with vested interest in the matter, e.g. the incumbent/Management of a post that was evaluated, may request that a decision emanating from a job evaluation in question be reviewed
- 7.4.3 The right of appeal is an invaluable safeguard that provides the individual objecting to the decision with the assurance that the decision will be reconsidered by the Job Evaluation Committee
- 7.4.4 The following process should be followed:
- 7.4.4.1 **Step 1:** The appellant should discuss the result with the supervisor/ line manager, manager and to solve the problem, this should ensure that job evaluation is understood clearly
- 7.4.4.2 **Step 2:** A request for a review should be done in writing through the Management and should indicate the following:
- a. reasons why there is an appeal against the decision and this must be based on sound reasons like wrong information utilised and/or wrong process followed
 - b. evidence should exist that the job evaluation was conducted incorrectly
- 7.4.4.3 **Step 3:** The Job Evaluation Committee will re-evaluate
- 7.4.4.4 **Step 4:** Should the appellant still be dissatisfied with the outcome, the appellant will refer the matter to the Executive Director: Corporate and Shared Services
- 7.4.4.5 **Step 5:** The Executive Director: Corporate and Shared Services will consider the review and establish if any grounds for further review exist
- 7.4.4.6 **Step 6:** The plaintiff will be informed in writing of the outcome with full reasons of the decision and the matter will be regarded as finalised

7.5 THE ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONING OF THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

7.5.1 THE COMPOSITION OF THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

- 7.5.1.1 As a general guideline, members (other than those who serve on the Job Evaluation Committee as a result of the occupation of a specific post) should serve for a period of at least eighteen (18) months to ensure consistency and continuity
- 7.5.1.2 The committee shall consist of the following persons:
- a. Chairperson: Elected by Members of the Job Evaluation Committee
 - b. Committee Members: The Committee shall be comprised of four management representatives
- 7.5.1.3 All members of the committee must have received formal training on grading using the approved job evaluation system
- 7.5.1.4 Line Managers whose job evaluations are to be considered would normally attend meetings of the committee to present their cases

7.5.2 THE ROLE OF THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

- 7.5.2.1 The Job Evaluation Committee is responsible for moderation of all jobs evaluated to ensure quality in the job evaluation process and the consistent application of the approved job evaluation system
- 7.5.2.2 The Job Evaluation Committee must conduct itself in such a way that it will support/enhance the credibility and acceptability of the job evaluation system

7.5.2.3 The Job Evaluation Committee will review the results of the evaluations carried out and make a final recommendation with regard to the level of, and the salary range that should be attached to a specific job/groups of jobs

7.5.3 THE FUNCTIONS OF THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

7.5.3.1 To make recommendations on job grading based on the job weight as indicated by the approved job evaluation system

7.5.3.2 To establish policies and procedures to ensure a consistent approach with regard to recommendations on grading

7.5.3.3 To ensure that a job has been analysed thoroughly and consistently relative to other jobs previously evaluated and determining the need for additional information/job analysis to enable the Job Evaluation Committee to make an informed valid decision on a specific job. For *example*: Where the committee is concerned about the representivity of jobs in a sample (if job evaluation was done on a sample basis) or additional information is needed on any aspect of the evaluation

7.5.3.4 To indicate possible implications on grading to be implemented

7.5.4 THE FUNCTIONING OF THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE

7.5.4.1 A dedicated secretariat and administrative support service must be provided to the Job Evaluation Committee with the following responsibilities amongst others *determining a programme of meetings, booking a venue, notifying all the committee members of the meeting, supplying all the relevant documentation and material to the members of the committee and ensuring that all other arrangements are in place*

7.5.4.2 The discussions of the Job Evaluation Committee must be based on the software report, questionnaire and recommendations of the unit, as well as pertinent facts presented to the Job Evaluation Committee

7.5.4.3 The decisions should be objective and based only on facts and the Job Evaluation Committee's must base its recommendations on consensus

7.5.4.4 The Job Evaluation Committee must keep the information confidential at all times

7.5.4.5 The Job Evaluation Committee shall abide by the terms of reference of the approved job evaluation system

7.5.4.6 The Executive Director: Corporate Support and Shared Services is delegated to authorise the grading of all posts, except the post of the City Manager which is the responsibility of the Performance Audit Committee

8 THE APPROVAL

8.1 Policy changes are to be approved by the Mayoral Committee

9 THE AMENDMENTS

- 9.1 The Policy may be reviewed and amended at least every two (2) years or more frequently, as and when required
- 9.2 Maintenance and implementation of the policy is the responsibility of the Director: Human Resources Shared Services (HRSS)

- End -

**ANNEXURE A:
JE MANAGER JOB EVALUATION REQUEST FORM**

JOB TITLE	
DIRECTORATE / REGION	
SUB DIRECTORATE (DEPARTMENT)	
SECTION	
SAP POSITION NO	

We confirm that the information in this activity profile is correct and agree to the standard of it.	
Manager / Supervisor	Signed:..... Date:.....
Head of Dept	Signed:..... Date:.....
HR Manager	Signed:..... Date:.....

Procedure
The Job Description must be signed as correct by the Head of Department: Human Resources as well as the Manager/Supervisor. No evaluations will be done without the required signatures.
The Director / HR Manager must agree the standard of the Job Description.

Please Note: *The relevant approved organogram must be attached to this request.*

The duly completed documents must be forwarded to the job evaluation panel at least three days before the actual evaluation

ANNEXURE B:
HAY JOB EVALUATION REQUEST FORM

Position Title:	
Region:	
Position Holder:	
Evaluation request approved by: <i>(Manager's signature)</i>	
Date Approved:	
Department	
Section	
Unit	
Vote number: <i>(Essential for processing the request)</i>	
Person responsible for invoice:	Name: E-mail Address:
Person to whom evaluation results must be sent:	Name: E-mail Address:
Is an interview required?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO