

**Resources Department
Town Hall, Upper Street
London N1 2UD**

Report of: Chair of Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Meeting of	Date	Ward(s)
Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee	31 March 2022	All

Delete as appropriate		Non-exempt
-----------------------	--	------------

Subject: Staff performance management and development

1. Synopsis

- 1.1 This report requests that the Executive receive the recommendations of the Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee following the completion of its review of Performance Development and consider additional ways to support career progression. A response to the recommendations set out in the report will be considered at a future meeting of the Executive.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the report and recommendations of the Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee be approved and forwarded to the Executive for consideration as follows;
- 2.2 Council officers will make sure that the current approach to performance development is being utilised by managers with recent improvements fully embedded. A communications campaign from April 2022 onwards will reinforce messages linking Quality Conversations to objectives and development planning for 2022/23, referring managers to a curated selection of supporting development resources and tools, linked to our CARE values.
- 2.3 Council officers will continue to progress the review into performance development, with the aim being to design, deliver and evaluate a new approach which is fit for purpose for a diverse population of roles and work styles through trialling approaches with different work groups.
- 2.4 Council officers will present more up to date recommendations to the Executive in June 2022, following ongoing engagement with the Corporate Management Board and the working group.

3. Background

- 3.1 In December 2021, the Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee commenced a review of Performance Management and Development in the Council. The Committee established an informal working group of 5 Members – Councillors Debono, Gallagher, Ismail, Khondoker and Heather were Members of the informal working group.
- 3.2 The Committee held 2 meetings and received evidence in relation to the past system of performance appraisal within the Council along with the current model of Quality Conversations, and how this links in with the Council's strategic objectives/values. This was followed with a presentation of the findings from the initial research and discovery phase.
- 3.3 During consideration of the evidence it was noted that the Council wished to utilise a number of different engagement strategies, such as focus groups, surveys and one to one consultations, and to look at how performance management is dealt with in other organisations, as a 'one size' fits all approach is not always suitable
- 3.4 The Working Group considered evidence as to how the Council wished to embed the CARE values framework into the performance management system for staff, and to ensure managers are confident that they can manage performance management and development effectively.
- 3.5 The Working Group noted the strategic plan for performance management, and that the CARE framework is intended to underpin this. There needed to be recognition of the CARE values, and embed these into a performance management framework. This will assist in recruiting and retaining staff, however there need to be clear communication of new strategies, and objectives of the Council, to all staff, as often it did not appear they were always cognisant of them.
- 3.6 The CARE values are (i) collaborative - to ensure, and the Council is more effective when staff work collaboratively as one team, with partners, colleagues, managers and residents (ii) ambitious – challenge ourselves to be the best, and be ambitious in creating new solutions that deliver best for communities (iii) resourceful – look to way to make things happen, especially when faced with new or difficult situations, by making the most of what we have, coming up with solutions, thinking creatively in approaches, and finding ways to effectively and sustainably use resources (iv) empowering – respect differences, champion diversity in the workplace, and supporting and enabling colleagues to do their best.
- 3.7 The Working Group were informed that the Council had introduced a system of Quality Conversations (QC), which had replaced the previous paper based performance appraisal system, and the online appraisal system, which was discontinued in 2019. The online appraisal system had been discontinued, as the information technology had become unfit for purpose, and lacked the flexibility for a varied and changeable working styles. Other elements also did not work effectively, such as the inconsistent application of ratings, and staff feeling that the appraisal system was just a 'tick box' exercise, and some groups of staff, such as repairs staff, who could not access the online system.
- 3.8 Quality conversations had started in September 2019, prior to the COVID 19 pandemic, as it was felt that there needed to be more regular conversations, and better communications with staff and managers in three key areas, well-being, performance and learning and

development, and that these should take place every 4-6 weeks. This had proven useful during the pandemic, in view of the health and safety concerns of staff, and to ensure staff were well motivated. In response to the pandemic managers were advised to hold more frequent conversations, with an increased focus on health, safety and well-being, more regular checks on progress, and shorter term goals in response to the changed working environment. During December 2021 additional templates for objective setting and creating personal development plans were shared with all staff.

- 3.9 The Working Group considered the results of the staff survey and noted that 82% of staff had said that they had regular conversations or 1:1s with their managers. The staff survey had taken place in March/April 2021 during the pandemic. The Working Group were of the view that the frequency of conversations between staff and managers was an important feature of effective performance management, however it had to be ensured that managers had the resources in place to deliver this.
- 3.10 In the follow-up questionnaire conducted in connection with this Scrutiny topic, there was an average rating of 3.75/5 on how clear staff were about the purpose of 1:1s or QC, an average rating of 3.12/5 on how useful QCs or 1:1s are for improving performance, and an average rating of 2.95/5 on how Islington improves overall performance.
- 3.11 The top four motivators for people in their jobs were pride in their work, make a difference to peoples' lives, feeling valued for their work, and interesting work. The four lowest scoring motivators were rewards and benefits package, general terms and conditions of employment, Islington values, pension.
- 3.12 The Working Group also considered the issue of how management dealt with poor performance, and the impact of this on other members of staff. It was noted that in the staff survey, staff did not always feel that managers dealt effectively with poor performance, and that whilst there should be a supportive approach and opportunities for staff to improve, there also need to be accountability if staff had continuing poor performance.
- 3.13 Quality Conversations should be monitored and reassessed against performance. There also needed to be clear guidelines, and procedures put in place, in order to ensure that poor performance is dealt with. Discussions had taken place with Trade Unions on how to deal effectively with poor performance, with a revised performance improvement procedure in place. The language around poor performance was previously more punitive in nature, however with the new system of Quality Conversations, it would make the process more supportive, and ensure managers were able to institute a development plan, whilst recognising the consequences of poor performance.
- 3.14 In terms of quality conversations the main themes that emerged from the Scrutiny focus groups/interviews were every manager has their own unique approach to managing QCs, managers are not always sure whether they are doing it right, effectiveness of QCs is influenced by the manager's capability, managers can struggle with well-being conversations, and feel pressured to give advice and solutions, effectiveness of staff/manager relationship, QCs do not manage under performance, difficulty keeping non-office based staff engaged with the process, for non-office based staff, good feedback from residents is the best motivator; on balance, a 'one size' fits all approach may not be suitable for Islington.

- 3.15 Positive aspects of QCs included that it is better than the IT based appraisal system, allows genuine conversations with managers, allows managers to understand staff better, provides a forum to cover key topics and to understand their roles better and what is needed for service improvements/better allocation of resources, can make staff more pro-active, and when done well people feel valued, listened to and invested in.
- 3.16 Some suggestions that emanated from the focus groups/questionnaire of what could be improved are: Islington's values need to be embedded, a more holistic approach needs to be taken, a more strategic approach with objectives tying in with Islington's organisational priorities/wider aspirations, reducing inequality, and the green agenda. There also needs to be more input into performance management from people other than management, and performance conversations need to hold people more accountable.
- 3.17 In addition, aspects of the old appraisal system with objectives/milestones could be included to give a clearer focus on tracking performance, frequency of QCs needs to be more flexible, particularly for managers with a lot of staff as every 4-6 weeks are too time consuming, there needs to be a more consistent framework, a new training approach needs to be embedded, shared platform to record conversations to ensure a more consistent approach, any online system needs to be accessible to non-office based staff, and there needs to be a quality check process and how effective they have been.
- 3.18 The Working Group expressed concern that some staff were unpopular with managers, as they often went above and beyond their duties in order to assist residents. There were a lot of excellent staff working for the Council, and there is a need to assess how as part of objective setting, staff can understand their role about making a difference to residents. There is also a need to assess what skills managers need, and to identify where managers were not effectively supporting, and developing staff. The view was expressed that dashboards were an excellent method of monitoring staff and service performance and it was noted that this was being explored.
- 3.19 The Working Group noted that a new guidance toolkit had been issued to managers, and that this would focus on specific wellbeing conversations about mental and physical health. Development workshops about managing mental health are also available for managers to attend.
- 3.20 In terms of career development 44% of staff agreed that Islington would help their career development, 36% disagreed, and 20% stated that they were happy in their current job. The 3 main barriers to career development cited by staff were lack of promotion opportunities (42%), being unsure of the next steps (36%), and a lack of confidence (28%).
- 3.21 The Working Group were also informed that the council participates in the London Tackling Racial Equality Working Group which enables boroughs to learn from each other and develop best practice collaboratively. It has instituted a focus on diversity, and proactive and targeted development for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff. This will enable Islington to build on existing opportunities such as the Black on Board programme, Islington Management Diploma, SOLACE emerging leaders, reciprocal mentoring programme etc. Cross borough data on career development, and progression, was also taking place with London Councils.

- 3.22 The Working Group also received evidence in relation to other London Councils, and outside organisations as to their approach to performance management. 18 Councils who responded indicated that regular check-ins with staff were a feature of 94% of Councils. 83% have an annual review with over half having mid-year reviews. One Council uses appreciative enquiry which is strengths based performance conversations. 94% of Councils include goal setting, behaviour/values and personal development in discussions, however only 33% or fewer include equality/inclusion, performance measures, or recognition or reward.
- 3.23 The Working Group were of the view that any recognition scheme introduced should not be based solely on the view of a manager, and reference was made to a 'peer recognition' scheme that could be considered.
- 3.24 In terms of next steps, the Working Group were informed that there will be a workshop event with the Corporate Management Board, and Be Islington Leadership network to explore what performance means for Islington Council, so co-creating a clear purpose, principles, and impact measures. There will also be a workshop with HR colleagues to explore casework, focused on performance management, and organising demonstrations of performance systems to explore what different systems can offer. This will all inform more detailed proposals for improvements to supplement the recently introduced new templates and training packages.
- 3.25 Following the CARE framework introduction, the next stage of the CARE values campaign focuses on embedding values into team and individual performance conversations, to identify a team/service within the Council for Organisational Development to partner as a test group and work alongside the teams to build in the public. E-learning, a career development course and online workshops for staff had been introduced.
- 3.26 The Working Group were of the view that it would be beneficial to include an office based and non-office based team in teams identified to be a test group. There will also be a workshop event with the Race Equality Network and others staff forums to explore performance development.

COUNCILLOR THERESA DEBONO

**Chair of Policy and Performance Scrutiny Committee/ Chair of
Performance Management and Development Informal Working Group**