

Concepts Not Directly Measured

For In-Scope (SGEU) Government Employees

Last revised: September 2020

Last reviewed: September 2020

Next review: September 2021

Table of Contents

Service Integration	3
Teams	3
Specific Job Evaluation Principles Relating to This Issue.....	3
Definitions	4
Job Evaluation and Cooperative Endeavour	4
Job Evaluation and Individual Responsibility	4
Job Evaluation and Managerial Style	5
How It Works.....	6

Aspects of work and managerial goals are not necessarily measured directly, as specific factors in and of themselves, but through a determination of how the factors measure that aspect of work.

1. Service Integration

Service Integration can be defined as the responsibility to ensure various organizations, or people therein, coordinate the delivery of service to their clients.

Within the organization, service integration is measured as legitimized authority to change policy or its interpretation, as well in problem-solving based on level of complexity and planning, and as such, may be evaluated at several levels based on the specific assignment.

As positions have no authority to change methods of work in another agency, service integration is achieved by influencing which is directly measured in human relations skill.

One position's role may be to provide explanations, while another may be to negotiate agreements with clients/stakeholders involving resources, rights and privileges. These two aspects of work are clearly of different value.

Service integration should be an expectation in every job and employees should have a clear understanding of what authority and influence they can exercise to achieve integration in carrying out their work.

A separate service integration factor would duplicate the above measures.

2. Teams

Specific Job Evaluation Principles Relating to This Issue

- 1) Measure the job assignment, not the person.
- 2) Measure the job assignment, not how well the job is being done (performance).
- 3) Measure the job assignment, not the working title.
- 4) Measure the employer's assignment of duties, not union roles assigned by the union. (Co-opts the union's role if management can dictate, as part of the job assignment and pay, how the union role is performed.)

Definitions

In order for us to understand the relationship of teams to job evaluation, some protocol relating to the usage of words such as "team", "project team" and "task team" is required.

The first form of team is the work unit. For the purpose of the job evaluation plan, however, a "work unit" is defined as a group of individuals reporting to a common supervisor, assigned to perform a permanent, ongoing function.

The second form of team is the "project team", which is created to accomplish a specific goal and the team members leave their home work unit for an extended period. Once the goal is achieved, the team is disbanded and individuals return to their home work unit. Alternately, you could have a permanent work unit, whose purpose is varying project assignments.

Another form of team is a "task team", which has an ongoing role, but the individuals retain their work unit role, as well as occasionally meet as a member of the team. Their role is one of consultation and input, based upon their specialized skill.

Any form of organized cooperation that brings people together for the purpose of achieving a common goal is a team.

Job Evaluation and Cooperative Endeavour

Working together cooperatively is a basic expectation of every job and not something for which an employer should pay extra.

While it is evident that quality of problem resolution is better if inclusive, quality is a matter of expectation and performance, not job evaluation.

A manager who expects good quality decision making should expect any individual charged with achieving specific outcomes to involve others that are affected, in other words, to achieve their own form of organized cooperation. This is teamwork and an expectation of every employee.

Assuming all individuals on a team have exactly the same job assignment, it must be recognized that job evaluation does not recognize differences in performance contribution.

Job Evaluation and Individual Responsibility

1) The concept of teamwork presupposes individually assigned responsibility as a prerequisite. In other words, the concept of a team cannot exist without acknowledging that individuals (on the team) must have an assigned responsibility to contribute to a common outcome.

- 2) Any set of duties and responsibilities could be assigned to either an individual, or a team.
- 3) Individuals on a team may have very different duties and responsibilities, differing levels of authority, etc.
- 4) When an employee is hired, we contract for a specific set of responsibilities in exchange for a specific salary. This is known in law as an employment contract.

We do not contract with a group of people or a team. To do so would require clarity at the onset that the team was a form of corporation and that non-performance of duties would constitute discipline, or dismissal of the team as a whole.

Because in law our employment contract is with the individual, the evaluation of that job must be based on the assignment to the individual.

The responsibility to represent one's own job on inter-branch, or inter-agency committees, task, or project teams does not automatically represent a change in the value of the job. Employees who have not been performing such roles and are now being asked to do so are not necessarily doing a higher level assignment.

- 5) It is not possible to create a work environment where all assignments can be team-based. For example, some work is performed in geographic isolation and decisions are of such urgency that they cannot be deferred.

In such cases, employees must be delegated independent authority. Examples include child protection, interventions in correction facilities, etc.

A separate teamwork job evaluation factor would, by definition, evaluate such jobs at lower levels than those who can share the decision making process with others. This would not be perceived as equitable, particularly as the same, or even of a more consistent and high quality of judgement is expected of those employees.

Job Evaluation and Managerial Style

There are four types of managerial approaches:

- 1) *Autocratic Managerial Control* - Where the manager makes the majority of operating and policy decisions. Typically, this model is used where staff are new to the organization, however, it is expected that as staff become more experienced, the managerial control will progress toward the participative model.
- 2) *Participative Management* - Where the staff make the majority of operating decisions, seek advice from each other on areas of expertise, use their own judgement as to when to take problems to the manager and contribute to policy decisions. The manager reserves the right

to intervene, involves staff in a participatory and consensus way in problem and policy resolution, as well as goal setting and retains accountability.

- 3) *Rotational Management* - Where all team members contribute to all roles, but each member has an area of expertise for which they are assigned an area of managerial accountability. In this context, all members of the team supervise all other members of the team, as it relates to their specific managerial assignment.
- 4) *Self-Directed Teams* - Where all responsibilities are shared equally amongst all members.

In an attempt to move the culture of the organization toward a more participative style, we change working titles from manager or director to team leader and call employees team members.

The title of the person has no effect on the level in job evaluation.

What we must examine is the authority exercised by the team leader, supervisor, or manager and the authority exercised by the employees.

An organization might choose to create a team culture by removing a level of supervision. However, the nature of the job assignment might be lessened by having the authority of employees lessened in the same process.

The creation of a team does not automatically assume higher level duties - teams can be created and duties lessened in the process.

As a principle, should assignments to committees and teams begin to affect job evaluation based on managerial style, do we wish to move to postings/challenges/advertisements for team participation?

How It Works

- 1) The entire assignment to the individual is evaluated.
- 2) All the job evaluation factors come into play, based on the whole assignment. Team responsibility is not given consideration independently from the rest of the duties.

Some Job Evaluation Factor Highlights:

- Human Relations Skill measures the skill exercised in influencing others and transferring knowledge. These skills are the primary distinguishing elements of what we call teamwork. Such skill is evaluated at varying levels based on the specific assignment.

- Problem Solving measures planning effort required to achieve increasing levels of program and service integration. "Service integration" is what some of us define as one of the critical purposes of teamwork.

Both of these job evaluation factors presuppose individually assigned levels of responsibility to achieve cooperative outcomes.

- Job Knowledge is measured directly based on the overall assignment, in terms of education and program specific knowledge.
- Decision Making measures the level of independence. Not all members of a team may be given the same level of authority, depending upon their experience. In this instance, team members with similar duties would be differentially evaluated. Similarly, different teams performing similar duties could be differentially evaluated.
- Responsibility for the Work of Others is measured as a responsibility. It does not distinguish jobs based on how the job exercises this responsibility in an autocratic, or participative way. Clearly, there are appropriate times for either approach. This factor does not measure how recipients of supervision are affected.
- Finally, the assignment is viewed in terms of Risk, Demand and Dexterity required to perform those duties. This can differ for different assignments.

3) Public Involvement

Public involvement is defined as involving the public in the decision making process of government. This is a new way of doing business, much the same as expectations around teamwork and service integration.

Such involvement is of varying degrees of influence and complexity and can range from advising the public of decisions, to soliciting their input, to jointly developing the decisions as equal partners. The trend in government is towards increased partnerships.

A separate public involvement factor would be a direct duplication of other measures, particularly human relations, and complexity.

4) Authority/Independence/Empowerment

Decision-making measures responsibility in terms of the degree of authority a position has to act independently of its supervisor (empowerment).

Responsibility for the Work of Others measures the aspects of other peoples work for which the position is held accountable.

5) Accountability

You are only accountable if you have independent authority to make decisions.

A separate accountability factor would therefore duplicate this measure.

6) Recommendations

All positions are expected to make recommendations to improve service. As such, we cannot differentiate between jobs on the basis of the responsibility to **make** recommendations.

7) Knowledge-based pay

A growing trend in compensation is towards knowledge-based pay. The information explosion and the expectation that the future is largely dependent on trade in knowledge is the key reason for this development.

The concept of knowledge-based pay has given rise to confusion with respect to how compensation should be attached to job assignments. At its worst interpretation we should pay the individual based on the knowledge that the person possesses, irrespective of the assigned duties. As an extreme example, this would mean paying the labourer on the highways crew, who happens to have a Phd in psychology, as a psychologist.

As the line between job assignment and knowledge required for the job assignment becomes narrower, this issues becomes more difficult to separate.

At the outset the employer is obliged, when entering into an employment contract, to establish the assignment. Provision of expectations around the assignment is a requirement to determine if the employment contract is being fulfilled. The knowledge required to carry out the assignment is secondary.

In the context of an existing employee, argument is often made that the specialized education possessed by an individual should be compensated at a higher level. In some cases, this argument is made even though the individual is assigned exactly the same duties as other employees. If, in fact, an individual is using specialized skills, not possessed by others, in the performance of work, then it is only logical to assume that the duties being performed are different from those performed by other employees. Relative to other jobs in the organization, the specialized knowledge must first be needed by the organization for some specific assignment, different from other employees. If this is the case, the assignment can be defined and evaluated by the job evaluation plan.

Equal pay for work of equal value requires that we evaluate skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions. While knowledge is a component of such job evaluation plans it cannot

be the only job evaluation factor. One can assume increasingly complex problems and higher levels of responsibility to be associated with higher levels of education. However, there is not necessarily a direct correlation between complexity or responsibility and formal education, as differing levels of accountability may very well require the same level of knowledge.

8) Confidentiality

Confidentiality is expected of all employees and all public servants swear an oath of confidentiality.

There are no degrees of confidentiality, either you maintain a confidence, or you do not. Although some employees have access to more (volume) confidential information than others, the skill required to maintain a confidence is the same, thus we cannot differentiate one job from another on this basis.

9) The Incumbent's Knowledge

The education and experience of the incumbent are not a consideration in the evaluation of the position's duties. Rather, the knowledge required to perform the duties is measured. For example, a person with a PhD in psychology should not be paid more than a person without a PhD if both are working as labourers.

However, if a person has qualifications which could be used by the employer, the job assignment could be changed. If this occurs the classification would be reviewed.

10) Volume

Volume is not its own job evaluation factor, or a direct measure. Rather, volume is measured as frequency. Volume (e.g., number of phone calls received, documents processed, clients on a caseload) can fluctuate dramatically - both upwards and downwards. Job evaluation based on a direct volume measure would have several negatives for employees:

- Downward movements in "volume" would result in downward reclasses;
- Increases in staffing levels would therefore cause downward reclasses;
- "Volume" cannot be fairly measured from one occupation to another; and,
- The classification plan should not be used as a disincentive to resolutions of excess workload issues.

Problem solving measures which level the preponderance of problems are, decision making, working conditions, mental and physical demand and coordination all include frequency measures.

11) Experience

Jobs require varying lengths of time to learn the position assignment.

Job evaluation factors measure the amount of knowledge required, including learning required after recruitment. How long it takes to learn, or how long the learning curve for specific individuals is not relevant. What matters is the

knowledge that needs to be learned, not the length of the learning experience, which is very individualistic.

A separate experience factor would be a duplicate of knowledge measures.

12) Stress

The stress an individual feels cannot be directly or fairly measured.

Response to such stimuli is entirely individual and variable and can even vary for the individual, based on an individual's mood on a particular day. Further, one person may thrive with many stimuli, while another with the exact same duties, may develop a performance problem. It follows that one cannot measure or compare, with any degree of objectivity, feelings of stress.

Instead we measure the conditions inherent in jobs that produce stress.

13) Consequence of Error

Consequence of error is the reverse of quality of judgement and as such is a performance measure. In such a factor, what becomes measured is the worst-case scenario of what might occur, in the event of inadequate performance.