

Policy

Title: PERSONAL PERFORMANCE & DEVELOPMENT REVIEW (PPDR)

Ref: HR/PDU/Version 2.1

Last updated: 1 March 2011

THIS POLICY IS THE LATEST VERSION & SUPERSEDES ANY OTHER POLICY THAT YOU MAY HAVE IN YOUR TERMS & CONDITIONS BOOKLET

Purpose

The purpose of this Review is to:

- Review the expected level of performance against the Career Pathway Skills and Capability Standards and specifics of the job description
- Review health and safety performance in line with the University Health & Safety policy
- Agree priorities in line with the expectations of the role and the needs of the Academic Unit or Professional Service
- Agree development to meet objectives and expectations of the role
- Recognise and record areas of good performance
- Inform processes for reward through changes in base pay
- Inform the capability process in areas of poor performance

Interfaces

The Review will be directly informed by:

- Priorities set for the period under review
- Academic Unit or Professional Services Strategic Aims
- Career Pathway Skills and Capability Standards
- The job description of the individual
- Individual and Manager expectations

Equality of Opportunity

It is expected that the review will be carried out within a framework of equality and diversity as outlined by the University's Equal Opportunities Policy which includes the Race Equality Policy. All reviews need to be carried out in a fair and equitable way with due consideration paid to an individual in relation to the process and outcomes of appraisal.

Frequency and Timing

Reviews will be carried out annually for all staff.

The Head of Academic Unit, Head of Professional Service or manager may wish for the review meeting to take place at much shorter intervals, particularly where performance is under question and as part of the Capability Procedure. The same may apply in supporting staff that are on the cusp of promotion. The interval between these reviews will be at the reviewer's discretion.

The University has a commitment to colleagues with disabilities under the "Two Ticks Scheme". This places a requirement on the University to ensure there is a mechanism in place to discuss, at any time, but at least once a year, with disabled employees what can be done to make sure they can develop and use their abilities.

The PPDR meeting may be an appropriate opportunity to do this.

The Reviewer

Staff within the ERE Career Pathway will be reviewed by their Head of Academic Unit or a nominated senior colleague who has a direct relationship with the work of the individual. Other staff will be reviewed by their line manager.

To ensure the effectiveness of the process, Heads of Academic Units and Professional Services should ensure that each reviewer, including themselves, is responsible for no more than 10 reviews.

In some cases, it may be appropriate for more than one reviewer to be present. This will be in the case where an individual may be working for more than one person. This will also apply to clinical staff to meet the requirements of a joint appraisal.

On completion of the review meeting, the reviewer will be responsible for establishing a process to monitor agreed expectations and outcomes.

The Individual

The individual will expect to have a review meeting within the agreed time-scales.

The individual will take part in the regular monitoring process established to follow the review meeting.

If, with good reason, the individual wishes to have an alternative reviewer he/she will be able to discuss alternative arrangements with the Head of Academic Unit or Professional services.

The individual will receive a copy of the completed documentation within four weeks of the review date.

Personal Performance and Development Information

Confidentiality is an important aspect of the review meeting as it can be with any meeting between manager and colleague.

What is said between parties at the review meeting remains confidential. However the information recorded on the forms, particularly the Outcomes, will inform other Human Resources processes. The information will be valid for a three year retrospective period when reviews take place annually and for six years when they take place every two years.

The Outcome information comprises performance and development.

Performance information may inform recommendations made by the Head of Academic Unit, Head of Professional Services. This can be done on an individual basis to ensure prompt recognition and reward for good performance.

Performance information may inform issues of capability under the separate Capability Procedures.

In both the above cases the reviewer will be responsible for ensuring the Head of Academic Unit or Professional Service is aware of the situation.

Development information is crucial to ensuring staff have the capability and skills to carry out their expected role and responsibilities. This will be informed by the agreed priorities which may require new skills, personal development, strategic needs of the Academic Unit or Professional Service, change management etc.

Appeals

There may be an occasion when the individual being reviewed cannot agree with the outcomes of the meeting.

In such circumstances, the individual can ask the Head of Academic Unit/Director of Professional Service to act as "arbiter" to resolve the difference. (The Dean/Registrar and Chief Operating Officer would be approached if the Head of Academic Unit or Professional Service were the reviewer)

The role of the "arbiter" is to ensure the outcomes of the meeting are reasonable and in line with the expectations and standards of the Academic Unit or Professional Service.

After consideration and consultation with both parties, the "arbiter" would append their comments to the review record.

If the individual was still dissatisfied with the outcome, the University's grievance procedures may be invoked if it is felt that the process or procedure has not been followed correctly.

Monitoring and Responsibility

Heads of Academic Units and Professional Services will be responsible for the effective and timely implementation of Performance and Development Review.

The following model may be a useful process to follow:

- Head of Academic Unit or Professional Service meets with reviewers to clarify process, establish levels of responsibility, standards expected, who is reviewing whom, etc.
- Reviewers have preliminary meeting with groups or individuals if appropriate to clarify process.
- Performance and Development Reviews take place.
- Heads of Academic Unit or Professional Service meets with reviewers to bring together themes of information affecting management decisions and development needs.

Development needs should be collated, reviewed and prioritised, and used to inform Development Planning within your Faculty/Department.