**Staff Remuneration Survey Report**

A survey on the draft remuneration policy was conducted amongst academic staff and support staff grades 6 and above. The request for staff to complete the survey went out in early July 2014 and the survey was closed on the 24th of July 2014. In total, 807 requests were sent out to permanent staff for the completion of the survey. In total, 364 staff replied, a response rate of 45%.

The profile of those who completed the survey was:

* Academic staff, 149 people, 41% of all responses
* Support staff, 215 people, 59% of all responses
* A good cross section of responses came from academics in all 5 Faculties and from various post levels (e.g. 41% of response were from Associate Professors and Professors, 33% from senior lecturers/researchers and the 25% from lecturers/researchers)
* There were a good cross section of response from support staff in various Divisions but the response rate from staff in Infrastructure and Operations was poor.

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had attended any of the remuneration presentations held (only 77 had) and if they had read the draft remuneration policy (268 indicated they had). This means that only 19 respondents answered the survey without knowledge of the draft policy. 164 respondents rated their understanding of the proposed policy as either good or very good and a further 124 rated themselves as having an average understanding.

The survey queried the level of support for the key issues of the policy. Due to the complex nature of the issues, definitions were provided to the respondent. The issues are listed below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Issue | Support % | Support with reservations % | Unsure % | Do not Support %  |
| 1 | Use of a remuneration range | 44 | 16 | 32 | 7 |
| 2 | No differentiation in remuneration ranges per discipline/type of job i.e. Professor in Botany paid on same range as Professor in History | 48 | 8 | 20 | 24 |
| 3 | Remuneration range from 80% to 110% of 50th percentile | 35 | 13 | 39 | 13 |
| 4 | Up to 10% on min of range linked to person’s experience and/or qualifications so person with PhD paid more than person without | 63 | 14 | 9 | 14 |
| 5 | Within a particular range for a particular post/grade, individual differentiation will be on the basis of contribution.  | 52 | 18 | 11 | 18 |
| No | Issue | Support % | Support with reservations % | Unsure % | Do not Support %  |
| 6 | The processes for individual differentiation based on contribution is not in policy. Would need to be determined and would be subject to negotiation and consultation. | 45 | 12 | 23 | 20 |
| 7 | No differentiation in individual remuneration based on years of service | 38 | 7 | 15 | 39 |
| 8 | Payment of scarcity allowances | 60 | 14 | 12 | 13 |
| 9 | Conducting of formal remuneration survey to benchmark competitiveness every 3 years | 88 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| 10 | Income differential analyses to be conducted to ensure no unfair discrimination | 79 | 6 | 11 | 4 |
| 11 | Adjustment/review of remuneration to take place at appointment/promotion | 75 | 8 | 13 | 4 |
| 12 | Adjustment/review of remuneration to take place after probation | 72 | 6 | 14 | 8 |
| 13 | Adjustment/review of remuneration to take place linked to review of contribution/achievements | 66 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| 14 | Adjustment/review of remuneration to take place linked to person being a member of an under-represented group i.e. equity premium | 26 | 12 | 20 | 42 |
| 15 | Adjustment/review of remuneration to take place when an offer is made by another employer and we wish to retain that staff member | 50 | 19 | 11 | 20 |
| 16 | Move to total remuneration structure | 49 | 8 | 32 | 12 |

This report does no cover all the questions asked but covers the key and certainly the more controversial issues.

The responses above show a support for individual differentiation based on contribution with much of the qualitative comments received on this issue relating to how exactly this would be implemented in order to ensure fairness and consistency and to ensure that this is not a burdensome task. Some individuals equated the contribution model with performance management. This term has deliberately been avoided in the policy and the survey because of the differing understandings of what this means, often based on faulty assumptions and lack of accurate information.

Interesting to note however, is the lack of support for years of service (39% of respondents) not being considered as a remuneration differentiator. Put differently, these respondents would want to see Ms X earning more than Ms Y based on Ms X being at Rhodes at that job for a longer period of time. This, as a methodology for remuneration, is incompatible with contribution being used as a means of individual differentiation in remuneration.

There was strong support for the current practice of paying scarcity allowances but poor support for the payment of an equity premium (42% of respondents did not support this with only 38% of respondents indicating some sort of support (categories of support and support with reservations). Qualitative comments raise concerns of this not being equitable while other comments call for more rigour around the implementation of such a premium e.g. how long does the premium last? would this apply only to under-represented groups in a particular work area?

There was strong support for multiple opportunities to review an individual’s remuneration in the course of their career.

Some of the qualitative comments of the survey also pointed to:

* a lack of understanding as regards certain people management practices at Rhodes e.g. the grading of jobs;
* the individual not accessing the information available e.g. indicating that the process of determining scarcity allowances should be determined (a protocol is available on the HR website indicates exactly how this is done); or
* simply inaccurate perceptions e.g. a statement that the two job categories of lecturer and senior lecturer have been merged into one post namely that of lecturer.

Areas that will require some more exploration in the finalisation of the policy include:

* The remuneration range proposed; and
* The use of the equity premium.

HR is currently discussing the results of this survey with NTEU. As previously agreed with NEHAWU, NEHAWU will provide verbal feedback from its constituency as regards the proposals of the policy.

The policy approval process will be:

* Remuneration Committee of Council in September to give support to the proposals (not for approval at this stage)
* Senate in November
* Council in December
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