PEA Job Evaluation Plan

Factor Weighting[1]

The 12 factors in the Job Evaluation Plan have different weights relative to each other. The PEA and the University have agreed that some factors are more important than others. The greater the weight (higher numerical value) the more the factor contributes to the relative value of a job.

The levels are also weighted within each factor. Each factor has several levels (4, 5 or 6, depending on the factor) and each level has a different weighted value. An example of the differences between levels can be found by looking at the level definitions for Factor 1:

FACTOR 1 – PROBLEM SOLVING

Definition

This factor assesses the application of knowledge to the analysis and resolution of problems. It is a measure of the difficulty and complexity of the work.

Levels

1. Requires some analysis of problems for which solutions can be identified through the application of existing procedures, policies and precedents.

2. Requires analysis of varying problems as well as judgement in the identification of solutions which are not always easily found. Solutions are generally guided by procedures, policies and precedents. Investigation is sometimes required to modify methods and procedures.

3. Requires in-depth analysis of complex and variable problems as well as critical thinking and judgment to identify solutions that are often difficult to find. Solutions require the interpretation, evaluation and adaptation of procedures, policies and precedents. Investigation and innovative thinking are required to develop new methods and procedures.

4. Requires in-depth analysis of complex and unique problems as well as creative and strategic thinking to arrive at solutions that are unanticipated. Extensive investigation is required to conceive new methods, procedures and policies.

Level Weighting

While the weight given to each level for eight of the factors increases numerically, four of the Factors were given greater weight at the higher levels.

The weighting of Factors 1 (Problem Solving), 2 (Knowledge), 9 (Impact of Decisions), and 10 (Independence Exercised), increase in order of magnitude at the 2 highest levels at double the rate of the other factors. This is illustrated in the tables showing the Level Weightings below:

Factor Weighting

Factor		Points
1	Problem Solving	12
2	Knowledge	14
3	Communication	12
4	Mental Effort	2
5	Physical Effort	2
6	Responsbility for Interactions	11
7	Responsibility for Financial + Material Resources	10
8	Responsibility for Human Resources	10
9	Impact	11
10	Independence	10
11	Physical work environment	3
12	Organizational work environment	3
		100

Level Weighting

Factor		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
1	Problem Solving	1.00	2.00	4.00	6.00	n/a	n/a
2	Knowledge	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	7.00	n/a
3	Communication	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	n/a
4	Mental Effort	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	n/a
5	Physical Effort	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	n/a
6	Responsbility for Interactions	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	n/a
7	Responsibility for Financial + Material Resources	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	n/a
8	Responsibility for Human Resources	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	n/a
9	Impact	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	7.00	n/a
10	Independence	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	7.00	n/a
11	Physical work environment	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	6.00
12	Organizational work environment	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	n/a	n/a

Total points by Factor and Level

Factor		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
1	Problem Solving	12	48	144	288	n/a	n/a
2	Knowledge	14	56	126	280	490	n/a
3	Communication	12	48	108	192	300	n/a
4	Mental Effort	2	8	18	32	50	n/a
5	Physical Effort	2	8	18	32	50	n/a
6	Responsbility for Interactions	11	44	99	176	275	n/a
7	Responsibility for Financial + Material Resources	10	40	90	160	250	n/a
8	Responsibility for Human Resources	10	40	90	160	250	n/a
9	Impact	11	44	99	220	385	n/a
10	Independence	10	40	90	200	350	n/a
11	Physical work environment	3	12	27	48	75	108
12	Organizational work environment	3	12	27	48	n/a	n/a

Level Weighting Detail

The factor levels for the 4 “extra weighted” factors are constructed in this way to recognize the relatively greater influence of these particular four factors towards the overall job value of professional positions at UVic. The difference in the numerical weighting of the levels (geometric vs. arithmetic) provides a method to measure greater qualitative and quantitative differences between the steps as they progress from lower to higher levels.

The University and the PEA made a deliberate decision to give these four factors somewhat greater weight within the context of the entire 12 JE factors Plan to ensure the following key objectives were met:

- A gender-neutral JE Plan meeting Pay Equity objectives
- Maintains the University’s ability to remain competitive with respect to recruitment and retention of PEA positions
- Measures and Captures UVic and PEA shared values in determining job worth
  Results in a Plan that falls within the budget negotiated between the parties.

The reason for greater weighting of the higher levels for each of these four factors is described below:

Factor 1 — Problem Solving

This factor has been weighted more heavily at levels 3 and 4. Level 3 is the first level at which problems are described as “complex”. There is a greater difference between “complex problems” and “varying problems” (levels 3 and 2) than between “varying problems” and simply “problems” (levels 1 and 2). Similarly, level 3 is the first level which requires critical thinking, judgment, interpretation, evaluation and innovative thinking, which is a significant increase from the level 2 where such activities are not specified. At level 4, problems are “unique” and require “creative” and “strategic” thinking. This level was regarded as being as far beyond level 3 as level 3 is beyond level 2.

Factor 2 — Knowledge

Levels 4 and 5 represent an exponentially greater depth and breadth of knowledge than represented in Levels 1 through 3. Level 4 recognizes either a much greater breadth of subject knowledge, or a significant increase in depth of knowledge, than at level 3. Level 5 refers to “comprehensive” knowledge, which describes a totality of knowledge well beyond a “broad range”. Level 5 also uses the terms “extremely complex”, which represents the upper limit of complexity. Level 5 also refers to “a highly specialized area of research or practice”, which is considered significantly higher than the knowledge described at the lower levels.

Factor 9 — Impact

Level 4 introduces individual responsibility for the “determination” and “evaluation” of results and objectives, which is considered as significantly greater than influencing the results or objectives, or having such responsibility as part of a team (Level 3). Similarly, Level 4 introduces individual responsibility for impacts at the division/faculty level, beyond that level, and/or even on the University’s defined “services, resources and obligations.” Level 5 is clearly distinct from all other levels in that in that it deals solely with individual responsibility at a very high level.

Factor 10 — Independence

Level 4 is the first level that involves “contribution to policy development,” (intended to be significant both in contribution and the nature of the policy) which takes it well beyond level 3. At level 3, position incumbents may define/develop practices, procedures or methods of operation which fall within general policy guidelines, however the Committee determined that the contribution at level 4 must go beyond this level of authority, and encompass the development of the actual policy guidelines. Level 5 involves the freedom to act to influence the University’s planning, including the development of policy for the University overall.

Salary Bands

Every job has a total point rating. The points for each factor are derived from the multiplication of three numbers: the factor rating (the score for the factor); the factor weighting (the percentage value assigned to that factor); and the level weighting (the value of different levels within the factor). The total points for the job are based on the sum of each of the twelve factors' points. The total point ratings for all jobs were placed in numerical order and then divided into point bands. The goal was to match each point band to a salary grade in the existing grid.

A band consists of the point totals ranging from a minimum value to a maximum value, that are associated with the matched Salary Grade, e.g. salary grade 4 ranges from 294 points to 354 points; the band width in this case is 60 points. The band widths in this plan are not all equal. They generally are wider at the higher levels, e.g. Salary Grade 4 is 60 points wide, while Salary Grade 15 is 225 points wide. There are some exceptions to this, which were necessary to balance the desire for minimal red-circling with the reality of the negotiated funding constraints. The general trend of widening band widths is consistent with the differential level weighting explained above. That is, jobs scoring at the higher levels in the individual factors, and thus placed in a higher Salary Grade, require a greater number of points to move to the next Salary Grade.

The model used exhibits gender neutrality, resulted in the least number of jobs red-circled, and remained within the project's funding guidelines. The salary banding is summarized in this table:

Points	Salary Grade
141 points - 186 points	1
187 points - 237 points	2
238 points - 293 points	3
294 points - 354 points	4
355 points - 425 points	5
426 points - 496 points	6
497 points - 571 points	7
572 points - 632 points	8
633 points - 698 points	9
699 points - 769 points	10
770 points - 840 points	11
841 points - 941 points	12
942 points - 1142 points	13
1143 points - 1368 points	14
1369 points - 1594 points	15
1595 points - 1820 points	16
1821 points - 2046 points	17
2047 points - 2272 points	18
2273 points - 2523 points	19
2524 points - 2774 points	20
2775 points - 3025 points	21
3026 points - 3276 points	22