**Further information to support PDR for RTE Staff**

A reviewer should conduct a PDR and assign an appropriate PDR rating based on the assessment of overall performance in the role. For further information on the performance ratings for PDR along with descriptors for each of them please see: <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/internal/pdr/about/assessment/>.

The following points were agreed by ALT on Monday 22nd January.

An individual who is underperforming in one aspect of their role, for example research or teaching, cannot be given a rating of Excellent overall.

It would be very unlikely that someone who is not performing in one aspect of their role, for example research or teaching, will be given a rating of Very Good overall. The exception might be if one aspect of their performance in a given area is excellent despite this not being the case overall. An example might be an individual whose research publications are problematic but where their grant income is excellent and the applied outputs from the work (e.g. industrial reports) are the same.

A person whose performance falls below expectations in an area of their work that is significant to their role must have this recorded on their PDR form. So, for example, an individual might receive an overall rating of Good or Very Good but if their research contribution is not at the required standard this needs to be explicitly recorded on the PDR paperwork as requiring improvement.

It is imperative that the commentary which supports the overall rating provides an explanation for the rating and highlights any areas where the performance falls below acceptable standards. One example is insufficient evidence that the individual meets the research standards set by the School / University. In research outputs this broadly equates to one high-quality research paper per year (or equivalent, where other types of output are acceptable). A note should also be made if there is a concern that the individual might not have publications that can be submitted as part of the University’s REF return although this is a secondary issue. The primary concern is the quality and volume of research outputs.

If performance in a particular area has been identified as requiring improvement, specific research objectives need to be set for the individual in consultation with the Dean and appropriate Associate Dean. This should be flagged on the PDR form (i.e. that detailed research objectives will need to be set in discussion with the Dean and ADR) and that the specific objectives will subsequently form part of the PDR record.

The reviewer should advise the reviewee that a separate meeting will be held with the Dean and appropriate Associate Dean. This meeting will enable the Dean to agree an appropriate action plan with the individual to help them to improve their performance to the required levels. The plan should include some clear objectives as well as any support that the individual may benefit from (mentoring, attendance at Staff Development or CAP courses, for example). The plan should also set a timetable for reviewing whether the objectives are being met.

It will be the responsibility of the Dean to monitor the individual’s progress against the action plan and to meet with the individual regularly.

If the performance improves to the required levels no further action will be necessary. However, if performance does not improve within the agreed timeframe of the action plan, it may be necessary for the Dean to consider invoking the formal Capability Ordinance. See: <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/governance/ordinances/ordinancexli/ordinancexlicurrent/>.

Deans are encouraged to tackle any performance issues promptly and not to wait until the PDR in cases of underperformance. Deans are also encouraged to discuss any cases of underperformance with their HR Partner.