Summary of 'Part 2' of Noëlle Rawé's Performance 'Appraisal' with Peter Bassett, HR Partner for my group, and Kathy Woodhouse, European Lead HR Manager, KPMG, on 24 Oct 07, in Dorset Rise, from 10h15 to 12h00 (Version I supplied to KPMG with my 17.01.08 Grievance)

Page 1 of 5

(**NB**: In the light of events by then (see my <u>17.01.08 Grievance to KPMG</u>) I had secretly recorded the meeting. This is <u>the transcript</u> – I did NOT give to KPMG)

K explains her role; she is independent; conclusions I and they reach might be different and will have to agree on disagreeing. Says Ceri covered my goals (during 9 Oct meet); hence purpose is to complete remaining parts

N: what are main points from Ceri? (Peter looks taken aback)

P: her view is that my work is of "reasonable quality".

N: I stop him saying that's not what she said, her words more complimentary: quality of my work cannot be faulted, high level of attention to detail and accuracy + about my work on media used by competitors: "superb quality and done very quickly".

P: Ceri concern I did not achieve a number of my goals

N: she flagged-up services and industries (I then explain – as per my notes of 9 October meet); say that, as project lead, her role should be to keep me informed; when I manage projects one thing I ensure is to keep people informed, I send them updates, etc.

I add, as I have role to play, ideal would have been for me to attend meetings, failing that to be told of outcome. I say "how many times am I meant to ask Ceri for the outcome of the meetings?" I repeat my view that I was being excluded, cut-off and that there were blocks to my being able to move on to next stage of performing my objectives (Roadmaps not finished until July, new Intranet platform, new leaders)

At some point Kathy stops me; we end-up agreeing that my view in relation to my ability to take these two goals further are different from Ceri. At some point, in reply to Kathy's question I say that Ceri's reply to my highlighting lack of feedback from her was that she is "very busy"

(I can see that K is going down Ceri's line: that I "should demonstrate more initiative")

## Skills and behaviours section

N: wrote in my form that a lot of the work I did was solo, hence difficult to get feedback

P: in terms of relationships with the service lines and industries (He is obviously intent on making the 'relationship' label stick, that I was 'not proactive')

N: I repeat what I wrote on form: very comprehensive review of c. 130 sites was 1<sup>st</sup> step; next step was to discuss with service lines and industries and agree how I could best assist them. Tried with FRM, IRM, Global Conversion, Economic capital and went down a long way.

P: asks if I got feedback from them

N: cos took place towards end last yr

P: how did I make an impact?

N: Feedback from Denise Black shows strong performance on my 3 key areas

P: that's knowledge of services. How have I made an impact in terms of relationship (= He is back to his objective of wanting to stick against me 'not being proactive')

N: I read the (excellent) feedback from Denise. In her last sentence she wrote: "In terms of making an impact, well I would definitely get in touch with Noelle again in terms of a similar situation".

P: That's just one person (= he is really intent on getting something to stick against me)

N: I yet again repeat that much of my work has been solo. I quote the KM event, for which I got v. good feedback from Ceri – and Finbarr Geanev

P asks about feedback from Ceri's team

N: Ha, we are coming to Finbarr Geaney's feedback, are we? (I can't help control an ironic tone) I read what Finbarr wrote and remark on what he said in context of my impact on others. When I read the last paragraph I say that there is a noticeable change in style of writing and tone.

('He' wrote: "...we have worked together as part of the same team and I would feedback a little on my interaction with you at this level – and specifically on your impact within the team. You have a well known personal legal difficulty with your house. This problem does get you down a lot and it sometimes impacts

Summary of 'Part 2' of Noëlle Rawé's Performance 'Appraisal' with Peter Bassett, HR Partner for my group, and Kathy Woodhouse, European Lead HR Manager, KPMG, on 24 Oct 07, in Dorset Rise, from 10h15 to 12h00 (Version I supplied to KPMG with my 17.01.08 Grievance)

Page 2 of 5

negatively upon your mood in the office and thus your impact with colleagues. I think that you need to find some way of bringing closure to this house issue, or to better manage the impact which it has on your mood whilst at work. For it to continue into the future is not positive for you on a personal or on a professional level. It is a particular shame as you are genuinely well liked and respected as someone with a very kind and generous heart by all in the team")

P 'comes to Finbarr's rescue' saying that he could have saved himself writing this

N: I read Finbarr's comment about "my house situation" and say, pardon? What does he know about my situation?

K: he says that it's well known, so you must talking about it

N: No, I don't. It's people who talk about it behind my back

K: do I see his feedback as fair?

N: that's his point of view. I read my reply to Finbarr – in which I make it clear that what has been taking place at work has been impacting on me

(I wrote: "Thank you very much for your feedback Finbarr. Much appreciated. I am very pleased to see that I am liked and valued by the team, and will take the opportunity to say that the feeling is reciprocated. You have noted that my mood has been down at times due to, as you put it, 'my house problem'. I am sorry that I have not been able to 'keep up a front' as well as I have done in the past. (In addition to very distressing events taking place outside of work), over recent months 'the problem' has also invaded my work life. Aware of my mood, I have since redoubled my efforts at covering up my emotions, and I hope that this has been equally noticed").

(Note: As they all recognise that before I was able to keep my 'personal problem' out of the office (and I have gone through sheer utter hell since 2002): what has changed this year? The actions they took against me. But they don't want to admit that. Instead, they try to pin the cause for my mood to my personal problem.

P and K: comment that on fact I only have handful of people who provided me with feedback.

N: Yet again I explain why. I have been in contact with hundreds of people during the year, but all apart from those contacted were limited contacts. I mention 2 other colleagues: one who did not reply to my email (and, tellingly, has never since contacted me); the other was off on long sickness leave

K asks if I got feedback for my mid-year appraisal

N: no

P: Ceri feels I should not have been working so much in isolation, that I should have had more contacts with the team (NB !!!)

N: I was reviewing 130 sites. How can I work with other people doing this? Once I had finished reviewing site for Forensic and CF I approached the Knowledge managers for their input.

P: you did not get feedback from them (i.e. performance assessment)

N: no (Note: I did not think it warranted that. We had discussed my assessment face-to-face – which led me to make some amendments to my findings, and them to their site)

P: your business understanding is clearly v. strong, both FAS and RAS side; v. important and valuable. But on more personal side, re.making an impact, building and managing relationships, not as strong (He keeps trying to make that one stick)

N: I guote from Denise feedback; say that it is nature of work this year that has isolated me

K joins in, backing up Peter, trying to make it stick.

N: I yet again repeat what I said in relation to services and industries; I was being isolated, cut out, not getting feedback on meetings

K asks whether I raised it, saying that it is linked to being proactive (Here we go again!)

N: reiterate that I asked Ceri for feedback on my work. I again say what I do when I manage projects

K insists on getting some admission from me by asking me what I could have done better in terms of impact on others, building relationships, being more pro-active

N: I have explained. I have done to best of my ability, so you tell me what else I could have done in situation

Summary of 'Part 2' of Noëlle Rawé's Performance 'Appraisal' with Peter Bassett, HR Partner for my group, and Kathy Woodhouse, European Lead HR Manager, KPMG, on 24 Oct 07, in Dorset Rise, from 10h15 to 12h00 (Version I supplied to KPMG with my 17.01.08 Grievance)

Page 3 of 5

K: insists on getting reply from me

N: by insisting on getting feedback, asking for it every day

(They don't like my answer. No lever for them)

K: says might be something to do with my tenacity, pro-activity, determination

N: I laugh saying that she would have a very hard time proving I lack determination and tenacity. I give as proof of my ability to establish strong relationship that yesterday, a colleague contacted me from Germany writing as though we had been in regular since the time I was in Germany. I also mention another German colleague who, c. 2yrs ago wanted me to come to Germany to manage a project because she had been very impressed by the way I had managed a project of which she was a member. I say: that's not the kind of contact and feedback you can associate with somebody who stays in their shell. That's the impression I am making on colleagues

P: that's the impression making 3 years ago. Know you have lot of experience. Concern is what has taken place this year. Says his understanding is that I view I have not been provided with opportunities to demonstrate these skills this year because of nature of activities

N: agree. And when provided with the opportunity, I demonstrate strong performance on making an impact, on developing relationship, on business understanding – as evidenced by Denise feedback

P: but that's only one (Note – my view: and that's 'one' they were not expecting)

K: brings back feedback from Finbarr, saying she is concerned about 'relationships' i.e. my impact on others (They sure are trying to get something to stick)

N: He assumes due to my flat. How does he know?

P: brushes my comment aside (doesn't like it) saying Finbarr noticed the outcome

N: and colleagues saw me in tears at my desk throughout April; had nothing to do with my personal problem; cause was messages I was getting when trying to access Intranet sites - from which I had been cut-off - that made me feel as though I was the criminal. Did colleagues see me in tears? Oh yes they did. Was it due to my 'house problem'? No, it was this – added to my personal problem, that's what affected me

K says not a best year for me

N: No, to survive the hell I have been made to go through this year = triple ticks for me. A lot of people in my place would have gone under

## Personal development

N: I explain e-learning courses I have gone through.

P: asks about the 'soft skills' side, personal development

N: give me examples

P: negotiating skills, relationship building, making an impact on others (Here we go again! Sure trying to make that stick) At some point says in relation to my feeling isolated, cut off: training courses good for interacting with people (Unbelievable! They isolate me and imply that the outcome is my fault, something I need to address through training)

N: I emphasise I don't have a problem establishing contact with people, and have shown that in my 10 yrs at KPMG. Issue is my not working on tasks that provide opportunity for contact

P asks if I am in the wrong role, maybe would be best if I was handling project from beginning to end

N: service lines and industries are exactly that type of work; next step now is to discuss implementation with them

P: but issue is you feel isolated (Again, throwing that back on me!)

N: what needs to be clarified is my role going forward, as I wrote on form, as these are part of my objectives. At some point say that it's not Ceri's way of working, people needing to ask her what happened

(Getting distinct feeling that P is trying to stir me away from the implementation stage re services and industries – which is supported by my being excluded from meetings that have taken place + not being copied on anything by Ceri)

Summary of 'Part 2' of Noëlle Rawé's Performance 'Appraisal' with Peter Bassett, HR Partner for my group, and Kathy Woodhouse, European Lead HR Manager, KPMG, on 24 Oct 07, in Dorset Rise, from 10h15 to 12h00 (Version I supplied to KPMG with my 17.01.08 Grievance)

Page 4 of 5

P: asks if reason I did not raise with Ceri my perception of being excluded is because I did not want to hear answer

N: one thing I am not is afraid of people being open and direct with me + these are part of my objectives

K re my feeling of being excluded, asks for my explanation, reasons behind it; says she is confused as I said not Ceri's way of working

N: I don't know, you tell me. Why also has Ceri handled my performance appraisal in this manner. That's not her way. No, I am not going to second guess reasons for what has taken place

K insists, trying to drag something out of me, says I am highly intelligent. I refuse to reply. She continues to insist

N: what has taken place is totally un-KPMG way; don't know why; it's not I who took decision to do that way. Hence, I am wrong person to ask for an explanation

(I don't think she likes my answer)

## Career development

P asks plans had in place to fulfil objective to become senior manager

N: wrote on form that sadly, objective is not going to be realised. What has taken place over last few months = no hope of achieving this ambition. I am being treated differently from others e.g. no Internet access

P says that again it's my interpretation, no reason why I should not keep as objective, what steps should take

N identified with Ceri the 3 skills and behaviours of focus for promotion: (1) business focus; (2) building relationships; (3) making an impact. At some point I say that, from April there was a switch in the way I have treated. I talk again about April, the messages I was getting back from the Intranet that made me feel like a criminal, the injustice of it as I am not the criminal, I am not the one who stole money from people, I am not the one who lied to a court, I was not the court who made people pay money they did not owe. I have done nothing wrong.

K asks if I have been in contact with Well Being

N yes, but people have been in contact with don't have understanding; Harley St person was just a therapist. What I have gone through in last 5 years is unbelievable, most people cant comprehend. I say I have somebody I can talk to. K says something to which I reply that I have lost faith in having a future here because of what has been happening, being isolated. What has taken place has shook me up completely.

P asks what would take to gain back trust, how going to be moving, what will it take?

N I don't feel I am wanted here anymore

P: says no; over last 9 months tried to help, inc. Ceri. (Note: Call that help?) Says maybe opportunity for me as result of merger (Note: KPMG UK + France +Germany) to move away from environment where there are preconceived ideas (NB!!!) pick-up on relationships I made in Germany. (= further confirmation want me out)

N: what about other issues? What has taken place with Ceri is not the Ceri I know. I add that I can feel and sense what takes place around me (i.e. aim to communicate that I am not stupid, can see what's going on)

K says maybe cos I was sad, Ceri thought best to protect me (NB!!!). Need to provide me with support. Again mentions relationships i.e. puts the blame on me. Suggests I should have a coach, to help me with promotion objective. Also to look for opp for short secondment (Alarm bell: (1) other confirmation want me to move on; (2) AND if 'I' don't find something? Is the plan to take that as reason to make me redundant? That would look 'more acceptable')

P: Need to develop have plan for going forward.

## Performance rating

N I rated myself as strong performance.

K: says that I have missed performance on some goals (she sure keeps trying).

N: because could not be performed due to circumstances

K: Has not been a good year for me. On relationship side... she asks Peter for input

P: not a good year (Yeah! Thanks to all his actions!) Strong performance results, but skills & behaviours "needs development" – rating of ND8 - Means still entitled to salary review and bonus.

Summary of 'Part 2' of Noëlle Rawé's Performance 'Appraisal' with Peter Bassett, HR Partner for my group, and Kathy Woodhouse, European Lead HR Manager, KPMG, on 24 Oct 07, in Dorset Rise, from 10h15 to 12h00 (Version I supplied to KPMG with my 17.01.08 Grievance)

Page 5 of 5

N: I raise again Denise feedback. (Thank God I got her feedback!)

K: says only one person

N: I keep repeating the impact of circumstances on my ability to demonstrate skills and behaviours

P: says agree difference of views

Outcome: they penalise me for the actions they took against me this year. Note that neither of them said anything about that, other than: "it has not been a good year for me"

They left out the overall conclusions in which I detail the events that took place since February, saying I had achieved the objectives under very distressing circumstances for half the year.