

Description of the two service based Performance management schemes currently adopted

Housing Management

Within Housing Management line managers are much more evident within the day to day operation of the work undertaken by their staff. They are therefore able to notice and give praise immediately when “things go well “and indeed to recognise when there are problems. They address such issues as they occur and work with individuals to remove barriers or identify a skills gap and either arrange immediate support or arrange training to ensure any such barrier is minimised as soon as possible. This difference in working relationship has allowed the needs normally met within a PDR to be met throughout the year as part of their normal staff / management relationship. As a result of this the automatic offering of PDR to all staff was stopped. Normal practice now is for individuals to request a PDR if they feel they want one.

This led to 30% having a PDR in 2009/10 and 20% having a PDR 2010/2011. The head of service feels this reduction is a direct result of staff becoming more comfortable with the new approach to performance management. It should be noted that in the event of poor performance then the appropriate capability action is followed which requires a number of meetings to review performance and improvement and can lead to dismissal if no improvement is made. This is in line with PCC standard action and incorporates full documentation of all meetings. Planning for change and future development is a more open process within the systems thinking style of management and so future plans are available and are discussed openly with staff.

Information Services

Within IS a totally new PDR process has been adopted. This can be seen at Appendix 3. The Head of Service has worked with her management team to reduce the number of staff competent in only a narrow specialisation and to identify the behaviours and attitudes they need to be evident in their staff so that the staff deliver their work in the way IS wish to operate in future.

Objective setting is used as is fairly standard within such schemes and there is a balance between business objectives and personal development matters. This scheme also reflects the fact that development does not need to involve attendance at courses and can also include experience of new work or learning from colleagues. This service too operates an active management

process and each manager recognises the readiness or hesitancy of their teams and individuals to move into such objective setting so the implementation can be flexed to suit.

To be successful IS needs both team and individual performance to be of good quality as much of their activity is for other services each of which in turn must be free to focus on their customer demands supported by effective IS systems. Consequently when preparing for each individual's PDR their manager will talk to colleagues, other managers and customers across PCC to request comment on their performance, behaviours and attitudes. The discussion held at the PDR interview will therefore involve discussion on performance, behaviours and attitudes supplemented by the feedback. Individuals are also encouraged to bring forward evidence of things they believe to be successes and where they think some elements have gone wrong or perhaps have led to improvements then to discuss how they could improve or perhaps approach things differently in future.

The new element for PCC is that the manager also offers each individual a rating for their attitude and behaviours which can be

- Not currently meeting expectations
- Meeting expectations: Doing a good job and behaviours are in line with those identified
- Exceeding expectations: Achieving over and above objectives, early delivery, enhanced savings etc. and behaviours are also in line or exceed those required.
- Outstanding: Not yet given, but will indicate a star individual with excellent performance in all aspects.
- This assessment is openly discussed and moderated within the management team and consequent challenge of manager's intended mark and challenge to justify or vary marks where others feel they are out of line with the rest of managers standard helps lead to a consistency of marking across the service.

This approach could be adopted by other services with minimal change hence its inclusion as an appendix. Indeed financial services already have a set of managers' standards although the managers are not actively rated in this manner at present. Within social care if either service chose to use this tool such behaviours could easily be developed from those already existing at national level for social workers.

These examples are for illustrative purposes and any system is acceptable if it meets the needs of the service and the standards set out in Section 4.