

Motion on PS Remapping

Proposed by: Elisa Wynne-Hughes

Cardiff UCU [notes](#):

- Key concerns have come to light about the PS remapping process including the following breaches of the University's published *Role Mapping Process Guidance*:
 - **Mapping decisions do not appear to be grounded in assessed job content.** This raises concern that staff are being mapped without their actual work being properly understood or assessed. It has been acknowledged that job descriptions being used do not always accurately reflect the work currently being undertaken as they refer to what is in central HR records, information which is known to be out of date in many cases. Despite this, mapping has proceeded.
 - **Mandatory mapping steps appear not to have been fully followed.** Where significant uncertainty exists, the guidance requires the process to pause and resolve these issues, not move forward regardless. Reliance on later appeals to address known weaknesses is not consistent with this approach and places the burden on individuals rather than on the process itself. This raises concerns about procedural fairness and compliance with the Management of Change framework.
 - **The 70% mapping threshold has not been evidenced transparently.** Where mapping has proceeded despite acknowledged misalignment between roles, it is difficult to see how this threshold has been robustly applied in practice. Without clear evidence that the threshold has been met and documented, staff cannot have confidence that mapping decisions are being applied equitably.
 - **Appeals risk being used to correct process failures, not judgement calls.** If individuals are expected to appeal outcomes that were known — at the point of decision — to be weakly evidenced or potentially incorrect, this places undue pressure on staff and risks normalising appeals as part of the core process. This is not compatible with a fair Management of Change process. Appeals should be a safeguard, not a mechanism for fixing avoidable procedural shortcomings.
 - **Protections built into the staged process are being diluted.** Issuing mapping letters creates a reasonable expectation among staff that the outcome represents their allocation within the staged process. If that expectation can later be displaced — for example, because other individuals appeal on the basis that they may have mapped to the post had their job description been correct at Stage 1 — this risks undermining confidence in the integrity and finality of Stage 1 decisions and blurring the protections intended by the mapping → ring-fenced → open competition sequence. Equally, moving prematurely to competitive processes where mapping has not been properly assessed risks bypassing the safeguards built into the staged approach.

Cardiff UCU believes:

- That PS Staff have a right to fair and robust mapping processes in line with the University's published *Role Mapping Process Guidance*
- Collectively, these issues raise concerns about whether the Grade 7 mapping process (and any further grades mapped by the same process), as applied, meets the stated requirement that it be **fair, transparent and compliant**.

The key risks are:

- staff being mapped without proper recognition of their work;
- inconsistent application of thresholds and stages;
- increased reliance on appeals and competition;
- erosion of trust in the Management of Change process.

These are not abstract risks; they affect job security, morale and confidence in institutional processes.

Cardiff UCU resolves:

- To lobby the university to:
 - ensure that Stage 1 mapping decisions meet the published evidential requirements;
 - seek clarity on how known inaccuracies in job information have been mitigated;
 - seek reassurance on whether outcomes with low confidence are being reviewed before confirmation;
 - seek clarity how adherence to the staged protections in the guidance is being maintained;
 - to restore staff and union confidence that the process is being applied fairly, consistently and transparently