

Theses and Dissertations

2018

Integrating competency frameworks and goal setting in an individual development plan process

Farhan Rizvi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Rizvi, Farhan, "Integrating competency frameworks and goal setting in an individual development plan process" (2018). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1002.
<https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/1002>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact Katrina.Gallardo@pepperdine.edu, anna.speth@pepperdine.edu, linhgavin.do@pepperdine.edu.

**INTEGRATING COMPETENCY FRAMEWORKS AND GOAL SETTING IN AN
INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROCESS**

A Research Project

**Presented to the Faculty of
Pepperdine Graziadio Business School**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
in
Organizational Development**

**by
Farhan Rizvi
August 2018**

This research project, completed by

FARHAN RIZVI

under the guidance of the Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the faculty of Pepperdine Graziadio Business School in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Date: August 2018

Faculty Committee

Committee Chair, Miriam Lacey, Ph.D.

Committee Member, Terri Egan, Ph.D.

Deryck van Rensburg, DBA, Dean
Pepperdine Graziadio Business School

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to design an integrated goal and competency framework based individual development plan process. Interviews with eight employees who had been through the process were conducted. Competency frameworks have been shown in existing literature and this study to be an effective tool for leveraging for employee development and driving discussions that employees value. Findings showed that using competency frameworks provides more than enough benefits to justify people managers investing the time to understand it, socialize it within their teams, and use it as a core piece of this process. Future studies should look at multiple teams with different managers to explore that variable further.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
List of Tables	vi
1. Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Case Organization.....	3
Importance of the Study.....	3
Thesis Outline	4
2. Review of Literature	5
Individual Development Plans.....	5
Importance and benefits.....	6
Process	8
Goal Setting	9
Importance of goal setting	10
Uses and designs of goal-based individual development plans.....	11
Competency Frameworks	12
Importance	14
Uses and purposes in organizations	15
Blending competency frameworks and goal setting processes.....	16
Summary	16
3. Methods.....	18
Research Design.....	18
Participants.....	19

Ethics.....	20
Existing TechCo Process	20
New TechCo Process	21
Data Collection	22
Data Analysis	23
4. Results.....	24
Process Efficacy.....	24
Outcomes and Impacts.....	28
Summary.....	31
5. Discussion.....	32
Interpretation and Connection to Literature.....	32
Summary of Findings.....	35
Conclusions.....	36
Recommendations.....	36
People managers	36
Employees.....	37
Organizational development practitioners	38
Limitations	38
Suggestions for Further Research.....	39
Summary.....	39
References.....	41
Appendix.....	44

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Evaluation of the Overall Process.....	24
2. Critiques of the Process	25
3. Critiques of the Initiation Phase.....	26
4. Critiques of the Executing and Assessing Progress Phase.....	27
5. Critiques of Mid-Year Assessment Phase.....	28
6. Outcomes and Impacts of the Program.....	29

Chapter 1

Introduction

In today's business environment, talent is the major differentiator (Wilcox, 2016). Developing that talent is one of the most significant drivers of employee engagement, which in turn is the key to the business outcomes organizations seek: revenue, profitability, innovation, productivity, customer loyalty, quality, and cycle time reduction (Kaye & Giulioni, 2012). Studies on competency frameworks show that when development is a focus, employees not only get prepared for other roles but improve in their current job as well (Rodriguez, Patel, Bright, Gregory, & Gowing, 2002).

Employee growth and development is essential to organizational effectiveness. Studies confirm that best-in-class managers—the ones who consistently develop the most capable, flexible, and engaged teams able to drive exceptional business results—all share one quality: they make career development a priority (Lipman, 2016).

Career development in many organizations involves a focus on developing employee competencies (Ennis, 2008). Competency frameworks are a set of characteristics that align to how the organization defines high performance behaviors (Misra & Sharma, 2017). These competencies are used to build individual development plans (IDPs) to ensure that organizations are able to support improved performance and career growth for their employees while also building bench strength for future leaders (Ennis, 2008). Organizations have become fairly adept at building competency frameworks and the majority of organizations believe they will rely on them more and more in the future for development (Gangani, McLean, & Braden, 2006). However, the same organizations spend a disproportionate amount of time developing the competency framework and little time applying it (Megheirkouni, 2016).

An IDP is a practical development tool that leverages competency frameworks to grow and develop employees (Clifford, Fuhrmann, Lindstaedt, & Hobin, 2013). Developing and monitoring IDPs provide employees with regular dialogue and consistent, timely feedback about their development (Wright, 2013). However, the process is so complex for both managers and employees that the focus becomes completing the process versus having a meaningful development conversation (Kaye & Giulioni, 2012).

Instead, many organizations focus primarily on goal setting as a means to track employee performance and contribution toward organizational initiatives (Greenan, 2016). Goals are critical to drive alignment with how employees prioritize their tasks with what the organization values (Locke & Latham, 2006). The goal-setting process captures specific deliverables the employee needs to accomplish related to their day-to-day work. Goals also can be tied to monetary incentives so there is consistent dialogue between employees and managers throughout the year (Ellis, 2004).

Although goals are important, too often goal setting and tracking is done separate from competency frameworks and employee development. There is an opportunity to integrate development and goal setting into one process and present it in a way that drives more impact.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to design an integrated goal and competency framework based IDP process. Two research questions were examined:

1. What is the efficacy of the integrated process?
2. What are the outcomes and impacts of the integrated process?

Case Organization

The case organization was a US-based telecommunication services company. The study was conducted with an information technology team that works on an enterprise technology program that being implemented within the company to replace the existing billing system, user interface, and many other existing applications.

At the time of the study, there were approximately 1000 team members. Of these, 750 were vendors, many of whom were employed offshore in India. The study subjects were a subset of the 1000 workers, drawn from one IT design team on the program.

The case organization utilized goal setting to feed annual bonus compensation and biannual talent review sessions that leveraged a competency framework to evaluate employee potential. The team examined in this study experienced the new process that integrates goal setting and the competency framework in its IDP process.

Importance of the Study

Organizations are struggling to retain talented individuals and effectively build bench strength for the future (Kaye & Giulioni, 2012). One of the factors driving a lack of development is the process itself. Organizations tend to take actions, like eliminating annual performance reviews, in an effort to drive more meaningful dialogue around development in the organization. This study provided information about what an integrated process of goal setting and competency development using an IDP process looks like before, during, and after the performance period being evaluated. Learnings from this study may be helpful to other organizations that wish to improve their human resources practices around employee development.

Thesis Outline

This chapter described the background and purpose of the study. A description of the case organization was provided. The importance of the study also was stated. Chapter 2 reviews literature for this study. IDPs, goal setting, and competency frameworks are discussed. Chapter 3 describes the methods used in this study. The research design, participants, ethics, data collection, and data analysis steps are described.

Chapter 4 reports the study results generated through interviews. Chapter 5 outlines study conclusions, recommendations, limitations, and suggestions for research.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this study was to design an integrated goal and competency framework based IDP process. This chapter reviews literature related to this study. IDPs, goal setting, and competency frameworks are discussed.

Individual Development Plans

An IDP is a structured plan written by employees that describes their goals and objectives, activities, needed resources and support, and measures of success for a performance period (Clifford et al., 2013). An IDP is an output of focused conversations that revolve around what is important to the employee. These are not tied to performance, but instead focus on things like professional goals, motivations, talents, strengths, development opportunities, and action steps (Goffnett, 2014). Each organization assesses what is important to it and its employees, based on organizational objectives, employee needs, culture, and values to determine the specifics of how the IDP process is implemented.

Key components of development include job-related development, self-development, changing roles, and external development (Greenan, 2016). Job-related development simply involves looking at the landscape in the organization around an employee's current role and tasks, and then working with the manager to identify areas where action can be taken to drive development (Beusaert, Segers, Fouarge, & Gijsselaers, 2013). This may include examining various projects happening in the company and selecting assignments that will yield individual growth. Job shadowing with other teams is another useful tool in this area. Additionally, opportunities exist for

strategically choosing where employees can lead certain activities to help increase proficiencies in those areas (Margerison, 1992).

Self-development entails the employee taking personal ownership in identifying the areas in which they want to improve (Austin, Marini, & Desroches, 2005) and locating resources to spur their development. Such resources could include forums, webinars, and individuals who are similarly driving their own development. Incorporating specific actions into an IDP can be extremely effective ways to engage in self-development.

Changing roles is focused on looking at specific roles that an employee can change to in an effort to develop in certain areas (Davis, 2015). An example of this would be for a person in an individual contributor role to move into a people manager role. Organizations may even have formal programs around job rotation that ensure effective development of future leaders that can be leveraged as a part of IDPs (Parding & Liljegren, 2017). Many organizations encourage movement to different roles to ensure that employees are always continuing to develop and grow.

External development is an effective way for employees to develop skills that will help them improve their job performance. A common example of this is joining groups like Toastmasters to improve public speaking abilities. Joining volunteer organizations or participating in various capacities like secretary of a local musical society, taking roles in groups like Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts, parent-teacher association positions, or being a part of a home owners' association all represent opportunities for growth and development that can benefit individuals at work as well.

Importance and benefits. Organizations can use IDPs to make a conscious effort to have meaningful professional development and career growth conversations with

employees (McConnell, Delate, & Newlon, 2015). For example, General Mills believes that having committed employees will result in improved company performance (Wright, 2013). Wright's research at General Mills suggests that committed employees believe in three things: their leadership, development, and empowerment. An IDP is a key way to gain commitment from employees by showing them that the company is investing resources into their long-term development (Davis, 2015).

The most important aspect of an IDP is the dialogue that is created throughout the process (Beusaert et al., 2013). It impacts the mindset of the managers and employees while giving both the vehicles they need to drive consistent development conversations. Managers need to actively support employee growth in both their interactions with the employee and how they represent them to the rest of the organization. It gives employees the framework they need to make sure that they are having the development conversations they want to have with their managers (Goffnett, 2014). This will not work if both parties are simply going through the motions, treating this as a check-the-box exercise.

Companies like Sprint align their IDPs around their five core competencies (Ellis, 2004). Everyone in the organizations, starting with top-level leaders, use the same systems they ask all employees to use. This helps create a culture that evolves around the chosen core competencies (Goffnett, 2014). As a part of reporting on IDP progress, employees are able to share experiences, like call center employees helping customers on their own time. It is a nice example of their core competency of focusing on customers and a reflection of how this can drive alignment across the organization in unique ways (Ellis, 2004). As IDPs become part of the culture, they shift employees' and managers'

expectations to engage in active dialogue around development. Over time, the process will result in increased performance for the organization overall.

IDPs should begin with conversations that occur outside of appraisals or performance discussions (Austin et al., 2005). Although there will always be some discussion about development during appraisal conversations, it should be minimal, as it can be very challenging to effectively do both at the same time. Creating a culture of having IDPs and a dialogue focused on development cultivates an environment of safety around strengths and opportunities (Davis, 2015). Employees are able to continue the dialogue regarding the skill and knowledge they need to do their jobs in the context of professional growth. Wright (2013) presented the example of DPR Construction, which credited its exemplary safety record to its use of a competency-based performance model, which clearly defined expectations, and IDPs, which tracked employee development (Wright, 2013).

Organizations need to support development and progress through dialogue if they want to make a genuine commitment to their employees' career development (Davis, 2015). Such an approach enhances employee engagement and satisfaction. By ensuring that organizations are developing future potential in their employees while making them better at their current job, they can experience both near-term benefits and continue to build their bench strength (Goffnett, 2014). Employees are looking for this type of development and opportunity which results in better overall employee retention and better bottom-line results (Kaye & Giulioni, 2012).

Process. Personal responsibility and choice are the two most important aspects of an IDP (McConnell et al., 2015). At the end of the day, each person is responsible for their own development, but there are roles and processes that both the employee and the

manager can do to support each other (Margerison, 1992). General Mills, for example, used employee surveys to uncover employees' perspectives that varied based on tenure. As a result, they tailored their tools to best suit each group (Ellis, 2004).

It is important to have action-oriented discussions to initiate the dialogue around development and build the plan that will go into the individual's IDP for the year (Greenan, 2016). It then becomes critical to follow up on progress at least twice a year, at minimum. The discussions around how the plans are progressing will make them even more effective (Beusaert et al., 2013). Sprint sets annual targets for employees to complete IDPs by March and meet with their managers at least twice (June and September) before holding a final end-of-year discussion (Parding & Liljegren, 2017).

It is important to make the process of completing an IDP relatively painless by deemphasizing the form and making it short and simple. This approach allows for authentic connections between the manager and employee (Kaye & Giulioni, 2012). The form should be there only to capture highlights of the discussion, with the focus being on the fostering a rich development discussion between the employee and manager (Beusaert et al., 2013). As organizations mature in this process, they also should consider evaluating their managers based upon their development of employees, investment in formal learning and training opportunities (Kaye & Giulioni, 2012). The ultimate aim is for managers to put career development on every meeting agenda.

Goal Setting

Goal-setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990, 2002) was developed within the field of industrial-organizational psychology over a 25-year period, based on 400 laboratory and field studies (Locke & Latham, 2006). Goals define what success looks like for an individual and offer a means for individual to self-assess their job performance

(Ordóñez, Schweitzer, Galinsky, & Bazerman, 2009). Specific, challenging goals lead to better performance in the tasks needed to complete the goal (Benzer, Creech, Mohr, & Charns, 2014). Research indicates there is a direct relationship between goal difficulty and performance, provided the individual has the ability to attain the goal and no conflicting goals are present.

The most common framework for measuring a goal is the acronym SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-based; Platt, 2002):

1. Specific goals mean that the precise behaviors needed are identified. It is critical for the goal to be specific enough to allow measurement.
2. Measurable goals involve specifying the rate, number, percentage, or frequency of needed behaviors. Measurement typically requires implementation of a system or process that can accurately assess whether the goal has been achieved.
3. Achievable goals means that the performance targets are appropriately challenging—neither too easy, nor too hard. The most important factor is agreement between the manager and employee that the goal is an achievable stretch goal.
4. Relevant goals are those that are within the employee's ability to affect and that are organizationally important.
5. Time-based or time-bound means that there are clear start and finish dates for accomplishing the goal (Locke & Latham, 2006; Platt, 2002). This makes it possible to determine how often to track progress and to know when to set new goals (Bipp & Kleingeld, 2011).

Importance of goal setting. Goals are set by employee, his or her manager, and are driven from other organizational relationships that tie to the employee's work. It is critical for employees' goals to align with organizational goals and for managers and employees to agree about the goals specified. Employees need to commit to achieving the goal, and managers need to commit to providing feedback and tracking progress. This means that employees should prioritize value-added tasks that contribute to goal achievement (Benzer et al., 2014).

Many managerial or professional jobs lack clear performance indicators that readily allow the employee to self-assess performance (Gregory, Beck, & Carr, 2011). When that is left solely up to the manager to communicate, misalignment is common, and performance conversations happen primarily when the manager wants them the employee to do something better. Goals are a way for both the employee and manager to agree on what the most important tasks are and how they will measure performance. A strong indicator of success and employee well-being is when employees are able to make positive progress on goals they consider important to the organization (Bipp & Kleingeld, 2011). Macro-level goals between two organizations also are important in scenarios like a company and their suppliers. When an employee's goals are mutually identified, the organization can nurture cooperation rather than negative sentiment due to perceived or misunderstood behaviors. Studies have indicated that when goal setting is done well at the organizational and individual level it is almost always followed with performance improvements that positively impact bottom-line success at some level (Locke & Latham, 2006).

Goal setting can be applied in any organization or context where the individual or group setting the goal can influence the outcome (Locke & Latham, 2006). The success of goal setting is entirely dependent on employees and managers taking accountability to determine the effectiveness and relevancy of the goals (Benzer et al., 2014).

Uses and designs of goal-based individual development plans. As more and more organizations move away from annual appraisals, a need is arising to change how IDPs evolve (Greenan, 2016). Companies like Accenture, Microsoft, Gap, and Expedia have all moved away from annual reviews in favor of more informal processes for development. Younger workers are demanding immediate feedback around development

and challenging traditional methods of development (Davis, 2015). This dynamic is making organizations look at IDPs differently.

Approaching IDPs with a goal setting approach is one of the key drivers to integrate more regular feedback into the development process (McConnell et al., 2015). There is little overall research on what would effectively replace the annual appraisal based on the recent shift away from this approach. Some early studies done with this approach show that there is potential, but some managers may lack the skill to do this effectively. Organizations should explore these opportunities and be prepared to invest in managers and employees as needed to evolve into a new development-focused culture (Greenan, 2016).

Competency Frameworks

A competency framework is a synthesis of knowledge, skills, traits, attitudes, and behaviors that contribute to outstanding job performance (Ennis, 2008). Professional organizations have created competency frameworks for individuals in general, and for certain industries or types of careers (Bartram, 2005). For example, Bartram analyzed 29 validation studies to create a framework of eight broad competencies related to good work performance. Organizations also create competency frameworks by position.

Briscoe and Hall (1999) discussed four types of competency frameworks: research-based, strategy-based, values-based, and hybrid approach. Research-based competency frameworks leverage behavioral research to define the key characteristics for high performing executives in their organization. This can be done through behavioral event interviewing, interviewing executives, or holding focus groups. Some companies also use generic competencies of high performing executive compiled from consultants.

The captured behaviors then are used as the framework and common language to focus developmental conversations.

Strategy-based competencies focus more on the business strategy of the organization and look for expected behavioral characteristics that will contribute to making that strategy successful. The most common approach to compile these competencies is to interview top executives to determine the challenges and obstacles associated with the desired future state and then determine the competencies most needed. Additionally, it is common to use external consultants' databases of competencies and to pick ones that correlate best with the direction the organization is headed. Panels or expert panels, both internal and external, also can be leveraged to determine competencies that could work well (Katz, du Preez, & Louw, 2016).

Values-based competencies focus on formal or informal organizational norms or cultural values to determine the competencies that are most relevant. Organizations generally convene structured dialogue across all executives to create this list of competencies. In some cases, a competency list can simply be issued by the chief executive officer who pronounces the competencies he or she believes best align with organization's identity. Yet another approach is for human resources to take the lead in coming up with this list of competencies then getting executive sponsorship or approval (Hosie & Nankervis, 2016).

The hybrid approach combines one or more of the three approaches described above to develop a single competency framework. Each approach described has advantages and disadvantages. The most important aspect for organizations is to ensure its chosen framework is indeed implemented, updated, and improved as organizational learning occurs.

Competencies can be organized into five generic categories (Holt & Perry, 2011):

1. Education, training and experience: includes formal or informal learning and various learning experiences within organizations, but generally refers to what the individual needs to learn to be successful.
2. Application: competencies that represent employees' ability to apply knowledge within the organization.
3. Leadership: attributes determined as most important for individuals in positions of influence and authority.
4. Interpersonal skills: essential soft skills, communication ability, and relationship building skills needed to be successful in the organization.
5. Personal commitment: characteristics that demonstrate individual commitment to be successful in the organization.

Importance. Foundationally, one of the most important functions competency frameworks serve is providing a common language to use for development (Gangani et al., 2006). This is essential to be able to clearly articulate strengths and opportunities, discuss performance and potential, and development across individuals in any organization. In today's competitive landscape and demanding environment, organizations are looking at every area to gain competitive advantages. That includes developing and retaining leaders in their organization (Misra & Sharma, 2017). Leveraging a competency framework is a key way to do that. Competencies are perceived to be an essential tool in improving employee performance through development (Parding & Liljegren, 2017).

A competency framework provides a systematic approach to things like succession planning that has, in the past, been viewed as too subjective (Rodriguez et al., 2002). By leveraging a competency framework, it can legitimize development processes by giving employees a roadmap that shows them what they have to do. That is a critical element in what employees expect from their organizations (Wright, 2013)

Each approach to developing a competency framework has a different set of advantages to it (Bartram, 2005). A research-based approach will be grounded in actual behavior, is perceived to be more legitimate since due to its research base, and heavily involves the participation of executives. A strategy-based approach allows an organization to base competencies on where they are headed from a strategic perspective, focuses on what new skills are needed, and can support organizational transformation efforts. A values-based approach can be a strong motivator because it aligns closely with both the organization's cultural identity and with values-based competencies, which together provide stability because they will, in most cases, provide guidance over a longer period of time (Katz et al., 2016).

Uses and purposes in organizations. Competency frameworks provide organizations with a guide for several processes around employee service and performance management (Glidden, 2004). They can be used for making hiring and promotion decisions, suggesting development and training needs as well as helpful experiences, providing a common language for development, and identifying core behavior characteristics most important to the organization (Gangani et al., 2006).

Competency frameworks are critical to succession planning in organizations. Competency frameworks provide a view into the potential of employees beyond an individual that looks different than just the list of top performers (Rodriguez et al., 2002). Top performers in a single area are not given adequate attention during succession planning conversations. This does a disservice to both the employee and the company. Competency frameworks allow for development plans that promote employees' growth and help organizations build legitimate bench strength (Hosie & Nankervis, 2016).

Blending competency frameworks and goal setting processes. IDPs leverage competency frameworks to identify what additional knowledge, skills, and abilities an employee needs to maintain or improve performance (Ennis, 2008). In this way, development plans provide an additional way to improve employee performance without doing a performance assessment against a set of specific objectives (Gangani et al., 2006).

Goal setting is related to performance against specific objectives and is a measurement of an individual's contribution to the success of a project, process, or initiative that is critical to an organization (Bipp & Kleingeld, 2011). Competencies define the areas that an employee needs to be proficient in or improve upon to achieve ongoing success (Gliddon, 2004). Typically as an employee gains additional knowledge, skills, and abilities, they will contribute more to the organization, and are rewarded with additional pay or a promotion (Misra & Sharma, 2017).

Summary

Talent is the major differentiator in the current business environment (Wilcox, 2016), and developing an organization's talent is a significant driver of employee engagement. Rodriguez et al. (2002) have concluded based on their study that employees improve both their current and future performance when development is an organizational focus. Competency frameworks provide a guideline for employee development, as they outline how the organization defines high performance behaviors (Misra & Sharma, 2017). These competencies are used to build IDPs to ensure that organizations are able to support improved performance and career growth for their employees while also building bench strength for future leaders (Ennis, 2008).

Although IDPs are practical development tools (Clifford et al., 2013), in many organizations, meaningful development conversations are not emphasized (Kaye & Giulioni, 2012). Moreover, the development planning process often is divorced from goal-setting activities and competency frameworks. There is an opportunity to integrate development and goal setting into one process and present it in a way that drives more impact. The next chapter outlines the methods used to evaluate one organization's integrated process.

Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this study was to design an integrated goal and competency framework based IDP process. Two research questions were examined:

1. What is the efficacy of the integrated process?
2. What are the outcomes and impacts of the integrated process?

This chapter describes the research design, participants, ethics, existing and new TechCo process, data collection, and data analysis procedures used in the study.

Research Design

A qualitative semi-structured research interviewing method (Creswell, 2014) was selected for this study due to the limited research existing on integrating goal setting and competency frameworks into a single process and development plan. Qualitative research enables the capture of rich feedback in the form of stories from the participants on their experience integrating these two processes. Qualitative methods allow a depth of inquiry on topics that are typically challenging to quantify—namely, experiences with development and the ease of the IDP process. Qualitative methods in this study offered the opportunity to dive deeply into issues participants identify as being more meaningful or easier.

The challenge of research interviewing is the potential for researcher and participant bias, as well as the difficulty in generalizing the findings to other populations (Creswell, 2014). Moreover, interviews can produce a tremendous volume of information that can be difficult to analyze, absorb, and interpret (Kvale, 1996).

Participants

For qualitative studies, Kvale (1996) recommends 5 to 25 participants and Morse (1994) suggests at least 6. When selecting participants, it is important to deliberately select who to include, so as to ensure that the data captured is as valid as possible and thought is put in to who is included to avoid any unintended harm to participants.

Possible participants for this study were limited to:

1. Employees who worked in TechCo's IT department.
2. Employees who worked at TechCo for at least 2 years by the time of the study, so they were experienced in both the old IDP process and the new integrated IDP process.
3. Employees who were individual contributors and not people managers.

These criteria limited the group of possible participants to nine people. All nine people were personally invited to participate and provided consent to participate in this study. Seven of them have been working with TechCo's IT competency framework for the last 6 months and first integrated their goals with their development plan in the fourth quarter of 2017. At the time of this study, each of the participants completed their IDP using their competency framework. At the conclusion of this study, all participants had been using the new TechCo process for approximately 8 months and were nearly halfway through the year's process. All participants had mid-year check-ins on goals, including development, assessment on how they performed, traction on development, and course correction on goals and development for the remainder of the year.

Recruiting study participants in this way is called convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling technique where subjects are selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher. The advantage of convenience sampling is

that it is easy to carry out, with few rules governing how the sample should be collected. The relative cost and time required to carry out convenience sampling were small compared to other probability sampling techniques. However, this form of so-called backyard research increases the likelihood of biased data that are not generalizable to other populations. Convenience sampling also elevates the risks of researcher and participant biases due to their familiarity with each other (Creswell, 2014).

Ethics

Confidentiality and consent procedures are important to protect participants from physical or psychological harm (including loss of dignity, loss of autonomy, and loss of self-esteem), protect their privacy and confidentiality, and protect against unjustifiable deception.

Study subjects must give voluntary informed consent to participate in research. In this study, all participants worked at the same company and the study data consisted of feedback on processes they were already participating in as a part of standard operating procedures. A research assistant from outside the company performed all interviews, and all responses were anonymous. At the beginning of each interview, the research assistant asked for participants' consent and their response was recorded and transcribed as a part of this study. Participant demographics for each participant were not gathered in order to shield their identities and maintain their confidentiality. The project observed all human subjects protection regulations.

Existing TechCo Process

The existing TechCo process instructs employees to set goals in the first quarter for the year and align with their managers before entering the goals into the appropriate HR system. At the time of the study, setting up an IDP in TechCo's IT department was a

separate process. Employees also are asked to have entered this before the end of the first quarter and to set it up for the year. Managers and employees are encouraged to align on this, but it is not strictly enforced.

The IDP is stored as goals in a separate location in the same HR tool. There is no tracking on whether IDPs are followed up on or not. Goals are revisited every year as a part of the annual bonus program. Every salaried employee receives their bonus based on individual performance against their goals. This drives a lot of dialogue between managers and employees because there is monetary incentive for the employee to ensure they meet their goals.

Based on TechCo's employee satisfaction surveys, employees were dissatisfied with the development they were receiving and did not feel they got the training or coaching they needed to do their jobs. The employees who were happy with their development credited their specific manager for their satisfaction rather than the TechCo process.

New TechCo Process

The new TechCo Process occurs over the period of 1 year, from January to December. The steps are as follows:

1. Identify goals, which relate to normal milestones associated with work deliverables. The goals serve as the starting point for performance planning and evaluation. It typically takes a couple of weeks to draft and finalize each employee's goals. Goal definition occurs through one-on-one meetings occurring at least twice in this time frame. This step is the same as in the existing process.
2. Select competencies to work on that contribute to goal achievement. This step occurs in parallel with goal setting.
3. Identify the steps for developing the desired competencies. This step mimics the SMART goal definition process by assuring that the plans for developing competencies are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound.

4. Hold ongoing one-on-one conversations throughout the year to discuss the progress being made on each employee's IDP and consider whether changes are needed.
5. Hold quarterly check-in meetings to evaluate progress in all areas, make changes as needed, and align on reading and progress.

Data Collection

Each interview was conducted in a private location to facilitate confidentiality and comfort for the participant. A research assistant with a master's degree organizational development conducted the interview to keep all responses anonymous.

During the interview, verbal consent was obtained and questions answered before the interview began. Then, the participant was thanked for the interview and procedures were explained. Demographic data were gathered and the integrated process they experienced was reviewed. Participants then were asked whether the process as explained was consistent with how they experienced it, and participants were asked to elaborate on the nature of their experience with the approach.

Five interview questions were asked to answer Research Question 1 regarding the efficacy of the integrated process:

- Please expand on what things were specifically better.
- Please expand on what things were worse or the same.
- Tell me about initiating this process (Was it easier or harder? Why?) What should be added, removed, or changed regarding how we initiate the process?
- Tell me about executing and assessing progress in this process (Was it easier or harder? Why?) What should be added, removed, or changed regarding how we execute the process or assess progress?
- Tell me about going through the mid-year assessment. What should be added, removed, or changed regarding the assessment process?

Four questions were asked to answer Research Question 2 regarding the outcomes and impacts of the integrated process:

- What are the benefits of this approach?
- What are the challenges of this approach?
- Do you feel that this approach contributed to your ability to do your existing job well?
- Do you feel that this approach impacted your development positively?

The interview script (see Appendix) was designed in a way to allow the discussion to flow dynamically and let the participant drive the conversation. Some answers generated new insights that resulted in additional unscripted questions. After the interview, participants were thanked for their insights. Interview data were audio-recorded and transcribed for later analysis.

Data Analysis

The research assistant organized the data to hide the participants' identities. Only anonymous transcripts were shared with the researcher. The interview data were analyzed to categorize responses and identify patterns and themes. A second person reviewed the data analysis for accuracy.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to design an integrated goal and competency framework based IDP process. Two research questions were examined:

1. What is the efficacy of the integrated process?
2. What are the outcomes and impacts of the integrated process?

Eight direct reports who participated in integrated process were interviewed about their experiences. This chapter reports the results of these interviews organized by research question.

Process Efficacy

Participants were asked to evaluate the efficacy of the new process. Five of the eight participants stated that the new integrated process is better than the one used previously, whereas one concluded the process is the same as before, and two additional participants provided no particular response (see Table 1).

Table 1

Evaluation of the Overall Process

Evaluation	n
Process is better	5
Process is same as before	1
No response	2

$N = 8$

When asked to share their specific critiques of the process, most participants offered both positive and critical comments about the integrated process (see Table 2). Regarding positive aspects, four participants said it is easier having just one integrated process. One participant commented,

It doesn't feel like two different isolated areas anymore that I have to compete with to be able to accomplish both of them. I think that's the bottom line. It feels like its something that I can tackle at the same time.

Table 2

Critiques of the Process

Critique	n
Process is Better (N = 6)*	
Easier having just one integrated process	4
Process provides a common language	3
Process is Worse (N = 6)*	
Don't have the time to fully carry out the process	3
Difficult to select the competency and tie it to goals	3
Challenging to select and measure goals	2

N = 8; *Some participants provided multiple critiques; Most participants reported positive and negative critiques

Another explained:

Whereas before, it felt like a disjointed, "You need to have your goals, and then you need to have an IDP." ... We were probably doing it the whole time, but just the way [we] were setting the IDPs up was not that way. It's just much clearer now to be doing it all together and making it something that I can do from day-to-day.

Three participants additionally noted that the process provides a common language. One participant explained, "But the benefit is that everyone's working off the same thing so you can speak about this with a common language with other people."

Six of the eight participants also pointed out ways in which the new integrated system is worse than what is in place earlier. Three of these participants expressed that they did not have the time to fully carry out the process. One of these stated:

I'm not really experiencing [the approach and] I have nothing else to say [because doing the IDP/CF process is] not anything that's relevant to surviving my job. [The process hasn't] registered [or] sunk in with me. I'm really busy [with] work [so] I haven't done [my IDP]. I have ideas about it. We've had some conversations about it.

Three participants further stated that it was difficult to select the competency and tie it to goals. One participant explained:

Personally, I have items that I can work with from a development standpoint, but being able to tie that to the competency and whatnot for company goals ... was probably the biggest struggle—trying to identify an area in competencies where I can work on and also tie to the goal that I will need to be developing on.

Participants were then asked to elaborate on their answers and, in particular, provide feedback about the different phases of the integrated process. Most participants provided positive and negative comments about the initiation phase (see Table 3). Three participants liked the structured approach to goal-setting that is part of the new process. One participant explained: “This is more structured. My development plan was easy to do with this approach. It probably took me about an hour to write it down.”

Table 3

Critiques of the Initiation Phase

Critique	n
Initiation Phase is Better (N = 7)*	
Provides a structured approach to create goals	3
Process gets easier over time	3
More self-driven process	2
Initiation Phase is Worse (N = 7)*	
Goal setting and tracking is more challenging and time-consuming	6
Competency framework can be limiting	2

N = 8; *Some participants provided multiple critiques; Most participants reported positive and negative critiques

Three participants additionally suggested that the process gets easier over time.

But the first time you do your goals, you find yourself [spending a lot of time on this process]. The second time, well, now, you’ve baselined and you start to develop things. And maybe now, you’re thinking ahead all the time about how can I measure everything I’m doing.

In terms of critical feedback, six participants expressed that goal setting and tracking are more challenging and time-consuming using the new integrated system due

to the need to try to tie goals to the competency framework, mindfully choose which goals to pursue, set appropriate time expectations around goals, figure out how to measure goals, and set aside ample time to calibrate with their manager. One participant explained:

It's not just something you can sit down in 10 minutes and knock out. It's something you have to consider: You have to shop around, you have to talk to people to figure out what it's gonna be. ... I always end up with more goals than I'm used to. ... I think sometimes timeboxing a goal can be difficult or figuring out when you're going to come back and follow up or when you're gonna call something closed is a little bit of an enigma to me at times.

Regarding the executing and assessing progress phase, six participants noted that the process was more difficult and time-intensive due to goal-development-work linkages (see Table 4). One of these participants noted:

It's more mentally challenging because I'm trying to keep it all in perspective at the same time, whereas, before it might be, "Oh, yeah, view these things separately." So, I really think there's been an effort to combine it all together, which then makes it more of a challenge to think through. Before it was more of checkboxes and different categories, and this having it together is hard sometimes.

Table 4

Critiques of the Executing and Assessing Progress Phase

Critique	n
More difficult and time-intensive due to goal-development-work linkages	6
Assessing progress is easier since it is tied to daily work	3
Effectiveness of phase depends upon individual employee's commitment to prioritize development	1

N = 8; Some participants provided multiple critiques

At the same time, three participants asserted that assessing progress is easier since it is tied to daily work. One of these participants shared:

Well, coming back to it being about my day-to-day work, it's very easy to assess it from before because I have a clearer goal. When you have a clearer goal, it's easier to execute on, it's easier to assess your progress, and it's easier to feel like

you're actually accomplishing something. Yeah. It just ties into what I do every day, so it's much, much easier.

Seven of the eight participants provided feedback about the mid-year assessments (see Table 5). Of these, three noted that, compared to the old process, the new integrated process required more effort and planning to effectively assess progress. Participants noted having to take time for activities such as soliciting additional sources for feedback on progress and accomplishments, tracking and discussing progress with their manager, and taking great care to get the feedback right. One participant explained:

Some of it [was] a little it harder, like a lot of the reporting stuff. That took weeks of meeting to get the reports right and reflecting everything, so that one took a lot more effort. But again, that goals that were more reflective of what my job is, that's part of my job, so I feel like it was really any additional work above what I should've been doing to begin with. So, I would say, to assess it, it wasn't a lot, unless I wasn't assessing it the way I was supposed to. I assessed, "Hey, again, check. You finished your reporting."

Table 5

Critiques of Mid-Year Assessment Phase

Critique	n
More effort and planning required to effectively assess progress	3
Too early to provide feedback on mid-year assessment	3
Process anticipated to be easier	2

N = 8; Some participants provided multiple critiques

Outcomes and Impacts

When asked to identify the outcomes and impacts of the new integrated process, participants reported impacts that aligned with three main themes (see Table 6). All eight participants emphasized that, as a result of the new integrated process, their development efforts are more effective. Participants explained they enjoyed more effective and meaningful development due to close linkages with day-to-day work (*n* = 7); more personalized, specific, and relevant feedback and coaching (*n* = 5); and productive

conversations and planning about promotion opportunities (n = 2). One participant described the net result as creating an intentional environment focused on goals. This participant explained, “What you’re doing is you’re creating an intentional environment for you to work on your goals and you’re creating goals that allow you to exercise the competencies you want to focus on. That seems very sensible.”

Table 6

Outcomes and Impacts of the Program

Impact	n
Development Efforts are More Effective More effective and meaningful development due to close linkages with day-to-day work (7) More personalized, specific, and relevant feedback and coaching (5) Supports productive conversations and planning about promotion opportunities (2)	8
Improved Daily Performance due to Alignment with Competency Development	6
Goal Setting More Effective More thought and effort is put into defining goals (4) Better alignment of goals and development (3) Leveraging the competency framework allows you to structure developmental goals effectively (2) Creates intentionality around development goals (1)	6

N = 8; Participants provided multiple critiques

Another participant added:

A lot of times, the IDP, your Individual Development Plan, didn’t necessarily feel like it was something that you could do every day. I think that’s the best way to work on your skills is if you just tie [development to daily tasks]. By being able to tie it into your day-to-day job, it’s easier. It’s more achievable, much more achievable. It feels like it’s more connected . . . not just, “You’ve got this huge blue chip.” Blue chip, right now, which for a different side thing that I do at work that is not necessarily directly with this team, and it’s kind of like that. It’s not going to ever get done because there’s just not time. Whereas if you set it as something that you can do day-to-day as part of your already predefined duties of your job, it’s much more realistic. Before it wasn’t as much direction, and it didn’t really tie in to our day to day work.

Yet another described the benefits he or she gained from manager feedback:

The conversations that Farhan and I had were always circling back on different skills or things that I was trying to achieve, and it always kept it fresh in my mind. And I feel like I evolved as a person. I was nicer. Yeah. But I think it really helped a lot. And, like I say, my team right now is setting their goals and their performance things. I shared my goal document with [a new team member] when she came on board and I said, “You should take a look at this. This is how Farhan likes to do it. You can fill out the form like this, but I was like, don’t get scared or he’ll walk you through it and you’ll review it multiple times until you lay on something that both of you guys are comfortable with.” But I really think that it has helped me evolve in my own ability to self-assess the things that I need to work on outside of [TechCo] was telling me.

The second common outcome participants noted was that their daily performance improved due to the alignment of their day-to-day work and competency development.

One participant explained, “If you’re looking at what you do every day already and how can you get better at this competency tied into what you can do every day, then naturally the quality of your work is better.” Another noted:

It all ties together in my opinion, and the fact that I can tie my career development with the goals that we’re working on is just great. It’s more cohesive, and it allows us to do our jobs, and it sets the bar a little higher to continue developing ourselves and be better at what we do to meet those goals and drive those changes.

Yet another noted how the new integrated process led to daily on-the-job insights:

I notice “ah-ha” moments. Now that I have that in the back of my head, when I do stuff, I’m like, “This is what I can be working on. This is a great example of how I’m working on it,” and now taking this a-ha moment and what am I going to do with it. Whereas before, it would pass me by, and 2 weeks later, I would realize, “Oh, I had a moment there, wow this and that.”

The third and final theme, also mentioned by six participants, was that goal setting in the new integrated process was more effective. Participants explained that in the new process, goals are better structured and aligned with development (n = 5) and more thought and effort is put into defining goals (n = 4). One participant explained:

It has helped put some structure around developmental goals and being able to actually find things. You’ve been able to go look at everything that you’re doing and kind of helps you come up with an idea for how to gain a new skill set or how

to speak about things a different way. I think it takes the squishy work out of it. Or maybe it's just that I'm thinking about myself. In my job, I'm working towards something. I'm not ever speaking about myself or what I'm doing, I'm trying to accomplish a goal and work with a team and make sure everyone's aligned and this is all about what are you doing personally to make sure that you are best set up for success with something and its interesting.

Another participant stated:

The benefits are that it forces you to sit down and think about stuff. I think especially in teams where you have leadership that's not really good at this or interested in it. It forces the conversation and the expectations that the leadership will give this benefit to their teams. In doing my job and doing my development are sort of intertwined, since I'm always trying to do my job better. It's kind of the same thing. It helps me be more intentional about the next job I want to do though. If I want to do this next, then I should be doing development stuff now for that.

Summary

This chapter reported the results of a study to design and evaluate an integrated goal and competency framework based IDP process. Based on interviews with eight direct reports who participated in the integrated process, themes were discovered related to the efficacy of the process and its outcomes and impacts. According to the majority of participants, the process is overall better than before, although certain aspects are worse, and certain aspects are better. For example, participants reported that executing and assessing progress is more difficult and time-intensive due to goal-development-work linkages. Nevertheless, in terms of outcomes and impacts, participants reported that as a result of the new approach, development efforts are more effective, daily performance is improved due to alignment with competency development, and goal setting is more effective. The next chapter brings the study to a close.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to design an integrated goal and competency framework based IDP process. Two research questions were examined:

1. What is the efficacy of the integrated process?
2. What are the outcomes and impacts of the integrated process?

Eight direct reports who participated in integrated process were interviewed about their experiences. This chapter discusses the results of the study. Key findings are reviewed first, then conclusions are presented. Recommendations are outlined followed by suggestions for further research.

Interpretation and Connection to Literature

Participants identified several specific benefits of the process, including the self-driven aspects of the process, autonomy to select what they work on and when and how to measure progress, more meaningful development (although the process requires more effort and involves a learning curve), and incorporation of everything into a single, easier process. Additionally, participants appreciated the common language that the competency framework brought to development conversations and planning. Similarly, Gangani et al. (2006) pointed out that one of the most important functions competency frameworks serve is providing a common language to use for development. Being able to easily align the discussion of development strengths and opportunities is critical to improving the process of initiating and executing development plans. Kaye and Giulioni (2012) asserted that the process needs to be simple so that focus can be placed on the conversation. It is important to make the process of completing an IDP relatively painless. This can be done by using a short, simple form and then deemphasizing it, thus allowing the process to

drive authentic connections. Combining goal setting and competency development into one plan simplifies the process for employees so they do not have two different things to work on and track. In most organizations, the development plan is left and treated as a chore rather than a tool for improvement.

Having core competencies integrated into a combined goals and development plan allows the desired behaviors to manifest in daily, productive ways. As a part of reporting on IDP progress, employees are able to share experiences like call center employees helping customers in public on their time. This is an example of employees' core competency of focusing on customers that reflects how this focus can drive alignment across the organization in unique ways (Ellis, 2004).

Competency frameworks can provide a common language for development opportunities and be used for discussions and planning around strengths and opportunities for employees. This can help drive a culture of development by providing focus on competency improvement versus task completion. By aligning work-related goals to competencies, close ties are created between employees' daily work and their desired competencies. Using this integrated process is anticipated to naturally enable productive conversations on how they are progressing in competency improvements, which should in turn be tied to promotion readiness. As noted by all eight participants, these activities contribute to conversations that provide employees with a more meaningful conversation as a result. Lastly, following this process creates natural structures for creating goals. Beusaert et al. (2013) similarly asserted that the most important aspect of an IDP is the dialogue created throughout the process.

Beusaert et al. (2013) similarly pointed out that the dialogue throughout the development plan process is critical. Combining improvement to selected core

competencies with goal setting super charges that dialogue to be even more specific and relevant to both the organization and employee. Having one process also increases the frequency of development conversations, which is essential for successful employee development. IDPs are conversations that should occur outside of appraisals or performance discussions (Austin et al., 2005).

These features are helpful because it frees employees to focus on learning one tool and process related to goals and development, allowing them to invest more time into their own development and into conversations with their manager and others. This also means that employees have to be very intentional about what development competencies they pick and how they tie them into day-to-day work. It makes initiating their development plan more challenging but also results in a more personalized and intentional plan.

OD practitioners should consider what structures and processes exist in organizations around goal setting and development. This study shows there remains opportunities to continue to find better ways to drive development and improve job performance—particularly in ways that facilitate the appraisal of contextual and task performance (Hosie & Nankervis, 2016). This process should be considered when analyzing an organization's people and performance management effectiveness. Moreover, OD practitioners can simply examine this process in the larger field of OD. Managing talent will always be critical to organizational success and evolving talent management processes should always look at the three components of this process (i.e., IDPs, goal setting, competency frameworks).

Personal responsibility and choice are the two most important aspects of an IDP (McConnell et al., 2015). Asking employees to combine these plans together takes

personal initiative from employees that inherently make this more meaningful than having a goal plan and a separate development plan. Having to think through how competencies show up in daily work, how one can improve, and how it can be measured are all challenging conversations that improve the plan, the conversations, and the outcome.

The existing literature around goal setting proves how the goal setting process successfully contributes to employees' job performance and how that translates to bottom-line success for the organization. Applying a goal setting approach to development is something that organizations are starting to do and something today's employees are demanding. Organizations are also looking to find more meaningful ways than annual performance reviews to provide regular coaching and feedback. There is not any current literature that discusses leveraging goal setting, competency frameworks, and development plans all in one process.

Summary of Findings

1. Although the majority of participants (five of eight) stated the new integrated process was better than the previous process, they reported both critical and positive comments about the new process.
2. Several participants commented that the new integrated process was challenging and required a great deal of time and effort to complete accurately. In particular, the executing and assessing progress phase was noted as being more difficult and time-intensive than the previous process, due to goal–development–work linkages.
3. All participants noted that their development efforts are more effective thanks to the new integrated process. This improvement was due to linkages of development to daily work, better feedback, and productive conversations.
4. Participants also reported improvements in their daily performance and goal setting due to the new process.

Conclusions

1. Competency frameworks have shown in existing literature and in this study to be a useful tool to leverage for employee development.
2. The study data indicated that all eight participants reported the process as being successful in driving discussions that employees value. By aligning competency development with day-to-day work, it makes for much richer dialogue than being simply focused on task completion.
3. The data in this study show that using competency frameworks provides sufficient benefit to justify people managers investing the time to understand it, socialize it within their teams, and use it as a core piece of this process.
4. The study data indicated that this process is successful in driving discussions that employees value. Aligning competency development with day-to-day work makes for richer dialogue than being simply focused on task completion.

Recommendations

People managers. People managers should take the existing tools used in any organization (most commonly some version of IDP, competency framework, and goal setting) and combine them into one process. Job-related goals should be set first, then competencies most relevant to achieving the goals should be identified, and specific competencies to focus on developing during the performance period. The SMART framework should then be applied to both the job portion of the goal and competency improvement. It is critical to assure that the measurement portion of the goal is carefully planned. These various elements then should be folded into one plan, and regular one-on-one discussions should be convened about the employee's progress on the plan.

Additionally, the tools and templates used in the process should be continuously evolved to make the documentation part of the process easier over time.

The study data indicated this process is successful in driving discussions that employees value. By aligning competency development with day-to-day work, it makes for richer dialogue than being simply focused on task completion. It also makes it even

more important for people managers to make sure they are having these discussions frequently enough to support the employee. Managers should collaborate with employees on the needed frequency and block off enough time to take advantage of the rich discussions this process can help create. People managers should use this process as a framework to guide their discussions with employees. It is a framework that allows employees and managers to discuss work specific problems and link them to competency development. People managers need to ensure they touch on the development plan associated with this process in every discussion. How deep they go into the plan can and should vary based on each employee's needs.

Competency frameworks have shown in existing literature and in this study to be a great tool to leverage for employee development. The biggest gap in most organizations is that this tool is not socialized, understood, or used. The data in this study shows that using competency frameworks provides more than enough benefits to justify people managers investing the time to understand it, socialize it within their teams, and use it as a core piece of this process. Invest time in understanding the competency framework that is used in your organization. Spend time to ensure that employees understand and use it when setting up their development plans. People managers should partner with their HR teams in the organization to first understand their competency framework and then partner to educate their teams. Implementing this process should align with existing goal setting and performance management processes in their organizations. In the study organization, the data and conclusions generated from this study will be used to evaluate and refine the integrated process as needed.

Employees. Employees should continue to use goal setting and frequent meetings with managers as a way to drive performance. Goal setting is a proven way to improve

performance. This will continue to be important. Combine goal setting and a competency framework to create one IDP that creates a single process that improves performance in current role and develops employees more effectively for future roles. Once goals related to the current role are selected, determine what competencies are essential to drive the behaviors critical for successfully achieving the goals. Then select the competencies that represent opportunities and identify behaviors that can be measured and select relevant milestones to track. Measure progress and self assess at the completion of the goals. Create one IDP that incorporates goals and competency development. Create an IDP following these recommendations and then calibrate with your manager.

Organizational development practitioners. When working with organizations to improve performance, OD practitioners should understand how these processes work in their current forms. Then start to look at how to combine and simplify organizational processes around goal setting and development. This should also be connected with organizational talent management processes to effectively drive development and succession planning within organizations. OD practitioners should understand how these processes work. They also should look for opportunities to simplify and combine the processes into one.

Limitations

Three limitations were found in the execution of this study:

1. **Sample characteristics.** One limitation of this study was that only one team was included, and all participants are on the team of the study's principal researcher. All participants were allowed to give their responses anonymously; however, there could still be bias to provide responses to say what they think wants to be heard. To mitigate this in future studies, it is important to select companies or teams where members do not have a preexisting relationship with the researcher.

2. Short duration. The study time was relatively short (6-8 months). Although some rich data were gathered, limited insights were gained regarding how some of the assessments came out or on the multiple cycles of this process. As a result, measuring development or promotions over time was not possible. Longer studies would be needed to mitigate this in the future.
3. Use of only one team. The other limitation of only working with one team is that the variable of different managers and management styles could not be compared. Individual managers and their management style can heavily influence performance and development. This study left that variable unexplored. Future studies should involve multiple teams to understand how management style influences this process.

Suggestions for Further Research

The present study produced qualitative data that reflects improved employee performance in current role. In future studies, this should be tracked over multiple cycles of the process to better understand the effects of this process on job performance. Similarly, improved development would need to be tracked over multiple cycles as well. Such studies will need to include pre and post testing as well as comparisons between control and experimental groups.

The present study also looked at results from one team reporting to the same manager. As a result, this study did not explore how different management styles impact the initiation, progress, and assessment of this process. There also was no data to show how management styles impact the results of this process. Future studies should look at multiple teams with different managers to explore that variable further.

Summary

Goal setting has been proven effective in contemporary organizations as a means for directing work. A competency framework similarly is a suitable tool for helping employees identify and focus on how to improve. IDPs comprise another type of tool that can be effective, but which often is lost as the secondary process to goal setting in

organizations. Combining these into one process that leverages a development plan that starts with goals and then picks the most relevant competencies on which to focus is easier and helps tie development into what employees work on every day. This process allows employees to take the initiative to own their development while making feedback and coaching more relevant to what they are trying to improve.

References

- Austin, Z., Marini, A., & Desroches, B. (2005). Use of a learning portfolio for continuous professional development: A study of pharmacists in Ontario (Canada). *Pharmacy Education, 5*, 175-181.
- Bartram, D. (2005). The great eight competencies: A criterion-centric approach to validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1185-1203.
- Beausaert, S., Segers, M., Fouarge, D., & Gijsselaers, W. (2013). Effect of using a personal development plan on learning and development. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 25*(3), 145-158.
- Benzer, J. K., Creech, S. K., Mohr, D. C., & Charns, M. P. (2014). Learning goals may prevent "Goals gone wild." *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(12), e1.
- Bipp, T., & Kleingeld, A. (2011). Goal-setting in practice. *Personnel Review, 40*(3), 306-323.
- Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. (1999). Grooming and picking leaders using competency frameworks: Do they work? An alternative approach and new guidelines for practice. *Organizational Dynamics, 28*(2), 37-52.
- Clifford, P. S., Fuhrmann, C. N., Lindstaedt, B., & Hobin, J. A. (2013). An individual development plan will help you get where you want to go. *Physiologist, 56*(2), 43-44.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davis, P. J. (2015). Implementing an employee career-development strategy: How to build commitment and retain employees. *Human Resource Management International Digest, 23*(4), 28-32.
- Ellis, K. (2004). Individual development plans: The building blocks of development. *Training, 41*(12), 20-25.
- Ennis, M. R. (2008, January 29). Competency models: A review of the literature and the role of the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Pilots and Demonstration Team Division of Research and Evaluation Office of Policy Development and Research Employment and Training Administration. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/Competency Models - A Review of Literature and the Role of the Employment and Training Administration.pdf
- Gangani, N., McLean, G. N., & Braden, R. A. (2006). Competency-based human resource development strategy. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 19*(1), 127-140.

- Gliddon, D. G. (2004). Effective performance management systems. *Performance Improvement*, 43(9), 27-34.
- Goffnett, S. P. (2014). Steer your career. *Quality Progress*, 47(7), 64.
- Greenan, P. (2016). Personal development plans: Insights from a case based approach. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 28(5), 322-334.
- Gregory, J. B., Beck, J. W., Carr, A. E. (2011). Goals, feedback, and self-regulation: Control theory as a natural framework for executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 63(1), 26-38.
- Holt, J., & Perry, S. A. (2011). *A pragmatic guide to competency: Tools, frameworks and assessment*. London, UK: British Informatics Society Limited.
- Hosie, P., & Nankervis, A. (2016). A multidimensional measure of managers' contextual and task performance. *Personnel Review*, 45(2), 419-447.
- Katz, B. R., du Preez, N. D., & Louw, L. (2016). Alignment of internal and external business and innovation domains. *South African Journal of Industrial Engineering*, 27(1), 61-74.
- Kaye, B., & Giulioni, J. W. (2012). IDP: Individual development plan or impediment to dialogue and progress? *People and Strategy*, 35(3), 4-5.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lipman, V. (2016, January 11). The best managers—always—develop their employees. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/victorlipman/2016/01/11/the-best-managers-always-develop-their-employees/#61aefc2b1d10>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57, 705–717.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 265-268.
- Margerison, C. (1992). Individual development plans. *Target Management Development Review*, 5(4), 25-31.
- McConnell, K. J., Delate, T., & Newlon, C. L. (2015). The sustainability of improvements from continuing professional development in pharmacy practice and learning behaviors. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 79(3), 1-8.

- Megheirkouni, M. (2016). Factors influencing leadership development in an uncertain environment. *Journal of Management Development, 35*(10), 1232-1254.
- Misra, Y., & Sharma, V. (2017). An exploratory study on business strategy, competency and firm performance. *Sumedha Journal of Management, 6*(2), 22-34.
- Morse, J. M. (1994). *Qualitative research methods for health professionals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ordóñez, L., Schweitzer, M. E., Galinsky, A D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). Goals gone wild: How goals systematically harm individuals and organizations. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 23*, 6-16.
- Parding, K., & Liljegren, A. (2017). Individual development plans as governance tools—changed governance of teachers' work. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 61*(6), 689-700.
- Platt, G. (2002). Smart objectives: What they mean and how to set them. *Training Journal, 23*-26.
- Rodriguez, D., Patel, R., Bright, A., Gregory, D., & Gowing, M. K. (2002). Developing competency models to promote integrated human resource practices [Special issue: Human resources management in the public sector]. *Human Resource Management, 41*(3), 309-324.
- Wilcox, M. (2016). *Effective talent management*. Oxford, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Wright, P. (2013). Some practical thoughts on annual performance management process. *People and Strategy, 36*(2), 54-57.

Appendix

Instructions for Research Assistant:

1. Provide intent & gain consent
2. Gather relevant demographics of each participant: tenure, # of performance cycles gone through (goals & development), gender, position
3. Setup: “Over the last ~8 months you have been approaching goal setting and development differently than normal. Development plans have been focused on using competency frameworks and combined with goal setting.”

Questions

1. Is that an accurate picture of the last 8 months? (If no, then inquire more)
2. Tell me about your experience with this approach?
3. Please expand on what things were specifically better
4. Please expand on what things were worse or the same
5. What are the benefits of this approach?
6. What are the challenges of this approach?
7. Do you feel that this approach contributed to your ability to do you existing job well?
8. Do you feel that this approach impacted your development positively?
9. Tell me about initiating this process (easier/harder – why?) What should be added/removed/changed to how we initiate the process?
10. Tell me about executing & assessing progress in this process (easier/harder – why?) What should be added/removed/changed to how we execute the process or assess progress?
11. Tell me about going through the mid-year assessment. What should be added/removed/changed to the assessment process?