

Job Evaluation and Salary Progression Working Party – Minutes 4 April 2013

Venue: Eraring Power Station – Finance Meeting Room

Present: Clare Besley Employee Relations Manager
Karyn Price PSA Representative/ AO
Mark Gill USU Delegate/ PO

Apologies: Shannon Logue EO
Patrick Elsley HR Officer
David Kinsey APESMA Representative/ PO

Item Description
1 Engineering Officer Items

| | Issue/ Comment | HR Comments | HR Proposed Action |
|----|--|---|--|
| 1 | Individual issues can be discussed with TL, HR or, if required, through a dispute | Agreed. No action required | No action |
| 2 | Original JE principles not currently being followed, e.g. employee evaluators not on all panels; employees briefed on JE process prior to commencement | There is always an employee rep on each panel, however an appropriate employee rep will now be consulted on desktop evaluations. The employee who has applied for a JE is always briefed on the process prior to a panel commencing. | No action |
| 3 | Regular external market benchmarking and reported. | Benchmarking is conducted regularly using AIM, APESMA, and the Geoff Nunn Electricity Industry salary surveys. | No action |
| 4 | JE process not transparent, fair and equitable. | It was discussed that this was an opinion. No action required. | No action |
| 5 | Job Analysis | Trained Job Analysts in the HR team. Job Analysis now included in JE Corporate Procedure. | No action |
| 6 | Agreed Position Descriptions | The employee, TL, Group Manager and Exec Manager all sign the Classification Review Request form, which includes a current PD. No action required. | No action |
| 7 | Combine with 14. | | |
| 8 | Employees not involved with development of Position Profiles | It was agreed that employees should be involved with the creation of a PD or PP. | No action |
| 9 | Specific Eraring Energy JE manuals are required. | It is agreed in the EA that we use the Mercer CED methodology – we cannot create our own manuals. No action required. | No action |
| 10 | Qualifications and years of experience are not recognised. | We use the Mercer CED methodology which often considers quals and experience. Our Position Descriptions and Position Profiles also often specify both. | No action |
| 11 | Breadth charts as required for all JE panels | An organisational chart is provided to a JE panel. If the position to be evaluated reports to a contract employee then there is no hierarchical JE to provide. | For further discussion |
| 12 | JE panels can agree or disagree on outcomes. | Agreed - The outcome and HR recommendation of a JE are approved by the Exec Manager and Managing Director. | No action |
| 13 | Employees do not understand the process once a JE has been | Individual employees who request a Classification Review/ JE have the | Further education on the entire Classification |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|----------------------------|
| | completed, i.e. internal and external market salary comparisons. | process explained to them. The Corporate Procedure also provides information. | Review process is required |
| 14 | Employee input not used for new positions through desktop evaluation. | Desktop evaluations only completed for new positions with no incumbent. See point 2. | No action |
| 15 | The EA now recognises the appeals and disputes avenues. | No action required. | No action |
| 16 | Career path planning – job levels and descriptors required. | This is an area that this working party can further discuss. | For further discussion |
| 17 | Combine with 16. | | |
| 18 | Changes to the Mercer CED system are not communicated. | There is now an up-to-date manual available for all employees in the HR area. Any changes that are communicated from Mercer will be forwarded to trained evaluators. | No action |
| 19 | Working party to continue to review the processes and update as required. | Updates to the LCC as required. | Ongoing |

3 **Next Meeting – Confirmation**

Next meeting to be held:
Eraring Power Station – Finance Meeting Room
Thursday 2 May, 2013
2pm

Clare Besley
30 April 2013

Attach.

- 1) Questionnaires sent to EO staff in regard to job evaluation issues the panel received a mixed response we request individuals with outstanding issues pursue this with their team leader and HR or award dispute settlement procedures
- 2) Original job evaluation principles negotiated for the implementation of CED have fallen away and in some cases nonexistent in regard to original agreement to implement Job Evaluation using Mercer CED determined by the IRC.eg, workplace evaluators will sit on all panels, formal briefing of employees prior to je process starting.
- 3) It appears regular benchmarking to determine position value against outside doesn't happen that often. Benchmarking internally and externally should be yearly and should be discussed through the agreed consultation/review process annually.
- 4) Staff feedback is that the job evaluation process is not that transparent and is wanting in fairness and equity there is a perception that positions are being valued lower than previously evaluated positions.
- 5) No position analysis takes place in the context of development of a position description as developed by Mercer CED. Although since the last award this may change consideration should be given to train staff nominated representatives.
- 6) Incumbents who develop their job to a point where it is to be review or evaluated or have a position description developed for must sign off on the position description.
- 7) Job evaluation utilising workplace evaluators appears to be happening infrequently, new positions are being developed and evaluated in house without employee nominated representative involved.
- 8) Employees have not been involved in the development / rating or implementation of the Earning capability framework this should be discussed.
- 9) Specific Earning manuals for job evaluation with recognised descriptors need to be developed in the future.
- 10) Qualification and years experience needs to be recognised as both adding value to the business, recognition of competence as an equal to educational standards needs to be clearly defined in the evaluation process. Knowledge and Experience should be by a competent person to do the job and not be bound by qualification alone, years' of service , knowledge, experience and competence needs to be recognised as an equal not as a barrier.
- 11) Because Breadth is hierarchical in the CED JE process charts need to be developed for evaluators it is our understanding the organisation does not have charts available but individual breadth for a position can be requested.
- 12) Job evaluation panels can have a have an agreed or disagreed outcome and can be signed off as such.
- 13) Feedback to incumbents from the evaluation panel process outcome appears to be inadequate in regard to organisational context or plans and how these impact on the position value some EO's are concerned that a position can be evaluated high only to come out lower after other HR processes take place.
- 14) Desktop evaluations that are being undertaken by Earning Energy that exclude workplace employee input and should be considered.
- 15) Resolution through the appeal/dispute procedures under the enterprise agreement needs to be included in the agreement. This is now in the current award.
- 16) Career path planning for EO appears to be difficult in regard to generic position descriptions and or individual positions with no clear career paths for staff.
- 17) Job levels and descriptors need to be developed for a career path and included in the enterprise agreement.
- 18) Changes or amendments within the Mercer system need to be reviewed in context of perceived advantages or disadvantages and its impact on staff.
- 19) Review process needs to continue in the new enterprise agreement consultative mechanisms so as issues can be discussed jointly with the JE process and career development for engineering officers, admin officer and professional officers.

Endorsed by Engineering Officers 04 April 2013