

Job Evaluation for White-Collar Workers in Private Sector Employment in the United States

A. L. KRESS ¹

EVERY ORGANISATION, large or small, has the problem of determining how much employees should be paid. Over the past few years a steadily increasing number of companies in the United States have been adopting job evaluation plans as a yardstick to replace arbitrary personal judgments. The purpose of this paper is to outline the principles and procedures which, even though the specific techniques may vary, are now generally accepted in the private sector of employment as providing the basis for sound salary administration.

The essentials of salary administration are few and simple, namely (i) a salary administration policy which sets forth what the company stands for in administering salaries and to whom responsibilities are delegated; (ii) a job evaluation plan to be used as a yardstick for the classification of jobs; (iii) job descriptions setting forth concisely the duties and responsibilities attaching to all jobs and serving as a basis for their evaluation and reference for future changes in content; (iv) a salary schedule setting forth the rate ranges for the various grades.

These four steps will be discussed more fully as a guide to the development of a programme.

Salary administration policy

The purpose of a salary administration policy is to provide guidance to the management staff on how salaries are to be administered. For

¹ Management consultant; former lecturer on job evaluation, School for Industrial and Labour Relations, Cornell University. For a recent account of job evaluation in the public sector, also in the United States, see the article by Carl F. LUTZ in *International Labour Review*, Vol. 99, No. 6, June 1969, pp. 607-619.

example, is it the policy to wait until a person asks for an increase in salary, or is there to be a systematic periodic review? Is it the policy to pay as little as possible or to see that salaries compare favourably with other companies in the area? How is overtime to be paid for? Shall promotions be made from within the organisation, even though that may mean training two persons instead of one when a vacancy is filled? Answers to these and similar questions should be spelled out as a guide to the staff.

In addition, the policy should specify who is responsible for salary administration, how new positions are to be classified, how salaries are to be adjusted in cases of promotion, the company's position on sick leave, travel time, vacation pay. A sample page from such a salary administration policy is reproduced as Annex I.

Job evaluation

There are two types of plan used in the United States for evaluating white-collar positions—point rating plans and factor comparison plans. The former are by far the more numerous.

Point rating

This system involves the selection of certain factors to be used in rating a job. Typical factors are education required by the job, experience, contacts with other persons, monetary responsibility. These factors are always requirements of jobs and not characteristics of persons performing them. For example, traits such as honesty and personality would have no place in a job rating plan since they relate to people and not to jobs. The number of factors may vary between four and ten.

The factors are assigned arbitrary percentage weights. Thus experience required by the job might be given a weight of 40 per cent. These factors are in turn broken down into degrees and points are assigned to each degree. For example, experience might be broken down into seven degrees as follows:

Degree	Time	Points
1	Up to three months	20
2	Over three months, up to twelve months . . .	40
3	Over one year, up to three years	60
4	Over three years, up to five years	80
5	Over five years, up to seven years	100
6	Over seven years, up to ten years	120
7	Over ten years	140

The final evaluation of the job is expressed in total points scored for all the various factors.

Job Evaluation for White-Collar Workers

The last step is the grouping of comparable jobs into grades or classes to simplify the salary structure. Clearly it would be unwise to set a rate range for every different total of points scored. There would be too many different salaries with insufficient variation between them. Thus a table is established listing the point ranges corresponding to different grades. Annex II shows the factors, degrees, points and grades by point ranges used in one such plan.

Factor comparison ¹

As already mentioned, the factor comparison method is used by relatively few companies compared with those using point rating plans. The reasons for this will soon be obvious.

If a company chose to adopt the factor comparison method, the procedure would be somewhat as follows:

(1) It would have to set up a job evaluation committee of five or more persons.

(2) The committee would select ten to twenty "key jobs" to be used as benchmarks or reference points. The salaries for these jobs should be neither subjects of controversy nor admittedly too high or too low.

(3) It would break the key jobs down into five rating factors—mental effort, skill, physical effort, responsibility, working conditions.

(4) It would prepare job descriptions for all jobs to be rated. This is usually done by a job analyst.

(5) It would have the committee construct a rating scale as follows:

(a) Each committee member ranks independently the key jobs selected on each of the five rating factors in sequence from high to low.

RANKING—MENTAL EFFORT

Job	Rater No.:					Pooled judgment
	1	2	3	4	5	
File clerk	1	1	2	1	1	6
Stenographer . . .	3	2	2	1	2	10
Secretary	4	2	3	2	3	14
Draftsman	4	3	2	3	3	15
Tool designer . . .	5	4	4	4	3	20

¹ See BERGE, BURK and HAY: *Manual of job evaluation* (Harper & Brothers, 1941) for a complete exposition of this method.

- (b) The committee is assembled and each member votes on the rankings; the rankings of all members are then totalled to arrive at the "pooled judgment". This is illustrated below for the factor mental effort, taking five jobs and five raters.
- (c) The pooled judgment "weights" are simply the sum of the rankings of the five raters.
- (d) Differences of opinion as to the rankings are discussed and any necessary changes made.

(6) The next step would be to evolve the job rating yardstick. The committee would allot point values to each of the five factors for all the key jobs. This involves three operations:

- (a) Allotting a total point value to each key job. Here the committee has to decide whether the present pay rates for the key jobs are about right, since the salaries will become the total point values. As one company explains it: "If an existing rate does not appropriately reflect the relationship of any key job to the others, judgment may be exercised in making adjustments here and there, in order to establish over-all relationships which seem reasonable." Advocates of point rating systems would not subscribe to this arbitrary procedure.
- (b) Having decided what each of the key jobs should pay, the next stage is to allocate or apportion that amount among the five factors. Thus if it is agreed that the stenographer's job should pay \$300 per month, the allocation might be:

Factor	Dollars
Mental effort	90
Skill	90
Physical effort	30
Responsibility	60
Working conditions	30
Total	300

An allocation among the five factors would similarly be made for every other job.

- (c) The final stage is called "smoothing the comparison scale" and consists of reviewing the factor values. The raters compare individual ratings and pool their judgment.

This completes the development of the yardstick under the factor comparison method. The procedure described will have occupied a great many hours of the committee's time. To summarise, the factor comparison method is based on (i) the selection of a number of key jobs (ten to twenty) chosen "because the rates paid for them are generally agreed

to be about right”¹; (ii) the ranking of these jobs by a committee, on at least three occasions, and the averaging of these rankings²; (iii) the arbitrary apportioning among the five factors of the rates of pay agreed to be about right; (iv) the comparison of all other jobs with the key jobs on each factor to determine the ratings; and (v) the use of dollars and cents rather than points in the ratings.

In practice the factor comparison method is unwieldy, slow and uncertain. The use of actual salaries to construct a rating scale is unsound. The less the individuals rating jobs know about present salaries the better. No reference to salaries should be made until jobs have been classified into grades.

Job descriptions

Before he starts writing job descriptions, the analyst should get a clear picture of the organisation. It is essential to know and to be able to visualise to whom the various persons report. The author has found it helpful, in conversation with the department head, to sketch out an organisation chart showing clearly which jobs involve supervisory responsibilities.

The first step in applying the job rating plan is the preparation of clear, concise job descriptions (a specimen of which appears as Annex III). It is impossible to rate jobs from job titles only. Securing the necessary information and writing the descriptions are the most time-consuming parts of a job evaluation plan and will require at least half the total time involved.

There are three methods used to secure the information—asking the employee to write out a statement of what he does, on a position data sheet; asking his supervisor to write it out; interviewing the employee. The first is the preferred method since it gives the employee a sense of participation. Often the supervisor is not familiar enough with the duties for the second method to be practicable. The third—interviewing—takes too long. The employee should be given a brief oral or written explanation of the purpose of the study before being asked to fill out a data sheet.

There is no one best way to write job descriptions. They are usually written by a job analyst, who will produce a clearer description by observing the following pointers:

- (a) The job analyst should study the data sheet carefully to see what is involved. He must have some understanding of the job in order to describe it.

¹ BENGE, BURK and HAY, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

² “The average of these thirty opinions (ten committee members) is taken as the official key-job ranking”, *ibid.*, p. 44.

- (b) If there is no sequence in the facts listed on the data sheet, the duties should be ranged in rough order of apparent importance.
- (c) The first sentence should say what the purpose of the job is. If the analyst cannot phrase it so that a reader will know why the job exists, he cannot write the rest of the description.
- (d) Succeeding sentences should be amplifications or elaborations of the basic duties set forth in the opening sentence.
- (e) Names of individuals should not appear in descriptions; reference should be made to other job titles.
- (f) Each sentence should begin with a word which denotes action such as "prepare", "analyse", "post".
- (g) Items which are not important should be omitted. For example, to include "open and read mail", "answer telephone", or "sign letters" in a buyer's description adds nothing of importance.
- (h) The use of abstract phrases such as "handle rejected material", "check records", or similar phrases should be avoided, since the scope of what is involved is not clear.
- (i) The description may contain more information than is actually required to rate the job. This information may be useful later in determining whether changes have occurred in job content.

After the descriptions for a department have been written, they should be submitted for approval and signature (in the following order) to the employee or employees concerned (some companies do not do this but it is recommended), to the immediate supervisor or section head, and to the department head. Where a bargaining unit is involved, the descriptions should now be reviewed and signed by the union, if no changes are proposed.

Job titles

Some data sheets may be returned by employees without any job title because none was ever assigned them. The title shown may be simply "clerk" or it may include the word "supervisor" even though no one is supervised. For example, the term "file supervisor" may be used to describe the person in charge of the files, who supervises no one. A necessary step may be the review of job titles. The use of titles such as senior clerk, intermediate clerk, junior clerk should be avoided. They are meaningless. If several sets of duties are involved, the most important should serve as a basis for the title. Terms such as "accountant", "chemist", and "engineer" should be used only if the job requires the equivalent technical education associated with such professions. Thus an employee making routine chemical analyses is not a "junior chemist".

Rating the job

Once the job evaluation plan has been adopted and the job descriptions written, it is possible to rate the jobs. There are several alternative methods.

(1) The person responsible for salary administration rates the jobs in consultation with the department head involved. Together they review the description, discuss the requirements of the job in terms of the rating factors, refer to the plan and decide on the degree for each factor. It is preferable to rate the jobs one factor at a time.

(2) The person responsible for salary administration rates the jobs and then submits a classification by grades to the department head for discussion as to the proper relationship of the various jobs.

(3) The rating is done by a committee.

The first or second method is recommended. In a typical organisation it is not possible to assemble a committee of manageable size whose members know enough about all the jobs to rate them. The department head should be the key man in the rating process and be made to feel he has a real part in rating the jobs for which he is responsible. The salary administrator's function is to explain the rating plan to the department head, give him examples of the degrees for the various factors and ensure consistency in the over-all application of the plan.

After the jobs have been rated with a department head, the points are added and the grade is determined from the table of grades by point ratings. A classification by grades is then prepared (see Annex IV). This process is repeated for all departments. A composite job classification is then prepared for the entire organisation for review by the management.

The end result of the study is the composite job classification by grades supported by job rating specification sheets, on one side of which is the job description and on the other side the requirements of the job in terms of every rating factor (see Annex V).¹

The salary schedule

The last step in the application of a job evaluation plan is the development of a salary schedule. The point rating plans usually provide for the grouping of jobs by grades or classes according to points scored. The number of grades is determined by the scope of the plan—how far up the salary structure the company decides to go.

¹ The procedure described here is basically that for point rating plans. The procedure using factor comparison is outlined in the description of that method on pp. 343-345 above.

There are three considerations in developing a salary schedule—

- (a) prevailing rates of pay for comparable jobs in the area;
- (b) the company's existing salary structure;
- (c) the fundamentals of a sound schedule.

Prevailing rates of pay

Most companies subscribe to the policy of seeing that salaries compare favourably with those paid by other companies in the area for similar jobs. It is common practice for companies to make salary surveys to ascertain the prevailing rates. Usually ten or so jobs are selected which can reasonably be expected to be found in other companies, such as stenographer, typist, key-punch operator, detailer, time-study man, industrial nurse. A typical group of companies is selected and a representative of the company visits them to compare salaries in terms of job descriptions. The data should not be limited to average rates, which are of little value: the number of persons on each job with their individual rates should be obtained.

In the United States the Bureau of Labour Statistics (BLS)¹ makes excellent salary surveys yearly in various areas. The most significant data in a salary survey are the ranges for the middle 50 per cent of the persons on a job, excluding the top and bottom 25 per cent. These ranges are shown on the BLS surveys for a large number of jobs. The surveys are usually far superior to those made by companies.

Existing salary structure

Having classified jobs into grades and listed the names of persons in them, the next step is to appraise the company's existing salary structure. Some companies plot correlation charts and compute the line of relationship. Such charts are scatter diagrams only and offer little basis for constructing a salary schedule. The writer prefers a simple tabulation showing salaries by grades and number of employees as shown below.

DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES BY GRADES AND SALARIES

Grade	No. of employees	Proposed rate range (in dollars)	Present monthly salaries (in dollars)									
			265	275	280	285	300	310	345	425	465	475
1	2	280-345	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	6	310-425	—	—	2	2	2	—	—	—	—	—
3	20	345-465	—	—	—	5	5	5	2	2	—	1

¹ In the Department of Labour.

Job Evaluation for White-Collar Workers

From this it can be seen at a glance that there are two employees in grade 1—one earning \$15 less than the proposed minimum and the other \$5 less than the minimum. In grade 2 there are six employees—two earning \$30 less than the minimum, two \$25 less, and two \$10 less. In grade 3 there are twenty employees—five earning \$60 less than the minimum, five \$45 less, five \$35 less, two earning the minimum, two within the range, and one earning \$10 above the maximum.

This tabulation would cover all the grades and would make it a simple matter to compute the cost of adopting the salary schedule. This might be between 3 and 6 per cent of the existing salary bill.

Fundamentals of a sound schedule

There are two types of salary schedule in use. The most common has a rate range for every grade. The other, which is typical of union-negotiated schedules, has a single rate for every grade. Thus if there were six key-punch operators, they would all receive the same rate. The purpose of the rate range is to recognise and reward individual merit.

In constructing a salary schedule two questions arise: what should be the percentage differential between the minimum of one grade and the next, and what should be the percentage range from minimum to maximum within a grade? These percentages should be consistent from grade to grade.

The author has used a formula for many years whereby the minimum of each grade is $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent higher than that of the grade below, and the range from minimum to maximum within a grade is in the neighbourhood of 35 per cent. In practice the latter figure varies between about 25 and 50 per cent.

SALARY SCHEDULE

Grade	Monthly rates (in dollars)			
	Minimum	Mid-point ¹	Maximum	Range
1	280	315	345	65
2	310	365	425	115
3	345	405	465	120
4	390	465	540	150
5	435	520	600	165
6	500	590	675	175
7	560	655	750	190
8	630	740	850	220
9	710	830	950	240
10	800	940	1 075	275
11	900	1 060	1 215	315
12	1 000	1 175	1 350	350

Note: The above schedule is based on the present statutory minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour or \$280 per month. It should be reviewed annually.

¹ Rounded to nearest \$5.

The author follows the practice of ascertaining the salary ranges of the middle 50 per cent from the BLS survey of the area for a few key jobs such as stenographer, key-punch operator, telephone operator and industrial nurse. From an analysis of these he constructs a salary schedule, using the 12 ½ per cent and 35 per cent principle, which could take some such form as that set out below.

TRAINEE PROGRESSION SCHEDULE

The rate ranges in the salary schedule are for experienced employees. A stenographer who has just completed a short course of shorthand and typing and has had no experience should be hired at less than the minimum. She is a trainee or beginner.

On the other hand, a job classification should not be made for a trainee whose competency is expected to increase month by month. Instead trainee progression schedules are set up related to the experience the job requires. This is especially applicable to clerical jobs. An example of such a schedule is given below:

TRAINEE PROGRESSION SCHEDULE

Grade	Monthly rates (in dollars)					Range
	Minimum hiring rate	Rate after:				
		3 months	6 months	9 months	1 year	
1	280	← no progression →				—
2	290	300	310	—	—	20
3	315	325	335	345	—	30
4	350	360	375	390	—	40
5	385	400	415	435	—	50
6	440	455	470	485	500	60

Assume the stenographer job is in grade 3. The minimum rate for that grade might be \$345 per month. The inexperienced person would be hired on the trainee progression schedule at \$315 per month with a review at the end of three months, six months and nine months. If she made satisfactory progress, she would automatically receive \$325 at the end of three months, \$335 at the end of six months, and \$345 or the minimum rate for the grade at the end of nine months.

The trainee progression schedule should be regarded as the minimum progression schedule. Trainees should be advanced more rapidly if their progress warrants it until the minimum for the grade is reached.

Putting the plan into effect

We have described the successive steps in the application of a job evaluation plan. If these steps have been carried out, all jobs have been

Job Evaluation for White-Collar Workers

described, classified by grades, employees assigned to jobs, a set of rate ranges established and the "impact cost" of installing the plan computed. All that now remains is to put the plan into effect.

For this purpose there needs to be a company policy decision on the following points:

(1) Are employees who are below the minimum for their grade to be brought up to the minimum? If not, the answer to the next question must be qualified.

(2) Should the individual employee be told his job title, grade and rate range? Unless the employees are to be brought up to the minimum, obviously they should not be told their rate ranges.

(3) Should the employee be permitted to see his job description?

(4) Should he be permitted to question his grade if he wishes?

There are differences of opinion on how far a company should go in telling employees these things. Some companies tell them nothing. Some tell them everything but the rate range. The author recommends an affirmative answer to all four questions. Obviously, where a union is involved, the employee will know these things.

It is suggested in putting the plan into effect that (i) a letter over the signature of the chief executive be sent to employees explaining the new plan and outlining company policy as to its administration; (ii) every employee be told his job title, grade and rate range; (iii) any employee who wishes to see his job description or discuss his grade be given an opportunity to do so; (iv) employees presently receiving salaries in excess of the maximum of their grade be assured there will be no reduction; (v) employees receiving less than the minimum of their grade be brought up to the minimum if qualified (otherwise they should be placed on the trainee progression schedule); (vi) a statement of policy as to administration of the plan be given to all department heads for their guidance; (vii) someone, preferably in the personnel department, be made responsible for the administration of the plan.

Union relationships

Unionisation of white-collar workers has made little progress in the United States except in some of the larger industries like automobiles and steel. The techniques described in this paper are applicable whether the white-collar personnel are organised or not. The outline of a job evaluation scheme in the steel industry developed in full consultation with the union concerned is given in the appendix. The existence of a bargaining unit may modify the procedure in some respects.

The union may or may not want to be a party to the adoption of the rating plan. Often the union denies interest in the plan but reserves

the right to contest the results of its application in terms of the job classification by grades. It tells the company to go ahead and rate jobs as it sees fit: it will not be bound to accept the results.

On the other hand, if the union does want to review and accept, modify or reject the plan, then the company must go through the process of explaining it and trying to win acceptance for it. The former course is wiser for the union since its bargaining position remains more flexible.

Job evaluation may be requested by the union or proposed by the company. In either case, there should be a clear understanding on the following points. How does the company propose to get the information for the job description from employees, and who will approve the job descriptions on behalf of the union? Who will represent the union in reaching an agreement on the classification of jobs by grades and a salary schedule? The final step must be the incorporation of the plan in the collective agreement by the addition of suitable clauses.

* * *

Although it is obviously impossible in a paper of this length to do justice to so vast a subject, we have attempted to outline the basic principles and techniques which are generally followed in the United States in the application of job evaluation for white-collar employees in the private sector of employment. The details of these schemes vary between companies, but all of them rely on: a rating plan, using either the point system or factor comparisons; job descriptions; salary surveys; rate ranges and trainee progression schedules.

APPENDIX

A Joint Union-Management Job Rating Plan for an Industry

The majority of job evaluation plans for white-collar employees in the United States are unilateral. This means they are developed and applied by management with little or no participation by employees, other than their written statements as to their duties. The chief reason for this is the fact that unionisation of such employees has made little progress.

An outstanding exception (perhaps the only one of its kind) is the "CWS Salaried Clerical and Technical Job Classification" in the steel industry. The plan itself was developed by American Associated Consultants jointly with and for the steel companies and the United Steel Workers of America for job rating white-collar employees represented by the union.¹ It is the yardstick accepted by both the union and the steel companies for use in the evaluation of white-collar jobs in bargaining units. The objective is not only the elimination of intra-plant inequities: it is also to standardise salaries for such employees throughout the industry.

The plan follows the same basic principles as are outlined in the body of this paper. The factors used in rating and their weights are as follows:

Basic factors	Percentage of total
Pre-employment training.	15
Employment training and experience	18
Mental skill	27
Responsibility for performance	22
Responsibility for contacts	7
Working conditions	5
Responsibility for direction	6
Total	100

Each factor is subdivided into factor code levels and point values are assigned to each level.

The manual sets out in detail the criteria to be applied in determining whether certain jobs are to be excluded from the scope of collective bargaining for these purposes, such as those performed by supervisory, administrative and professional employees, management trainees, watchmen and guards, and employees occupying confidential and other non-management jobs directly associated with management, such as industrial relations jobs.

The manual sets forth the procedure to be followed in writing job descriptions and includes descriptions and ratings for some 150 jobs.

A section deals with the administration of the plan, such as handling transfers, promotions, demotions. There is a standard salary for every job class, in other words there are no rate ranges.

The rating plan itself is included in the manual.

¹ The manual explaining the plan is available from American Associated Consultants Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York City 10017 at \$18.50.

ANNEX I. SPECIMEN PAGE FROM SALARY ADMINISTRATION POLICY

VIII. Salary Increases

A. *Basis for salary increases*

1. Individual salary increases shall be made only for the following reasons:
 - (a) Merit increase to or within established rate ranges.
 - (b) Promotions.

B. *Merit increases*

1. A merit increase is an increase in an employee's salary made as a reward for good performance. A merit increase should be earned by the employee through increased effort.

C. *Frequency of merit increases within rate ranges*

1. Employees shall be reviewed annually on the anniversary of their employment, or the date of placement in the grade, whichever is later, for a merit increase not to exceed 10 per cent, levelled to the nearest \$5, *so long as such increase is within their rate range.*
 - (a) This policy is not to be construed as a commitment to increase every employee 10 per cent annually until the grade maximum is reached. It does, however, permit annual merit increases up to 10 per cent where an employee has *earned* such increase.
 - (b) Recommended increases in excess of 10 per cent shall be specifically approved by the Division President.
2. Merit increases beyond the midpoint of a rate range shall be made only if the employee's performance is above average.

D. *Merit increases—promotions*

1. A promotion involves the transfer of an employee from his present position to a position classified in a higher grade. Promotions may involve:
-

ANNEX II. SALARY RATING PLAN

Job Rating Plan—Non-Manual Jobs

Factors	Degree:						
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
1. Education	15	30	45	60	75	90	—
2. Experience	20	40	60	80	100	120	140
3. Complexity of duties	15	30	45	60	75	90	—
4. Responsibility for errors	5	10	20	40	60	80	—
5. Responsibility for contacts with others	5	10	20	40	60	80	—
6. Responsibility for confidential data	5	10	15	20	25	—	—
7. Mental-visual attention	5	10	15	20	25	—	—
8. Working conditions	5	10	15	20	25	—	—
<i>Factors to be added for supervisory jobs only</i>							
9. Type of supervision	5	10	20	40	60	80	—
10. Extent of supervision	5	10	20	40	60	80	100

Job Evaluation for White-Collar Workers

Grades by Point Ranges

Grade	Point range	Grade	Point range
1	100 points or less	11	375-400 points
2	105-130 points	12	405-430 „
3	135-160 „	13	435-460 „
4	165-190 „	14	465-490 „
5	195-220 „	15	495-520 „
6	225-250 „	16	525-550 „
7	255-280 „	17	555-580 „
8	285-310 „	18	585-610 „
9	315-340 „	19	615-640 „
10	345-370 „	20	645-670 „

ANNEX III. SPECIMEN JOB DESCRIPTION

Position Description

CLERICAL, TECHNICAL AND SUPERVISORY

POSITION NAME: Chemist	POS. NO.: 160-2
REPORTS TO: Supervisor, chemical laboratory	DIV.: XYZ Co.
POSITION DESCRIPTION:	PLANT: Elmira
	DEPT.: Engineering
	GRADE:

Perform a variety of duties in connection with the making of chemical and physical control analyses of incoming material and the control of various solutions.

Inspect and analyse incoming material such as cast iron, steel, alloys, non-ferrous metals, paints, oils, cleaning compounds, purchased parts, in accordance with standard procedures. Record results of inspections and tests. Approve or reject material; diagnose trouble. Maintain solutions such as chrome, cadmium, copper plating; chemically check and calculate additions as required. Test and check coatings.

Perform related duties such as maintain chemical corrosion control checks on boilers; suggest chemical additives, carry out tests on equipment such as salt spray chamber, humidity and submersion chambers, trouble shoot on problems in plant.

THIS DESCRIPTION IS NOT A COMPLETE STATEMENT OF ALL THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH GO WITH THE POSITION. IT CONTAINS ONLY THE FACTS NECESSARY TO RATE THE POSITION.

ANNEX IV

Composite Job Classification by Grades, XYZ Company

Job code	Department	Job name	FLS Act
	<i>Grade 2</i>		
10-1	Accounting	File clerk	NE
10-5	Accounting	Typist-clerk	NE
15-1	Engineering	White print operator	NE
	<i>Grade 3</i>		
10-2	Accounting	Key-punch operator	NE
10-3	Accounting	Payroll clerk	NE
10-4	Accounting	Stenographer	NE
25-5	Office	Switchboard operator	NE
40-3	Production control	Flexowriter operator	NE
50-6	Purchasing	Stores record clerk	NE
	<i>Grade 4</i>		
25-4	Office	Stenographer-secretary	NE
	<i>Grade 5</i>		
30-5	Personnel	Nurse-industrial	
	<i>Grade 6</i>		
20-3	Industrial engineering	Time study man—B	
30-4	Personnel	Interviewer	

Note: The column headed FLS Act shows overtime exemption status, which is determined by Fair Labour Standards Act. NE denotes non-exempt or by statute subject to time-and-one-half for hours worked in excess of forty in a week.

ANNEX V. JOB SPECIFICATION SHEET

Job Rating Specification

CLERICAL, TECHNICAL AND SUPERVISORY

JOB NAME: Cost clerk — Plant controls

OCC. NO.: 330-1

DIV.: COST

GRADE: 5

POINTS: 200

Factor	Specification	Rating	
		D	PTS
EDUCATION	Use arithmetic to check additions and extensions on statements, prove ledger, prepare reports, vouchers, statements. Work with invoices, statements, vouchers, ledgers, record books. Knowledge of book-keeping and calculating machine operation. Equivalent to four years high school plus short specialised training up to one year.	2	30

Job Evaluation for White-Collar Workers

Factor	Specification	Rating	
		D	PTS
EXPERIENCE	Over one year, up to three years.	3	60
COMPLEXITY OF DUTIES	Somewhat repetitive duties, working from standard practice, which involve planning and performing various procedures. Make decisions as to how and when duties are to be performed which require initiative and judgment to analyse statements, plan work, determine action to be taken within limits of standard procedure, such as suggesting methods of preparing cost statement books, plant controls.	3	45
RESPONSIBILITY FOR ERRORS	Probable errors such as mistakes in extensions, preparation of reports are usually apparent before the work leaves the section. Correction would involve some loss or difficulty in back checking.	2	10
RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONTACTS WITH OTHERS	Regular contacts with persons in other departments to obtain or supply information regarding charge numbers, statements, which require tact to discuss problems and get co-operation. Primary responsibility rests with next higher level of supervision.	3	20
RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONFIDENTIAL DATA	Regularly works with some confidential data such as cost statements where indiscretion may cause internal dissatisfaction.	3	15
MENTAL-VISUAL ATTENTION	Continuous mental and visual attention to perform assigned duties since the duties require constant alertness.	3	15
WORKING CONDITIONS	Usual office working conditions.	1	5

Factors to be added for supervisory jobs only

TYPE OF SUPERVISION			
EXTENT OF SUPERVISION			