

Scorecard Of Shame - Fact Or Fiction

Members will have seen the recent Intranet message from Wealth Management responding to LTU's last Newsletter entitled 'Scorecard of Shame'. Whilst we want to avoid tit for tat communications, it is important to respond to some of the points raised in Wealth Management's Intranet message and separate fact from fiction. The real facts are these:

- **The balanced scorecard we were criticising didn't appear from nowhere. Wealth Management don't question whether the 'Scorecard of Shame' existed merely that it wasn't "...formally cascaded within Operations".**
- **If it wasn't formally cascaded why did LTU receive copies of the scorecard not only from Band 4 Managers but from staff who had been shown the scorecard by their Line Managers?** Incidentally, since the Newsletter was written we have been contacted by a number of staff in Haywards Heath who have confirmed that the scorecard was in fact genuine and, more importantly, had been cascaded to Line Managers. Whether that cascading process was done formally or informally is, frankly, irrelevant. It was issued.
- In my Newsletter I said "Line Managers will be targeted on the number of staff on PIPs in 2006." Wealth Management say "we have never given Band 4 Managers targets such as these". Given that we know the Balanced Scorecard was cascaded to Line Managers, what was the objective, if it wasn't part of the targeting process, of telling them that in order to achieve an 'exceeded' rating 12 staff had to be on formal PIPs, 7 on formal coaching plans and 4 on action plans?

The act of publishing those targets makes their achievement by Line Managers more rather than less likely.

- Wealth Management say they expect to see a distribution of ratings but that the distribution we quoted in our Newsletter was incorrect. The figures we were quoting were in fact set out in the 'Scorecard of Shame' which was produced by Wealth Management. What Wealth Management are now saying is that they would expect to see 20%, and not 15%, of staff in the bottom 2 ratings. Why the difference?
- **This is the important bit, so sit back, get comfortable and read carefully.** Wealth Management say "a forced distribution of ratings is one where we force someone who is really a 'met' to be a 'partially met' just to fit the distribution and we do not want to do that." I've underlined the important words because for many staff in Haywards Heath that's exactly what happened in practice last year. LTU has seen a copy of a memo written by a group of Line Managers and sent to their Line Managers protesting, in the strongest possible terms, that they were being forced to give staff a 'Partially Met' rating, despite having no issues with the performance of the individuals concerned, simply to ensure that 10% of staff fell into the 'Partially Met' category. If that's not a forced distribution of ratings then I don't know what is.

Members with any questions on the issues raised in this Newsletter can contact the Union on 01234 262868 or email Mark.Brown@ltu.co.uk.

Mark V Brown
Assistant General Secretary

