

‘Must Improve’ PCS members’ evaluation of Performance Management

**Report of the 2016 PCS Performance Management
survey**

June 2016

**Dr. Steve French
Centre for Employment Policy and Equalities
Keele University**

Contents

Section 1: Introduction	3
Section 2: Members' views on the operation and effects of PM	5
Section 3: Personal experience of PM	12
Section 4: Conclusion	19
Appendix 1: Comparing the sample with PCS and Civil Service data	20
Appendix 2: Survey completion by employer	21

About the author

Dr Steve French is a Senior Lecturer in Industrial Relations and HRM at Keele University. His research, within the Employment Policy and Equalities research group, focuses upon the regulation of the employment relationship, notably the implementation or avoidance of employment legislation, employers' personnel policies, and workers' perceptions of their working lives.

Section 1: Introduction

The release of data on performance management ratings for 2014-15 has raised a number of serious concerns about the operation of performance management systems in the Civil Service. The analysis of the ratings by grade, contract and protected personal characteristics, conducted by the author on behalf of the PCS¹, provided strong evidence to suggest that the performance management systems across the 17 Civil Service departments (covering 286,000 civil servants) led to discriminatory outcomes.

While these data are useful in highlighting the *outcomes* of Performance Management (PM) according to the ratings given to civil service staff, they do not provide any indication of how such discriminatory practices develop within the target setting, review and rating process. While previous research into the discriminatory effects of appraisal and PRP are presented in the PCS report and other research by the LRD and Keele University conducted for the PCS provide further context in relation to issues of stress, workloads and work-life balance², a dedicated analysis of performance management, which seeks to capture the perceptions of staff operating under these systems has been absent.

This report represents an attempt to address this gap, by presenting the findings of the PCS union's internet-based survey on PM, run between 31st March and 28th April 2016. A total of 120,117 PCS members were invited to complete the survey by personal email from the union. In total, 27,090 members participated and 26,786 complete responses were received.³ The response rate of 22.3% is significantly large to provide a reliable dataset for analysis. Appendix one provides details of the survey sample and compares it against the union's membership profile. This comparison shows that the survey sample is broadly representative of the union's membership. This is particularly the case in terms of gender, but the sample is slightly skewed towards those on full-time contracts, members who are white, those who are disabled and the age group 51 to 60 is over-represented at the expense of those aged 21 to 40. There is good participation from all regions where the union is organised, but those in Northern Ireland are over-represented, while members in Scotland and Wales are under-represented. Appendix 2 also provides an overview of participation by separate employer, providing evidence of the spread of the respondents across different sections of the public and commercial services sector.

In addition, it should be noted that, as with the data held by the civil service, a number of members participating in the survey do not declare certain personal characteristics. So while almost complete data exist on gender (26,772), age (26,625), grade (26,537) and contractual status (25,590), the sample sized is reduced when considering data on ethnicity (18,635), disability (16,917) and sexual orientation (7,485). This needs to be considered when dis-aggregated data are analysed in the report.

Finally, some further characteristics of the survey sample should be noted. A total of 5,130 (19.3%) members participating in the survey are line managers responsible for conducting performance management reviews. The vast majority of participants (93.2%) are ordinary members of the PCS and do not hold representative positions, most members (70.7%)

¹ French S. (2016) Civil Service Performance Management Diversity & Inclusion outcomes data 2014-5 – an analysis. Report conducted for the PCS union.

² LRD (2014) LRD survey shows high stress levels in the civil service, Labour Research Department and French, S. (2014) *Public services at risk: The implications of work intensification for the wellbeing and effectiveness of PCS members*, PCS: London

³ This reduction is partially explained by the 305 members who had ended their membership between the survey and analysis (for which personal data was not available) as well as incomplete responses.

have been in union membership (PCS and predecessor unions) for over ten years, while only 10.3% have been in membership for less than 3 years. This corresponds with the length of service of respondents, with over four-fifths (82.6%) having been employed in civil and public services for over 10 years and only 4.1% having been employed for three years or under.

The report is structured to explore two related themes. Section two explores members' general perceptions around the principles and operation of PM. The first part of this section ascertains views on the desirability and operation of PM, examining its impact on team-working, the use of forced distributions, its impact upon line management and whether its implementation can be linked to bullying and harassment. The second part of this section then looks at the potentially discriminatory aspects of PM, examining the extent to which the system may be prone to favouritism and whether certain groups of members are perceived to do better, or less well, out of the operation of the PM system. The final section then explores the views of line managers themselves, considering the impact of PM on the ability to manage staff and the value of PM as a management practice.

While section two explores members' general views about the operation of the PM system, the second theme, explored in section three of the report, focuses upon members' own experiences of PM and how the aims of performance management resonate, or fail to resonate, with their own priorities around work. While the first part of this section examines views around motivation, personal development and the link between performance and pay, the second part of the section looks at the mechanics of PM: the time it takes members to prepare for reviews; the extent to which members exert influence over the PM (target-setting) process; and the relevance of targets to their work. This part also explores the most recent PM outcomes and the extent to which the ratings received by members correspond to their own evaluation of their work and performance. The second part of this section then evaluates responses by members to a range of questions about their priorities at work and the extent to which these relate to, or clash with, the aims of the PM system before exploring their overall assessment of PM and how it could be revised or replaced.

In both these substantive sections to the report, the analysis will be based upon an assessment of the aggregate data: that is by looking at the overall responses of all members. Where the dataset is sufficiently large, there will also be a secondary disaggregated level of analysis, where responses are analysed according to the personal and job characteristics of members, namely: contract type, grade, age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability. This is simple bivariate analysis using chi-square statistical testing. Where the results of this analysis show *highly* statistically significant results (a 'p value' of 0.000), indicating that differences in the distribution of the responses cannot be expected to have occurred by chance, the findings are reported and analysed.

The main conclusions of the report, provided in the final section, highlight the deep level of resentment towards PM systems, their lack of effectiveness in members' eyes, and important questions about their relevance to the jobs of PCS members. The findings also highlight the potential discriminatory effects of its operation, with perceptions of favouritism and members, particularly those who are disabled or from BME backgrounds, believing themselves to be detrimentally affected by PM.

Section 2: Members' views on the operation and effects of PM

In order to gain an understanding of PCS members' general views about PM, a number of questions were asked relating to its aims and operation. In this section these responses are examined, firstly by looking at members' views on the general aims of PM and then by looking at a number of questions related to its potential discriminatory impacts of the system. Finally, specific issues related to its operation from the perspective of line managers involved in rating staff are examined. Here, the impact of PM on their situation at work and upon issues such as such as the fixed distribution of performance ratings, the impact on team-working and transparency are explored.

As table 1 indicates, a significant majority of staff express serious concerns about the operation of the PM system in their workplace. Over two-thirds (67.0%) do not agree that PM is a worthwhile exercise and over four-fifths (82.3%) believe it is a system that needs to be replaced. A key issue identified by members' responses to the survey is that of forced distributions: almost four-fifths (79.7%) do not believe that 'a fixed 10% of staff will receive a must improve rating' and three-quarters (74.6%) do not agree that there should be a limit on the number of top (exceed) ratings. Indeed, two-thirds of respondents (66.2%) agree that PM would be fairer if the forced distribution of box markings were removed.

Table 1: Members' attitudes to Performance Management systems

	Agree	No view	Disagree	Responses
	%	%	%	n
The performance management process is a worthwhile exercise	20.5	12.4	67.0	26,563
The current performance management system should be replaced with one which is fairer	82.3	10.8	6.9	26,536
It is right that 10% of staff will receive a 'must improve' box marking	9.9	10.4	79.7	26,569
It is fair that only a certain amount of staff can receive a top box marking	19.0	6.4	74.6	26,600
Performance management would be fair if the forced ranking element was removed	66.2	20.5	13.3	26,545
Performance management generates healthy competition between team members	4.0	8.1	88.0	26,642
The performance management process places too much pressure on line managers	65.7	17.5	16.8	26,634
Performance management is used to bully and harass staff	53.9	24.3	21.8	26,533

In terms of the PM process itself, members also express strongly negative views. Over four-fifths of those surveyed do not agree that PM causes 'healthy competition' between members of teams (88.0%), almost two-thirds (65.7%) agree that it places too much pressure on line managers and over half (53.9%) believe that it is used to bully and harass staff.

In terms of the spread of working patterns a number of significant differences emerge:

- members working on part-time contracts are more likely to disagree that PM is a worthwhile exercise than those on full-time contracts (70.9% to 66.6%) and are more likely to agree that PM is used to bully and harass staff (56.7% to 53.7%);
- staff who are disabled are more likely to disagree that PM is a worthwhile exercise than those on without disabilities (70.2% to 64.9%) and more likely to agree that PM is used to bully and harass staff (67.7% to 51.6%);
- BME staff are less likely to disagree that PM is a worthwhile exercise than staff who are white (59.4% to 66.5%), are less likely to disagree that it is right that 10% of staff should get a must improve rating (70.6% to 79.9%); are more likely to agree that PM would be fair if forced distributions were removed (73.0% to 65.7%); are more likely to agree that only a certain amount of staff can get a top box marking (24.0% to 18.4%) and less likely to disagree that PM generates healthy competition (80.1% to 88.4%). BME staff are also less likely to agree that PM places too much pressure on line managers (58.1% to 65.0%), but are more likely to agree that PM is used to bully and harass staff (58.4% to 52.9%);
- women are less likely to disagree that PM is a worthwhile exercise than men (66.2% to 68.2%), are less likely to disagree that it is right that 10% of staff should get a must improve rating (77.8% to 82.8%); and are more likely to agree that PM would be fair if forced distributions were removed (67.2% to 64.7%). Women are also less likely to agree that PM places too much pressure on line managers (63.7% to 68.8%) and also less likely to agree that PM is used to bully and harass staff (51.5% to 57.6%);
- the extent to which members agree that PM was a worthwhile exercise decreases with age: those aged under 21 (41.0%) and between 21 and 30 (29.1%) are significantly more likely to agree than those aged 51-60 (18.3%) and over 60 (16.2%). A similar pattern emerges when looking at responses to the question that 'it is right that 10% of staff should get a must improve rating': those aged under 21 (59.0%) and between 21 and 30 (72.8%) are significantly less likely to disagree with this statement than those aged over 30 (79.8%). This is also the case in relation to the issue of whether PM creates healthy competition: those aged under 21 (76.9%) and between 21 and 30 (80.7%) are less likely to disagree with this statement than those aged over 40 (88.0%). In relation to the issue of pressure on managers, those aged under 21 (41.0%) and between 21 and 30 (54.6%) are less likely to disagree with this statement than those aged over 40 (65.7%). Finally, younger members are also less likely to agree with the statement that PM is used to bully and harass staff: those aged under 21 (41.0%) and between 21 and 30 (32.0%) are more likely to disagree with this statement than those aged over 40 (21.8%); and
- the extent to which members agree that PM is a worthwhile exercise decreases with seniority. Those in AO and AA (70.8%) and EO (68.9%) grades are more likely to disagree that PM is a worthwhile exercise than those in HEO and SEO (61.2%) and senior manager (52.4%) grades. Similar patterns also emerge in relation to the extent that PM should be replaced (82.7% of AO and AA, 83.4% of EO and 81.3% of HEO and SEO grades agreed it should be replaced compared to 77.2% of senior managers); the fairness of PM systems if forced distributions were removed (65.1% of AO and AA, 68.6% of EO and 65.1% of HEO and SEO grades agree it would be fair compared to 63.0% of senior managers); the fairness of limiting top box markings (75.4% of AO and AA and 77.0% of EOs disagree that this was fair it compared to 71.9% of HEO and SEO grades to 65.6% of senior managers); and,

most strikingly, the extent to which PM is used to bully and harass staff (60.2% of AO and AA and 55.8% of EOs agree it is used to bully and harass compared to 44.9% of HEO and SEO grades to 36.4% of senior managers). Finally, HEO and SEO grades are far more likely to agree that PM places too much pressure on managers (71.2% compared to 65.9% overall across grades).

While there are some distinctive views, particularly among younger staff (who make up a small proportion of the total sample), the most interesting views relate to BME staff, who appear to be slightly more supportive of the system in principle, but more critical of its use, notably in relation to bullying and harassment. Disabled members are also more likely to highlight that it is used to bully and harass staff and are more likely to doubt its worth. These differences, while interesting, should not detract from the aggregate findings, which indicate that members perceive there to be serious limitations with the current PM system as a whole, such that there is widespread support for its replacement and revision, notably in relation to the practice of using a forced (pre-set) distribution of performance markings.

In light of the different perceptions to emerge about the aims and operation of PM according to different groups of PCS members and following the evidence of potentially discriminatory outcomes arising from the PM ratings data, members were also asked a series of questions about the potential for discriminatory practice in PM systems, reported in table 2 (below).

Table 2: Members' attitudes to Performance Management and discrimination

	Agree	No view	Disagree	Responses
	%	%	%	n
If your face doesn't fit, you'll never get a top box marking	70.3	16.6	13.2	26,644
If you are a disabled person you are more likely to get a lower box marking	23.5	46.1	30.4	26,407
People from black or minority ethnic backgrounds are more likely to receive a lower box marking	14.3	46.4	39.3	26,542
It is harder to get a decent box marking if you are older	33.7	35.1	31.3	26,540
It is harder to get a decent box marking if you are a younger member of staff	9.8	45.6	44.6	26,517
Performance management rewards senior staff over junior staff	41.1	32.9	26.1	26,602
If you are actively involved in the trade union, you are more likely to get a lower box marking	17.6	53.5	28.9	26,786

It is interesting to note that over two-thirds of all members (70.3%) believe that staff could be excluded from the top 'exceed' box marking if their 'face did not fit', highlighting the scope for individual prejudice within the PM process. Overall, while a significant proportion of members do not feel able to provide a view on whether staff with specific personal characteristics or roles would benefit or suffer from the operation of PM, it is important to note that the proportion of members believing there to be potential discrimination in the process exceeds the proportion of members with those particular characteristics. While

only 9.6% of the sample are BME members, 14.3% of those surveyed believe staff from these backgrounds are more likely to receive a lower box marking. Similarly, compared to 7.8% of the sample who are disabled members, 23.5% of those surveyed believe staff from these backgrounds are more likely to receive a lower box marking. And while only 6.8% of the sample are trade union representatives or activists, 17.6% of those surveyed believe that union activists are likely to get a lower box marking. Further, the perceptions of members in relation to senior staff getting higher box markings (41.1%) and older staff being more likely to get lower box markings (33.7%) also resonate with the data on PM ratings.

However, it is perhaps more interesting to examine the extent to which these perceptions on the discriminatory nature of PM relate to those members with protected personal characteristics:

- members working on part-time contracts are more likely than those on full-time contracts to agree that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are older (37.8% compared to 33.1%) and less likely to agree that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are younger (7.5% compared to 10.5%);
- disabled members are more likely than those without a disability to agree that: people from BME backgrounds are more likely to get a lower box marking (25.7% compared to 13.8%); people with a disability are more likely to get a lower box marking (50.1% compared to 31.2%); that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are older (37.8% compared to 33.1%); that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are younger (13.9% compared to 10.2%) and that those in senior grades are better rewarded than junior staff (51.8% compared to 41.6%). They are also more likely to believe that staff will not get a top box marking unless their face fits (78.2% compared to 69.4%) and that trade union activists are likely to get a lower box marking (31.2% compared to 16.6%);
- BME members are more likely than those who are white to agree that: people from BME backgrounds are more likely to get a lower box marking (51.9% compared to 11.0%); people with a disability are more likely to get a lower box marking (33.9% compared to 22.4%); that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are older (42.7% compared to 31.9%); that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are younger (15.2% compared to 9.8%) and that those in senior grades are better rewarded than junior staff (50.4% compared to 40.7%). They are also more likely to believe that staff will not get a top box marking unless their face fits (74.2% compared to 70.0%) and that trade union activists are likely to get a lower box marking (27.1% compared to 16.8%);
- LGBT members are more likely than those who are heterosexual to agree that: people from BME backgrounds are more likely to get a lower box marking (24.0% compared to 15.4%); people with a disability are more likely to get a lower box marking (36.5% compared to 24.3%); and that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are younger (19.3% compared to 12.0%);
- men are more likely than women to agree that: people from BME backgrounds are more likely to get a lower box marking (17.7% compared to 12.1%); people with a disability are more likely to get a lower box marking (26.7% compared to 21.4%); that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are older (35.6% compared to 32.4%); that it is harder to get a decent box marking if you are younger (13.4% compared to 7.4%) and that those in senior grades are better rewarded than

junior staff (45.6% compared to 38.1%). They are also more likely to believe that trade union activists are likely to get a lower box marking (21.9% compared to 14.8%);

- in terms of age, in many cases there is a polarisation between the younger and older age groups. While, overall, 14.3% of members believe that people from BME backgrounds are more likely to get a lower box marking, members under 21 are less likely to believe that this is the case (7.7%) while those aged over 60 are more likely to believe this to be so (15.5%). While, overall, 23.5% of members believe that disabled people are more likely to get a lower box marking, members under 21 are less likely to believe that this is the case (17.9%) while those aged over 60 are more likely to believe this to be so (28.1%). While, overall, 41.4% of members believe those in senior grades are better rewarded than junior staff, members under 21 are less likely to believe that this is the case (38.5%) while those aged over 60 are more likely to believe this to be so (47.9%). And while, overall, 17.6% of members believe that trade union activists are likely to get a lower box marking both members under 21 (20.5%) and over 60 (23.3%) are more likely to believe that this is the case. Younger staff under 30 (under 21: 38.5%; aged 21 to 30: 61.5%) are also less likely to believe that staff will not get a top box marking unless their face fits (72.0% overall);
- the polarisation by age is most strongly reflected when looking at whether younger or older workers find it harder to get a good box marking. Those aged under 21 (7.7%) and 21 to 30 (15.1%) are less likely to believe it is harder for older workers to get a decent box marking, while those aged 51 to 60 (40.6%) and those over 60 (52.5%) are more likely to believe this to be the case. Conversely, those aged under 21 (33.3%) and 21 to 30 (28.2%) are more likely to believe it is harder for younger workers to get a decent box marking, while those aged 51 to 60 (8.1%) and those over 60 (9.6%) are less likely to believe this to be the case;
- in terms of grade, the pattern of differences of views according to seniority is also apparent. Those in AO/AA (73.8%) and EO (71.8%) grades are more likely to agree that 'you'll never get a top box marking if our face does not fit' than those in HEO/SEO (64.4%) and senior manager (60.7%) grades. Similar patterns also emerge in relation to disabled staff (25.3% of AO/AA grades and 23.2% of EO grades agree disabled staff are more likely to get a lower box marking compared to 21.6% of HEO/SEO and 21.7% of senior manager grades); trade unionists (20.3% of AO/AA grades and 18.3% of EO grades agree union activists are more likely to get a lower box marking compared to 13.8% of HEO/SEO and 10.7% of senior manager grades); and the rewarding of staff by seniority (43.9% of AO/AA grades and 42.0% of EO grades agree senior staff are more likely to get higher box markings are more likely to get rewarded under PM compared to 37.5% of HEO/SEO and 24.9% of senior manager grades). Staff in AO/AA grades are more likely to agree that older workers are more likely to get a lower box marking (36.0% compared to 33.7% overall), whereas those in senior manager (19.0%) and HEO/SEO (16.6%) grades are more likely to agree that BME staff would get lower box markings (14.4% overall across grades); and
- trade union activists (40.3%) are more likely than ordinary members (16.0%) to agree that involvement in the union is likely to lead to a lower box marking.

What is striking from these results is the extent to which members from with a specific personal characteristic appear to be more aware of the potentially discriminatory impacts

of PM across a wide range of groups of workers, by personal characteristic or job role. For the most part this awareness also correlates to the data on performance ratings, with the exception of the better performance of younger workers. This is also the case with men, who have been shown, overall, to have received worse box markings than women, and who identify with the potential discriminatory aspects of PM on other groups. Significantly, *ahead* of the recent publication and analysis of PM ratings, there is evidence to indicate that those working under the systems were aware of potentially discriminatory outcomes

Table 3: Line managers' attitudes to Performance Management practices

	Agree %	No view %	Disagree %	Responses n
The performance management process places too much pressure on line managers	75.6	9.8	14.5	4,836
The performance management system is a good way for line managers to be able to manage staff	21.6	13.2	65.2	4,834
Managers are placed in an impossible position by having to give a certain number of staff a 'must improve' or 'top' box marking	77.4	8.9	13.7	4,837
Managers have to spend too much time preparing for and undertaking performance reviews with staff	75.3	9.1	15.6	4,826
Performance management generates healthy competition between team members	5.9	9.0	85.1	4,828
Performance management encourages team work	6.4	10.3	83.2	4,823
Performance management is a clear and transparent way of managing staff	13.5	10.4	76.1	4,829

Finally, the views of line managers, responsible for conducting performance reviews, are explored in relation to performance management. As the data presented in table 3 (above) indicate, line managers believe that PM systems create problems for the line management of staff. In practical terms, three-quarters of line managers (75.3%) agree that they spend too much of their time preparing for, and undertaking, performance reviews, highlighting the costs of operating PM.⁴ Three-quarters of those surveyed (77.4%) also agree that the forced distribution of performance box markings places them in an impossible position. It is not surprising, given these two responses, that three-quarters of line managers (75.6%) believe that PM systems place excessive pressures on them.

More worryingly, almost two-thirds of line managers (65.2%) do not agree that PM is a good way to line manage staff. This shocking result is explained by their remaining responses. Over four-fifths of line managers do not believe that PM creates healthy competition between team members (85.1%) or that it encourages teamwork (83.2%), while three-quarters of respondents (76.1%) also do not agree that PM is a clear and transparent way of managing staff.

⁴ PCS (2015) *Performance Management – Administration Costs (MoD)*

Summary

The findings reported in this section highlight that the perceptions of members toward their respective PM system, in general, is mainly negative. A significant majority of the members surveyed question whether PM is worthwhile, oppose the use of forced distributions, believe it is not a healthy way to build team-working and that it places too much pressure on those line managers responsible for conducting PM reviews. Most worryingly, over half the members surveyed actually believe that PM is used to bully and harass staff.

In addition to this, there is a recognition by members that PM provides scope for the operation of discriminatory practice, by ethnicity, age, disability, contract status, seniority and trade union activism, and that this occurs notably in the awarding of lower box markings. These findings reflect the concerns that have arisen from the analysis of PM outcomes, which show statistically significant correlations between lower box markings and a number of job roles and legally protected personal characteristics.

Finally, this section shows the scepticism that many line managers hold about the effectiveness of PM, its usefulness in the process of line management and its lack of transparency. In addition to this, line managers also agree that PM systems place too much pressure on managers, both in terms of time and through the restrictions imposed by forced distributions in the performance rating process.

While the disaggregated results should not be used to detract from the fairly consistent set of findings that emerge from members' overall views on PM, they do provide some important findings, particularly in relation to potential discriminatory practices. One trend to emerge is the differences between the views of members from younger age categories (up to 30) who tend to be less negative in their views about PM, and those aged over 50 who tend to be more negative. Similarly, women are less negative in their perceptions of PM compared to men, while those in more junior grades (especially AA/AA) grades) are more likely to be negative in their views on PM than those in higher grades, especially senior managers.

However, the most important disaggregated findings relate to the questions relating to the potentially discriminatory impact of PM, with the responses from disabled, BME and male members, those in more junior grades and older workers, as well as to a limited extent part-time and LGBT members, perceiving there to be discrimination across protected characteristics and job roles and, thus, reflecting the findings from analysis of PM outcomes.

While this section has provided an overview of members' general perceptions of PM, the following section looks to explore their views about their personal experiences of PM. These focus upon the role of PM in terms of issues of motivation, the practical impact of PM in terms of preparation time, control over target setting and the relevance of targets, as well as an evaluation of PM outcomes based upon their own performance rating.

Section 3: Personal experiences of PM

Having examined the general perceptions of members in relation to PM, this section seeks to explore the personal experiences of members with performance management. The first part explores a number of responses from members on how PM affects them personally, in relation to motivation, personal development, team working and the link between pay and PM. The experience of members in the process of setting PM targets and the relevance of these targets are then explored along with their views on their latest performance rating. The second part of the section then explores and ranks how members evaluate their work and assesses how this fits with PM, before looking at the extent to which members respond to questions about potential changes to PM systems.

Table 4 (below) outlines members' responses to a number of questions about PM. Again the findings are largely negative. Over four-fifths of respondents (81.6%) do not agree that PM motivates them to do their best, while two-thirds (66.7%) actually agree that the PM process is demotivating. Almost three-quarters of members (72.6%) do not see PM as a process that is about personal development, highlighting how PM contaminates the developmental aspects of appraisal, while four-fifths (81.8%) confirm that it is not an effective system to build team-working in the context of their own team. Finally, over two-thirds of respondents (67.4%) agree that the link between PM and pay should be severed. These are important findings, as they confirm that members' concerns are not linked to general concerns about the operation of PM, but that PM is seen to have direct, detrimental effects on a significant majority of them as individual employees.

Table 4: Members' personal experiences of Performance Management

	Agree	No view	Disagree	Responses
	%	%	%	n
Performance management motivates me to do my best	8.9	9.5	81.6	26,638
The current performance management process is helpful for my personal development	13.4	14.0	72.6	26,660
The performance management process demotivates me	66.7	17.4	15.8	26,628
Performance management is a good way to build the team I work in	6.1	12.2	81.8	26,603
Performance management outcomes should not be connected with how much I get paid	67.4	16.6	16.1	26,607

While it is important, again, to stress the importance of the views about PM expressed by all respondents, when examining the experiences of members of PM according to different job and personal characteristics, the following significant differences are found:

- members on part-time contracts are less likely than those on full-time contracts to disagree that PM is not a good way to build the team they work in (84.5% to 81.5%);
- disabled members are more likely than those without a disability to disagree that PM is helpful for personal development (77.1% compared to 65.1%); agree that it is demotivating (73.6% to 65.1%) and should not be linked to pay (72.2% to 66.9%);

- BME members are less likely than members who are white to disagree that PM motivates them to do their job (74.5% compared 81.6%); and are less likely to disagree that PM is a good way to build the team they work in (75.0% to 82.0%);
- men are more likely than women to disagree that PM is helpful for personal development (75.0% to 71.0%), that PM motivates them to do their job (84.6% to 70.7%) and that PM is a good way to build the team they work in (84.6% to 80.7%). Men are more likely to agree that the PM process demotivates them (69.8% to 64.7%);
- there appears, again, to be polarised views by age. Those aged under 21 (30.8%) and 21 to 30 (19.9%) are more likely to agree that PM is motivational, while those aged 50 to 60 (7.0%) or over 60 (5.4%) are less likely to agree. Those in the younger age groups are also less likely to agree that PM demotivates (under 21: 56.4% and 21 to 30: 58.8%) compared to other age groups (66.8% across all age groups). Similarly, those aged under 21 (35.9%) and 21 to 30 (23.1%) are more likely to agree that PM is good for their personal development, while those aged 50 to 60 (11.0%) or over 60 (8.8%) are less likely to agree. This also extends to team working where those aged under 21 (10.3%) and 21 to 30 (11.2%) are more likely to agree that PM has helped to build their team, while those aged 50 to 60 (5.1%) or over 60 (3.7%) are less likely to agree; and
- members in lower grades are more likely to be critical of their personal experiences under PM. Those in AA/AO (11.7%) and EO (12.6%) grades are less likely to agree that PM helps personal development compared to those in HEO/SEO (16.0%) and senior grades (21.5%). AA/AO (4.7%), EO (5.7%) and HEO/SEO (7.7%) grades are also less likely to agree that PM helps to build their team compared to members in senior grades (11.2%). Further, AA/AO (72.1%) and EO (68.2%) grades are also more likely to agree that PM should not be connected to pay compared to members in HEO/SEO (61.3%) and senior manager (54.4%) grades. Finally, senior managers are less likely to be demotivated than other grades by PM (61.4% compared to 66.8% across all grades).

Moving on to the more practical aspects of PM, the following tables highlight how much time PM consumes, the extent to which members can influence the PM agreement and targets and, finally, the relevance of these targets to their work.

Table 5: Members’ preparation time for Performance Management reviews

How much time do you spend preparing for and undertaking your own performance management review?	%	n
Over 7 hours	16.6	4,424
Over 4 but less than 7 hours	14.8	3,934
Over 2 but less than 4 hours	23.5	6,252
Over 1 hour but less than 2 hours	21.7	5,771
Up to one hour	17.2	4,588
A few minutes	6.3	1,685
Total		26,654

Table 5 highlights that PM does impose a significant cost on the employer, reinforcing work done by the PCS in the MoD in relation to the cost of operating PM. Even with a most conservative estimation of the time taken to prepare and undertake PM, members participating in the survey spend over 61,000 hours on PM.

In terms of the time spent preparing and undertaking PM reviews, the following significant differences emerged: members on part-time contracts are less likely to spend more than 7 hours preparing than those on full-time contracts (14.1% to 17.0%); disabled members are more likely to spend over 7 hours preparing than members without disabilities (19.5% to 15.3%); and men are more likely to spend one hour or less in preparation than women (26.4% to 21.6%). Members aged under 21 (33.3%) and 21 to 30 (29.8%) as well as those over 60 (26.2%) are more likely to spend less than one hour preparing for a PM review, while younger members are also less likely to spend over 4 hours preparing (under 21: 10.3% and 21 to 30: 21.5%). Finally, AA/AO (29.8%) and EO (24.1%) grades are more likely to spend less than one hour preparing for a PM review, compared to HEO/SEO (13.9%) and senior manager (15.8%) grades. Conversely, those in HEO/SEO (43.0%) and senior manager (33.3%) grades are more likely to spend over 4 hours preparing compared to AA/AO (25.6%) and EO (30.0%) grades

Table 6: Members’ influence over PM target-setting

How much influence do you have on the performance objectives that you are set for the year?	%	n
Complete control	1.5	398
More than enough influence	4.9	1,314
Enough influence	19.3	5,144
Some influence but not enough	29.0	7,724
No influence at all	45.3	12,060
Total		26,640

Despite the time taken to prepare for PM reviews, table 6 highlights how marginalised PCS members are from the process of target setting, with almost half (45.3%) claiming to exert no influence at all on the process, and almost three-quarters (74.3%) overall claiming they cannot exert enough influence over the process. Again the apparent large scale imposition of targets reflects the extent to which PM detracts from the developmental aspect of appraisal and resonates with earlier responses related to the lack of transparency with, development under, and effectiveness of PM.

A number of important differences also emerge from dis-aggregated analysis of members’ responses: members on part-time contracts (78.8% to 73.9%), disabled members (79.9% to 73.0%) and BME members (78.9% to 73.2%) are all more likely to claim they have insufficient influence over target setting. Members aged under 21 (64.1%), 21-30 (65.6%) and 31-40 (70.9%) are less likely to claim they have no influence over the setting of performance targets, but those over 60 (78.8%) are more likely to claim they had no influence. Finally, AA/AO (78.6%) and EO (81.3%) grades are more likely to agree that they have no influence over target setting, compared to HEO/SEO (62.4%) and senior manager (46.6%) grades.

However, perhaps of even greater concern are members' evaluations of the appropriateness of the targets set. As table 7 highlights, over three-quarters of members surveyed (76.0%) claim that their objectives are rarely, if at all, referred to in the day to day work setting. BME members are more likely than white members to say they refer to these objectives at least sometimes (35.6% compared to 23.2%) and men are more likely than women to say that they never refer to these objectives (41.9% to 37.2%). Here members in senior manager grades are less likely (69.8% to 76.0% overall) to claim that their objectives are rarely, if at all, referred to in the day to day work environment.

Table 7: Members' perceptions of the relevance of PM targets

In your day to day work, how often do you refer to the objectives that you have been set	%	n
Often	6.6	1,759
Sometimes	17.5	4,655
Rarely	36.9	9,815
Never	39.1	10,402
Total		26,631

This set of results is disturbing. Despite the significant time, and therefore cost, devoted to the PM systems, members are to a large extent marginalised from any meaningful say over their performance targets, while those targets set (or in some cases clearly imposed) do not appear to be relevant to the work of PCS members. These findings appear to explain a lot of the previous responses from members, and among them line managers, which doubt the effectiveness and appropriateness of PM systems. It would appear that one interpretation of these results is that the beneficial aspects of staff appraisal and development have been sacrificed for a performance driven (hard) target setting exercise used to control (or more emotively bully and harass) members and limit pay through forced distributions (which assume that a fixed proportion of staff will not hit targets imposed upon them). The relevance of PM targets may also reflect the significant changes to working practices and changing use of technology in the civil service and whether PM targets capture these changes and are appropriate.

Finally, this part of the section explores PCS members' views of their latest performance box marking (table 8 below). While the majority of respondents believe that the outcome was fair (57.0%), over two-fifths (42.9%) do not believe the outcome to be a fair reflection of their work, with a significant minority of these (15.8%) claiming it to be unfair. The disaggregated results are particularly important to consider in relation to members' views on their latest box marking. When considering all respondents who felt their rating was not a fair reflection of their work or unfair, members on full-time contracts (43.3% to 39.9%), disabled members (53.6% to 41.9%); BME members (55.9% to 40.9%) and men (45.6% to 41.2%) are all more likely to claim their rating was not a fair reflection or unfair. Although there were few differences by age group across all the categories in relation to the box marking being a fair reflection of their performance or unfair, those under 21 are less likely to think that their review was unfair (2.6%) but rather 'not a fair reflection' of their performance (41.0%)

Table 8: Members' views on their most recent PM review

Thinking about the last box marking or performance mark you received, how would you describe your feelings about your grade?	%	n
Completely fair – I was happy with my box marking	13.4	3,543
A fair reflection of my performance – I agreed with my box marking	43.6	11,510
Not a fair reflection of my performance – I was disappointed with my box marking	27.1	7,138
Unfair - I considered complaining about it	8.8	2,331
Completely unfair – I complained about it	7.0	1,858
Total		26,380

Finally, members were asked whether they had lodged a formal complaint about their box marking. Overall, 16.7% of respondents (n=4,443) had lodged a formal complaint. Again the dis-aggregated results are important in this context. Disabled members (26.0% to 15.2%), BME members (20.6% to 15.8%) men (18.0% to 15.9%) and members in EO grades (19.2% compared to 16.7% across grades) are all more likely to have lodged a formal complaint. When analysing this by age, members under 21 (2.6%), 21 to 30 (7.7%) and 31 to 40 (13.3%) are less likely to have lodged a complaint, while members aged 51 to 60 (18.0%) and over 60 (18.8%) are more likely to have lodged a complaint.

Members also responded to a set of questions which identified possible motivations to work. Members could identify any, or all, of the ten set questions and Table 9 presents the findings ranked by popularity of response.

Table 9 Members' motivations to work (ranked)

	Agree	
	%	n
Doing the best job I can	83.3	22,303
Not wanting to let my colleagues down	63.6	17,046
Getting a decent salary	57.3	15,349
Delivering public services	42.3	11,333
Keeping the job I have	37.2	9,953
Getting an annual bonus	24.1	6,468
Working in the public sector	22.7	6,089
Getting promotion	19.8	5,303
Getting a good box marking each year	18.6	4,986
Getting a better job	14.9	4,003

The results highlight the importance members attach of the job they do and the necessary collegiality involved in their work. Over four-fifths (83.3%) identify doing the best in the job that they can as the most important to thing which motivates them, while almost two-thirds

(63.6%) also identify with not wanting to let their colleagues down. Additionally, over two-fifths of members (42.3%) identify with delivering public services. While job insecurity clearly plays a role in 'motivating' staff (37.2%), there is less motivation to use work to get a better (different) job (14.2%), but a larger motivation to get promoted (19.5%). Crucially, members; place greater emphasis on the overall level of pay, by getting a decent salary (67.3%), than upon achieving bonuses (24.1%) or a good box marking each year (18.6%).

Finally, members were asked to rate their personal experience of PM overall. While 14.5% of members have a mainly positive experience of PM and 25.8% have neither a positive or negative experience overall, almost three-fifths (59.7%) claim their experience has been mainly negative. Disabled members (68.8%), men (68.7%), HEO/SEO grades (62.3%) and members aged 50 to 60 (62.3%) and over 60 (64.7%) are more likely to claim they have had a negative experience of PM. By contrast, BME members (54.3%), women (53.8%) and those aged under 21 (41.0%) and 21 to 30 (51.1%) are less likely to claim they have had a negative experience of PM.

Members were then asked to identify, from five alternative questions, what *one* thing they would most like to change about PM. Table 10 presents the results from this question. It is clear that the most problematic issue in most members' eyes is the issue of forced distribution, with three-fifths (60.5%) identifying its removal as the most important change that could be made. One fifth of members (19.8%) want the removal of box markings altogether (essentially removing a key rationale for PM) and over one twelfth (14.4%) want to remove any link between PM and pay. By contrast few members wanted either a stronger performance element with through more differentiation between pay, bigger bonuses for top markings (3.3%), or a more sophisticated ranking system (2.1%).

Table 10 What members would most like to change about PM

	%
Removing the forced ranking/guided distribution system	60.5
Getting rid of all box markings	19.8
Ensure there is no relation between performance management and pay	14.4
Bigger bonuses for top box markings	3.3
Rank all staff in the department from best to worst	2.1
Total	26,345

Members in AA/AO grades are more likely to identify with the need to remove the link between PM and pay (17.0%) and for the end of all box markings (27.1%) as are staff over 60 (15.8% and 24.9% respectively). Staff under 21 (23.1%) and those aged 21 to 31 (8.8%) are more likely to call for bigger bonuses, while those under 21 are also less likely to want the removal of box markings (2.6%).

Summary

The importance of the findings reported in this section relate to the fact that they primarily focus upon the personal experiences of members with the PM system, rather than more generalised and potentially abstract views upon PM. However, it is clear from the findings that the personal experiences of members with PM are equally problematic.

Again a large majority of members clearly agree that PM does not motivate, does not aid personal development and does not contribute to the building of teams in their own place of work. Moreover, a large majority also find PM to be demotivating and question, in particular, the link between PM and pay. Further, a large majority of members claim that they have insufficient, or even no control over the setting of the performance targets and a similar proportion also claim that their targets are rarely or never referred to while working. These findings raise serious questions about the applicability and effectiveness of PM as a tool to manage staff, reinforced by the line managers' evaluation of the systems' weaknesses, and appears increasingly exclusionary and not relevant to current working practices. Perhaps it is not surprising that under these circumstances that a significant proportion (over two-fifths) of staff believe their latest rating (box marking) not to have been fair and that such a significant minority of members (16.6%) have complained against this outcome.

Again when these sets of responses are analysed using disaggregated data, a number of important themes emerge (though these should not be used to detract from the overall findings). Following the trends identified in the previous section, members who work part-time, are male, disabled, BME or older, as well as those in junior grades, are more likely to claim their experiences of PM have been negative. By contrast, younger members (under 30), women and those in more senior grades are less likely to report such negative views about PM. Within these findings, the most important are those on target-setting and PM outcomes. Members on part-time contracts, disabled members, BME members, those over 60 and those in AA/AO and EO grades are all more likely to agree that they have no influence over target setting. And among those members who feel their last rating was not a fair reflection of their work or unfair, those who are disabled, from a BME background or male are more likely to believe this to be the case. Finally, this is also reflected in differences in the higher proportion of members in these groups formally complaining about their PM box marking.

The second part of this section highlights how elements of PM, box markings and bonuses, are not valued particularly highly by members, motivated rather by the opportunity to do the job as well as they can, the importance of public service work and a decent salary. This complements the overall finding that three-fifths of members have predominantly negative experiences of PM and would especially like to see forced distributions ended, as well as the removal of box markings and the link between pay and performance.

Section 4: Conclusion

This report, based upon a timely survey conducted by the PCS, highlights members' difficulties and issues with the PM systems under which they work. The findings show how the PM is perceived to be ineffective, to a large extent demotivating, and based on inappropriate targets, over which members have little or no say. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that a clear majority of members have a negative opinion of PM, reinforced by the views of those members within the survey sample who are line managers.

Secondly, and following on from the recent evaluation of PM ratings and what appears to be discriminatory outcomes in the rating system, the views of members, when disaggregated, mirror these outcomes and highlight how certain groups of members, notably those from BME backgrounds, disabled members, those in more junior grades and older workers, perceive themselves to be subject to detrimental treatment and outcomes under the PM.

In the light of both of these developments - a system in which members appear to have lost faith and whose relevance is questionable as well as one which is discriminatory (with clear implications under the Equality Act and when linked to pay) - it would appear that a fundamental reform or even the termination of PM would be appropriate. As argued above, the marginalisation of members from target setting and the apparent irrelevance of many targets suggest that the system, relying on forced distributions, is aimed solely at seeking to measure (often highly subjectively) work to justify an almost pre-determined outcome with the aim of holding down pay costs. It is not surprising, therefore, that the motivational or developmental aspects of appraisal within the PM process have been lost. At the same time as this survey and other research by the PCS has shown, this is an excessively labour intensive process, which takes up, at considerable cost, the time of members and particularly line managers, placing pressures on staff and leading to what most managers think is a bad way of line managing staff.

It is also clear from the findings that the most problematic issue identified by members is that of the forced distribution of box markings, which is perceived to distort the system, while the box marking system itself and the link to pay are also questioned. In practical terms, therefore, it would appear that, while the discriminatory aspects of PM are examined by the employers and unions, an immediate step in the right direction would be to remove the link to pay and to end forced distributions. However, while this would focus upon the most problematic aspects of PM from the viewpoint of PCS members, this should not come at the expense of questioning the wider role and appropriateness of PM, given the scepticism about the whole system expressed by members in this survey.

Appendix 1: Comparison of survey sample with PCS data

Membership characteristic		Survey sample %	PCS membership %
Gender	Female	60.5	59.4
	Male	39.5	40.6
Age	Under 21	0.1	0.2
	21-30	3.4	6.9
	31-40	14.2	18
	41-50	31.5	29.7
	51-60	42.7	34.9
	Over 60	8.0	10.5
Ethnicity	Asian: Bangladeshi	0.4	0.4
	Asian: India	2.1	2.5
	Asian: Pakistani	0.9	1.1
	Asian: Other	0.4	0.6
	Asian	1.0	1.7
	Black: African	1.1	1.7
	Black: Caribbean	1.7	1.9
	Black: Other	0.2	0.3
	Chinese	0.2	0.2
	Mixed Ethnicity	0.9	1.1
	Other	0.6	0.7
	White	90.4	87.7
Disability	Disabled	7.8	5.5
	Non-disabled	92.2	94.4
Sexuality	Heterosexual	94.4	n/a
	LGBT	5.6	n/a
Working Pattern	Full-time	87.2	82.2
	Part-time	12.6	17.8
Region	Eastern	4.3	3.7
	London & South East	22.7	24.8
	Midlands	10.8	10.4
	North West	15.3	15.4
	Northern	10.3	8.8
	South West	6.0	6.8
	Yorkshire & Humber	7.7	6.5
	Northern Ireland	5.7	0.7
	Scotland	11.1	13.5
	Wales	6.0	9.3
Other	0.1	0.1	
Role	Administrative	37.2	n/a
	Executive officer	34.8	n/a
	HEO and SEO	23.5	n/a
	Senior managers	4.5	n/a
Total		26,786	188,625

Appendix 2 – Responses by Employer

Employer	Responses	Invites	Participation %	Managers	
ACAS	121	465	26.0%	25	21%
APHA Animal & Plant Health Agency	80	239	33.5%	20	25%
Arts & Humanities Research Council	1	20	5.0%	0	0%
ATOS IT Services	55	546	10.1%	9	16%
Biotech Biological Sciences Research Council	5	34	14.7%	1	20%
British Council	91	371	24.5%	54	59%
British Library	28	156	17.9%	5	18%
British Museum	3	83	3.6%	0	0%
Cabinet Office	59	326	18.1%	22	37%
Cap Gemini UK PLC	44	274	16.1%	18	41%
Care Quality Commission	15	45	33.3%	1	7%
Charity Commission	29	141	20.6%	3	10%
Civil Aviation Authority	28	122	23.0%	7	25%
College of Policing	8	48	16.7%	2	25%
Commonwealth War Graves Commission	6	40	15.0%	6	100%
Companies House	24	171	14.0%	9	38%
Competition and Markets Authority	24	72	33.3%	7	29%
Corporation of the Church House	1	41	2.4%	0	0%
Criminal Cases Review Commission	1	32	3.1%	1	100%
Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority	44	139	31.7%	11	25%
Crown Agents	4	59	6.8%	1	25%
Crown Commercial Services	31	142	21.8%	17	55%
Crown Estate Office	5	32	15.6%	2	40%
Crown Office & Procurator Fiscal Service	63	355	17.7%	12	19%
Crown Prosecution Service	222	1368	16.2%	30	14%
CSC Computer Science Ltd	5	105	4.8%	1	20%
Defence Equipment and Support	4	63	6.3%	1	25%
Department for Business Innovation and Skills	140	525	26.7%	36	26%
Department for Communities and Local Government	89	373	23.9%	27	30%
Department for Culture Media & Sport	11	70	15.7%	3	27%
Department for Education	150	872	17.2%	77	51%
Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs	87	390	22.3%	40	46%
Department for International Development	77	323	23.8%	18	23%
Department for Transport	85	279	30.5%	25	29%
Department for Work & Pensions	8220	34804	23.6%	1249	15%
Department of Energy and Climate Change	58	283	20.5%	25	43%
Department Of Health	121	467	25.9%	37	31%
Driver & Vehicle Licensing Agency	312	2152	14.5%	62	20%
DVSA (ex DSA)	475	1566	30.3%	63	13%
DVSA (ex VOSA)	138	624	22.1%	29	21%
Economic & Social Research Council	0	21	0.0%	0	0%
Electoral Commission	5	51	9.8%	2	40%
Engie (was Cofely)	25	313	8.0%	1	4%
Engineer & Physical Sciences Research Council	4	25	16.0%	1	25%
Equality and Human Rights Commission	12	111	10.8%	4	33%
ESTYN	3	13	23.1%	1	33%
Food Standards Agency	24	77	31.2%	7	29%
Foreign and Commonwealth Office	110	507	21.7%	53	48%
Forestry Commission	108	433	24.9%	47	44%
Fujitsu Services	47	395	11.9%	6	13%
Gambling Commission	9	86	10.5%	1	11%
Gangmasters Licensing Authority	8	34	23.5%	1	13%
Gatwick Airport Limited	10	129	7.8%	4	40%
Government Internal Audit Agency	4	33	12.1%	1	25%
Government Legal Department - (Was TSOL)	26	133	19.5%	4	15%

Health & Safety Executive	150	544	27.6%	34	23%
Health and Social Care Information Centre	7	90	7.8%	2	29%
Heathrow Airport Holdings	32	378	8.5%	17	53%
Heritage Lottery Fund*	16	70	22.9%	7	44%
Higher Education Funding Council for England	13	82	15.9%	1	8%
Highways England	128	664	19.3%	30	23%
Historic England	9	141	6.4%	2	22%
Historic Environment Scotland	12	105	11.4%	5	42%
Historic Royal Palaces	4	61	6.6%	1	25%
HM Court & Tribunal Service (HMCTS)	5	24	20.8%	1	20%
HM Treasury	13	83	15.7%	5	38%
HMRC	7102	26472	26.8%	1080	15%
Home Office	2146	9511	22.6%	537	25%
Homes & Communities Agency	16	138	11.6%	4	25%
House Of Commons	27	218	12.4%	6	22%
House Of Lords	4	56	7.1%	1	25%
HP Enterprise Services	31	617	5.0%	5	16%
Imperial War Museums	1	21	4.8%	0	0%
Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority	1	19	5.3%	0	0%
Independent Police Complaints Commission	33	359	9.2%	11	33%
Information Commissioner's Office	23	172	13.4%	5	22%
Insolvency Service	60	235	25.5%	15	25%
Land Registry	600	2233	26.9%	57	10%
Legal Ombudsman	2	34	5.9%	0	0%
Marine Management Organisation	15	59	25.4%	4	27%
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	60	274	21.9%	18	30%
Maximus CHDA	13	177	7.3%	2	15%
Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)	2	47	4.3%	1	50%
Medical Research Council	2	35	5.7%	0	0%
Metropolitan Police Service	273	3440	7.9%	50	18%
Ministry of Defence	1706	6115	27.9%	491	29%
Ministry of Justice	1464	6119	23.9%	311	21%
MyCSP	16	151	10.6%	2	13%
National Archives	24	135	17.8%	8	33%
National Audit Office	31	263	11.8%	16	52%
National Gallery	8	151	5.3%	0	0%
National Museums Liverpool	5	85	5.9%	0	0%
National Offender Management Service	327	2079	15.7%	55	17%
National Portrait Gallery	1	50	2.0%	0	0%
National Savings & Investments	6	27	22.2%	3	50%
NATS (National Air Traffic Services)	32	593	5.4%	6	19%
Natural England	72	297	24.2%	13	18%
Natural Environment Research Council	16	90	17.8%	6	38%
Natural History Museum	5	35	14.3%	1	20%
NCA	38	459	8.3%	20	53%
NHS Business Services Agency	1	39	2.6%	0	0%
Office for Nuclear Regulation	21	108	19.4%	7	33%
Office Of Rail and Road	5	34	14.7%	0	0%
Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner	1	20	5.0%	0	0%
Office of the Public Guardian	35	154	22.7%	7	20%
Official Solicitors & Public Trustee	3	27	11.1%	2	67%
Ofgem	14	61	23.0%	5	36%
Ofqual Office of Qualifications and Exam Regulations	5	40	12.5%	2	40%
Ofsted	40	190	21.1%	10	25%
OFWAT	2	28	7.1%	1	50%
Ordnance Survey	6	38	15.8%	1	17%
Parliamentary Information Communication & Technology	0	16	0.0%	0	0%
PHSO	39	181	21.5%	5	13%
Planning Inspectorate	23	127	18.1%	12	52%
Prisons and Probation Ombudsman	4	29	13.8%	0	0%

Public Health England	7	64	10.9%	2	29%
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education	3	72	4.2%	1	33%
R&C Digital and Technology Service	3	15	20.0%	0	0%
Royal Botanic Gardens Kew	1	40	2.5%	0	0%
Royal Household	16	122	13.1%	2	13%
Royal Mint	1	39	2.6%	0	0%
Royal Parks Agency	5	26	19.2%	0	0%
Rural Payments Agency	184	787	23.4%	58	32%
Science Museum	0	23	0.0%	0	0%
Security Industry Authority	3	29	10.3%	1	33%
Serious Fraud Office	8	59	13.6%	3	38%
Shared Services Connected Limited (SSCL)	27	364	7.4%	8	30%
Skills Funding Agency	35	332	10.5%	6	17%
Sopra Steria	26	154	16.9%	3	12%
Sport England	14	103	13.6%	5	36%
Student Loans Company	64	522	12.3%	9	14%
Tate Galleries	8	145	5.5%	1	13%
The Pensions Regulator	5	61	8.2%	2	40%
Transport for London	6	35	17.1%	3	50%
UK Commission for Employment and Skills	0	23	0.0%	0	0%
UK Export Finance	9	41	22.0%	5	56%
UK Hydrographic Office	0	33	0.0%	0	0%
UK Intellectual Property Office	38	176	21.6%	9	24%
UK SBS	24	147	16.3%	5	21%
UK Trade & Investment	27	125	21.6%	11	41%
UKSA & Office For National Statistics	194	707	27.4%	69	36%
Valuation Office Agency	248	969	25.6%	30	12%
Vehicle Certification Agency	9	27	33.3%	3	33%
Victoria & Albert Museum	5	97	5.2%	0	0%
Visit Britain	0	29	0.0%	0	0%
Wallace Collection	3	25	12.0%	0	0%
Youth Justice Board	8	48	16.7%	3	38%
Totals	27090	120117	22.6%	5213	19%