

University of Birmingham

Performance and Development Review Scheme for Academic and Related Staff

1. The Performance and Development Review (PDR) Scheme is designed to provide a transparent and, so far as possible, objective scheme through which individual performance is stimulated, supported and managed in the context of continuing personal and professional development. It has the following objectives:

For the individual:

- to enable members of staff to develop their University careers by discussing, reviewing and setting challenging yet realistic targets and objectives, within the context of the aims of their School/Budget Centre, College and the University;
- to foster a spirit of trust and co-operation;
- to help staff achieve their best;
- to identify and develop potential for promotion;
- to identify and celebrate high performance;
- to identify and address under performance;

For the University:

- to enhance staff performance;
- to help the University to achieve its challenge of becoming a leading global university;
- to identify changes in the organisation or operation of the School/Budget Centre, College or University which would enable individuals to optimise their performance;
- to contribute to the University's policy aim of ensuring that all staff have equality of opportunity in employment and in relation to personal and career development according to their qualifications, abilities and potential.

2. While a review interview can be an appropriate and helpful forum for discussing under-performance in a constructive and helpful way, significant and/or sustained under-performance identified through this process must be dealt with separately through the relevant procedures by the Head of School/Budget Centre as part of his or her management responsibility. PDR forms will not be admissible in disciplinary proceedings relating to under-performance.
3. The University recognises that this review procedure should be implemented flexibly to deal with a range of different duties, disciplines and related outputs, as appropriate to the current stage of the individual's career. It will be a key task in each interview to consider the aims and aspirations of the individual member of staff, whatever the stage s/he has reached in his/her career, and to match them against those of the University.
4. The requirement is that each member of staff takes part in a review interview every year with the Head of the School/Budget Centre and/or a representative nominated by the Head of School/Budget Centre. The annual meeting under this scheme is to enable the reviewer and the reviewee to stand back from day to day activity to take account of longer term progress and development through a discussion of the full breadth of the reviewee's duties. This does not preclude meetings during the course of the year between the two parties to follow up points raised in the review interview or for other specific purposes, as appropriate.
5. Reviews may take place at any time of the year. Outputs from the review meeting may be used to inform promotion and salary review processes. The timing of the review meeting should therefore be as appropriate to the individual member of staff.

6. Training for the review interview is of crucial importance and briefing and training is arranged by the People & Organisational Development (POD) team for reviewers (which continues to be mandatory) and reviewees. Members of staff are encouraged to contact POD if they feel further help is needed in respect of either of these roles. Periodic refresher training should also be undertaken by reviewers. Training will address both the skills required and the behaviours and attitude needed to engage fully with the process.
7. Heads of School/Budget Centre should meet with the reviewers in the School/Budget Centre before the start of each round of reviews to set out what the objectives of the School/Budget Centre are for the period ahead and to inform the conduct of review meetings.
8. The Head of School/Budget Centre will notify each member of staff who will be responsible for conducting that person's review meeting. If the reviewee has concerns about the choice of reviewer, he or she is encouraged to explain them to the Head of School/Budget Centre who will try to find an alternative, if appropriate. Where a reviewee is a candidate for a higher degree, the reviewer will be someone other than the reviewee's higher degree supervisor. If concerns remain, the member of staff may ask the Head of College or, for staff in Corporate Services, the Registrar and Secretary to review the position whose decision will be final.
9. It is the responsibility of the reviewee to prepare a brief document for discussion, to be provided to the reviewer at least ten days before the interview, which includes:-
 - (i) a statement of the objectives agreed following the previous interview;
 - (ii) a summary of relevant activity and achievement since then which shows how those activities and achievements measure up to the objectives, together with an explanation of the reasons for any variation from the agreed objectives;
 - (iii) suggested objectives for the next year (although this does not preclude the possibility of longer term objectives being suggested);
 - (iv) aspirations for the future (eg promotion, retirement etc);
 - (v) any ideas for continuing professional development or personal development;
 - (vi) any other items for discussion not included in the above.

The Head of School/Budget Centre will provide guidance on which forms should be used. Whatever the format of the document, it must include statements addressing the matters detailed in items (i) to (vi) in the order set out above. The submitted document should provide sufficient information to enable a constructive discussion to take place. For a first review no documentation from a previous meeting will be available, although objectives may have been set through other means (eg through a recruitment/induction process or through other review processes which may have been operating).

10. The reviewer may request further information to be furnished by the reviewee and/or raise another issue which the reviewer wishes to discuss at the meeting.

11. After the interview, the reviewer will prepare a summary report of what was discussed and will also record the objectives which have been set (which will include work and personal development objectives), making clear who is responsible for follow-up action and in what timescale. The objectives shall be included in the documentation supporting the next interview.
12. This report will be sent to the reviewee for his or her comment and then formal agreement and signature, after which it will be submitted to the Head of School/Budget Centre for implementation and approval of agreed action, as appropriate. A copy will be sent to the reviewee, and the reviewer, which will include any feedback or other comments by the Head of School/Budget Centre, and the Head of School/Budget Centre's signature.
- 13 Any disputes over the objectives to be achieved will be resolved by the decision of the next senior person above the level of the reviewer, who will consider written representations.
14. As with all personal data affecting members of staff, the outputs from the Performance and Development Review will be treated in a confidential manner within the University in accordance with the provisions of the Data Protection Act.

Approved by the University Executive Board

October 2013