

## Consultation Comments for the Appraisal Policy

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
15	I don't agree with section 15.	SNC	This is being moved to the Appendix, and supports competency awareness.
	Someone performing well is what we want surely? Are we really saying that anything other than exceptional still requires work or improvement?	SNC	Yes, but there are always things that can be fed back to be done differently.
	I think that it's quite unrealistic, and not very encouraging, to say that someone who <b>performs well</b> still needs to work on that score.	SNC	Performs well is not the highest score so there is room for improvement.
	The end result could be too many 4's which are wholly unrepresentative.	SNC	Scores will be moderated to review any trends of high or low scoring
	If all my team were performing at 3 'well' for all their areas, with a few 4's I'll be satisfied with their performance.	SNC	NOTED
	The first is regarding the proposed timing of the appraisals. The flow chart indicates that these are due to be completed by the end of March. This could cause some difficulties as staff do tend to take leave in March to use up their holidays (I myself will be taking a week off in mid-March). It also coincides with the end of the financial year which is for many of us a busy time in any event.	SNC	Appraisals should be spread over Feb/March to fall in line with corporate planning.
	The second point is that it's proposed that a 4 point scale is used to measure performance. I would suggest that a 5 point scale would be more appropriate as the mid-point would be a good indicator of someone performing satisfactorily. If a 4 point scale is used a score of 2 would imply slightly less than satisfactory performance and a score of 3 slightly better neither of which may be appropriate.	SNC	This is a good suggestion and will consider 4 point score - 2 satisfactory and 2 not.
	On a more general point the guidance is welcome as it does clarify some of the points which caused concern last year.	SNC	NOTED
	The process of setting objectives and identifying development needs relies on having clear goals set at high level, which are cascaded down through the line management structure. I take it that priorities will be set by senior management in time for them to be passed down through	SNC	Service plans and budgets should be agreed in Feb so appraisals can take place for JMT.

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
	appraisal system.		
	Our main concern is the timeframe which is Feb/March	<b>SNC</b>	The appraisal cycle needs to take place in specified timescales to avoid impact on other things, although exceptional circumstances may dictate otherwise.
	This is "end of year" for my teams and is the busiest time, together with the fact that many of the staff will have booked their remaining annual leave.	<b>SNC</b>	
	I can see the reason why this would be the optimum time (before the new year begins) but it will be very difficult , especially this year, as there will be a squeeze if we cascade down from Senior Managers, and not everyone will have received training in time	<b>SNC</b>	
	Generally I think the notes are very good especially as they place more emphasis on developing employees, which seemed to be absent last year.	<b>SNC</b>	NOTED
	Point 16. Previously I did comment that I thought it would be better if there were 5 scores so that the 'Preforms satisfactory' is mid-range and not below the mid-point as it currently is when there are 4 scores. My feeling was that a score below the midpoint perceives an under achievement which I don't think should be the intention for a satisfactory score.	<b>SNC</b>	This will be reviewed.
	It could do with some refining in some areas and it would be good to move some of the theoretical parts to an Appendix Section	<b>SNC UNISON</b>	This is being reviewed.
	Needs to be clearer in terms of the three roles of Appraisee, Appraiser and Reviewer. Manager is referred to a lot rather than Appraiser.	<b>SNC UNISON</b>	This is being reviewed.
<b>3</b>	Section Three This is confusing and reference to partnership and shared working is an over-complication and does not relate to this policy.	<b>SNC UNISON</b>	It is important to note that all staff working at CDC and SNC should receive feedback even if not a formal appraisal.
<b>5</b>	Section Five Appraisal Cycle - this could go in the Appendix Section and needs to clarify that the February -March timescales is to undertake the Appraisal document for objectives commencing in April otherwise the timescales do not fit with Appendix1.	<b>SNC UNISON</b>	To be moved to Appendix and Amended.

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
6	Section 6 Manager should read Appraiser and smart should say S.M.A.R.T.	SNC UNISON	Amended
7	Section 7 should be headed How should <b>we</b> prepare?	SNC UNISON	Amended
10	Section 10 fifth bullet <b>Agree</b> a date for the Appraisal meeting.	SNC UNISON	Amended
12	Section 12 <b>If an employee is under-performing</b>	SNC UNISON	Amended
14	Section 14 Partially Achieved - Suggest 50% - 25% is too low.	SNC UNISON	Partially achieved is now marked as a 2. for under 50% or 3 for over 50%. Achievement would still need to be over 25% to score a 2. Nearly Achieved 2.
	Suggest including a fourth assessment criteria UN Unable to be achieved ie where priorities have changed , The way has processed was changed means that the role has changed, role changed or other there may be some external change which has meant that this objective could not be completed..	SNC UNISON	Not achieved should identify either where an employee cannot or has not achieved a target. Where the target cannot be achieved this should be removed.
16	Section 16 Competence and behaviours are substituted for each other and this is confusing. Would prefer the focus to be upon assessing competencies which is more objective rather than behaviours.	SNC UNISON	
23	Better to go as appendix.	SNC UNISON	Amended
	Remove the reference to voluntary work as it is not felt to be appropriate on this occasion when staff are already working very hard!	SNC UNISON	Agree and amended
28	Section 28 Seventh Bullet You are assuming that the Reviewer is aware of the performance of other team members.	SNC UNISON	The reviewer is likely to be a senior manager or head of service and should have an outline knowledge of the teams performance
29	Section 29 would be good to move this section to Section 7 as it is useful information to think about prior to the Appraisal Meeting.	SNC UNISON	Agreed and amended.

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
Appendix 1	Appendix 1 Looking Back Competencies Assessment Header should read <b>1,2,3 or 4</b> so that managers do not think that they have to put a number against each bullet point.	SNC UNISON	Amended
	The sign off section needs to refer to Appraisee and Appraiser rather than manager and employee.	SNC UNISON	Amended
Appendix 3	Appendix 3 What does <b>Part A</b> refer to?	SNC UNISON	This has been updated and Part A no longer referred to.
Appendix 4	Appendix 4 Question 2 or development did you identify?	SNC UNISON	This form is being reviewed. Some information is being moved to Appendices.
1	(i) Very detailed like a training manual. Would like an alternative bullet version.  (ii) Do not think the appraisal guidance document is clear enough to support this policy (see below)	Staff Consultation Group	NOTED
2	Agree with the sentiment behind the appraisal guidance and have maintained my own personal development plan as this would be helpful to keep an eye on where I am going and where I was the year before.  What will happen if not done by end of March, i.e. sickness	Staff Consultation Group	It's good for staff to keep their own evidence and information about appraisals. In the event of exceptional circumstances such as sickness and maternity, dates may change.
5	There seems to be info missing from box 2  Does 2 'The previous year's performance...' mean the financial year?	Staff Consultation Group	This will be updated in the policy.  Yes
6	Like the idea of regular (every 2 to 4 weeks) one-to-ones but do not see this as practical or realistic given my experience to date.	Staff Consultation Group	121's should be held regularly based on the needs of the employee, manager and service. This may not be every 2 to 4 weeks.
14	First thing that struck me is that its quite short notice. Second was that in section 14 Assessing Specific Objectives, its only possible to Fail, Partially or Fully Achieve objectives. Most appraisal systems also have an Exceeds as it is possible that you could realise that more could be done with the objective that has been set and you could go beyond the original objective to achieve this.  If this is linked to the criteria on Looking back there are four areas of	Staff Consultation Group	The appraisal process has been in place for many years, so timescales are not changing.  These are being revised to 4 scores.

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
	achievement, This section should mirror that		There will be four scores for both sections.
17	How can this be assessed fairly? Further clarification on how this will be implemented this April needs to be considered and communicated effectively. Have some doubts as to how the pay increment will be implemented fairly this April given this guidance is only now available and was not available at the previous appraisal. Does this imply that no increments will happen until April 2014? I guess there will be some people who have lots of objectives and some people who have fewer objectives. Will increments start from April or the April 2014?	<b>Staff Consultation Group</b>	Training will take place in Feb/March 2013. Moderation will also take place. Increments at CDC will be backdated to the 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2012.
23	Whilst there are a number of areas for development the practical ability for people to attend is often outweighed by the requirement to get the job done	<b>Staff Consultation Group</b>	Not sure what this means, but, the appraisal process is important to ensure performance is reviewed and amended regularly.
25	The "setting of the objectives" section (25) is not clear. Under the subheading "How many objectives?", its not clear on how many objectives should be set. The first statement means 8 or less objectives and it is not clear why fewer should be set for non-office based staff or as part of team where others are fulfilling the same role. Why should be people whose workload is shared or work outside the office have less objectives to achieve?	<b>Staff Consultation Group</b>	Being reviewed.
Appendix 2	Appendix 2- The form in appendix 2 has 6 objective boxes, does this mean that 6 is a better number than 8 or would you need to have someone sharing your workload to have 6 objectives? This section is not clear enough and needs further work.	<b>Staff Consultation Group</b>	The Appendix form is an example and more or less objectives can be added. The ideal number is no more than 8.
Appendix 4	The self-assessment form in appendix 4 is particularly useful to highlight problems within the organisation others may not be aware of and an opportunity to say what has been good and bad throughout the year and any further resources which may be required if innovative ideas are given merit. Providing the manager and HR actually read this section, I feel this is a positive addition to the process. However, this may not work for all employees and managers if there is not a good working relationship there already.	<b>Staff Consultation Group</b>	Suggest this form as being optional as not all staff may want to use.
	I know that a couple of members of my team have some concerns about the draft policy. Approximately 60% of the teams work is responding to planning applications and listed building consent applications. This area of the work is difficult to quantify, as the quality of output and advice is more important than the speed and turn around. The majority of performance targets relate to reports and guidance that we put together, typically being either planning policy or	<b>Staff Consultation Group</b>	This appears to be an issue with target setting and the training will help ensure targets are SMART

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
	<p>conservation area appraisals. These documents are however subject to change as the planning agenda and political climate changes and it is not uncommon for this to happen in a review period.</p> <p>A specific concern is how changes in agenda are managed within this process. For instance one member of my team was asked to take on two very important pieces of planning policy work a couple of months after her appraisal. These were very time consuming, but the outputs were excellent and strategically important for the Council. It is however unlikely that she will meet the original goals set out in her appraisal. Would the system have the flexibility to deal with this situation, where the employee has not met targets and yet performed to a very high standard?</p>		<p>Targets should be reviewed at all appraisal meetings and this may mean adding, deleting or changing them before a final assessment is undertaken so the scheme and process should be flexible to allow for this.</p>
	<p>At the feedback meeting there were issues raised by managers that they felt that sometimes there is difficulty in completing the various aspects of the appraisal process because they have their job as well as the management role. It was pointed out that the role of a manager is to manage staff and all that that involves and if other aspects could not be dealt with that it was the responsibility of the manager to talk to their managers. This may be an aspect that senior managers would wish to note, along with the comment above as it may be identifying a training need.</p>	<p><b>Staff Liaison Co-ordinator</b></p>	<p>Appraisals are a tool to help both employees and managers feedback on performance. It is the responsibility of both to ensure this happens.</p>
1	<p>Can we split the policy so that it is the actual policy on what is required to be done to record, monitor and report on performance is one section. And then all the other info as a 'training and advice' appendix.</p>	<p><b>CDC UNISON</b></p>	<p>This is being reviewed.</p>
2	<p>What will be the schedule of audit be.</p>	<p><b>CDC UNISON</b></p>	<p>For CDC as part of the incremental progression policy moderation.</p>
3	<p>Who are other organisations? We could end up doing lots of work for other organisations. The employee should show evidence of performance to their own manager from wherever they come.</p>	<p><b>CDC UNISON</b></p>	<p>Occasionally the council has seconded employees or employees from partner organisations where it is important to ensure feedback is given.</p>
5	<p>Can we have a bullet point chart as well as the flow chart.</p>	<p><b>CDC UNISON</b></p>	<p>Unfortunately as this is a cycle, bullet points would not show the same thing.</p>

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
6	There should be an evidence gathering log. Appendix 4 could be expanded to have a log at the bottom of it.	CDC UNISON	Appendix 4 will remain as requested elsewhere but an evidence log can be added.
8	Must be a log for scrutiny and consistency	CDC UNISON	See above.
10	There must be a form to show where evidence gained from so that it can stand up to later scrutiny	CDC UNISON	See above.
17	Evidence log required. What is expected behaviour? Against what criteria is an individual being assessed? We could end up with view as per manager x or y instead of an objective measurable assessment	CDC UNISON	Expected behaviour is a competency and criteria is an objective as detailed on the appraisal form.
19	Every feedback must be based upon evidenced conduct so that the person receiving the feedback can understand exactly the context that the feedback is about and not some abstract example.	CDC UNISON	Noted, but this is not always going to be practical.
23	The small boxes within the Conscious competence model are very misleading. An example in the conscious competence box would tend to suggest that there is still a desire to seek competence. This is not the case the person knows what to do otherwise they are not competent	CDC UNISON	This model has been checked and is accurate.
27	Will we create an org chart that shows the appraise, appraiser, reviewer for all staff	CDC UNISON	Organisation charts are already available that show line managers and employees. Reviewers will be heads of service.
Appendix 1	Should there be a managers comment Could we include a check box for vehicle documentation Checking Lone worker details could have a check box Competencies for H & S should be included if they are part of the incremental progression	CDC UNISON	Yes, amended Yes and Head of Service issues. This is being removed as not a competency
Appendix 2	Should there be a manager's comment.	CDC UNISON	Yes Amended
Appendix 4	This would benefit from having a series of boxes underneath in which staff can record evidence of their performance	CDC UNISON	A new form will be provided.

Section	Comments	Comment From Unison/Staff Consultation Group/JMT/SNC	Action Taken
3	Should employees on probation have an appraisal – or does this start once probation has been successfully completed?	CDC HR	Amended – Yes the appraisal be completed within the first month of employment
5	<p>I think there is some text in box 4 that we can't see? (MT: I'm happy to volunteer to revamp this diagram before this document goes off to committee to ensure it looks 100%)</p> <p>There is mention of new starters here but I think targets and performance are monitored well through the use of probation reports so this scheme should potentially commence upon completion of the probationary period.</p>	CDC HR	Amended – General tidy up spacing etc
6	<p>This whole section is a little bit confusingly laid out (MT: Again, I'll volunteer to revamp if Paula agrees – I'm thinking a table perhaps).</p> <p>Bottom of page 4 – give positive feedback “all the time”? I think the other two bullet points cover it.</p>	CDC HR	“All the time” removed
9	I think this section should sit under section 8 – as it forms part of the employee preparation and shouldn't be considered separately really.	CDC HR	Agreed and Amended
25	I think the role provided as an example should be Directorate Support Officer (rather than Administration).	CDC HR	Amended
30	I think this section could be a little clearer, maybe adding the Appendix numbers would help.	CDC HR	Put as Appendix