

## **Performance Review Committee Recommendations for University Guidelines pertaining to the Performance Review Process**

### **Committee members:**

Ella Born, Internal Medicine  
Victoria Green, College of Dentistry  
Ray Haas, Hospital Human Resources  
Ellen Twinam, College of Medicine  
Debra McFall-Wallerich, College of Nursing  
Lisa-Jan Irving, College of Public Health  
Lois Friday, Psychology  
Sheri Sojka, International Programs and Staff Council Representative  
Maureen McCormick, Learning & Development

A performance review committee appointed by Sue Buckley, Associate Vice President of Finance and Operations and Director of Human Resources was charged with the following responsibilities:

1. Review the Operations manual guidelines related to performance review and suggest changes to ensure alignment with the University strategic goal of organizational vitality, professional standards, and campus core values.
2. Develop an annual communication plan including key talking points to be used by University leaders in communicating expectations related to the performance review process.
3. Ensure that performance management tools offered on the Performance Management website at <http://www.uiowa.edu/learn/perfmgt/index.html> are in alignment with guidelines outlined in the Operations manual.

To that end, the Performance Review committee has submitted recommendations it believes will lead to improvement in five key areas in the current performance review process. These five recommendations will serve as key talking points for University leaders in communicating expectations.

1. A well-developed and implemented performance review process facilitates the growth and development of the employee and the behavioral change as needed to ensure achievement of institutional goals. The two-way communication performance review process documented in written form is beneficial for both parties when done well. When a need for a behavioral change is identified by the supervisor or employee, standards are developed, measures are identified, and support is provided.
2. Every employee has a right to an annual review process and the responsibility to help ensure that a quality, meaningful exchange occurs. Each employee should be a part of the process including discussion regarding the setting of goals, identification of necessary resources, and career enhancement opportunities. If the employee does not agree with the review as written by their supervisor, the process allows for the employee to submit comments as a part of the written review and for both parties to sign and date the review.
3. The annual performance review should be a reflection of ongoing feedback received throughout the year. It should include a face-to-face meeting where both the supervisor and employee has an opportunity to discuss goals, express any concerns, and create an action plan for the future. In extenuating circumstances other models may be used as appropriate to provide for this exchange of information."
4. An employee's performance review is one of a number of important factors in determining salary increases for non-bargaining professional and scientific employees in accordance with University, collegiate, division, and departmental salary policy. Other factors in determining salary may include retention, market issues, and salary equity.
5. Accountability should exist at every level of the University system. Strategies the committee suggests that further this goal include:

- ... creation of a strong, joint statement from the President, Provost, and Associate Vice President of Human Resources in support of providing a quality performance review process,
- ... development of a process to ensure all supervisors have access to training and are highly encouraged to attend training that facilitates best University practices for performance review,
- ... development of a system that makes performance review compliance a part of the evaluation process for every dean, executive officer, manager, and supervisor on campus.