Performance management is an ongoing process of communication between employees and supervisors through giving and receiving feedback, integrating evaluation, and identifying development opportunities in support of the organization’s strategic goals.

I. INTRODUCTION
The Engineering Research Support Organization (ERSO) has a firm commitment to performance management of its employees. The primary purpose of performance management is to assist employees in professional development and in achieving ERSO’s and the University’s goals. The procedures outlined in this document apply to every non-student and non-academic ERSO employee. Academic employee evaluation is addressed through the Academic Personnel Office.

II. OBJECTIVES
The performance management system is designed to:
1. Promote communication between the employee and the supervisor to provide useful feedback about job expectations, standards, and job performance.
2. Facilitate better working relationships.
3. Assist in planning personnel moves and placements that will best utilize each employee's capabilities.
4. Contribute to professional growth and development
5. Serve as a systematic guide for supervisors in planning each employee's training.
6. Provide historical record of performance for such purposes as salary adjustments, promotions, and personnel management.

III. RESPONSIBILITY

A. **ERSO Human Resources** has the overall responsibility for the administration of the Performance Management Program and will work to ensure the fairness and efficiency of its execution:

1. The availability and clarity of proper forms.
2. Ensuring completed forms are returned for file by a specified date.
3. Reviewing forms for completeness.
4. Working with Supervisors to identify and correct discrepancies.
5. Ensuring proper safeguard and filing of completed forms.

B. **Immediate Supervisor** (Evaluator) is the employee's "evaluator" and has the responsibility for:

1. Reviewing the job description, standards and communicating expectations with the employee.
2. Continuously observing, evaluating, and documenting an employee's job performance.
3. Holding regular meetings with each employee to discuss job performance and development opportunities.
4. Completing Performance Appraisal Forms on time as required.

IV. PROCEDURES

**Job Descriptions and Performance Standards**: should be reviewed by the supervisor with the employee at the beginning of each evaluation period for accurateness and should be revised as necessary to indicate any significant changes in duties and/or responsibilities. This is a shared effort between the employee and the supervisor. It is very important to establish a joint understanding between the supervisor and the employee as to the job description and major performance standards at the beginning of the evaluation period. The Performance Standards Discussion Form should be signed by the supervisor, employee, and Human Resources Director.

**Meeting Sessions** between supervisors and employees should be scheduled regularly. (See timeline for suggested schedule) During these sessions, an open dialogue should occur to allow the exchange of performance oriented information. The employee should be informed of how well or how poorly he/she has performed to date. In the case where improvement is needed, the employee should be informed of the steps necessary to improve performance to the desired level. Supervisors should maintain a record of each counseling session. (Use the ERSO Discussion log to track meeting notes.)
Performance Evaluations should be prepared during the month of August for each employee. The evaluation period will cover September 1 through August 31. “Performance Evaluation Form (Represented Staff)” will be used for all represented personnel and either “Performance Evaluation Form (Non-represented)” may be used for non-represented personnel. All forms are available in the HR Section of the ERSO website and in the Performance Management Supervisor toolkit. Appraisal forms should be completed and submitted to the Human Resources Director no later than August 31.

Please use the following links for information regarding applicable policies http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/employees/policies/staff_policies/index.html and contracts http://hrweb.berkeley.edu/hrlabor.htm.

A. The Immediate Supervisor should:

1. Review the employee’s self appraisal. Complete the appraisal form as promptly as possible. Describe why performance needs improvement and specify how performance can be improved, or explain why performance meets or surpasses expectations. It is highly encouraged for supervisors to meet with HR prior to discussing a “Fails to Achieve Expectations” rating with the employee. ERSO is required to notice the union when represented staff receives a “Fails to Achieve Expectations” rating.
2. Discuss the appraisal with the employee emphasizing strong and weak points in job performance. Commend the employee for a job well done if applicable and discuss specific corrective action if warranted. Set mutual goals for the employee to reach before the next performance evaluation. Recommendations should specifically state methods to correct weaknesses and/or prepare the employee for future career opportunities.
3. Allow the employee to make any written comments he/she desires. Have employee sign the appraisal form.
4. Forward the original signed copy of the appraisal form to HR Operations.

Upon Human Resources' receipt of the completed appraisal form, it will be reviewed for completeness. Any unresolved problems will be discussed with the supervisor. If required, unresolved problems will be brought to the attention of the next line of authority. The completed form will be placed in the employee's departmental Personnel File.

NEW EMPLOYEES
New Employees should be evaluated during the third and fifth months of their probationary employment. The evaluation form will be processed as outlined above. If job performance is judged to be unsatisfactory the supervisor should partner with Human Resources to determine next steps.
V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING DEFINITIONS
ERSO is committed to a consistent system of evaluating employees. The rating definitions below should be used to accurately evaluate the employee’s performance.

5= Exceptional
Performance far exceeded expectations due to exceptionally high quality of work performed in all essential areas of responsibility, resulting in an overall quality of work that was superior; and either 1) included the completion of a major goal or project, or 2) made an exceptional or unique contribution in support of unit, department, or University objectives. This rating is achievable by any employee though given infrequently.

4= Exceeds expectations
Performance consistently exceeded expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, and the quality of work overall was excellent. Annual goals were met.

3= Meets expectations
Performance consistently met expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, at times possibly exceeding expectations, and the quality of work overall was very good. The most critical annual goals were met.

2= Improvement needed
Performance did not consistently meet expectations – performance failed to meet expectations in one or more essential areas of responsibility, and/or one or more of the most critical goals were not met. An individual development plan to improve performance must be developed, including timelines, and monitored to measure progress.

NOTE: To assist in achieving improvement for the next evaluation cycle, supervisors should develop specific learning goals, steps/resources needed on the individual development plan.

1= Unsatisfactory
Performance was consistently below expectations in most essential areas of responsibility, and/or reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas. A plan to correct performance, including timelines, must be outlined and monitored to measure progress.

NOTE: An employee who receives this rating should be evaluated and rated again within 3 months.
VI. PITFALLS IN MAKING PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS

1. The Isolated Incident
   A rating should not be based on a few isolated performance incidents. When this is done, the rating is unfairly influenced by non-typical instances of favorable or unfavorable performances.

2. The "Halo" Effect
   The "Halo" effect occurs when one factor influences ratings on all factors. Examples: An employee's work is of good quality; therefore, other ratings are higher than normal. Another employee is frequently absent, with the result that the ratings on other factors are usually low.

3. The "Cluster" Tendency
   The tendency to consider everyone in the work group as above average, average, or below average. Some raters are considered "tough" because they normally "cluster" their people at a low level. Others are too lenient. "Clustering" overall ratings usually indicates that the rater has not sufficiently distinguished between high and low levels of performance.

4. Rating the Job and Not the Individual
   Individuals in higher-rated jobs are often considered superior performers to those in lower-rated jobs. This normally means that confusion exists between the performance appraisal and how the job has been evaluated.

5. Length of Service Bias
   There is a tendency to allow the period of an individual's employment to influence the rating. Normally, performance levels should be higher as an individual gains training and experience, but this is not always the case.

6. Personality Conflicts
   Avoid judgments made purely on the basis of personality traits. Effective, efficient employees do not necessarily agree with everything a supervisor believes in or states.

VII. SUGGESTIONS

1. Consider the entire appraisal period. Try to enumerate high points and low points in performance, and then assign a rating that characterizes the individual's overall performance. Do not attempt to assign a rating to a performance standard and then create justification to support it. Be able to explain the reason for each rating.

2. Rate each standard independently. When evaluating more than one person simultaneously, be sure not to compare them to one another. Performance should be evaluated against the established standards.

3. In a group of people in similar jobs, performance is likely to be spread over most performance categories. Review your own record as a rater.
Check the tendency to be either "too tough" or "too lenient" in your appraisals.

4. Consider how an individual is performing in relation to what is expected. Rate the person's performance, not importance of the job.

5. Recognize that some people may never achieve top ratings, regardless of length of service. Watch closely the progress of newcomers and be ready to recognize superior performance if it is achieved.

VIII. SUMMARY
It is incumbent upon each employee, regardless of level or category, to perform in an exemplary manner reflecting the mission of ERSO. Used constructively, this process of performance management can prove to be a valuable tool in individual career advancement, and result in increased productivity throughout all areas of ERSO.

To access performance management forms go to the performance management section on the ERSO website or to the Performance Management Supervisor Toolkit.