

*The Federal Ministry of Public Service and Human Resource Development has been coordinating service improvement programmes in both federal and state agencies. The most recent job-related reform.*

Process[ edit ] The process of job evaluation involves the following steps: Before undertaking job evaluation, top management must explain the aims and uses of the programme to managers, emphasizing the benefits. Employees and unions may be consulted, depending on the legal and employee relations environment and company culture. Creating job evaluation committee: It is not possible for a single person to evaluate all the key jobs in an organization. Often a job evaluation committee consisting of experienced employees, union representatives and HR experts is created to set the ball rolling. Finding the jobs to be evaluated: Every job need not be evaluated. This may be too taxing and costly. Certain key jobs in each department may be identified. While picking up the jobs, care must be taken to ensure that they represent the type of work performed in that department, at various levels. Analysing and preparing job description: This requires the preparation of a job description and also an analysis of job specifications for successful performance. Selecting the method of evaluation: The method of evaluating jobs must be identified, keeping the job factors as well as organisational demands in mind. Selecting a method also involves consideration of company culture, and the capacity of the compensation and benefits function or job evaluation committee. The relative worth of various jobs in an organisation may be determined by applying the job evaluation method. The method may consider the "whole job" by ranking a set of jobs, or by comparing each job to a general level description. Factor-based methods require consideration of the level of various compensable factors criteria such as level and breadth of responsibility, knowledge and skill required, complexity, impact, accountability, working conditions, etc. These factor comparisons can be one with or without numerical scoring. If there is numerical scoring, weights can be assigned to each such factor and scores are associated with different levels of each factor, so that a total score is determined for the job. All methods result in an assigned grade level. Installing the programme[ edit ] Once the evaluation process is over and a plan of action is ready, management must explain it to employees and put it into operation. Reviewing periodically[ edit ] In the light of changes in environmental conditions technology, products, services, etc. For example, the traditional clerical functions have undergone a rapid change in sectors like banking , insurance and railways , after computerisation. New job descriptions need to be written and the skill needs of new jobs need to be duly incorporated in the evaluation process. Otherwise, employees may feel that all the relevant job factors - based on which their pay has been determined - have not been evaluated properly. For job evaluation to be practicable it is necessary: Methods[ edit ] There are primarily three methods of job evaluation: While many variations of these methods exist in practice, the three basic approaches are described here. Ranking method[ edit ] Perhaps the simplest method of job evaluation is the ranking method. According to this method, jobs are arranged from highest to lowest, in order of their value or merit to the organization. Jobs can also be arranged according to the relative difficulty in performing them. The jobs are examined as a whole rather than on the basis of important factors in the job; the job at the top of the list has the highest value and obviously the job at the bottom of the list will have the lowest value. Jobs are usually ranked in each department and then the department rankings are combined to develop an organizational ranking. The variation in payment of salaries depends on the variation of the nature of the job performed by the employees. The ranking method is simple to understand and practice and it is best suited for a small organization. Its simplicity however works to its disadvantage in big organizations because rankings are difficult to develop in a large, complex organization. Moreover, this kind of ranking is highly subjective in nature and may offend many employees. Therefore, a more scientific and fruitful way of job evaluation is called for. Classification method Grading method [ edit ] According to this method, a predetermined number of job groups or job classes are established and jobs are assigned to these classifications. This method places groups of jobs into job classes or job grades. Separate classes may include office, clerical, managerial, personnel, etc. Following is a brief description of such a classification in an office. Class I - Executives: Further classification under this category may be Office Manager, Deputy office

manager, Office superintendent, Departmental supervisor, etc. Class II - Skilled workers: Under this category may come the Purchasing assistant, Cashier, Receipts clerk, etc. Class III - Semiskilled workers: Under this category may come Stenotypists, Machine-operators, Switchboard operator etc. Class IV - Unskilled workers: This category may comprise peons, messengers, housekeeping staff, Daftaris[ clarification needed ], File clerks, Office boys, etc. The job grading method is less subjective when compared to the earlier ranking method. The system is very easy to understand and acceptable to almost all employees without hesitation. One strong point in favour of the method is that it takes into account all the factors that a job comprises. This system can be effectively used for a variety of jobs. The weaknesses of the Grading method are: Even when the requirements of different jobs differ, they may be combined into a single category, depending on the status a job carries. It is difficult to write all-inclusive descriptions of a grade. The method oversimplifies sharp differences between different jobs and different grades. When individual job descriptions and grade descriptions do not match well, the evaluators have the tendency to classify the job using their subjective judgements.

Factor comparison method or Point method[ edit ] This method is widely used and is considered to be one of the reliable and systematic approach for job evaluation in mid and large size organisations. Most consulting firms adopt this method, which was pioneered by Edward Hay in Here, jobs are expressed in terms of key factors. Points are assigned to each factor after prioritizing each factor in order of importance. The points are summed up to determine the wage rate for the job. Jobs with similar point totals are placed in similar pay grades. The procedure involved may be explained thus: Identify the factors common to all the identified jobs such as skill, effort, responsibility, etc. Divide each major factor into a number of sub factors. Each sub factor is defined and expressed clearly in the order of importance, preferably along a scale. The most frequent factors employed in point systems are: Mental demands of a job, Physical demands of a job, Degree of potential stress The educational requirements sub factor under the skill key factor may be expressed thus in the order of importance. Find the maximum number of points assigned to each job after adding up the point values of all sub-factors of such a job. This would help in finding the relative worth of a job. This job is now priced at a higher level. A wage survey is usually undertaken to collect wage rates of certain key jobs in the organization.

Market Pricing[ edit ] Market pricing is the process for determining the external value of jobs, allowing you to establish wage and salary structures and pay rates that are market sensitive. Job matching session is conducted. Merits and demerits[ edit ] The point method is a superior and widely used method of evaluating jobs. It forces raters to look into all key factors and sub-factors of a job. Point values are assigned to all factors in a systematic way, eliminating bias at every stage. It is reliable because raters using similar criteria would get more or less similar answers. The methodology underlying the approach contributes to a minimum of rating error Robbins p. It accounts for differences in wage rates for various jobs on the strength of job factors. Jobs may change over time, but the rating scales established under the point method remain unaffected. On the negative side, the point method is complex. Preparing a manual for various jobs, fixing values for key and sub-factors, establishing wage rates for different grades, etc. This may be too taxing, especially while evaluating managerial jobs where the nature of work varied, complex, novel is such that it cannot be expressed in quantifiable numbers. The following table lists several vendors of analytical job evaluation systems. The list is not conclusive.

## Chapter 2 : "Job evaluation and grading" Keyword Found Websites Listing | Keyword Suggestions

*The new national jobs evaluation and grading system, which will be prepared based on the decision of the Council of Ministers, is aimed at creating productive civil servants, the State Minister said.*

The most recent job-related reform aims at standardizing the public service jobs through nation-wide cross sectoral job evaluation and grading. Accordingly, the service sector government agencies prepare job descriptions as different levels with their own minimum education and experience requirements, and receive the approved posts after passing through the point rating process. The latest of such deeds is the Job Evaluation and Grading JEG , enacted in with details of employee placement procedures. The JEG reform targets to equate salary and benefits of similar positions and job grades in different institutions because it was discovered that different institutions have varied salary scales for similar jobs. These varied salaries and benefits augmented the public servant turn-over as employees leave one and join another for a better employment. This was believed to be biased and unfair. Hence, equitable salary and benefits proportional to job weight, irrespective of institutions, is planned to be put in effect in the coming Ethiopian fiscal year. The pre-implementation stage of the JEG regulation took more than two years. The Ministry designed an experimental procedure of implementing the reform. It selected sample institutions to enforce the reform and anticipates to find out flaws before the full endorsement and execution. No matter how long it took to complete the point rating processes, sampled institutions have received the officially validated job levels and have started allotting workers to the new vacant levels, since last June. Nevertheless, placement of workers in the new levels has not been an easy task. Placement is determined by 70pc performance score, 10pc readiness to implement governmental policies and strategies, 10pc profile, and 10pc experience of service on higher positions. These measurement tools are hardly objective and are subject to biases. In as much as the allocation of workers on relatively higher level posts has got to be competitive, there is a need for optimal objectivity. Hence, to mitigate subjectivity, the Ministry briefed the establishment of JEG committees, as presented in the JEG Regulation Article 11, for each institution and gave timetables to the committee to undertake the placement of workers. Nonetheless, these institutes and their respective JEG committees, included in the reform process, were observed facing multi-dimensional problems when they started the placement of employees into the new levels. Some of these problems are intrinsic to the reform regulation itself and some others are extrinsic to it. The intrinsic problems are either related to the assumptions believed to bring an overall change that gears to the aspired goal, or the process of reform establishment. Because this reform has some paradoxes to the national mission of human resource development, it not only contravenes goals that are set up by other ministries but also devalues and undermines higher learning as well. First, in the JEG, all positions in all government institutions demand a Bachelor degree for the highest level. Even though many research institutes and excellence centres want to hire highly educated professionals for desirable achievements, they are not structurally permitted to employ them. Because all positions are set to be sate by Bachelor degree holders and below. This depicts that there has been an assumption that believes knowledge acquired as an undergraduate suffices for the most intricate jobs in governmental institutions. Second, expert positions demand few years of experience to reach the highest level. No matter how long an expert has worked in a position, it does not matter to the acquisition of a certain level. Hence, it disregards invaluable knowledge that can be accumulated only through job experience. It devalues long years of experience as it forces both the freshly graduated and the professional with ample experiences to compete for the same post. This inevitably leaves the knowledge based services and operations under inadequate leadership and, finally, makes those sectors themselves uncompetitive. The extrinsic problems, on the other hand, are paramount. Salary has been the hottest issue in the whole JEG process. But, no word has been said on that aspect from the Federal Ministry. As a result, the new job levels are claimed to be occupied by experts holding their salary scales from the previous structure. The JEG levels go up to 22 unlike the former that had only nine, though the JEG levels do not have their fixed amount of salary. This fact compels the expert to see JEG as a mere extension of levels on the position ladder. The salary torpor, on the one hand, reminds one of the uncertain vision the government

has on money control and generation. This mania by the government has a bad implication on the peace and security of the country. Small business taxpayers have started to complain about the amount of tax imposed on them more so than ever. But, tax collection is not, as such, consistent as usual. The situation rather seems to have stimulated an all-encompassing turmoil. The hope public servants used to have that salaries will increase along with the new JEG level goes hand in hand with the grief small businesses share after the new tax estimation was imposed. The collective reaction of the anguished civil servants with tax grieved retailers will most likely result in political instability. Speculating the annihilation of this structural, functional relationship would not remain the interpretation of the situation by a structural functionalist, but, is a call for the attention of concerned, wiser politicians. Consequences of dejected civil servants would not be different from what happened to those irrationally taxed retailers. Generally, the JEG reform itself needs to be reformed. To contact the copyright holder directly for corrections or for permission to republish or make other authorized use of this material, click here. AllAfrica publishes around reports a day from more than news organizations and over other institutions and individuals, representing a diversity of positions on every topic. We publish news and views ranging from vigorous opponents of governments to government publications and spokespersons. Publishers named above each report are responsible for their own content, which AllAfrica does not have the legal right to edit or correct. Articles and commentaries that identify allAfrica. To address comments or complaints, please Contact us.

### Chapter 3 : Human Resource Advisory Manager Job at Grant Thornton (Job Expired) | Ethiojobs

*Job evaluation/grading is the classification of jobs according to a job grading system such as Paterson, Peromnes, Hay, Castellion or simply a semantic scale describing occupational levels (e.g. top management, senior management, mid management, junior management etc).*

### Chapter 4 : Ethiopia Grading System

*FEDERAL CIVIL SERVANTS PROCLAMATION the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, it is hereby proclaimed as follows: 3/ Job evaluation and grading shall be.*

### Chapter 5 : Login - African Development Bank

*Grading System in Ethiopia. Ethiopia GPA calculator Grading Scales: Ethiopian General Secondary Education Certificate. Grade Scale US Grade.*

### Chapter 6 : Education | Ethiopia | U.S. Agency for International Development

*Job evaluation and grading expert @ national job evaluation & grading project(JEG) Ministry of Public Service & Human Resource development of ETHIOPIA April - Present 6 years 7 months.*

### Chapter 7 : Job evaluation - Wikipedia

*A Review of the Civil Service Grading and Pay System. First published in by the Job evaluation 17 Types of grade and pay structures*

### Chapter 8 : Job Analysis Training Course For Professionals - Sign Up Today

*Employment Manual. JOB EVALUATION AND. GRADING POLICY. This policy explains the County Council agreed policy on job grading to ensure fair and consistent application of evaluation and grading.*

*Besides, BPR is failed in a sense that the momentum in the early implementation stage could not be sustained as it was not accompanied by job grading and incentive packages.*