

LIBRARY

Department of Biodiversity,
Conservation and Attractions

This PDF has been created for digital preservation. It may be used for research but is not suitable for other purposes. It may be superseded by a more current version or just be out-of-date and have no relevance to current situations.



Employee Performance Review

'The person who makes no mistakes does not usually make anything' (E. J. Phelps)

Philosophy

It is an accepted principle of personnel management that review of staff performance should be ongoing - we all appreciate being thanked or otherwise praised for doing a task well. Likewise, although it may be disheartening at the time, we'd rather receive immediate (though not public) corrective feedback on our performance when it is unsatisfactory rather than have the matter saved up and brought to our attention months later.

Superimposed on this need for regular, informal feedback on performance is the requirement for a more formal, annual review.

The major purpose of the annual review is to provide a formal opportunity for an employee and their supervisor to review performance, plan activities, evaluate training requirements and discuss career pathways in the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC). Guideline No. 5 (Criteria Progression) is also relevant to the latter.

The process

Who appraises whom?

Appraisee	Appraiser
Director	Director General
Program Leader	Director
Scientist	Program Leader or Supervising Scientist
Technical Officer	Supervising Scientist
Clerical, Financial or other staff	Supervisor

Lead time

When an EPDP (Employee Personal Development Plan) is due, People Services Branch notifies the appraisee and supervisor.

The appraisee is expected to liaise with the appraiser(s) about a mutually convenient time for the review. It is most important that the review is conducted as close as possible to the due date.

Details about EPDP, including the forms to be completed, are available online at the following address

<http://calmweb.calm.wa.gov.au/drb/csd/hrb/training/idaps.html>

Scientists in the Division are also to complete the Science Productivity Review Framework Form and bring to the EPDP session.

The appraisee is to obtain from the Executive Assistant, Science Directorate, a list of approved Science Project Plans (SPPs) in which the appraisee is involved as scientist or technical assistant.

Appraisee's role

The appraisee will need to prepare for the EPDP session.

For the review section of the meeting the appraisee should have a copy of the goals set at the last planning meeting and should document their performance against these specific goals. This will then be discussed during the EPDP session.

For the planning section, the appraisee can identify future goals for the coming 12 months. It is important that the goals are specific and measurable.

The appraisee can complete much of the forms prior to the review. The forms can be completed electronically. The appraisee should also bring details of outstanding Annual and Long Service Leave.

Venue

The review is normally carried out at the appraisee's research centre. It is important that the review is conducted in quiet surroundings, free from any interruptions for about 60 - 90 minutes. Completed documents can be open on the computer so that they can be worked on during the EPDP session.

The EPDP session

The review is confidential between the appraisee and appraiser(s). The Directorate Executive Assistant, the Program Leader, the Director of Science Division, and the Manager People Services Branch are the only staff with authorized access to the completed form.

The review is meant to be a frank, relaxed, non-judgmental and helpful exchange of information about the appraisee's performance during the previous 12 months. It provides the opportunity for the appraiser and appraisee to discuss what they expect from each other and how well those expectations are being met. It is not intended to be an exercise in fault finding. Discussion of sensitive issues should focus on the deficiency, not on the person. Both strengths and weaknesses of the appraisee should be discussed free from bias and prejudice. Ideally the appraisee should depart from the review with positive feelings about the appraiser, the review, their role and themselves.

It should be noted that outstanding performance refers to:

- Work completed with less guidance/assistance than the agreed standard.
- Tasks completed at a higher level (unless specified in the JDF).
- Tasks completed before the deadline set.

- Achievements of a higher quality or quantity than expected.

If performance is not considered satisfactory, this should be discussed in relation to specific aspects of the job. The supervisor should clearly identify specific and mutually agreed upon actions to improve performance, so that their attainment can be assessed at the next review, which may be earlier than the formal 12 monthly review. We should recognize that although past behaviour cannot be changed, future performance can.

The Development and Learning component is an opportunity to identify any specific training required to enhance performance. Note that costs associated with training will be met from project budgets.

The Career Aspirations section is intended to encourage the appraisee to reflect on what they expect to be doing in DEC in the future. Goals must relate to career development only and should not reflect poor performance.

Supervisor and employee are both required to sign the completed EPDP form. The Science Division cover sheet should also be signed. The appraisee will make a copy of the Planning Forms for bring up at the next EPDP session. All EPDP pages plus the Science Division cover sheet, and the Science Productivity Review Framework Form (if applicable) are forwarded to the Science Directorate Executive Assistant for the Director's endorsement. The Science Directorate Executive Assistant will then forward the original EPDP to People Services Branch to place on the relevant personal file.

It is a breach of DEC Policy ([Circular 9/1989](#)) and Public Sector Standards (Human Resources Standard on Performance Management 4.6) if completed review documents are not forwarded under confidential cover. This means that sending these papers in an unmarked envelope or not in an envelope puts staff and DEC at risk of failing to comply with the confidentiality requirement.

The controlled version of this document is on the DEC web. Previously printed versions of this document may not be current. This document was last amended in August 2009 and can be located at the following URL address:

<http://calmweb.calm.wa.gov.au/drb/science/docs/guidelines/>

Science Division



Department of
Environment and Conservation

Our environment, our future



EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

(EPDP) REVIEW AND/OR PLANNING – 2009

Officer's Name:

Signature:Date2009

Supervisor/ Program
Leader's Signature:Date2009

Director's Signature Date 2009

Meeting date recorded in database

Directorate Office:Date2009



Guideline 3 – Scientist Productivity Review Framework

NAME HERE.....

OUTPUTS for the periodto.....								
SCIENCE <i>What did we learn?</i>			COMMUNICATION <i>Who did we tell?</i>			KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER <i>What difference did it make?</i>		
Type	Purpose	Achievements months	Type	Purpose	Achievements (list)	Type	Purpose	Achievements (list)
SPP	Ensures projects are properly planned, approved and implemented. <i>Timing: SPP prepared prior to project starting.</i> <i>Expectation: See Staff Guideline #17</i>	(list new SPPs)	Media interviews (radio/TV/print)	Communicates research findings to wider community. <i>Expectation: Minimum of 1 in 5 years.</i>		Advice (e.g. EIA) (verbal)	Promotes best practice by DEC <i>Expectation: Ongoing, as & when necessary.</i>	
Data collection and reporting	Ensures project data (incl. data quality statements) are accessible, archived, registered on the Division's meta-database and easily retrievable for alternative and future uses. <i>Timing: within 3-6 months of data collection ending.</i> <i>Expectation: For all approved SPPs</i>	(list databases)	Pamphlets / Information sheets/ Newsletters etc	Communicates research findings to key internal and external stakeholders and wider community. <i>Expectation: Minimum of 2 in 5 years.</i>		Advice (e.g. EIA) (written)	Promotes best practice by DEC. <i>Expectation: Ongoing, as & when necessary.</i>	
Technical report	Ensures timely delivery of research findings and policy/planning/management implications for departmental purposes. <i>Timing: within 12 months of data collection ending.</i> <i>Expectation: Variable, depending on nature of research</i>	(list reports/guidelines etc)	Briefings / formal discussions etc (verbal)	Communicates research findings to key stakeholders <i>Expectation: Minimum of 1 per year.</i>		Planning/ Management guideline (contributing author)	Promotes best practice approach to species and protected area management	
Conference paper	Ensures accessibility and longevity of research findings to wider scientific community; promotes professional networks etc	(list)	Web-based communications	Electronic communication of research findings to wider community <i>Expectation: Minimum of 1 per</i>		Planning/ Management guideline (primary author)	Promotes science-based approach to species and protected area management <i>Expectation:</i>	

OUTPUTS for the periodto.....								
	Timing: as appropriate. Expectation: Minimum of 2 over 5 years			year			Minimum of 1 per 5 years.	
SCIENCE What did we learn?			COMMUNICATION Who did we tell?			KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER What difference did it make?		
Type	Purpose	Achievements months	Type	Purpose	Achievements (list)	Type	Purpose	Achievements (list)
Journal paper	Ensures accessibility and longevity of research findings to wider scientific community; promotes DEC science capability; reinforces science-based approach of DEC's conservation programs Timing: within 3 years of data collection ending. Expectation: Minimum of 10 over a 5 year period	(List)	Popular article (e.g. Landscape)	Communicates science findings to wider community Expectation: Minimum of 2 over a 5 year period.		Species and Protected Area management plans (contributing author)	Ensures science-based approach to conservation planning Expectation: On-going, as & when necessary.	
Book chapter	Contribution to 'big picture' science Timing: as appropriate. Expectation: Minimum of 1 over a 5 year period	(List)	Milestone reports/final reports etc	Communicates progress to external funding agencies Expectation: For all externally funded projects.		Species¹ and Protected Area management plans (primary author)	Ensures science-based approach to conservation planning Expectation: On-going, as & when necessary.	
Major review	Major update and summary of existing knowledge Timing: as appropriate. Expectation: Minimum of 1 over a 10 year period	(list)	Conference / seminar / lecture/ workshop abstract and presentation / poster/ formal field days	Communicates science findings to scientific community / stakeholders Expectation: Minimum of 5 over a 5 year period		Policy/strategy statement (contributing author)	Ensures science-based approach to policy/strategy development in DEC. Expectation: On-going, as & when necessary.	
Book	Major contribution of new scientific knowledge Timing: as appropriate. Expectation: Not expected but encouraged	(list)				Policy/strategy statement (primary author)	Ensures science-based approach to policy/strategy development in DEC. Expectation: On-going, as & when necessary.	