The role of the supervisor in providing comments following each staff member’s response to the questions is to ensure that positions under their supervision are treated equitably, and so that all positions can be accurately compared and evaluated by the Joint Job Evaluation Committee.

It is very important to the job evaluation process that supervisors consider the responses to their own staff members’ questionnaires in the wider context of the other jobs within the professional staff group. The questionnaire has been designed to assess the bona fide job requirements of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions for all jobs within the PEA.

When a position has changed (i.e. significant duties or responsibilities have been added to or subtracted from the position), the incumbent may submit a JEQ highlighting the changes to the position.

Please read the instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire to familiarize yourself with the procedures. Then review the position summary prepared by the staff member and ensure that it is an accurate representation of the core responsibilities and duties of the position. You may add comments where appropriate.

Each question requires a response level to be selected by the staff member, followed by job specific examples to illustrate the response chosen. Please carefully review the examples provided by the staff member. If you conclude that the staff member has either over or under estimated a response level, we recommend that you consider the following:

- If you have a collaborative working relationship with the staff member, you may meet with her/him and query their rationale further. Please do not put pressure on her/him to change their response. You may point out any factual discrepancies in her/his examples for them to consider, however, if it a matter of opinion, we suggest that you thank him/her for the clarifications and leave it at that. At the end of the day, it is the Committee who will assign factor ratings based on its knowledge of the systems and other jobs on campus; what we need from the incumbent and from you is concrete examples of work performed.

- In the comment section, provide factual information that the joint committee requires. For example; if the staff member provided an example under problem solving that you consider is not a core function of the position, indicate that this occurs rarely, or is not expected of the position. If the staff member underestimated her/his financial responsibility and did not provide examples that accurately illustrated the level of financial responsibility of her/his position, rather than
providing argument, provide alternative examples that factually represent the core responsibilities of the position’s financial responsibility.

- Provide the committee with your suggested “Alternative response level”.
- Avoid expressing opinions or argument such as “this position is invaluable” or “the employee is wrong”.
- Please keep your comments brief. If you have nothing to add, that’s fine; however, the Committee does very much value and require the input of supervisors.

Excluded managers (Deans, Executive Directors, or in some cases, Vice Presidents) are asked to provide comments at the end of the questionnaire. You should take the same approach, but on a more global basis, since you will be reviewing a larger number of questionnaires covering a broader range of positions. Please ensure that there is consistency across administrative units with respect to the various factors. This is very important from an institutional perspective.

The questionnaires are returned to the staff member for final comment before they come to the joint committee for evaluation. This provides an opportunity to the member to review your observations and make any last comments.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact either Co-Chair of the Joint Job Evaluation Committee (JJEC) by email: peajec@uvic.ca