

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL**

**HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Draft**

**For Approval**

**17<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2009**

**Report of:** Service Director: Strategic HR & Workforce Strategy

**Title:** PMDS Scores 2008-09

**Ward:** Citywide

**Officer Presenting Report:** Sue Grist (HR Adviser)

**Contact Telephone Number:** (0117 92) 22225

**RECOMMENDATION**

This report is submitted to this Committee for its information and observation.

**Summary**

The Performance Management and Development Scheme is an important component in delivering lasting improvement and improving the performance of the authority. A summary of the PMDS scores for the year ending 31 March 2009 is attached at Appendix A.

**The significant issues in the report are:**

This report focuses on two key issues:

- (i) the level/percentage of PMDS appraisals undertaken within Bristol City Council, and
- (ii) the follow-up actions taken to address poor performance

Any outstanding PMDS appraisals/actions are being chased by the relevant HR Business Partner.

## **1. Policy**

- 1.1 The Performance Management and Development Scheme is the City Council's approach to planning, monitoring, reviewing and improving the performance of people throughout the organisation.
- 1.2 The scheme includes:
  - an individual performance plan agreed between the jobholder and manager(s) of the process. This contains key objectives and performance measures for the following 12 months. Progress is reviewed at least twice during the year. Overall performance is jointly reviewed at the end of the 12-month period and the jobholder's performance is given an overall rating of 1,2,3,4 or 5.
  - an agreed personal development plan to support the delivery of key objectives, which includes any training needs identified for the manager or employee concerned.
- 1.3 PMDS data will form part of the Council's performance management review and report submitted to the CAA inspection (Use of Resources) next year. The Deputy Chief Executive and the Service Director: Strategic HR, are also comparing and contrasting organisational and employee poor performance, as part of ongoing "Directorate health checks", to see the extent to which there is (or should be) a correlation between them.
- 1.4 An extract from the Performance Management (Framework) Policy, concerning action to be taken where staff/management appraisals are below the required standard of 3, is attached as Appendix C.

## **2. Consultation**

### **2.1 Internal**

The proposal set out in this report has not been the subject of trade union consultation. The formal PMDS report is being considered by SLT on 8th December 2009.

## 2.2 External

Not applicable.

## 3. Context

- 3.1 The decision was taken by the Chief Executive in July 2008 that all individual PMDS scores for the year ending 31 March 2008 onwards would be input into the HR system (Vision). This has been delayed owing to other e-development priorities, and work associated with the establishment of new systems/structures for the STS (HR).
- 3.2 Systems developments to allow this work to be done by line managers through manager access to the HR Vision System was not completed in time, therefore a manual exercise was undertaken to collect these scores through nominated directorate "Champions". Inevitably there have been moves of staff within and across directorates since the start of this exercise, as stated below.
- 3.3 A summary of the PMDS scores for 2008/09 for each directorate is shown at Appendix A, together with a comparison against 2007/08
- 3.4 Appendix A shows that:-
- 89.63% of all employees eligible for a PMDS review have been scored. This compares with 87.06% of eligible employees in 2007/08.
  - 1.69% of employees were awarded a score of 1 or 2. This compares with 2.66% of employees in 2007/08.
  - 87.95% of employees were awarded a score of 3 or above. This compares with 84.4% of employees in 2007/08.
- 3.4 This data does not include information for employees within locally managed schools, who are not subject to the Council's PMDS appraisal process. Employees were unable to be awarded a score due a number of valid reasons eg. new employee, on maternity leave, long term sick or long term sickness of manager, employed under alternative employment arrangements (eg. Teachers' Pay & Conditions) are also not included.
- 3.5 Work has been undertaken to check the level of compliance across the Council against:-
- a) target of 90% completion of PMDS reviews council wide. This has been undertaken by cross checking PMDS data against the HR

system (Vision) (see Appendix A).

- b) target of achieving 100% formal action council wide for all employees with a score of 1 or 2. This is being undertaken in conjunction with HR Business Partners (see Appendix B).

3.6 From this 'audit' it can be seen that:-

- a) As at 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009 the Council wide level of compliance is 89.6%. These results show that there are some work groups in the Council where PMDS has not yet been embedded. These are:
  - Health & Social Care (Older People's Services) 68.2%
  - Neighbourhoods (Development Unit) 39.7%
  - Transformation 18.1%
- b) As at 25th November 2009, appropriate action has been taken in 88% of cases where an employee has scored 1 or 2. (Appendix B). The main problem area is in City Development. The Strategic Director (City Development) is following this up, to ensure compliance with the Performance Management Framework Policy.

3.7 The HR Business Partner for the directorates concerned have followed up all remaining outstanding appraisal scores. Similarly, HR are ensuring that all employees awarded a score of 1 have been given a warning under the Improving Performance Procedure and those awarded a score of 2 have been issued with a formal / written Performance Improvement Plan.

## **4. Proposal**

- 4.1 This report is submitted to this Committee, in response to Members' requests that they receive details of the PMDS application on an annual basis.

## **5. Other Options Considered**

- 5.1 Not applicable.

## **6. Risk Assessment**

6.1 Not applicable.

## **7. Equalities Impact Assessment**

7.1 Not applicable.

## **Legal and Resource Implications**

**Legal** Not sought.

### **Financial**

**(a) Revenue:** Not applicable.

**(b) Capital:** Not applicable.

**Land** Not applicable.

### **Personnel**

As set out in paragraphs 3.1 - 3.7 above.

## **Appendices**

Appendix A PMDS Scores 2008-09 by Directorate

Appendix B PMDS Scores of 1 and 2 by Directorate

Appendix C Extract from Performance Management (Framework) Policy regarding PMDS appraisal scores.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985 Background Papers:**

None

## Appendix (6) A

Department / Division	Eligible Headcount 30/09/09	Total Scores	1s	2s	3s	4s	5s	Totals
<b>City Development</b>								
City Development	52	52	0.00%	0.00%	34.62%	63.46%	1.92%	100.00%
Economic & Cultural Development	571	570	0.00%	0.00%	57.62%	40.81%	1.40%	99.82%
Major Projects	93	93	0.00%	0.00%	61.29%	35.48%	3.23%	100.00%
Planning & Sustainable Development	130	130	0.00%	1.54%	45.38%	51.54%	1.54%	100.00%
Transport	290	289	0.00%	2.41%	57.24%	37.59%	2.41%	99.66%
<b>CD TOTAL</b>	<b>1136</b>	<b>1134</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.79%</b>	<b>55.37%</b>	<b>41.81%</b>	<b>1.85%</b>	<b>99.82%</b>
<b>Children Young People &amp; Skills</b>								
Inclusive & Learning Communities	257	250	0.00%	1.95%	52.53%	41.25%	1.56%	97.28%
Learning Achievement & Schools	259	253	0.37%	0.73%	30.77%	55.31%	5.49%	92.67%
Performance, Policy & Partnerships	38	21	0.00%	2.63%	13.16%	31.58%	7.89%	55.26%
Safeguarding & Specialist Services	701	701	0.14%	0.43%	56.55%	39.17%	3.56%	99.86%
<b>CYPS TOTAL (not including schools)</b>	<b>1255</b>	<b>1225</b>	<b>0.16%</b>	<b>0.87%</b>	<b>48.90%</b>	<b>42.83%</b>	<b>3.70%</b>	<b>96.46%</b>
<b>Deputy Chief Executive's</b>								
Communications & Marketing	22	22	0.00%	0.00%	13.64%	81.82%	4.55%	100.00%
Strategy & Performance	32	32	0.00%	0.00%	13.79%	75.86%	3.45%	93.10%
<b>DCX TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>12.96%</b>	<b>83.33%</b>	<b>3.70%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Health &amp; Social Care</b>								
Older People Services	261	178	0.00%	0.77%	38.31%	25.29%	3.83%	68.20%
Mental Health, Learning Difficulties & Disabled People	91	72	0.00%	2.20%	53.85%	20.88%	2.20%	79.12%
Care Services	1681	1230	0.00%	1.67%	57.29%	13.98%	0.24%	73.17%
Putting People First	96	80	0.00%	4.17%	35.42%	42.71%	1.04%	83.33%
<b>H&amp;SC TOTAL</b>	<b>2134</b>	<b>1560</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>1.69%</b>	<b>53.70%</b>	<b>16.92%</b>	<b>0.80%</b>	<b>73.10%</b>
<b>Neighbourhoods</b>								
Neighbourhoods Development Unit	68	27	0.00%	0.00%	20.59%	19.12%	0.00%	39.71%
Environmental & Leisure Services	422	392	0.00%	2.37%	56.16%	30.81%	3.55%	92.89%
Landlord Services	768	760	0.00%	2.34%	69.53%	26.30%	0.78%	98.96%
Safer Bristol	186	185	0.00%	4.30%	43.01%	50.00%	2.15%	99.46%
Strategic Housing	371	360	0.27%	4.31%	47.17%	41.24%	4.04%	97.04%
<b>NEIGHBOURHOOD TOTAL</b>	<b>1815</b>	<b>1724</b>	<b>0.06%</b>	<b>2.87%</b>	<b>57.30%</b>	<b>32.56%</b>	<b>2.20%</b>	<b>94.99%</b>
<b>Resources</b>								
Finance	272	266	0.37%	1.10%	46.69%	44.49%	5.15%	97.79%
Legal Services	180	177	0.00%	2.22%	44.44%	42.78%	8.89%	98.33%
Strategic HR & Workforce Strategy	178	178	0.56%	0.56%	47.19%	50.56%	1.12%	100.00%
<b>RESOURCE TOTAL</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>0.32%</b>	<b>1.27%</b>	<b>46.19%</b>	<b>45.71%</b>	<b>5.08%</b>	<b>98.57%</b>
<b>Transformation</b>								
Transformation	11	2	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	18.18%
Integrated Customer Services	257	256	0.00%	1.56%	45.91%	47.86%	4.28%	99.61%
Information Communications & Technology	172	171	0.58%	1.16%	52.33%	34.88%	10.47%	99.42%
Portfolio Programmes & Projects	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Shared Transactional Services	179	117	0.00%	0.56%	45.25%	19.55%	0.00%	65.36%
<b>TRANSFORMATION TOTAL</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>0.16%</b>	<b>1.13%</b>	<b>46.85%</b>	<b>35.38%</b>	<b>4.68%</b>	<b>88.21%</b>
<b>COUNCIL WIDE TOTAL 2008/09</b>	<b>7643</b>	<b>6864</b>	<b>0.08%</b>	<b>1.61%</b>	<b>52.55%</b>	<b>32.95%</b>	<b>2.45%</b>	<b>89.63%</b>
<b>COUNCIL WIDE TOTAL 2007/08</b>			<b>0.06%</b>	<b>2.60%</b>	<b>56.67%</b>	<b>25.77%</b>	<b>1.96%</b>	<b>87.06%</b>

	Awaiting medical advice / employee off sick	Employee left / dismissed	Employee suspended	Improvement plan in place / employee being monitored	Resolved	Score changed / appealed	Unknown	Total
<b>City Development</b>								
Score 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Score 2	0	0	0	4	1	0	4	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Children Young People &amp; Skills</b>								
Score 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Score 2	1	1	0	9	0	1	0	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Deputy Chief Executive's</b>								
Score 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Score 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Health &amp; Social Care</b>								
Score 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Score 2	7	3	0	7	6	9	4	36
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Neighbourhoods</b>								
Score 1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Score 2	1	4	1	12	10	3	4	35
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Resources</b>								
Score 1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Score 2	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Transformation</b>								
Score 1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Score 2	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>COUNCIL WIDE TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>COUNCIL WIDE TOTAL %</b>	<b>9.26%</b>	<b>9.26%</b>	<b>0.93%</b>	<b>40.74%</b>	<b>15.74%</b>	<b>12.04%</b>	<b>12.04%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

### **Tackling Poor Performance**

The following section (5) from the Performance Management (Framework) Policy outlines the action to be taken where staff/management appraisals are below the required standard of 3.

#### **5. Tackling Poor Performance**

5.1 The Improving Performance Procedure is a practical guide to supporting poor performing employees in reaching required standards of performance, and making fair dismissals on grounds of capability when performance fails to improve. Poor performance is defined as less than satisfactory performance against performance objectives, behavioural competencies and attitudes.

5.2 Regular 'one to one' meetings between manager and employee are an important performance management process that will ensure close communication between both parties and enable ongoing assessment and review of performance.

5.3 Where a manager has a concern about an individual's performance he/she should raise that with the member of staff as soon as any concerns are identified and refer to the improving performance procedure. Managers must not wait until formal PMDS reviews to address concerns around performance.

5.4 Similarly, where performance is appraised as being less than satisfactory during the formal PMDS reviews the improving performance procedure must be used, if it has not been invoked already.

5.5 An overall PMDS appraisal score (from 1 to 5) is assessed by the manager taking into account an employee's performance over the year and the individual scores that they assessed against each individual key performance criteria (refer to section 6 for full details).

Where an overall PMDS appraisal score of 2 or 1 is awarded for performance, action should be taken as follows: -

i) Score of 2: an individual employee performance improvement plan should be drawn up, discussed with, and issued to the employee (refer to Improving



## Performance Procedure)

ii) Score of 1: formal action should be taken, which if the poor performance is serious, could lead to dismissal (refer to Improving Performance Procedure)

Where a PMDS score of 3 is recorded, the employee's overall performance is deemed as being "satisfactory". However, there may be some elements of the employee's performance that require improvement, and the manager will score the relevant key performance criteria as a 2 or 1 as appropriate. Performance against these individual criteria should be addressed in discussion with the employee and recorded as part of the PMDS outcome.

5.6 A performance improvement plan should include the following: -

- Identification of the under performance and standards required
- The time period set for the requisite improvements to be achieved
- Confirmation of any additional training or support required by the employee