To fix performance reviews, stop documenting the past—start developing for the future - HR Executive

Source: gnews-performance-management | **Published:** November 12, 2025 | **PMS Relevance:** PMS CORE | **Type:** Opinion/Commentary | **Geography:** United States

Source URL: https://news.google.com/rss/articles/CBMirgFBVV95cUxNX0FHMjRLZFdQUmlqRDlvSkR4dlZ

Executive Summary

This article addresses the widely recognized failure of traditional annual performance reviews to drive employee development, productivity, or trust. The central argument, advanced primarily by Jackie Dube, Chief People Officer at The Predictive Index, is that performance management must shift from backward-looking documentation to forward-looking, continuous development supported by technology and behavioral insights. Key evidence includes WTW research finding that only 39% of organizations believe their performance management process effectively meets employee expectations, McKinsey data showing that companies with effective performance systems are nearly three times more likely to outperform peers, and a Resume Now survey indicating 66% of workers believe AI-led management could improve fairness. A Predictive Index survey is also cited, noting that 71% of employees feel safe discussing AI at work, yet nearly half feel their input does not influence its adoption. The article concludes that technology — when deployed transparently and incrementally — can reduce administrative burden on managers, surface early warning signals, and enable continuous feedback loops that rebuild employee trust over time.

Key Insights

1. Only 39% of organizations report that their performance management process effectively meets employee expectations for clear goals, regular feedback, fair ratings, and links to rewards, according to WTW research.

2. McKinsey data cited in the article indicates that companies viewing their performance management system as effective are nearly three times more likely to have outperformed peers over the prior three years compared to those with ineffective systems.

3. A significant trust and transparency gap exists around AI in performance management: 71% of employees feel safe discussing AI at work, yet nearly half believe their input does not influence how it is adopted, per a Predictive Index survey.

Practical Takeaways

• Organizations piloting AI in performance management are advised to begin with administrative tasks such as summarizing feedback or tracking goals, rather than using AI for evaluative judgments, in order to reduce manager burden without compromising human oversight.

• Establishing clear data governance policies — including defining access to AI-generated insights and ensuring algorithms are auditable — is identified as a prerequisite before introducing technology into performance management processes.

Critical Analysis

Strengths: The article draws on multiple third-party data sources (WTW, McKinsey, Resume Now) to substantiate its critique of traditional performance reviews, lending credibility to the problem diagnosis. The inclusion of specific statistics adds precision rarely found in opinion-driven HR content. Limitations: The primary voice, Jackie Dube, is CPO at The Predictive Index, a behavioral assessment vendor with a commercial interest in the adoption of data-driven performance tools. This creates an inherent conflict of interest that the article does not disclose or caveat. The WTW survey is based on approximately 280 HR professionals, a modest sample that may not be globally representative. The Resume Now survey methodology is not described in sufficient detail to assess reliability. Biases: The article consistently frames technology adoption as the logical response to performance management failures, without substantively engaging with critiques of algorithmic management, surveillance risks, or evidence that continuous feedback models produce better outcomes at scale. The transition from problem identification to technology advocacy is smooth but not analytically rigorous.

Organizational Practice

The article describes organizations moving away from annual performance reviews toward continuous, real-time feedback models. Practices mentioned include manager-led check-ins throughout the year, use of AI tools to transcribe conversations and summarize feedback, behavioral assessment data integrated into performance conversations, and piloting of AI tools with select managers before broader rollout. Data governance practices such as IT and legal review of AI tools are also noted as emerging organizational practices.

Strategic Implications

The article reflects a broader industry tension between productivity-focused performance measurement and employee-centered development. The data cited suggests a persistent gap between organizational intent and employee experience in performance management, which appears unresolved despite increased investment in HR technology. The emphasis on transparency and data governance as preconditions for AI adoption signals that employee trust is emerging as a constraint on technology-led performance transformation. The framing of continuous feedback as a trust-rebuilding mechanism — rather than purely a performance optimization tool — points toward a possible reorientation of how organizations position performance management to their workforces.

Validation Status: passed
