

Council Review of Self-Appraisal System

Background information

In December 2006 Council agreed a revised competency based appraisal system. It was also agreed that the new system should be piloted and evaluated to review its effectiveness.

All Council members undertook the self-appraisal between April and September 2007 and had either a meeting with the President or a telephone conversation. All members completed and signed their appraisal forms.

In July 2007 Council considered a paper which set out a summary of the themes which had emerged from an analysis of members' views and experiences as detailed in the forms.

Feedback regarding members' experience of the new system was also sought and has been divided into the following headings;

1. How easy was the form to complete?
2. Did you find the ratings scale easy to follow?
3. In your opinion were all the competencies/questions relevant?
4. Were there any other competencies/questions you would like to have seen included?
5. Do you think that this is an appropriate way of measuring your performance?
6. Do you think that this is an appropriate way of measuring performance of the President?
7. Do you have any comments regarding the general layout of the form?
8. Any other comments?

Summary of Feedback

The majority of council members found the feedback form easy to complete, and believed it was a helpful process for reflecting on their performance. A useful addition, as suggested by a number of members, would be a comments box/section, where they could expand on their competency ratings.

Another suggestion which came from a couple of members was that the form could be supplemented with opportunities for discussion, particularly in relation to the president's performance. Two members suggested that HPC staff could also provide feedback on the council's performance.

While five people found the ratings scale easy to follow, this was the most controversial part of the self assessment, with a number of members stating that it was difficult to know what to measure themselves against. It was felt by some that the ratings members gave themselves would be subjective and would not provide consistent results.

Question	Assessment		Comments
1. How easy was the form to complete?	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Not easy</i>	Perhaps too easy (easy to fill out without giving much thought?) Easy, but not entirely sure about its effectiveness
	18	1	
2. Did you find the ratings scale easy to follow?	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	Five people mentioned the subjectivity of self assessment ratings Hard to decide on ones own level (never feel good enough) Don't feel confident about self ratings Ratings rather arbitrary and difficult to assess with any degree of objectivity Never found ratings of competencies helpful Limiting – conversation around competencies more important than ratings themselves Ratings will vary from person to person and are perhaps of limited value 5 points rating helpful. Difficult to know what we are measuring ourselves against
	5	6	

			Ratings are subject to individual interpretations
3. In your opinion were all the competencies/questions relevant?	Yes	No	Three people commented that some competencies were not as relevant for alternates The competency relating to ETC standards a little dated/difficult to follow Competencies might require adjusting
	5	3	
4. Were there any other competencies/questions you would like to have seen included?	Yes	No	Add “representation of HPC to other bodies” under president’s competencies Could cover listening events
	2	2	
5. Do you think that this is an appropriate way of measuring your performance?	Yes	No	Nine people mentioned that it was a useful/helpful process for reflection on their performance Introductory – also need dialogue at appraisal
	9	1	
6. Do you think that this is an appropriate way of measuring the performance of the President?	Yes	No	Appropriate but limited A suggestions/comments section on the president would be helpful, as may be more useful than the competency framework
	2	1	
7. Do you have any comments regarding the general layout of the form?	Six people commented on the need for comment box/section, in order to expand on competency ratings Older style [form] useful in the beginning as it encouraged members to write in more depth Three people commented that the form was an improvement on previous years		
8. Any other comments?	Two people suggested it might be useful to have HPC staff provide feedback on council performance Support for involving council members in CEO appraisal process next year Need to make clear distinction between appraisal and opportunity to discuss issues of importance to the development of HPC Happy with the self assessment process and ratings		