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1. **Did this performance review go well as well as it could have? Why or why not?**

Performance management can be defined as the process of establishing, assessing and enforcing performance in institutions or organizations by connecting personal objectives and performance to an institution’s overall goals and mission (Berry, 2003). As a continuous process, the performance review between Pamela and Nob wasn’t conducted as efficiently as required because the capabilities and integrity of the appraiser were questionable. For example, Pamela did not enjoy the management position that she had been promoted to because she was disinterested and proficient in responding to the feedback that the employees actually needed.

Despite her high qualifications in consultancy and economics, she received little training for the appraisal process. In addition, she was uncomfortable with issues relating with persons from diverse ethnic groups, meaning that the interview process might have been subject to bias, although this wasn’t directly reflected in the interview. As an annual event, the performance review did not meet the ideal standards of a performance review process--by applying an ongoing and extensive feedback that employees should consider in improving their future performance (Smith, 2001)—which isn’t a fundamental requirement in performance review processes (Smith, 2001).

On the other hand, the appraisal review had some elements of efficiency as strategic business interests were taken into consideration. For example, Pamela emphasized on the need for Nob to work smarter in beating deadlines by delivering reports on time. This is an indispensable requisite in performance appraisal systems whereby appraisers are required to examine the weaknesses and strengths of an employee prior considering a promotion award (Smith, 2001).

1. **Dangers of having a poorly designed and administered performance review process**

Disastrous implications may affect all the stakeholders of an organization that relies on a poorly designed and administered performance review process. Some of the repercussions as proposed by Smith (2001) include but not limited to: strained relationships between managers (supervisors) and their subordinates, increased rates of employee dropouts, employees become less motivated and the organization suffer an irreparable damage. As documented by Roberts, (2003), poorly designed appraisal systems could be biased in nature, leading to wasted resources, time and expensive lawsuits. Ultimately, poorly-designed and low quality performance review systems can result to cynicism and immense frustration for all parties to the process (Roberts, 2003).

Berry (2003) also points out that performance review systems and processes that fail to reflect elements of positivity between rators and ratees are ideally meaningless and unreliable. An appraisal system that meets international standards should be procedurally fair, distributional and a concise measure of the prevailing circumstances. Owing to the enormous quantity of resources that need to be invested in the design and enforcement of a valid performance appraisal system, a poorly-designed and administered system can pose as a serious threat to an institution. Furthermore, such threats can translate to a serious loss of human and financial resources (Berry, 2003).

.

1. **Changes needed in the performance appraisal process at Terminologies Complete Inc**.

From an organizational perspective, a well –designed and implemented performance appraisal system is characterized by numerous benefits. For example, the employees’ self-esteem and levels of motivation is improved; more opportunities and insights are availed; tasks and duties are efficiently delegated and clarified, and self-awareness to expectations and responsibilities is developed among participants (Smith, 2001). From an employer’s perspective, appropriate and fair personnel activities are permitted; more insights about the capabilities and weaknesses of employees are reflected, and organizational objectives are communicated with clarity to all affected parties. In addition, Roberts (2003) suggests that for organizational change to be driven, a good performance appraisal system should be capable of protecting its stakeholders from undue litigation.

For the aforementioned benefits to be realized by Terminologies Complete Inc., the management should integrate a collaborative, team-oriented and egalitarian culture in realigning its appraisal system (Smith, 2001). As Roberts (2003) points out, this will promote a conviction in the exercise of fairness and justice in the overall process. Therefore, all sub-ordinates and peers should be made part and parcel of the process. Notably, a substantial amount of effort is required in the implementation of an ideal performance appraisal system. However, this does not commence immediately the system has been established. The multiple goals of the system cannot be accomplished unless specific considerations are available before the system is put into place (Smith, 2001).

Therefore, changes that need to be initiated in the performance review system at Terminologies Complete Inc. as hypothesized by Berry (2003) should: reveal all the dimensions of relevant performance (thorough); be valid--the performance metrics should not be deficient or contaminated; specific­—should avail reliable criteria of employee improvement; practical—should not demand excessive resources and time, and transparent—should be open without secrets. Smith (2001) also provides tangible changes that can improve the performance appraisal system of Terminologies Compete Inc. According to Berry (2003), a good performance management or appraisal system should be ideal--the implications must be properly clarified; the inputs from multiple channels should be incorporated (inclusive), and corrigible—mechanism of correction of errors should be indicated (Berry, 2003).

In conclusion, it can be summarized that a well designed and strategized performance appraisal process is an important tool in enhancing the acceptance and enrichment of a performance appraisal system. This can only be achieved if the appraisers and employees consider the feedback as favorable and relevant. Therefore feedback is an essential necessity in performance appraisal processes and should be carefully figured out by organizations committed to delivering promising results.
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