Six Thinking Hats on "Continuous Feedback: The New Normal"

Dr. Smruti R. Patre,

Associate Professor,
School of Management,
Arka Jain University, Jamshedpur, India.

ABSTRACT

Employee feedback is the core to performance which impacts the personal and professional growth of employees. Annual appraisal, which was once one of the most vital bustle within HR domain is gradually becoming redundant. performance management today has evolved to a technology enabled, new normal –Continuous feedback. system. This paper aims to explore the various aspects of CFS from six different perspectives. Being a relatively new concept, the benefits and impact on business results of Continuous Feedback System is more scantily understood by organizations. A Six Thinking Hats approach may help managers, specially HR professionals, understand this better. Since this technique encourages the most pessimistic people to think of positive outcomes of a given situation, resulting in those who have not yet started with Continuous Feedback System to give a start and those who have started but are stuck midway because of lack of clarity, to advance further.

Keywords: Continuous feedback, annual appraisal, six thinking hats, new normal.

INTRODUCTION:

Businesses blossom on agility, speed, passion, and alignment. The process of driving and measuring performance has to do the same. Within the backdrop of rapidly changing business environments, disruptive technologies and generational changes with Gen Y becoming a substantial part of the workforce, traditional performance system has become one of the most debated topics today. Annual appraisal, which was once one of the most vital bustle within HR domain is gradually becoming redundant. Employee feedback is the core to performance which impacts the personal and professional growth of employees. It has to be timely and very precise. Traditional feedback system is unable to meet these changing requirements. Driven by these imperatives, performance management today has evolved to a technology enabled, new normal –Continuous feedback system. However, this demands a number of transformations in HR arena to make it practically successful. This paper aims to explore the various aspects of CFS from six different perspectives.

What is Six Thinking Hat?:

Six Thinking Hats® is a practical and effective management tool developed by Edward De Bono (1985), one of the pioneers of brain training. For over 50 years, he has presented new and interesting ideas through his books, courses, games and speaking engagements. Dr De Bono invented the L Game (1968), coined and introduced the concept of Creativity Step by Step (1970), Lateral Thinking for Management (1971), Po**:** A Device for Successful Thinking (1972), Textbook of Wisdom (1996), Simplicity (1999), New Thinking for the New Millennium (1999), How to Have A Beautiful Mind (2004), Six Value Medals (2005), and H+ (Plus)**:** A New Religion (2006), among others. Of these, Six Thinking Hats is considered to be one of his greatest literary works. Six Thinking Hats is a simple and effective "parallel thinking" process that helps people to walk outside the limits of small-mindedness, unidirectional thinking and fixed positions (De Bono, 1985). It is a practical and systematic process for individual and team thinking, predominantly helpful in problem solving, decision making, generating innovative solutions. The traditional method of thinking, also known as adversarial

thinking, results in too many, too stretched, non-productive meetings which are dominated by ego and promote more status quo than bringing any change or innovation. On the other hand, the Six Thinking Hats method includes the fundamental elements of efficient thinking focusing on a specific virtual colour "hat," thinking in one particular direction at a time instead of switching from one idea or thought to another. These thinking elements include the following:

Blue hat thinking: The Planner—managing and controlling thinking • White hat thinking: The Prober—focusing on the facts • Red hat thinking: The Partner—using intuition and feelings • Yellow hat thinking: The Provider—generating positive ideas • Black hat thinking: The Preventer—evaluating the risks and potential problems and • Green hat thinking: The Proposer—searching for solutions to overcome barriers

As a result, each person contributes his/her unique thinking on a particular challenge, resulting in a much better and impactful solution. When teams engage in Six Hats Thinking, they practise "parallel thinking," thus speeding up the discussion, reducing meeting time by up to 50 per cent and increasing their productivity manifolds. This has been proven over the years by many top-ranked organizations operating in different sectors and located in different countries across the globe. A few to mention are as follows: IBM, Prudential, GM, BT (UK), NTT (Japan), Nokia (Finland), Mondadori (Italy), Total (France), Siemens (Germany), Bosch (Germany) and Ericsson (Sweden).

Continuous Feedback System and six thinking hats:

Being a relatively new concept, the benefits and impact on business results of Continuous Feedback System is more scantily understood by organizations. A Six Thinking Hats approach may help managers, specially HR professionals, understand this better. Since this technique encourages the most pessimistic people to think of positive outcomes of a given situation, resulting in those who have not yet started with Continuous Feedback System to give a start and those who have started but are stuck midway because of lack of clarity, to advance further. Let us examine few statistics on traditional annual appraisal and put on various hats to analyze if Continuous Feedback System is a solution to appraisal related issues.

Statistics that discourage use of annual appraisals:

Studies have found that performance reviews are the second-most disliked work activity by managers after firing employees (HCI, 2015), and 86 percent of employers report being unhappy with their performance management systems (Rock, Davis and Jones, 2013). Other research has found that only 8 percent of HR executives thought their performance management systems made a significant contribution to employee performance (Rock, Davis and Jones, 2013). According to a recent survey by the Human Capital Institute (HCI), 35 percent of survey respondents said they trusted their employee ratings to be an accurate reflection of actual performance. The survey also found that Only 27 percent of survey respondents thought their performance management process was effective in developing their employees' knowledge, skills, and abilities. Only 30 percent of survey respondents thought their performance management process improved employee performance (HCI staff, 2015). The same study found that annual performance reviews result in only a 3 to 5 percent improvement in employee performance (McGregor, 2013). Research has also found that employees who believed their organization's review process was poor in quality were more likely to have lower job satisfaction and higher intentions to quit (HCI staff, 2015). Research by Bersin by Deloitte actually showed that only 8% of global organizations believe their performance management process is worth the time they put into it. The report revealed 58% of the organizations viewed traditional appraisal process as "time consuming and resource intensive" and only 8% felt that the existing process was still relevant. In 2015, Global Human Capital Trends research showed that 82 percent of companies reported that performance evaluations were not worth the time. (Hoffman et. al, 2010)

Statistics encouraging Continuous Feedback System:

Research firm CEB found that 6 percent of Fortune 500 organizations had already eliminated rankings because they believe they lower performance, increase attrition, and have a negative effect on stock prices (Business.com editorial staff, 2015). According to research by Bersin by Deloitte, about 70 percent of organizations are reconsidering their performance management strategies (Business.com editorial staff). In a recent TriNet survey, 85 per cent of employees said they'd feel more confident if they could have more frequent conversations with their managers. Another study from Robert Half, showed 82 per cent of employees would like to discuss their career path one to four times a year. The impact of these new performance practices is high: 90 percent of companies that have redesigned performance management see direct improvements in

engagement, 96 percent say the processes are simpler, and 83 percent say they see the quality of conversations between employees and managers going up.(Rock et.al, 2015)

BLUE HAT-THE PLANNER:

The blue hat opens the discussion, explains its agenda and decides the sequence of hats which channelizes the direction of thinking. Everyone in the discussion is asked to express their views from different perspectives depending upon the color of hat. Putting on the blue hat, one can open the discussion with white (to present background information on CFS), followed by red (to gauge the feelings of the participants), yellow (to capture positive aspectsof CFS), black (to study barriers and limitations of applying continuous feedback), green (to develop new alternatives to overcome barriers), once again red (to assess the final views of participants) and finally, concluding the discussion with blue hat thinking. Accordingly, the different thinking approaches are mentioned below**.**

WHITE HAT: THE PROBER:

It attempts to answer few questions on the basis of available information**:**
- What is continuous feedback system?
- What are the limitations and drawbacks of traditional annual appraisals?
- What is the need for continuous feedback system?
- Companies in Action

Continuous Feedback System:

Continuous Feedback System is the process of setting objectives together by manager and employee, assessing progress and providing ongoing coaching and feedback to ensure that employees are meeting their objectives and career goals. Hence, it is continuous process of planning, periodic monitoring and Feedback. Continuous Feedback System is an application of Job characteristics model which describes the relationship between job characteristics and the responses of individuals to work or the job being performed, is clearly applied (Hackman and Oldham's, 1980). The model identified five core job dimensions (skill variety, skill identity, skill significance, autonomy and Feedback from job) that prompt three psychological states (experienced meaningfulness of job, experienced responsibility of the outcome of the job and knowledge of actual results of the work activities) which, in turn, lead to or have an effect on five work-related outcomes or results (high motivation, high satisfaction and high effectiveness of work). It promotes five core job dimensions encouraging three psychological states and thus resulting in desires outcomes of organization. Let us look at these relationship by explaining Continuous Feedback System in detail.

Continuous Feedback system consists of three vital phases**:**

Planning phase:

The planning phase is a collaborative goal setting effort involving both managers and employees during which they develop a work plan for the employee that outlines the tasks or deliverables to be completed, the expected results and the measures or standards that will be used to evaluate performance. This imbibes autonomy granted to employee to participate in deciding his goals. This phase also Identifies critical areas that will be key performance objectives for the year. The choice of areas may be determined by the organization's strategic plan, by the employee's desire to improve outcomes in a certain part of his or her job or by a need to emphasize a particular aspect of the job. This imbibes Meaningfulness of work through task identity and significance as well as skill variety.

Monitoring:

This includes assessing progress made towards meeting performance objectives which is done on a regular basis so as to identify barriers that may prevent an employee from accomplishing performance objectives and what can be done to overcome them and also Determine if any extra support is required from the managers or others to assist the employee in achieving his or her objectives.

Feedback and Coaching phase:

This includes coaching employees to address concerns and issues related to performance so that there is a positive contribution to the organization on a periodic basis, rather than once a year. The feedback is focused on employee strengths and weaknesses on a regular basis. During this phase, the employee and supervisor meet

regularly to summarize and share feedback on the performance progress relative to the goals set at the beginning of the performance period. This includes capturing key results, accomplishments and shortfalls for each objective. This gives knowledge of the actual results of the work to employee, relating to Feedback from Job.

Thus the focus is on constant improvement through consistent communication by addressing the problems as soon as they arise. As the feedback is in the moment, the recipient adapts quickly to the changing reality. This is the hallmark of doing knowledge work effectively. Thus the essence of Continuous Feedback System is that it is frequent, relevant and two-way.

Limitations / Drawbacks Of TPA:
- **Work is different.** Work moves at a much faster pace today, with goals and projects measured in days and weeks instead of months and quarters. Performance reviews traditionally were done on annual basis—which means they're not keeping pace with production. Moreover nowadays, team-success is a priority over individual success, where teams are virtually connected. Hence, individual annual performance appraisals do not reflect the certainty of how work is done.
- **Nuances:** The problem with traditional performance management approaches is that they're hierarchical, annual, weakness-based and backward-looking. They're also focused on measuring employees with ratings—boiling down all the skills and nuances of an employee to a number—which becomes a central point of frustration.
- **Decisions are not data driven:** A decision taken on appraisal usually depends on managers capability to recall employees performance be memory , without having a solid base of data to authenticate the decision. Hence, it is flawed, leading to incorrect reviews.
- **Tied to compensation:** Any function which is tied to the employee salary becomes sensitive, making it very critical to operate. This increases the likelihood of erroneous decisions. Traditional appraisals are always tied to employee compensation, which makes it very unpopular.
- **Untimely corrections:** Problems need to be corrected at right time, else they will just multiply making it difficult to rectify. During annual appraisals the problems are not sorted at right time, thus demoralizing the employee and creating a negative effect on company morale and culture.
- **Rater Bias:** The essence of annual appraisal is the rating given to employees for their performance. This breeds errors in evaluations. There are number of raters errors like stereotyping, prejudices, recency, halo effect etc that affect their ratings given to employees. Rater Bias is a huge problem with performance reviews, and most of the time we don't even know that we have these biases. Managers hire employees that are similar to them. When it's time for these managers to give reviews, their opinion is biased, and they end up giving a high review, regardless of if they deserve it or not. On the other side, managers that review employees that are different than them will be biased to give them a lower review.
- **Imbalance in communication:** During annual appraisal meetings, the communication is always in one direction, from manger to employee. Seldom does an employee gets opportunity to discuss ways to improve their performance.

Need For Continuous Feedback System:
- **Change in management thinking:** We have entered a new era of "management thinking"— which is guided by a new set of principles for leadership, goal setting performance evaluations etc. New performance management practices (and tools) facilitate regular discussions about capabilities and skills, helping employeesto develop holistically. Annual appraisal is incapable of giving these results. Hence, there is an urgent need to change the ways the performance are measured.
- **Shift of focus from accountability to development:** There has been the tug-of-war between accountability and development over the decades. Today, Companies are under competitive pressure to upgrade their talent management efforts. They are taking every step to remove the dissatisfiers that drive employee away. Annual appraisals tend to be one of them.
- **Change in workforce demographics:** Organizations today are characterized by a sizeable increase in much younger workforce, i.e., The millenials resulting in multi-generation diversity. Each generation is driven by different management practices. This demands an altogether different ways of managing and leading them. Traditional appraisal are becoming hugely unpopular amongst them, thus increasing the concern to change it. Employees want more regular feedback. (Bersin, 2014, Cappelli & Tavis, 2016)

- **Dynamic business environment:** Business environment is continually changing. They no longer have clear annual cycles. Jobs have turned into projects, which are short-term, so employees' goals and tasks can't be set in advance accurately. Employees and organizations expect continuous learning.

Companies In Action:
- Technology companies such as Adobe, Juniper Systems, Cisco, Dell, Microsoft, Google and IBM have led the way. They were joined by professional services firms like Deloittes, Accenture, PwC and Gap, Lear, OppenheimerFunds in other sectors. Even the longtime role model for appraisals GE ahas also joined the club. (Cappelli and tavis, 2016).
- Adobe, a technology driven company faced severe attrition consistently. Switching over to frequent check-inns in 2012, Voluntary attrition dropped by 30% , Stock rose by 68%, revenues are up by 4.4% (Source **:** How Adobe Redesigned Performance Management – Bersin by Deloitte)
- Microsoft, a software based company, faced high dissatisfaction amongst its employees towards their performance management system. Replacing it with continuous feedback system aimed to shift the focus from evaluating employees to helping them continually improve. This resulted in increase in Overall satisfaction for the new performance appraisal system by 15% for employees and 21% for Managers from 2012 to 2014.

RED HAT: THE PARTNER:

The red hat on CFS focuses on the emotions and feelings of all those involved in the discussion towards the CFS implementation.
The typical positive emotions associated with it are as follows**:**
- Continuous Feedback system sounds great
- Other top companies are successfully using it, so it's possible to do the same.
- It has become very common; hence, getting proper guidance won't be a problem.
- It will supplement human efforts and not replace them.
- Appraisal decisions and also the judgments, are based on quality and trustworthy data, hence a sense of elation.
The negative emotions might include the following**:**
- A fear of the unknown.
- Continuous Feedback System may risk jobs security resulting in anxiety.
- Implementing Continuous Feedback System brings with it a big change making people feel insecure, anxious and nervous.
- Managers getting baffled by how to evaluate performance for purpose of career advancement and increments.
- To meet new expectations of Continuous Feedback System, training will be required for managers for effective coaching and hence demand more efforts by employees which may not be forthcoming, resulting in rejections.
- A sense of dubious , since using data generated through regular monitoring and coaching in the right context is tricky and challenging.
- Proper management of data requires numerous of trial and errors and lot of patience to get the desired outcome, so can be a matter of worry till results are achieved.
- Continuous Feedback System can be risky and dangerous if there is no feedback supportive culture and climate in the organization.
- Implementing Continuous Feedback System demands a change in the business model and requires support from top management which may not be easy to obtain, thus ensuing in discouragement, demotivation and disappointment amongst employees.
- A fear that the feedback may contain an element of bias.

YELLOW HAT: THE PROVIDER:

The yellow hat thinking focuses on benefits of adopting Continuous feedback system in an organization. The most alluring feature is its ability to rectify problems timely and provide for solutions. It has numerous benefits to every stakeholder in the organization, be it the employee, manager, HR or the organization itself. Let us briefly discuss them.

Benefits to Managers:

- Timely information about performance metrics enables managers to appreciate great work and train employees effectively.
- Managers receive clear business intelligence on people that needs training and projects in trouble well before they affect profitability.
- This system can enable the managers to act as a coach , encourage desired behavior and most importantly help in development of a partnership rather than adversarial relationship, which can be a huge motivation for any employee.
- For managers, regular check-ins helps encourage mentoring and coaching, cut down on end of year paperwork and ensure that annual conversations (if you still have them) have fewer surprises

Benefits to Employees:

- Employees are happier with continuous feedback appraisal system as they appreciate the consistent input with an opportunity to respond instead of receiving a poor raise or a poor bonus.
- Receiving timely feedback is a blessing for poor performers, which helps them to address the problems and act quickly on it at proper time. It is always better to get few criticisms intermittently rather than a severe blow at the end.
- When managers provide continuous feedback to their team members , they are more likely to fully understand the what is required to continue good performance , correct poor performance and improve average performance.
- Regular feedback sessions can help the employees in understanding the difference between effective work & working effieciently, hard work vs smart work and high priority work vs low priority work.
- It enables more timely behaviour change and keeps employees focused on the most important goals. Furthermore, because you can obtain feedback from anyone, outcomes are more fair and unbiased.
- For financial leaders, there is a good return on investment. Sales leaders appreciate customer satisfaction, HR executives are happy with the involvement and engagement. So, it provides the concrete evidence for the changed environment.
- Human beings value collaboration, creativity and celebration. Feedback can become part of everyday work culture; it helps the people to achieve their true potential. It also helps us to understand our collective capacity.
- Short feedback cycles help build confidence because problems can be addressed when they are small, allowing for quick course correction as well as the acknowledgement and re-use of what's working well.

Benefits to HR:

- In many ways, the performance review is a product of the systems in place throughout the HR cycle. Instead of focusing on performance reviews as an isolated task, HR teams will better serve employees by focusing on a rigorous practice of continuous improvement. By studying, reviewing and improving systems and internal processes, HR can take a lead role in transforming an organization.
- For HR teams and executives, having more accurate and timely data means you can better find and develop your high performing talent, as well as manage underperformers more effectively.

Benefits to Organization:

- Company capabilities to implement performance management have improved.
- Continuous feedback makes employee evaluations effective,
- creates employee engagement,
- Improved collaboration and timely decision making: continuous feedback creates open communication and ensures problems are addressed quickly;
- Ability to plug skills gaps more effectively: with skill shortages on the rise, continuous feedback technology can allow organisations to be more agile and adaptable;
- Higher employee engagement and retention: employees will have greater incentive to remain productive and engaged when their performance is an ongoing conversation
- Leads to better communication and
- Overall increased productivity.

- The increase in quality and quantity of data generated through continous feedback gives organizations an insight to identify high performers and make more informed data driven decisions related to pay, promotion, and other rewards. (2017 Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends)

BLACK HAT: THE PREVENTER:

Organizations are most likely to face tough challenges and barriers in the course of implementation of CFS which may include **:**

- **Aligning individual and company goals:** Organizations today are driven by projects. So employee goals may be set around specific projects. As projects complete and tasks change, it becomes difficult to align individual's goals to new projects as well as overall organizational goals. CFS may be incapable of addressing this problem, which otherwise traditional appraisal which was driven by hierarchy may be able to.
- **Rewarding performance.** Companies practicing CFS may be unclear to decide the basis for rewarding performance and how the new system will affect the pay-for-performance model. They are nervous as they don't find CFS a fair and validated method to decide par raises.
- **Legal issues:** The IR managers often worry that there may be unrest amongst employees, if the companies stop basing pay rises and promotions on formal ratings. Though traditional annual appraisal provide ratings , but they are not free from bias in ratings. Similarly, to check gender pay discrimination, if any, a clear appraisal scores and their pay indexes is required. CFS cannot provide for this. Also at many global companies, regulatory or cultural factors restrict any performance related innovations, and can even require organizations to maintain ratings. Adidas Group, for instance, found that its employees in Asia wanted a more traditional, structured approach, while US workers wanted a more agile process. (Amy Berg (Adidas), 2016)
- **Biasedness:** Gap has found that getting rid of annual appraisal rating scores enhanced fairness in pay and other decisions, but there is quite a large possibility of bias while considering information during CFS, while judgements are made.. So one cannot get rid off bias; discriminations and faulty assumptions have their place in CFS too.
- **HR issues:** The biggest resistance to adopting CFS can come from HR itself. Several processes and systems that HR has developed over the years revolve around those traditional annual performance ratings. HRIS also were not designed to accommodate Continuous feedback. Taking away appraisals doesn't necessarily solve every problem that HR failed to address and adopting CFFS requires a complete overhaul of organization culture and climate.
- **One size does not fit all:** Not all types of organizations face the same kind of business pressures to move on to CFS. Organizations with a strong public mission may also be well served by traditional annual appraisals emphasize accountability and financial rewards for individual performers.
- **Lack of concrete record of performance:** Annual appraisals provide for concrete records of performance. This data can help to take important employee related decisions like promotion and talent reviews, development plans, and career migration and even terminations.
- **Ideology at the top matters:** Some companies feel that annual appraisals create healthy competition and clear outcomes (Intel), while others feel that traditional appraisal is essential for accountability (Sun Communities). Employers are not ready to completely give up tradional appraisal and adopting CFS, rather they are looking for some middle ground. (HBR, 2016)

After analyzing all the above limitations and drawbacks, it is unclear if CFS can mitigate appraisal issues.

GREEN HAT: THE PROPOSER:

After studying the barriers or limitations of continuous feedback system, the green hat proposes solutions to address them. Some of the solutions to address the barriers are as follows**:**

Upskilling employees on feedback skills:
To begin the transition, one should understand how to give and receive feedback in the best way. CFS demands feedback to be frequent, technology based and two-way. To incorporate these changes, It is vital to develop leadership, creating discipline in feedback process and encouraging both coaching and collaboration. Hence, employees should be upskilled on these aspects.

Conversations should be two-way:
No one enjoys a one-sided conversation—not even in the workplace. At the same time managers are giving feedback to their employees, employees should also be giving feedback to their managers. If employees

give managers feedback, it opens opportunities to improve performance for the entire organization and not just individuals.

Align feedback to the corporate culture:

If the organization culture promotes transparency in feedback, one can choose to make the feedback open, else keep it anonymous. Accordingly the stage should be adapted to incorporate things. But it will be better to give employees an option to give feedback anonymously. This practice will slowly help everyone to comfortably handle face to face feedbacks.

Promote a culture of trust and honesty:

Honesty and trust are the core to actionable feedback. Hence they should be promoted at all levels in the organization, to such an extent that it gets imbibed the culture of the organization.

Small gestures for big impact:

Acknowledge every accomplishments of employees with awards and letters of appreciation. Noticing good work of employees will enhance their quality of work.

Promote cross-functional feedback:

Enabling cross-functional feedback will help an employee to gain insights on his performance holistically, thus discouraging biasedness in feedback. With multiple feedback points from different relationships-peers, customers, superiors and subordinates, one would have a balanced understanding of his/her performance, thus reducing every element of bias in the process.

Incorporate greater number of feedback channels:

By using diversified channels and tools to communicate feedback, one can curb the practice of ignoring different aspects of feedback on employee performance.

Avoid overloading information:

Feedback provided should always be short and focused on performance. This would generate better results as compared to lengthy feedbacks, which may be overlooked.

Disintegrate discussions:

performance based discussions should be separated from the ones focusing career plans. This will lead to more better results due to its specificity.

Upskill managers in coaching skills:

Continuous feedback for employees is a critical feature of the new PM paradigm, yet managers often need help learning how to be full-time coaches rather than part-time evaluators. Companies adopting a new PM approach should focus heavily on leadership development, building new "muscles" in managers, and creating discipline around feedback, coaching, and collaboration. (2017 Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends).

Incorporate structure:

Employees at every level need structure which need to be provided. But taking away annual appraisal removes this structure. Hence it is vital to provide tools to employees at every level to engage in continuous feedback leading to constructive conversations.

Supplement with career focused interviews in intervals:

Along with regular continuous interviews, at certain intervals in a year, career focused interviews be conducted. It should focus questions on career trajectory.

Periodic compensation review:

A periodic compensation review process aligned with the company's compensation philosophy should be formalized. As a result, managers will get a flexibility to have more goal centric conversations with employees.

BLUE HAT: CONCLUSION:

Frederick Herzberg once said – "If you want people to do a good job, give them a good job to do." Employees today are more proactive and seek empowerment. They want to articulate in shaping their career, they expect regular feedbacks and development opportunities which calls for a shift in the attitude towards performance appraisals from 'evaluating' to ' Continuous Coaching and development'. Encouraging Managers, regular feedbacks, development & training opportunities will enable the employees to work on their skill set and performance, aligned with the organizational objective. Hence, in today's globalized, talent constrained workplace, with more number of Gen Y participating, it's apparent that the traditional appraisal has to transform. Continuous Feedback System is n stimulating advancement—pioneered by the foresight of a few innovative organizations several years ago and has now become the new normal. The need of the hour is to focus on using CFS to support robust career paths that offer a wide variety of opportunities, offer recognition and differentiated (performance-based) rewards, and foster a culture of high performance. Transparency in communications,

expectations, and collaboration among managers and among team members is a prerequisite to drive CFS. Organizations that take advantage of these advances will provide a better ecosystem for their employees where they can flourish and excel. The success of CFS depends largely on the organizations culture. An environment of fear and politics in the organization will refrain from achieving the objectives. It is the time for the organizations to think bold and create opportunity for business aligned, evidence based innovation. One who will take advantage of these advances will provide a better ecosystem for their employees where they can flourish and excel. Certainly we can now say, Continuous Feedback system is the new normal.

REFERENCES:

Amy Berg (Adidas), (November 2016). In discussion with the authors(Nathan Sloan, Dimple Agarwal, Stacia Garr, Karen Pastakia). Performance management: Playing a winning hand. 2017 Global Human Capital Trends. Retrieved from https://dupress.deloitte.com/dup-us-en/focus/human-capital-trends/2017/redesigning-performance-management.html#endnote-sup-11

Bersin J, (May 6, 2013). The Little Black Book of Billionaire Secrets: Time to Scrap Performance Appraisals? Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/joshbersin/2013/05/06/time-to-scrap-performance-appraisals/#1692d5e831c3

Bersin, J. (2014). The Myth of the Bell Curve: Look for the Hyper-Performers.

Bersin, J., & by Deloitte, B. (2013). Predictions for 2014. *Bersin by Deloitte*.

Brian Hoffman, Charles E. Lance, Bethany Bynum, and William A. Gentry, (Spring 2010). Rater source effects are alive and well after all, *Personnel Psychology* 63, no. 1 (): pp. 119–151)

Business.com editorial staff (06 October 2015). Break free from performance management shackles: Companies that are paving the way. Business.com. Retrieved from http://www.business.com/management/performance-management-companies-that-are-breaking-free/.

Cappelli, P., & Tavis, A. (2016). The performance management revolution. *Harvard Business Review*, *94*(10), 58-67.

David Rock, Beth Jones, and Camille Inge., (2015). Reengineering performance management: How companies are evolving PM beyond ratings, *NeuroLeadership Institute.*

Edward De Bono. Six Thinking Hats. Retrieved from http://www.debonogroup.com/parallel_thinking.php

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign.

Human Capital Institute staff (2015). No review, no problem: Making talent decisions without ratings. *Human Capital Institute.* Retrieved from http://www.hci.org/hr-research/2015-talent-pulse-no-review-no-problem-making-talent-decisions-without-ratings

Jacob Shriar, Employee Feedback: The Complete Guide. Retrieved from https://www.officevibe.com/employee-engagement-solution/employee-feedback)

Kimberly Schaufenbuel (2016). *Transforming the Traditional Performance Review Process.* UNC Executive Development. Retrieved from http://www.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/~/media/Files/documents/executive-development/unc-white-paper-transforming-the-traditional-performance-review-process.pdf

McGregor, J. (14 February 2013). *The corporate kabuki of performance reviews.* The Washington Post. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/on-leadership/the-corporate-kabuki-of-performance-reviews/2013/02/14/59b60e86-7624-11e2-aa12-e6cf1d31106b_story.html

Patre, S., (2016). Six Thinking Hats Approach to HR Analytics. *South Asian Journal of Human Resources Management,* 3(2), pp.191-199.

Pelster, B., & Schwartz, J. (2017). Global Human Capital Trends.

Performance Management Process. State of Oklahoma. Training and Development, OMES Human Capital Management. Retrieved from https://apps.ok.gov/opm/documents/PMPHandbook.pdf

Rock, D., Davis, J., and Jones, E. (2013). One simple idea that can transform performance management. People and Strategy. Retrieved from http://blueroom.neuroleadership.com/assets/documents/readings/HRPSPS-36-2_ResearchCorner.pdf

Simple Steps to Improve Real-Time Feedback & Recognition. Retrieved from http://www.icoachfirst.com/blog/simple-steps-to-improve-real-time-feedback-recognition)

The HR Executive's Guide to Building a Feedback Culture. Retrieved from www.betterworks.com

----