

Consistency Standards Checklist — Meridian Group

Maintained by: Employee Relations Specialist, People Operations Last updated: Current checklist version Classification: Internal Applies to: Cross-artifact governance reviews

Purpose

This checklist defines the consistency standards applied when reviewing multiple HR artifacts together. Use it alongside the Bias Review Criteria to assess whether language, standards, criteria, and justification patterns are applied uniformly across performance, promotion, compensation, and policy artifacts.

A. Terminology Consistency

- The same role title is used for the same individual across all artifacts (no switching between job title variants)
 - Department names match across all artifacts referencing the same organisational unit
 - Performance rating labels use the same scale in every artifact that references ratings (e.g., do not mix "Strong/Meets/Below" with "Exceeds/Meets/Needs Improvement" across documents)
 - Grade and level references use the current Meridian banding structure (Level 1–5); legacy grade labels (e.g., Mercer M1–M5) must not appear in current-cycle artifacts unless explicitly marked as historical
-

B. Criteria Application Consistency

- The same evaluation criterion is weighted consistently across all candidates or employees assessed in the same cycle (e.g., Knowledge Sharing cannot be treated as a blocking gap for one candidate and a non-blocking development item for another at the same level)
 - Promotion readiness thresholds are applied identically: the number of "Strong" criteria required for a Promote recommendation must be the same for all candidates at the same target level
 - Compensation adjustment thresholds (e.g., the 8% standard cap, the 0.90 compa-ratio trigger) are referenced consistently across all employee reviews in the same cycle
 - Policy enforcement standards use "must" language for mandatory requirements and "should" language for recommended practices — mixed usage of "must" and "should" for the same requirement across artifacts is a consistency failure
-

C. Evidence and Traceability

- Every evaluative claim in a performance narrative cites a specific evidence log entry, client feedback score, or dated event
 - Every promotion panel rationale references the specific criteria framework and evidence summary rather than restating subjective impressions
 - Every compensation adjustment rationale cites the benchmark source, compa-ratio, and applicable policy section
 - Policy revision rationale cites the specific case, compliance reference, or stakeholder request that triggered the change
-

D. Cross-Artifact Alignment

- Performance ratings referenced in promotion panel documentation match the ratings recorded in the performance review artifacts
- Performance ratings referenced in compensation rationale match the ratings recorded in the performance review artifacts
- Promotion outcomes that inform compensation decisions are reflected accurately (e.g., a deferred promotion should not trigger a promotion-linked adjustment)
- Policy changes that affect performance management, compensation, or promotion processes are reflected in the criteria and language used in the corresponding operational artifacts

Note: This section does not currently include a check for alignment between policy language and the bias review criteria categories. The Employee Relations Specialist has flagged this gap for inclusion in the next revision.

E. Decision Rationale Consistency

- Where the same decision type is made for multiple individuals (e.g., deferral of promotion), the rationale uses comparable specificity and evidence depth for each
 - Where a panel or reviewer deviates from a draft recommendation, the deviation rationale is documented to the same standard regardless of the direction of the change (upgrade or downgrade)
 - Deferral rationale includes specific, measurable re-evaluation criteria rather than open-ended development language
-

F. Data Quality Flags

- Compensation figures are sourced from the HRIS extract; any discrepancy between HRIS data and manager-submitted figures is explicitly noted
- Where benchmark data is older than 12 months, this limitation is acknowledged in the artifact
- Missing data (e.g., incomplete 360-degree feedback, unrecorded variable compensation) is flagged rather than silently excluded from the analysis