



AGENDA FOR CHANGE JOB EVALUATION – ADDITIONAL ADVICE MAY 2005

This is additional advice following on that published in June 2004 by Amicus and the Joint Divisions of the BPS “Agenda for Change, Job Evaluation – Joint Professional and Amicus Guidance for Understanding Family of Psychology Job Profiles and reviewing Job Description and Person Specifications”. Web addresses - www.amicustheunion.org and www.bps.org.uk/sub-syst/dcp/index.cfm

This additional advice derives from a series of enquires following on the first publication and changes brought about by revision and a development of additional profiles in 2005.

What other Professional Jobs can be matched using Generic Clinical Psychology Profiles?

These are listed on the attached Department of Health profile note on the published profiles. These should be used to match Child Psychotherapists, Adult Psychotherapists and Family Therapists.

These generic profiles were originally developed and remain the profiles to use for Health Psychologists, Counselling Psychologists, Forensic Psychologists, Occupational Psychologists and Child Psychologists and indeed any other Applied Psychologists working in health.

These profiles should be used for those engaged in training of applied psychologists where they are on secondment from a NHS role to act as trainers. A more detailed note offering advice for those with a training role follows.

The attached published list includes Counsellors profiles together with psychology as this is considered to be a single occupational grouping for matching purposes.

Changes to Profile Titles 2005

Profiles should initially be identified by their band index and for psychology these are bands 4, 5, 6, 7, 8a-b, 8c-d and 8d-9.

The 2005 revision of profiles with new profile titles includes some clarification of wording but no change to banding scores. The table of revised titles should be used in reading the 2004 guidance for the tables 1 and 2 on page 2 and throughout part 2.

Reviewed Profiles for Clinical Psychology with Former Title – Bands unchanged

New Profile Label	Former Profile Title	Band
Clinical Psychology, Assistant Practitioner	Assistant Psychologist	4
Clinical Psychology Assistant Practitioner Higher Level	Assistant Clinical Psychologist (Higher Level)	5
Clinical Psychologist Trainee	Trainee Clinical Psychologist	6
Clinical Psychologist	Specialist Clinical Psychologist	7
Clinical Psychologist Principal	Highly Specialist Clinical Psychologist	8A-B
Clinical Psychologist Consultant	Consultant Clinical Psychologist, Head of Speciality/Consultant Lead Clinician	8C-D
Clinical Psychologist Consultant, Professional Lead/Head of Psychology Services	New Profile	8D-9

Matching Split Posts and where post holders hold more than one job but with a single Trust or NHS employer

It remains the recommendation that a single or combined job description and person specification should be the basis for job matching where one person holds more than one post but with a single employer.

Where managers fail to agree on a single JD and P.Spec the matters should be referred to the next in-line manager. If the matter remains unresolved then the local Amicus rep and/or regional officer should be asked to aid to reach agreement or conciliation to agree a single JD. This is an alternative to use of the grievance procedure to gain agreement. Most difficulty is likely to be around terminology which can be turned into descriptive statement to aid matcher's comprehension. Some difficulties may be apparent where there may be differences between the two job components of a single JD on a particular factor level. This may be resolved where the factor levels have a range of scores. The results of matching on combined jobs can not lead to down grading as the previous pay is protected.

Matching two or more jobs with two or more Trusts or NHS employers

When two or more posts are held by one post holder and there is a single employer acting as pay master the advice remains to encourage personnel officers for the employers to co-operate and agree a single JD and P.Spec.

Where there are separate contracts and separate pay arrangements it is still worth trying to get an agreement and if possible a single pay master. If this fails there will have to be separate matching of these posts in each of the Trusts.

Matching those on secondment to training or other responsibilities

All jobs with an NHS contract are subject to A.F.C. and will be matched.

There is no uniform or model contract for applied psychology trainers on secondment to University Courses. National discussion may improve this situation.

Employees carry terms and conditions of employment to the seconded role. For psychology trainers a single JD and P.Spec combining the original post with the training job is advised.

The new Agenda for Change Terms and Conditions do not restrict or specify the length of time that jobs can be seconded. It should be noted however that previously under Whitley secondment was reviewable within a five year period. This may raise some difficulties for those seconded under these arrangements if their secondment was coming up for review under the Whitley review system. There may be individual contract conditions and/or local Trust policy on secondment that may place restrictions on secondments. Where there are issues of this kind a local rep, regional office or regional rep from the Family of Psychology can be of assistance in negotiating an agreement on the continuation of the training secondment.

The advice for those with part time secondment from NHS posts will depend on the individual conditions of their contracts.

- Some universities ensure a degree of parity with clinical academic pay scales, which may result in trainers pay being higher than NHS pay scales.
- Some universities have other pay mechanisms to reflect parity with other training pay.
- Those with a high percentage of secondment may wish to review their contract and the potential advantage or disadvantage of negotiation for a university based contract.
- This should ensure transfer of equivalent pension benefits. NHS and University pension schemes are being harmonised under the new public pensions sector revision plan.
- Job transfer to a University contract would not require NHS job evaluation, but would be evaluated under the proposed university job evaluation scheme.

- Given the great variation of individual contracts advice should be taken from Course Directors and university personnel departments on the most appropriate contract in the circumstances. Amicus local and regional representatives and regional officers are able to advise and support contractual negotiations.
- Course directors will be informed through the Group of Trainers in Clinical Psychology of any further advice following discussions with the DOH Job Evaluation Working Party.

Secondment to other responsibilities

Where this is within one Trust or by agreement between two or more trust then a single JD and P.Spec combining the original post and the seconded roles should be matched. Any change of job and responsibility subsequently may require a further job evaluation at the time of change and the possibility of a further job match to assign the appropriate pay band.

Matching those working for a statement of equivalence or on lateral transfer to a post

Typically those employed on a statement of equivalence are paid on a defacto acting basis at a qualified grade pending completion of the SOE requirements. Matching their job should be on the basis of the job being carried out under contract, be this on an acting basis or not. The job description and contract may include stated paid release to complete SOE placements.

Where time in placement is not recognised or funded for example unpaid, unpaid study leave or carried out in the employees own time this work would not normally be included in the JD and P.Spec for matching.

Band 7

Matching to this profile should only apply to newly qualified in the post and for up to 18 months to 2 years maximum. It is advised that JD's and P.Specs be written as a band 7 – 8a to make clear the expected development into 8a. Providing clinical supervision of trainees and peers is only recognised from band 8a on. Providing clinical supervision and the completion of additional CPD and other clinically supervised experience additional to the original qualifying training are the grounds for a grade review to enable progression to band 8a.

Band 8a-b

All those providing clinical supervision to trainees and to peers must be graded at 8a principle as a minimum.

Titles

Once a job has been matched it is identified by the profile job title. The use of local titles is likely to continue but local titles and any reference to previous Whitley grade must not be used as a basis for matching or clustering jobs for matching. Matching must be on the basis of individual job descriptions and person specifications alone and no reference or use of local titles or previously Whitley grade should be used.

Similarly, local titles or reference to Whitley grades are not an appropriate or accurate basis to group or cluster jobs for matching. Only job descriptions and person specifications that are sufficiently similar can be proposed for clustering for matching purposes.

Clustering

This still requires the agreement of the post holders who must be told which post is proposed to be the cluster example. They should have access to the post holder of the example job to ensure that any difference between the cluster example and their own post is understood and can be made clear to matchers. Clustering requires agreement, if there is no agreement then a job can not go forward in a cluster.

Person Specifications

It is advisable to avoid use of column describing desirable competences and skills. This risks discrimination and it is preferable to place all necessary skills and competences under single heading of essential. Matches are likely to ignore information place in the Desirable column.

Clinical Psychologist Consultant, Professional Lead/ Head of Psychology Services

Job Description Guidance Notes

Introduction

These posts will be band 8d or 9. This guidance is to assist post holders in writing job descriptions and emphasises those factors that are likely to decide the actual band that fits the post in question. It is important to read the Job Evaluation Guide carefully for every factor. Words have very specific definitions and meanings in A4C.

The A4C Job Statement for a Head of Service/ Professional Lead is as follows:

JOB TITLE: CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST CONSULTANT, PROFESSIONAL LEAD/ HEAD OF PSYCHOLOGY SERVICES

JOB STATEMENT:

- (1) Responsible for organisation and professional leadership/management, service and policy development of psychology services for one or more organisations
- (2) May carry specialist caseload of clients: provides advice & consultancy to patients & professionals
- (3) Manages, leads, motivates practitioners, assistant(s), trainee(s) from own and/or other professions
- (4) Undertakes research, teaching, lecturing
- (5) May be responsible for psychological aspects of policy development for other services across one or more organisations

The table overleaf compares the A4C levels and scores for Consultant Clinical Psychologists 8c or 8d with PL/Heads of Service 8d or 9.

Table Consultant compared to PL/Head of Service: Profile Levels and scores

Factor	Consultant JE level	Consultant score	PL/Head JE level	JE score
1.Communication & Relationship Skills	6	60	6	60
2.Knowledge, Training & Experience	8	240	8(a)	240
3.Analytical & Judgemental Skills	5	60	5	60
4.Planning & Organisational Skills	4	42	4	42
5.Physical Skills	2-3	15-27	2-3	15-27
6.Responsibility for Patient/Client Care	6	39	7	49
7.Responsibility for Policy/Service Development	3-4	21-32	4-5	32-45
8.Responsibility for Financial & Physical Resources	2-4	12-32	4(a)	32
9.Responsibility for Human Resources	2-3	12-21	4(a)	32
10.Responsibility for Information Resources	1	4	1	4
11.Responsibility for Research & Development	3-4	21-32	2-5	12-45
12.Freedom to Act	5	45	5	45
13.Physical Effort	1-2	3-7	1- 2(a) (d)	3-7
14.Mental Effort	5	25	4(b)-5	18-25
15.Emotional Effort	4	25	4(b)	25
16.Working Conditions	2-4	7-18	3(a) –4(a)	12-18
	8c/d	631-709	Band 8d -9	681-756

The table can be used to identify the key factors that need attention in differentiating PL/Head jobs from other consultant jobs and that differentiate 8d PL/Head jobs from 9 PL/Head jobs.

The rules of matching are that a job will match the profile if it is one level up or down for any particular factor. This rule does not apply to factors 2 or 12 for which the match must be exact.

Note that the boundary for band 8d is 720 points, 721 points = band 9.

1. The first three factors reached the ceiling for consultants so there is no need for further advice on these here.
2. Factor 4. Some PL/Heads might match at level 5.
3. Factor 5. Either level (2 or 3) might be popular with your local matching panels.
4. Factor 6. All PL/Heads should be level 7.
5. Factor 7. Some PL/Heads may not score above some Consultants, but this should be unusual, because by definition the PL/Head has the lead responsibility with respect to standards of psychological care. Responsibility for policy and standards in relation to psychological care across one or more trusts or directorates, irrespective of whether provided by the psychology service would fit this definition. Other trust-wide service development and policy initiatives are also relevant.
6. Factor 8. Some PL/Heads will match at level 3. It is necessary to read the definitions for level 3 a-d carefully to identify which apply. Others will be Level 4a. Level 4b would not apply to psychologists. Occasionally PL/Heads will reach level 5, because they manage budgets for several services.
7. Factor 9. PL/Heads will span levels 3-5 depending on their actual responsibilities.
8. Factor 11 is very wide. Levels 2-5 =12, 21, 32, or 45 points. It would be very unusual to be level 2, given that the PL/Head has overall responsibility for the programme of research carried out within the psychology service.
9. Note that Factor 14 may be lower than for other consultants (i.e. 4b).

There are some senior PL's whose responsibilities are fundamentally strategic (e.g. Exec. Board/ reporting direct to the CE) and who do not have operational line management responsibilities. Agenda for Change does not fit these posts very well. They may fail to match at band 9 even though the responsibilities are clearly greater than a typical band 9 Head of Service. The question arises as to whether these posts should be in the Agenda for Change pool at all, but this will need to be resolved by local negotiation.

Further Advice

The Joint Job Evaluation in Working party can be contacted via Jake Lyne (jake@lynemead.fsnet.co.uk), Dorothy Fielding (Dorothy.Fielding@leedsth.nhs.uk), Antony Vassalos (Antony.Vassalos@ntlworld.com), and Patrick Smuts (Angela.Hannam@awp.nhs.uk)