Preparing Written Rationale for an Appeal

For In-Scope (SGEU) Government Employees

Last revised: August 2021
Last reviewed: December 2021
Next review: December 2022

Saskatchewan

Table of Contents

This document has been prepared by the Joint Union-Management Class Plan Maintenance Committee to assist appellants.

What do I need to get started?

1) The job description form and organization chart that were submitted for the classification review.
2) The classification decision letter.
3) Written rationale from the classification consultant.
4) Access to Factors and Notes to Raters for the factors.
5) Access to Comparative Descriptions (CDs).

The document on Factors, Notes to Raters and CDs can be accessed here or by contacting your Human Resource Business Partner Team.

Note: only those Factors, Notes to Raters and CDs currently on the PSC website are the official documents which can be used for comparison in job evaluation and appeal hearings.

Why should I prepare written rationale for the appeal hearing?

This is your opportunity to leave the appeal panel with your argument in your own words. When you and the consultant leave the room and the appeal panel is deliberating, they will have the consultant's written rationale and your written rationale to refer to rather than relying solely on their notes on what you said in the hearing. After the appeal panel has concluded their deliberations, they forward their recommendation to the Joint Audit Committee (JAC).

As per Article 5.5 D of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), an appeal hearing will not be scheduled until you have provided your written rationale for the factors you are appealing.

The PS/GE Job Description Guide provides information on how to complete the job description form and includes specific guidance for each factor. Rationale takes this one step further by explaining how the examples of work meet the intent of the level definition. "Rationale" is a presentation of how typical job characteristics do, or do not, meet the level definition in a job evaluation factor. The latter half of this document provides some examples. Good rationale is concise and descriptive. **One page or less per factor is sufficient.** The most frequent mistake appellants make other than having no rationale is having too much. Make your point brief and concise so it does not get lost in a lot of details.

What is the make-up of the appeal panel?

The appeal panel consists of four members equally split between union and management. A quorum shall consist of three members subject to the approval of the minority party. Appeal panel members are drawn from employees across the service who have completed training provided by the Joint Class Plan Maintenance Committee.

What is their authority?

The appeal panel can either recommend no change to the existing rating for an appealed factor or recommend to move it up or down.

What is the make-up of the Joint Audit Committee?

The JAC consists of one union and one management representative from the Joint Class Plan Maintenance Committee and they review all the documentation forwarded from the appeal hearing and make the final decision.

What is their authority?

The JAC can either confirm the existing rating for an appealed factor or move it up or down. Decisions of the JAC are final and binding.

How can I assess whether to appeal a factor rating?

1) Read the Factor Definition and Notes to Raters carefully and thoroughly so that you understand what the factor is measuring. The Notes to Raters provide guidance as to how the factor is to be interpreted and applied. They include definitions of words used in the factor. If a word is not defined in the Notes to Raters, then the dictionary definition applies. The Notes to Raters also clarify what the factor considers and what it does not consider. If an item is measured in another factor, the Notes to Raters will refer you to the other factor.

2) Read the full content of the level definition at which your position is currently rated. In reading the level definitions, be careful to read the full definition, not just certain words or phrases. Little words like “and”, “or” and “may” can easily be missed and they are very important. If the statement says you must do x “and” y, both must be done for the position to be at that level. If the statement says you must do x “or” y, then only one must be done for the position to be at that level. If the statement says you “may” do x, then the position could still be at that level even if it does not do x as long as the position meets the rest of the level definition.

3) Review the information already provided on that factor on your job description form.

4) Read the consultant’s rationale and CDs referenced.

5) Read the next higher level definition. Can you make an argument that your position meets the full definition of the higher level? If so, prepare your rationale.

How should I prepare written rationale for the appeal hearing?

1) Briefly outline why the position assignment was submitted for classification review. For example, is this an initial allocation to the class plan due to a scope review or a department being brought into executive government? Was there a change or changes to the job assignment that resulted in a classification review being submitted? If so, what were the changes if they are not already outlined on the job description form?

2) Prepare written rationale for each factor appealed. Rationale should focus on one factor at a time. If a factor has two sides, be clear which side you are appealing. If you are appealing both sides, write separate rationale with supporting CDs for each side of the factor.

3) Provide actual examples of work performed relative to the factor. You can use examples that are already on your job description form or add others that are relevant to the time the review was submitted. An important thing to keep in mind is that the examples of work should relate back to the primary responsibilities on the job description form. The appeal panel will have a copy of the job description form and organization chart and will include that information in their deliberations. Many of the appeal panel members have been working with the class plan for close to 10 years and are very familiar with the CDs. Therefore, if you use an example identical to one described in a CD, the appeal panel will ask for an example specific to your job assignment.

4) Support your rationale by comparing to CDs which demonstrate the higher level and explain how your position is stronger than CDs at the same level your position is currently rated. CDs are examples of various kinds and levels of work. They do not represent all types of work, rather, they exist to represent the different levels in the factors. Therefore, you will not find a CD identical to your whole job assignment. Use them as guides for comparing against examples from your position. When comparing to the CDs to validate a rating on any of the factors, you do a comparison factor by factor, not on a whole job basis. For example, you can look at one CD for factor 1, another CD for factor 2, and so on. DO NOT compare to the ratings of other government positions in your rationale; the panel will not accept this information. Also, comparison to job ads for classification purposes is not valid as job ads are not job description forms and may not give the full understanding of why a position is evaluated at a particular level.

5) Have your out-of-scope supervisor sign off the rationale as being reflective of your job assignment. (By signing, the supervisor is not approving the level you have selected, but is verifying that the examples are part of your job assignment.)

6) Different positions are often responsible for different aspects of the same program. As a result, it is important to ensure that the rationale makes the position's role clear (e.g., between peers and between managers and their staff). Please ensure that the roles and responsibilities provided are indeed those of the position and not of other positions, the branch or the department as a whole.

Note: See page 11 for an example of how to format your rationale.

Things to keep in mind about your appeal.

The appeal hearing is your opportunity to explain why you feel your position should be assigned a particular rating level, not a forum to "negotiate" a higher level (i.e., arguing for a two level move when you really think the position should be one level higher). Remember, the role of the appeal panel is to maintain the integrity of the class plan, not negotiate a middle ground between the level you believe is appropriate based on the assignment and the level the consultant has assigned.

At the appeal hearing, be prepared to answer questions from the appeal panel and the consultant. They will be looking for clarification and explanation of statements you have made. For example, if you have used words in your rationale that are subject to varying interpretation (e.g., assists, coordinates, supports, participates, as required, may, prepares, helps, deals with, handles, etc.) the appeal panel will ask you to explain what you mean.

Unless a term is specifically defined in the Notes to Raters, the dictionary definition of words will be applied by the appeal panel.

If you have asked someone to attend the hearing as your witness, be prepared to ask him/her questions to corroborate your rationale. Please remember the witness must be someone who has factual knowledge about your job assignment and is not there to give their opinion regarding the appropriate level of the position, but to answer questions put to them by you, the appeal panel and/or the consultant. Note: the out-of-scope manager is always invited as a witness.

You may also ask the consultant questions to clarify statements they have made in their rationale.

Only responsibilities that were assigned to your position as of the effective date of the classification review can be considered at the appeal. The appeal panel will not consider any rationale or examples of work related to additional responsibilities assigned since that date. If there has been substantial change to your job assignment since the review was submitted, the appropriate recourse would be to submit another request for review.

What happens after the appeal hearing?

The appeal panel deliberate over the material presented at the hearing. If they require additional information before making a decision on a factor (s) they or the classification consultant on their behalf will ask the employee and/or manager to provide the information. Once the appeal panel have reached consensus they send their recommendation to the Joint Audit Committee. If the appeal panel is not able to reach consensus, they forward the differing arguments to the JAC who make the final decision.

How long will I have to wait for the decision?

The JAC meets on average once a month. Decisions are usually reviewed as they are received unless the appeal is related to others that have yet to be hard. When scheduling appeals, the Appeals Coordinator tries to ensure that related appeals are heard the same day or as close together as possible. Once the JAC have agreed on the final decision, they send the results to the employee via Human Resource Business Partner Team.

Some key points about the factors:

1) Problem Solving

Measures typical problems solved. Think in terms of why the problem exists and what you must do to solve it. What are the possible outcomes?

Provide specific examples of typical problems, issues, challenges or complexities encountered in the position. The key points here are that only three examples are needed and they should be typical problems, not things that happen once in a while. This is because the factor measures the typical problems/preponderance and three examples are enough for an evaluator to determine the appropriate level. Providing too many examples can sometimes result in the position being rated at a lower level.

Most positions have a variety of problems they must solve. For example, some may fit at level 1, some at level 2 and some at level 3. The question is, at which level do the preponderance of the problems fit?

When using the CDs to justify your rationale it is important to read the full description under each factor in the CD, not just part of it. You might find two CDs with the same problems yet they are rated differently because the solutions are different.

2) Decision Making

The “A” side measures authority to make decisions, authority to create policy, and the authority to act outside of an existing policy. One or two examples are enough.

Consideration is not given to the complexity of the decision or the analysis that goes into making the decision as that is measured in problem solving.

The Notes to Raters defines “decision” as making a choice between two or more options. If something happens and there is only one course of action for the position to take, there is no decision. There are six levels of decision making taking into account whether decisions are made within or outside of policy and whether the decisions are reviewed. In order for a decision to be made outside of policy, a written policy statement must exist. As mentioned in the “Suggestions for Approach”, to demonstrate whether a decision is within or outside of regulation or policy, provide a copy of the policy or legislation.

The phrase “for future use by others” means for use by positions other than the position under review.

The “B” side measures the urgency of decisions affecting the well-being of others, or the level of corrective action required to address financial or environmental threat. The frequency is very important and please be specific. Do you make these decisions once a day, once a week, twice a month? One or two examples are enough.

For decisions affecting the well-being of others, consideration is given to the frequency the position makes the decisions and how often the situations escalate to the point of physical danger to others.

For decisions affecting finances or the environment, consideration is given to the frequency the position makes the decisions and the significance of the consequences (i.e., limited, some and significant). The CDs provide examples of what is considered limited, some and significant. There is also a guide at the back of the factor for financial decisions with specific examples of decisions and the CDs to reference. For example, financial decisions of limited consequence are defined as primarily corrections of a checking-matching nature where financial loss has not yet occurred. CD28 is identified as a CD which makes these types of decisions when correcting inaccurate invoices.

A key thing to remember here is that the position must be making a decision to correct a situation caused by someone else. No credit is given to causing harm or loss, nor to correcting your own mistakes.

On both A and B sides, you must be the one making the decisions, not passing them on for further review.

3) Human Relations Skills

The “A” side measures interpersonal skills required to influence others or modify their action/behaviour. The “others” referred to could be anyone internal or external to government except the position’s staff. One or two specific examples are all that is needed.

Here again it is important to read the full definition and not just part of it. For example, the word “calms” is in both level 2 and 3. To determine which level applies to a position you must look at the whole level definition to see the context in which the word is used. At level 2 there is no requirement to resolve the person’s issue once you have calmed them down by establishing a rapport, developing an appreciation of the situation or providing assurances, support and/or empathy. At level 3 there is a requirement to use persuasion or negotiation where programs, actions or decisions are called into question or where it is necessary to convince others to adhere to generally accepted standards. In addition to calming someone down at level 3 positions must sort statements which may be conflicting and provide explanations of standards, regulations and policies in order to expedite action and achieve mutual understanding and acceptance.

The “B” side measures communication skill required to transfer knowledge to others. What is the content and how complex is the information you communicate? Who is the audience and how knowledgeable are they on this subject? What capacity do they have to challenge what you say? Is the information or idea you are presenting generally accepted in the field of study? If it is not generally accepted in the field of study, explain why? One or two specific examples are all that is needed.

4) Responsibility for the Work of Others

Measures shared, occasional and full supervision of others. This factor does not credit responsibility for contract staff – this is measured in other factors.

For “full” supervision the complete content of all five bullets in the Notes to Raters must be met, not just part of them. For “shared” supervision, two or more complete bullets must be met.

Please keep in mind that this information will be cross-referenced with the organization chart. If you state you have 5 FTEs reporting directly to your position, there must be 5 FTEs on the organization chart reporting directly to your position.

5) Job Knowledge

The "A" side measures applied knowledge as obtained through formal education or equivalency. It does not measure what you personally have for education; rather, it measures what level of knowledge the work requires.

When you refer to the CDs you will see that they contain a description of the body of knowledge required and how it is used in the position. At the end of the description on this factor it will indicate how that knowledge is typically obtained.

The "B" side measures the depth and diversity of distinctly different program knowledge. Think of the knowledge you apply in terms of programs, acts, regulations, client-relations, client services, etc. The terms used in the level definitions are subjective. For example, what one person thinks of as being "extensive" another may think of as being "considerable". Therefore, you will not find these terms referenced in the classification consultant's, appeal panel's or Joint Audit Committee's rationale. Rather, the CDs demonstrate the intent of the different levels. As a result, this side of the factor can only be rated using the CDs.

When appeal panels and the Joint Audit Committee are reviewing the rationale submitted by the classification consultant and the Appellant on Factor 5B, they have to make a determination as to which CDs the job is more like in terms of depth and/or breadth of program knowledge.

The CDs contain a description of the body of knowledge required and how it is applied in the position. It is important to take note of both as two CDs may have the same body of knowledge but be rated differently because of how the knowledge is applied. For example, one position may be applying the knowledge to answer general inquiries about a program while another position is reviewing and approving/denying applications for funding for the program which requires a greater depth of knowledge about the program. It is helpful to look at a range of positions to narrow down the rating. Look at CDs that are rated the same level as your position, look at some rated one level lower, and some rated one level higher to get a feel for the progression from one level to another. And again, it is important to read all the content written in the CD. There may be four or five paragraphs on this factor in the CD. It is the full content that justifies the rating assigned, not just part of it.

The sectioned called Suggestions for Approach further explains to read the full content of the whole CD for knowledge application. For obvious reasons, not all the knowledge applications are likely to be written in the knowledge statements as to do so would require rewriting the entire CD in the Knowledge factor.

When comparing to the CDs explain how your position is equivalent to or higher than the CD you have chosen. Does your position have the same breadth of knowledge and knowledge application as the CD? Does your position have the same breadth of knowledge but greater application and therefore warrants being rated higher than the CD?

Notes for the last three factors.

If you are appealing any of the last three factors, you must provide information specific to your position as laid out on the job description form as opposed to referring only to CDs.

It is the same work week that is being evaluated on these factors, as such, even if you only appeal one of the last three factors, the appeal panel will review all three factors based on the information provided.

We realize that the information you provide here is your best estimate of how many hours a week on average are spent on the different activities and look for reasonableness given the nature of the work and information provided on the other factors.

The appeal panel also does a reasonableness check for activities that cannot logically happen in the position. For example, if a position works a 36 hour week and spends 30 hours keyboarding, it cannot also spend 12 hours walking as the total hours for each factor cannot exceed the work week.

The Suggestions for Approach (after the Notes to Raters) explains how to calculate the overall rating for these factors.

6) Working conditions

Measures the disagreeable conditions in which you must work. The Representative Examples in the factor identify which level certain activities are credited. Not all positions have disagreeable conditions for the entire work week so the hours on this factor may be less than the full work week but cannot exceed the regular hours of work for the position.

7) Demand

Measures physical and mental demand inherent in the job assignment. Consideration is given to physical demand, sensory demand required for exactness and mental demand from interaction with others. Hours must total the number of regular hours you work per week.

8) Coordination

Measures speed and/or accuracy requirement for performing physical tasks. Any hours that do not require either speed or accuracy of physical movement are defaulted to level 1 where neither speed nor accuracy of physical movement is a major consideration. Level 2 gives credit to activities where either speed or accuracy of physical movement is required and level 3 gives credit to activities where both are required. There is a guide at the back of the factor indicating which activities would meet the different levels.

As soon as people see the word “accuracy” they usually think of mental accuracy. It is important to remember this factor is measuring “physical” accuracy, not mental accuracy. For example, adding up the numbers correctly for the total points on this factor is mental accuracy and is measured in Demand. However, the physical act of writing the numbers requires physical accuracy and is measured in this factor.

APPELLANT RATIONALE FORMAT EXAMPLE

Appellant Rationale

Name of Employee:

Working Title:

Entity (Ministry):

MIDAS Position Number:

I am appealing the following factors:

Factor	Current Rating	Desired Rating

Background

What was the reason for the classification review?

Sample:
The position was submitted for review in September 2006 due to assignment of new duties:

- *Processing administration invoices (i.e., S4's, business expense claims, reimbursement of loss)*
- *Automation of the invoice process*

Factor: ________

See sample rationales for how to write your argument for changing the level.

____
Out-of-scope Manager's Name

____
Out-of-scope Manager's Signature

Some examples of written rationale:

Example of Rationale for level 3 on Problem Solving (Factor 1)

I believe this position should be rated at level 3 on problem solving as the majority of problems involve analyzing information (e.g., water chemistry, fish populations, pond characteristics) regarding the development of new fish enhancement projects or assessment of existing projects, comparing to established criteria (e.g., technical standards, policies) and using judgment in choosing from a variety of possible approaches (e.g., lowering or raising water levels in a pond) where outcomes are predictable but not certain.

For example, the position receives reports that northern pike (i.e., predatory species) have been introduced into a trout pond threatening to eventually destroy the fishery. The position samples the pond (e.g., test netting, electrofishing) to determine the fish population (i.e., species, size and number), compares the benefits of rehabilitating the pond now (i.e., lowering the water level of the pond to the point where oxygen depletion would take place during the winter) or later, thereby allowing the remaining trout (i.e., those large enough to be desirable to anglers) to be angled until their numbers are low enough to warrant pond rehabilitation, and raising or refilling the pond again before restocking the pond.

I see this as similar to CD178, Fisheries Technician whose problems relate to the collection of fish eggs, rearing of the fish and stocking lakes. For example, when the fish in the tanks are not feeding, the CD checks to see if the water flow has been interrupted, or if the level of oxygen is high enough in the water based on guidelines for the capacity of the tank, assessing the fish for disease and oxygen stress, determining the reasons that the fish are not feeding and making adjustments to the water quality, taking measures to get the water flowing again, or treating the fish (e.g., inoculations) to restore their health.

I believe the level of problem solving required of the position is greater than CD243, Fire Tower Worker whose typical problems include confusion between towers regarding the location of a "smoke". In order to resolve this problem, the CD discusses the location of a smoke with other tower workers who can also see it, to ensure that the accurate location is called in to the District Depot. This involves checking to ensure that equipment is operating correctly, discussing the location of the smoke with the other towers to ensure they are operating their equipment properly.

This does not require the same level of research, the number of variables affecting the solution, nor the number of choices to choose from to resolve the typical problems encountered in the position under appeal.

Example of Rationale for level 6 on Problem Solving (Factor 1)

I believe that the position should be rated at level 6 as it describes the typical type of problem the position is required to identify and resolve.

Level 6 requires identification of problems through in-depth research of issues, evaluation of the outcomes of potential solutions and/or the evaluation of programs. An example of this from the position is the identification that provincial service delivery models are outdated and do not adequately address current child welfare issues such as increasing incidents of family violence and deaths of children from abuse or neglect. The position makes this determination by:

- In-depth research of issues by reviewing statistics on issues such as family violence, deaths of children related to abuse or neglect, etc.;
- **Evaluating existing departmental programs** to determine how services are currently delivered, who services are currently targeted to, and **whether they are accomplishing stated program goals**; and,
- Researching and analysing programs and treatment modalities used across North America for application to Saskatchewan including evaluation of the outcomes of these potential solutions.

At level 6, solutions require the development and integration of programs and longer-term strategic alternatives involving various possible outcomes, that others deliver, in order to achieve overall service delivery goals. For example, developing and implementing a new case management model that will be used by all provincial Family and Youth Services Workers (across the various programs) to reduce family violence and deaths of children related to abuse or neglect. This involves:

- designing a new case management model to address current and projected future child welfare issues that provides integrated services to clients who receive services from more than one program area and/or as they move from one program to another;
- creating teams to test the newly designed case management process and tools (e.g., risk assessment, ecomaps, genograms, behavioural specific outcomes);
- modifying the model based on problems and concerns identified by the committee;
- developing a practices and procedures manual to be used during orientation, training and for daily reference for use by others;
- determining pertinent information to be collected by an automated information system that will be used in developing and measuring the effectiveness of Family and Youth Services programming to assess the various possible outcomes;
- developing provincial training courses and implementation schedules; and,
- setting service delivery goals based on the new model and evaluating its effectiveness by analysing statistics to determine if there is a decline in the number of family support contacts and the number of children from the family currently in care and, if there is, assessing if the decline is related to use of the case management model.

I believe that this is equivalent to the CDs rated at level 6 and stronger than CDs at level 5 such as CD175 which conducts specific research projects and program and policy evaluations that do not typically require development **and integration of programs** and longer-term strategic alternatives. For example, lack of operating information to evaluate the effectiveness of a proposed program (e.g., province-wide income security program for youth). Rather, the position is responsible for designing a case management model that integrates the needs of all the program areas and will be used by all program areas.

Example of Rationale for Level B on Level of Corrective Actions to Address Financial Threat – (Factor 2 - B side)

This position should be rated at Level B as it meets the paragraph stating that at least once per week, and including daily, makes corrective decisions which directly alleviate financial loss, or environmental hazards; corrective actions are of limited consequence. According to the representative examples for financial decisions, corrective decisions of limited consequence are rated at Level B if they occur at least weekly and Level A if they occur less than weekly.

Limited consequence is defined as being primarily corrections of a checking-matching nature where financial loss has not yet occurred.

Although many corrective decisions are checked again in central office (e.g., time sheets, CVA, employee entitlements, etc.), there are still weekly corrective decisions that this position makes independently that are the final check.

Typical examples from the position include:

- Financial loss occurs when vendors are over charging on their invoice submissions, submit invoices for goods we have not received or send the wrong supplies and when contractors do not fulfill the terms of their contract. Corrective decisions include correcting the invoice, returning goods, exchanging goods, negotiating a different price or refund or enforcing contract specifications.

This is similar to CD97, Contract Administrator which is rated level B: When contractors issue an invoice for an incorrect amount, makes a corrective decision to contact the contractor, clarify the amount and issue the cheque in the correct amount. These actions occur weekly.

The position warrants being higher than CD98, Administrative Assistant which makes the same types of decisions but only on a monthly basis and is therefore rated at level A. According to the level definitions, the position makes these decisions of limited consequence on a weekly basis which is level B.

Example of Rationale for Level D on Level of Corrective Actions to Address Financial Threat – (Factor 2 - B side)

This position should be rated at Level D as it meets the paragraph stating that at least once per week, and including daily, makes corrective decisions which directly alleviate financial loss, or environmental hazards; corrective actions are of significant consequence. According to the Representative Examples for Financial decisions, corrective decisions of significant consequence are rated at Level D if they occur at least weekly and Level C if they occur less than weekly.

Significant consequence is defined as being primarily significant intrusion into systems affecting how many people in the organization do their work, involving large dollar amounts, or significant intrusion into an individual's whole finances.

Typical examples from the position include:

- Financial loss to the government occurs through non-payment of taxes by large provincial national and multi- national companies. Corrective decisions involve levying tax assessments, penalties and interest amounts and approving tax exemptions. These decisions occur on a daily basis.

This is similar to CD37, Senior Business Auditor which is rated level D for making daily decisions of significant consequence by levying tax assessments on large national and multi- national companies.

The position warrants being higher than CD39, Business Auditor which makes the same types of decisions but with regards to small provincial vendors and consumers in the retail and contracting industries which is considered to be of less financial consequence and is therefore rated at level C.

Example of Rationale for level 3 on Human Relations Skill (Factor 3 - A side)

I believe the position should be rated at level 3 on Human Relations Skill for the following reasons:

The position is required to negotiate contract agreements with a variety of parties to research and write nominations for the Canadian Register of Historic Places (CRHP).

The position is required to meet with contractors to explain required change requests to CRHP nominations submitted for approval, determine issues, concerns and misunderstandings, review the documentation standards and CRHP nomination policies and explain the necessity of following established protocols.

This meets level 3 for achieving understanding through persuasion and negotiation where programs are called into question and it is necessary to convince others to adhere to standards and negotiation of terms and conditions in contracts including commitment of time and resources.

I see this as comparable to the following CDs:

- CD201, Student Aid Consultant which clarifies the client's concern/situation, re-evaluates applications for program funding and explains eligibility requirements to students and Post Secondary Institutions. Like the position, the CD explains program criteria that must be met in order to meet eligibility requirements.
- CD147, Housing Inspector which negotiates costs with contractors (e.g., the cost of changes to be done that were not in the original contract; when a tender comes back, if the lowest bid is much higher than what this position considers reasonable).

I see this as stronger than the following CD:

- CD94, Manifest Processing Supervisor which interacts with dealers who dispute an invoice, reviews the invoice specifics with the dealer in order to clarify and gain an understanding of the situation, and corrects identifiable errors. If the dealer continues to dispute the invoice or if there is no agreement regarding the corrections to be made, the problem is referred to the District Inspector or the Field Services Manager for resolution. Unlike this CD, the position is expected to resolve the situation and go into a more detailed explanation of program requirements in order to achieve agreement.

Example of Rationale for level 5 on Human Relations Skill (Factor 3 – A side)

I believe that the position should be rated at level 5 as it describes the typical type of situations in which the position is required to use interpersonal skill to influence others. Level 5 requires achieving consensus on strategies, policies or standards where the majority of situations have substantial diversity of client/interest groups, conflicting values, and disagreements on resource commitments, rights, privileges, benefits. The Notes to Raters indicate that at this level, the position must be assigned the lead responsibility where there are three or more groups who must reach consensus. A typical example from the position is achieving consensus on the strategy to integrate immigrants and refugees into mainstream society.

There are conflicting and competing interests and philosophies between (three or more stakeholders) departments, third-party service providers (e.g., Sask. Learning, Community Resources, regional colleges, SIAST, minority advocacy groups). Competing interests and philosophies centre around:

- a department's mandate to train and increase the labour participation of Saskatchewan residents, which includes aboriginal groups, conflicts with efforts to integrate immigrants into the labour market;
- declining federal funding for non-government agencies, causing continuation of services to be threatened, increasing inter-agency conflict; and
- a stakeholder's mandate clearly regarding a minority group as its sole priority which conflicts with needs of other minority groups.

The position is required to lead the stakeholders to view immigrant and refugee programs as critical to the province's socio-economic success and achieve consensus on levels of support for the clients (e.g., levels of education/training, income support, social programming). The position achieves consensus through joint stakeholder consideration of funding and other options, and developing agreed upon recommendations and/or strategies until long-term solutions are achieved. This includes challenging traditionally held views that immigration should remain a federal responsibility, addressing the ongoing resource and mandate conflicts between community-based settlement agencies and institutional service providers through multi-party consensus building.

I believe this is consistent with CD203, Specialized Livestock Development Specialist which represents the department (Ag and Food) and advocates indigenous animal industry development to the technical advisory committee on domestic indigenous animal farming, comprised of provincial environmental and wildlife groups, federal representatives and representatives of agri- businesses and industries. Though the topic is different the CD requires the same skills as the position to achieve consensus on such divisive issues as the utilization of indigenous animals for farming, development and controls of the industries, support for paid hunting, enforcement measures and costs, and response to designated diseases and develops agreements with Environment on the respective authorities vis-à-vis indigenous animals and the mutual commitment and actions to take with respect to paid hunting and using crown lands for indigenous animal farming.

The complexity of human relations skill required of the position is greater than CD51, Petroleum and Natural Gas Tech in that there are more parties at the table, each with different view points and the position is required to get them to reach consensus rather than convince them of the action to take based on its assessment of the situation and recognized position as a mediator.

Also, the issues at stake for the position are broader and more complex (e.g., strategies) than the CD which typically resolves specific complaints between a landowner and oil/seismic company.

Example of Rationale for Level B on Transfer of Knowledge (Factor 3 – B side)

The position requires that knowledge be transferred to others through presenting, demonstrating or teaching in oral or written form. For example, the position replies to inquiries from and instructs other office staff, Building Managers, Building Operators, other building staff, some who have strong dialects where English is not their first language, on the various processes within SPM (i.e., Human Resource policies, Payment Unit procedures, contract and tendering procedures, client charge-backs on Job Requisitions). With client charge-backs on Job Requisitions, the position instructs them on the processes involved, in person, by telephone or by e-mail making sure the person understands each step or gives them a document the position has written on the Job Requisition process and reviews it with them until sure they understand the process and how to carry it out.

I believe this is equivalent to the following CDs rated level B:

- CD97, Factor 3B
  "Delivers information at seminars relating to policies and procedures of the tendering process, work orders, contract administration and awards, specification content, Builders' Lien and Workers Compensation Board legislation, to staff, housing authority personnel, local contractors and field workers. Communicates with tenants and local contractors of northern communities where caller has different dialects and may have difficulty stating their concerns and/or understanding explanations."

- CD103, Factor 3B
  "Communicates verbally with customers, with strong dialects, where English is not their first language, when answering inquiries, issuing permits and explaining policies and regulation."

I believe this is stronger than the following CD rated at level A which is not communicating with people who have strong dialects:

- CD90, Factor 3B
  "Responds to inquiries from other court house employees and police forces regarding information on specific tickets and general payment procedures. Responds to general informational inquiries from the public (e.g., how is the fine calculated for a speeding charge; the violation is identified on their ticket with a number but is not spelled out and they want to know which violation is referred to on their ticket [e.g., vehicle over width, vehicle over weight]).

Example of Rationale for Level B on Program Knowledge (Factor 5 – B side)

I believe the position should be rated at Level B as it requires the following knowledge:

- Building, Operating and Maintenance terminology
- SPM administrative policies, procedures and organizational structure
- Government filing system
- Visual Identity Standards

This knowledge is applied in processing invoices/employee forms, maintaining filing systems and responding to inquiries.

I believe this is similar to the following CDs rated at level B:

- CD28 Invoice Clerk which requires knowledge of the government payment policies contained in the Financial Administration Manual pertaining to when interest is paid, when a payment is considered late and what information is required from suppliers. Knowledge is required to explain policies to staff and to comply with standards when processing payments. The position requires similar depth and diversity of knowledge in terms of processing invoices and responding to payment inquiries.

- CD102 Programs Typist which requires knowledge of the Corrections Management Information System and department policy regarding release of information on inmate status in order to retrieve information from the system and respond to inquiries. Requires knowledge of program policies in order to develop and complete forms and to follow procedures for visits and telephone requests. Requires knowledge of administration policies and contracts to order supplies, call for equipment service and repair and to direct deliveries. Requires knowledge of the visual identity program in order to format documents to government standards. The position requires similar depth and diversity of knowledge in terms of administrative procedures and policies within a branch.

Application of knowledge in terms of providing administrative support to a branch is also similar. I believe this is stronger than the following CD rated at level A:

- CD244 Pasture Rider which requires an understanding of the department procedures and methods used in the pasture. Knowledge is applied in the provision of care to client’s cattle (grazing, water, salt) and for maintaining pasture facilities. The position requires a greater diversity of program knowledge than this CD.

Example of Rationale for level C on Program Knowledge (Factor 5 – B side)

I believe the position should be rated at level C, not level B on Program Knowledge.

The position requires the following program knowledge in order to provide clients and stakeholders with explanations such as how to qualify for program funding, to redirect clients to partner agencies (e.g., Community Living, Aids to Independent Living), to explain how award nominations are gathered, to explain to employers the amount of wages the department will commit to salaries for summer students, etc.:

- Adult Basic Education Program, Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Program, Proficiency Awards Program, New Careers Program, Partnerships Program, Job Start, Accreditation Policy, Home Based Education Policy, Integrated School Linked service, Student Loans, Apprenticeship and Trade Certification, Federal/Provincial Summer Language Bursary Programs, Core Curriculum and Common Essential Learning policies.

In addition to these department programs and policies, the position requires knowledge of the School Divisions, schools, programs, special schools (e.g., French immersion, community schools, bilingual schools, and independent schools) in order to provide clients and stakeholders with information and to refer to appropriate channels.

The position also requires knowledge of government billing codes and processes in order to complete S4s, S5s and remit office expenditures for payment.

This application of program knowledge is similar to CD109 which is a Regional Secretary and similar to the position. However, the position requires a greater diversity of program knowledge that not only requires knowledge of all the programs in the department, but also extends beyond the department to the School Divisions etc.

Therefore, the position should be rated one level higher than CD109 and equivalent to CD 108, Client Services Representative which requires program knowledge of all the programs in the department as well as external agencies (e.g., SERM, Health, federal/provincial programs, industry sector programs).

Example of Rationale for Factors 6, 7 and 8

I believe the following is an accurate breakdown of hours for the position which would result in Factor 7 moving from level 2 to level 3.

Activity	Hours	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
Working with others	4	-	4	4
Facilitate meetings – angry not hostile	4	4	4	4
Deadline pressures while on computer	5	5	5	5
Additional computer work	9	9	9	9
Calculator	6	6	6	6
Research/reading	8	-	8	8
Total	**36**	**24**	**36**	**36**

Factor 6 – 1A

Level	Activity	Hours	Points
3	Keyboarding	14 (5 of which under deadlines)	
		Total: 14	**74**
2	Calculating	6	
	Meeting with angry people	4	
		Total: 10	**49**
Grand Total			**123**

Factor 7 – 3A

Level	Activity	Hours	Points
2	Keyboarding	14	
	Meeting with angry people	4	
	Calculating	6	
	Research/reading	8	
		Total: 32	**236**
1	Meeting with people	4	
		Total: 4	**31**
Grand Total			**267**

Factor 8 – 2A

Level	Activity	Hours	Points
3	Keyboarding with deadline pressures	5	
		Total: 5	**70**
2	Calculating requiring physical accuracy	6	
	Keyboarding requiring physical accuracy	9	
		Total: 15	**70**

1	All the rest	16	
		Total: 16	**31**
Grand Total			**171**