



Modernisation and the Higher Education Sector

**A Survey of Responses
from Amicus
Representatives in the
Higher Education Sector
regarding the Job
Evaluation and
Modernisation Process.**



35 King Street, Covent Garden, London WC2E 8JG.
Telephone: 020 7420 8900

www.amicustheunion.org

Higher Education Sector, Amicus

National Officer-Mike Robinson, Researcher-Janet Golds Janet.golds@amicustheunion.org

Administrator - Vera Titmus Tel: 02476-227522 Vera.titmus@amicustheunion.org

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Methodology	4
Section 1: Starting Off	5
Section 2: Pilots	10
Section 3: Access to Information	11
Section 4: Protecting Members	12
Section 5: Training	15
Section 6: Pay Grades	16
Section 7: Data Gathering	18
Section 8: Evaluation and Analysis	20
Section 9: Monitor and Review	21
Section 10: Important Points	22
Section 11: The Future – Amicus Recommendations	25
Comment: Mike Robinson, Amicus National Officer	26

Executive Summary

- A number of Higher Education institutions (nearly 15%) have done little to implement the agreement made between the employers association (UCEA) and trade unions.
- 14% of institutions have forced through the job evaluation process without consulting the trade unions fully on the methodology
- 74% of Amicus representatives surveyed have been denied access to job evaluation software or data by employers
- Only 18% of institutions are committed to an equal pay review after the job evaluation process has been implemented
- In 44% of institutions communication to staff regarding job evaluation is from management only, rather than through a joint negotiation team
- There are still a large number of institutions (52%) yet to reach the point of defining grade boundaries and only 3% of institutions seem to have got there

Introduction:

Since the start of the job evaluation process in higher education, Amicus has been working hard to ensure that the job grades, pay and conditions of our members are protected and in as many cases as possible improved upon. The process of job evaluation is proving extremely complex and challenging, and the use of a number of job evaluation systems, including predominantly HERA and HAY, makes it difficult for our members to ensure that the pay grade and benefits they are awarded are not inferior to that of other colleagues doing the same job in other higher education institutions.

In response to comments from representatives, members and officers of Amicus working with the job evaluation process we decided to survey our members to see how the process was progressing, to try to ascertain whether a partnership approach was being adopted by employers with the unions involved and whether employers were ensuring that all staff were positively involved in the job evaluation process. The approach followed here is one where we are hoping for a snapshot of the higher education sector at this time of extensive change.

Methodology:

Our postal survey was distributed to all Amicus workplace representatives in the higher education sector, 200 were distributed and 27 completed questionnaires were returned. Although the return is relatively small, it still represents over a 10% response, which is usual for this type of survey. Amicus is confident that this represents a robust statistical return on which to base the analysis of the survey responses. We would also mention that the survey responses cover most of the main higher education institutions and present a useful cross section of institutions that have either nearly completed the job evaluation process, are in the process of job evaluation or are just about to start the process. Only a small number of institutions at this time (June 2005) have fully completed the job evaluation process and have adopted the new grading and pay structures.

Section 1: Starting off

1a. How often do you meet with HR representatives on the Framework Agreement?

Weekly	Fortnightly	Monthly	Two Monthly	Other
11%	3%	33%	7.4%	3%

1b. Do you only use formal meetings or do you speak informally

	YES	NO	Don't Know
Formal meetings	66.6%	3%	
Informal meetings	51.8%	3%	
Other			

As we can see from table 1a there was a broad range of responses, the highest indicated a schedule of monthly meetings, which broadly fits with the framework agreement. Part of the successful progress of the job evaluation process is good communication from management, with reps and staff being fully involved in any decision-making.

It is encouraging to see that there are nearly as many informal meetings as formal meetings indicated on 1b. 66.6% of respondents said they meet formally with management, some also indicated that they had informal meetings too if they asked for them, 4% of respondents said they only met formally due to time and work constraints. Of the 51.8% who said they met informally 3% said they only had informal meetings and there had not been any formal meetings tabled by management, a situation that they were concerned about. A number of respondents said they had a specific trade union group that met with Personnel staff and also tabled JNC meetings with senior management where pay and modernisation is a standing item on the agenda. Two respondents specifically mentioned that they had received no communication from management regarding the modernisation process; they said that their questions are rarely answered satisfactorily and reservations voiced about implementation are ignored.

2. How well would you say partnership working is going in your institution?

Very well	Reasonably well	Not very well	Slow	Very slow	No progress at all
7.4%	44.4%	18.5%	3%	3%	14.8%

For 44.4% of organisations partnership is working reasonably well, there is communication on both sides and modernisation is progressing at a steady pace. For 18.5% of organisations partnership is a

problem, a number of respondents said there has been a one sided response from management, some reps have had to push hard to get management to see the staff side of the situation and also commented 'their grasp of industrial relations leaves a lot to be desired'. For 14.8% of respondents there has been no progress on modernisation, the partnership approach advocated by the Framework Agreement is just not happening. A number of respondents also said that they have to constantly remind management what negotiation is, and that they (management) cannot just tell staff what has been decided in an autocratic and unilateral way. For the small group of 7.4% where partnership working is going very well, it would seem that the key to this is good communication between all parties and an open approach to consultation and negotiation.

3a. Have you reached an agreement on facility time for trade union reps?

YES - formal	<input type="checkbox"/>	40.7%
YES - informal	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Still Negotiating	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%

3b. If so, how much? Please indicate: as much time as needed, one day a week, one full time post, unlimited time, 50%, 0.6 FTE between two members, indefinite, as much as required, as long as is needed.

There was a very wide range of differing responses for facilities time. Of the 40.7% who responded to say that they had formal facilities time negotiated with their employer there was a very broad range of time allocated. This ranged from the equivalent of one full time post, an agreement that full-time facilities time for the modernisation process would be added to the usual facilities time and an agreement in one university where the Vice Chancellor wrote to all the heads of department informing them that facilities time had to be allowed to ensure the process progressed in a timely manner.

For the very small group, 7.4% that have an informal arrangement for facilities time, it was felt by reps that a more formal agreement would be better, this would enable reps to do the necessary training and work involved in the job evaluation exercise without having to negotiate with their line managers, some of whom had very poor industrial relations experience.

For the 22.2% that had no facilities time agreed the main issues seem to be problems with management coming back to agree requests for facilities time and in a couple of cases has not been agreed due to action by other unions.

4a. Has your management recruited an 'expert' to help with the process?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	48%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	44.4%
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%

4b. If so, were you involved in the recruitment / selection process?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.5%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	40.7%

4c. Does that person(s) report to a joint body or just to HR?

JOINT BODY	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
HR ONLY	<input type="checkbox"/>	25.9%
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%

In the responses to this question there was very little between yes - 48% and no - 44.4%. For most of those that responded yes to the first question there was a varying answer to the second question regarding whether the reps were involved in the recruitment process. Of those that said yes, 18.5% nearly all agreed that although they had been a part of the selection process the consultant reported exclusively to the H.R. department. Only two respondents said that the steering group had been involved in the selection process and that the consultant reported to the steering group (which includes H.R. personnel) exclusively.

For those that said they were neither involved in the selection process and did not receive feed back from the consultant 40.7%, there was a feeling that decisions were being made without the input of the steering group or the staff in general. One respondent said they had been kept in the dark completely by their management, another said they had not been consulted initially but after an informal discussion with management this situation had changed. Another respondent questioned where the extra HFCE funds had gone, it seemed that most of the employers had recruited internally from their own H.R. departments or had recruited extra H.R. staff to deal with the modernisation process, a situation not viewed as ideal by most respondents.

5a. Have you decided which job evaluation scheme to use?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	74%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	

5b. If so, which one?

HAY	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%
HERA	<input type="checkbox"/>	62.9%
OTHER	<input type="checkbox"/>	Please indicate:

5c. Have you been forced to accept a scheme you don't want?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	59.2%
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	

The table shows that 74% of respondents have decided on a job evaluation scheme and the favoured scheme with 62.9% is HERA, the scheme favoured by Amicus. 14.8% of respondents indicated that they have been forced to accept a scheme that has been forced on them by management with no consultation or negotiation. One university is piloting 3 schemes, HAY, HERA and a union scheme – the Gold Book. There is also an indication by this respondent that any unilateral decision by the employer to select a scheme without trade union agreement will be met with a dispute.

6. Are all staff in your university (from v-c to porter) being evaluated?

- YES 33%
- NO 37%
- Don't know 7.4%
- Still in Negotiation 14.8%

In question 6 the responses for yes and no were incredibly close. Many of the respondents said that the new 51 point pay scale only goes to the top of senior lecturer scale, and only jobs up to this level are being evaluated and job matched to the new grades. One respondent mentioned that at their university, during the pilot all jobs were evaluated even the Vice Chancellor but this was done by a consultant and the steering group were not allowed to see the results. In another case professorial and related grade 6 staff have been excluded from the pilot, the union reps involved have made a formal complaint about this to management. In another case all manual weekly paid staff have proved problematic due to the huge differences in existing terms and conditions, which need to be re-negotiated.

7a. Have you set up a steering group or other joint decision making body to oversee job evaluation?

- YES 88.8%
- NO 7.4%
- Don't know

7b. If so, what is the management/TU ratio?

No Trade Union reps	25% Union – 75% Management	50/50	75% UNION – 25% Management	Other: please indicate
3%	7.4%	40.7%	18.5%	

7c. If not, how are decisions currently made? Please indicate

Over 88% of respondents said that they had set up a steering group to oversee the modernisation process, from that group 40.7% had a 50/50 split in the composition of the group with equal trade union reps (across all the main unions involved, apart from the AUT) and H.R./management representatives. The next largest percentage response was for a 75/25% split in favour of union representatives, this usually happened in institutions where there were a large number of faculties in separate buildings that warranted their own union reps, these were then accommodated within the steering group. Of the responses that indicated they had no steering group, one commented that the official steering group has no official trade union representation, it is made up of senior managers and formally reports to the University's strategic planning committee, it is purely a communication route using the H.R. department as a filter. In another decisions are made by management in conjunction with the H.R. department and then communicated down to staff.

8. What decisions have already been made by the steering group (or management if no joint body)? E.g. choosing the scheme, managing the pilot, the methods of data gathering (e.g. job descriptions or interviews or both) and agreeing any benchmark jobs.

	Choosing the scheme	Managing the pilot	Method of data gathering	Agreeing benchmarks
YES	59%	33%	18.5%	33%
NO	14.8%	11%	11%	
Don't know	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%

A number of respondents indicated that they had been instrumental in making decisions on choosing the job evaluation scheme used, managing the pilot, agreeing benchmark jobs, selecting evaluators and agreeing job descriptions. However there were wide differences reported in the decision making process. For one respondent, management make all the decisions, the reps are unhappy about the lack of transparency in the benchmarking process and the choice of data gathering was never agreed. Reps have asked for a detailed resume of all benchmarked roles but so far have not received a response from management. For another group there was no input regarding the decision making process on managing the pilot, no agreed method of gathering data and no agreement on benchmarked jobs. Yet for another respondent all decisions were agreed after full consultation with all the trade unions involved, no policy decisions – as yet – have been taken by management without reference to the trade union group. This shows the very wide differences in the approach by the various institutions to the communication and involvement of the staff and reps in the decision making process.

9a. Have you agreed an implementation date so that all staff groups are moved across at the same time?

- YES 48%
- NO 22.2%
- Don't know 3%
- Still Negotiating 18.5%

9b. If so have you agreed a policy for backdating?

- YES 26%
- NO 26%
- Don't know

Of the 48% that have agreed an implementation date, August 2006 is the favoured date with August 2005 following a close second. For many of the organisations there has been no formal agreement regarding a policy on backdating, for one institution this has not been budgeted for at all. For another respondent there seems to be a great deal of confusion regarding the implementation date, with little or no communication from management and a request to discuss backdating was met with derision. For the group who are still negotiating there are significant issues with the laissez-faire attitude to confirming an implementation date by management, the view of some respondents was that some institutions could overshoot the cut-off date significantly.

Section 2: Pilots

10. Have you run a pilot in your institution?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	40.7%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	48%
PILOT IN PROCESS	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	

A number of those who responded yes to this question mentioned that their employer had been very thorough, running pilots for HAY, HERA and in one case the AUT scheme too. For the proportion who said no, (48%) a number said they had raised the suggestion with management but it had been rejected, one respondent said their employer indicated they had left it too late to run a pilot so would have to proceed without it. For another respondent management had decided not to run a pilot but the steering group would be selecting basic core jobs to analyse which should be completed by November 2005, then they would spend more time on the more specialised jobs.

11. If so, how involved were trade unions?

Full training	Some training	Full participation	Some participation	No training	No participation
22.2%		44.4%	7.4%		14.8%

Over 40% of respondents said that they had been fully involved in a pilot scheme. One respondent said that all the trade unions were involved at their institution, they observed the interviews with a role analyst, results were made available to the trade unions and there was feedback and an evaluation of the process. Another mentioned that they too had been fully involved and management had said they were very impressed with the input and ideas from the union side, Amicus had scored all the technicians and manual staff, also some clerical, academic related and academics (including the Professor). One rep commented that Amicus was much more proactive during the process as the reps had experience of the 'blue book' system. Other unions had little or no experience of job evaluation. Of those 14.8% who had no participation, many mentioned the lack of communication from management and a heavy top-down approach to the pilot scheme.

Section 3: Access to information

12. Have you had access to the same training, information and software as the HR department?

	Training	Information	Software
YES	66.6%	48%	14.8%
NO	14.8%	26%	48%
DON'T KNOW	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%

The largest response group indicated that they had been given access to the same training and information, but that employers were dragging their feet when it came to supplying them with the relevant software. Most of the respondents indicated that their employers saw an advantage in making the modernisation process work by ensuring that the reps were trained and involved. This would ensure that the large majority of the workforce could rely on their union for correct information and not have to rely on communications from management.

13. How have management communicated to staff about the process of job evaluation? Through a joint body, or from management side only?

Joint Body	Management Only	Other Method-please indicate	NO PROCESS YET
29.6%	44.4%		18.5%

Respondents indicated a huge variety of ways in which management had communicated with the staff regarding the process, from leaflets, the college intranet and email messages through to posters, road shows and college web sites. The unfortunate part of this is that many of the institutions did not liaise with the unions involved and did not get agreed communications sent out to workers. It was apparent that again there is a predominantly top down approach within the sector. One respondent said that the communication from their management had been so poor that after speaking to the staff involved he came to the realisation that most staff are unaware of what the process of job evaluation entails and how it will affect them personally.

14. Has your university tried to restrict TU access to any data? If so, what?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	29.6%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	51.8%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%

Of the 29.6% who indicated that there had been a restriction, it was apparent that most of the restriction dealt with the removal of interviewees names (which is not a problem) but what was a problem was where institutions have not been clear about salary scales, whether any members/groups of staff have been excluded from the process (for whatever reason) and holding back information from staff in an effort to speed up the process.

Section 4: Protecting members

15 Have you negotiated an extension to the 4 year minimum in the Framework Agreement?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	33%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	48%

Most of the respondents to question 15 indicated that they had not managed to negotiate an added extension, although 48% are still in the process of negotiation so this figure may change. Of those institutions where an extension has been agreed, four years seems to be the norm with various agreements for the overseeing of the professional development of anyone who has been red-circled and regular reviews over the four year period to cover any capability issues.

16. Have you made particular arrangements for members who may find themselves on pay protection and are nearing retirement with a final salary pension scheme?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	55.5%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	

An overwhelming 55% are still negotiating an agreement on this issue. Of those who have negotiated an agreement, one respondent has agreed pay protection from 5 years before normal retirement date up to retirement and another said that anyone who is affected by this would have their pension protected even if they passed the four years and had their pay reduced, their pension would not be affected if they were between 60 and 65 years of age. Of those who have not been able to negotiate an agreement with their employer, 22.2% of reps have mentioned there is great anxiety about this issue, with a potential loss of membership if it cannot be resolved.

17. If you have started the job evaluation process, what information / briefing do staff receive prior to being evaluated?

Not Started Process Yet	40.7%
Full Departmental Briefings from HR	26%
Help with Form Filling	3%
One to One sessions	3%
TU Officers Briefing Sessions	7.4%
Standard Advice Sheets Only	3%
Support from TU Reps	7.4%
No Information/Briefings	11%
Other-please indicate	

There was a large variety of information and communication sources named by respondents, even though 40.7% of respondents have not started the process there are indications that some information is being disseminated. There is information also coming through from HAY and HERA facilitators, with briefings from management and other information being sent out by management. It is also apparent from the table that trade union briefings are not in the majority that most of the information coming through is via management and this information is not being shared sufficiently with the unions involved.

18. Do/will staff have access to annual (or rolling) regrading reviews, as they were entitled to under the 'Blue Book' scheme?

YES-ANNUAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.5%
YES-ROLLING	<input type="checkbox"/>	11%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.5%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	33%

The highest percentage of respondents 18.5% indicated that there would be an annual review once the appeals process has been finalised. It seems that a number of institutions have been informed that if this is not part of the agreement then staff are not prepared to go through the job evaluation exercise. A number also mentioned that this agreement was still being negotiated but that it was of high priority and the institutions involved were aware of the importance to staff.

19a. Are appeals available to all who go through job evaluation and are unhappy with the outcome?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	40.7%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	44.4%

19b. Are there any restrictions on who can appeal?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%

The response to question 19a is self explanatory but needed to be clarified to ensure that all staff would be entitled to an appeal and also how the appeal process would be managed.

An equal number of respondents said that there would not be any restrictions on who could appeal and that there would be some restrictions. It seems from the evidence that of those who have been told there will be restrictions, they have not been told by their managements how or whom this will affect. One respondent mentioned that although everyone is entitled to appeal at their institution, there would be an initial informal workplace surgery where staff can discuss issues with an H.R. person before needing to go through the formal process. The reps are hoping that they will be involved in this process and it should assist in resolving any initial problems.

20. Appeal panels should be joint – i.e. equal numbers of trade union and management representatives on the panels?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	33%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	37%

There was an overwhelming response to this question with the majority of respondents 33%, agreeing to a joint appeal panel, in only a couple of instances had this been vetoed by management. The reps involved are still negotiating to resolve the situation.

21. Are people on the appeals panel those who have not previously been involved in the individual's job evaluation?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.5%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	44.4%

It is encouraging to see that of those who have negotiated who will be on the appeals panels, nearly all had an agreement that it would not be the same people as those involved in the initial job evaluation. However a large number of respondents are still in the process of negotiating this agreement, but the reps indicated their awareness of how important it is to get an agreement finalised.

Section 5: Training

22a. Have TU reps been trained in job evaluation by the university?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	77.7%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	

The majority of respondents said the reps have been trained in the job evaluation process, this is most important in ensuring that the process is done correctly and that reps can negotiate key agreements with management to resolve any issues. The majority of respondents said that there was training available if they wanted it, however the problem was balancing this new role with their existing workloads.

22b. If so, how many?

22c. Are all reps involved (e.g. negotiators, those who may be advising members on appeals, or who may be role analysts / job evaluators?).

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	26%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	

There were a large variety of responses to this question, most of the respondents said the reps on the steering group had been offered training by management and that the unions involved were training any other reps involved. One of the respondents said five of their reps were being trained, but there was a need to identify who would be negotiators, role analysts and job evaluators. There was also an indication that Amicus was much more pro-active regarding the training of reps than the other unions involved.

Section 6: Pay grades - the crucial part of the process

23. Have you decided on grade boundaries?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	51.8%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	29.6%

Over half of respondents, 51.8% indicated that they had not agreed grade boundaries with their employer, this also overlapped with those who indicated that they were still in negotiation with employers. One respondent said they had set the boundaries and another said that grade boundaries had been forced upon them by their management, who, after a considerable backlash by the reps have decided to rethink the whole process and work more closely with the reps from the unions.

24. Have you decided how many Hay/HERA points will put people into which grades?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	66.6%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	26%

Only one of the respondents said they had decided on the points required, 66.6% of the sample said they had not decided, a number of whom commented that their management had indicated that they had decided but had not informed anyone else. For the 26% still negotiating, they all said that they were not far enough into the process to decide this yet.

25. Have you decided on the salary range for each grade?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	62.9%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.5%

The responses regarding salary ranges are very similar for the grade ranges; those that have agreed a range have indicated what the range is and whom it applies to. Another respondent mentioned that there would be some stretching of the appendix C model at the top and the bottom and somewhere in the middle. For the 62.9% who said no, again management were deciding on the salary range and the reps were waiting to hear what this would be. 26% are still negotiating with their managements.

26. Have you agreed on staff access to regular training and development reviews to ensure that they are able to progress between grades?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	44.4%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	29.6%

Of those who responded yes to this question there was an indication that H.R. were aware that this was something they needed to take on board and that staff development was a crucial part of the modernisation process. One respondent mentioned that although a performance and development review was in place at their institution, unilateral modifications to the scheme from management were a growing concern. Of the 44.4% that said no to this question a number said they had agreed it in principle but it had not been ratified.

27. What performance related pay (or contribution-based pay) arrangements have you made with your university (if any)?

Full Agreement	
Some Arrangements	3%
Still Negotiating	7.4%
No Decision Made Yet	26%
NONE	51.8%

The largest response came from those who had not arranged anything yet 51.8% most did not indicate why this was. Of those that have been agreed, one respondent said that there would be performance points at the top of the scale and it is proposed that these be obtained through recommendation after the annual review process. In another institution management have proposed a 3 levels per grade system, the reps are bitterly opposed to this and have made it clear there will be no agreement. In another institution a contribution based reward scheme of one off payments has been unilaterally introduced.

Section 7: Data gathering

28. How are you going to carry out data gathering? Interviewing, or agreed job descriptions or both?

INTERVIEWS	AGREED JOB DESCRIPTIONS	BOTH	NO DECISION YET
	18.5%	29.6%	37%

There was a broad range of responses to this question; some reps are gathering their own data for job comparisons across different departments. For a number of reps it is obvious that institutions are gathering data but this is not being disseminated to the unions unless the unions specifically request it. In other cases there is a joint effort to carry out a combination of individual interviews, comparisons with old job descriptions and informal talks with management.

29. What percentage of people are being individually evaluated?

Of those who responded to this question a number indicated that the process was ongoing and had not yet been finalised, for those who are farther forward, one rep mentioned that benchmark job descriptions have been agreed and form the basis for the grade profiles to which all jobs are being matched. Another said that they are using 250-300 people in total for benchmarking, management wrote the benchmarks using HERA and the reps are editing the benchmarks. In another institution 100 posts were benchmarked, however some anomalies arose due to job content so 25% of people who applied for an appeal are to be job evaluated rather than job matched and the reps concerned can see this figure rising.

30. If someone is not individually evaluated, can they ask for this to be done?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	29.6%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	37%

Of the group that said yes 29.6%, a number of reps said that all jobs can be assimilated individually, and although some staff have opted to be matched as a group even in this case a person can ask to be evaluated on an individual basis. For most of the other respondents no decision has been made about what would happen but reps are negotiating with management to ensure this does happen.

31. Who verifies the information about the person's job?

HR Department	11%
Line Manager	44.4%
Head of Department/School	22.2%
Other-please indicate	
Not Known	11%
To Be Agreed	7.4%

In nearly all cases it will be the line manager that verifies the information about a person's job, in some cases this is done in conjunction with the head of department. In one case staff get a report about their job before the benchmark is completed.

32. Is the role holder given a chance to check the information about them for accuracy?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	51.8%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
NOT ALWAYS	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%

In this case over half of respondents said staff could check the information about their job, one rep mentioned that this was compulsory at his institution, the worker must sign a form to say they have seen the information. Under the HAY scheme this question does not apply as the role holder supplies the information about their job. For the 7.4% who answered no, there was no anecdotal evidence to explain this.

Section 8: Evaluation and analysis:

33. Are there an equal number of union nominated and management nominated role analysts/job evaluators?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	33%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	33%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	11%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	11%

It is interesting that of the respondents, there are an equal number 33% that have said yes and no to this question. For those who said yes it is encouraging to see that a number of reps said that the panels were made up predominantly of a mixture of personnel people, middle managers and reps, but a number said that although this too was the case for them, each of the panels so far had more reps in evidence.

For those that said no, it would seem that many of the institutions have arranged to have either management role analysts only or management picks the analysts with no input from reps, and in one case the reps have not even been informed who the role analysts are. For those reps who are still negotiating a number indicated that they would demand that there were at least equal numbers or reps on the panels.

34. How are the role analysts checked for consistency?

Moderation by HR Only	
Moderation by HR & JE PANEL	11%
Moderation by JOINT GROUP (inc TU reps)	26%
OTHER-please indicate	18.5%
NOT DECIDED YET	29.6%

There were a number of different anecdotal responses to this question. Initially there seems to be a focus on meeting and talking about various points, asking the role analysts how they interpret certain questions, to check consistency and see if they follow the union model. For one rep this has enabled them to go through the first few roles that were benchmarked point by point and contest anything that looked suspicious. This has helped to clarify issues for management and the reps. Another respondent said they have decided that when the full database is ready, unions and personnel will check the entire batch for consistency. All the respondents said that there was checking going on which is very encouraging and the 26% that indicated moderation was by a joint group is something that Amicus would encourage across all institutions.

Section 9: Monitor and review

35. Has your steering committee set up a method for monitoring the process of job evaluation and reviewing it once it is complete?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	26%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	40.7%

The largest number of respondents in this group are still negotiating the monitoring process. Of those that said yes 22.2%, it would seem that the H.R. departments are undertaking the majority of the monitoring. The data will then be released to the unions involved. A number of reps said that they are conducting their own data gathering which they hope will help members, for example when a job comparator is required.

37a. Has your employer agreed an Equal Pay Review after implementation?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.5%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	22.2%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	44.4%

37b. If so will the EPR cover performance payments to highlight any inequalities in that aspect of pay?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%

As Government have indicated that the eradication of pay inequality is an imperative of the modernisation process, this question was very important. Most of the respondents are still in the process of agreeing these arrangements but a number of reps said that they had agreed with management to undertake an equal pay review at the end of the process and one rep mentioned that they had arranged for a review to be undertaken immediately prior to job evaluation and one will be done shortly after. For those institutions who are not planning an equal pay review, the reps are lobbying management to encourage them to change their decision.

Section 10: Important points

38. Have non-members at your university been told about the process and given the chance to join Amicus before the process begins?

YES 74%
 NO 11%
 DON'T KNOW

All reps said that they had tried specifically to ensure that non members were included in any briefings, newsletters or communications from the union regarding the job evaluation process. This had proved fruitful, as a number of new members had been recruited once they saw how important and complex the process was going to be and how hard reps were working on behalf of members.

39. Is/will trade union advice and representation be available to members who require it on appeal?

YES 81.4%
 NO 3%
 DON'T KNOW 3%

It is clear from the 81.4% response that reps would not turn any staff away who needed help or assistance regarding the job evaluation process, however most reps commented that this situation was one where they could encourage staff to join the union, as this was a situation where staff who were not members could see the value of being a member of a union.

40a. Have members been briefed by the union on job evaluation prior to the process starting?

YES 59.2%
 NO 22.2%
 DON'T KNOW 3%

40b. If so, how (meetings, fact sheets, newsletters, etc)

MEETINGS	44.4%
TRAINING SESSIONS	3%
FACT SHEETS	14.8%
NEWSLETTERS	22.2%
E MAILS	14.8%
INTRANET	
OTHER-please indicate	3% (Posters)

The union reps have indicated a wide variety of methods to ensure that the union message was delivered. The most popular was meetings with a 44.4% response, with the use of newsletters, fact sheets and email bulletins being used extensively.

41a. Have you drafted in more activists to become representatives to help you with this process?

YES 29.6%
 NO 51.8%
 DON'T KNOW

The high percentage of respondents who answered no to this question mentioned that for many the process was not far enough along to allow them to do this, and there was also a feeling among staff who may have been interested in becoming a rep that the job evaluation process is so complicated and the training quite time consuming that it is putting them off becoming a rep. For those who responded yes 29.6%, the reps had received a good response which in turn had helped to share the workload.

42a. Are committees and the role analysts / job evaluators as representative of the staff as possible.

YES 37%
 NO 40.7%
 DON'T KNOW 11%
 STILL NEGOTIATING 3%

42b. Have women and those from under-represented ethnic groups been encouraged to come forward where there is a lack of volunteers from those groups?

YES 48%
 NO
 DON'T KNOW 3%

Reps have indicated that in many cases management have not attempted to be representative, but the reps are trying to get people from all groups of staff, all disciplines and especially from minority groups. However a number of reps said this has proved difficult, as many members are unwilling to spend time training away from their departments. Reps are trying to emphasise the importance of understanding the scheme and how it works to all staff and also to encourage others to become more involved.

43. How regularly do you communicate with members on the process?

WEEKLY	
MONTHLY	29.6%
Quarterly	3%
WHENEVER THERE IS NEWS	51.8%
OTHER – please indicate	14.8%

Although the highest response rate was for whenever there is news with 51.8%, many reps mentioned that they communicate frequently with the staff to ensure there is a steady flow of information from

the union. However a number of reps did say that they felt they did not communicate enough with the staff and that they would be making a conscious effort to do this. It is apparent that facilities time for key reps holds the key to good communications with staff, a number of institutions recognise this and have ensured that the reps have this facilities time but there are still a number who have not agreed this and the reps have to engage in the job evaluation process as well as doing their full time job, a situation that is proving difficult for a number of reps.

44. How well are things working with other unions in your university (AUT, Unison, GMB etc)

EXCELLENT WORKING RELATIONSHIP	
HAVE A JOINT NEGOTIATING TEAM	14.8%
WORKING WELL	51.8%
NOT WORKING WELL	3%
DISTINCT LACK OF COMMUNICATION	
NO JOINT WORKING AT ALL	3%
AS WELL AS CAN BE EXPECTED	11%

The table shows that for the most part the joint union teams are working well and communicating. A number of institutions have joint negotiating teams and these are proving useful when covering the very various job bands in the higher education sector. A couple of reps said that there was no joint working with other unions at their institution as there had been problems with the AUT reps coming on board and wanting to work independently. The Amicus reps were being the most proactive in the view of the respondents and were driving the campaign to ensure the unions were fully involved in the decision making process.

45. Do you have plans to ballot staff when your institution completes the evaluation and before it impacts on members' salaries?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	55.5%
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
DON'T KNOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.8%
NONE AS YET	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%
STILL NEGOTIATING	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.4%
ALREADY BALLOTTED	<input type="checkbox"/>	3%

The largest percentage of respondents (55.5%) said they would be balloting members once the process had been completed. The feeling was that many Amicus members thought the job evaluation was a good idea but the process itself was quite problematic and there were concerns about staff gradings. The reps also felt that as the whole process was so complex it was important to get the formal ratification from the members to legitimise the huge changes involved.

Section 11: The Future – Amicus Recommendations

Our survey has shown that the Job Evaluation process is proving much more complex and divisive than originally acknowledged. Our representatives have indicated where their institution is regarding this process, and in completing this survey they have suggested the following recommendations for the further implementation of Job Evaluation and for those institutions about to start the process.

- Further work needs to be done to encourage institutions to adopt and implement partnership working
- The lack of data exchange needs to be addressed by Amicus and the software providers
- All Higher Education institutions should be encouraged to undertake equal pay reviews
- Institutions should make public their pay grading, boundaries and pay scales
- Those institutions that have not yet started the Job Evaluation process should encouraged to move forward on implementation
- Communication between all parties, regarding Job Evaluation needs to be clear, transparent and open
- Negotiation and consultation is the key to a successful Job Evaluation implementation
- Higher Education institutions should be offering training regarding Job Evaluation to all representatives

Comment

This survey gives us a snapshot on how the implementation of job evaluation is progressing across the Higher Education sector. Its findings in many cases reflect other experiences from the employers association, UCEA and other unions.

The Framework Agreement signed on behalf of Institutions, confirms that implementation will be complete by August 2006. 14.8% of our survey suggests no progress has been made. This bodes badly and suggests some Institutions could be in breach of the Framework Agreement unless things change dramatically. I know this is also a concern of UCEA who are also aware of lack of progress on this item in some areas. Other worrying features include the lack of partnership working in some places. This is manifested by the high number of HR or Vice Chancellors in Institutions who have unilaterally decided which job evaluation scheme to use. Our survey shows over 14% of Institutions have forced through these measures.

On data exchange an even higher number (48%) of union representatives have no access to the software used to process the data. This position should be challenged because if we do not have access to the software its akin to fighting with one hand behind our backs. If representatives are still struggling with this can they please let their local Regional Officer take the matter up or if it is a HERA issue let ECC Ltd owners of the software know about the restrictions. If we add to this the fact that in at least 29.6% of Institutions, our reps report HR have sought to restrict data to trade union reps. It suggests a concerted effort to prevent Trade Union reps from doing their job properly. One can only speculate on the real reasons why HR Managers are so afraid of giving us software access and data.

Only 18% of schemes are committed to an equal pay review but a lot have still to decide. It is a feature of good equal pay principles to apply a review and the Framework also confirms it must take place. We should insist it is done, as of right.

There are still a lot of Institutions yet to get to the point of defining grade boundaries and only 3% of Institutions seem to have got there. Amicus has now got some good grade boundary results that we are able to share with our representatives. On the plus side, and there is a lot we as Amicus can be positive about, many representatives work co-operatively with both management and other unions. The key to successful implementation is developing a partnership approach, working together, sharing the data and results, using trade union reps as part of the job evaluation team and finding imaginative solutions to the implementation process.

Over 62% of institutions that replied have chosen HERA. Lets hope that figure grows, as HERA is the Amicus scheme of choice provided it's applied correctly.

There are an encouraging 33% of Institutions that will have a parity approach to appeal panels. We must strive for more. Over 40% have 50/50 parity on steering committees. Again the best-known experience is that the more Amicus is involved the better the individual feels about the result. The implementation process is poised at a crucial stage and only continued hard work from everyone will ensure the final results benefit our members.

Finally my thanks to all the Amicus representatives who took the time to complete the survey form, Naomi Nicholson R.O in London Region, Janet Golds Research Officer and Vera Titmus in my office for starting, analysing and finishing the survey.

Mike Robinson
National Officer
Education