Role Grading Policy

Introduction

The University recognises the contribution of all staff to its effective operation and has adopted pay and grading structures which appropriately reward knowledge, experience and responsibilities, whilst providing for salary and career progression.

The Role Grading process provides a structured approach to the grading of roles in Professional, Administrative, Library and Technical job categories. The process assists the University in ensuring a clear and consistent hierarchy of jobs and internal relativity within the university's grading structure.

Job roles do not always remain static and changes to the range, complexity and level of duties, accountabilities and responsibilities may necessitate a review of the grade of the post. The growth of roles should be management led and be the result of planned job development or organisational structural change. It is therefore expected that cases for job grade reviews will normally be requested by the line manager, who would discuss the matter with the employee as part of a career conversation. The employee may approach manager regarding a career conversation. Open and honest communication regarding the role is an important element of the Role Grading process. It is open to any employee if they wish to invoke the grievance procedure in relation to the sizing of their post. Grievances will be addressed in a timely manner.

This policy is not intended to reward outstanding performance or recognise and reward one-off or temporary contributions of exceptional and significant performance. This policy defines the principles and process to follow where it is believed that a role appears to meet the criteria of a different level. Requests for review of a job should be based on significant, substantive and indefinite changes to

the level of duties and responsibilities driven by business needs in the context of the requirements of the organisation. It should be noted that an increase in the volume of work undertaken by the postholder would not normally result in an increase in the job size in line with grading criteria.

Scope

The grades in scope within this policy are Professional, Administrative, Library and Technical grades. A full list is contained in Appendix 1. Roles will be assessed within their current job category. There is no facility to cross to a different job category under the role grading process. All grades in scope are comprehended by this policy irrespective of the source of funding.

General Principles

Role Grading Committee: Review of posts where there is an incumbent is managed by the Role Grading Committee. Review of vacant posts is carried out by HR.

Applications: Applications may be made by a manager who wishes to have a role in their area graded. Managers must inform the incumbent in the post prior to a post being submitted for grading and must keep the post-holder informed regarding the timelines of the application.

Role is sized: The process is centred on the role, not the person in it. It is expected that role grading will be the exception not the norm, and that managers would only put forward posts to sizing where they consider the job has materially changed in scope.

Current job content: Roles are reviewed based on the requirements of the role as it is now, not what it might be in the future, or what it was in the past. The process focuses on roles, not the role-holder. Roles are assessed based on job content. Job titles, current pay, status of the employee, or performance of the employee do not form any part of the review process. Roles are reviewed in the context of internal relativity in the university and are not considered against market rates or other external factors.

Outcomes: Once a role has been graded by the Role Grading Committee, the outcome is communicated to the manager, who in turn communicates the outcome to the incumbent as part of a career conversation. Decisions of the Role Grading committee are final.

Implementation: Regrading of posts may not be implemented retrospectively.. Managers should ensure that any initial additional cost arising from regrading in the short-term is remediated through normal good organisation design, and staff and budget planning in the medium and long term

Monitoring: The University is committed to ensuring that the effect and application of this procedure accords with the commitments set out in its Equality Policy and will monitor this as appropriate.

Review: The policy will be formally reviewed by the Role Grading Committee in consultation with management and unions after 2 years in operation or in line with university policy on policy review.

Role Grading Processs

Introduction

There are distinct professional career paths for professional, administrative, library and technical staff. There is a national agreement applicable to technical staff and a Labour Court recommendation applicable to library staff that affect how some roles or grades will be managed within the university's career framework.

The process set out below is applicable to all grades in scope. Alternative arrangements applicable to some technical or library grades are set out in appendices 2 and 3.

Where professional qualifications and mandatory requirements are currently required for a role, they will be maintained.

Application process

Application Form: available electronically, completed by the manager of the post to be reviewed. Detail of application set out in Appendix 4. Approval of the Head of Area is required before submitting an application. Heads of Area should make their decision to approve or decline the request and inform the manager within three working weeks of receiving the form. The employee must be informed of the decision by the manager.

Email: The manager sends the application to a secure electronic system accessed by HR administrative staff, who will administer the process on behalf of the Role Grading Committee. The manager must inform the employee when the form has been submitted.

Preparatory Check: HR administrative staff make an initial assessment of the applications and check eligibility. Eligibility criteria are set out in Appendix 5. HR may revert to the relevant manager with any queries if further information is required e.g. incomplete forms, insufficient information, further clarification required.

Initial Assessment: Trained managers within HR carry out the job sizing exercise on the applications received using the agreed methodology and complete a role-grading assessment document.

Agenda/Workplan: HR compile an agreed number of applications and send as a batch with the role-grading initial assessments to the Role Grading Committee members. The number of applications per meeting will be agreed by the Chair. Where possible, similar roles will be considered in the same batch. Depending on the number of applications received, it cannot be guaranteed as to when posts will be assessed. Managers will be advised approximately when the role will be considered by the committee, noting that applications are generally considered in the order they are received.

Meeting: Role Grading Committee members meet. The size of each role is assessed by the Committee, who are trained in job sizing methodology. At all times, it is emphasized that the role is assessed, not the role-holder.

Communication of Outcome: Role Grading Committee decisions are communicated by email to the relevant managers, copied to the Head of Area. The manager communicates the outcome to the incumbent, explaining any effects for the individual.

Records: All documentation is stored electronically only. Documents will not be printed. All communication with the Role Grading Committee will be carried out via CorePortal or other electronic means.

Potential effect of Role-Grading

Lower: If the post is graded at a lower grade than the staff member is currently at, then there is no change for the post-holder. If the post is vacated by the post-holder at a future date, the post may be filled at the lower grade.

Same: If the post is graded at the same grade as the post-holder, there is no change.

Higher: If the post is graded at a higher grade, the post and post-holder are re-graded.

Composition of Role Grading Committee

Seven-person committee comprising a chairperson, three members of professional and support staff nominated by SIPTU, UNITE and IFUT, and three HR staff.

The Role Grading Committee is responsible to the Director of Human Resources. Accountability for appropriate governance rests with the Director of Human Resources.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Grades in scope

<u>Professional and Administrative Job Category</u> Senior Administrative SA3, SA2, SA1 Administrative AO1, AO2, AO3, Senior Executive Officer 1,2 Executive Officer, Secretarial
<u>Technical Job Category</u> Experimental Officer Senior Experimental Officer Chief Technical Officer 1, and 2 Chief Technical Officer Specialist Senior Technical Officer, Technical Officer Lab Attendant, Senior Lab Attendant Technical Storeperson, Senior Technical Storeperson Medical Scientist, Senior Medical Scientist, Chief Medical Scientist
<u>Library Job Category</u> Library Keeper Sub Librarian Assistant Librarian 1, Assistant Librarian 2 Higher Library Assistant (Exec 1, 2 and 3) Library Assistant Library Shop Assistant
<u>Buildings & Services Job Category</u> Executive 1 Executive 2 Executive 3

Appendix 2: Technical Staff Career Path

Staff at the Technical Officer grade will proceed to the next level of Senior Technical Officer subject to satisfactory review without requirement for review of the role. The requirements for movement to the grade of Senior Technical Officer in terms of qualifications and experience are set out in the Report of the Expert Group on University Technician Grades 2005 and are unchanged from previous practice.

The process by which staff at the Technical Officer grade may move to the Senior Technical Officer grade will be encompassed within the cyclical increment approval process.

All other movements in grade for technical staff will be considered under the role grading policy and process.

Appendix 3: Library Staff Career Path

Staff at the Library Assistant grade will proceed to the next level of Higher Library Assistant (Executive 3) subject to satisfactory review without requirement for review of the role.

Staff at the Assistant Librarian 2 grade will proceed to the next level of Assistant Librarian 1 subject to satisfactory review without requirement for review of the role.

The Labour Court Recommendation 20111 states "In these circumstances the higher scale is, de facto, an extension of the standard scale and could not be equated with promotion".

The process by which staff at the relevant grade may move to the next grade will be encompassed within the cyclical increment approval process.

All other movements in grade for library staff will be considered under the role grading policy and process.

![Trinity College Dublin logo] Trinity College Dublin
Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath
The University of Dublin

Appendix 4: Requirements for Role-Grading

Applications must include 4 items:

1	Application Form	Completed by the manager to Include title of post, reason for review, and other relevant information.
2	Job Specification	An up to date Job Specification is required from the manager/head. This should outline the job as it is now, not what it was, or might be in the future. The Job Spec describes the job: the duties and responsibilities, and any mandatory qualifications and experience required for the role. A job spec template is available to assist managers where required. The Job Spec should be reviewed by the manager and the post holder in advance of being submitted and any queries addressed at this point.
3	Org Chart	An organisation chart is required to show the context of a role and how it fits into the unit and wider organisation, and any roles above and below this post. If the job being reviewed is one of a number of jobs of that type, this must be considered by the Role Grading Committee as part of the process.
4	Head of Area approval	The head of area must approve in advance for a role in their area to be considered for regrading. There may be other considerations such as potential restructuring of the area that may have a longer-term implication for posts in the area.

Appendix 5: Eligibility for Role Grading:

Before a role is reviewed the following provisions apply:

	Proviso	**Detail**
1	Already reviewed?	Roles may be reviewed if the role has not been reviewed before, or if the role has not been reviewed within the previous three years.
2	Service in role?	Roles will not be reviewed where the incumbent has not yet completed three years continuous service in the role.

Trinity College Dublin
Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath
The University of Dublin

Appendix 6: Flow Chart

1. Manager identifies role for potential regrading

Or, Employee initiates conversation on their role with manager

↓

2. Career Conversation

Manager & Employee discuss the role and also the employee's potential career path

↓

3. Review of Job Spec of Role

Manager & Employee both input into the job spec, ensuring it is accurate and up to date.

↓

4. Manager determines if role has changed significantly, substantially & indefinitely

Yes or No.

Yes

Manager completes application form, and attaches Job Spec & Org Chart

↓

Head of Area reviews and approves & signs; or not*

↓

If Yes, Manager sends application, Job spec & org chart for Role Grading

↓

Role Grading Committee assess the role based on the information provided

↓

Outcome communicated to Manager

↓

Manager resumes career conversation and informs employee of outcome

No

If the employee is of the view that the role should be submitted for review

↓

Inform the manager of the grievance (referring to the grievance procedure (Stage 1)

↓

Raise it with Head of Area (stage 2) or *if the issue arose at the point of HoA sign off then inform the HoA of the grievance.

↓

If unresolved, raise it with HR (stage 3)

↓

If unresolved, raise it at appropriate 3rd party forum (stage 4)

↓

End of process