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Desired Outcomes

1) Understand purpose and benefits of evaluations
2) Understand your role
3) Write and deliver honest evaluations
Agenda

• Annual Performance Discussion
  • Purpose of Evaluations: Employees, You, Lab
  • Normalization: The Process and Your Role
  • Preparation: Schedule, Inputs, Writing, Scoring
  • Delivery

• Future Performance
  • Goal Setting
  • Development Plan
Building a Performance Culture

• Commit to Excellence
• Measure what’s important
• Build individual accountability
• Communicate timely & repetitively
• Reward success and confront failure
Introductions

- Name / directorate or department
- Number of employees
- Will you provide input for others (e.g., are you a matrixed manager)
- Name an opportunity or challenge preparing or delivering evaluation
Cost of Not Writing and Delivering an Honest Review

Is your Written and Verbal Message Accurate?

What is the cost of telling employee who is fails to deliver results “meets most expectations”?

What is the impact of telling an employee who is abrasive “meets most expectations”?

Is it more accurate to tell employee “needs improvement”?

Cost to employee?
Cost to you?
Cost to the team?
Cost to SLAC?
Purposes and Benefits of Evaluations
Employee Perspective

- Chance to ask questions and share accomplishments
- Learn strengths, areas for improvement
- Better understand:
  - your expectations
  - their contribution to lab agenda/mission
  - their current job duties
  - their level of performance
  - development pathways

Feel and be aligned to lab mission and needs
Purposes and Benefits of Evaluation
Manager and Lab Perspective:

• Drives results and productivity – keeps employees focused on lab/dept. goals
• Considers job and career development needs/opportunities
• Gives underperforming employees guidance that can lead to improved performance
• Develops candor in relationships and ability to deliver any crucial conversation with constructive dialogue
• Provides an objective - and legally defensible - basis for key human resources decisions

Helps managers and the lab achieve their goals
Key Milestone – FY13

1. August 16th – Goal Setting Tool closes.
2. August 19th: Performance Evaluation Tool opens. Access given to supervisors to begin writing evaluations and seek employee and contributor (matrixed supervisor / functional lead/other) input; Employees invited to provide input.
3. August - October: Voluntary performance evaluation training session for supervisors – classroom and Directorate leadership meetings.
4. September 20th: Employee/contributors complete input into evaluations tool.
5. September 20th: Supervisors provide input on their work group/team’s performance to Dept./Div. Head
6. September 27th: Dept./Div. Heads provide input to ALD
7. October 11th: Directorates complete their normalization process and communicate guidance to supervisors
Key Milestone – FY13

10. November 11th: Evaluations can be released to employees; supervisors begin meeting with employees.
11. November 29th: Directorates finalize salary increase and bonus recommendations. Submit recommendations to Compensation.
Normalization
Because We Aren’t That Great at Writing Performance Evaluations

- Provides managers with realistic targets: if the division gives itself a “4,” then it can’t rate everyone a 5 or 6; forces managers to differentiate
- Creates linkage between performance of individuals and directorate
- Drives honest performance evaluations
  - 5 years ago all but 3 employees exceeded expectations yet lab was getting Cs on our PEMP

Normalization Drives Differentiation

![Graph of FY12 Performance Evaluation Ratings Distribution]

- Average 4.4

![Graph of FY12 Distribution by Directorate]
Normalization: The Lab Performance Differentiation Process

Level individual performance ratings across Division/Dept.

ALD assigns final Division/Dept. rating

Division/Dept. Head provides input on Division performance

ALD evaluates Division rating and recommends Directorate rating

Lab Director assigns Directorate performance rating

Lab Director evaluates Directorate rating

Lab Agenda

Performance to Objectives
Examine yourself: are you overly influenced by these or other biases -

- Recency: placing most weight on recent events
- Harshness: rating more severely than performance merits
- Leniency: rating more favorably than performance merits
- Avoidance: failing to address soft skills - poor interpersonal skills, lack of teamwork, difficult temperament, mediocre customer service, or “no one wants to work with you” syndrome
- Sameness: using prior years’ review comments

How will you avoid them when you write and deliver your evaluations?
Gather Inputs

- Matrixed managers, functional leads, etc.: give enough time; encourage them; escalate if no response
- Employee: encourage/require them
  - Future goals: above and beyond daily job
  - Development ideas: education, experience, exposure
- Job descriptions / R2A2s: use them; get them right
Writing the Evaluation

- Using inputs
- Writing your perspective and examples
  - Comments should be included for any competency with a high (>5) or low (<3) rating
- Selecting the score
Influencing Behavior
Which Statement May Get Better Results

A. You’re always failing to communicate deadlines to the team.

B. There were two times this past year when project changes came up and you didn’t anticipate the impact on deadlines and notify the team quickly enough. Because they didn’t know about the changes fast enough to adjust, we missed those deadlines. In the future, I’d like you to communicate any changes to the entire team as soon as you’re aware of them.
A. You never seem to manage your time well.

B. At times, you’ve focused on lower-priority responsibilities such as X and X, resulting in two missed deadlines on your highest priority project Y over the past year. During the coming year, you’ll have increased responsibilities for project Y, so it’s even more important that you prioritize effectively.
Scoring: A Four is Good

7=Consistently Exceeds All Expectations
6=Frequently Exceeds Expectations
5=Sometimes Exceeds Expectations
4=Consistently Meets All Expectations
3=Meets Most Expectations
2=Needs Improvement
1=Does Not Meet Expectations

A “4” is not like a “C”
Goal Setting

Do you know where your lab agenda is?
http://www-group.slac.stanford.edu/do/

SMART Goals
- Specific
- Measurable
- Aggressive
- Realistic
- Time-bound

Performance Goals are above and beyond the daily job.
Performance Goals are not development plan/goals.
Goals are Different than Competencies: Example

Goal: Strengthen Internal Financial Controls

Goal Measure:

3: Internal financial controls strengthened to satisfaction of CFO Sub-council by end of FY
5: Internal financial controls improved per Critical Goals in Ops Directorate Strategic Business Plan FY11 and validated by external review team of SMEs
7: Internal financial controls improved as validated by Internal Audit so greatest risks mitigated and plan exists to address significant remaining findings by end of FY11
The Development Discussion: Online Info Aid

Ensure your people have the skills you and the lab will need in the future.

Bring your people along.
Delivering the Evaluation
Prepare for Discussion

Take time to review the evaluation
• Does it include key messages you want to convey?
• Do you have examples to support your rating?
• Do you need notes to refer to?
• Have you set aside adequate time?
• Are you surprising them with a poor rating or commentary?

When review concludes, will your employee know….
• What should I continue doing (or do more of)?
• What should I stop doing (or do less of)?
• What should I start doing?
Understanding Threat Triggers
SCARF Model

• **Status** is about relative importance to others: *who’s better than who*

• **Certainty** relates to being able to predict the future: *uncertain impact of review*

• **Autonomy** provides a sense of control over events: *they are the supervisor’s words, not mine*

• **Relatedness** is a sense of safety with others: *may create separation*

• **Fairness** is a perception of fair exchanges between people: *am I being treated the same or better*


Be aware of triggers and normal reactions (flight, fight, freeze). Keep employee engaged
Watch This

Video  http://youtu.be/eZRDAwCxmw4

• What did not go so well?
• What did the supervisor do?
• How did the employee react?
• What could the supervisor have done differently?
Be Aware of Cues

If employee appears angry, confused, shutdown, off target…

Don’t
- Continue with review because they can’t hear you
- Ignore feelings

Do
- Acknowledge what you are seeing
- Refer to form and current competency or goal: “do you understand” vs. “do you agree”
- “You don’t look comfortable. Is there something you need to say or that I need to know before we can continue?”
The Development Discussion

- Review with employee
- Get their perspective

https://www-internal.slac.stanford.edu/humanresources/training/career/career-development.aspx

Ensure your people have skills you and the lab will need in the future.

Bring your people along.
Walk Away With This In Mind

1) It is your evaluation of the employee. Listen, but no need to convince or debate. It’s not the time for the coaching discussion.

2) A “4” is good.

3) The employee should not be surprised – open dialogue year-round.

4) The employee should leave feeling that you care about his or her success and future – how well she or he did and where she or he can improve.

5) If it gets too exciting consider breaking or rescheduling – respect is #1 for you and for the employee.

6) HR can help you with discussion prep or follow-up.
Advice, Practice, Support: A Call Away

• Christine Green
• Andrea Moore
• Frank Topper

Call us if you’ve never done performance evaluations before or if you have a particularly challenging situation
Crucial Conversations – Nov 5th/6th/12th/13th and 4x/year

Graduates:

- Bamrick, Theresa Anne; Battersby, Leslie C.; Becker, Marie A.; Bobczynski, Norman Ives; Boehnlein, Amber; Bonetti, Lisa T.; Brachmann, Axel; Carrone, Enzo; Chaffin, Julia; Colby, Eric R.; Corbett, William Jeffrey; Cottrell, Roger L.; Cutino, Philip G.; Davey, James Edward; Deacon, Ashley M.; DeBarger, R. Scott; Doumani, John; Flath, Daniel L.; Fong, Gail; Fry, Alan R.; Gassner, Georg L.; Gomes Jr., Ernie T.; Haase, Andrew; Heimann, Philip; Himel, Thomas M.; Juni Ferreira, Marcelo; Kelez, Nicholas; Kenney, Christopher J.; Ligeti, Olga M.; Liu, Yuhua; Loos, Henrik; Lowe, Cindy; Lu, Donghui; McMahon, Terrence Thomas; Melen, Shirley I. Mongetta, Lisa; Nelson, Mary E.; Ng, Cho-Kuen; Nuckolls, Helen Marie; O'Donnell, Helen; Pilastro, Yolanda L.; Prado, Hector A.; Rabedeau, Thomas A.; Rafael, Fernando Da Silva; Ratcliffe, Kathleen M.; Robert, Aymeric; Rodriguez, Ponciano A.; Rokni, Sayed H.; Rowen, Michael; Schaufele, Sherrie Lynn; Schuh, Peter M.; Scott, Benjamin D.; Sevilla, Javier A.; Tankersley, Ricky D.; Thayer, Jana B.; Tran, Toni N.; Vaillancourt, Kurt W.; Van Winkle, Daniel D.; Wong, Kong Sing; Wrona, Matthew Walter; Yakimenko, Vitaly; Zscherpel, Lori
Reactions? Questions? Payoff?
The Form’s Format: One Place for Input, Writing, Scoring, Discussion Support

Competencies

https://www-internal.slac.stanford.edu/hr/forms/SLAC_National_Accelerator_Laboratory_competencies_12-14-10_rev.pdf

Form

- https://www-bis2.slac.stanford.edu/slaonly/performance/
- Competencies: essential
- Competencies: leadership/professional
- Scientific achievements
- Evaluation period goals
- Development period plan
- FY14 Goals
- FY14 Development Goals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Competencies Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Concern</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention to Safety:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Work:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of Work:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Knowledge:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Skills:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependability/ Reliability:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptability:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading and Developing Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Decisions Effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Maintaining Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive for Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee is still learning a new job or role (often within 6 months of assuming new role); typically employee is meeting objectives, but we expect more; expectations should be documented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFORM</th>
<th>DEPLOY</th>
<th>LEVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s current performance is inconsistent, often just meeting or missing objectives; employee has capacity for more; expectations for transformative improvement should be documented in a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)</td>
<td>Employee demonstrates sustained effective performance currently working “at level”; development / career plans and expectations (especially to keep skills current) should be documented.</td>
<td>Employee demonstrates sustained strong performance and effectiveness, achieving all and exceeding some individual goals and expectations; employee models positive behaviors; expectations should be documented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITION</th>
<th>IMPROVE</th>
<th>SUSTAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s current performance is inconsistent and/or inadequate; there needs to be a dramatic change in their approach to work documented in a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) and/or Transition Plan</td>
<td>Employee’s current performance is adequate, often meeting objectives; however capacity and interest in excelling beyond basics of role is unclear; expectations should be documented in a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)</td>
<td>Employee demonstrates sustained strong performance; employee models positive behaviors; expectations should be documented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great Short Articles on Performance Evaluations

How To Talk So Employee Performance Produces Results
http://humanresources.about.com/od/manageperformance/a/talk_results.htm

Holding Difficult Conversations: Discussing Performance Appraisals and Performance Improvement

The Ultimate Crucial Conversation
http://johnbossong.com/2013/08/15/the-ultimate-crucial-conversation/