diverseo

Cognitive bias advisors

Reinventing performance management

Executive summary

Business leaders increasingly recognize their performance management processes need some fixes. Performance management[1] systems do not serve their business goals anymore: they fail to produce full engagement, appropriately evaluate achievements, help design the right development plans or set fair compensation. Crucial in today's large corporations, they fail to leverage a wider range of talents.

Yet, objectively and effectively managing performance is more needed than ever. As a result, there is currently a major debate mainly in the US about removing numbered performance ratings and annual performance reviews. Research has shown that even those who receive a good review will be negatively affected by receiving a numerical assessment: people do not like being labelled. In addition, a single annual performance review is most often less objective than more frequent ones, for example by project. However, frequently touted replacement solutions often carry significant, sometimes unexpected, impact. While managers quite often have a preference for these solutions and their appealing simplicity – such as asking "Would you like to work with this person again?" –, how do you then make, fairly, this time, the key decisions which used to depend on the rating: bonuses, trainings, promotions? In many countries, the absence of ratings increases the legal risk of asking a low performer to leave. Moreover, such new solutions do not always bring the objectiveness needed to leverage a large and diverse talent pool. Yet today, more companies need to integrate new skills and competencies mainly related to IT and digital, to be better equipped to make decisions under uncertainty and develop their business in more remote countries. Integrating such new competencies and differences will therefore require at least an update of the current, traditional processes.

In fact, very few companies are good at objectively and effectively evaluating performance. Most people fail to understand how their brain processes information and makes decisions. This is mainly because our brain operates like a computer with two processors, as described by Daniel Kahneman, 2002 Nobel laureate. System 2 is the rational processor, which we know and control. System 1 is automatic: everyone has it; no one is aware of it. System 1 manages much more information than System 2 and has more influence that we think on our behaviors and decisions. Most decision making processes are designed to address System 2 only; they do not effectively address the mistakes or biases induced by System 1. This is complex because we cannot stop it, access it or control it.

Sometimes, our biases and decision making processes even conspire to create unexpected impacts. Such impacts can be surfaced only by analyzing the process with a cognitive lens. For example, when processes are too complex, people get into cognitive overload and unconsciously focus only on the information they like and that confirms their unconscious biases. When processes are too light, they lack the facts needed to be objective.

In fact, while some key principles are helpful, there is no one-size-fits all process, as it must be adapted to the implicit culture and operations of the company. Some of the current trends in performance management such as removing annual performance evaluations come from fast paced technologies companies where annual objective setting and performance evaluations do not fit with fast changing business goals. While encouraging more frequent, informal and formal feedback is an excellent practice, completely removing annual review is not necessarily needed for more stable businesses. They still help identifying quick learners. Best in class processes are therefore significantly different from one company to the next.

In setting up a new process, some key principles have proven successful:

- *Embed actual, business-related performance drivers* to allow managers to be objective and best enhance the performance of their teams. This sounds as a no brainer, but many businesses have standard performance

[1] Throughout the document, to avoid often unwieldy turns of phrase, we use "evaluation" to describe "performance evaluation" or "performance management".

evaluation criteria which do not fit the company or specific jobs.

- *Sustain a growth mindset:* Replace the absolute judgement of a rating with a dynamic assessment of the performance trajectory; numerical ratings would be replaced by constructive words. Provide frequent formal and informal feedback.
- *Remain simple:* complexity can generate overload but also waste of time. In our experience, many stages and documents can often be eliminated with no negative impact.
- *Be calibrated:* as managers tend to perceive performance of their direct reports differently depending on their age, gender… but also their own strengths and weaknesses, setting upfront clear expectations can help enhance objectiveness.
- *Strive for homogeneity:* people in the same jobs should be evaluated homogenously (i.e. same frequency, criteria….). It also allows best capturing everyone's core strengths.
- *Be culturally neutral*: different cultures have different ways of perceiving and expressing the same perception of performance. In a global company, the process should ensure that people from different countries will be fairly evaluated so as to include as much as possible a wider range of talents.
- *Reduce individual inferences and biases* with specific decision-making techniques such as the 7 Steps™: weighting the performance criteria, hiding the name of individual when assessing the results….
- *Fit into the organization structure:* On-going feedback should be nurtured, but corporate needs should drive frequency of formal evaluations, decision makers to involve….
- *Improve continuously*: key changes in the labor market or in corporate strategy – new skills needed – should directly be embedded into the process.
- *Keep line managers' ownership*: They are the ones who know their team members' performance best and therefore should buy into the new process, which should be adapted to their understanding, needs and constraints.

Companies considering a new approach should structure the work to achieve effective results:

1. Decide why you need to change and what you need to change:
   - *Identify what you expect from your process* and the key interrelationships with other business processes – people development, bonuses,…
   - *Perform a quantitative analysis of current key elements such as performance distributions, differences* across social groups. How many people receive each rating, do women tend to systematically receive lower ratings?...
   - *Understand how managers implicitly assess performance and what changes they buy into*. Managers usually intuitively know what makes a good performance and have developed habits. It is crucial to understand what drives their behavior, and what needs and can be changed. Besides, assessing their ability to provide day to day feedback can provide a clear performance enhancer moving forward.
   - *Surface and quantify the biases that need to be mitigated*. Some biases are unexpected. Knowing them will allow addressing them.
   - *Assess effectiveness,* and especially time spent. Search for simplifications.
2. Change only what needs to change, simplify and adjust to your context. There is no one size fits all process. Involve managers in pilots, ensure the new process enhances objectiveness and leverages managers' time.
3. Effectively roll it out :
   - *Involve line managers* to set job-related performance criteria and formalize who should be involved at each stage,
   - *Communicate why* you changed the process and *what* it will bring,
   - *Train managers*, even if the new process is simple. Show how to provide on-going, formal and informal feedback, be fair and engage their teams. The simpler the process, the more training is needed as managers will have fewer guidelines.

**** **** **** ****

Reinventing performance management

Evaluation systems often fail to engage employees and deliver improved performance, despite considerable investment in time and money

Evaluating performance is one of the core managerial tasks in today's organizations; it helps drive employee engagement and performance. But businesses devote surprisingly little time to thinking through what actually constitutes a good performance management system[2]. This is not because they are happy with their existing systems: business leaders increasingly recognize that their systems do not properly serve their business goals: they do not fully produce engagement, appropriately evaluate achievements, help design the right development plans or set fair compensation. Crucially in today's large organizations, they fail at leveraging a wider diversity of talents: in our experience, performance rating depends more on such factors as professional background, gender, and ethnicity, rather than actual performance.

In the majority of our recent client projects, most employees felt that their performance was indeed assessed subjectively and did not provide a clear view of what was expected of them. This led to reduced engagement. Employees were not the only dissatisfied stakeholders in the process: managers felt they wasted considerable time and money for unsatisfying results. CEB, a consultancy, estimated that on average, a business with 10,000 employees spends about $35 million a year assessing performance in a process that not only adds little value to their team's performance, but results in many difficult evaluation conversations.

Are formal ratings useful?

In part as a result of this frustration, there is currently a debate around performance ratings and standard annual evaluations. In the US mainly, some organizations are moving away from ratings. Deloitte for example has replaced ratings with four simple questions, such as "Given what I know of this person's performance, I would always want him or her on my team"; or "Given what I know of this person's performance and if it were my own money, would I award this person the highest pay increase and bonus?".

It is tempting to ditch old processes in favor of such a light system. It saves managers significant time and enhances their short-term satisfaction. However, it often does come with unintended consequences. Certainly, ratings are criticized for being unfair and overly dependent on the person doing the rating. But is the alternative more objective? Without a rating, how does one make – fairly, this time – the key decisions on bonuses, trainings, promotions? How do managers objectively assess the quality of the "how" and "what" someone achieved? In case of litigation, how do you justify you decided to terminate an employee due to poor performance? Importantly, some research also shows that clear and transparent performance feedback increases engagement. Where is the right balance?

In addition to moving away from ratings, some companies are also letting managers decide when and at what frequency to evaluate performance. At Gap, for example, managers are encouraged to discuss performance every month, but this is not mandatory. In some organizations, such freedom has led managers to evaluate the performance of people they like the most –often white, young males– once a month while ethnic minorities, women, elder employ-

[2] Throughout the document, to avoid often unwieldy turns of phrase, we use "evaluation" to describe performance evaluation or performance management.

ees, … are evaluated only twice a year. And obviously, no matter what system is finally selected, the job of objectively assessing someone's performance still needs to be done: it is necessary to identify the best performers that will receive higher bonuses and pay increases.

Yet objectively and effectively evaluating performance is more needed than ever

Beyond the debate about numerical ratings and annual reviews, it is clear that classic evaluation frameworks no longer can account for the increasing diversity and complexity of the talent pool. They should evolve to ensure that managers can make more objective decisions.

- Large organizations need to constantly adapt their operations to their environment, which often requires integrating new competencies and technologies. In today's era of digital transformation, hiring and integrating highly needed data scientists, specialized IT developers, etc., is often a daunting task even for the most attractive employers. Demand for such highly competent people currently exceeds their availability. The best ones might not even come from the organization's home country nor be willing to relocate where the company needs them. They often have different mindsets and work habits than current employees, including the managers who will be in charge of motivating, developing, evaluating and retaining them. Providing both employees and managers with an adapted appraisal process fostering objectiveness to bridge the cultural gaps and potential misunderstandings is a core requirement to success. Job satisfaction and delivery for such crucial employees is essential to the company's success.
- In a more uncertain world, strategic and technological options are more difficult to select, and often costlier to explore. Research shows that the ability to integrate different viewpoints significantly improves the quality of decision making under such circumstances. So does nurturing creativity and agility. Most current evaluation systems are typically geared towards selecting look-alike and think-alike individuals. They also fail to value intellectual agility and seldom reward people bringing new perspectives.
- Most systems are calibrated and tested in countries where the current core business lies. And yet, significant growth potential is often located in countries that are culturally quite different. As a result, evaluations can be open to interpretation, if not inoperative, in growth areas.

Few companies are good at evaluating – because people fail to take into account how their brain processes information and makes decisions

Hiring and retaining more diverse people, creating an inclusive and fair working environment, assessing each person's performance in a truly fact-based manner is therefore more needed than ever. Yet few organizations achieve this. Cognitive biases hamper managers' ability to truly select the best, enhance their performance on a daily basis but also objectively assess their performance and ensure the best will be promoted. This is because they overlook the workings of the most important tool that employees use to get results: their brain.

The two-system brain

Recent research in mind sciences has established that our brain operates like a computer with two processors, which Nobel laureate Daniel Kahneman describes as System 1 and System 2.

System 2 is the rational system, the one we know and control.

System 1, on the other hand, works largely automatically, without the individual being aware. It processes much more information than System 2: about 200,000 times more information, according to research. A lot of it has to do with reflexive actions such as breathing, getting the heart to beat, etc. But it also influences decision making in very concrete ways.

No matter what System 2, the rational system, perceives and thinks it decides, System 1, the automatic one, has reacted first and influenced the decision: for example, when we first meet someone or assess their reactions, System 1 associates the individual with attributes, in just a few milliseconds, without us even being aware. Such unconscious reactions will impact how we perceive someone's performance and how we rate it. The automatic workings of the mind cannot be overridden.

System 1 has a significant impact, yet most evaluation processes, even "best in class", are designed as if only our rational System 2 existed. As a result, they show limited effectiveness in reducing the widespread unwanted impact of System 1 which is systematically associating attributes – often irrelevant, sometimes damaging – to individuals.

Effectively reducing the impact of System 1 is complex, in part because we cannot stop it: we have to live with it. We constantly make mental shortcuts, interpret the information we receive by integrating our own automatic assumptions. But recent progress in understanding these mental mechanisms allows addressing these flaws and making sustainable and deep progress.

When biases and decision making processes conspire to create unexpected impacts

Decision making processes, including performance evaluation processes, can further exacerbate the unintended influence of our unconscious brain.

Some processes are too complex and generate what is known as *cognitive overload*, leading people to "revert to intuition". Others are too light and do not facilitate fact-based analysis of performance. Some simply trigger biases right from the start: starting a performance evaluation calibration meeting by providing the previous period's ratings creates an anchoring bias, which is difficult to overcome.

Small, invisible cues can sometimes also have significant consequences depending on the company's culture. We have seen that the number of words in self-appraisals can impact how managers perceive performance, in ways which are dependent on the culture: at some client organizations, a long self-appraisal unconsciously leads evaluators to believe the individual is a high performer that achieved a lot, while in others, it will indicate that he/she is a low performer needing to justify him/herself.

Thus an evaluation process which works for one company could be completely unsuited to another. Each company should start by identifying key business performance drivers and how these should be integrated in the evaluation process. But crucially they should also assess then how culture and existing processes lead to biases in how people process information in their minds and ultimately in their decision making. Only by integrating these elements can a company create an evaluation process that enables objective decision making.

There is no one-size-fits-all process. It must be adapted to the implicit culture and the operations of the company

Objectiveness and effectiveness of an evaluation process are mainly derived from the combination of:

- the corporate culture, and how it fosters openness and fairness;
- the process itself with its structure, criteria, online tools, documents and specific responsibilities assigned to decision makers.

People often equate formality and completeness with objectivity. The more complete and formal the process, goes the argument, the more objective and scientific the result. This is not always true. Highly structured decision making processes are sometimes so complex to navigate that they generate cognitive overload. Imposing externally designed competence grids and processes, which do not correspond to how people actually evaluate performance, only compounds the issue: it often leads managers to first intuitively decide what performance assessment someone deserves and then back engineer all the contents of the evaluation to justify the desired result. In other words, they can unintentionally increase biases. They are also extremely costly as managers need to allocate too much time to administer the process.

The best processes are tailored to the company's culture and business needs. Some organizations can achieve highly objective evaluations with a relatively "light" process thanks to an open culture. Others need a more structured process with more guidance provided to managers to get the same objectivity. It is therefore necessary, to foster objectiveness and enhance performance, that the evaluation process reflects the organization's specific performance drivers, culture and best fit into the organization structure.

This is all the more important for very successful companies with a strong culture. Their process need to capture the core DNA of company's performance drivers, while allowing the appropriate degree of differentiation to account for function's and business unit's idiosyncratic success factors. It should then best allow decision makers to assess those performance drivers fairly across different groups of people. While there is no standard system, there are best practice principles in system design, with proven effectiveness to generate better outcomes

Reflect actual performance, as it is, not as the grid tells you. As mentioned earlier, the best performance evaluation processes are based on performance criteria which truly reflect actual performance. Many organizations are imposing external, standard competencies grids. These often do not fit with how managers implicitly assess performance. They intuitively know what makes a difference, and are equipped to assess performance according to the job's actual performance drivers: *"on this job, what really makes a difference?"* To provide a useful and unbiased evaluation, they should also be encouraged to be curious, open and observe what people do.

Create a growth mindset. The latest neuroscience research indicates that the very fact of giving a rating creates disengagement, even for those employees who receive a positive rating. Numerical performance ratings tend to reduce people's future performance: with a rating, people feel labelled, which is generally frustrating. When people are rated average or below, this unconsciously anchors in their mind this lower ability to achieve, which undermines future performance. Research also shows that people need clear and transparent feedback to be engaged. Therefore, giving people a dynamic assessment of their performance and showing them how to grow enhances their future performance. In other words, organizations need to *create a growth mindset,* in which *feedback moves from "you have not mastered this competency and therefore you deserve a 2 rating" to "you should better master this competency, and here is how you can achieve this in the next 6 months*". Such a dynamic assessment still assesses how the employee performs, but reduces anchoring bias in management. A senior leader at a bank recently told us he gave the lowest rating to a banker on his team two years ago. Since then, this banker has significantly improved his performance. Yet, he is currently still not considered for promotion while he deserves it, and his manager supports him. All other senior executives have labelled him as a poor performer and cannot change their mindsets.

Another key element to create a growth mindset is to *provide frequent, on-going feedback, which should be both formal and informal.* Such frequent feedback can be embedded directly in the performance evaluation process, but special attention needs to be drawn to make sure that such on-going, frequent feedback is constructive and does not unduly increase stress.

Simple. To improve quality of performance assessment, organizations have quite often created sophisticated and complex performance evaluation systems. In fact, too much information i.e. many competence criteria, long and open supporting documents and guidelines, crowded performance evaluation IT screens, not only are time-consuming but also actually reduce objectiveness. For most people, the brain cannot manage more than 6 evaluation criteria at a time. Therefore, when decision makers need to navigate a framework with 10 competencies and more, they will pick the ones that support the outcome that they unconsciously prefer. Women will be more discussed for their collaborative skills and men for their leadership. Women will then be more directed to coordination and supporting roles while men will be encouraged to take leadership, line management roles. In other words, too much data kills decision making quality.

Calibrated. System 1 leads us to perceive differently the performance of two people who deliver the same results. Depending on who they are and where they come from, we will interpret differently the quality of their results: "ah yes, but he faced such a tough market environment… ". Managers should set and communicate upfront clear expectations for the job, openly and transparently update those expectations as needed. They should then work with the right level of "cold" and homogeneous facts to assess how their expectations were achieved. Such facts can serve as a base for discussion for talent reviews where several decision makers can challenge each other, thereby fostering calibrated evaluations and promoting fairness.

Homogeneous. Employees in a similar position should be homogeneously evaluated i.e. same criteria, same frequency of feedback and evaluation, including across different geographies. Most of the variation on ratings depends on the raters' and not on the performance of the ratees. Specific tools therefore should mitigate the bias in the performance perception of the evaluator, even in companies that have removed performance ratings. Such homogeneity in the process does therefore not imply that all individuals are expected to have the same strengths. It ensures that everyone's core strengths, no matter how different, are fairly captured.

Culturally neutral. Different cultures have different perceptions of performance and different ways of expressing it. In our global projects, Chinese people tend to have a more modest expression of their achievements than Americans, and certainly tend to be less assertive when communicating their performance perceptions. Especially for companies that develop themselves internationally, cultural neutrality should be a goal.

For example, at one global industrial leader where leadership is a key performance criterion, executive committee members implicitly equated it with extraversion and assertiveness. Thus Chinese managers tended to receive lower performance ratings than their Western counterparts, even more so when they reported to Western executives. We worked with that client to create a fact-based definition which allowed all leaders, no matter their culture, to best understand what was expected of them and benefit from a fair evaluation of their leadership skills: "a leader is someone who systematically improves the market position of a business he/she will be responsible for while ensuring large scale followership as measured by 360° feedbacks". Such a definition might not fit all companies, but our client's senior executives and their direct reports all accepted it, no matter where they were based or came from. As a result, Chinese high performers received praise for their leadership and were more engaged.

Reduce individual mental inferences with techniques such as the 7 steps ™: some decision making techniques can reduce individual evaluators' unconscious biases. For example, directing managers to explicitly write down performance criteria, weight them according to their importance for the job, assess the quality of the results achieved for each criterion, while hiding the name of the evaluated person – the anonymization we suggest is targeted-, enhances decision making quality.

Best fit into the organization structure. When moving to a new system, businesses should take the time to customize it to their operations and constraints. Many companies right now are thinking of emulating Deloitte and Accenture, companies which are discontinuing annual their evaluation conversations and process. In our opinion, both are right to do so. When analyzing the effectiveness of the performance evaluation process of one of the "Big 4" accounting firms, we found that the evaluations given at the end of each project were significantly more objective than annual evaluations. These were based on a synthesis of the various project performance assessments, and then reviewed during evaluation meetings by people who had no direct experience with the individual discussed. The end result was often disconnected from project managers', teams' and clients' feedbacks. But what makes sense for Deloitte or Accenture might not make sense for other companies. So it is best to first determine what process and frequency would best fit your needs, before thinking of copying new or widely "hyped" systems. Legal constraints also play a role: in some countries, formal annual performance discussions are an obligation.

Embed continuous improvements… Best-in-class companies usually update the performance process as needed, mainly by adapting to changes in the labor market or corporate strategy. Such on-going updates should ideally be limited in scope and/or depth to ensure that managers will best know how to use the updated process and trust it. Otherwise, if the system evolves too often, managers would perceive it as inconsistent, unstable, and less efficient than the informal ones they could develop by themselves.

Owned by line managers, supported by HR. Direct managers know best their team members' and peers' performance. Their ownership and trust in the system will actually drive its overall impact. Best in class processes therefore first fit with managers' skills and operational constraints and capture their buy-in.

Generally speaking, a cumbersome process with many documents and significant online work tends to reduce overall managerial buy-in and willingness to get positively involved. It results in heightened temptation to defend one's candidate and reinforces decision making biases: managers become emotionally involved instead of conducting an open and fact-based analysis. Best-in-class corporations have therefore automated fact gathering and data reporting as much as possible with user-friendly systems. This frees up managers to focus on value added tasks such as discussing actual performance.

How to get there?

Companies considering a new process should structure their approach to get beyond lengthy discussion and achieve effective results:

First, have a clear idea of why the company needs to change and what needs to be fixed

- Clearly identify what you expect from your performance evaluation process, along with the key interrelationships with other business processes – development, bonus setting,… Over time, business processes grow in complexity while some features are not needed. For example, research has shown that actual performance tends to be split on a power bell curve. Very few people have either a poor or an excellent performance. The small number of outstanding performers delivers a very high percentage of the total performance. Therefore, one objective of the performance evaluation system can be to identify and retain the outstanding performers while driving others to become outstanding performers. With a 5 ratings scale, a very high percentage of the population will be awarded ratings of 2 to 4. Therefore, investing significant time to differentiate people across those three ratings and distributing compensation across these can be a waste of resources.

- *Perform a quantitative analysis to identify issues* – non-objective processes usually impact how different social groups –including people with different professional backgrounds and skillsets – are developed and promoted inside the organization. By leveraging internal data it is possible to find out whether different genders, ethnic groups, degrees etc.. are indeed evaluated differently.
- *Analyze how burdensome the process is.* This involves getting core performance evaluation KPIs: overall time spent on the process, percentage of people who have a complete evaluation, potential differences in ratings coming from the rater himself/herself, how understand what they need to improve…
- *Identify how managers really assess performance.* Managers intuitively know what makes a high performance. They also frequently discuss their team members' performance with their bosses and peers. Real, important decisions are often implicitly made more in such discussions than within formal processes. In fact, when formal decision making processes are externally imposed to managers, they rarely apply them. Additionally, implicit criteria are often quite different from the explicit and formal ones. Such implicit criteria are often key business performance drivers which should be captured by the process. Uncovering the informal processes and understanding how decisions are actually made will allow setting a process that fits with managers' needs while giving them the tools to enhance the objectivity of the decisions they make. Such an updated process will be more effective, more natural, and better accepted.
- *Identify biases in decision making.* This is not straightforward as biases are unconscious, and sometimes unique to the organization. Checking biases off a pre-established list is not enough. Consciously trying to counter them without verifying that they exist is just as dangerous. At one of our clients, people were so convinced that they had a "pro-Harvard" bias that managers actually systematically downgraded Harvard MBA graduates. The "Harvard MBA bias rating downgrade" does not appear on usual lists of cognitive biases. To uncover specific biases, we interview decision makers; we use questions that are carefully designed to be neutral, to understand how they "automatically" think, we review individual performance evaluation files, and look whether biases can be tracked in the data. We also look at how decision-makers automatically decipher information on documents and identify what needs to be changed to allow them to enhance the quality of their decisions.

Second, focus specifically on what needs to be changed, simplify and adjust to your organization. Pilot key elements before large scale roll-out.

Over the last few weeks, several of our clients have asked us: should I discontinue ratings and annual performance reviews? Perhaps, we answer, but the real question should be: how can I best design an objective, growth oriented and effective performance evaluation process?

This will certainly require embedding core business performance drivers in performance evaluation, and enhancing fact-based, deductive reasoning, reducing inferences and unconscious biases for each and every manager. It will certainly imply closer, probably more frequent and lighter conversations with direct reports.

In such a redesign, specific attention needs to be brought to the impact of the contemplated process on unconscious biases – something that "hyped" processes often lack. Importantly, those elements of the current process that actually are effective and foster objectiveness, should be kept as is.

Special attention also needs to be brought to the selection or to the evolution of the IT system, as a poor choice can annihilate the project's impact.

Last, ensuring buy-in and support from decision makers throughout the redesign phase is a key success factor. Piloting some key elements to check how they are perceived and whether they fit the context is helpful. Setting the right project team and process, involving influencers along the way to make sure they take ownership for the updated process are other success pillars.

Third, effectively roll out the new process.

Depending on the redesign, the implementation and roll-out of the adapted process will mobilize different resources. In fact, the roll out of the updated performance process *always* requires some practical compromises. In our experience, the previous "old" habits tend to creep back and reduce impact. Best in class implementation generally includes three pillars:

- Invite line managers to contribute by setting fact based performance criteria for specific jobs within their teams. Workshops with HR and line managers, targeting key structural features, can also help identify the decisions makers that need to be involved at each stage. Workshops can also be conducted with decision makers to calibrate criteria with relevant and compelling facts.
- Communicate the need for a new process and what it will bring. Use internal social networks. Mobilize opinion leaders to accelerate change.
- Train managers to make the best use of the new process, even when it is very simple. Explain why change was important. Show managers how to be fair, objective in assessing performance and reduce decision making biases. Beyond the formal performance evaluation system, encourage managers to provide on-going, descriptive and daily feedback. Get them to exercise how to deliver growth oriented feedback and enhance day to day performance; formal weekly check and priorities setting for team members have shown positive impact. Daily nice and positive conversations too. These seem basic but are often neglected and do enhance quality of work environment and overall performance.

To know more about how to best enhance quality of performance:

Nathalie Malige, CEO Diverseo SAS

Nathalie.malige@diverseo.com

Martin Schoeller, COO, Diverseo SAS

Martin.schoeller@diverseo.com

Visit our website:
www.diverseo.com

Biography

- *Reports of the death of performance reviews are exaggerated; The measure of a man; The Economist, Schumpeter; Feb 20th 2016 | From the print edition*
- *Microsoft Abolishes Employee Evaluation System, The New York Times, By Nick Wingfied, November 13, 2013*
- *Why GE had to kill its annual performance reviews after more than three decades, Quartz, Max Nisen August 13, 2015*
- *The Push Against Performance Reviews, JULY 24, 2015, by Vauhini Vara, The NewYorker*
- *Performance Management Can Be Fixed: An On-the-Job Experiential Learning Approach for Complex Behavior Change, Elaine D. Pulakos and Rose Mueller Hanson, PDRI—A CEB Company, Arlington, Virginia; Sharon Arad, Cargill, Minneapolis, Minnesota ; Neta Moye, PDRI—A CEB Company, Arlington, Virginia; Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 8(1), pp 51–76 March 2015.*
- *Informal and Formal Performance Management: Both Are Needed. Industrial and Organizational Psychology; Robert L. Cardy, 2015.*
- *Does rater personality matter? A meta-analysis of rater Big Five–performance rating relationships; Michael B. Harari; Cort W. Rudolph and Andrew J. Laginess; Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 2015*
- *Forced Distribution Rating Systems: When Does "Rank and Yank" Lead to Adverse Impact? Gary W. Giumetti; Amber N. Schroeder; Fred S. Switzer, III; Journal of Applied Psychology, 2015*
- *The best and the rest: revisiting the norm of normality of individual performance; Ernest O'Boyle Jr, Department of Management, College of Business and Economics, Longwood University; Herman Aguinis, Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, Kelley School of Business, Indiana University; Personnel psychology 2012*
- *The Leadership Decoder; Diverseo; October 2014*

diverseo
Cognitive bias advisors

contact@diverseo.com