

**Performance & Development Review**

**Guidance for Reviewers**

This guide aims to support reviewers in preparing for the review discussion.

The [Hallam Deal](https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/hallamdeal/?doing_wp_cron=1521037581.4430229663848876953125) sets out the University's commitment to staff and what the University expects in return. The Performance & Development Review (PDR) supports that two way commitment, through recognising individual's achievements and setting out clear and focused objectives.

The purpose of the Performance & Development Review (PDR) is to align an individual's personal performance and development with that of [Transforming Lives](https://portal.shu.ac.uk/departments/bis/pt/PIP/PIPW1/Portfolio%20Stakeholder%20Engagement%20%20Comms/Strategy%20-%20final.pdf). The [Performance & Development Review Toolkit](https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/shupdreviewtoolkit/?doing_wp_cron=1522832680.6540420055389404296875) provides you with information and helpful resources when preparing for your review discussions.

In support of Transforming Lives, the PDR enables you to have meaningful conversations throughout the year about an individual's achievements, developments and is complemented by regular one-to-one discussions.

Additionally, the annual review conversation considers the future, identifying priorities and setting out SMART[[1]](#footnote-1) (**S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**elevant, **T**ime-bound) objectives, including development needs for the year ahead.

If you require any further assistance accessing these documents or have specific requirements (e.g. large print format) please contact the People Development Team on ext. 3948.

1. **Key Stages - Ensuring a Successful Outcome**

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Process & Timescales** |
| * As a line manager you will normally be responsible for conducting the review with all your direct reports. Should any different arrangement be in place this will be communicated with you via your line manager. * The review meeting will take place between May and September and the final agreed Performance & Development Review signed off by 30th September. * The reviewer and reviewee need to agree a date and appropriate venue for the review meeting, allowing each party enough time to prepare appropriately. You will need to set aside at least one and a half hours for the meeting. * The review form will then be used in KIT meetings, mid-year review and during the next review to evaluate the year's activities. * The review form and supporting documentation replaces any previous appraisal information. * A mid-year review meeting to monitor progress and make adjustments to reflect any changes and /or new developments is recommended to be scheduled with the reviewee, approximately six months after the annual review meeting. |
| * 1. **Preparation - Before** the review meeting |
| * Preparing for the review will help to enhance its effectiveness by allowing you and the individual to have a meaningful conversation. You will have already discussed a lot of the detail throughout the year and during their mid-year review. * You should not use the review discussion as an opportunity to raise concerns about performance for the first time. If you have been actively managing performance concerns prior to the review, then this should be discussed and noted in the review documentation. * Remind yourself of the [purpose](https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/shupdreviewtoolkit/practical-support-for-embedding-the-process/) of the meeting prior to attending so that you get the most out of it. * In advance of the review meeting the reviewee should complete: * **Academic staff**: sections 1, 2, 3 and 6 of the review form. * **Professional services staff**: This is a transitional year from the old appraisal process so in advance of the review meeting the reviewee should do the look back (summary of overall performance and achievements against objectives) on the current paperwork 17/18. Additionally, the reviewee should be ready to attend the meeting with initial thoughts associated with section 1 of this new PDR form.   They should send this draft of the form to you as their identified reviewer at least 7 working days before the date of the meeting to help you to prepare effectively. Additionally, you should be ready to attend the meeting with your initial thoughts associated with:   * **Academic staff**: sections 4 and 5 * **Professional services staff**: section 1   Ensure you have a copy of the individual's previous year's review document to help inform the conversation.   * It is also important to consider there may be other colleagues that the individual engages with or who manage elements of their role and it may be appropriate for you to seek their feedback/contribution to the discussion, to inform the review meeting. Reviewees are asked to do this as part of their preparation for the discussion. |
| * 1. **The Discussion - During** the review meeting |
| * The meeting should provide a constructive, two-way, open discussion and is an opportunity for you to provide feedback to the reviewee on their previous year’s contribution[[2]](#footnote-2). * Use the review form to provide structure to the conversation. * Approach the meeting in a way that is open-minded, encouraging and positive, by asking open-ended questions in order to allow the reviewee to express themselves fully; recognise achievements and seek to address concerns or problems in a constructive way. For both the reviewer and reviewee the meeting should be a positive and rewarding experience. It is an opportunity for you to celebrate the successes of the individual. * The university is committed to equality, diversity and inclusion. Everyone must be given the opportunity to demonstrate their abilities and develop their potential. It is important that you consider this in terms of how you conduct the review. Take account of how people will articulate themselves in different ways through both their communication and approach to different situations. * The meeting should take place in a confidential and private space, free from interruptions. * Set a tone of joint responsibility by remembering that the review meeting is owned by the **reviewee**, therefore the reviewee should do most of the talking, not the reviewer. * Raise any problem areas constructively and discuss ideas and options jointly with the reviewee to generate solutions. * Ensure you put enough time aside to discuss not just performance and objectives but the reviewee's career and development needs and aspirations[[3]](#footnote-3). * When setting future objectives with the reviewee, it is important that you and they are fully briefed on faculty/directorate objectives and how these fit into the wider University strategy and support the four strategic pillars. * In developing objectives with the reviewee you should also consider their role in terms of supporting equality, diversity and inclusion and set an objective(s) to support this. Further guidance is available in the embedding equality objectives guidance document in the toolkit. * The reviewee should be able to see how their contribution links to the wider work of the faculty/directorate and the University so that you can assess their individual contribution. * Close the meeting by clarifying and gaining agreement on expectations and discussing next steps. * ***Academic staff only:*** For the purposes of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) we need to be clear who is research active. To support us in identifying which staff are potentially eligible for submission, individuals should have a clear objective(s) agreed through the PDR process.  An example objective is as follows:   *"Producing internationally recognised (REF 2\*), internationally excellent (REF 3\*) or world leading (REF 4\*) research output. Outputs are internally quality rated by Unit of Assessment reading groups, whose processes are externally calibrated".*  REF-eligibility will also be determined by other criteria, such as time/resource allocation to undertake research and the REF definition of an ‘independent researcher’.   * ***Academic staff only:*** The PDR discussion should be acrried out in reference to the academic career framework (ACF) |
| * 1. **Next Steps - After** the review meeting |
| * Following the review meeting, it is the reviewee's responsibility to complete the review paperwork as a record of the discussion, forwarding this to the reviewer, who will also complete their reflections in the summary of overall performance. * Agree a mid-year review date with the reviewee and put this into your diary. At the mid-year review it is also a good idea to set the date for the next review. |

1. **Confidentiality**

The contents of the Performance & Development Review discussion and completed form are confidential between you and the reviewer. However;

1. Annual work objectives will be shared in the team[[4]](#footnote-4) and
2. High level overviews of career, professional & development aspirations will be shared with appropriate senior leaders

This provides benefits to both the university and individuals in enabling us to gain a shared understanding of performance as well as the longer-term career, professional and development aspirations of our staff and the development required to support[[5]](#footnote-5).

1. **Review Training**

The University provides a range of support to ensure staff can effectively engage with the review process for both the reviewer and the reviewee. Please see the [practical support to help you embed](http://blogs.shu.ac.uk/shupdreviewtoolkit/practical-support-for-embedding-the-process/) the process part of the toolkit for more information.

1. *Please see Guidance for Setting SMART Objectives in the toolkit.* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *For further guidance, see giving feedback - some practical considerations in the toolkit.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Please refer to the career and development conversation guidance in the toolkit.* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *The purpose of sharing work objectives is to enable teams to build a shared sense of direction based upon understanding of the contributions of individuals. The Director/Head of Department/Head of Research Centre or other senior directorate/faculty leadership team members, after discussion with the reviewee, are responsible for deciding which teams it makes sense to share work objectives across. Individuals may, of course, choose to share their objectives more widely if it seems appropriate.* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *Once the review form is completed, it is the responsibility of the reviewer to share annual work objectives and career, professional and development aspirations appropriately. The Director/Head of Department/Head of Research Centre or other senior directorate/faculty leadership team members will make clear how this is to be done locally.* [↑](#footnote-ref-5)