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### Introduction

- Science and Mathematics Program Improvement (SAMPI) exclusively using WMU Human Resources “Performance Management Program Annual Review Form” for staff annual performance reviews.
- Form provides annual opportunity for SAMPI staff and Director to meet and discuss past performance and future development plans.
- Experiences with staff performance reviews and ALA convinced me of need for additional procedures to develop team trust and encourage staff buy-in (Lencioni, 2007).

### Literature Review

- Performance management literature and Personnel Evaluation Standards were reviewed to generate ideas for enhancing current process.
- Review of relevant evaluation standards led to prioritizing ideas that focused on staff strengths, practicality, and productivity (Table 1).

**Table 1. Relevant Personnel Evaluation Standards (Gullickson & Howard, 2009).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Evaluation</td>
<td>Do procedures and expectations allow both strengths and weaknesses to be identified rather than solely deficits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up and Professional Development</td>
<td>Is a structure in place to allow the data generated to be used in professional development plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Procedures</td>
<td>Are procedures for collecting data as simple and job-embedded as possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Information</td>
<td>Is there oversight to ensure that the evaluation procedures are the same for all evaluatees?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** SAMPI Staff Photo

### New Process

- Several new activities identified from the performance management literature (Bouskila-Yam & Kluger, 2011; Budworth et al., 2015):
  - Feedforward Interview (FFI): staff member asked to describe experience at work where they felt their best.
  - Reflected best self feedback (RBSF): Director shares story with staff member.
  - Online-questionnaire: Director and staff complete questionnaire based on strengths from FFI and RBSF.

### Staff Discussion

- Meeting held to discuss the proposed changes to staff evaluation.
- Staff were provided the opportunity to provide feedback.
- All staff felt the review process provides useful feedback on how they are doing and how they can improve.
- Some expressed that they were hopeful the new process could help identify strengths and team growth.
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### Conclusions/Future Plans

- Some team members also noted that there is anxiety with any new review process.
- The team also felt that the new processes need to be piloted.

- High-quality performance review should focus on strengths rather deficits.
- There are some relatively simple practices that can be employed by supervisors to increase staff participation in performance review.
- The hope is that the new staff review process will lead to increased staff ownership of staff evaluations and individual/team growth.
- We will pilot test the new review system this fall in order to use the information the WMU HR review process next year.
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