

Job Evaluation Pay and Grading

Scheme Provider/Job Evaluation Process – Appeals Process

Background

[Paper 2.4 – Job Evaluation Process Proposal](#) and [Paper 2.6 – Appeals Process and Procedure](#) were fully discussed at the College Employers Scotland (CES) meeting on Wednesday 24 September 2025. An output paper – [Paper 8.1](#) was presented to CES at its Business Meeting on Wednesday 1 October 2025, which summarised the overall position on Job Evaluation.

Job Evaluation – Appeals

It is a requirement of Job Evaluation schemes (in general) that the recipient of a Job Evaluation grade should have the ability to appeal against the grade allocated by an evaluation, and therefore that a clearly defined Appeals Procedure/Process be available to facilitate that.

As the National Joint Negotiating Committee (NJNC) National Job Evaluation Scheme being developed arises from a Collective Agreement, and Scottish Government funding for the implementation of the scheme requires joint agreement between CES (the employer) and the recognised trade unions, a scheme is required which includes an Appeal Process that all parties can agree to.

The discussions with the trade unions to date have seen them emphasise the need for full transparency of the Job Evaluation Scheme, including the factors that lead to the graded outcome, and that information should be available to their members and all support staff covered by the Job Evaluation. To that end, the trade unions (primarily Janet Stewart, UNISON Regional Officer and Support Staff Secretary) have pointed to the Appeals Process used in the scheme agreed by the [Scottish Joint Council for Local Government Employees](#) (SJC-JE) as a good example of an open Appeals Process.

The trade union and CES had initially thought that the SJC-JE Appeals Process could be adopted with minimal change and used for the purposes of our National Job Evaluation. A modified Appeals Process based fundamentally on the process within the SJC-JE Scheme was subsequently drafted and shared with ECC for review and comment.

ECC provided a [response](#), stating clearly that they could not and would not entertain the application of the modified SJC-JE Appeals Process for use with the FEDRA scheme, as there would be no sharing of factor scores with employees whose jobs were evaluated.

It should be noted that all parties agree that ECC would carry out accurate evaluations, based on the agreed Job Descriptions that they are provided with, and that if that Job Description is accurate, then the outcome evaluated score will also be accurate.

Employers Only – Job Evaluation/Pay and Grading Working Group (EO-JEPGWG)

ECC's position has been discussed at recent meetings of the EO-JEPGWG. The group highlighted that the original [NJNC – Role Evaluation Process Documentation](#) – agreed in September 2018, supports the trade union position.

Section 3.4 states:

“...All role evaluation element levels and scores for each identified role in each college will be made available to the role holder(s) within each college and included in the notification letter as an attachment.”

During discussions with the group, many members are supportive of the trade union's position on transparency.

Current Position

We may be at an impasse if the trade union maintains its requirement for Scheme transparency and the sharing of factor scores with staff whose roles have been evaluated, while ECC maintains its position that the factor information will not be shared.

Given the potential impasse, the CES Team presented ECC with a series of questions to fully understand their position on this matter. The questions and the ECC response (**Appendix 1**) will be shared with the trade union to consider whether there is room for compromise or whether we are at a point where an alternative scheme/scheme provider may need to be considered.

Recommendations

CES is asked to:

- review and discuss **Appendix 1**
- consider and discuss the implications of the impasse and the consequences of alternatives to ECC/FEDRA.

CES Team
January 2026

CONFIDENTIAL – Questions to ECC and ECC Responses

Questions 9 Jan 2026	ECC Response – 20 January 2026
<p>1. It is accepted that ECC has stated that individuals will not get a breakdown of the factor scores, and that no other client of ECC operates an Appeals process on that basis, but can ECC please explain why that is their position?</p>	<p>Our position is that detailed scores should only ever be shared with a trained Role Analyst.</p> <p>The detailed element scores in themselves are meaningless and potentially misleading without a deep understanding of the FEDRA evaluation process.</p> <p>This is a practice that has been adopted by all our 130 plus members and has been agreed by all trade unions within these member organisations.</p>
<p>2. Could individual colleges be provided with a factor breakdown, as well as the overall score for an individual?</p> <p>a) If that information was provided to a college, could a college choose to share that information with an individual?</p> <p>b) If the answer to Question 2a is 'No', can ECC explain why the information can be shared with the College but not the individual?</p>	<p>Our position is that detailed scores should only ever be shared with a trained Role Analyst, wherever that person is located.</p> <p>We would be prepared to share scores with an individual college HRD (or equivalent) and (with the college's agreement) the recognised trade union, assuming they have been FEDRA trained and providing these scores are not shared with the role holder.</p> <p>We would not be comfortable with a college sharing this with an individual role holder in this scenario.</p> <p>The detailed element scores in themselves are meaningless and potentially misleading without a deep understanding of the FEDRA evaluation process.</p> <p>Finally, you will appreciate that the FEDRA scheme details represent valuable intellectual property and sharing any outputs or aspects of the scheme has to be managed in a highly controlled manner.</p>

Questions 9 Jan 2026	ECC Response – 20 January 2026
<p>3. If individual colleges were to obtain FEDRA licences, and had knowledge of the factoring scores, would they be permitted to share that information with an individual employee, as part of that person’s appeal?</p> <p>a) If the answer to the above is no, could ECC please explain why not?</p>	<p>This would ultimately be a matter for the college as the employer, but our strong advice to all our client organisations is to only share detailed scores with a trained Role Analyst.</p> <p>Providing these to someone who is untrained and has a conflict of interests in the outcome is likely to generate a significant volume of detailed appeal and resubmission documentation, risks encouraging behaviour to ‘game’ the system and undermines the credibility and objectivity of the entire process.</p> <p>For all the same reasons we would not advise any FEDRA organisation to allow a Role Analyst to evaluate their own role.</p>
<p>4. Noting that it has been requested before; although it is unclear if there may be some confusion over the request, does ECC have a documented explanation of their FEDRA scheme, similar to that of the Scottish Local Government Employees Scottish Councils Job Evaluation Scheme.pdf, and if so, can it be provided to CES and the TU?</p>	<p>ECC carries out a rigorous training programme for Role Analysts, part of which is the handling of appeals. We have run many sessions for members on this.</p> <p>Not giving out a breakdown of scores has always been our stance, and I include a document from 2018 which evidences this.</p> <p>ECC would not wish to comment on the robustness or otherwise of any other JE Scheme (Scottish Councils JE scheme for instance).</p> <p>We are satisfied that our recommended appeals process is transparent and open. As stated above, we have had no issues from any of our 130 plus members, nor their associated trade unions with the ECC approach to the appeals process.</p> <p>Our original bid documentation contained very detailed information on the background to FEDRA, and Role Analysts receive full details of the operation of the scheme during their training. We do not have a comprehensive manual similar to the 275 page document you shared, but if CES or the TUs could set out specific information requirements we would be happy to consider what would be most helpful to provide.</p>

Questions 9 Jan 2026	ECC Response – 20 January 2026
<p>5. The Job Descriptions provided to ECC for evaluation will be agreed by the individual (or group of individuals) to whom it relates, the line manager of that function, and the college HR. However, if the individual only receives either a final score, and/or is advised of a placement on a pay scale, which may be higher, lower or the same as current, how would ECC suggest that the individual could appeal on the first point of Appeal, i.e. that there has been a “Factual inaccuracy in either the inputs or the outputs of the evaluation process” without some indication of the factorial elements?</p>	<p>The first ground for appeal actually states, “<i>factual inaccuracy or omission in the inputs to the evaluation process (the preparation questionnaire/Job Description)</i>”, so individuals would be arguing after the fact that the agreed JD / preparation questionnaire had been incorrect.</p> <p>The grounds for appeal do not refer to the <u>outputs</u> and hence knowledge of the elements is not needed.</p>
<p>6. If we proceed as intended, i.e. that all evaluation activity be outsourced to ECC, and that therefore in most colleges there would be no in-house knowledge or expertise of FEDRA, does ECC believe that a fair approach to appeals can be achieved?</p> <p>a) If the answer to above is yes, could ECC explain how that can be achieved</p>	<p>Yes, absolutely.</p> <p>If the Job Description is signed off by all parties (Role Holder, Line Manager and HRD) then this is an acknowledgement by all parties that the JD accurately reflects the duties and responsibilities being carried out by the role holder, and therefore the evidence to be evaluated.</p> <p>On receipt of this signed off documentation, the role will then be evaluated by an independent and trained ECC Consultant to determine the score.</p> <p>ECC will then carry out a wide range of consistency checks to ensure that the role has been evaluated accurately and consistently in relation to every other role that has been evaluated.</p> <p>Scores would be released to the relevant HRDs and a process agreed nationally as to how best to inform employees about the output of the process.</p> <p>This same process is currently carried out successfully within all colleges in Scotland who are either members of ECC and/or have their roles evaluated by ECC.</p>

Questions 9 Jan 2026	ECC Response – 20 January 2026
	<p>You may wish to seek feedback from these colleges to ascertain how successful this is. Our consistent feedback has been that it is a successful process and ECC have certainly not been made aware of any issues from our membership group.</p> <p>As part of this exercise, we have spoken to several HRDs within Scotland's colleges, and they state that they would be very uncomfortable releasing element scores due to the same reasons as we explain above.</p> <p>After evaluation, should there be subsequent changes to the Job Description, and these changes are signed off by all parties (see above) then the role would be re-evaluated accordingly.</p> <p>Essentially, if the evidence from the JD is agreed and correct, the score will be correct, as all roles will be evaluated by highly experienced and competent and independent role analysts, using the same Notes for Guidance and questions to analyse roles.</p> <p>If ECC Role Analysts feel that the JD is light, key information has been omitted etc, then a dialogue will take place with the role holder/line manager to ensure that the JD is fit for purpose and scoreable.</p>
<p>7. If the TU hold to their position that factor scores for the purpose of an Appeal process, is a fundamental requirement and that they will not otherwise agree to the use of the scheme, can ECC please clearly state what their position would be?</p>	<p>ECC would be surprised if trade unions insist on element scores for each role being shared with the role holder.</p> <p>Current practice within the FE sector in Scotland does not give a breakdown of scores, and to our knowledge this has never presented a barrier to agreement of the stakeholders involved.</p> <p>Not providing element scores to individuals has always been our approach and we enclose information from early discussions to support this.</p> <p>Ultimately, if the national process must include sharing role scores with role holders, ECC could not agree to this and would have to end our involvement in the project.</p>

Questions 9 Jan 2026	ECC Response – 20 January 2026
<p>8. In the original “NJNC Role Evaluation Process Documentation” (attached), at section 3.4 The Notification Stage, it states that: “...All role evaluation element levels and scores for each identified role in each college will be made available to the role holder(s) within each college and included in the notification letter as an attachment. Sector wide factor levels and outcomes will be retained within the NJNC National Bargaining machinery and not released.”. It is understood that ECC were aware of and involved in the drafting of this document, hence why to date there had been no anticipated concerns regarding the process of Appeals.</p> <p>a) Can ECC confirm if they were aware of this document? b) Can ECC confirm if they had any input into this document? c) If the answer above is ‘Yes’, can ECC explain why their position on sharing this information has changed?</p>	<p>We commented on the earlier 1 August 2018 draft of this document. Many of our comments were taken account of in the September version of the Process document which you sent through recently.</p> <p>However, our comment in relation to this specific point under 3.4 confirming that detailed scores can only be shared with trained Role Analysts does <u>not</u> seem to have been considered in the September version. Our current position is entirely consistent with our stance in 2018 and has been reiterated several times in many meetings and other forums during the life of the project.</p> <p>During this early period of the original project ECC was not always advised of agreements between CS and the TUs, and on more than one occasion (e.g. the content of intranet information about the project) we had to insist on project design amendments after CS had already implemented wording agreed with TUs without our prior knowledge.</p> <p>ECC does not therefore view the September 2018 Process document as definitive and representative of our previous and current opinion.</p>