

Checklist

Gender neutrality in job evaluation and classification



INSTITUTE
FOR THE EQUALITY
OF WOMEN
AND MEN



Colophon

Publisher:

Institute for the equality of women and men
Rue Ernest Blérot 1, 1070 Brussels
t. +32 2 233 41 75 - f. +32 2 233 40 32
egalite.hommesfemmes@iefh.belgique.be
igvm-iefh.belgium.be

Authors:

Diane Pardon (LBC-NVK - Unites clerical workers and executives)
Yves Vergeylen (CGSLB-ACLVB - Liberal Trade Union of Belgium)
Johan Van Eeghem (SETCa – the socialist trade union)
Carla Rijmenams (Institute for the equality of women and men)

Final editing:

Institute for the equality of women and men
Carla Rijmenams

Layout:

Cypres

Translation:

Belga Translations sprl-bvba
Wilkens c.s

Publisher responsible at law:

Michel Pasteel
Institute for the equality of women and men

Registration number:

D/2010/10.043/5

Deze publicatie is ook beschikbaar in het Nederlands.
Cette publication est également disponible en français.
Diese Publikation ist auch auf Deutsch vorhanden.

Introduction

The wage gap between men and women remains a reality. Part of this wage gap can be explained by the fact that women more often opt for less well-paid sectors, more often work part time and less frequently move on to higher positions. However, part of the wage gap cannot be explained and may be attributed to discrimination between the sexes in the job classification system used.

The social partners repeatedly emphasized the importance they attach to the observance of the principle of equal payment of men and women. Establishing that equal pay for men and women is still not always achieved, collective labour agreement 25ter forces sectors and companies who haven't applied it yet, to test their job evaluation systems and their wage classifications system and make any necessary adjustments.

The federal government wants to offer a helping hand to the social partners by providing various instruments designed to accomplish this difficult exercise. We will now clarify the checklist, which can be used to detect sex discriminations in job classifications.

This evaluation instrument was developed by a working group¹ consisting of experts from the social partners and the Institute for the equality of women and men. The instrument consists of two parts: the checklist and an accompanying text. The accompanying text provides further explanation and justification regarding the questions included in the checklist. This makes it clear to the user why these questions have been raised. It also provides an insight into the factors that ensure a gender-neutral job classification system. In addition to being an evaluation instrument, the manual also serves as a recommendation when drawing up evaluation systems.

The scores given make it possible to get an idea of the extent to which the system used meets the requirements for gender neutrality. Unequal treatment may occur throughout the job classification process. This is why all phases are included in the evaluation. After all, it is important to remain vigilant throughout the process.

When drawing up the checklist, it was decided to use existing instruments as much as possible. The Institute for the equality of women and men has already developed a number of tools in cooperation with the social partners as part of the "EVA" project, to detect and eliminate the discrimination found in job classification systems. The EVA project manual 'Gender-neutral job classification' was taken as a starting point when drawing up this checklist. This manual is available on line via the website of the Institute for the equality of women and men (www.igvm.be). It is therefore recommended that this manual is used to supplement the instrument provided here.

¹ The working group included Diane Pardon (LBC-NVK), Yves Vergeylen (CGSLB-ACLVB), Johan Van Eeghem (SETCa) and Carla Rijmenams (Institute for the equality of women and men).



Gender neutrality in job evaluation and classification

A ■ No	B ■ More or less no	C ■ Don't know	D ■ More or less yes	E ■ Yes
--------	---------------------	----------------	----------------------	---------

1. Introducing a job evaluation project

1.1. Setting up committees and determining project approach

1.1.1. Is there a proportionate and balanced representation depending on job and gender?

1.2. Procedures: establishing project approach and arrangements

1.2.1. Is there an agreement on the principle of 'equal pay for equal work'?

1.2.2. Do the procedures include provision for everyone, men and women, to be involved at each stage of the process?

1.3. Importance of choosing a gender neutral system

1.3.1. Is the chosen system analytical?

1.3.2. Is a consultant brought in?

■ If so: go to question 1.4.1. ■ If not:

1.3.3. Is there a proportionate distribution of male and female characteristics in the company-specific system?

1.3.4. Are the scores to be allocated in the company-specific system in proportion to the effort required from the work?

1.4. Importance of open communication

1.4.1. Before: do all members of staff receive the necessary information about the purpose of the classification, the system and the process?

1.4.2. During: do all members of staff receive the necessary information about the progress being made?

1.4.3. After: do all members of staff receive the necessary information about the job descriptions, the job classification, the appeal and maintenance procedure?

1.5. Training for committee members and staff

1.5.1. Have all members received training on the system focusing on the pitfalls that pave the way for discrimination in job evaluation?

A	■	No
B	■	More or less no
C	■	Don't know
D	■	More or less yes
E	■	Yes

2. Preparatory phase

2.1. Organisation chart

2.1.1. Is there a clear organisation chart?

2.2. List of jobs

2.2.1. Are all jobs, including the typical women's jobs, included?

■ If so: go to question 2.3.1. ■ If not:

2.2.2. Is there an objective reason why jobs are left out of the exercise?

2.3. Job titles

2.3.1. Is a reference to gender avoided in the job title?

■ If so: go to question 2.3.3. ■ If not:

2.3.2. Is the term [M/F] used?

2.3.3. Are efforts made to avoid male job names sounding as if they carry more responsibility than female job names?

2.4. Appointing job spokespersons

2.4.1. Was attention paid to the choice of female job spokespersons?

3. Describing jobs

3.1. Creating job descriptions

3.1.1. Were sufficient job holders selected to be able to correctly reflect the job content?

3.2. Job descriptions: minimum content and quality requirements

3.2.1. Does the job description contain all the information needed to be able to evaluate the job?

3.2.2. Are the job descriptions drawn up on the basis of a fixed plan?



Checklist

	A <input type="checkbox"/> No	B <input type="checkbox"/> More or less no	C <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know	D <input type="checkbox"/> More or less yes	E <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
3.3. Balanced approach to male and female characteristics					
3.3.1. In the job evaluation system used, are all job characteristics considered relevant included among the evaluation criteria?	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
3.3.2. Are these evaluation criteria described clearly and unambiguously?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.3.3. Are the evaluation criteria not open to interpretation and are they gender neutral?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.3.4. Are the criteria representative of the jobs to be evaluated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.3.5. Are the evaluation criteria also applicable for typically female jobs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.3.6. Are steps taken to avoid a high grading (respectively a high level) only being linked to one or more jobs (mostly done by men) so that typically female jobs will systematically receive lower scores?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
3.3.7. Were all evaluation criteria consistently applied?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
3.4. Role of the job analyst					
3.4.1. Does the job analyst have enough of a feeling for the issue of gender neutrality?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.5. Approval of job description by job holder and manager					
3.5.1. Are the job descriptions approved by the job holders and the manager or managers?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
3.5.2. Are adequate opportunities provided to make any additions or corrections?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
4. Evaluating jobs					
4.1. Objective evaluation on the basis of criteria and avoiding evaluation errors					
4.1.1. Were steps taken to avoid prejudice when applying and describing the evaluation criteria?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.1.2. Can the weightings (scores, weights) be adequately justified?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.1.3. Were steps taken to avoid typical male characteristics and achievements being given a higher evaluation than female characteristics?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.1.4. Was the same series of evaluation criteria used for each evaluation and was this always systematic and consistent?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
4.1.5. Were all jobs examined and evaluated using all the criteria put forward?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
4.1.6. Was double counting avoided when evaluating a job characteristic?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>

	A ■ No	B ■ More or less no	C ■ Don't know	D ■ More or less yes	E ■ Yes
4.1.7. Were steps taken when weighting to avoid taking account of part-time work or age?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
4.1.8. Was the weighting based solely on the job and not on the way in which the job holder operated?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
4.2. Checking the evaluation					
4.2.1. Was a check carried out using a pairs comparison of male and female jobs?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
4.2.2. Was a quality and consistency check carried out by a job classification expert?	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>
5. Developing a classification system					
5.1. Layout of a classification system					
5.1.1. Were gender-specific clusters (men's jobs as against women's jobs) avoided?	<input type="radio"/>				<input type="radio"/>
6. Maintaining a classification system					
6.1. Maintenance procedure					
6.1.1. In the maintenance procedure, is enough attention paid to ensuring that all staff (men and women) are given an opportunity to have their job description and evaluation updated if there are any fundamental changes in the job content?	<input type="radio"/>				

Scores:

No points are allocated for the replies in columns A to C.
 One point is allocated for each reply in columns D and E.
 Add up the scores in columns D and E.

- **Poor (from 1 to 10 points):** the system does not offer any guarantee of gender-neutral job classification. There is a great risk that women's jobs receive unequal treatment.
- **Warning (from 11 to 20 points):** you are on the right path, but there are still a great many problems with application. There is a very real risk that women's jobs receive unequal treatment.
- **Good (from 21 to 30 points):** the system should establish equal treatment for men's and women's jobs. However, vigilance is still recommended. Shortcomings remain that could lead to women's jobs receiving unequal treatment.
- **Very good (from 31 to 40 points):** the system meets the requirements for equal treatment of men's and women's jobs. Remain vigilant, however, to ensure that no new risks of unequal treatment for women creep in.



Pointers for equality between women and men in job evaluation and classification

Job evaluation is one way of implementing the principle of “equal wage for equivalent work of equal value” in practice. When choosing the job evaluation system, it is therefore best to opt for a system that guarantees gender neutrality. Research has shown that analytical systems offer the most guarantees of this, provided that they are correctly applied. This means complying with stringent conditions as regards a process-based approach and procedures.

1. Choose a gender-neutral and analytical system.
2. Make sure the job evaluation process is undertaken on a gender-neutral basis.
3. Guarantee gender neutrality within the procedures.

The best remedy is of course to increase awareness among all the stakeholders and make recommendations about gender neutrality in job evaluation. After all, equality between women and men in job evaluation benefits not only women but men as well. Preconceptions and gender-based stereotypes in job evaluation may have a negative and discriminatory effect in both directions.

The entire job classification process consists of various phases. We are pleased to give you some advice on avoiding discrimination between women and men.

1. INTRODUCING A JOB EVALUATION PROJECT

1.1. Setting up committees and determining project approach

In the preparatory phase, a supervisory committee having equal representation is set up. It is advisable to include women in these committees, when drawing up the procedures and when supervising the job evaluation project. This way they can influence the decisions taken throughout the process and attention can be focused on certain points and approaches relating to equal opportunities. The role of women in these committees, and of course that of men, is precisely to monitor equal treatment throughout the entire job evaluation process.

N.B.: the presence of women on such committees does not automatically offer a guarantee of gender neutrality. Both women and men can take decisions that are based on gender stereotypes.

So ask yourself the following question:

- Is there a proportionate and balanced representation in the committee in terms of job and gender?

1.2. Procedures: establishing project approach and arrangements

Job evaluation appears to result in greater equality in wages between men and women if there is a systematic, formal procedure. In practical terms, this implies that a number of steps are taken, i.e.:

- a schedule is agreed for activities and decision-making times,
- the committees are set up and the roles of all those involved are clearly and expressly defined,
- arrangements are made for filing complaints and keeping the classification up to date (appeal and maintenance procedure),
- the stakeholders are trained in theme-based job evaluation.

Pay adequate care and attention to the active participation of women throughout the job evaluation project. If women are not involved, or are only slightly involved in the procedures, for instance when drawing up the list of jobs or preparing job descriptions, they cannot exert any influence on the decisions taken during the process.

So ask yourself the following questions:

- Is there an agreement on the principle of 'equal pay for work of equal value'?
- Do the procedures include provision for everyone, men and women, to be involved at each stage of the process?

1.3. Importance of a gender-neutral system

During the preparatory phase, a job classification system should be chosen that takes into account the specific features of the sector or the company. The fact that there are various job evaluation systems does not make the choice any easier.

Of course, it is best to opt for a system that offers as many guarantees of gender neutrality as possible. Empirical research into the impact of various types of evaluation systems and evaluation procedures confirms that analytical systems – if correctly applied – increase the chance of equal pay for men and women. Other systems, such as pairs comparison and ranking, offer fewer guarantees.



Research² shows that a gender-neutral system fulfils a number of criteria:

1. The system must be analytical, i.e. the jobs should be analysed and evaluated on the basis of predetermined, clearly described evaluation criteria agreed by the social partners (i.e. points of view or job characteristics).
2. The system is used to evaluate all job characteristics throughout the company, i.e. the system should analyse and evaluate jobs in terms of **all aspects** that are important when doing the job. A number of **main characteristics** must in any case be analysed and evaluated, i.e. knowledge, responsibility, skills and working conditions (inconveniences).
3. The system as a whole must apply various criteria (both male and female). Male and female characteristics must occur equally in the structure of the system.
4. The system must enable an **equivalent approach** to the **possibilities for weighting** men's and women's jobs, i.e. both groups of characteristics must be able to score to at least the same extent.
5. The **values** allocated by the system must be **in proportion to the effort required** to do the work, i.e. the values allocated per job characteristic must be in the right proportion to one another and to the total value allocation.
6. The system should be **applied as a whole throughout the company**, i.e. all jobs in the company, both in breadth and in depth, must be evaluated using the same system. An exception to this requirement may be granted for very large and complex companies where the organisational structure renders necessary the use of sub-systems for various job groups.



So ask yourself the following questions:

- Is the chosen system analytical?
- Is a consultant brought in?
- If not:
 - Is there a proportionate distribution of male and female characteristics in the company-specific system?
 - Are the scores to be allocated in the company-specific system in proportion to the effort required to do the work?

² X., Van punten naar munten (From points to coins). Research project in the context of the European Commission's Fourth Action Programme. Report on working visit the Netherlands, Brussels, Ministry of Employment and Labour in conjunction with the University of Ghent, 1997, p. 27-29.

1.4. Importance of open communication

Providing information for staff is an important element in the job evaluation process. An organisation wishing to introduce a system of job evaluation needs to make this acceptable to the staff. A lack of information for staff and a lack of clear language when referring to the project can give rise to serious resistance to the evaluation project and even cause it to fail. Unclear arrangements, guarantees or procedures can lead to misunderstandings and hamper or even totally block the smooth running of the job evaluation process. Opposition can be overcome by involving all staff members in the project from the outset and providing clear communication about the project. So information for staff plays an important role before, during and after the completion of the job evaluation project. This can be provided in an information brochure and/or a newsletter, for instance.

So ask yourself the following questions:

- Before: do all members of staff receive the necessary information about the purpose of the classification, the system and the process?
- During: do all members of staff receive the necessary information about the progress being made?
- After: do all members of staff receive the necessary information about the job descriptions, the job classification, the appeal and maintenance procedure?

1.5. Training for committee members and staff

Prejudices and gender stereotypes are generalisations about men and women that form part of our culture. These prejudices are often unconscious and this soon tips into discrimination. Prejudices and stereotypes have negative consequences in the job classification process: just think of the possible low evaluation given to jobs done mainly by women. Research has shown that awareness of the occurrence of a distinction between the genders in job evaluation is minimal. So it is important to make everyone involved more aware of discrimination in job evaluation through training and instruction.

So ask yourself the following question:

- Have all members of the committee received training on the system focusing on the pitfalls that promote discrimination in job evaluation?



2. PREPARATORY PHASE

2.1. Organisation chart

An organisation chart is prepared to provide a clear view of the current organisational structure and the jobs in this structure. The failure to draw up an organisation chart and have this ratified can create difficulties later on when jobs are inserted into a framework (organisation chart). Certain jobs do not find a footing and begin to 'float'.

 **So ask yourself the following question:**

- Is there a clear organisation chart?

2.2. List of jobs

A job evaluation project begins by drawing up a full inventory of all the jobs carried out in the organisation. This means that all jobs done by men and women are mapped out. Account must also be taken here of part-time and temporary jobs which are often done by women. In principle, all the jobs done in an organisation should be described, analysed and evaluated.

Make sure that jobs are not formulated too broadly when drawing up the list. It is striking to note that administrative, executory or support functions undertaken mainly by women in particular are combined under a single job description (for instance, secretary, administrative staff, etc.), whereas the more technical functions and executive or managerial positions are described separately and in detail.

If certain jobs are not included after all, it is important to explain why this is the case, so that no problems arise about this in a later phase.

 **So ask yourself the following questions:**

- Are all jobs, including the typical women's jobs, included?
- If not, is there an objective reason why jobs are left out of the exercise?

2.3. Job titles

There must be a clear relationship between the job title and the job content, which must both be recognisable.

So be careful with job names. They may be interpreted as adding to or detracting from the level, for instance personnel department staff member or HRM assistant.

Moreover, make sure you are not misled as regards the weight of the job by typically male or female job names such as secretary. Sometimes typically male job names sound as if they carry with them more responsibility than female jobs. For instance, what is the difference between a department coordinator and a head of service? Sometimes a female job holder is known as "assistant to" while in practice the same activities may be carried out as the person whose assistant you are.

As far as possible, avoid referring to gender in job titles. If this is unavoidable from a linguistic point of view, then always add M/F.

So ask yourself the following questions:

- Is a reference to gender avoided in the job title (e.g. telephonist, receptionist)?
- If not: is the term (M/F) used?
- Are efforts made to avoid male job names sounding as if they carry with them more responsibility than female job names?

2.4. Appointing job spokespersons

The supervisory committee will indicate the jobs to be included in the evaluation process. The job holders (those who do the job) are appointed to provide information about the content of the job. They act as job spokespersons. When appointing job spokespeople, ensure that there are female job spokespeople and that they are involved. After all, experience shows that women and men find different things important in their job, or emphasise them differently, or express things differently. Things that go without saying for one member of staff may perhaps be expressly highlighted by another.

So ask yourself the following question:

- Was attention paid to the choice of female job spokespersons?



3. DESCRIBING JOBS

3.1. Creating job descriptions

The job spokesperson, the person who does the job in question, is a privileged source of information. Ensure that both sexes are represented. Of course, a discussion with the immediate superior is also important. He or she can provide further relevant information for the job description.

A job interview and in some situations a visit to the workplace provides a great deal of information and is an ideal way to test the job information and pre-conditions. A preparatory and clear questionnaire breaks down barriers and will provide objective information.

The role of the job analyst is very important. He or she is responsible for correctly interpreting the job information and for analysing the job content objectively and critically in line with the system requirements and the standards applied by the system holder.

So ask yourself the following question:

- Were sufficient job holders selected to be able to correctly reflect the job content?

3.2. Minimum content and quality requirements

The description must fulfil a number of minimum requirements:

- it must be clear, consistent and complete: use simple language and avoid 'professional and corporate jargon'; the information should be so clear that it can only be interpreted in one way.
- it must be recognisable: the job description must reflect the reality, i.e. the job holder concerned must be able to recognise his or her job in the description.
- it must be uniform and comply with the requirements of the chosen job evaluation system;
- it must be described in gender-neutral terms: just because certain tasks are traditionally entrusted to women does not mean that they do not have to be described; cooking, cleaning and tidying up are not innate, and neither are conscientiousness, flexibility and the ability to concentrate.
- do not give any gender identification with the job spokesperson, through the job title, form of address or use of personal first names (for instance, begin the description of the activities with a verb, thereby avoiding the use of the subject).
- it should provide a picture of what is done and not how it is done (i.e. not of the way the person in question works).

So ask yourself the following questions:

- Does the job description contain all the information needed to be able to evaluate the job?
- Are the job descriptions drawn up on the basis of a fixed plan or template?

3.3. Balanced approach to male and female characteristics

Specific characteristics of women's jobs must be expressed to the same extent in the points of view or the criteria and may not be evaluated at lower grading levels. So ensure that job characteristics such as

- meticulousness
- discretion
- neatness and hygiene
- willingness to help
- patience
- ability to listen
- tact
- integrity
- repetitive and short-cycle work
- representativeness
- empathy
- caring and tending.

are treated in the same way in the job description as

- authority
- outdoor work
- organisation
- technical activities
- etc.
- heavy physical assignments
- managerial tasks
- policy development and advice
- commercial, financial and material responsibility

All evaluation criteria must be described and defined in such a way that they are applicable to both men's and women's jobs. Certain evaluation criteria that are not directly typical of men's or women's jobs such as autonomy, responsibility, creativity, complexity, knowledge, etc. are also described in a number of job evaluation systems in such a way that they work in favour of men's jobs. Examples include: placing the emphasis on financial and commercial responsibility, technical knowledge or management knowledge and describing responsibility in organisational terms.

One other point of criticism is that a number of criteria and level descriptions are not clearly expressed; with the result that they are open to various interpretations and such freedom to interpret can mean scope for distinction between the sexes. Just think of the difference concealed behind a 'coordinator' and a 'head of department'.

Sometimes certain levels are linked from a number of points of view with one sort or type of job. For instance, "creativity" is linked to engineering jobs or "complexity" to activities that require professional technical abilities.



In a number of job evaluation systems, examples are used when describing criteria. If the only examples used are typical of men's jobs, and not of women's jobs, this can have an adverse effect on the evaluation of women's jobs. For instance, if lifting heavy objects such as bags of cement is taken as an example describing the criterion "heaviness of the job", there is a risk that, for example, lifting people is not evaluated.

So ask yourself the following questions:

- In the job evaluation system used, are all job characteristics considered relevant included among the evaluation criteria?
- Are these evaluation criteria described clearly and unambiguously?
- Are the evaluation criteria not open to interpretation and are they gender neutral?
- Are the criteria representative of the jobs to be evaluated?
- Are the evaluation criteria also applicable for typically female jobs?
- Were steps taken to avoid a high grading (respectively a high level) only being linked to one or more jobs (mostly done by men) so that typically female jobs will systematically receive lower scores?
- Were all evaluation criteria consistently applied?

3.4. Creating job descriptions

The job analyst involved must work objectively and pay the necessary attention to the issue of equal opportunities. He or she plays a crucial role in guaranteeing equal treatment by interpreting information on a gender-neutral basis in the job description, analysis and evaluation.

So ask yourself the following question:

- Does the job analyst have enough of a feeling for the issue of gender neutrality?

3.5. Approval of job descriptions by job holder and manager

Once the job description is clear, it is submitted to the job holder for approval. The immediate superior and the management will also need to agree with the description: ultimately the management determines the content of a job or compiles the range of duties.

So ask yourself the following questions:

- Are the job descriptions approved by the job holders and the manager or managers?
- Are adequate opportunities provided to make any additions or corrections?

4. EVALUATING JOBS

4.1. Objective evaluation on the basis of criteria and avoiding evaluation errors

All jobs described and approved are evaluated using the chosen system. The basis for the job evaluation is the job description that has been carefully gone through and approved. The evaluation itself is carried out on the basis of the job characteristics and in accordance with the evaluation system chosen.

Special attention must be paid to counting related criteria twice. For instance, management and bearing responsibility for people cannot be counted twice. The same applies for managing and motivating people, guiding, etc. (Aspects that are evaluated under the communication criterion).

So ask yourself the following questions:

- Were steps taken to avoid prejudice when applying the evaluation criteria and their description?
- Can the weightings (scores, weights) be adequately justified?
- Were steps taken to avoid typical male characteristics and achievements being given a higher evaluation than female characteristics?
- Was the same series of evaluation criteria used for each evaluation and was this always systematic and consistent?
- Were all jobs examined and evaluated using all the criteria put forward?
- Was double counting avoided when evaluating a job characteristic?
- Were steps taken when weighting to avoid taking account of part-time work or age?
- Was the weighting based solely on the job and on the way in which the job holder operated?



4.2. Checking the evaluation

A good way of checking evaluations is to compare jobs with one another once the evaluation is complete. A number of comparable pairs of men's and women's jobs at various levels of the organisation are selected. A pair consists of a man's job and a woman's job that are evaluated in approximately equal terms in points. The description and evaluation of the selected pairs is then analysed and any inconsistencies are noted.

Moreover, it is advisable for the management of the company to make the entire system together with the job descriptions, the detailed results of the evaluation (in other words the gradings) and the ranking in job classes or categories available to the job classifications experts of the employers' federation and of the trade union organisations as soon as the procedure is complete. They can test the coherence and objectivity of the evaluations objectively.

 **So ask yourself the following questions:**

- Was a check carried out using a pairs comparison of men's and women's jobs?
- Was a quality and consistency check carried out by a job classification expert?

5. DEVELOPING A CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

5.1. Layout of a classification

When defining the category boundaries, it is important to make sure that a group or cluster of women's jobs does not systematically drop down to a lower category or be forced below the category boundary. In addition, they make it harder to move on to the following category and comparisons between job groups are no longer possible. The way in which the dividing line between two categories or groups of jobs is drawn and the reasons put forward to justify this are also important.

Once the boundaries between the categories have been drawn and the various categories have been defined or described (descriptions of categories or levels) it is advisable to formulate these in gender-neutral terms. When defining job categories, it is best to be guided by the natural breaks in the job evaluation results and a mathematically justified model (always the same scales of points for each class, increasing scale of points for each category, percentage-based structure of the category model, etc.).

 **So ask yourself the following question:**

- Were gender-specific clusters (men's jobs as against women's jobs) avoided?

6. MAINTAINING A CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Once the classification system has been developed and implemented, it also has to be kept up to date. New jobs or altered jobs have to be included in the existing model. For instance, make sure that all members of staff (and their managers) can report annually that their job description is out of date and needs adjusting. If fundamental changes are made to the job content, then the job is re-evaluated. Make sure in the procedures that women and men can make use of this possibility, for instance by officially asking all members of staff whether the job needs reviewing. This avoids a situation in which only those who shout loudly or dare to do so appeal to the maintenance procedure.

 **So ask yourself the following question:**

- In the maintenance procedure, is enough attention paid to ensuring that all staff (men and women) are given an opportunity to have their job description and evaluation updated if there are any fundamental changes in the job content?

7. LINKING THIS TO REMUNERATION

In wage negotiations, job categories are converted into wage categories. Jobs of equal value or equal weight will therefore entitle the job holders to the same wage. But an employee's wage usually consists of more than just the rate for the job. Other wage components are often added, such as additional bonuses (e.g. for overtime, evening or weekend work, dangerous work, etc.), or non-statutory forms of remuneration are granted, such as luncheon vouchers, group or hospitalisation insurance, etc. In some companies, in addition to the fixed wage (the rate for the job), variable remuneration systems are also applied. All these elements can result in a wage difference between men and women in the company. It is therefore important to pay sufficient attention to equal treatment between men and women in the job classification-remuneration link! Otherwise, despite the gender-neutral evaluation of their jobs, women and men will not receive equal pay!

Institute for the equality of women and men – Rue Ernest Blerot 1 - 1070 Brussels
Tel. : +32 2 233 41 84 - Fax : +32 2 233 40 32 - egalite.hommesfemmes@iefh.belgique.be - igvm-iefh.belgium.be



**INSTITUTE
FOR THE EQUALITY
OF WOMEN
AND MEN**