

THE UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERSFIELD

Senior Staff Performance Pay Assessment

This process is intended to reward those who can demonstrate sustained excellent performance and achievement over and above the expectations of their job description.

The Senior Staff Performance Pay Assessment will take place at the beginning of each academic year by the Vice Chancellor and will consider performance primarily based over the preceding 12 months.

The effective date for the award of salary increase will be 1 August.

There is no right of appeal against the non-award of a salary increment. Awards are made at the discretion of the University and all decisions are final.

Eligibility

This process applies to all staff at grade 10 and above who have at least one year's service with the University at the point of consideration. To qualify all eligible staff must have successfully completed all requirements of the probation, must be engaging and progressing with University and PDPR targets and must not be subject to any informal capability or disciplinary matters.

Judging Performance

An increment (or equivalent spot grade movement) can be awarded in the context of the UCEA median salaries and only if there is evidence of **sustained** good and/or excellent performance. There should be evidence of continuous improvement and development and consequently it is not expected to award increments for good performance more frequently than every two years. Judgements on the merits of recommendations will be based on quantitative and qualitative assessments.

Discussions relating to pay award assessments should take place within the annual PDPR. Deans and Directors may nominate individuals where they can evidence performance at a level to merit a pay increase assessment. Specific examples, covering a range of issues across the 12 months, should be provided to evidence any assessment of "good" or "excellent". Evidence must also be presented as to why this performance is at a level beyond that you would normally expect or significantly beyond what you would normally expect. By definition exceptional performance is rare.

Performance levels

Satisfactory - individual is fulfilling the duties of their role. Their previous targets have been met and there is no criticism of their standard of performance – "they are doing their job".

Good - individual who both fulfils the duties of their role and achieves previous targets but goes beyond the role and performs at levels beyond which would normally be expected of the postholder. They take on new responsibilities, projects...

they show initiative in developing the role to the benefit of the School/Service/University.

Excellent - Exceptional performance that stands out. Individual performs at significantly high levels of performance across the range of their role. Not only do they develop their role but regularly show creativity in identifying new ways of doing things and effective ways of solving complex problems. By doing so they make a significant contribution to the University that can be recognised by a wide audience.

Making a salary review recommendation

Deans and Directors should consider several factors when deciding to whether to recommend individual salary increases. These factors include but not limited to University and PDPR targets, UCEA median salaries and NSS results. HR will provide UCEA salary information to Deans and Directors on an annual basis in early July.

Deans and Directors are required to complete the 'Senior Staff Pay Award Recommendation' form (see below) and submit to the Director of Human Resources by 31 August.

Those making recommendations should be mindful of the importance of valuing diversity of contribution made by staff and consider any impact on performance related to fractional posts, family related absence and other responsibilities undertaken.

Line managers have a responsibility to monitor the contribution of their staff and PDPR discussions should include the possibility of a pay award assessment application. Only cases where performance is considered 'good' and 'excellent' over a sustained period should be put forward for consideration.

Recommendations are made by Deans and Directors, but in exceptional circumstances an individual may feel they have a compelling case and can therefore nominate themselves. The individual must complete the salary review recommendation form and submit to the Dean or Director who must confirm that the information provided is factually correct and that the individual has delivered over and above the expectations of their role for a sustained period.

THE UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERFSELD

Senior Staff Pay Award Recommendation Form

Name:

Job Title:

School:

Current Salary: £

Recommendation based on

Market pay	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Complete s1)
Performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Complete s2)
Both	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Complete both ss 1 and 2)
Professorial Band 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Complete s3)

1. Market Pay Review

a) Does the current salary match the equivalent UCEA median salary?

YES

NO

b) If yes, what objective evidence do you have to support your request for a salary in excess of the UCEA median? (Please note the sources of objective evidence to be used in the University's Market Supplement Policy)

c) If salary is already at the median, or an adjustment is requested in excess of the median, what evidence do you have to support the case of retention difficulties which are affected by the market? (Please note the sources of objective evidence to be used in the University's Market Supplement Policy)

d) The University policy of matching senior staff salaries at the equivalent UCEA median salary is based on the expectation that the normal standard is sustained "good" performance¹ when compared to peers within and outside the University. What specific examples, providing quantitative and qualitative evidence, would you provide to justify this assessment?

¹ Sustained good performance is defined as someone who performs their role, achieving both personal targets and securing overall high performance for their department/area of responsibility over a period of time. There should be evidence of continuing development and improvement in their area of responsibility. Such evidence should be capable of measurement. They should also show initiative in developing their role to the wider benefit of the School/Service/University.

2. Performance Pay Review

Adjustments to pay based on performance will only be considered in the light of performance that is considered “excellent”. By definition, in comparison to peers within and externally to the University, this will be exceptional, and by definition rare. Excellence stands out and therefore should be widely acknowledged across the University and where relevant across external peer groups. In meeting personal targets, the individual will consistently perform well ahead of the challenges that have been set, outperforming standards within the University and amongst relevant peer groups.

Quantitative and qualitative evidence² should be presented as to why performance is judged as “excellent”:

² For the avoidance of double counting, please ensure that evidence is confined to actual performance in the current academic year. Grants etc... should only be counted in the year they are won showing total value of the award and the number of years over which that sum is allocated. Publications, conferences, exhibitions, performances etc... should only be included if the work is actually published/performed in this year (works accepted for publication/papers submitted etc... but not yet in the public domain should not be included but should be used to assess performance outcomes in the following year). Project management initiatives should only be included when the project has been completed and actual outcomes known. External awards and recognition again should only be included when granted in this academic year.

3. Request to Re-assign a Professor to Band 2 Salary

Band 2 recognises significantly higher levels of distinction than those in Band 1. They are recognised as being international leaders of exceptional calibre in research and scholarship in their field, signalled not only by their substantial record of achievement but also by significant marks of esteem from their peers in the University, across the UK sector and internationally.

Name of Professor:

School:

Deans Recommendation:

(Please provide details of how the Professor matches the criteria for Band 2 Salary)

External Assessors

Please provide details of six external assessors who will be able to comment on match to Band 2 criteria. At least one (but no more than three) must be international.

Name	Position	University/ Organisation	Email & Telephone	Reason for Choosing Assessor	RAE rating at Dept. s/he works at

Signed:.....

Date:

(Dean)