

## Job Sizing Scheme – FAQs

**1. What is Job Sizing?**

Job Sizing is a management-initiated process of job analysis, assessment, and comparison.

**2. Will job sizing look at existing posts?**

The job sizing scheme will consider new and existing posts.

**3. Why would a post be considered for Job Sizing?**

Over time, the demands and responsibilities associated with a post may have changed. If the manager considers that the post has changed over time in terms of complexity, decision making, supervision, skills, and experience, he/she can apply to have the post reviewed and considered for resizing.

**4. What grades are covered by the Job Sizing Policy & Procedure?**

The examination of existing administrative posts from Grade 2 up to and including the Grade 5 administrative assistant posts will be covered by this policy.

**5. How is the job sizing scheme aligned to the Employment Control Framework?**

The University is obliged to provide the HEA (Higher Education Authority) with a report on our Employment Control Framework, in line with government requirements. This requirement will continue and any changes in grading structures will have to be reported on.

**6. What is the scoring method?**

Please see attachment of Korn Ferry Hay job evaluation overview at the end of the FAQs.

**7. What are the implications of the 10% limit per grade?**

This will ensure that one grade is not moving exponentially and leading to grade drift and will have limited effect on the ratios of various grades. This is also important to ensure the integrity of the scheme and ensure the scheme is not seen as an exercise whereby all grades in a unit are resized up.

**8. Does this process apply to roles above Grade 5?**

The scheme does not apply to existing professional administrative roles above Grade 5.

**9. What happens to the incumbent if they are not successful at interview stage?**

Where the incumbent is not successful at interview for a post that is regraded, they will be assigned to an alternative suitable role at their substantive grade.

**10. Will the Committee rotate every 2/3 years?**

Membership of the committee will rotate every 2 to 3 years. This is to ensure some level of continuity from one committee to another.

**11. What are the deadlines for applying for Job sizing of existing roles?**

There shall be two such deadlines in 2022: 16:00 hours on the last working day in June and 16:00 hours on the last working day of November. There shall be two deadlines for 2023: 16:00 hours on the last working day of May and 16:00 hours on the last working day of November.

**12. Will late applications be considered?**

Late applications will not be considered but will be held on file for the next scheduled committee meeting either new or existing as applicable.

**13. Will the committee consider additional documents after the application is submitted before the deadline?**

No, the committee will not accept any additional documents / amendments to the Job Sizing Application Form, unless expressly requested by the committee as part of clarification that is sought.

**14. When will I know the outcome?**

The Job Sizing Committee will certify the outcome of an evaluation. This outcome will be issued no later than 3 weeks after the job sizing committee meeting takes place.

**15. Am I guaranteed upgrading if I apply for job Sizing?**

Posts will only be resized if the Job Sizing Committee make the decision based on the relevant criteria.

**16. By how much can a post be upgraded?**

The evaluation assessment awards a post a total number of points. Each grade in the structure has its own points range, and the post being sized is aligned to the correct grade. Some job evaluations may not result in an upgrade. Where upgrading occurs, it is usual that the post moves up one grade.

**17. How will the post be filled if it is upgraded through job sizing?**

Where an upgrade to a post is recommended by the committee and the post has been occupied by an individual for 4 years or more at the time of a job evaluation that individual will stay in the position. If the person has been in the position for less than four years, the post will be filled by competition, or reassignment.

Posts will be filled by way of:

- Re-assignment
- Confined competition
- Open competition

**18. Will my terms and conditions change if the post is upgraded?**

Appointment to an upgraded post is treated as a promotion. The salary will increase and working hours and annual leave will be in line with new standard terms and conditions for the grade.

Annual leave for existing staff employed prior to 2014 and who are appointed by designation will be in line with the Annual leave Policy for existing staff.

*'Existing staff maintain their current leave entitlement if the leave entitlement for the grade to which they are promoted is lesser than their current entitlement, subject to a maximum entitlement of 30 days annual leave. Staff with a current annual leave entitlement of greater than 30 days will have their leave entitlement reduced to 30 days on promotion.'*

**19. If my post is upgraded, will I receive back pay?**

There will be no retrospective pay. The date of regrade will be the date of the meeting of the outcome, or the date of appointment following competition.

**20. Is there an appeal mechanism?**

If a job sizing application for a post is unsuccessful, feedback will be given to the manager and a resubmission of the application will be accepted for the next Job Sizing Committee meeting.

## Scéim Toisithe Poist – Ceisteanna Coitianta

**1. Céard is brí le Toisiú Poist?**

Is próiseas arna thionscnamh ag an lucht bainistíochta a bhaineann le postanailís, meastóireacht, agus comparáid a dhéanamh atá sa Scéim Toisithe Poist.

**2. An mbreathnóidh toisiú poist ar phoist reatha?**

Breathnóidh an scéim toisithe poist ar phoist nua agus ar phoist atá ann cheana.

**3. Cén fáth a ndéanfaí post a mheas le haghaidh Toisiú Poist?**

Le himeacht ama, d'fhéadfadh na héilimh agus na freagrachtaí a bhaineann le post athrú. Má mheasann an bainisteoir go bhfuil athrú tagtha ar an bpost in imeacht ama ó thaobh castachta, cinnteoireachta, maoirseachta, scileanna, agus taithí de, is féidir leis/léi iarratas a dhéanamh go ndéanfaí athbhreithniú ar an bpost agus é a chur san áireamh le haghaidh atoisithe.

**4. Céard iad na gráid a chlúdaítear faoin bPolasaí agus Nós Imeachta maidir le Toisiú Poist?**

Áireofar faoin bpolasaí seo go ndéanfar scrúdú ar phoist riaracháin atá ann cheana féin ó chúntóir riaracháin ag Grád 2 go dtí Grád 5, agus na gráid sin san áireamh.

**5. Cén chaoi a bhfuil an scéim toisithe poist ailínithe leis an gCreat Rialaithe Fostaíochta?**

Tá dualgas ar an Ollscoil tuarascáil a sholáthar don ÚAO (an tÚdarás um Ard-Oideachas) ar ár gCreat Rialaithe Fostaíochta, de réir riachtanais an rialtais. Leanfar leis an riachtanas seo agus caithfear tuairisc a thabhairt ar aon athruithe ar struchtúir ghrádaithe.

**6. Céard é an modh scórála?**

Féach le do thoil ar fhorbhreathnú meastóireachta poist Korn Ferry Hay ag deireadh na gCeisteanna Coitianta.

**7. Céard iad na himpleachtaí a bhaineann leis an teorainn 10% in aghaidh an ghráid?**

Cinnteoídh sé seo nach mbeidh grád ar leith ag bogadh go han-sciobtha agus go mbeadh síobadh gráid de thoradh air agus go mbeidh éifeacht theoranta ar chóimheasa na ngrád éagsúil. Tá sé seo tábhachtach freisin chun ionracas na scéime a chinntiú agus chun a chinntiú nach mbreathnaítear ar an scéim mar bheart trínar féidir atoisíú a dhéanamh ar gach grád in aonad ar leith go grád níos airde.

**8. An mbeidh an próiseas seo i bhfeidhm do róil atá níos airde ná Grád 5?**

Ní bheidh an scéim seo i bhfeidhm do róil riaracháin ghairmiúla os cionn Grád 5 atá ann chean féin.

**9. Céard a tharlóidh don sealbhóir mura n-éiríonn leis/léi ag céim an agallaimh?**

I gcás nach n-éiríonn leis an sealbhóir san agallamh do phost a dhéantar a athghrádú, sannfar é/í do ról oiriúnach eile ag a g(h)rád substainteach.

**10. An n-athróidh an Coiste gach 2/3 bliana?**

Athrófar ballraíocht an choiste gach 2 go 3 bliana. Déantar é seo chun leibhéal éigin de leanúnachas a chinntiú ó choiste amháin go coiste eile.

**11. Cad iad na spriocdhátaí chun iarratas a dhéanamh maidir le toisiú poist do na róil atá ann cheana?**

Beidh dhá spriocdháta ann in 2022: 16:00 an lá deireanach oibre i mí an Mheithimh agus 16:00 an lá deireanach oibre i mí na Samhna. Beidh dhá spriocdháta ann in 2023: 16:00 an lá deireanach oibre i mí Bealtaine agus 16:00 an lá deireanach oibre i mí na Samhna.

**12. An ndéanfar iarratais dhéanacha a mheas?**

Ní dhéanfar iarratais dhéanacha a mheas ach coinneofar iad i gcomhad don chéad chruinniú eile den choiste, poist nua nó atá ann cheana, de réir mar is cuí.

**13. An ndéanfaidh an coiste cáipéisí breise a mheas tar éis don iarratas a bheith curtha isteach roimh an spriocdháta?**

Ní dhéanfaidh. Ní ghlacfaidh an coiste le haon cháipéis bhreise / leasuithe ar an bhFoirm Iarratais Toisithe Poist, mura n-iarrann an coiste go sonrath iad mar chuid den soiléiriú atá á lorg.

**14. Cathain a bheidh an toradh ar eolas agam?**

Deimhneoidh an Coiste Toisithe Poist toradh ar an meastóireacht. Eiseofar an toradh seo tráth nach déanaí ná 3 seachtaine tar éis chruinniú an choiste toisithe poist a bheith ann.

**15. An bhfuil aon chinnteacht agam go ndéanfar uasghrádú má dhéanaim iarratas ar Thoisíú Poist?**

Ní dhéanfar poist a atoisíú ach amháin sa chás go ndéanann an Coiste Toisithe Poist an cinneadh bunaithe ar na critéir ábhartha.

**16. Cé chomh mór is féidir post a uasghrádú?**

Tugann an próiseas meastóireachta líon iomlán pointí do phost. Tá a raon pointí féin ag gach grád sa struchtúr, agus tá an post atáthar a thoisíú ailínithe leis an ngrád ceart. D'fhéadfadh nach mbeidh uasghrádú mar thoradh ar roinnt meastóireachtaí poist. Nuair a dhéantar uasghrádú, is gnách go mbogann an post suas aon ghrád amháin.

**17. Conas a líonfar an post má dhéantar é a uasghrádú trí thoisíú poist?**

Sa chás go bhfuil sé molta ag an gcoiste go ndéanfaí uasghrádú ar phost ar leith agus go raibh duine sa phost sin ar feadh 4 bliana nó níos faide ag an am a rinneadh meastóireacht poist fanfaidh an duine sin sa phost. I gcás go raibh an duine níos lú ná ceithre bliana sa phost, déanfar an post a líonadh trí chomórtas, nó trí athshannadh.

Déanfar na poist a líonadh mar seo a leanas:

- Athshannadh
- Comórtas teoranta
- Comórtas oscailte

**18. An dtiocfaidh athrú ar mo chuid téarmaí agus coinníollacha má dhéantar an post a uasghrádú?**

Caitear le ceapachán go post uasghrádaithe amhail ardú céime. Ardófar an tuarastal agus beidh uaireanta oibre agus teidlíochtaí saoire bliantúla de réir téarmaí agus coinníollacha caighdeánacha nua don ghrád. I gcásanna áirithe, d'fhéadfadh go mbeadh ar shealbhóir poist uaireanta níos faide a oibriú nó go mbeadh níos lú saoire aige/aici má dhéantar a p(h)ost a uasghrádú mar go dtiocfaidh deireadh le téarmaí agus coinníollacha pearsanta stairiúla.

**19. Má dhéantar mo phost a uasghrádú, an bhfaighidh mé pá aisghníomhach?**

Ní bheidh aon phá aisghníomhach ann. Is é dáta an athraithe gráid dáta an chruinnithe ag a ndéanfar an cinneadh, nó dáta an cheapacháin tar éis an chomórtais.

**20. An bhfuil meicníocht achomhairc ann?**

Mura n-éiríonn le hiarratas i dtaca le toisiú poist, tabharfar aiseolas don bhainisteoir agus glacfar le hiarratas eile a chuirfear isteach don chéad chruinniú eile den Choiste Toisithe Poist.

# Korn Ferry Hay job evaluation

An overview of the method

June 2023

## The Korn Ferry Hay Guide Chart – Profile<sup>SM</sup> method of job evaluation

This note provides an overview of the Korn Ferry Hay Guide Chart – Profile Method of Job Evaluation and comments on how its unique features can be used to support the development of a grade framework. We have prepared this note to help managers and staff at University of Galway understand more about the evaluation method.

### Overview of the method

The method, developed by Edward Hay, was among the first analytical approaches to job evaluation. It built on the strengths of factor comparison, points rating, and job ranking methods and is established on the principle that all jobs exist to make a contribution to an organisation's output/end result.

The aim of the Korn Ferry Hay Method is to bring consistent criteria to bear in establishing the relative contribution of different jobs to an organisation. Consistency implies using the same elements against which all jobs are measured, however much they may differ.

In all types of organisation, we have found that the contribution of jobs depends on a number of common elements. All jobs exist for a reason. That is to say that they exist to deliver something to the organisation. Therefore, the key role of job evaluation is to understand and measure these deliverables or outputs in the element Korn Ferry Hay calls **ACCOUNTABILITY**.

For a job holder to be able to deliver Accountability, they need at least a minimum level of **KNOW-HOW**. That is to say, knowledge, skills and experience needed in order to deliver the Accountability (or results/outputs) which is linked to the role.

Finally, different roles need the Know-How to be used in different ways. They have different demands on the job holder for creativity, original thought and complexity. We call this **PROBLEM SOLVING**.

So, in evaluating jobs using the Korn Ferry Hay Method we are aiming to understand:

*'The **Know-How** required to **Solve** the **Problem** and deliver the output for which the job is **Accountable**.'*

### Guide Charts<sup>SM</sup>

These three common factors are typically judged using a separate Guide Chart for each. The three main factors are further sub-divided into a number of elements or dimensions and are designed as grids on which there is a numerical scale. The core grids are designed to cover the range of jobs that may be found throughout the economy. Jobs are located on the grid by selecting definitions which are most appropriate to the job under consideration. The intersect indicates a points or job units score for that element of the job. The total score is determined by adding the three separate scores.

## Numerical Scale

Each of the evaluation elements is set out on a grid, with defined levels within the elements and points scores indicating job size alongside them. The relationship between these points scores is another distinctive feature of the Korn Ferry Hay Method. The numerical scale chosen for use on the Guide Charts follows a geometric rather than arithmetic pattern. That is to say that the numbers themselves are directly proportional to each other in a geometric (percentage) progression, e.g., 100, 115, 132, 152. The reason for this is that we wanted to be able to show, for example, that an increase in job size from 100 to 115 points is proportionately greater than an increase from 1000 to 1015 points. This avoids the difficulty that in an ordinary progression, e.g., 1, 2, 3, 4, the numbers are in a constantly diminishing relationship to each other.

## The Step Difference Principle

Our aim in using a geometric numbering pattern for the reasons stated above was supported by empirical evidence – Weber's Law. Ernst Weber said, "in comparing objects we perceive not the actual difference between them, but the ratio of this difference to the magnitude of the two objects compared." That is to say that the observed difference between two objects is not absolute and independent of the objects themselves but is relative to their size and is a constant fraction of one of them. This is expressed as a 'Just Noticeable Difference' or 'Step Difference'. The Step Difference is the essential building-block of the Korn Ferry Hay Method, and thus the basis of the job evaluation scale. The Korn Ferry Hay scale of progression (or step difference) is 15% and means that each judgement is given this constant relativity wherever it falls on the scale. This is common to all applications of the Guide Chart – Profile Method.

The Korn Ferry Hay Method is a modified factor comparison method, and this allows us to express, using the step difference principle, the magnitude of each factor of a job evaluation in relation to the other factors in that job, and the relative magnitude of a factor in one job to the same factor in other key jobs.

Therefore, although the primary consideration is the scale and impact of the things for which the role is Accountable, the secondary consideration is the relationship within each role between Accountability, the Know-How requirement and the Problem Solving complexity. This relationship is known at the Profile.

## Profiles

Every job consists of the elements, Know-How, Problem Solving and Accountability. Different jobs, however, draw more heavily from one or another. The Korn Ferry Hay Method has a further unique facility for checking the soundness of an evaluation by considering the shape or profile of the job. This is done by testing the distribution of the three elements of Know-How, Problem Solving and Accountability in the evaluation of each job to see if it makes sense, and relates to the nature of the role (accountable line manager, adviser, etc.) There are two different ways to profile a job, however, the most commonly used is the Short Profile.

### Short Profiles

In simple terms, short profiles assess the balance between Problem Solving and Accountability and reflect the nature (shape) of the job. So, for example, where Problem Solving is 4 steps bigger than Accountability the job will be most likely be focused on resolving a problem over a period of years (fundamental research). Typically, where Accountability is 4 steps bigger than Problem Solving the job is concerned with producing, and continuing to produce, immediate results (high volume, simple technology production).

Therefore, Short Profiles are useful as:

- they serve as an independent check on the validity and reliability of the judgements about job size;
- they describe the nature of the contribution expected from a job by the organisation; whether the job is predominantly Problem Solving or Accountability orientated in emphasis.

## The Factors in More Detail

### Know How

The sum of every kind of knowledge, skill and experience – however acquired – necessary for standard acceptable performance in the role. The framework for judging Know How includes three dimensions, each of which has several defined levels:

- **(Depth and range of) Practical/Technical Knowledge.** This is normally judged against a scale of A to H, where A covers jobs that require core abilities to read, write and carry out basic calculations. H relates to world-leading authorities on deep and learned disciplines – usually a scientific or academic field.
- **Planning, Organising and Integrating Knowledge** i.e. the requirement for planning, organising, coordinating, directing, executing, and controlling over time. This is normally judged against a scale of 0 to IV, where 0 does not involve, or indeed, need any forward planning or prioritising because it is not necessary, or because the system or process sets out the order. IV relates to roles that plan, prioritise, integrate and organise all aspects of all activities in a functionally complete organisation (i.e., everything from legal services to sales and marketing and everything in between) on a strategic (10+ years) time horizon.
- **Communicating & Influencing skills,** i.e. the skills needed to communicate with and influence individuals and groups, within and outside the organisation to achieve results. This is normally judged against a scale of 1 to 3 where 1 involves normal, day-to-day communications and the passing and receiving of information and 3 relates to situations where job objectives couldn't be completed without influencing others and ultimately, changing their behaviour.

The evaluator takes a view on how the role fits each of these criteria, locates the point on the Guide Chart where they intersect, and this produces a composite score for Know How. Detailed judgements can be adjusted by adding a + or – to the dimensions. So, for example, a job which matches the definition for D, but which in comparison with other jobs at D requires more detailed knowledge, a broader range of knowledge/understanding, across a wider range of more complex matters – or a combination of these – would be evaluated at D+.

### Problem Solving

The thinking required for analysing, evaluating, reasoning, arriving at and drawing conclusions. The framework for judging Problem Solving has two dimensions, each of which has several defined levels:

- **Thinking environment,** which assesses the extent to which thinking is determined by its context (sector environment, organisation policies, guidelines, procedures or even rules, etc.) – judged on a scale of A to H. A is used for jobs where there is no scope for thinking about what should be done, how it should be done, the order in which it should be done and by when. H is reserved for those few roles that are constrained only by laws of nature and science, public opinion, business philosophy and cultural values.
- **Thinking challenge,** which assesses the complexity of the problems encountered and the extent of original thinking needed to arrive at conclusions (judged on a scale of 1 to 5). Level 1 covers jobs that face highly repetitive situations where a very small number of challenges are faced and the solution is the same each time. Level 5 covers a relatively small number of jobs where the challenges have not been faced before, there are few, if any direct precedents and novel or path-finding solutions need to be invented.

As with Know-How, + or – modifiers can be used to adjust the score on the Problem Solving dimensions. This is dependent on the strength or weakness of the job content when compared with the scale definitions and the other jobs which have been deemed to fit the definitions more directly. Again, as with Know-How each dimension is rated against the two scales, and the composite score located on the Guide Charts where the scales intersect.

## Accountability

The extent to which a job is answerable for actions and their consequences. The framework for judging Accountability has three dimensions, each of which has several defined levels. They are shown in the order of importance:

- **Freedom to Act**, which assesses the absence or presence of discretion in making decisions or taking action. It combines this with the extent to which decisions or actions are scrutinised or checked and the length of time before the consequences of those actions are likely to become apparent. In most organisations it is measured on a scale of A to H. At level A, there is no scope to take any action other than that which is set out in detailed instructions or rules. No deviation is permitted without first seeking permission. At level H jobs have a mandate to work with external stakeholders to decide on the strategy and direction of the entire organisation. Generally speaking, H level jobs are to be found only in free-standing organisations.
- **Nature of Impact** is concerned with the type of impact that the role has on objectives or outputs. It is measured on a 4 level scale comprising R (Remote), C (Contributory), S (Shared) and P (Prime). This is intended to reflect the proximity of the role to the end results being achieved. So, R covers roles where the activities may be complex but the impact on the overall organisation is either relatively minor, or after the event. C relates to roles that give advice, support and/or enable others. S involves partnership, matrix and/or project working, and P is for roles that have sole direct and controlling impact on a particular end result.
- **Area of Impact**, which gauges how much of the organisation the job has the defined degree of impact on. It is generally measured on a scale of 0 to 4 where the part of the organisation concerned is described (4 – whole organisation, 3 – major directorate, 2 – department/function/service, 1 – team, 0 – individual or not-quantifiable) or where this is converted into the financial dimensions that relate to the particular organisational unit (e.g. 4 = whole organisation or the total University annual budget as measured in € euros).

Jobs commonly have different types/levels of impact on different objectives or parts of the organisation. For example, it would be true to say that a head of finance could be P on the finance function (as represented by the departmental budget). However, this is only a part of the reason for the role existing. It would be more appropriate to say that the head of finance is C on the whole organisation. Since Accountability is scored in the same way as the first two factors – i.e., the points located at the intersect of the three dimensions chosen, it often happens that the two options chosen give the same score (e.g., D4C, D3S and D2P all give 132 points). Therefore, the evaluators must use the evidence in the job documentation to assess the combination of Nature and Area of Impact that best reflects the purpose of the role.

- **Indeterminate/Individual (Not-Quantified) Area of Impact** Some roles may be evaluated at 0 Area of Impact and a Nature of Impact letter (A, B, C or D) allocated. This combination is used when jobs do not seem to have an impact on any particular part of the organisation, or the part of the organisation can vary depending on the nature and size of the projects they are involved with. Rather, what is important is the quality and/or intensity of the impact they have or the support they provide. It can also be used in administrative roles where the part of the organisation impacted is quite clear (e.g. an accounts payable administrator impacts on all invoices processed) but where a change in the size or scope of the part of the organisation would have no direct effect on the processes, systems, accuracy targets, deadlines, etc. that relate to the job. This would generally be because the accounts payable administrator does not decide on or have any control over the value of the invoices being processed yet the standards of accuracy, timeliness, etc. that apply are the same regardless.

## Arriving at a total score

The evaluators add the scores for the three factors to produce a total job size. There are consistency checks to be done, to ensure the evaluation describes the type or shape of the role in a coherent way. There are also relativity checks, to ensure that the conclusion makes sense in comparison to evaluations of other roles. Either of these sets of checks can lead to adjustments in the evaluation.

The overall evaluations produced by this process can make little sense at first glance but are a form of language with which trained and experienced assessors become very familiar.



## Making sense of the results

We would not expect individual job holders to understand the detail of the evaluation 'code' as they have not been trained in the use of the method (a 2-day course followed by evaluation panels under the guidance of experienced Korn Ferry consultants). Since it is not possible to provide this to employees, most organisations choose not to communicate the evaluation code, the total points, or even the ranges that apply to each grade. Rather, they would tend to communicate the grade result and provide a brief summary (often a few paragraphs) to describe the nature of work at each grade or level. In certain circumstances they may also provide generic examples of jobs that have been assigned to each particular grade.

Since local University of Galway managers and HR staff will be required to explain how the evaluation code translates to a grade outcome, this note is intended to help in the interpretation of the detailed evaluation information.