

Chapter 6

Job evaluation weighting and scoring

Job evaluation weighting and scoring

1.1 Some form of weighting – the size of the contribution each factor makes to the maximum overall job evaluation score – is implicit in the design of all job evaluation schemes. Most schemes also have additional explicit weighting. The rationale for this is generally two-fold. It is unusual for all factors to have the same number of levels because some factors are capable of greater differentiation than others. This gives rise to weighting in favour of those factors with more levels, which may need to be adjusted. It is also the case that organisations place different values on different factors, depending upon the nature of the organisation.

1.2 Weighting was considered by an extended Joint Secretaries Group (JSG) which included Job Evaluation Working Party (JEWPP) members and an independent expert. The group approached weighting by discussing and provisionally agreeing the principles to be adopted. These were then tested on evaluation results, rather than calculating what weighting and scoring would achieve a desired end, which would have carried risks of being indirectly discriminatory.

1.3 The following was agreed:

- Groups of similar factors should have equal weights.
- Weighting for each factor should be of sufficient size to be meaningful so that all individual factors add value to the factor plan.
- There was recognition that the NHS was a knowledge-based organisation, justifying a higher weighting to knowledge than other factors.
- Jobs would score at least one on each factor.
- There was recognition that differentiation worked best when scores were stretched, which could be achieved through a non-linear approach

1.4 A number of models of weighting and scoring were tested. They all had a similar effect on the rank order of jobs. The changes occasioned by different models had a very limited effect. It was agreed that in order to effect significant changes to the rank order, very extreme weighting would need to be applied and this could not be justified.

1.5 The model has a maximum of 1,000 points available. The number of points available for each factor is distributed between the levels on an increasing whole number basis. Within the available maximum number of points for the scheme, the maximum score for each factor has a percentage value, the values being the same for similar factors. The allocation of total points to factors is set out below.

Responsibility: 6 factors: – maximum score 60: – $6 \times 60 = 360$ – 36% of all available points in the scheme.

Freedom to act: 1 factor: – maximum score 60: – $1 \times 60 = 60$ – 6% of all available points.

Knowledge: 1 factor:– maximum score 240: – $1 \times 240 = 240$ –24% of all available points.

Skills: 4 factors:– maximum score for each 60: – $4 \times 60 = 240$ –24% of all available points.

Effort and environmental: 4 factors: – maximum score for each 25: – $4 \times 25 = 100$: – 10% of all available points.