



UNIVERSITY
of York

Developing a performance culture: Consultation

Why change the current PDR arrangements?

Two PDR cycles later.....

- New HR Director – opportunity to review approach/build on wider experience
- Feedback from UEB members, HoDs, HR, Ops managers, trade unions
- Pros: well established; valued by many
- Cons: some resistance; concerns about confidentiality; too narrow view of performance; unclear whether purpose is to manage under performance; not making the most of PDRs as a potentially motivational approach; confusion about how to handle concerns about performance



What's been done so far?

- Discussions with the HR project team who worked on the PDR project previously
- Individual discussions with as many HoDs as possible (via 1:1 meetings, telephone calls etc.)
- Informal discussions with trade union representatives
- Discussions with the Deans, Operations Managers and some department managers
- Attendance at Faculty FASGs and FEGs
- Presentation of ideas at the HoDs forum
- Consideration of approach taken by other organisations
- Discussion at University Executive Board



PROPOSAL – at a glance

- Retain the annual PDR approach – but encourage ongoing dialogue, and targeted discussions where needed between PDRs
- Confirm that PDRs should be supportive; dialogue is very important; PDRs shouldn't be driven by 'metrics' and 'form-filling'
- Clarify that the annual PDR is not how to deal with concerns about performance (use other methods)
- Remove “Moderation” after the meetings – instead encourage discussions *before* the PDR cycle starts (e.g. shared objectives within a department; agreement of what performance looks like for the different possible ratings etc.)
- Quality assurance after the PDR cycle ends – anonymous; review of overall picture after completion of the cycle; equality impact analysis



PROPOSAL – in detail

- Broader more holistic perspective of ‘performance’ rather than just performance against objectives as previously done
- Strong emphasis on the importance of the *discussion* in the PDR meeting. For example:
 - what has gone well (including suggestions of ‘agenda items’ to cover)
 - what could have gone better
 - review of progress against objectives
 - performance against expectations for the role
- Retain performance ratings (now proposing a 5 point scale) - but now allows for recognition of much wider performance rather than just progress against objectives



PROPOSAL – in detail

- Review of performance to include a discussion of *how* someone works, not just what has been achieved:
- Currently no institution-wide set of values and behaviours, but still valid to consider how a reviewee has worked, e.g.:
 - Setting personal high standards of performance
 - Working with integrity, openness and honesty
 - Promotes an inclusive approach
 - Working well with colleagues within and outside the department
 - Striving to enhance student and staff experiences
- Link with Staff Engagement Survey action plan (4 areas: Performance; Career Conversations; Health, Wellbeing and Resilience; Employee Voice and Communication)



PROPOSAL – in detail

- Encourage the reviewee and reviewer to actively seek feedback from others
- Encourage setting stretching objectives – it is ok to ‘not meet’ if there are reasons for this (e.g. changing focus; strong performance on other areas)
- Encourage a supportive approach: discuss what is required, and agree what support may be needed
- ‘Confidentiality addressed:
 - “Grandparent” approach (Reviewer’s line manager and/or Head of Department?), ensures fairness and consistency of approach, objectives etc.
 - Anonymity of PDR/data beyond this relationship apart from specific contact within HR for data analysis



PROPOSAL – performance ratings

- Retain the principle of self review/self assessment before the review meeting
- Retain performance ratings – but now an assessment of the much broader perspective on ‘performance’
- Gives the reviewer and reviewee flexibility to focus on what’s important and how priorities can and do change during the year
- Ratings give an overall more consistent language and approach
- Now **anonymised** analysis of performance data:
 - equality impact assessment
 - department/faculty/institution perspective



PROPOSAL – PDRs and pay

- PDR performance ratings are not linked with pay for the majority of staff
- For a very small number of staff, pay is already linked with performance via the PDR process:
 - Head of Department
 - Senior management pay group

i.e. we are not proposing to introduce performance-related pay to anyone who is not already within such a scheme



PROPOSAL – PDRs and promotion

- PDR performance ratings are not linked formally with academic promotion/progression
- For example, there will not be a requirement to clear a ‘bar’ of (say) X years of good performance reviews before promotion can be applied for
- However, we do propose that Head of Department reports for promotion applications make reference to PDR outcomes
- Similarly, applications for ‘Rewarding Excellence’ contribution points and Making a Difference awards may reference PDR outcomes



PROPOSAL – training and guidance

- Training will offered but not be ‘mandatory’ (although strongly recommended for reviewers if they have not done the training already)
- Existing training and guidance will be updated to reflect the changes
- ‘Drop in’ sessions for reviewers or reviewees to come and discuss either confidentially or in a group session



Consultation

- Trade Union representatives
- Staff
 - Open sessions
 - Email feedback
- Faculty Executive Groups
- Faculty Administration Support Groups
- University Executive Board



Next steps - questions!

- Review the suggested revisions to the PDR forms – suggest look at the ones relevant for your role:
 - ART staff
 - Professional support staff with objectives longer than 3 months
 - Professional support staff with objectives less than 3 months
 - Head of Department
- What do you like / not like?
- Anything else needed?
- Any other questions?



Next steps - questions!

- How to feed back comments:
- Comments at this session
- Email by 11th May 2018 to:

performance-review@york.ac.uk