

Rob parsons - promote not promote

Experience, Human Nature



This report presents an independent analysis addressing the insights for important management issues associated with performance appraisal and performance management in the Capital Market Services of Morgan Stanley. The analysis will be focused on identifying the major problems, analyzing the situations, and making feasible and thorough recommendations for the board of Morgan Stanley to improve the existing situations.

2. Problem Statements. Rob Parson was a star producer in the Capital Market Services Department who had been recruited from a competitor two years ago and had generated substantial revenues since joining the firm.

I would like to address more specific and surface problems for this situation as follows:

2. 1 Problem 1 -Rob Parson's Performing Issues. Parson's success at generating business was offset by performance reviews from internal co-workers that painted him as a poor fit in the firm's collaborative culture. Parson's performance issues had been making his two immediate supervisors, Paul Nasr, the senior managing director in early 1996 and Gary Stuart, the just promoted managing director in early 1997 faced the dilemma whether to promote Rob Parson as managing director.

2. Problem 2 -Rob as Irreplaceable Staff. Stuart felt certain that Parson would leave the firm if he was not promoted in 1997. This would mean losing a valuable employee and a star producer and creating an empty seat in an area important for the firm's business. Morgan Stanley needed Parson to attain the firm's strategic business objectives and even Stuart felt strongly that Parson would be impossible to replace.

2. 3 Problem 3 - Little consensus for the 360-degree evaluation process The purpose of 360-degree evaluation is to emphasize teamwork, cooperation, and cross selling.

However, there was little consensus on what the 360-degree evaluation actually meant in practice since its implementation in 1993. 3 Issues / Problem Analysis. It is doubtful that the 360 degree performance evaluation process at Morgan Stanley yielded data that were valid and reliable. It is critical to figure out whether the 360 degree performance management system well aligned with Morgan Stanley's strategic objectives. It is also important to verify the two performance evaluation results and objectively induce the implications so that Gary or the board could effectively manage the situation. 3. 1 Not a real 360 degree performance review @ Nasr's time. The performance comment "raw data" including the quantitative, qualitative, and anecdotal -- none of which is perfectly consistent from the 360 process. It is doubtful that raters knew how to effectively participate in the process and the Paul knew how to use the data. There was no indication of rater's interaction with Parson and how each rater's rating contributed to the average scores shown on Summary of Performance Ratings.

The arithmetic average for the collage average score is 3.6, however the overall rate is at 2.8. It seems that quite a number of Parson's supervisor and colleagues were admiring his cross-selling skill but it was hard to tie to the result of Downward Average 3.0 and colleague Average of 3.7. What were the criteria to evaluate item 4A in the Summary of Performance Ratings. -Team Player Skill and how the comments from Parson's supervisors and colleague tied to the average rating.

Rater Parson E's comments in the "Development Recommendation" sections did not include concrete example but just stating rather subjective observations and feelings. The rates were not interpretable and there was no

scale identification for the rates. What a 2.0 different was from a 4.0 average score? What were the benchmarks? There was no explicit indication of management's expectations for Parson, such as specific sales target and customer satisfaction index that are measurable and be able to described in concrete terms.

It seems that there was no prior communication of the expectations of the key performance indicators with specific values to Parson. There was no attempt to think deep the unique qualities of Parson that bring him to achieve excellent business sales. There were no indications of key success factors for Parsons that would link to the performance evaluation process. There was inherited bias from Nasr that he treated Parson harsher because he wanted to show to everybody in Morgan Stanley that he would not treat a subordinate who was hired from his previous life better. . 2 Improved 360 degree performance review @ Gary's time In early 1997 during Gary Stuart's time - A " revised" performance review " raw data" including the quantitative, qualitative, and anecdotal was come up in different ways. The process had been improved when compared with the last year exercise in the following ways: Indication of involvement from each rater and excludes the ratings from evaluators who had limited interaction with Parson when coming up with average score in every performance criteria to ensure fair evaluation.

Indication of rating scale from 1-6 and with interpretations for each rating. However, there is no in-depth explanation on how to define Top 10%, Top 20% and Top 50% etc. Each rater provided a rating with corresponding comments and valid examples for each performance requirements category

Elimination of the " Team Player" rating which was previous seen as a subjective and board term. However, the review showed an extraordinary amount of Parson's progress on the team player front by examples. The overall rating from downward and colleague at 5 and 5. respectively which is in the category of Outstanding -Top 20% It was mentioned by Stuart that he need to deal with the politics in the firm, it is time to think of whether Parson was confronting the culture or he a gear to help the firm to change some of the rooted culture.

3. 3 What are the alternatives? After illustrating the underlying causes of the problems, we have to consider whether the efforts Parson had made were sufficient to be promoted, promoting Parson would mobilizing a lot of support from within the firm. The main alternatives are as follows:

- * Be prepared to search Parson # 2 for replacement and fire Parson.
- No to promote and increase payment for Parson and let him tender his resignation.
- * Promote Parson to the managing director and further motivate and develop his weak area.

4 ; Solutions and Recommendations. Morgan Stanley changed its corporate strategy to focus on being a " one-firm" firm, the use of the 360 degree performance evaluation procedures at Morgan Stanley has been designed to reinforce the change in culture which is now emphasizing teamwork, corporation, and cross selling. The firm should reward those who acting in accordance with the mention notions as well as great business generators.

The main purposes of carrying out an efficient 360 degree performance assessment in Morgan Stanley are to develop, to manage and to pay ; amp; promote. The effectiveness of the performance assessment did affect the job satisfaction of Parson and the organization effectiveness. Therefore, it is

critical to come up with a fair judgment for Parson, review and improve for any loop holes in the existing performance assessment process. I would like to recommend promoting Parson to the managing director, further motivating, rewarding and developing his weak areas.

It was hard to compare the results from 2 consecutive years because it is meaningless to use some misleading or ill-defined rates from @ Nasr's time and compare to a more representative set of result this year. However, the revised process in the recent year provided more sensible data, it is worthwhile to focus on the review result of this year as decision making base. The Summary of Performance Ratings and Distribution showed that nearly all (except 33% of his supervisor rate 3 for leadership and management skills) Parson's supervisors rated 4 to 6 for all 4 perspectives include the Overall Downward.

These implied most of the Parson's higher up did recognize Parson's contributions. It should be easier to mobilize a consensus on Parson Promotion this year. The management needed to reconsider the motivation elements and to come up with a thorough career development plan for Parson rather than just focus on using the review result as a promotion justifications. Actions Plans: * A constructive and through feedback session to be held by Stuart with Parson and mentioned that he will be promoted to the managing director on condition that Parson need to further improvement on certain areas from leadership and management skills.

Quote concrete example for his weak areas. * Make sure a detail job specifications (expectations) and key performance index for the managing

director position be in placed. To communicate management's expectation to Parson clearly. * To carry out after promotion review with Parson in three months time and make sure he will still be in good shape after his promotion. * Stuart has to tender a promotion recommendations report to the management with support and firm tone that Parson is ready to promote based on this year's performance assessment results. * To involve those being rated in the development of the rating scheme.

Continuous to carry out performance appraisals training to make sure all the staff understands the logic behind. To fine tune the process with more specific definition for each of the ratings. In conclusion, with proper implementations, a 360 degree performance assessment process can provide a more accurate assessment of an employee's performance and help eliminate accusations of favoritism. It will definitely lead to continuous learning, team building, growing self-confidence and improved productivity. I look forward seeing a more constructive and productive team lead by Parson in the coming future.