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STATE OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
and Implications for Pay for Performance

Findings and Observations from Three Key Studies
Focus of Our Webinar

**This webinar will provide an overview of:**

- Compelling data on perceptions from HR professional and line managers about performance management and pay for performance (P4P).

**The data is from three sources:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Performance Management 2010</th>
<th>Sibson’s Real Pay for Performance Study</th>
<th>Performance Management Pulse Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>conducted with</em> WorldatWork</td>
<td><em>SIBSON CONSULTING</em></td>
<td><em>conducted with</em> leadershippulse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**We will also describe:**

- Steps your organization can take to improve the effectiveness of its performance management processes
- Issues and best practices in performance management and implications for P4P
Information on the Studies

State of Performance Management Survey
- Conducted jointly by WorldatWork and Sibson Consulting in May/June 2010
- Surveys sent electronically to WorldatWork members, and 750 responses were received, primarily from senior-level HR professionals

Leadership Pulse Survey
- An online survey among line managers to understand their view of performance management and relationship to pay in their companies
- Received 470 responses from senior leaders in diverse industries

Pay for Performance Study
- Conducted an online survey of 130 companies and detailed interviews with 30 participants to gain input on best practices in pay for performance linkage
- Study conducted between March 2010 and July 2010
Some Form of Performance Management Exists in Most Organizations

Does your organization have a formal performance management program?

- Yes 91%
- No 9%

Simply stated, the PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT process includes:

- setting expectations,
- evaluating results,
- providing feedback,
- conducting formal or informal discussions,
- communicating the evaluation and link to rewards

Source: 2010 State of Performance Management Study
The Top 3 Desired Outcomes for Performance Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 desired results of the performance management program</th>
<th>% Selecting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated distribution of rewards based on individual performance</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater individual accountability</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent development</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 State of Performance Management Study
Assessments Indicate Programs May Not be Making the Grade on these Goals

Overall, what letter grade would you give your organization’s performance management program’s ability to achieve the desired results?

- “F” 1%
- “D” 8%
- “C” 49%
- “B” 40%
- “A” 3%

Is a “C+” sufficient? What would be different if you had a B or better?

Source: 2010 State of Performance Management Study
Sense of Trust and Effectiveness Mixed

Employees have a sense of trust in the performance management program.

- Strongly Disagree: 3%
- Disagree: 28%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 38%
- Agree: 28%
- Strongly Agree: 2%

Performance management has helped the organization to achieve strategic objectives.

- Strongly Disagree: 1%
- Disagree: 14%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 39%
- Agree: 42%
- Strongly Agree: 5%

Source: 2010 State of Performance Management Study
And Business Leaders Agree with this Assessment

The way my company links pay with performance is fair and effective for all employees

- Strongly Disagree: 5%
- Disagree: 13%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 21%
- Agree: 34%
- Strongly Agree: 24%

The overall performance management process at our company (setting expectations, evaluating performance, providing feedback, using formal or informal performance appraisals) helps our organization achieve positive business results.

- Strongly Disagree: 5%
- Disagree: 13%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 21%
- Agree: 48%
- Strongly Agree: 14%

Source: Sibson/Leadership Pulse Survey 2010
Leaders Cite the Following Key Issues in Performance Management Processes

“Forced rankings and highly structured formulas which must be followed to the letter and allow little/no room for judgement.”

“Secret processes causing uninformed employees to feel disgruntled, often due to ignorance and assumptions, rather than actual injustice.”

“Incentive goals that aren’t calibrated well for difficulty so some receive bonuses for doing their daily job while others have stretch goals.”

“Failure to hold people responsible and accountable for their own performance.”

“Conflict-avoiding behaviours that lead to not giving feedback to people or dealing with poorer performers.”

“Rewards for just the ‘what’ at the expense of the ‘how.’”

“Poor quality, ambiguous goal-setting and the tendency to then manipulate goals to reduce or increase performance ratings.”

“When pay for performance becomes an expectation.”

Source: Sibson/Leadership Pulse Survey 2010
Survey Results Confirm these Key Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 4 challenges of the performance management program</th>
<th>% Selecting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers lack the courage to have difficult performance discussions with employees</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewed as an “HR process” instead of business-critical</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor goal setting</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards not linked to performance</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 State of Performance Management Study
So How Do We Improve Performance Management?

The foundation: fundamentals, but not drivers of effective results

Key success criteria

Critical for Sustainable Impact

Improved Organization Results

Frequent Performance Conversations

Leadership Champions

Differentiated Individual Outcomes

Business Critical Goal Alignment

Technology Enablers

Business Process Design

The foundation: fundamentals, but not drivers of effective results
It’s Not About the Number of Ratings

- 5 performance categories most prevalent, but other options can work
- Clear definitions and calibration on their meaning are a key to success
Or the Timing of the Performance Review

- Timing of performance review varies
- Ensure quick alignment with outcomes and calibration on ratings

- Prior to the end of the fiscal year: 11%
- Within one month of the end of the fiscal year: 23%
- Within two months of the end of the fiscal year: 37%
- Employee anniversary date: 12%
- Other, please specify: 18%
It’s About Ensuring Trust Among Employees and Managers

Visibility of ratings and pay actions is driven through calibration among peer managers to improve transparency and reinforce expected standards.

**Low Visibility**
- Old Assumption: Performance Management and Pay is between Manager and Employee
- New Assumption: These decisions are too important to be made individually without visibility

**High Visibility Calibration**
- Manager
- Employee
- Leader
- Peer Manager

SIBSON CONSULTING
Acknowledge Performance Differences

- Trend is away from a “forced” distribution
- Trend is towards a target distribution linked to organizational performance
- More organizations using calibration or audits to make actual ratings visible

**EXAMPLE**

**TARGET RATINGS DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1 LOW</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTUAL RATINGS DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1 LOW</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 2010 Real Pay For Performance Study
“Best Results” organizations are able to realize more differentiation and have a better understanding of how much pay differentiation is achieved for high performers, particularly with annual incentive plans.

### Greater Merit Award
(Last Performance Cycle)
High Performers vs. Average Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Other Companies</th>
<th>Best Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%–2%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% or More</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Greater Annual Incentive Payout
(Last Performance Cycle)
High Performers vs. Average Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All Other Companies</th>
<th>Best Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x or More</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Real Pay For Performance Study
Provide Metrics to Track Pay for Performance

METRICS USED TO TRACK PAY FOR PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS

- Do Not Use Metrics: 30% (All Other Companies) 19% (Best Results)
- Base Pay Increase Distribution by Rating: 61% (All Other Companies) 74% (Best Results)
- Annual Incentive Distribution by Rating: 31% (All Other Companies) 59% (Best Results)
- Long Term Incentives by Rating: 9% (All Other Companies) 26% (Best Results)

Participant Quotes

“We use metrics that are made public to leaders to help track our effectiveness on pay for performance execution.”

“We used to not track much of anything, now we track it and make it visible. It holds leaders accountable to make the right decisions.”

Source: 2010 Real Pay For Performance Study
Viewing PM as Business Critical Also Drives Better Outcomes

Please rate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

Managers focus on having effective performance conversations and not just on completing the forms.

- Strongly viewed as Business-Critical: 5% Strongly Disagree, 9% Disagree, 6% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 32% Agree, 48% Strongly Agree
- Strongly viewed as only Administrative Process: 29% Strongly Disagree, 14% Disagree, 43% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 14% Agree

High performers receive significantly differentiated pay increases from average performers.

- Strongly viewed as Business-Critical: 11% Strongly Disagree, 11% Disagree, 12% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 30% Agree, 36% Strongly Agree
- Strongly viewed as only Administrative Process: 43% Strongly Disagree, 29% Disagree, 29% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 29% Agree
As Do Aligned Goals and Acknowledgement of Performance Differences

What you can do:
• Improve visibility of goal setting, have goals documented and transparent.

Participant Quotes
“Company and division goals are published on our intranet so that all employees have a guide when setting their individual goals.”

“Our management team develops their goals first and shares them with each of their direct reports. That continues with all supervisors expecting to share their goals with their direct reports.”

Source: 2010 Pay For Performance Study
Align Goals Across the Organization

Individual goal and priority setting must be done in light of company and unit goals and priorities and with cross-unit alignment.

- **CEO and Executive Team**
  - Sets Company and Executive Goals; Reviews Unit Goals

- **Business Units**
  - Cascade corporate goals into mid-managers and BU objectives
  - Align goals across functional units

- **INDIVIDUALS/MANAGERS**
  - Employee goals and priorities linked to unit goals
  - Expectations clear on “what” to achieve (results)
  - Goals and objectives visible to others

Downward and Lateral Cascade and Alignment
Define the Link to Pay to Performance—
*Differs by Organization, Must Reinforce Desired Culture*

**What are some of the ways it works?**

1. Low base, high variable driven by individual success against goals
2. Mostly base, but base pay varies a good deal by performance, modest bonus driven by company, division, or unit results
3. Base ties to market, variable is main reward for individual performance, everyone gets options
4. Base varies with individual performance, group gain-sharing bonus
5. Large advance-from-within organization promotions are the main reward for performance

**Participant Quotes**

“We usually only have about 5% of our population identified as high performers so there is no debate with paying them more.”

“Our merit has been small but top performers get 2 or 3 times the average performers.”

“We use merit as ‘market’ and differentiate mainly with bonus.”

**What you can do:**
- Make the desired approach clear and transparent
- Reward achievement of critical success factors (both what and how)
- Measure and report on pay for performance alignment

Source: 2010 Real Pay For Performance Study
Make Promotions Prominent

- Promotions should not be an entitlement, i.e., for years in a position or level
- Promotion is often seen as the biggest reward for performance
- Promotions are not only a huge reward, they send a message about who and what is valued

Participant Quotes

“Everyone understands that the biggest reward is a promotion, so we manage them like we do other rewards by having criteria and approval processes.”

What can you do:
- Budget and report on promotions like other aspects of pay
- Make part of talent reviews or calibration
- Require multiple levels of approval
Differentiate Based on Performance, While Managing To A Merit Budget

Stay Within Budget By Flexing Payouts According to Ratings Distributions

- Managers will tend to rate high if they think they can get their people more money—adjusting the merit increase targets based on performance distributions avoids this gaming.
- A modest change in merit increases relative to the performance distribution maintains the desired budget.

**ACTUAL AND EXPECTED PERFORMANCE RATING DISTRIBUTION BY SALARY INCREASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Performance Distribution</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Merit Increase</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Performance Distribution</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Salary Increase</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensure that Leaders Champion Performance Management, and Value of the Program Will Increase

Please rate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

Performance management has helped the organization to achieve strategic objectives.

- President/CEO is champion: 9% Strongly Disagree, 15% Disagree, 35% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 47% Agree, 8% Strongly Agree
- President/CEO is NOT champion: 2% Strongly Disagree, 19% Disagree, 40% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 40% Agree, 3% Strongly Agree

Employees have a sense of trust in the performance management program.

- President/CEO is champion: 3% Strongly Disagree, 19% Disagree, 37% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 37% Agree, 4% Strongly Agree
- President/CEO is NOT champion: 3% Strongly Disagree, 31% Disagree, 39% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 25% Agree, 2% Strongly Agree

2010 State of Performance Management Study
Top Performing Companies are More Likely to Have Support of Senior Management in the PM Process

Please rate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements.

**TOP BOTTOM QUARTILE OF 3 YEAR TOTAL RETURN TO SHAREHOLDERS**

Senior management in the organization publicly supports the performance management process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top Quartile</th>
<th>Bottom Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senior management in the organization privately supports the performance management process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top Quartile</th>
<th>Bottom Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart above illustrates the percentage distribution of responses across the top and bottom quartiles for two statements regarding the support of senior management in the performance management process. The responses range from Strongly Disagree (0%) to Strongly Agree (100%).
Leadership Support is the Catalyst for Real Pay for Performance

**Leadership Support** is the #1 factor that enables an effective pay for performance culture

86%  
74%  
68%

Leadership Support  Processes to Differentiate Performance  Processes to Deliver Pay to High Performers

**Participant Quotes**

“Our CEO has personal interest in performance evaluations. He does not hesitate to push back on pay arrangements if they do not reflect performance levels. This drives our senior managers to be directly involved with pay differentiation.”

“Our President does not encourage pay for performance, therefore, it doesn’t happen.”

**What you can do:**

- Help leaders get it right for their own group: goal setting, evaluation, and differentiating rewards
- It does not start well in the middle, but does cascade down

2010 Real Pay for Performance Study
Focus on Conversations
Improve Managerial Courage

Remember the greatest challenge

➤ 63% cited managerial courage

Yet—

➤ Managers know who their best and worst performers are, and

➤ Many managers naturally want to give direction and feedback

➤ So, what gets in the way?
  • The difficulty of bad news
  • The difficulty of good news

What you can do:
• Design Performance Management to support management process
• Train managers to use regular conversations to build trust
• Balance company and individual needs
Build Trust Through Manager-Employee Interactions
Sibson’s Five Conversations Used in PM training

CONVERSATION #1
- Recognize priorities, goals, styles
- Agree on relationship norms

CONVERSATION #2
- Understand Company’s goals/objectives and requirements of the role
- Translate to actionable expectations given needs of the business and employee
- Discuss respective roles in delivering on expectations

CONVERSATION #3
- Exchange performance information
- Plan for success

CONVERSATION #4
- Identify performance and development challenges
- Agree on potential actions

CONVERSATION #5
- Clarify personal development and growth goals
- Align goals with personal business realities
In Summary—Integrate and Align Processes

Synchronizing the performance management calendar with other key processes ensures appropriate information (inputs and outputs) is available when making decisions / investments.
In Summary—Keep in Mind Seven Success Criteria

**Effective Performance Management Requires**

1. Leadership to not only sponsor but model appropriate behaviors
2. Goals and other performance criteria clearly defined and aligned across the organization
3. Regular and constructive communications to occur between supervisor and employees
4. Calibration to occur across the organization to reinforce fairness and equity
5. Answer to the question—“What’s in it for me?”
6. A process that is viewed as business-critical
7. Rewards and other talent management processes to be consistently linked

Seek TRANSPARENCY throughout the process.
Thank you!

David Insler
dinsler@sibson.com
310.231.1743
www.sibson.com

Angelita Becom
abecom@sibson.com
919.233.6680
www.sibson.com