

GUIDELINES TO HEADS OF INSTITUTION

PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING/REVIEWING THEIR STAFF REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT SCHEME¹

1. Institutional Scheme

Details of the institution's scheme should be prepared and passed to the appropriate Personnel Consultant, who can also provide drafting advice, for confirmation that their scheme is in accordance with the framework scheme.

Provided that the details of the current schemes meet the SRD framework, existing arrangements within an institution can be retained, brought together under a single institutional framework.

Alternatively, small institutions may wish to collectively develop a Faculty/School/Divisional scheme or may use the SRD framework, merely allocating reviewers.

2. Reviewers

Careful thought should be given to the method by which reviewers are selected; this should be specified in the institution's scheme. The reviewer will normally be the Head of institution or his/her nominated representative, for example the member of staff's line manager/supervisor or principal investigator or a senior member of the institution. The names of reviewers should be reviewed annually; each reviewer should ideally review no more than eight staff and not more than twelve per annum.

Similar care should be given to the allocation of staff to reviewers; wherever possible, staff should be allowed to express a preference for a choice of reviewer before a firm allocation has been made and should be given the opportunity to discuss an alternative reviewer with the Head of institution.

3. Training

All reviewers should receive appropriate appraisal training. In addition, it is recommended that institutions arrange for members of staff to attend a briefing session before they are reviewed for the first time.

4. Review Schedule

A schedule of reviews to be carried out in the forthcoming academical year should be prepared annually and passed to the Personnel Division, together with information on reviews carried out in the previous year.

5. Meetings with reviewers

The Head of institution should make arrangements to meet with reviewers before and after each cycle of reviews, or at least on a biennial basis. One function of the meetings should be to identify any common themes or emerging problems so that appropriate action can be taken, for example, after the cycle of reviews advising the Staff Development Unit of generic training needs and informing staff of issues that have emerged and steps that are being taken to address them.

¹ Taken from Annex 4 of the Joint Report of the Council and the General Board on a revision of the arrangements for appraisal, *Reporter*, 2003-04, 15 Dec 2003.