
TITLE: REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SCHEME AND APPRAISAL FORM

Committee: Regulatory & Support Services Committee

Date: 5th December 2016

Author: Nicole Pema, HR Manager

[R149]

1.0 ISSUE

1.1 To review the Performance Management Scheme and appraisal form after the policy was updated last year to incorporate Performance Related Increments.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 It is recommended that the Committee support the changes that have been made to the Performance Management Scheme and appraisal form for 2016/17 (Appendix 1).

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 The Performance Related Increment (PRI) Moderation Panel, comprising of the Chairman of the Regulatory and Support Services Committee, the Director (Resources) and the HR Manager, met on the 2nd August to consider the provisional ratings awarded under the new appraisal process and to determine final ratings where the provisional ratings differed.

3.2 During the Moderation Panel, it became apparent that the quality of completed appraisal forms varied in some cases across different service areas and the Moderation Panel found it difficult to support ratings of "Excellent" or "Outstanding" where the individual's strengths and achievements had not been sufficiently evidenced.

3.3 The Panel felt that the process had highlighted a number of problems with the new scheme and the design of the appraisal form.

3.4 The HR Manager carried out a short survey to better understand how managers felt about the new scheme and if they thought that any changes needed to be made.

4.0 ARGUMENTS/CONCLUSIONS

4.1 The Scheme has been updated to emphasise the responsibility of both the line manager (as the Appraiser) and the employee (as the Appraisee) for getting the appraisal meeting arranged before the 31st March deadline. If an employee is unsatisfied that their appraisal meeting has not been arranged, then they should escalate the matter to a senior manager who will ensure that the employee's line manager gets the appraisal meeting arranged at the earliest opportunity.

- 4.2 Feedback from managers strongly suggested that, when assessing performance, the rating 'Satisfactory' was not effective. The word suggests that you are adequate and reasonable which are not pleasing words for people to hear about their own performance. It gives the impression you are 'good but not good enough' and can be de-motivating. This comment was raised by a number of staff, including members of Management Team. It has been proposed that the rating 'Satisfactory' is changed to 'Good'.
- 4.3 It has been included in the revised Scheme, that if an Appraisee fails to submit their appraisal paperwork to the Appraiser in sufficient time for appraisal meeting, then he/she cannot be considered for 'Excellent' or 'Outstanding', the maximum rating that they can be awarded is 'Good'. Equally, if an Appraiser misses submitting the paperwork by the 31st March deadline, then the Appraiser can only be awarded a maximum rating of 'Good' by the Appraiser's manager.
- 4.4 From the survey, a number of comments were received about the appraisal form. In order to address these issues, a number of changes have been proposed:
- a) It was indicated that Sections A and B of the form were too repetitive, as such some changes have been made to the layout and terminology.
 - b) It was suggested that the form made reference to the old 'accountabilities' in certain areas which caused confusion, to address this the form now only refers to 'performance indicators' and 'SMART targets'.
 - c) It was suggested that the layout of Sections A and B was confusing because Section A shows Appraisee's comments from left to right and in Section B they are above and below for each question, this has now been changed so that they both follow the same format.
 - d) Section C of the appraisal form has been moved to a separate page to emphasise the importance in completing this section in order to produce the Appraisee's SMART targets for the next 12 months, these should be produced in line with the requirements of the Service Delivery Plan.
 - e) Section F has been improved to ensure that the decision of the Appraiser's Manager is clearly shown and that comments to support their decision is clearly documented.
- 4.5 Comments were received that manager's who completed the original appraisal had not always been consulted/informed in circumstances where the senior manager had reviewed the appraisal paperwork and changed the rating. The Scheme has therefore been changed to highlight the responsibility of senior managers to notify the manager who carried out the appraisal if they have changed a provisionally agreed rating.
- 4.6 Comments were also received to suggest that the appraisal form is too long and does not work effectively for manual posts, e.g. Grounds Maintenance Operatives and Cleaners. For fairness, Management Team have agreed that

manual staff should still have equal access to the scheme, however, they have tasked the HR Manager in producing a one-page summarised version of the appraisal form ahead of the appraisal meetings commencing next year.

5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 There are no costs associated with this report.

5.2 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was done when the policy was first introduced.

6.0 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Revised appraisal form for 2016/17

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer</u>
A Guide to the Council's Performance Management (Appraisal) Scheme	Room 118, The Grange, Ely	Nicole Pema HR Manager (01353) 616325 E-mail: nicole.pema@eastcambs.gov.uk
Performance Related Increments (PRI) Policy		
Appraisal forms for 2015/16		
Results of Survey (Oct16)		