

Brunel University Pay Framework - 3 August 2006 (without prejudice)

Contents

1. Scope
 2. Basis of the Agreement
 3. Job Evaluation
 4. Job Matching
 5. Under-graded roles / appeals
 6. Discretionary Increments
 7. Sick Pay Harmonisation
 8. Overtime Harmonisation
 9. Annual Leave Harmonisation
 10. Equality Proofing
 11. Attraction and Retention Premia
- Annex A – Grade Structure

1. Scope

This agreement covers the pay arrangements relating to staff employed by Brunel University other than those appointed, or promoted, to the Professorial Minimum or above (currently the top of the nationally agreed 51-point pay spine).

2. Basis of the Agreement

The Brunel University Pay Framework agreement (hereafter referred to as “this agreement”) represents the full extent of the local agreement reached between the University and the recognised support staff trade unions (Amicus, GMB and Unison) regarding the implementation of the national JNCHES Pay Framework Agreement. Discussions with the UCU on this agreement are ongoing.

Any changes to this agreement will be negotiated in accordance with the University’s arrangements for collective bargaining with the trade unions and will be subject to the approval of the Council of the University.

3. Job Evaluation

In accordance with the JNCHES Framework Agreement, an underlying principle of this agreement is that the pay and grading of posts is related to their relative demands, as determined by an appropriate job evaluation (JE) process. The use of the Higher Education Role Analysis (HERA) JE scheme for the joint job evaluation benchmarking exercise, covering all categories of staff, including academic and academic-related staff, was approved by the Council of the University. Accordingly, it underpins this agreement and will hereafter be used as the mechanism for assessing the relative demands of jobs.

4. Job Matching

The outcome of the joint benchmarking exercise was considered in detail by the University and the support staff trade unions. It showed clear clusters of jobs, resulting in a negotiated agreement regarding the matching of posts to the new grades in the rationalised grading structure, as set out in Annex A. (The underlying rationale was that the vast majority of posts had at some point been compared to the roles evaluated in the benchmark exercise through the use of the various, outgoing, job evaluation/assessment processes).

The HERA ranges for the grades in the new structure are as follows:

HERA Range	Grade
Below 270	S1
270 - 285	S2
286 - 305	S3
306 - 340	S4
341 - 400	S5
401 - 500	S6
501 - 560	H2
561 - 620	H3
621 - 700	H4
701 - 800	H5
Over 800	H6

5. Under-graded roles / appeals

The University will write to all members of staff covered by this agreement setting out details of the new grade to which they are being transferred. Details of the benchmark role profiles which have been developed for all the new grades will also be made available. Accordingly, all staff will be able to assess whether their job is bigger than the benchmark for the grade to which they have been transferred and better fits the benchmark for a higher level. Advice from the recognised trade unions and human resources on this matter will be available. Should the result of this assessment be that a member of staff believes that their job is closer to a higher benchmark than that for the grade to which they have been transferred s/he can have the matter reviewed through one of the following processes, as appropriate:

Academic Staff: May apply for promotion in the next promotion round, in accordance with the process and criteria approved by Senate. The promotion criteria formed an essential part of the generic academic role profiles that were developed in 2005/6, in consultation with academic staff, and staff working at a higher level than their grade should apply for promotion.

Support Staff (including former academic-related/professional staff): May submit an appeal against the grade to which they have been transferred effective from 1 August 2006, in writing, to the Director of HR, **before 1 Feb 2007**.

Following the grade transfer, effective 1 August 2006, a member of support staff may appeal against the grading of their post on the grounds that the role has expanded significantly since it was matched, or last evaluated under the HERA job evaluation scheme, and it better fits a higher level benchmark. An appeal on these grounds will not be allowed if it has been formally evaluated within a two-year time period. (This does not include evaluations undertaken as part of the 2005/6 benchmark exercise and staff taking part in the benchmark exercise will have the same right of appeal as other support staff).

The process for job evaluation appeals will consist of two steps; an informal appeal discussion with a trained HERA evaluator engaged by the University and, should a member of staff be unsatisfied with the outcome, a formal review of all the relevant information by the joint HERA Panel or jointly agreed body. In either step, a member of staff may be accompanied / represented by a trade union representative or work colleague. The outcome of the formal review with the joint HERA panel will be final and subject to no further appeal.

6. Discretionary Increments

Where discretionary increments are included in the structure of a particular grade, all staff in the grade shall have an equal opportunity to access such increments. The University and the support staff unions are jointly committed to finding a more open, transparent and fair process for the determination of discretionary increments prior to decisions on this being taken in 2007.

7. Sick-Pay Harmonisation

The University and the support staff unions are jointly committed to reaching an agreement on the harmonisation of sick pay by November 2006.

8. Overtime-Pay Harmonisation

The University and the support staff unions are jointly committed to reaching an agreement on the harmonisation of overtime by November 2006.

9. Annual Leave Harmonisation

The University and the support staff unions are jointly committed to reaching an agreement on the harmonisation of annual leave for all staff within a particular grade by November 2006.

10. Equality Proofing

The jointly agreed grading structure (as set out in Annex A) was approved following an agreed impact assessment of its implications in terms of gender, race and disability that demonstrated there was no (negative) differential impact. The University shall

review this impact assessment annually with the trade unions and corrective action will be taken, should any negative, differential impact transpire.

11. Attraction and Retention Premia

The law requires that employers have objective justification if they offer different rates of pay to staff whose work is of equal value. It is therefore important that the University has an agreed policy for the use of attraction and retention premia, which it may decide, in specific cases, it is necessary to use in order to match pay rates in the external market.

Should there be a business need, in a specific case, for the University to match external market pay rates, attraction and retention premia may be considered, as described in the following steps:

Assemble the evidence (such as data from published or specially commissioned pay surveys, and/or systematic analysis of advertised pay rates) that the proposed attraction and retention premia can be objectively justified.

Decide which employees are eligible for each attraction and retention premium, including existing staff.

Determine the level of premium required in each case.

Record the rationale for each attraction and retention premium in the personnel file of all those to whom they are paid, and notify the individuals concerned explicitly as regards the basis of the additional payment they will receive.

Include in the contract of employment the conditions under which an attraction and retention premium is paid and may, in certain circumstances, be reduced or withdrawn in accordance with the agreed policy.

Review at least every other year (but preferably once a year) the case for preserving, amending or withdrawing each attraction and retention premium in accordance with the policy guidelines.

As part of a regular equal pay review process, the University will also identify the proportions, in the groups to whom attraction and retention premia are paid, of men and women, of different racial groups, and of those with disabilities, and; check that differences between the pay of those carrying out like work, work rated as equivalent or work of equal value, which arise from attraction and retention premia, can be objectively justified and, if not, that corrective action is taken.