Performance Development Review Process & Guiding Principles 2022-2023

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

Performance and Development Review (PDR) is a University wide process to support staff in maximising their career and professional development through meaningful conversations, allowing contribution to be documented and reviewed and aligned to the high-performance culture which is instrumental in the achievement of the University's strategic ambitions. PDR is a joint process, with the line manager/reviewer supporting and guiding staff to define and achieve their objectives and progress towards appropriate professional and career development ambitions. Whilst PDR can inform other processes where relevant, e.g., Academic Promotion, it is widely recognised that a meaningful PDR discussion is of significant importance and value to every member of staff and their respective line manager.

2. Annual Cycle 2022-2023

Staff Group	PDR Cycle	Performance Review & Objective Setting
All Eligible Staff	July 2022 – 30 June 2023	18 July – 29 September 2023

3. The Process

3.1 Roles and Responsibilities

The Principal, VP/Heads of College and the Chief Operating Officer are responsible for ensuring compliance with the University's PDR Process & Guiding Principles. This includes setting strategic objectives aligned with University strategy, determining the standards required and identifying/agreeing associated career and personal developmental plans. Further, they are each responsible for ensuring that line managers/reviewers are fully aware and apply a consistent approach across the University.

Prior to the commencement of the PDR cycle, it will be the responsibility of the Principal, VP/Heads of College and the Chief Operating Officer, in discussion with Heads of Units and the local Heads of People & OD to produce a clear hierarchy of reviewers/reviewees. It is understood that the hierarchy may require modification as the cycle progresses and staff may leave or join.

3.2. Management, Preparation and Oversight

VP/Heads of College and the Chief Operating Officer for University Services are responsible for the integrity of the process and ensuring that a robust and consistent approach is taken. In advance of the PDR round, each VP/Head of College and the Chief Operating Officer will outline their expectations in relation to delivery of the strategic aims of their respective business units.

Reviewers should have discussions with their line-managers on determining unitary and university priorities to be reflected in individual/team objectives in advance of the annual PDR exercise.

It is essential for each reviewer to engage in discussion with their respective line manager on career development and a review of objectives if set/proposed.

Line managers are ultimately responsible for ensuring that reviews take place. Implementation will be through the agreed PDR hierarchy, which will ideally, although it may not always be possible, reflect the line management structure, at Unit level. Units should work to ensure that: there are a sufficient number of trained and competent reviewers; each reviewer should conduct a sufficient number of reviews to be able to ensure a consistent approach, whilst maintaining a manageable load. Ideally, each reviewer should conduct no more than a maximum of 12 reviews. Where not acting as reviewers, line managers are responsible for ensuring that nominated reviewers have access to relevant information to carry out the review.

3.3 Alignment of Objectives

To ensure the activity of individual staff is aligned to the needs of the University, it is vital that the University defines and communicates its plans appropriately. The University has defined its priorities in Strategy 2025: World Changers Together supported by College, School and Service strategic plans. This document is the key reference point for senior managers in determining School or Service plans and to help establish the desired outcomes required by each area to ensure delivery of these objectives.

The development and communication of these local plans is instrumental to the successful application of the PDR process; translating our high-level strategic objectives into deliverables that are relevant at an operational level and enable staff to understand their potential contribution to the overall purpose of the University. The creation of these local plans will typically include information relating to staff and the associated skills and behaviours required to ensure these plans are achievable. The Glasgow Professional Behavioural Framework serves as a useful tool in determining requirements for professional services and academic areas. It is the role of managers, reviewers and supervisors to ensure this translation from strategic aims to shorter-term tangible deliverables and milestones are effectively communicated in ensuring individual performance, career development plans and objectives are relevant, appropriate and aligned with University ambitions.

3.4 Measurement and Performance Monitoring

To support the delivery of the University Strategic Plan, the University uses Planning Dashboards which incorporate College/School/Service KPIs. This tool enables the University to monitor progress at a strategic level and identify areas of concern. These dashboards also provide a strategic focus for senior managers to cascade information on the development of School/Service plans to provide both clarity and focus.

It is anticipated that CMGs/PSG will develop supporting operational information and systems that enable proactive management of day-to-day activities as well as providing key performance indicators to monitor progress against the desired strategic outcomes.

For Colleges/Schools this may include:

- Undergraduate satisfaction (NSS)
- Assessment and feedback (NSS)
- International FTE
- PGR:Staff Ratio
- Research output quality
- Research income per staff FTE
- Entry tariff

Sound business and management information is a vital component in informing the focus of performance management discussions to enable a tangible review and assessment of performance, aligned with the delivery of objectives.

[The Glasgow Professional Behavioural Framework](#) provides a useful reference point for identifying gaps and determining development needs for staff in both professional services and academic roles.

3.5 Job Families, Role Profiles and Job Descriptions

A critical component of the University's PDR Framework is to ensure that reviews are completed with reference to the appropriate [Job Family Role Profile](#) and job description of each staff member. The former provides an outline of the expectations of the role whilst the job description articulates the duties for which the staff member is responsible. The PDR is also an ideal time to review the Job Description for accuracy. Where significant changes are identified, a separate follow-up discussion should be arranged with local P&OD to take this forward.

The job family structure provides a clear and concise indication of general expectations at each grade level and facilitates a consistent and transparent approach to:

- Job grading
- Performance management and development
- Review and evaluation
- Personal and career planning, development and progression

Role profiles and job descriptions, coupled with the cascading of University objectives, enable objectives/performance standards and development plans to be agreed at an individual and team level, and offer clarity to both line managers and role holders as to expectations relating to ownership of accountabilities and key areas of responsibility.

4. Inclusions and Exemptions

The following groups of staff are fully exempt from the PDR process:

- Those on an NHS clinical academic pay scale
- Those who are on a contract of less than 0.2FTE

The following staff are required to set objectives only:

- Staff who started on or after 1 January 2023
- Staff who increased their hours to greater than 0.2FTE after 1 January 2023

4.1 Absence

Where there has been a significant period of absence within the PDR year, i.e., long-term sick leave, maternity/adoption/shared parental leave etc., such staff may be exempt from participating in the PDR process, with exemptions to be agreed by the [local People & OD Team](#). However, if exempt, objectives and development plans will require to be refreshed and updated on the staff member's return to work to enable future engagement in the process.

4.2 Resignation

Where a staff member is due to leave the University during the annual review period there need not be a formal PDR, however, regular informal review meetings should take place between the line manager and the staff member in accordance with operational needs.

Please raise an enquiry on the People & OD Helpdesk should you have any queries regarding staff who may be exempt from the process.

5. The Review Meeting

The PDR meeting is a face-to-face, two-way discussion between a staff member and their reviewer. The review discussion will essentially focus upon a number of aspects:

- review of the past year, with reference to any relevant documentation
- feedback from others, where appropriate
- performance during the review period, in relation to duties, responsibilities, accountabilities, achievement of objectives/performance standards and display of appropriate behaviours/values
- update on progress and delivery of agreed objectives in year
- areas of excellence including contribution to team performance
- areas of performance that could be improved
- factors that influenced performance
- personal development activities undertaken in the past year
- identify career development plans for the forthcoming year, and
- objective setting/performance standards for the forthcoming year.

Objective deadlines should be set in the context of local strategic requirements and therefore may extend beyond the review period. In this case, milestones may be established within the review period.

The review process should flag individual staff and organisational needs to the reviewer, and if appropriate onwards to the line manager (where different) such as workload distribution, job satisfaction, opportunity for challenge, growth, behavioural competencies and skill enhancement.

The formal review meeting provides the ideal forum for discussion of future career development plans, long term aspirations or potential retirement, where relevant. Where a staff member indicates they are considering retirement, more detailed discussion can take place around future intentions. Further guidance can be found in the University's Retirement Guidance.

It is appropriate to provide the opportunity for all staff to discuss their future career intentions, including desire and readiness for promotion regardless of career stage.

6. The Development Plan

A key outcome of the review meeting for all staff should be a development plan aligned with the goals and objectives of the staff member and the University. It will take into account existing knowledge and skills, the role and future development needs.

The plan may include:

- areas of development
- how the development will be achieved (e.g., support; workshops; on-the-job training; coaching; mentoring) and

- how progress will be monitored.

The following might be considered when preparing the plan:

- new skill interests or requirements
- potential ways to gain new knowledge
- short-term and long-term career ambitions and plans
- scope for development within current role
- general performance against objectives
- any requirements to enhance or improve behavioural competencies
- the ways in which development could improve performance.

Although reviewees are primarily responsible for determining and progressing their own plan and its implementation, reviewers should provide encouragement, guidance and support with this process. Applied fairly and consistently the process should reflect Equality and Diversity policies, focusing on individual performance, based on merit alone, cognisant of all equality implications.

The University's Athena Swan Action Plan encourages staff to discuss a development plan with their Head of School/ /Line Manager/Reviewer or Head of Service to facilitate their future potential for promotion/career development. Women typically spend longer at the same grade before being promoted than men: this is particularly pronounced at the Grade 9/10 promotion point. In the case of staff performing strongly at Grade 9 who have been at this grade for more than seven years, reviewers are encouraged to explore with them in the context of their development objectives for the forthcoming year any actions, support or interventions that might initiate or further prepare an effective case for promotion in the future.

7. Performance Ratings

Performance ratings are required only for staff on the Early Career Development Programme (ECDP); staff employed at University of Glasgow, Singapore; or, where performance concerns have been highlighted relative to any other member of staff.

For ECDP participants, it is important that regular progress reviews and monitoring continues to take place. The University requires evidence of sustained performance and satisfactory progress towards completion of the programme within the relevant timescale/s. This evidence is gathered via the annual PDR exercise which captures objectives set at each stage of the programme and tracks progress, taking into account any outstanding activities or development required to meet the relevant promotion criteria or other identified career steps.

The full PDR process should therefore be undertaken openly and transparently. Reviewers should make an informed decision on the overall performance assessment descriptor that most appropriately describes the level of performance.

Performance outcomes will be informed by general contribution, achievement of in-year objectives and overall performance in the post.

Reference to Job Description, Job Family role profiles, academic promotion criteria, and Russell Group Benchmark data should assist in informing decision-making processes with regard to performance assessment outcomes at an individual level. Further, assessment against agreed timescales, standards, and anticipated impact will be critical in making an accurate assessment.

It is advised that those reviewing ECDP colleagues make themselves familiar with the Early Career Development Programme and the Academic Promotions process and Criteria.

The performance summary should be supported by a performance outcome based on the following indicators and descriptions. The descriptors are critical in ensuring that PDR outcomes are applied in a fair and consistent fashion.

Exceptional Contribution
Consistently exceeds expectations relative to role/grade, as evidenced by delivery against objectives to an exceptional standard. In addition, the staff member may have significantly contributed to activities outside the normal scope of their role and/or successfully overcome particular challenges.

Strong Contribution
Overall performance in the role is strong, demonstrated through strong delivery of objectives and progress against development plans. Performance has been within the normal requirements of the role with some elements above expectations.

Inconsistent Performance
Overall performance in the role is variable and some key objectives may not have been delivered to the required standard. Expectations are met in some, but not all essential areas of responsibility and further development is required.

Improved Performance Required (IPR)
Performance is significantly below expectations of the role. Insufficient progress has been made towards the achievement of objectives and standards and demonstrates areas of repeated inconsistent performance or where significant improvement and/or personal development is required.

It is anticipated that the 'Strong Contribution' outcome will be applicable to a large proportion of the eligible staff groups. At all outcome levels it is expected that the reviewer, through quality dialogue with each reviewee, will provide sound and constructive feedback relating to progress, development goals/needs and level of performance.

It is important that the reviewer discusses, recognises and documents where each reviewee has fully met the requirements for the role and level, demonstrated through the achievement of desired outcomes and objectives. This assessment should recognise areas where the reviewee has demonstrated over-achievement indicative of exceptional performance, by the fact that some objectives may have been delivered to a standard over and above those expected for the role and level and general achievements are beyond those realised for the role, as well as areas where potential improvements could be made.

7.1 Performance Concerns

An IPR outcome can normally only be applicable where a staff member has previously been involved in discussion about their level of performance. This may have involved local People & OD support and:

- a previous discussion between the line manager and a reviewee as part of the normal management feedback processes (one-to-one meetings) or a previous *inconsistent performance* assessment
- objectives having been set for the required areas of performance improvement with a jointly agreed plan to implement these plans
- the reviewee having been given a realistic opportunity to have made some impact upon the required improvement objectives.

In all cases, **visible** evidence of **documented** under-performance resulting in an Inconsistent Performance or IPR outcome must be provided, and a record uploaded onto the PDR Portal of all meetings and a copy of the agreed [Performance Improvement Plan](#) (and any updates).

The criteria outlined above should be carefully followed where the level of performance justifies an IPR outcome.

On completion of the annual exercise with performance assessment outcomes applied, each School/ Service should review the distribution of these outcomes to ensure consistency and appropriateness.

8. Resources and Training

There is a suite of resources available to both reviewees and reviewers on the [PDR Webpages](#). They include practical guidance such as video walk-throughs of the PDR system as well as guidance on creating SMART objectives and links to relevant supplementary information on University Strategy, Values etc.

Further training is available via the [Organisational Development](#) webpage. This includes an Introduction to PDR online course (reviewer and reviewee versions), Objective Setting and many other types of development to suit individuals.

9. Equality and Diversity

The Performance Development Review process will operate fairly and consistently reflecting the University's Equality and Diversity policies. It will primarily focus on reviewing individual performance in the past year, based on merit alone, taking into consideration the development needs of the reviewee for the forthcoming year, reflecting the University's strategic goals in objective setting and addressing any skills gap. Further information is available here – [Equality & Diversity](#).

10. Data Protection

All PDR forms and associated documentation will be treated in the strictest confidence by all participants in the process. Please note that completed forms are accessible to those within the line management hierarchy and to the relevant People & OD teams. PDR content may be used to inform other processes linked to Promotion, Regrading and Rewarding Contribution.

Document Control	
Policy name	Performance Development Review Process & Guiding Principles 2022-2023
Implementation date	July 2023
Last reviewed	July 2023
Next review	July 2024
Owner	Central People & OD – Performance, Pay and Reward
Drafted by	Director of Performance and Reward