



## CONSULTATION FEEDBACK and response on pay strategy review related policies

### General feedback

1	For all consultations, background information should be provided to accompany the draft policy. This helps to 'set the scene' and give a full picture of the situation so employees are in receipt of all the facts before responding.	There has been ongoing background information provided to all staff on the pay strategy review via various briefings since July 2023. Information has been provided on the HUB. For this objective, background information was provided in the document Objective 2 of pay strategy draft schedule circulated to all staff on 26 January. Further the Wider Management Team had a briefing on the proposals on 7 February and two HR surgeries were held on 8 <sup>th</sup> and 13 <sup>th</sup> February to answer any staff queries.
2	Consultations that occur over the school holidays or at the end of the financial year should be avoided, or the period of consultation extended to ensure everyone has an equal amount of time to respond.	Two weeks consultation is our current custom and practice and considered reasonable. No concerns were raised when the draft schedule was circulated on 26 January outlining that consultation would commence on 2 to 16 February, with two surgeries with HR to be held on 9 and 13 February.
3	As a general point regarding consultations, the Authority should agree a minimum period of time for consultation. Two weeks is not sufficient time for people to consider the proposal and set out their response. Neither does it consider annual leave commitments.	Noted. However, given the draft schedule was circulated on 26 January, and no concerns on length of time was highlighted
4	How has 'best value' been considered? Whilst the Authority is not an administrative council, it is in its interests and its employees interests to consider this given it is on a fixed budget from Defra.	All activities of the Authority must be deemed value for money, as it is one of the auditors' criteria. Vfm includes not only costs but also performance – if we have posts that we are unable to fill, this will impact on our performance. Furthermore, if these are specific key posts, it may mean the Authority cannot function.

		Business continuity, particularly in relation to our statutory duties, is a key consideration in relation to the implementation of these policies.
5	I would ask you to include consideration of moving to a 32 hour week full time hours model in your deliberations. There is growing evidence that productivity, staff retention and mental health all benefit along with other socioeconomic effects. The approach appears to be a genuine win-win for employer and staff; particularly in the public sector. Some of the discussion around this is in the links below. There is also plenty of hard evidence on the positive effects of the approach.	<p>Thank you for the suggestion however, it was considered beyond the scope of the working group on pay.</p> <p>However, it is worth noting that the government does not support a 4-day working week in local authorities, as it does not believe that it delivers local taxpayers' value for money. The non-statutory guidance can be found here:  <a href="#">Four-day working week arrangements in local authorities - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a></p>

#### Recruitment and retention incentives

	Feedback	Management response
1	Para 3.1: Query: Is there a need to expand upon 'various recruitment activities'?	Changed to 'at least two external recruitment rounds' having been undertaken
2	<p>Para 3.2: Suggest addition to define 'critically low' – to the extent where a team would be unable to fulfil its <b>statutory</b> function to an acceptable level that meets the statutory purposes of the National Park.</p> <p>- This could occur when not meeting statutory duty at present or would be likely to occur if 1 or more of the existing team members were to leave their post(s). It should be recognised that this could potentially be the case even if a team was fully staffed.</p>	<p>Accept the suggestion to better define critically low however hard to retain posts may also occur in teams that do not have a statutory function.</p> <p>Accepted.  Now reads:  1.1 Hard to retain posts are those where, staffing levels within a team become critically low to the extent where a team would be unable to fulfil its function to an acceptable level that meets our legal duties and objectives of the Authority Plan, and/or towards the end of a funded project when employees plan to leave to commence other employment putting the delivery of outcomes at risk. Depending on the size of the team, and/or demands on the team, this could be the case</p>

		even if a team was fully staffed.
3	Para 5.4: Suggest inclusion of 'Retention payments for existing staff' to make clear they can be applied to existing staff as well as to new appointments.	Accepted
4	Para 6.1: Suggest that where a Golden Hello payment is approved for a post, it shall trigger the implementation of a retention payment to existing team members at a comparative or higher grade should one not already be in place. In the interest of fairness across comparative/higher posts which must be by definition 'hard to fill' and therefore critical to retain given approval has been granted for the Golden Hello.	Where a golden hello payment is approved for a post, it shall trigger implementation of a retention payment to all identical posts and be subject to the same repayment terms as the golden hello.
5	<p>Para 6.3: Suggest that payment of a market supplement shall trigger a review of the salaries for all existing team members and vacant posts within the team of the post subject to a market supplement. The approval of the market supplement indicates a shortfall in pay against the market median in a specific field of work. As such all other post holders in the team are entitled to go through a comparative process for their job role(s). If this does not happen existing team members may feel they have not been treated fairly and seek higher numeration elsewhere. Suggest market supplement for in demand specialism with a demonstrable shortfall in suitable candidate shall be calculated on a national basis. This is given to the general move to agile/remote working which allows professionals to be employed at locations that previously would not have been commutable when full time office attendance was required.</p> <p>- Suggest that the minimum £1,000 differential between posts of a higher grade and that of a post subject to a market supplement is insufficient and will not reflect the greater responsibilities, pressures and expectations applicable to the higher post holders who will likely be more experienced.</p>	<p>Disagree. Market supplement payment is considered for post classed as 'hard to fill' which includes the fact that its vacancy has been unsuccessfully advertised at least two times. Where a market supplement is approved for a vacancy it will be applied to all identical posts.</p> <p>Market supplement payment application is made for each post separately. Each post is different and must be assessed individually.</p> <p>Managers are expected to consider the implications of any market supplement on those posts that have the same professional function and area of expertise, to determine whether any incentive payment is necessary.</p> <p>There are some posts that are so niche (e.g. mineral planners) that there is insufficient data in the regional geographical area for reliable market data therefore national data would be used.</p> <p>Where there is sufficient regional market data available, it will be used to calculate the market rate. This is based on the fact that local employers pose the higher risk of attracting from the same local pool.</p> <p>The minimum £1,000 differential is indicative of the</p>

	<p>Suggest either a review of the market position in relation to the higher graded posts or at least a payment to those higher post holders comparative to the market supplement that is to be applied. This will maintain parity across the pay structure of the effected team.</p>	<p>difference between two grades at the higher end of the pay scale at the moment. If a post receives a market supplement then the senior post will move to a pay point to ensure a £1,000 differential is maintained, this will ensure the parity.</p> <p>Market supplement payment is approved to a specific post with the objective justification provided – i.e. evidence to demonstrate hard to fill.</p>
6	<p>Para 6.5: Inconsistency across job roles in regards essential requirement for professional body membership e.g. <i>(redacted to maintain anonymity)</i> only stated as Desirable for lower grade and left blank for higher grade but <i>(redacted)</i> team Essential, which is comparative to <i>(redacted)</i> post. Request that parity is sought across grades within service/Authority. Otherwise supportive of the policy.</p> <p>- Noted that professional subs payable to posts that list membership as desirable is at discretion of manager. Again this is supported as allows flexibility and to reward good performance. Also aligns with many other comparable competitor organisations. Query: Is the payment of subs to be reviewed every 2 years by the line manager or will discretionary payment only be permitted for maximum of two years. Wording in policy is unclear at present.</p>	<p>The point is noted but suggest it is out with the scope of this consultation. It is for the Head of Service and Team Managers to regularly review the requirements in the person specifications for posts in their team.</p> <p>The discretionary payment will be reviewed by the Head of Service at the end of the agreed period of time.</p>
7	<p>Para 6.8: Suggest where a retention payment is agreed for a new starter it will trigger a process to review the need for a retention payment applicable to existing team members.</p> <p>- Query: How will the 10-20% of salary retention payment be decided upon? Suggest based on market data, individual performance and critical business need.</p> <p>Suggest where Golden Hello or Market Supplement approved it will trigger retention payments to existing team members as the GH/MS has demonstrated a lack of suitable candidates meaning retention has become critical.</p>	<p>Where a retention payment is agreed for a new starter, it will trigger a process to review the need for a retention payment to those in identical posts.</p> <p>Agreed, and current salary. 10% of a middle grade salary, after tax, national insurance etc, might not be a sufficient incentive.</p> <p>Will trigger payment for identical posts only. Each post must apply for incentive payment on its own merit. The case must be made for other posts where the service delivery is critical.</p>
8	<p>Para 8.1: Supportive of these criteria</p>	<p>Noted</p>
9	<p>Para 8.3: Suggest that there is a need to recognise that some niche roles that are hard to fill/retain due to a national skill shortage will mean competitor employers will be willing to make exceptions to attract suitable candidates</p>	<p>Agreed, the policy is to be used in exceptional circumstances. It is accepted that for some posts regional</p>

	<p>such as remote/agile working and enhanced remuneration and benefits. In this regard it will be important to recognise national pay differences and not just regional ones</p>	<p>data is not sufficient and that national data will be compared. Have added national to the statement to recognise this situation.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>For all applications relating to policies that deliver a financial incentive, we request <b>an independent panel</b> be set up to review each request and that the Service Manager present the case to the panel for consideration. At present the approval process proposed is limited to HR and the Finance Officer to approve, we request there be greater oversight of the process by chief officers and the chair of the Authority. This will remove bias and ensures a decision is made in a fair and transparent way, with the interests of the Authority the focus of the decision.</p> <p>The reasons for this are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A manager applying for a role within their team to receive a financial reward may receive an incentive themselves as a result of the application</li> <li>2) What is the evidence to demonstrate it is critical for the Service that the role attracts a financial incentive?</li> </ol> <p>With regards to the second point, not all roles or teams deliver a service that is critical to the function of the Authority. In addition, within services that deliver a statutory function it cannot be assumed that all roles within that service are critical to the function of the service. <b>The Authority should identify which roles are critical and set out the reasons why.</b></p>	<p>The policy and process outline the framework for ensuring any case for an incentive can be objectively justified as well as safeguarding a consistent and fair approach.</p> <p>It is proposed in the policy that decision making is delegated to the appropriate level, that being a Head of Service (Chief Officer), the Chief Finance Officer, and the Head of People Management.</p> <p>This composition is made up of the key posts from RMM to make a business decision in a specific operational area.</p> <p>This composition for decision making on financial reward is already reflected in Standing Orders to authorised payment of honoraria.</p> <p>These are professional individuals in their respective functions. Appropriate records will be kept of decisions and open to audit.</p> <p>Agreed, not all roles will deliver a service that is critical to the function of the Authority, but some will, and these can be time (eg stage of programme delivery) and/or situationally (eg critical staffing level due to combination of long term sick and inexperienced new staff) dependent.</p> <p>Each case must be assessed on its own merit. Although we have provided objective eligibility criteria in the policy there will always be an element of subjectivity in the decision making.</p>

11	<p>If someone receives a financial incentive (recruitment/retention) and decides to leave the Authority, there should be a consistent approach to any clawback of the incentive. There should be no difference between how the Authority seeks to clawback from an incentive to join the Authority and an incentive to retain an employee.</p>	<p>Agreed and adopted in the policy.</p>
12	<p>Recruitment and retention should be split in to two separate policies as they are different issues. This will ensure transparency and avoid ambiguity in interpretation and application.</p>	<p>Disagree, they are not separate but related, it is more useful to have the policy on all incentives in one document for reference. The consultation feedback will assist in providing any clarity needed on interpretation.</p>
13	<p><b>Retention payments - general comments</b></p> <p>We tried to use the guidance to work out whether the <i>(redacted to maintain anonymity)</i> would be eligible for a retention payment. (Just by way of an example, not suggesting we believe this to be the case.) Eligibility is described slightly differently throughout the document (in para 3.2, 5.4, Section 6.8 and Section 8). You can get a different answer depending on where you look and how you interpret what is written. These inconsistencies need to be ironed out. Here's a worked example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using 6.8 definition – <b>yes</b>, scheme applies. There is a business-critical risk if the <i>(redacted)</i> were to leave.</li> <li>• Using 8.1 eligibility – <b>depends</b> if there are recruitment and/or retention difficulties relating to the post.</li> <li>• Use para 3.2 definition of hard-to-retain post - '... those where staffing levels within a team become critically low'. So retention scheme for an <i>individual</i> depends on whether the <i>team staffing levels</i> are critically low. If a post is within a team with critically low staffing levels, it can be eligible for retention payment. How is 'critically low' defined? If critically low is defined in relation to establishment posts, then <i>(redacted)</i> is <b>not eligible</b>.</li> <li>• Use para 5.4 to decide if whole team is at a 'critical staffing level'. This says 'critically low' means in relation to staff levels needed to maintain performance and service delivery. Looks like <b>yes</b> then.</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree, what is set out throughout the document gives guidance on what information and evidence is required to build the case for consideration. Each post and situation are likely to be different.</p> <p>It is for the Team Manager and Head of Service to evidence whether a post is business critical. Sometimes business critical posts will change over time, for example, a project or specific piece of work needs completing.</p> <p>Would suggest the bit used in 8. Eligibility '<i>extent of the potential impact upon service delivery if the staffing issue is not resolved</i>' '<i>Critically low</i>' has been redefined see response 2</p> <p>Yes, it could be. Again, each situation is likely to be different but you could have a situation where there is a combination of long-term sickness, maternity leave, new inexperienced staff and only one experienced member of the team who has been offered a job by one of our regional competitors, and we need to retain them. We must also think about the wellbeing</p>

	<p>The policy does imply that retention payment is contingent on a team being ‘critically low’. Is this correct? If so it needs re-stating in Section 6.8. The policy should also set out how ‘critically low’ is to be defined – whether it is ‘low’ in relation to the number of established posts in a team, or ‘low’ in relation to the business critical activity. At the moment it’s not clear. This is really important. It would be unfair to frame a retention payment policy around a definition of ‘critically low’ that didn’t prioritise current business critical service plan delivery. The ‘established posts’ mechanism may not always be an accurate or useful indicator of point-in-time critical staffing levels.</p>	<p>of the team as well as service delivery.</p> <p>It might be a yes, it depends. As said above, it is complex with numerous variables. It is for the manager to make the case what we can and cannot do without, in a given situation, at a given time.</p> <p>Where staffing numbers are low, it is likely to have an impact on activity. 6.8 has been changed to 6.8</p> <p><i>Retention Payments (used where there is a business-critical risk in terms of activity, if an employee or group of employees were to leave)</i></p>
14	<p>3.2 Hard-to-retain posts are those where staffing levels within a team become critically low and/or towards the end of a funded project and employees leave to commence other employment putting the delivery of outcomes at risk. Struggle with the grammar on this. Also 2 different issues.</p>	<p>Changed to:</p> <p>3.2 Hard to retain posts are those where, staffing levels within a team become critically low to the extent where a team would be unable to fulfil its function to an acceptable level that meet the objectives of the Authority Plan, and/or towards the end of a funded project when employees plan to leave to commence other employment putting the delivery of outcomes at risk. Depending on the size of the team, and/or demands on the team, this could be the case even if a team was fully staffed.</p>
15	<p>4.2 Regular equalities monitoring of the outcomes of the application of incentive payments will be undertaken, for example, gender monitoring for jobs in receipt of the payments.</p> <p>What do you mean by gender? Probably not a good idea to use ‘gender’ as a synonym for ‘sex’ if sex is what you mean.</p>	<p>We have used the term ‘gender’ here to be consistent with our obligation to monitor and report on the ‘Gender Pay Gap’.</p>
16	<p>6.3 Market supplement</p> <p>A market supplement payment is a monthly payment paid for an agreed period of time (up to 2 years).</p> <p>This section goes on to say ‘Market supplement payments will be reviewed every 2 years . . .’ So it could last longer than the 2 years stated?</p> <p>Where a market supplement is agreed for a post which takes the total amount paid to the respective employee close to, or beyond the more senior post . . .</p>	<p>Yes, it could in certain circumstances after review.</p>

	Does this apply to the grade of the senior post or what is actually paid to the senior post?	What is actually paid to the senior post
17	<p>6.8 Retention payments</p> <p>A retention payment is a lump sum paid to an employee on completion of a specified period of time in a post.</p> <p>When does the time period start? Can it apply retrospectively?</p> <p>The amount payable will range between 10-20% of the employee's salary.</p> <p>How is this determined?</p>	<p>When the request has been approved.</p> <p>The manager has the discretion when to make the payments as set out in the policy.</p> <p>It will be determined on market data, individual performance and critical business need. Also, by the current salary of postholder as 10% of a middle grade salary, after tax, national insurance etc, might not be a sufficient incentive.</p>
18	<p>I support this suite of draft policies around recruitment and retention. The draft policy on recruitment and retention incentives is particularly welcome to ensure we can attract and retain people in hard to fill posts. Having an agreed set of incentives and criteria to be used means that we have a clear and consistent approach when dealing with hard to fill posts. The draft policy also provides the flexibility of approach, so this can be applied appropriately to individual circumstances. As the policy sets out the framework for our approach, this then enables operational decisions when implementing the policy to be taken by appropriate managers rather than having operational decisions being made at RMM for example. Hopefully the incentives will enable us to attract and retain people to our current hard to fill posts, so we have the right skills, experience and capacity in place.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
19	<p>Staff Committee believe that market supplements and retention payments are essentially the same thing i.e. a retention payment is a market supplement added to a current employee's salary to incentivise them to stay with the organisation, so we consider paragraphs 6.3 and 6.8 should be combined within the policy document. This should provide clarification and avoid ambiguity.</p>	<p>They are not the same.</p> <p>A market supplement payment is paid monthly to top salary up to the identified (at the time of application) market rate.</p> <p>A retention payment is a lump sum paid at the most appropriate time decided by the manager, to incentivise an individual to stay in our employment, and not linked to the market rate.</p> <p>The retention payment, depending when paid, (e.g. if payment is triggered by a new starter receiving a golden hello in an identical post) can be subject to repayment.</p>
20	<p>Staff Committee believes section 6.8 is not clear on how retention payments are applied to existing members of staff</p>	<p>The Team Manager/Head of Service would request an</p>



	<p>i.e. if a team is depleted and needs to ensure the remaining members are retained how is this policy applied? The document mentions having retention incentives noted in adverts but not how it applies to current staff members or what triggers might need to be hit to begin applying retention payments to the salaries of existing members of staff. Staff turnover rate within a particular post over a three-year period is one potential metric that could be used along with other factors such as comparable salary rates in other organisations.</p>	<p>incentive retention payment to retain an existing member of staff. Addition to 6.8 for clarity - <i>Where the manager has identified the need for a retention payment (either for a vacancy or existing employee, they would complete the Request Form – see section 9. Approval process.</i></p> <p>The manager would need to make the case around the impact on the team being able to function to an acceptable level to meet the objectives of the Authority Plan. There may be times that the Authority could temporarily withstand a period of unacceptable performance. Again, it depends on the circumstances and risks the organisation is prepared to run. Agreed, staff turnover rate can be a useful metric.</p>
21	<p>Staff Committee believe the policy needs to provide more detail in terms of the definition of retention difficulties. For example, and of particular relevance to applications for a retention payment/market supplement to retain employees, the level of turnover in the role in question for the proceeding three years should be considered. Any evidence linking labour turnover to the salary levels should also be provided. This information could be obtained from conversations with previous role holders or via information captured as part of the Exit Interview process.</p>	<p>Each case will be different and likely to be demonstrated by a combination of a number of factors including turnover rate and exit interviews.</p>
22	<p>The policy seems to lack detail on how a market supplement application should be assessed. We suggest that a panel comprising a HR representative, a management representative, a Staff Committee and UNISON representative review market supplement applications. All panel members will be trained in the market supplement policy and process in addition to being trained in job evaluation. The panel would assess each application in line with the criteria of recruitment or, retention difficulties, market data analysis or alternative relevant evidence and the exploration of alternative measures.</p>	<p>Disagree with this suggestion, we are consulting on the policy and the how it will be used, however each request will be a business decision not a consultation, involving the respective operational Head of Service, Chief Finance Officer for financial audit, and Head of People Management for fairness and consistency of application. Please see section 9 in the policy. A market supplement is a recruitment and retention incentive.</p>

		This will be a decision taken by the key professional postholders at the appropriate level. See response at 10.
23	<p>Staff Committee recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Combining paragraphs 6.3 and 6.8</li> <li>Clarifying how retention payments would apply to existing members of staff</li> <li>Detailing within the policy the triggers that would need to be met to begin awarding existing staff members retention payments</li> <li>Detailing within the policy the triggers that would need to be met to begin advertising a post with a market supplement. For example, at least three samples of comparable roles should be provided. This should include the salary, the benefits, the job advertisement and an outline of the duties of the roles (ideally role profile and person specification, if available)</li> <li>Detailing a robust method of assessment of market supplement/retention payment applications, to avoid controversy and meet equality criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not accepted, see response at 18</li> <li>Clarity made</li> <li>There are no set triggers, rather a list of likely criteria to demonstrate difficulties relating to the post if the postholders where to leave, recognising that this is not an exhaustive list.</li> <li>The proposed process is robust and monitored by SMT on a fortnightly basis, and will be open to audit.</li> </ul>
24	<p>The proposals seem appropriate. Also pleased that the purchase of annual leave will be offered as a benefit to all existing employees, as well as potential new ones.</p> <p>I think it is important to offer incentives like this to all employees, whereas some as the Golden Handshakes should be prioritised on the posts as outlined</p>	Noted
25	<p>I understand the reasons of post being hard to fill but all I can do is look at it from my own (staff morale) perspective and that's what the consultation is for so here are my thoughts</p> <p>"We are committed to the principles of equal pay for work of equal value and operate a job evaluation scheme to measure the relative value of all jobs."</p> <p>Regarding these Golden Hello's and Retention incentives. Hypothetical -This will probably never apply to me but IF someone was appointed in the same role as me and given an extra few grand I am not going to lie , I would probably be very angry and my morale would probably plummet in all honesty. Not that any ones individual bank balance is my concern as that is irrelevant to me but the principle that someone is earning more for doing the same job would really irritate me which surely you can understand? . So much so it may be one of the very few things that may even prompt me to reconsider my position. I think on one hand you say you try to be fair but then on the other hand you are willing to pay people more than others for doing the same post. So I don't see how you can objectively say you</p>	<p>If someone is appointed to the identical role as you and receives a golden hello, under this proposal, you will receive an equivalent retention payment.</p> <p>Our location and travel costs are not factors that contribute to these incentive payments.</p>

	<p>are being 'fair' as such I guess what I am saying is don't under-estimate how this may come across to certain staff in roles where this does apply. Like I say I doubt this will ever apply to my role (thankfully) but I could understand entirely if current staff that this applies to are disgruntled and morale suffers. I have also heard the reasoning about Bakewell being hard to get to and people have to pay a lot of travel costs (Petrol etc). Well current staff have to travel and pay costs so I don't get that argument really. I am not saying there is a perfect solution but people's money is one thing where you need to tread carefully.</p> <p>That said I can understand there is an issue here getting staff in certain roles but to be honest I do think the evaluation process needs a total makeover. I have always thought that. People scoring high for certain key words makes the process a bit of a farce in my opinion and this is why we have this issue maybe? Can't the job evaluation process be looked at properly. Is it outdated? I will use the database post in our department. How is this not scored higher? because the way you evaluate jobs will not allow it to be. I find this a bit ridiculous in all honesty as database/SQL knowledge is a very highly skilled job but you can only score it high on the "technical" aspect which only allows it to score so high. Is this not really why you are having these issues in the first place? on a more positive note I do appreciate the work being done for us finally being paid at least something close to the market median. Working here for somany years I never expected to be paid anywhere near what we probably should be paid but I like working here so it was just something I accepted so this was all a bit of an unexpected bonus. Thank you for that,</p>	<p>We recognise that our location can be a factor for potential candidates but we have introduced hybrid working arrangements to mitigate this, and this option is open to employees where business needs allow.</p> <p>A review of which job evaluation scheme we use is out with the scope of the working group on pay and this particular consultation. However, it is worth noting we use the Local Government Job Evaluation Scheme which is has been developed by National Joint Council for Local Government Services and set out in the Green Book (local government services terms and conditions). As part of the pay strategy review prior to the pay grade restructure, we independently assessed our job evaluation scheme for consistency of application and outcome. The result gave full confidence in the scheme.</p>
26	<p>This is a huge piece of work and is very thorough, it is very much aligned with the incentives etc of the corporate world I have come from and I think will meet with the expectations of those looking to join us at the PDNPA.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**Probation**

1	<p>Supportive of implementation of probationary period. Good for the authority but also ensure new starters are getting the support and training they need to do the job from their line manager. Is there an option to allow support/training from other team members so it doesn't all fall on the manager if not necessary?</p>	<p><i>Added: In addition to these review meetings, your line manager will check in with you regularly to ensure that you understand what you need to do, provide you with feedback and check that you are receiving sufficient support and training to do your job from them, the line manager or from other team members.</i></p>
2	<p>Suggest optional probation period at hiring managers discretion</p>	<p>No, the scope of this policy is for all employees to ensure consistency and fairness. The extension of the probationary</p>

		period is at the discretion of the line manager.
3	<p>With regard to probationary periods I have some concerns I presume there will be a scaled approach depending on the length of contract/skills base/critical nature of the post. Standard approaches would be up to 3 months for straightforward roles, much less for part time, junior or short term roles. Most mid management and below roles should be completed by 6 months, with up to 12 months for mission critical, senior management and CEO roles as these have the most important impacts on us. However If probation period is set low for senior posts (6 months or below) this should be reflected in the periods for lower grades. If a CEO has a 6 month probation then managerial post should be no more than 3 months, a standard or part time role no more than a few weeks and short term employees shorter than this. Instigating probation arrangements also raises the question of who will performance manage senior managers/CEO to ensure fairness; this would need to be, at least in part, supported by external expert agents with CEO line management/appraisal track record at some cost to us.</p> <p>Instigating probation also raises questions on the quality of the rest of our appraisal/performance management process. I would think this is a good time to bring in 360 degree appraisal. A very useful and instructive tool when carried out properly.</p>	<p>The length of the probation period will be 6 months for all employees. We want to keep the process as simple as possible.</p> <p>From an employer's perspective, this fixed amount of time is sufficient for the Authority to assess whether the new employee is right for the role, is the right fit for the team, and right fit for the Authority.</p> <p>It also gives a consistent framework to the support each new employee can expect when they start in a role.</p> <p>The CEO will manage any new Heads of Service probationary period, similarly, the Chair of the Authority would manage the probationary period of a new CEO.</p> <p>Noted. However, this suggestion is out with the scope of this consultation. We do encourage all staff to seek feedback without the formality of an appraisal. Employees undertaking management development have instigated their own form of 360 feedback.</p>
4	<p>The policy is very clear on the process of what happens in the probation period for a new employee, including what happens if performance is not as expected/required. However, it lacks detail on what happens should a new employee not feel supported during their probation period other than to state they should speak to a HR adviser.</p> <p>Staff Committee recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some additional wording in this area to make it clear that in such circumstances the employee would be supported and an appropriate review process undertaken</li> </ul>	<p><i>Added: In such circumstances the employee would be supported and an appropriate review undertaken.</i></p>

5	I am pleased to see a probationary period being introduced for new starters, a good process for both manager and employee to follow at the start	Noted.
---	--	--------

**Acting up and honoraria**

1	Honoraria could be paid in retrospect after suitable performance undertaking the additional duties.	Agreed
2	Para 6.1: suggest addition '.... Or within the same professional field.	<p>Noted – have added to 6.1</p> <p><i>Honoraria payments should not be paid where additional work is undertaken which is of a similar nature to the employee's existing role profile and/or commensurate with the grade for the post.</i></p>