

APPENDIX C

REVISED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT (APPRAISAL) SCHEME AND PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF PERFORMANCE RELATED INCREMENTS (PRI) POLICY

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM STAFF DURING THE CONSULTATION PERIOD – 5th – 27th MARCH 2015

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE SUBMITTED BY MEMBER OF STAFF</u>
1.	<p>In response to the current consultation re performance related payment of increments, I'd like to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In principle I have no problem with performance related pay, but believe increments should be awarded for achieving a 'Good grading' & should only be withheld to incentivise staff that are judged as 'in need of improvement'. We are all struggling to deliver services with limited resources & this is a difficult environment to deliver 'Excellent' performance even for the best of staff;• Staff morale is generally low & the prospect of having increments withheld when it is generally judged that you are doing a good job will not help;• A situation where some staff are receiving increments & some are not within the same team will not encourage team working & is likely to encourage staff to work in silo's to the detriment of service delivery;• The proposal will pressurise managers to award 'Excellent' gradings to staff rather than giving 'Good' & highlighting potential improvements. Failing to award 'Excellent' gradings will cause resentment towards managers, & again reduce the effectiveness of team working;• The use of moderation panels to check that 'Excellent' & 'Outstanding' grades can be justified will deter award of these grades to avoid additional workload;• In general, we are hanging on by our fingertips because resources are being reduced & expectations are increasing. In my opinion this proposal far from squeezing more out of staff will demotivate them & reduce productivity.

2.	<p>I'd like to make the following observations and comments based on the suggested performance related pay scheme.</p> <p>I believe that the performance related aspect of this policy should be awarded to all those who achieve a Good or higher rating, otherwise for all intents and purposes this scheme appears to be nothing more than a way to stop most staff receiving a pay increment, neatly wrapped up in a bow to make it appear the Council is rewarding excellent work in order to reduce the wages bill; given the painfully low pay rises for staff over the past few years compared to the on-going increase in living costs this policy in its current form will do nothing more than affect those who are paid least with no regard shown by those Councillors and Senior managers for whom this will make no real difference in take-home pay.</p> <p>This policy will do nothing but reduce an already painfully low staff morale even lower and given the inclusion of a 'Moderation Panel' I believe it will be viewed by most staff as a way the Council will find ways to stop increases for those that have received an 'Excellent/Outstanding' rating, this also seems a bigger snub to staff given the recent news that Cambridge City, South Cambs and Peterborough City Councils are all either accredited or working towards paying a Living wage to all staff.</p> <p>There are many staff for whom the work they are doing will make it virtually impossible to achieve anything other than a 'Good' rating, even though they may work as hard as those who have a flexible job that will allow them to achieve a higher rating, purely because the work they do won't allow anything else.</p> <p>Also this policy gives no increase to those who are at the top of their pay scale unless they receive an 'Outstanding' rating, surely if a member of staff receives an 'Excellent' rating they should move up to the next scale level so they can aim to improve further rather than being passed over? Otherwise is there any real chance that this policy will achieve what it expects to?</p> <p>I would also be interested in knowing if this policy will be used to judge the work done by Elected Members before they are allowed any increase in pay/benefits? Also whom will be responsible for the PRM for the Chief Executive and the Assistant Directors?</p> <p>Whilst I have no doubt that members will ignore all comments made in order to approve this policy I would still be grateful if you can confirm that comments made by staff will be published and given to EVERY member, not just those who sit on the R&SS Committee so that when this inevitably gets voted in the</p>
----	---

	members will understand it was their choice that leads to the continued poor morale of staff at this Council.
3.	<p><u>Draft Revised Appraisal Scheme</u></p> <p>Whilst it does not seem to be clear from the consultation documents, I am assuming that the appraisal process for the current year will be based upon the existing processes and paperwork.</p> <p>If this is not the case, I would have serious concerns as a Service Lead to the introduction of the new scheme and appraisal form with effect from May of this year, as Service Leads are still adapting to the radical implications of the past year's re-structuring, the new responsibilities and requirements placed upon them and the significant additional workloads arising therefrom. In addition, Service Leads also are being required to implement the new Performance Management Framework and Transformation Programme, as well as preparing for the new intake of Councillors from the forthcoming District Council Elections. The commencement of a new appraisal process on top of all this from May onwards, would probably be the 'straw that broke the camel's back' for Service Leads and result in unacceptable workloads and levels of stress for them.</p> <p><u>Draft Performance Related Increments Policy</u></p> <p>I do not have a problem with the concept of rewarding staff for excellent or outstanding performance, rather than merely on the basis of 'time served', irrespective of whether their performance is good, bad or indifferent. But any Performance Related Increments Policy should reward all staff on a fair and equitable basis. Therefore, the proposed policy seems flawed to me since it does not reward staff on a fair and equitable basis for excellent and outstanding performance.</p> <p>Staff within their salary scale that get a rating of 'Excellent' will receive 1 increment, whilst staff at the maximum point of their salary scale that get a rating of 'Excellent' will receive nothing at all. Similarly staff within their salary scale that get a rating of 'Outstanding' will receive 1 increment plus 1% of basic salary as a one-off lump sum payment, whilst staff at the maximum point of their salary scale that get a rating of 'Outstanding' will receive merely 1% of basic salary as a one-off lump sum payment. This means that excellent performance is not rewarded for staff at the top of their scale, but is rewarded for those within scale. In addition, the value of outstanding performance for staff within scale is much higher than for those at</p>

	<p>the top of their scale. This seems wrong on the grounds of merit, fairness and equity, as it implies that the value of excellent or outstanding performance from someone is less just because they happen to be at the top of their salary scale. Therefore, if a Performance Related Increments Policy is to be introduced, it should ensure that it rewards all staff as fairly and equitably as possible for excellent or outstanding performance, otherwise it risks being counter-productive and not incentivising all staff to achieve the highest levels of performance.</p> <p>Whilst I understand the need not to distort salary scales, I am sure that a method could be devised to ensure that staff at the top of their scales receive a one-off performance payment which more closely equates to that received by those within scale for achieving excellent or outstanding performance. This would be a good motivational tool and an aid to the retention and recruitment of high performing staff.</p>
4.	<p>I am emailing in response to the consultation on the proposed performance related pay. I should highlight at the outset that I have a number of serious concerns over the proposals.</p> <p>Firstly, I am concerned that the many staff have not realised what this consultation is about and the effect that the scheme may have. When asking in my own department, only one or two people were aware a consultation was taking place. I appreciate that all staff were emailed. However, given the serious implications of this particular proposal, I believe that a more robust approach would have been appropriate. The consultation method used is the same as has taken place for other more general changes to policies and procedures at the Council and I fear that it may have been disregarded as 'unimportant' by officers who are dealing with heavy workloads and stretched email inboxes.</p> <p>In terms of the proposal itself, I have a number of concerns relating to equalities implications, in particular in relation to the negative impact I believe this scheme would have on the 'gender pay gap' at the Council. However, I am aware that these points are being raised by Unison and as such, I will not reiterate those concerns here.</p> <p>Instead, I would like to give you some thoughts on why I feel this scheme would be particularly detrimental in my own area of work at the Council, planning.</p> <p>We carry out a Statutory function as the Local Planning Authority and as such our accountabilities relate in part to Government set targets. These targets are high and difficult to achieve. To meet them and ensure the</p>

authority is not deemed to be failing, whilst delivering a high standard of to our many different customers is no mean feat. In this respect, I believe it is extremely difficult to quantify the difference between 'Good', 'Excellent' and 'Outstanding' in our line of work (and incidentally even more so for those working in Planning Enforcement and Registration). To even achieve good in our department requires considerable effort and should be applauded. In my opinion this is key failing of the proposal, as it assumes that in all roles across the council it is equally possible to meet the definition of outstanding.

The impact of this in my department will be demoralised Officers who do not feel valued for the hard work they put in.

Another key concern in relation to my area of work is the significant adverse impact this will have on younger officers embarking on their career. Planning is a complex and multi-disciplinary profession. You require knowledge in a huge area of subjects from architecture, and the historic environment to drainage infiltration rates and ecological surveys! This is in addition to the details understanding legislation (which is often rapidly changing) and case law.

Even with a relevant undergraduate degree and a masters degree, a young planner is not ready made with this knowledge. It is something that you acquire through your work, over time. The pay scales and yearly increments reflect this. There is no equivalent mechanism in the performance related pay structure to appropriately remunerate for increases in knowledge and experience.

This will have a detrimental impact on the Council in two main ways.

Firstly, there will in my opinion, be a much higher turn-over of officers, as an increase in salary may only be possible with a change in job. This would have a significant detrimental impact in terms of staff recruitment costs and disruption from a team constantly in flux.

Secondly I believe it will be harder to recruit new planners who will see limited prospect for a salary in line with the industry standards for our profession. Indeed, with an improving economy this issue could be exacerbated as there are likely to more jobs created in this sector.

I do understand where the approach to a performance related pay structure is coming from. However, I do not agree that it is appropriate in the context of the Council, nor that the proposed scheme is the correct model to be used. I am not adverse to change and have helped to facilitate some significant changes in our

	<p>department. However, I feel that I must highlight my grave misgivings with this particular proposal.</p>
--	---

	<p>I am sure that you will give careful consideration to these points and all those raised as a result of this process. In light of my initial comments about the consultation process, I would advise caution against any assumption that a low response rate correlates with a lack of concern amongst staff.</p>
--	---