

# Prospect Briefing for members in QinetiQ



4 November 2014

## QinetiQ Pay – 45% of staff dissatisfied

Prospect's pay survey of QinetiQ employees following the recent pay award has shown that only 35% of respondents were satisfied with their pay award, and 45% of respondents were dissatisfied.

According to the survey the average increase was confirmed as 3% but more than half of the respondents received an award of 2% or less, which meant that the overall median was just 2%.

### Distribution of pay award:

% increase	% respondents
0	3.20%
1	12.90%
2	35.50%
3	26.50%
4	11.00%
5	3.20%
Greater than 5	7.70%

Business	Average	Median
Air	2.95	2.00
C4ISR	2.50	2.00
Maritime	3.30	3.00
Weapons	3.50	3.00
Other	2.16	2.00

What was more revealing about the survey were the comments from individuals, which have been reproduced in full in this newsletter. This does reflect an underlying dissatisfaction with the pay process.

85% of respondents responded 'no' to the question 'Do you think you were adequately consulted about your pay award this year?'. Over three quarters of respondents felt that the EEG had no influence on the pay process this year, which reflects a number of comments from respondents who were dissatisfied with the consultation on this year's pay process.

The most common issues raised in the comments are:

- ◆ the pay process lacking transparency;

- ◆ performance is not properly rewarded;
- ◆ pay anomalies have been addressed but this has reduced the pay pot for everyone else.

The comments received during the survey do provide a wider and more meaningful summary of employees' concerns at the pay process, which have not been moderated or edited except where individuals could be identified.

## New HR Director appointed

At the end of October it was announced that Oshin Cassidy has been appointed HR Director reporting to Ian Beresford (Director of Capability) who had taken over the HR role after Dave Bradley had left the Company at short notice in May (the third HR Director to have left QinetiQ since union derecognition).

Prospect wish Oshin Cassidy well in her new role and we will be continuing our informal dialogue with the Company, on union recognition derecognition.

More members means  
greater influence  
*Recruit a colleague...*



[http://www.prospect.org.uk/becoming\\_a\\_member\\_or\\_rep/member\\_get\\_member?ts=80795](http://www.prospect.org.uk/becoming_a_member_or_rep/member_get_member?ts=80795)

## Prospect exchanges with QinetiQ

Prospect Deputy General Secretary, Dai Hudd, has been in correspondence with Ian Beresford, Director of Capability, on the issue of union recognition and employee engagement within the Company.

In July Dai wrote to Ian referring to the previous informal discussions that had taken place with Dave Bradley who left as HR Director in mid-May. Dai had been invited to highlight a number of large private sector companies that enjoyed good and constructive relationships with Prospect. This with a view that QinetiQ might approach those companies to verify Prospect's reputation and positive relationship on behalf of our members in those companies.

In early August Ian Beresford responded by stating that *"we are now seeing staff engagement at unprecedented levels, with the recent election of new representatives to our Employee Engagement Group attracting voting levels of 60% of the electorate. Moreover, our staff engagement scores, independently administered by the Best Companies organisation continue to show improvement year on year"*.

Responding to these points, Dai Hudd highlighted the actual findings of the QinetiQ 'Best Companies' survey. In response to the survey statement *"I believe my views are represented to senior management by the EEG"* only 32% of the respondents in 2014 agreed, this was up from 31% in 2012. In answer to the proposition posed in the survey *"I think that the EEG has been effective"*, only 22% of the respondents in 2014 agreed, this was down from 23% in 2012. *"This is hardly a ringing endorsement of the arrangements set up to deliver improved workforce engagement"*. He went on to say that *"I say this not in any way to appear to be critical of the staff who volunteer to give their time to participate in such a body, as stated previously they are to be commended for doing so. However good people can only operate within the parameters they are given. As you will be aware the EEG, is prohibited from seeking to deal with any bargaining issues on pay, terms*

## All change at the top of QinetiQ

The sudden announcement in mid-October that Leo Quinn was leaving QinetiQ to take up a new role as CEO of Balfour Beatty was not wholly unexpected, as he has been in post for five years now. During that time there has been considerable change within QinetiQ, and there is no doubting that the financial performance of the Company has improved significantly from the profit warnings that were in place when he was appointed in November 2009.

However this has been at a very high price for many QinetiQ employees. The major redundancy exercises in 2010 lost hundreds of highly skilled and capable employees. At the same time the culture of the Company changed significantly with many respected specialists and renowned specialists being 'exited' at short notice out of the Company, leading to a sharp decline in morale and an evident increase in a climate of secrecy and fear which had not been part of QinetiQ's culture since the transition from DERA that started in 2001.

Prospect have been at the sharp end of representing many of the employees that left, and were also made aware of many other talented specialists

who voluntarily decided to leave as they expressed their feelings of being disengaged from an increasingly process-driven organisation that out less value on individual capabilities and skills.

The closure of the DB Pension Scheme, first announced in October 2012 was, we believe a significant factor in the decision to derecognise Prospect and the other trade unions so as to minimise considered arguments against closure. This is despite the fact that Prospect and the other unions had been praised by Leo in June 2010 for being willing to engage with members on difficult decisions relating to redundancy compensation; and we had been instrumental in saving the pension scheme from closure in our constructive engagement with QinetiQ back in 2007 prior to the pension options in 2008.

Our experience in helping many individual QinetiQ members since union derecognition has demonstrated the importance of having an independent trade union to provide a collective voice for employees and the resources to give practical help, advice and, where necessary, legal support.

We do believe that the climate for union recognition is changing in a positive way and we are continuing to work hard behind the scenes to create the circumstances for Prospect to be re-recognised within QinetiQ.

*and conditions and related matters, it is expressly excluded from conducting any negotiations, and from providing individual representation"*.

However, these were the views of QinetiQ employees, and therefore suggested that QinetiQ *"has a fair way to go in gaining the trust and support of its employees"* and that Prospect *"want to work positively with the Company in dealing with these issues"*.

Responding to these points, Ian Beresford, said that the QinetiQ Employee Engagement Group *"is a better fit for our people than collective bargaining. Moreover the EEG is a truly representative body, elected by all of our employees for the benefit of all. We recognise that the unions have a role to play in QinetiQ, representing employees on an individual basis. Indeed we respect the unions for the importance*

*and value of that role. Our issue has only been with the unions having a monopoly on the bargaining on behalf of all employees when there membership is a minority"*.

Prospect does not accept that union recognition and collective bargaining is in any way incompatible with good staff engagement involving all employees. Indeed a major part of our proposal to QinetiQ both before and after union derecognition was that we would work alongside the EEG but have the added advantage of providing an independent voice for employees with our own resources and backup to engage on important issues such as pay, pensions, and conditions of service.

Prospect has made a fresh approach to ACAS to help facilitate a fresh approach and dialogue with QinetiQ on employee engagement and union recognition.

# Prospect QinetiQ Pay Survey 2014 – Comments

The comments below from respondents to the pay survey have not been edited or moderated in any way.

•	No consistency across the divisions (or within divisions). If your face fits you get a rise. If you are near to retirement age you don't as you won't leave anyway!
•	It appears that part of the pay pot was also used to address pay staff anomalies. I believe this should have been addressed separately. I am a different case this year as I semi-retired in April and only work three days a week and my pay has been adjusted pro rata and I dropped a grade from GG12 to GG11
•	A letter saying your pay is competitive for your job. With no explanation or chance to discuss dose not reward or motivate
•	Such a high pay rise due to retention and becoming qualified within role
•	My wages are still way below industry average for my GG and skill set. With loss of the DB Pension and its freezing at this low wage level, I feel my time in QinetiQ is a waste. I also do not feel there will be any change in management attitude and they will continue to effectively freeze wages or blackmail extreme compensation for a wage increase, until I find another job. Working in QinetiQ is not conducive to career development.
•	I think the EEG did the best they could to influence the pay which at the end of the day is decided by the Company. Any suggestion that Prospect could have done better would not be true. Communications have already been sent out saying that the EEG are already engaging with the Company on next year's pay rise. The way the pay round was linked to the closure of the pensions was poorly managed.
•	I think the lack of transparency is a big problem. Also I'm sure that lower paid staff are being bumped up disproportionately which on the face of it may seem fair it doesn't take account of why slightly higher paid staff get a better salary anyway e.g what was offered for the job, differences in contracts (especially leave allowances)
•	I'd like to know the median salary for my global grade
•	Better than previous years. Managers had some say in the distribution of pay awards and some progress was made on addressing anomalies within areas of the company.
•	This year proved no different to previous, we were encouraged to obtain feedback from our customers (which I did many did not) People who did not even fill out their own objectives received higher percentage rises. Some old sayings come to mind- If your face fits and Not what you know but who you know. The whole pay process quite frankly stinks of corruption.
•	Once again reward the management with the share buyback but can't be bothered to reward its engineers
•	Not at all transparent. Staff awards completely at odds with that of Executives and Leadership teams. This was 4th year in row my pay as a performing member of staff was below inflation due predominantly due to position relative to 'peers' meaning effectively my pay has been falling.
•	no comment because we have no input or real representation.
•	The secrecy around the whole process is making you wonder what is really going on behind the scenes.
•	We understood it was happening but not widely consulted. Leo's note talked about an average of 3% but clearly that meant 3% paybill and so some would get more and others less but not everyone seemed to understand that. In terms of the actual process for managers, there was a spreadsheet which was used to code in people's performance mark (PP etc), their ladder ranking (T/M/B), their pay relative to the GG and then their potential flight risk. That popped out a calculated answer which was then rounded to the nearest sensible number. There was the opportunity for businesses to manually adjust thereafter but that was a rarity. So, a pretty fair and practically automated process within the constraints of a capped budget.
•	Although the EEG appears to have prompted some minor improvements, the critical decision of the overall pay bill appears to have been predetermined. The pay process is largely pointless in my area since everyone performs well and so gets basically the same pay award. The pay process in at least one division appears to be entirely dysfunctional (e.g. targets are not set, or are impossible to meet, or are ignored arbitrarily at the whims of management). In real terms I am no better off than 6 or 7 years ago, despite gaining much experience and being far more capable at my job.
•	I have no idea how pay awards were made, how good or how bad the pay awards were or whether I have been treated fairly or not.

•	Nobody I know got 3% so where did it go? Guess I need to look upwards to see the answer.
•	received just over the 3% despite receiving top marking, being only just above the bottom of the scale and in a group that was delivering double digit growth (for no allowance was made in the pay process).
•	Although my percentage pay-rise appears very generous, it put my salary just barely within my pay-band - or such is the rumour amongst colleagues in a similar position.
•	Leo says 12% of the staff got 5% or more? My arse! I don't know anyone who got more than 4%
•	As we are not allowed to discuss pay awards, I have no idea what colleagues received doing the same job on other sites. I do not have a career development framework for my global grade, I have been asking for this for the last 2 years! so I have nothing to compare it with! HR tell me that they are working on it.
•	I am female and an admin grade - I should count myself lucky that I didn't get PN . I know a few who did and it was clear that they had just been picked on - not because of their work ethic/output – shameful really.
•	Always jam tomorrow
•	Yet again the CEO takes a big slice and we get the crumbs
•	Once again the pool of money was insufficient it needed to be 5% minimum. In my area everyone was bought into the first 'quartile'. Still no transparency on the pay bands, why promise it for next year, if you are prepared to publish do it now.
•	Below inflation pay rises for many years does not appear to be a reasonable approach. However, realistically, in the absence of Union representation nothing can possibly improve even with an EEG in place as this does not appear to have the power or interest in challenging the views of the leadership of the company.
•	Pay rise percentage was good, but loss of pension payments was not
•	Although I am happy with the percentage increase, I am aware that this was given not as a result of performance but across the board on our site as our grade overall was being paid less than other sites. I would not be surprised to find that when the pay scales are revealed in January, this latest pay increase just brings us inside the lower bracket for the grade. It will also show that whilst the company goes on about not having regional pay levels any more, they are still present.
•	I was in the top box and yet got less than inflation so not really performance pay
•	Pay awards are about anomalies in the pay scale and not performance. It depends on your quartile so I do not believe the system is about performance related pay
•	Not impressed, again. Some dissatisfaction arises from the Corporate/EEG 'pay for performance' claims being overridden by the 'wider business'. The differential between exceptional and average performance was only a small percentage (or fraction of a percentage) in pay, which was then further diluted by rounding DOWN to the nearest £50. Why? the first I heard of this was when my line manager told me the outcome of the process. Motivating staff to deliver exceptional performance with a potential reward of perhaps +0.1% over average (or even mediocre) performance is, to put it simply, 'challenging'. Perhaps in business functions where 0.1% of a salary is of significant value, this may be a differentiator, but for the majority of QinetiQ staff it is not exactly much of a carrot. The overall pay pot allocated this year was nowhere near enough to bring salaries back in line with inflation losses over the years of 0% for the staff, let alone reflect the strong company performance. Would it be wrong to suggest that corporate investment in share buy-back might be better spent investing in the staff, the ones actually delivering growth and influencing share value? Further dissatisfaction arises from the four page, badly-worded 'legalise' letter that I was forced to sign in order to accept this year's pay award. Again - why? We were already aware that, once closed, there was no way QinetiQ would allow any future pay awards to contribute to our final salary pension - so why did the letter force me to accept changes and FUTURE changes to my T&C's with only a few days to consider and sign before the end of month pay cut-off (or later, be marked as refusing to accept the pay award)? I was not impressed with the process this year - no consultation apparent. Was the EEG fully aware of the letter and its contents before it was issued? Were they aware of the strength of ill-feeling such a blunt device created? Were they aware of the £50 rounding down this year and were staff properly briefed to expect this? Overall impressions - another unimpressive outcome after another good year for the company. QinetiQ staff need effective representation, meaningful consultation and two-way negotiation.
•	Pay is not the issue for me but the MyPsP is a bl00dy fiasco!

•	Allegedly, The pay rise at [site name redacted] was decided by a face fit mentality rather than merits. Certain people with family members in positions of management (FM) did rather well. The incumbent head of site, wasn't involved in this process, I am led to believe that the previous head of site was the decision maker, and this was apparent in relation to people being penalised with low percentages due to their face not fitting, In my opinion.
•	The accompanying letter relating to the DB pension was threatening and I also had less than 24 hours to sign it and return it in order to get my pay increase in the September pay packet. I felt bullied. This was done with no consultation, over a holiday period, and came with a rolling pin hitting you over head. In other words, QinetiQ was behaving true to form. Unfortunately, it is what we have come to expect.
•	My concern centres on putting all of the pay award against performance. It is divisive. Some grades cannot easily improve their performance and other's performance - e.g. mine results from team work. By all means reward hard work but remember everyone needs to live and cope with inflation.
•	I was given 5% to get me UP TO THE BOTTOM of the pay scale! Nearly 30 years loyal service as a good performer and I am at the BOTTOM of my pay scale. I told my manager that if I was a lazy good for nothing worker then I would expect to be at the bottom, but I am not! We keep hearing about performance pay, but the management still get confused with performance pay rises!! I know of a couple near the top of their pay scales, just performing, they still got about 2% each!
•	4% was above the overall 3% paybill, however apparently, according to one of the Corporate emails (published before i got my pay award) , the top performing 12% of staff received awards of 6% or more. Considering I was near the top of the ladder rankings I expected to fall into this category
•	I was ranked Top in the dept, and was pivitol to the dept success, so expected in excess of 3% to bring me up to the median. I did not get in excess of this. However do appreciate that 3% is better than what most people get outside of QQ.
•	The gap is widening between existing employees and new starters coming in on 15-20% more with no apparent budget available to rectify the difference.
•	The company policy is that they want performance related pay - this pay round failed miserably to do that.
•	The process was flawed from the start and management knew it. The rewards are not consistent with performance. No consultation and decisions made by those so far removed they may as well role a dice A secret ,magic formula for levels to global grades. Another secret ,magic formula for how pay rise was arrived at. What next annual leave lotto?
•	There was no base rate increase for all at PP or above, it was all performance related this year. Because the pot was only 3% anyone getting more meant someone had to be getting less. The pot was not big enough - Leo always talks about affordability of the tiny pay pot with respect to the business, but never justifies the affordability of his massive individual remuneration package!
•	I had a promotion this year and feel that the pay increase awarded at that time was acceptable.
•	I complained, but was ignored when from Level 7, my Global grade was set to 13. That is the main reason my pay award was so poor.
•	My pay letter did not even quote the percentage rise - even HR were ashamed to mention it.
•	There was no rationale or explanation on the way the individual awards were made.
•	I and several other people seem to have been downgraded from PP middle to PP bottom for no obvious good reason and no feedback or justification by security div was given. This looks likely to be a straight cost savings measure- and in truth I'm one of the lucky ones based on how I've seen others getting treated by them. its clear to me that performance has been adjusted to make the div appear more profitable. Luckily I and some others affected had already applied for and been accepted into posts in another div. Upon arriving the excuse was given that the pay increase is based on past performance so they had to go by whatever the old div said. At my recent half year review, which, like last year, was excellent, I stated plainly that I expect a decent pay rise or I will be leaving. It's all about supply and demand in the end.
•	Yet again, although the company and my division are doing very well, the profits do not appear to be shared fairly to the majority of the employees. We have the usual kind words and thank you's, but I'm sure that the majority of the wealth is being shared with a select few of the senior grades and those that are 'in favour'. The performance management process (MyPSP) is a sham!
•	Again, below average pay award for those who are performing above expectations.
•	EEG input only appears to be tinkering at the edges of the pay process. I had excellent customer & internal feedback but still only got 1%. Unhappy

•	No transparency, can't know if there has been a fair allocation, can't know whether performance is being justly rewarded; no confidence that market rates or affordability have been properly taken into account.
•	Percentage was high but my pay is still well below the median.
•	The way the pay increment, yet again below inflation, was linked to waiving pension rights seemed coercive and bullying. Still we have no choice because the boundless opportunities that senior staff love to talk about boil down to 'take it or leave.'
•	Usual 'behind closed doors' decision with no transparency, explanation of result or appeal process
•	From what I have been told the 'idea' behind the process for my dept seemed good however it still does not recognise those who are underpaid and have been for some time. I was informed I am one of the lowest paid Project Managers in [Division name redacted] and got 3% which still leaves me as one of the lowest paid. Apparently the higher paid got either nothing or 1% with the few of closing the gap!! They intend to do the same over the next few years to bring us all closer together. I will have retired by the time I get what I should be getting!!
•	It appears that the young graduates employed to meet the 5% target set by QQ Management were given much higher pay rises (need to retain etc..., same old excuses). I know for fact that the one graduate who works in my area was given 8% - absolute insult and joke!!!!!!!!!!!!!! 3% should mean 3%, if there is a requirement to 'retain' then offer retention bonuses, but don't rob peter to pay paul. As a footnote, I'm leaving the company since I feel the situation will never change as long as there is no Union recognition.
•	The process seemed more transparent this year. We had more consultation about my PSP.
•	As a PDM, I was involved with primary marking (Top, Middle, Bottom) then no involvement what so ever!
•	It seems that the pay has been rounded up to the nearest hundreds to make it easier for the bean counters. Also there is still a pay difference between people that carry out the same work. Do not know what the difference in pay is between Weapons sites for, again, the same type of work.
•	Although I did very well, it is on the back of two years where my uplift was insignificant, whilst my colleagues had much greater percentages (I was reviewed equally to my peers but received a much lower percentage uplift). I have had no input into the process this year, or how we compare to other sites carrying out similar work.
•	Low percentage allocated due to pay in top quarter of payband for GG. Under grading of GGs big issue that now will affect future pay of many regardless of performance.
•	Very much take it or leave it!
•	not in the slightest bit transparent
•	More work is being put on all members with no extra pay
•	Well I guess I had a decent pay rise this year but seeing as I have been screwed over for so many years - some of which while Prospect were supposed to be helping us - I have not got excited about it.
•	Ratings are based on biased views by incompetent people. Percentage pay awards being made rather than value. Discussed with my manager and for once the penny dropped and he will bring up for next year. I am paid lower than those on grade lower in my group. They still expect more from me. Working till 7 many days each week and not enough time. I am below ahp cut off but can't claim as I am gg13. Gg12s on more money can!
•	My above average pay award may be because it is currently considered that I work in an area of high demand or it may be because I am in the lower quartile for my pay band. I was not informed either way.
•	I totally disagree with the Company's decision to remove the unions from supporting staff in getting just rewards for their efforts. Prospect (IPMS) really helped me out a few years ago and their support was amazing. I know my immediate peers are on tens of thousands more than I am due to their length of service - one of the reasons the pay bands will NEVER be published. I appreciate the pay rise I have been afforded but could get more outside but without the flexibility. I feel very sorry for some of the EEG Reps - they have taken on this role really wanting to help and make a real difference but their hands are tied by the companies bullying nature and expectation that they will 'toe the company line'.
•	Again pay anomalies were addressed as part of the pay pot. These should be addressed prior to the pay round. More emphasis was placed on paying those staff who were deemed important to the business at the expense of the lower grades.
•	Once again favouritism and arbitrary measures determined who got what. And there was no consistency.

•	My award was about what I felt was justified, given the company's performance over the last year and my own achievements. Having said that, it was less than I'd hoped for but more than I feared I would be awarded ...
•	My grievance with the way the pay award was handled this year is that although a 3% cost of living rise was awarded across the company, a percentage (unknown) of performing employees received less than 3%, as the pot was used to fund anomalies across the business. Although I agree that anomalies should be addressed, performing employees should not suffer with a reduced pay rise as a consequence. Anomalies should be addressed from separate funds.
•	It is inherently unfair that the leadership team get massive pay rises and we don't get inflation. Even more unfair with the pension changes that have gone on. Leo Quinn should stand up and be fair and take the same percentage that everyone else does - if he thinks it fair why not have the backbone to do a townhall where he explains the pay rise and how it is fair for him to get huge amounts compared to most of the staff.
•	I was top of my peer group and was lead to believe my pay rise would be nearer to 5%. On top of that I can now only claim AHP for travel time and my job role makes it difficult for me to take Time Off In Lieu.
•	Frustrated that haven't got any idea of where my salary sits compared to other GG13s.
•	Very happy with this year's pay award as it finally gets me closer to my mid point for my global grade, still not sure how close though!
•	There is no clarity on how someone can be classed as critical. It all seems to subjective and is based around them rewarding who they want to award and not necessarily the hardest workers.
•	As a former technical grade (entered as a graduate engineer, chartered for 20 yrs etc.), now in project management, I am penalised by the PM grading system. Most of my technical peers are GG12, some up to GG14. As a consequence my pay is hitting a ceiling, even though I'm told I do my job very well.
•	About the rise I expected - given the pot was 3%. Having no formal consultation process to put a case forward is still a bit raw though... Here it is, take it or leave it, with the longest 'legalese' letter which gave the impression of a very heavy handed approach. Not good.
•	Talking to fellow workers, pay rises seem to take final pay to the nearest £100. It would appear that if your pay rise was say 2.25% your pay was rounded up or down to the nearest £100. This seems unfair if your % rise took you to just over the £100 mark. It means your pay is rounded down.
•	Didn't expect much, didn't get much. I attribute it to an artificially low global grade, common in MET (Us, Air Div), that then influences the ability of 'local' management to award within the range (not that anyone seems to know what it is) based on existing salary vs range maximum.
•	The average wage rise was 3% yet I am over performing and was told I did very well yet I was nowhere near 3% !
•	The all hands talk back sessions presented graphs showing distribution of staff before and after against their grade centres. As we don't know what the pay centres are let alone the bands this data may as well have presented the average crater size on Mars. As some job families essentially got demoted in the global grading process, (and it would not make sense from a management perspective to undergo such a change without grade deflation and make people re-climb the greasy pole) it is easy to see how many people are now doing better against their centre band position if that has now decreased. I have no idea how I did against my peers. I could have done really well and not know it.
•	The format, breadth and wording of the accompanying acceptance letter (for DB pension members) was heavy-handed and unnecessary and did not engender trust. Low pay pot given performance of the company.
•	Line manager was leaving company and outright lied when he said myself and rest of team would be getting a good pay rise
•	As I was only given a figure for what my new annual pay will be I have no idea what the percentage is. It is absolutely useless as a pay letter compared to what we used to get. There is very little information. We are being treated worse than ever before
•	Having being TOLD that you must sign away any rights to have the increase incorporated into the defined benefit pension, plus no effective consultation regarding why the increases were so small - it appeared very much a take it or leave it offer, no transparency and with no opportunity for negotiation. Plus don't tell anyone else what you got.
•	I think a lot has been done to bring lower paid staff up in the pay scale, which is great, but it doesn't help to keep PP staff feeling good at such low awards when average is 3%.

•	Prior to the pay rise being announced, I attended a training session for the revised performance assessment process. At that session we were told that the amount of pay rise individuals would receive would be decided according their performance assessment in September, a pay rise recommendation would be determined in October and subsequently approved in November. So it was a complete surprise to receive notification in early September without having had any sort of performance review that I was aware of or party to. So was my rise performance related? Possibly, as amongst colleagues who work with me it would appear that an across the board rise was not evident as we received different percentages.
•	Any rise below the rate of inflation represents a drop in living standards
•	No different to what we have come to expect.
•	Better award than dstl where I used to work!
•	Again this year pay anomalies were attended to as part of the pay round. This again gives less of the pay pot to share out. Pay anomalies should not form part of the pay round
•	My pay rise in real terms was less than half my weekly car fuel bill. The pay award should have been at least 3% with a minimum of at least £50 increase per month. The problem with a '%' pay rise is that if you're on a poor wage to start with, the outcome is still a poor wage.
•	there was no consultation. The company said it was 3% for all performing staff but I don't know of any on my colleagues who actually got 3%. All got less than that.
•	3% pay pot with no idea of the reduction from this for performing employees. Below prevailing rpi
•	Transparency, honesty, integrity. Three words this company has excised from its dictionary with regard to the pay process.
•	After fully delivering on all objectives, and 'going an extra mile' to be a 'good team player' (I personally identified a safety-related problem, and the cure for it), I was marked as NP (N for behaviours) and put on an Action Plan, with the observation that I was easily distracted from my day job. I saw the 'out of green' (ie non-PP) assessment coming, and appealed to my PDM+1. He refused to review the case, but I did get a 1% pay rise. My PDM seemed to think I should be pleased with this, since the norm for an 'out of green' assessment is deemed to be 0%.
•	I received a good pay rise this year, which has now put me on the very bottom of my payscale. Although I am happy that I no longer lower than the bottom, as some who is considered to be performing I do not find my position particularly satisfying. Added to this, I am a former member of the DB pension scheme. In order to receive my pay rise I had to sign an agreement which now means that part of my pension will be forever linked to a salary I was earning when I was below the bottom of the payscale. This does have a negative effect on my feeling about the way I feel about this year's pay award.
•	Yet again, a real terms pay cut as reward for a lot of hard work.
•	I was never convinced that the union had any influence over pay deals within QinetiQ. It's difficult to say, therefore, whether the EEG had any more or less influence. I'm tempted to believe it's probably the same.
•	Was reasonably happy but felt that I knew nothing about it until the rise was awarded. Also felt that there is too much secrecy over who got what.
•	I was expecting the usual 1% and actually got more. My division did try to reward performance, there was no criteria given (that I received). The pay award appeared to happen this year with very limited communication.
•	Just imposed no desiccation or even explanation. letter just handed out
•	no consultation. pay award not equal in that award was rounded up or down to nearest £00.
•	I at least got the headline rate this year, unlike the derisory increase last year. But it still doesn't make up for the pension going, and the several years of small or zero rises.
•	Its all very well collating this data but currently Prospect have no direct communication with QinetiQ so what are you going to do with it?.
•	I work very long hours, and have been instrumental in the success of many projects. However, because I value work more than the pointless performance development system, I am penalised as a result. I gather HR now have a significant say in our pay rises - and yet they no nothing whatsoever about the work we do.
•	Imposed in an arbitrary way as a way of avoiding interminable wrangles about the meaning of fair to all the stakeholders
•	I'd rather not say
•	Although I got a bit more this year it doesn't go anywhere near enough to make up for the sub inflationary rises we have had to endure for so long.
•	Our pay was decided by senior management, there was no consultation with any of the PDM's below GG14



•	Now the Leo Quinn is leaving perhaps the Union will be allowed back in
•	I resigned after the pay deal was agreed. Both my manager and his manager told me that my last pay for end of September would include an increase. It never came through and after 10 yrs service I am not surprised.
•	I had to sign to accept my pay rise and to agree it would not be part of my defined pension, I was basically blackmailed, very underhanded of QinetiQ.
•	The EEG are a niche organisation with no power whatsoever.
•	My UG7 grade (PSO) was converted to GG13 rather than 14 or 15 as happened with some other staff, so in spite of being marked PP, I am near the top of that pay band and my pay rise has been limited.
•	Again pay anomalies were sorted out as part of the pay round, reducing the % available for all
•	I have been too busy to take notice of the pay process maybe i was consulted but ignored it. My manager seems to have got me a good pay rise probably as two people recently resigned from my team who have scarce IT skills, also i suspect my pay is low as i had 6 year career break starting in 2000 and came back on same salary in 2006. I think union should be reinstated but not just for pay, they have fully trained reps rather than the EEG who have reps who are only in post temporarily and can't possibly give independent view.
•	As the years go by, I think the consultation becomes less and less. Although my pay rise appears to be fine from what I have been told by my PDM, there is no way of confirming that. I am lucky that I have a PDM I currently trust absolutely, but that hasn't always been the case. Also when we split from MOD (DRA, DERA, then QinetiQ) we were given the impression that a benefit would be better pay rises. Whenever I have compared with my MOD contemporaries, QinetiQ has always been worse off.
•	The QinetiQ pay review system rewards those that are perceived to be doing well by managers. The reality is many staff are performing really well or performing the work load expected of someone at a global grade higher. It does not reward those going the extra mile, working extra hours or frankly poorly paid for the level of responsibility they own. Neither does it reward those staff clearly working at a higher level against global grade that they been allocated. There is a 38.7% pay disparity between me and my colleague yet I been assessed as Performing and Promotable for like 5 years on the trot. Yet nothing is done to address the disparity.
•	The pay settlement does not reward performance and does not represent a pay rise in real terms. My pay over the last five years has not kept up with cost of living rises over the same period.
•	There was no obvious transparent process
•	No percentage given - was less given than expected?
•	Although the pay award was as good or better than many others in other companies or government it does not address the poor pay rises in previous years or the comparative strength of the company. The processes used to establish the pay rise are not transparent, do not follow the company's own procedure, take no account of evidence and benefit those who shout loudest rather than those who produce good, solid, consistent work.
•	I think the EEG is a waste of time.
•	I didn't have an award as I had just moved role and received a pay rise which I was happy with. I was disappointed that with a paypot significantly above the level of inflation (3% versus CPI at 1.9%) that the pay award wasn't underpinned at 1.9% for all deemed to be performing. In the event some people who were rated as performing were in real terms made poorer.
•	I know that I should be pleased with 3.5% as it is more than most and above inflation, but QQ is doing well and could do a lot more to make up for the years where we had no pay rises and fell well behind the accumulative inflation level.
•	The pay rise was as expected as the leadership team took a bigger proportion of the pay budget for themselves.