

Assignment II

# **Industry Validation of Performance**

## **Review Frameworks**

Group Members

Aiman Ahzaz 22L-7830

Amina Akhtar 22L-6198

Zaman Rafiq 22L-7955

## Deliverable 1 - Google Form Link

<https://forms.gle/Ace7o7u7PCDiJQsz9>

 Performance Review Frameworks (Responses)

## Deliverable 2 - Report

Starts from next page.

# **Performance Management in Software Development: An Industry Validation and Proposed Framework**

## **Section 1: Industry Validation - Support**

The article “Why does everyone hate performance reviews” by Muhammad Amir Iqbal criticizes the traditional performance review systems prevalent in companies. The article brings to attention the negative impact that these review systems have by keeping the psychological and behavioral responses of employees on these reviews as the basis for analysis. The following key themes were highlighted by the article,

### **1. Infrequency and Delay**

Performance reviews in most companies are out-dated and do not reflect real time progress.

### **2. Lack of transparency and fairness**

Ratings provided by performance reviews feel subjective and political especially as they are conducted based on unrealistic assumptions.

### **3. Focus on Numbers and Dehumanization**

Limiting the performance of an individual down to a number feels undermining and dehumanizing.

### **4. Negative Impacts**

Ratings create an unhealthy atmosphere of competition. With the small stage set for high achievers people become rivals instead of team mates. This increases stress and discourages team work.

The individuals interviewed provided insights into what employees actually perceive of these performance reviews. The final verdict on how employees react to them can not be given in the form of a sweeping statement. However, a trend is seen where people early in their career don't mind these reviews. While those further down the road have a more negative view on them. The reason for this can be said to be that the career starters are used to the educational system of being graded and evaluated based on certain metrics making performance reviews another one of those grades and trophies they chase after.

However, experienced employees who have long realised how surface level all of this is find them irritating and frustrating.

A concise analysis of the responses of the interviewed individuals along how they align with the articles perspective is provided in the table below.

Aspect	Responses in Agreement	Agreement with Article
<b>Frequency of Reviews</b>	Many disliked annual reviews; some preferred continuous or weekly feedback.	Matches the article's criticism of <i>annual performance reviews</i> as outdated and ineffective.
<b>Fairness of Ratings</b>	Most gave low-to-moderate fairness scores (2–3 out of 5).	Supports the article's claim that ratings often feel <i>unfair and subjective</i> .
<b>Effect of Ratings</b>	Effects mentioned include <i>competition, reduced teamwork, and frustration</i> .	Directly agrees with the article's point that ratings cause <i>unhealthy competition and demotivation</i> .
<b>Preferred Approach</b>	Multiple respondents chose <i>Continuous feedback and coaching</i> or <i>Metrics and data-driven evaluation</i> .	Reinforces the article's call for <i>real-time, coaching-oriented, data-supported feedback</i> .
<b>Suggested Change</b>	- “Feedback should be provided regularly.” - “Make review process more transparent.” - “Focus more on development discussions rather than numeric ratings.” - “Give detail about what caused rating changes.”	All these align perfectly with the article's advocacy for <i>transparency, developmental focus, and clarity in feedback</i> .
<b>Motivation Factors</b>	One Tech Lead said <i>salary is a motivation that keeps morale up</i> , showing reliance on external motivators rather than intrinsic growth.	The article mentions this as a <i>symptom</i> of flawed review systems - focus shifts to rewards instead of development.

<b>Collaboration Impact</b>	“Competition and reduced teamwork” and “Healthy motivation and collaboration.”	Matches the article’s view that reviews <i>can either harm or help collaboration</i> depending on structure.
-----------------------------	--	--

## Section 2: Industry Contradiction - Opposition

The differences that the feedback from the interviews brought forth are on similar stances as the similarities. However, the survey participants appear to be more optimistic about the performance reviews. This can be owing to the fact mentioned before that the optimism comes from career starters. They tend to see some benefits in ratings and metrics. Some employees do value structure and measurable evaluations unlike the article which favours open ended coaching decisions. The opinion on frequency of these reviews vary; the people interviewed seem to want more frequent reviews whereas the article advocates for on going and informal feedback loops not necessarily scheduled reviews.

Analysis of the industry contradiction is as follows:

Theme	Survey Responses	Article’s View	Nature of Difference
<b>Frequency Preference</b>	Some junior developers preferred <b>monthly</b> or <b>weekly</b> reviews.	The article criticizes both extremes — annual reviews are too rare, but too frequent reviews can feel micromanaging.	Minor difference — survey leans toward <i>very frequent</i> reviews; article favors <i>balanced, ongoing feedback</i> rather than formal weekly reviews.
<b>Effect of Ratings</b>	Some respondents said ratings “ <b>improved productivity</b> ” or had “ <b>no noticeable impact</b> .”	The article argues ratings generally <i>demotivate employees</i> and <i>distort teamwork</i> .	Mixed — a few found reviews motivating, while the article sees ratings as largely harmful.

<b>Preferred Approach:</b> <b>Metrics and Data-driven Evaluation</b>	Two respondents supported <b>metrics-based evaluations.</b>	The article warns that overemphasis on <i>quantitative metrics</i> reduces human judgment and nuance.	Partial disagreement - survey sees metrics as making reviews <i>fairer</i> , while article cautions against <i>over-reliance on numbers</i> .
<b>Traditional Reviews Still Supported by Some</b>	One <b>Tech Lead</b> preferred <b>annual performance appraisals.</b>	The article calls annual reviews <i>ineffective relics</i> .	Clear disagreement - the Tech Lead supports the system the article rejects.
<b>Perceived Fairness</b>	Most rated fairness <b>3/5 (average)</b> - suggesting partial satisfaction.	The article claims most employees find performance reviews <i>deeply unfair or biased</i> .	Slight disagreement - survey participants were <i>neutral to mildly dissatisfied</i> , not strongly opposed.
<b>Motivation by Salary</b>	A Tech Lead said " <i>Salary is a motivation that keeps up morale.</i> "	The article suggests motivation should come from <i>growth, recognition, and feedback</i> , not only salary.	Disagreement - salary-based motivation contradicts the article's emphasis on <i>intrinsic development</i> .

## Section 3: Proposed Framework

After analyzing the feedback from the interviews and the ideas discussed in the article, it is clear that traditional performance reviews are outdated and often create more problems than they solve. Employees prefer a system that focuses on continuous improvement, open communication, and personal growth rather than annual ratings and competition. Based on these findings, we are proposing a new framework that focuses on fairness, transparency, and development.

### 3.1 Overview

The main purpose of this proposed framework is to create a performance management system that keeps employees motivated, helps them grow, and ensures that rewards and promotions are based on real contributions. Instead of judging performance once a year, this framework promotes continuous feedback and open discussions between employees and managers. It aims to make the whole process more transparent, collaborative, and supportive.

## 3.2 Key Principles

The framework is based on the following key ideas:

- Performance reviews should not be limited to once a year. There should be regular feedback sessions between managers and employees so that improvements can be made continuously.
- The process should be transparent. Employees must clearly know how their performance is being evaluated and what criteria are used for pay raises and promotions.
- Evaluation should be balanced. Along with measurable results like project outcomes and deadlines, managers should also consider teamwork, communication, and overall attitude.
- Team collaboration should be encouraged instead of unhealthy competition. Companies should reward team achievements and collective efforts.
- Employees should be given proper chances to grow. They should have personal goals for learning new skills and building their career path, supported by training and mentorship.

## 3.3 Framework Components

### A. Pay Management

Pay should be based on the impact and value an employee brings rather than just a number or rating. Every six months, a short review can be conducted where managers evaluate employees based on their project results, skill improvement, and teamwork. This process will make pay decisions more transparent and reduce favoritism or bias.

### B. Promotion System

Promotions should be given based on proven skills, performance, and readiness for the next role. A clear “career path chart” can be introduced that lists the required skills and achievements for each position. Employees can prepare themselves by completing certain milestones like leading a project or learning new technologies. This will make promotions more predictable and fair for everyone.

## C. Growth and Learning

Each employee should have a Personal Growth Plan that is reviewed quarterly. This plan would include their career goals, technical skills they want to improve, and any courses or certifications they plan to take. Companies can support this by arranging internal workshops, training sessions, or mentorship programs. This keeps employees engaged and focused on self-improvement instead of just performance ratings.

## D. Motivation and Recognition

Motivation shouldn't only come from salary or ratings. Regular appreciation and recognition can make a big difference. For example, companies can introduce "Employee of the Month" awards, shout-outs in team meetings, or simple thank-you messages for good work. This kind of culture encourages teamwork, positivity, and a sense of belonging.

### 3.4 Implementation

To make this framework practical:

- Monthly check-ins between managers and employees can be scheduled for feedback.
- Quarterly performance discussions can replace annual reviews.
- Dashboards or tracking tools can be used to monitor progress and goals.
- Managers should be trained to give constructive and unbiased feedback.

### 3.5 Expected Results

By applying this new framework, companies can expect a healthier work environment where:

- Employees feel valued and motivated.
- Feedback is timely and useful.
- Pay and promotions are seen as fair and transparent.
- There is more focus on learning and teamwork instead of competition.

## Section 4: Participant Responses

The following table presents the verbatim appendix collected from eight professionals currently working in the software industry. These responses are collected through Google form.

## Verbatim Appendix

Position	Years of experience	Frequency of reviews	Satisfaction with review process	Fairness of ratings	Effect of ratings	Preferred Approach	Suggested Change
Junior Developer	Less than 2 years	Monthly	3	3	Improved productivity	Metrics and data-driven evaluation	The number that is given should have a little detail as to what caused deduction or increase
Junior Developer	Less than 2 years	Annually	2	3	No noticeable impact	Continuous feedback and coaching	Feedback should be provided to the employees
Junior Developer	Less than 2 years	Weekly	3	3	Competition and reduced teamwork	Continuous feedback and coaching	I dont knoww
Junior Developer	Less than 2 years	No formal performance reviews	3	3	Improved productivity	Continuous feedback and coaching	Performance reviews should be clear, and provide clear instructions on how things should be done and what changes are needed in a person to improve their performance
Tech Lead	3-5 years	Quarterly	3	1	Increased frustration	Annual performance appraisals	Salary is a motivation that keeps up morale.
Senior Engineer	6-19 years	Annually	2	2	Competition and reduced teamwork	Continuous feedback and coaching	I would prefer more frequent one-on-one sessions instead of annual reviews.

Engineering Manager	More than 10 years	Biannually	3	3	No noticeable impact	Peer and manager combined evaluation	make review process more transparent and tie goals to team outcomes.
HR	6-10 years	Annually	4	3	Healthy motivation and collaboration	Metrics and data-driven evaluation	focus more on development discussions rather than numeric ratings.