

Extension Material 7.4

Example of a generic redundancy selection matrix

| Criteria | Weighting | Points | | | | Points allocated |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Length of service | 1 | 0–2 years | 2–5 years | 5–10 years | 10 years plus | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Disciplinary record | 1 | Clean record | Verbal warning | Written warning | Final written warning | |
| | | 0 | –1 | –2 | –3 | |
| Quality of work | 3 | Acceptable | Good | Very good | Excellent | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Initiative and reliability | 2 | Below expectations | Meets expectations | Frequently exceeds expectations | Always exceeds expectations | |
| | | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Potential | 3 | Is unlikely to develop further | Shows limited potential | Has significant potential | Is a star of the future | |
| | | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |

Notes

1. There can be additional criteria depending on what is considered relevant and important.
2. Weighting—unless you weight criteria they will have the same impact unless the rating/points scale changes for each of the criteria.
3. It is important that the choice of weighting/rating/points scale results in sufficient discrimination in the overall points allocated otherwise those considered as potential for redundancy will be too closely grouped together.