

Guide to Applying the SGEU Classification Plan

Last revised: December 2021

Last reviewed: May 2017

Next review: December 2022

Saskatchewan 

Guide to Application

To fully understand how to properly apply this plan, classification consultants must be fully familiar with the following:

- Notes to Raters, Factor Definitions and examples for each factor;
- Guarding against bias in job evaluation;
- Use and analysis of Comparative Descriptions;
- Evaluation of workplace cultural issues;
- Occupational coding;
- Maintenance Agreement;
- Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value principles; and,
- Steering Committee decisions affecting application of the plan.

Procedure

1. Review the job description to ensure that you have a good understanding of the major duties and responsibilities. Areas requiring further clarification should be noted and clarified during discussion with the manager.
2. Study the organization chart to become familiar with the organizational setting in which the position is located. Take note of the classification level and ratings of other positions and determine the implications of your decision on other positions in the organization and, if possible, other similar organizations in government.
3. During the interview process, examine how the job has been described for the following:
 - a) Is the job described by someone not doing the work?
 - b) Is the job described in terms of expectations (use of complex words), rather than duties and responsibilities?
 - c) Is the job described with value-laden words (e.g., assist, basic, etc.), or performance-related words?
 - d) Are authority levels clearly articulated?
 - e) Is the job described, rather than the program or mandate of the branch or department?
4. Applying the factors:
 - a) Rate the job independently on each factor.
 - b) Examine the rating against similar comparative descriptions to validate your ratings.
 - c) If aspects of work appear to fit at different levels in the factors:
 - Do you have enough accurate information?
 - If a skill factor, the higher level applies.
 - If a responsibility or effort factor, majority duties apply.
5. Examine your classification decision for common errors in evaluating jobs.
 - a) Double Counting:

Double counting the same aspect of work in two or more different job evaluation factors is a common occurrence.

Some causes are:

- Not clearly understanding what the other factors measure.
- Lack of focus on the aspect of work being measured and what factor measures it ("jumping around" to a different aspect of work).

- Poor analysis, or inability to synthesize material.
- Lack of experience in plan application, particularly the Notes to Raters.

b) Transfer Bias:

This is the tendency to rate a job high (or low) on one factor because it rated high (or low) on another factor. Also included here is bias due to historical relationships between occupations. Some causes are:

- Poor application of the factor definition to the job content.
- Pure bias ("if the job has no problems, why does it require so much knowledge?")

c) Hierarchical Bias:

This is the tendency to rate jobs in order of their place in the hierarchy within the organization, perpetuating a hierarchical order of job worth. Where hierarchical structure exists, it is not uncommon for jobs higher in the structure to have more responsibility. However, skill, effort and working condition evaluations may offset responsibility, resulting in jobs lower in the hierarchy being of equal, or greater value. Some causes are:

- Ingrained personal values suggest to the consultant that hierarchical structure should be rewarded. Thus, there is a tendency to want to rate successive supervisory levels higher on knowledge and human relations skills factors.
- It is not necessarily wrong to rate supervisors and employees at the same level on a factor and it is acceptable to have the same ratings at successive levels for some factors, if warranted by the nature of the assignments.

d) Gender Effect:

This is the tendency to rate a job lower if the occupation itself is traditionally a female dominated occupation, or if occupied by a woman. Some causes are:

- Poor application of the factor to job content.
- Not taking into consideration commonly overlooked information.

CLASSIFICATION PROCESS

