



Job Evaluation Procedure

Date: September 2017

Version number: 2

Authors: Emilie Gray, Senior HR Advisor

Review Date: September 2020

If you would like this document in an alternative language or format, please contact NHS Shetland Corporate Services on 01595 743069.

DOCUMENT DEVELOPMENT COVERSHEET*

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|----------|---|
| Name of document | Job Evaluation Procedures | | |
| Registration Number | Reference | HRPRO004 | New <input type="checkbox"/> Review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Authors | Emilie Gray, Senior HR Advisor | | |
| Executive Lead (NHS) | Lorraine Hall, Director HR & Shared Services | | |

| Proposed groups to present document to: | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---|---------|
| Executive Management Team | | | | |
| All staff / Area Partnership Forum | | | | |
| Staff Governance Committee | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Date | Version | Group | Reason | Outcome |
| 01/09/2017 | 2 | APF/SGC | Agreed to revise review date as current policy is up to date. | PRO |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Examples of reasons for presenting to the group | Examples of outcomes following meeting |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional input required re: content (PI) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant changes to content required – refer to Executive Lead for guidance (SC) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional opinion on content (PO) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To amend content & re-submit to group (AC&R) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comments/suggestions (C/S) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For minor revisions (e.g. format/layout) – no need to re-submit to group (MR) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For information only (FIO) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend proceeding to next stage (PRO) |

*To be attached to the document under development/review and presented to the group

Please record details of any changes made to the document on the back of this form

| DATE | CHANGES MADE TO DOCUMENT |
|------------|--|
| 01/09/2017 | Various minor amendments to reflect organisational changes. Contents Page Added Sections 10 + 11 added |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| Contents | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1 Introduction | 5 |
| 2 Scope | 5 |
| 3 New Nationally Developed Posts | 5 |
| 4 New Locally Developed Posts | 6 |
| 5 Local Consistency Checking | 8 |
| 6 Blocked Matching Protocol | 8 |
| 7 Communication of Banding Outcome | 11 |
| 8 Opportunity to Request a Review of Banding Outcome | 11 |
| 9 Review of Posts Evaluated – Protection Guidance | 17 |
| 10 Monitoring and Review | 18 |
| 11 Equality Impact Assessment | 18 |
| Appendix 1 – Request Proforma | 20 |
| Appendix 2 – Review Request Proforma | 21 |

Link to Job Evaluation Handbook:

<http://www.nhsemployers.org/~media/Employers/Documents/Pay%20and%20reward/JE%20Handbook%20fifth%20edition/NHS%20Job%20Evaluation%20Handbook%20-%20sixth%20edition.pdf>

1) Introduction

It is standard job evaluation practice for proposed newly developed posts within the NHS to be evaluated as a desktop exercise, in order that a provisional pay band can be determined for recruitment purposes. Job evaluation will be carried out by an experienced job evaluation panel comprising of management, human resources and staff-side representatives who will be advised by the appropriate management representative from the relevant sphere of work.

2) Scope

These procedures cover all posts affected by Agenda for Change (AfC) Terms & Conditions of Employment. Posts within the Medical and Dental staff group (i.e. General Practitioners, Doctors, Dentists and Consultants) and posts within the Senior Management Cohort and Executive Grading are not covered by this procedure; these are graded by an external, central or regional panel.

The Scottish Terms and Conditions Committee (STAC) have agreed arrangements for evaluating newly developed posts under Agenda for Change. This is required to ensure consistency in approach and outcomes across NHS Scotland and falls into 2 main categories:

- new posts developed centrally for use across NHS Scotland (Section 3)
- new posts within individual Health Boards (Section 4)

3) New Nationally Developed Posts

3.1) When an organisation develops a new post, that organisation will be responsible for evaluating the post and placing on the appropriate pay band. If such a post is being developed for use by other organisations, there should be consultation with all parties involved.

3.2) Where new posts are developed centrally, principally through the Scottish Government Health Department (SGHD) or NHS

Education for Scotland (NES), a mechanism for evaluating these posts needs to be agreed to ensure all staff employed to undertake the new post are placed on the appropriate pay band and there is consistency within Scotland. It is agreed that one Territorial Health Board should undertake such evaluations on behalf of NHS Scotland. To action this, the job description should be submitted to the Human Resource Directors Group, who will arrange for evaluation to be undertaken in line with the protocol.

- 3.3) However, where such new posts are developed, but contain elements within them that may be adapted to suit local needs, core Job Descriptions should be issued to Boards to allow local job evaluation to take place to ensure that the role undertaken is rewarded appropriately and in line with the Agenda for Change Job Evaluation Scheme.

4) New Locally Developed Posts

- 4.1) The Recruiting/Line Manager will identify the likely demands of a new/newly developed post, which should be in the form of a Job Description, using the agreed Job Description template. The Recruiting/Line Manager will submit the Job Description, together with a completed and signed Request for Job Evaluation /Progression of a Stage 2 Formal Review Request form (see Appendix 1).
- 4.2) A Job Evaluation Panel will use the Job Description submitted to undertake a job evaluation exercise for the post. The Recruiting/Line Manager must be able to provide further advice to the panel in the case of any missing information. The outcome of the job evaluation will then go through the local consistency checking process for final banding approval.
- 4.3) After approval by a local Consistency Checking Panel, the banding outcome will then be communicated to the Recruiting/Line Manager and (if appropriate) the member of staff currently in post by the Human Resources Department. The Vacancy Approval

process should then be implemented following confirmation of the banding outcome.

- 4.4) It is necessary to allow a reasonable period of time for the job to "bed down" and this may vary according to the nature of the job but, unless there are exceptional circumstances, this period will be deemed to be 6 months from commencement of role. During this 6 month period, regular discussion should take place between the recruiting manager and the post holder regarding the content of the Job Description and how it fits in with the needs of the organisation. If there are significant alterations to the Job Description required by the organisation, the post holder will have the opportunity to seek advice and normal consultation would apply. Once the full demands of the post are clear, if there are substantial changes identified, the recruiting manager should request a re-evaluation.

Managers need to be aware that if the post results in a higher band outcome they must find this additional resource from within their existing budget resources. Managers must therefore ensure that due care and attention is paid when writing the job description and understand where in the band the original job has been evaluated. The financial section of the Vacancy Approval application must also highlight the risk element and finance must advise if the manager has financial leeway within their budget should a re-evaluation be needed.

- 4.6) The standard procedure should be followed for the matching or evaluation of the new post. This includes checking that the outcome is consistent with other similar jobs on a factor-by-factor basis at local level.

5) Local Consistency Checking

Local consistency checking is carried out to ensure that banding outcomes for posts are consistent against:

- other local banding outcomes within the same occupational group* and job family**
- other local banding outcomes within the same pay band

Only when consistency checking has taken place, are managers and staff (where appropriate) informed of the banding outcome for the post.

* examples of occupational groups within job families are (Nursing, Speech & Language Therapy, Finance posts)

** examples of job families are (Nursing and Midwifery, AHPs, Admin Services)

6) Blocked Matching Protocol

In recognition that there may be issues relating to job evaluation that cannot be resolved locally, the UK Staff Council agreed to the development of a protocol for addressing such issues. This protocol should be implemented as soon as it becomes clear within an organisation that there is an absolute failure to agree an Agenda for Change banding outcome, following the final local consistency checking process. The following is intended only to address issues around banding outcomes, with any breakdown in procedural issues being dealt with through local Grievance Procedures.

- 6.1) Where the parties within an employing organisation (Management and Staff-Side) have been unable to conclude the job evaluation process, or consistency checking of outcomes locally for any post, or group of posts, either of the parties may approach the Co-Chairs of STAC for assistance to help resolve the issues or areas of disagreement.
- 6.2) If not resolved through initial discussion with the Co-Chairs of STAC and, if the situation is agreed to be genuinely difficult,

arrangements will be made for a meeting of the interested parties (this may on occasions have to be video or telephone conference). The directly interested party/parties will be asked by the Co-Chairs of STAC to submit relevant documentation (i.e. Job Description, job evaluation outcome, consistency checking records) to support the resolution process.

- 6.3) If the issues are not resolved through the meeting of the parties, then the Co-Chairs of STAC shall establish a National Panel to undertake job evaluation and consistency checking of the post or group of posts.
- 6.4) The National Panel will be drawn from a pool of job evaluation panellists (equal in numbers from Management and Staff-Side). The Panel members will be provided by the Co-Chairs of STAC and will not include panellists from the individual Board involved, or anyone connected with the same job group.
- 6.5) All panellists will be qualified and experienced in job evaluation. In addition, the panel may be assisted by an agreed Independent Job Evaluation Expert.
- 6.6) The membership of the Panel will be the subject of consultation with all the relevant parties so that there is consensus and confidence in the process and those participating in it.
- 6.7) Arrangements for the convening and meeting of the Panel will be made by the Co-Chairs of STAC and, the Co-Chairs of STAC will be responsible for the notification of the outcome of the job evaluation process to the individual Board concerned, who will in turn notify the staff affected by the decision. All costs will be met by the individual Board requesting assistance.
- 6.8) Signed terms of reference shall be drawn up by the Co-Chairs of STAC in partnership with the individual Board concerned and appropriate staff-side representatives. The terms of reference will

set out clearly what is expected from the Panel and the notification process.

- 6.9) Job Advisers (staff representatives of the post being considered and line management) shall be made available to the Panel to answer any questions or points of clarification. This is in line with the agreed job evaluation procedures.
- 6.10) Exceptionally, for example, if matters emerge from this process that would benefit from National UK advice, the matters may be referred to the Staff Council Executive for consideration who may in turn, at their discretion, seek advice from the UK Job Evaluation Group.
- 6.11) In the event that a post holder(s) request(s) a review of the outcome following application of this process, it must be through their individual Board and the Co-Chairs of STAC will refer the review to another Panel convened in accordance with the process described in Section 6.4 and 6.5 above. This process does not build an automatic right to a further review of local outcomes by individual post holder(s).
- 6.12) All outcomes shall be consistency checked involving a second Independent Panel in accordance with the process described in the Job Evaluation Handbook.
- 6.13) The Co-Chairs of STAC may also convene Consistency Checking Panels in the event of inconsistent outcomes being unresolved by local processes.
- 6.14) The arrangements for consistency checking will be the same as those for job evaluation as described in Section 6.4 to 6.8 as above.
- 6.15) Following consistency checking, the outcome will be implemented by the organisation.

7) Communication of Banding Outcome

For new posts, managers will be informed in writing confirming the banding outcome of the job description submitted. A job matching report and the national profile used can be provided upon request.

Where appropriate, members of staff will receive a letter confirming the banding outcome of their job description, a job matching report and the national profile used. They are required to sign and return one copy of the correspondence as confirmation of receipt.

It is key for staff to bear in mind that when a Job Evaluation Panel identify profiles to which to match a post, the job purpose, rather than the job title, is taken into account, and that this may result in profiles for other groups of posts being considered. In addition, explanations available to members of staff around the job demands in relation to the Job Evaluation Scheme Factor Plan may also be key in staff understanding their banding outcome, and hence whether or not to seek a review.

NHS Shetland is committed to ensuring that staff who wish to seek a review under these procedures are supported to do so, and also recognises that it is in the best interests of post holders, line managers and partnership representatives to ensure that only requests that are supported by the required evidence are progressed through the procedural stages (see Section 8 below).

8) Opportunity to Request a Review of Banding Outcome

Post holders have the right to seek a review of their matching or evaluation outcome providing they produce written additional evidence and submit this within 3 months of the date that their matching/evaluation report is sent.

Reviews should only be requested if post holders do not agree with their matching or evaluation outcome for the job description they have

submitted. If the job has substantially changed since the job description was submitted then this should be treated as a new post, signed off by post holder(s) and manager, and submitted for job matching/evaluation separately.

A job will be considered as “substantially changed” if 50% or more of the factor levels (8 or more factors) are being questioned or if the person specification has changed reflecting the requirement for a higher level of knowledge, training and experience. If the requirements of the person specification have changed from the original submitted, a discussion needs to take place between the line manager of the post and the relevant senior operational manager/EMT member around when the change in the required qualification (or equivalent level of experience) came into effect and whether this level of qualification (or equivalent experience) is now an essential requirement to undertake the role and remit of the post.

Procedural Stages:

8.1) Informal Stage (Stage 1)

8.1.1) Following notification of a banding outcome by letter, a number of informal opportunities are available to staff to support resolution of queries or concerns that may not need to go to the formal stage. The informal stage must be followed before any formal request for a review can be made.

8.1.2) Staff should bear in mind that the deadline for a formal request is **3 months** from the date of their assimilation letter being sent out. Therefore, they need to commence the informal stage as early as possible in order to ensure that this can be completed and the outcome confirmed in time to submit a formal request. In situations where a post holder is on long term absence (e.g., maternity leave or long term sickness absence) at the time of notification, they are required to submit their formal review request within 3 months of their return to work.

8.1.3) Upon receipt of their notification letter, matched job report and profile, if the post holder has any immediate questions about the outcome they should discuss with their line manager in the first instance to see whether these can be satisfactorily resolved. The post holder and line manager will find it helpful to refer to the Job Evaluation Handbook.

8.1.4) If the post holder's concerns cannot be resolved with their line manager, the post holder should put their questions in writing by post to the Human Resources Department. The post holder must include details in writing of where they disagree with the matching or evaluation outcome, along with evidence to support their case.

These questions (dependent on the issue raised) will then be directed to the relevant member of the Human Resources Department. The Human Resources Department will contact the post holder no later than 2 weeks of the enquiry being received either in writing with a response to their questions or to arrange a meeting. As part of the written response or following the meeting, the Human Resources Department will write to the post holder to confirm that the informal stage has been completed and either that the matter has been resolved or advising the postholder of the deadline for raising a formal review request should they wish to do so.

If the post holder does not feel that the matter has been resolved, they should then notify a formal request (Stage 2).

8.2) Formal Notification Stage (Stage 2)

8.2.1) If the post holder is not satisfied that the informal stage has resolved their queries or concerns, the post holder should submit a formal review request to the Human Resources Department via their line manager, together with a completed and signed Request for Job Evaluation/Progression of a Stage 2 Formal Review Request form (see Appendix 1). To do this, the post holder puts

their questions in writing by post to the Human Resources Department .

The post holder must include details in writing of where they disagree with the matching or evaluation outcome, along with evidence to support their case, which must be detailed on the attached Request for a Review Pro-Forma (Appendix 2), indicating that this is a Stage 2 Review Request. This must be done within **3 months** of the date of the notification letter being sent out. A standard acknowledgement letter will be sent to post holders acknowledging the date of receipt of their formal review request.

8.2.2) If post holders are on long term absence from work e.g. on maternity leave or sickness absence, they must write to the Human Resources Department requesting a review within **3 months** of the date they return to work, as detailed in paragraph 8.1.2 above.

8.3) Exploratory Stage (Stage 3)

8.3.1) Following notification of a formal review request, the Human Resources Department will contact the post holder to arrange a Stage 3 (exploratory stage) meeting. This meeting will be attended by one staff side and one management side member of the Job Evaluation team who are trained Matching panellists, together with the line manager, the member of staff and his or her representative. Copies of the original job description, the response to any questions asked during the evaluation process, the original matching report and the Request for a Review Pro-Forma submitted at Stage 2 will be sent to all present at this meeting.

The exploratory stage meeting will take the form of a discussion which can be used to clarify the matching or evaluation outcome, identify whether or not a case exists and provide guidance on the steps the individual may then take.

8.3.2) Should the exploratory stage indicate that the original matching decision was made on inadequate information, then the post holder will be advised to provide the additional or revised information in writing using either the agreed Request for a Review Pro-Forma as attached (Appendix 1) or the original or a revised Job Analysis questionnaire to trigger the formal procedures.

A letter will then be sent to the post holder confirming the outcome of the exploratory stage meeting, the date that the final Request for a Review Pro-Forma or revised Job Analysis Questionnaire needs to be returned and explaining what will happen following the post being reviewed. All documentary evidence required for a review must be sent to the Human Resources Department (correspondence to clearly state on the outside of the envelope sent – Job Evaluation Review) within 4 weeks of the date of the letter confirming the outcome of the exploratory meeting.

8.4) Final Stage (Stage 4)

8.4.1) On receipt of the relevant information described above, the Human Resources Department will arrange for a Review Panel to be convened to carry out a further Job Matching or Local Evaluation - the majority of members of the panel will not have been previously involved in the previous evaluation. The Review Panel will be supplied with copies of the original job description, the response to any questions asked during the evaluation process, the original matching report and the Request for a Review Pro-Forma submitted for consideration at Stage 4 – no other documents will be considered.

The Review Panel will meet within **6 months** of submission of the original request for a review. The outcome will then be consistency checked at the next scheduled monthly Consistency Checking Panel. The outcome of the Review Panel will be confirmed to the post holder in writing.

8.4.2) After the review panel has reached a decision there is no recourse for a further review in relation to the matching or evaluation outcome. Should an employee feel however, that there has been an inappropriate application of the procedures he/she has the right to use the existing locally agreed grievance procedures to seek redress but not against the matching, evaluation or pay banding outcome. When raising a grievance, the employee must state in writing which part(s) of the procedure have not been followed. A grievance panel will not be able to determine a matching or evaluation outcome but if a grievance is upheld a potential remedy may be a reference to a new matching or evaluation panel. The Grievance Procedures can be accessed in the Human Resources Policies and Procedures.

8.5) Collective Reviews

The procedures above apply both to individuals and to groups of post holders. In situations where a group of staff, who have all signed off to the same job description, feel that the banding outcome is inappropriate they should also ensure that they have the necessary evidence for a review request in line with the procedures above. Post holders should seek clarification of whether to submit an individual or collective review in discussion with their line manager in the first instance.

The procedures for collective reviews are the same as above, with the following exceptions:

8.5.1) Formal Notification (Stage 2)

In situations where a group of post holders have signed up to the same job description staff wishing to request a collective review should submit a joint request, signed by all post holders, within 3 months of notification of the original panel's decision.

If any staff members who have signed up to the same job description are absent from work on a long-term basis (eg on

maternity leave/sickness absence) this should not hold up the review request procedure. Dependent on the circumstances involved, managers should contact the absent postholder(s) regarding the review request (either by telephone or letter) giving them the opportunity to have input to and sign up to the collective review request.

8.5.2) Exploratory Stage (Stage 3)

A maximum of 2 members of staff representing the group of post holders should be present at the exploratory stage, in addition to the line manager, staff side representative and trained members of the Job Evaluation team as described above.

9) Review of Posts Evaluated – Protection Guidance

The Management Steering Group (MSG) have debated the level of protection that should be applied to staff who are in posts that are down banded following a review. The guidance that follows outlines the suggested process to be followed where posts are reviewed and the outcome shows that the initial evaluation was too high. This may occur in a number of situations including:

- Where employees request a review of their initial Agenda for change (AfC) outcome
- Where new posts are re-assessed
- Where posts are reviewed following a recommendation by the national monitoring group (JEMG2) to reconsider an outcome.

Process

9.1) It is recommend that personal protection should be applied on a “mark time” basis but that the post should be down banded with immediate effect and any new staff appointed to the agreed lower pay band.

9.2) Where an employee is on a point on a pay band which is also available at the top end of the lower pay band, the employee should be transferred to the lower pay band on the same pay point. In this situation, there is no loss of earnings but the employee does not realise earnings potential that the higher pay band would have given. They will however receive annual pay uplifts to the maximum pay point of the correct band for the post.

9.3) Where an employee is on a pay point which is higher than the maximum of the lower pay band to which the post has been allocated, they should be transferred to maximum of the lower pay band but receive personal protection of the required amount to maintain current salary on a mark time basis. In this case, annual pay uplifts will increase the level of the band maximum and the overall earnings will be protected until the annual pay uplifts result in the maximum pay point on the band overtaking the level of protected earnings.

10. Monitoring and Review

This procedure will be subject to ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure that it is being implemented fairly, consistently, effectively and in line with the procedure's stated principles and values. The procedure will be subject to regular review, in partnership, to ensure that any new standards and/or structures are incorporated when necessary and that it remains fit for purpose.

11 Equality Impact Assessment

This procedure has been equality impact assessed using a rapid impact checklist process. One of the main purposes of a job evaluation process is to ensure fair and consistent pay practices. For this reason the overall purpose and output

t of the policy has a positive impact of all staff, regardless of protected characteristics.

However, some issues were identified in relation to the content and formatting of the policy, which may have a negative impact on people with some protected characteristics:

- The policy is not written in plain English and is not straightforward to follow in relation to the processes described. For this reason it is recommended that the policy be more thoroughly reviewed and re-written with a view to simplifying and making it more accessible to all.
- The font used on the document control pages is size 11 in places and also there is some text with capital letters which some people with literacy issues or visual impairments may find difficult to read. However, this is a Board-wide format and not in the remit of this policy to amend.
- There is significant reference to “written and letter” within the policy. If a disabled member of staff is unable to read or a member of staff does not have strong English language skills, a reasonable adjustment is required by the Equality Act. For individuals with literacy issues, some disability groups and English as second language, in terms of accessing the policy, understanding letters and being able to respond to the outcome, the policy needs to outline in guidance the support available. As a result of the impact assessment it has been highlighted within policy and that people can bring support worker or interpreter in agreement with the Chair of the meeting and that support is available through the HR team in relation to understanding letters.
- Potential negative impacts in relation to employment, income and stress were identified, though are difficult to mitigate due to the nature of the policy in question.

Appendix 1 - Request for Job Evaluation/Progression of a Stage 2 Formal Review Request

| | |
|---|--|
| Job Title | |
| Department | |
| Is there a member of staff currently carrying out this role? | Yes/No If yes – please complete section 1 below |
| Is this a new role that has not yet been advertised? | Yes/No If yes – please complete section 2 below |
| Is this a stage 2 formal review request? | Yes/no If yes – please complete section 3 below |
| Line managers should discuss any changes to job roles which may result in a change to the banding outcome of a post with the director responsible for their area and identify the source of funding (budget holder should discuss and agree with the finance department) before proceeding with any changes . Posts should be approved through the relevant group/ committee/fora structures e.g. APFservice redesign committee/etc and approved by the responsible director. | |

Section 1 (changed posts):

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of staff member(s) | |
| Date job holder commenced working to this job description | |
| The following documents must be sent to the HR Department before this job description can be scheduled for job evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic copy of job description • Hard copy of job description signed by postholder and line manager • If person specification has changed, please forward postholder’s appropriate certifications e.g. educational certificates, CPD detailing additional work/experience equivalence, etc • Evidence of service change i.e. supporting statement by relevant director | |

Section 2 (desktops):

| |
|--|
| The following documents must be sent to the hr co-ordinator before this job description can be scheduled for job evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic copy of job description • Evidence of service change ie supporting statement by relevant director |
|--|

Section 3 (reviews):

| |
|---|
| Section 8 of the job evaluation procedures detail how to request a review of a banding outcome. Before proceeding to the formal notification stage (stage 2) approval must be given by the responsible director (see below) |
|---|

Approval :

| | |
|--|--|
| Signature of line manager | |
| Signature of responsible director | |

Appendix 2 - Request for a Review Pro-Forma

Stage of Procedure being used
Tick appropriate box

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Stage 2 Formal Notification | |
| Stage 3 Exploratory Stage | |
| Stage 4 Final Stage | |

| CAJE No: (From Matched Job Report) | Job Title | Band (From Matched Job Report) |
|---|------------------|---|
| | | |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Name of post holder (s) | |
| Name of line manager | |

| Factor | Comments Please give below examples of practice linked to the job description and additional information questionnaire under the factor levels which you feel have not been adequately reflected in your matched job report |
|--|--|
| 1) Communication & Relationship Skills | |
| 2) Knowledge, Training & Experience | |
| 3) Analytical Skills | |
| 4) Planning & Organisational Skills | |
| 5) Physical Skills | |
| 6) Patient/Client Care | |
| 7) Policy & Service | |
| 8) Financial & Physical | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 9) Human Resources | |
| 10) Information Resources | |
| 11) Research & Development | |
| 12) Freedom to Act | |
| 13) Physical Effort | |
| 14) Mental Effort | |
| 15) Emotional Effort | |
| 16) Working Conditions | |

Additional comments (if specific tasks were omitted from job description, please give details here):

I confirm the information above:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Post holder (s) signature (s): | |
| Line manager signature: | |

Return to: Human Resources Department