

DRAFT 3
**JOB EVALUATION GROUP
ADVICE ON EVIDENCE FOR REVIEWS**

Background

It has come to the Job Evaluation Group's (JEG) attention that there have been instances where the review process has not been carried out in accordance with the spirit of Agenda for Change and that this has led to some factor levels being changed without any evidence being submitted. JEG believes that some supplementary advice is needed to remind panels of the procedures.

Review procedure

The JE Handbook states:

- A postholder or postholders may request a review if they are dissatisfied with their outcome
- The postholder(s) must provide details of where they disagree with the initial outcome and evidence to support their case
- The review panel will have the majority of its members different from the original panel
- For matching, the review panel will operate in the same way as the first panel and have access to job advisors or representatives
- For evaluation, the postholder can decide whether to use the original JAQ or resubmit a second JAQ, subject to the validation processes in the scheme

Evidence and the review panel

Since the NHS JE Scheme places paramount importance on the issue of accurate and up-to-date information, the review panel must only consider the facts before them.

In the case of matching, the postholder will have provided evidence relating to the factor levels they disagree with – if the panel wish to revisit other factors, they need to provide justification for this. They will then need to refer to the evidence they have been presented with, submit supplementary questions to the job advisors or representatives where necessary and allow the postholder to provide additional information. In the case of evaluation, they must use the evidence on the JAQ – if they need clarification or any further information, they must get this via the job analysts. Panels should only complete the review once they are satisfied that all relevant evidence has been examined.

All panel members will have been trained on the importance of matching or evaluating jobs using accurate information rather than making assumptions which are not evidenced. Therefore it is important that this process should equally apply to the review procedure: the risk in making assumptions about somebody's job could lead to the scheme being brought into disrepute and possibly to equal pay claims.