

**2018-19 Performance Conversations  
Supervisors Reminders and Tips**

<b>Remember!</b>
Performance management includes regular touch-points throughout the evaluation period with ongoing communication, feedback and coaching from the supervisor.
Performance ratings may affect employees' future eligibility for pay plan increases, etc.
<b>Do!</b>
Schedule time with your employees for the mid-cycle performance conversation.
Encourage employee participation by creating a respectful environment, asking open-ended questions, and focusing on both their achievements and their concerns.
Review goals and progress towards achievement with employee; address barriers to achievement; course-correct and/or refine goals as needed.
Document on a separate sheet of paper any mutually agreed upon changes to duties, reporting structure, goals, etc. and forward to UWSHR.
Discuss the performance rating with your employee based on all the factors above.
<b>Don't / Avoid:</b>
Do not document performance ratings without first communicating with your employees.
Avoid common performance rating errors (see next page for additional guidance).
Do not use the scheduled performance conversation to administer employee discipline.

## Common Performance Rating Errors to Avoid

<b>Bias</b>	The error occurs when the supervisor's attitudes/opinions about race, national origin, sex, religion, age, veterans' status, disability, hair color, weight, height, intelligence, etc., whether conscious or unconscious, affect their rating of employees.
<b>Central Tendency</b>	Clustering all employees' performance ratings in the middle of the range without reviewing individual work performed. May result from a lack of documented performance expectations or standards. Or a supervisor may find it easier to give everyone similar scores.
<b>Contrasting</b>	A supervisor rates an employee based on how the individual's performance compares to that of another employee.
<b>Favoritism</b>	The error occurs when a supervisor overlooks poor performance of favored or "nice" employees, especially those whom are well-liked by all, and provides a higher rating than earned.
<b>Grouping</b>	The supervisor excuses below-standard performance because it is widespread because "everyone does it" or when they are avoiding holding individuals accountable for performance.
<b>Guilt by Association</b>	Giving a lower rating to an employee based on the company they keep, rather than on the work they perform, is a performance rating error.
<b>Halo Effect</b>	The supervisor lets one positive work factor affect the overall performance assessment and gives the employee higher ratings.
<b>Holding a Grudge</b>	The error occurs when the supervisor makes an employee "pay" for past behavior by lowering performance ratings.
<b>Horn Effect</b>	The supervisor lets one negative work factor color the overall performance assessment and gives the employee lower ratings.
<b>Leniency</b>	Low ratings aren't given because the supervisor feels that everyone is working hard enough or that expectations / standards are too high. This may occur when a supervisor is avoiding addressing performance issues.
<b>Primacy</b>	The supervisor bases the current rating only on past performance and recent performance for the appraisal period is discounted or minimized.
<b>Recency</b>	The supervisor bases the current rating only on recent performance and past performance for the appraisal period is discounted or minimized.
<b>Strictness</b>	Higher ratings aren't given because the supervisor feels that no one is working hard enough. Often this occurs when the supervisor's higher expectations often haven't been communicated or understood.
<b>Sunflower Effect</b>	Rating everyone high, regardless of performance, to make yourself look good or to be able to give more compensation.