

Republika ng Pilipinas
(Republic of the Philippines)
MINISTRI NG EDUKASYON AT KULTURA
(MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE)
Manila

May 24, 1982

MEC O R D E R
No. 19, s. 1982

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM FOR KEY MEC OFFICIALS

To: Bureau Directors
Regional Directors
Cultural Agency Directors
Chiefs of Services and Heads of Units
Schools Superintendents
Vocational School Superintendents/Administrators

1. Inclosed is a copy of the Performance Appraisal System for Key Central and field officials of this Ministry approved by the Civil Service Commission in its Resolution No. 81-1175.
2. This instrument will be used for evaluating the performance of assistant secretaries, bureau directors and assistant directors, regional directors and assistant regional directors, superintendents, assistant superintendents, supervisors, district supervisors and school principals, starting school year 1983-84.
3. It is desired that this instrument be thoroughly studied and discussed by all concerned. Orientation meetings should be conducted extensively this school year to insure proper understanding of the use of this instrument. Where feasible, regions/divisions may implement this system on a pilot/try-out basis.
4. Regional directors are requested to identify members of the rating teams as soon as possible. An orientation/training program for members of regional rating teams will be conducted in August this year. Regional training teams will conduct similar programs for division rating teams subsequently.
5. Any queries, requests for clarification, or suggestions regarding the instrument or the guidelines may be sent to this Office, attention: The Assistant Secretary for Personnel Management and Development.

(SGD.) ONOFRE D. CORPUZ
Minister

Incl.:
As stated

Reference:
MEC Order: No. 2, s. 1979

Allotment: 1-2--(D.O. 1-76)

To be indicated in the Perpetual Index
under the following subjects:

BUREAUS & OFFICES
OFFICIALS
RATINGS
RULES & REGULATIONS

RATING SHEET FOR KEY MEC OFFICIALS
(Central Office and Field)

Name _____ Rating Period _____

Position _____

I t e m s	Rating
-----------	--------

A. Planning and organizing work, getting work done at specified time.
(Maximum pts. - 30)

Targets: a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

Accomplishments:

a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

I t e m s

Rating

B. Utilization/allocation of resources
(Maximum pts. - 10)

Explanatory statement: _____

C. Promptness and accuracy in submission
of required reports/statistics, budget
proposals. (Maximum pts. - 10)

Explanatory statement: _____

D. Problem Analysis and Decision Making
(Maximum pts. - 15)

Explanatory statement: _____

E. Leadership and Personnel Management
(Maximum pts. - 25)

Explanatory statement: _____

F. Public Relations and Community Involvement
(Maximum pts. - 10)

Explanatory statement: _____

T O T A L

PLUS FACTOR

Explanatory statement: _____

FINAL RATING

SUMMARY OF RATINGS

- A. Planning and Organizing Work _____
- B. Utilization/Allocation of Resources _____
- C. Promptness and Accuracy in Submission of Required Reports _____
- D. Problem Analysis and Decision Making _____
- E. Leadership and Personnel Management _____
- F. Public Relations and Community Involvement _____
- PLUS FACTOR _____
- T o t a l _____

Numerical Rating _____ Rater/s _____
Descriptive Rating _____

Shown to me _____ Reviewed and approved by: _____

Rates _____ Rating Official _____

Key to Descriptive Rating

- 87 - 100 - Outstanding
- 73 - 86 - Very satisfactory
- 53 - 72 - Satisfactory
- 35 - 52 - Fair
- 34 or below - Unsatisfactory

Guidelines for Rating Key MEC Officials

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE USE OF THE PERFORMANCE
APPRAISAL SYSTEM FOR KEY MEC OFFICIALS

Introductory statement

The Performance Appraisal System for Key MEC Officials stresses the output/results concept prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. However, since there are factors which should be considered in determining the overall performance of an official and which cannot be measured in terms of quantifiable results, this system makes use of appropriate indicators.

Officials will be rated on the basis of the following:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Planning and Organizing Work | 30 |
| 2. Utilization/Allocation of Resources | 10 |
| 3. Promptness/Accuracy in Submission of Required Reports/Statistics | 10 |
| 4. Problem Analysis and Decision Making | 15 |
| 5. Leadership and Personnel Management | 25 |
| 6. Public Relations and Community Involvement | 10 |
| 7. Plus Factor | |

Procedure

Central, Regional, and Division Office Rating Teams shall be formed, the composition of which is at the discretion of the rating official.

At the start of the rating period, performance targets shall be set by the rating team and the ratee, covering the major concerns for the rating period. Sample targets are given in the guidelines. The rating team should see to it that the targets are reasonable, not too low or too high, taking into account the resources available and the conditions obtaining in the ratee's area of service.

These targets will be the basis for the rating in the item Planning and Organizing Work. Rating for the other items may be determined on the basis of the indicators listed in the Guidelines.

A ratee may earn a bonus of five points as a Plus Factor for certain distinctive or outstanding accomplishments. Basis for the Plus Factor bonus is given in the Guidelines.

Also attached as annexes A and B are suggested instruments for getting inputs for ratings in Leadership and Public Relations and Community Involvement. Similar forms may be designed by the raters for determining rating in Leadership and Personnel Management, if deemed necessary.

Evaluation shall be yearly - to cover the period from April of base year to March of the succeeding year.

The ratings for each item, as well as for the Plus Factor, if any, shall be added and shall constitute the final numerical rating of the rated official.

The equivalent descriptive ratings are as follows:

87 - 100	- Outstanding
73 - 86	- Very satisfactory
53 - 72	- Satisfactory
35 - 52	- Fair
34 or below	- Unsatisfactory

The rating recommended by the rating team shall be subject to review and final approval by the rating official. The rating shall be shown to the ratee who shall then sign on the space provided.

N.B.

For rating those performing principally supervisory work, indicators not applicable may be disregarded such as, for example, the item on personnel actions under Leadership and Personnel Management. An alternative indicator sheet on Utilization of Resources, copy inclosed, may be used for supervisors.

**GUIDELINES FOR RATING KEY MEC OFFICIALS
(CENTRAL OFFICE AND FIELD)**

For Item A - Planning and Organizing Work
(Maximum Pts. - 30)

Targets, in accordance with a work plan, will be set at the start of the rating period. The targets should reflect the major thrusts of the division/region, such as for **example**, in the area of raising pupil achievement, school sites development, teacher development and special projects. The targets shall represent what is deemed as a satisfactory level of performance and shall be agreed upon by both the rater and the ratee.

Targets should, as much as possible, be quantifiable and time-bounded.

Actual accomplishments at the end of the rating period shall be recorded and compared with the target. Rating will be in accordance with the following:

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| a. Actual accomplishments exceed targets by 25% in quantity, quality or in time. | - 30 |
| b. Accomplishments exceed targets by 10% in quantity, quality, and time or by 25% in either quality, quantity or time. | - 24 |
| c. Accomplishments meet targets as set. | - 18 |
| d. Accomplishments fall short of targets by 10% as to quality, quantity or time. | - 12 |
| e. Accomplishments fall short of targets by 25% as to quality, quantity or time. | - 6 |

Example 1.

Target: Increase division reading proficiency of at least 80% of elementary school pupils by one level by March 1982.

Actual Accomplishment:

(Determined on the basis of division evaluation like division test, etc.)

Reading proficiency of 80% of elementary school pupils increased by two levels by March 1982. (Quality target exceeded by 100%.)

or

Reading proficiency of all elementary school pupils increased by one level by March 1982. (Quantity target exceeded by 25%).

Rating is 30

Example 2. Start of Rating Period - January 1981.

Target: 10 Learning Centers operational by December 31, 1981.

Actual Accomplishment:

13 Learning Centers operational by September 30.

Rating for this activity is 30.

A rating of 24 may be given if the accomplishment will be any of the following:

- (a) 13 Learning Centers operational by December, 1981;
- (b) 10 Learning Centers operational by September, 1981; or
- (c) 11 Learning Centers operational by November, 1981.

Each target shall be rated. If five targets have been set, the ratings of each of the five items shall be added and divided by 5. The result shall be the rating for Planning and Organizing Work.

For Item B - Utilization of Resources

<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<p>1. All funds judiciously utilized observing priorities in the purchase of equipment and supplies; no non-priority items purchased; fairness observed in allocation of travel funds so that all officials requiring travel funds enabled to perform work efficiently; buildings fairly allocated; all needs of office/region/division provided for with a minimum of 10 % savings realized. No excess personnel noted and basic needs attended to even with scant resources.</p>	
<p>(NOTE: All these indicators would be present to deserve a rating of 10)</p>	10
<p>2. All funds judiciously utilized observing priorities in the purchase of equipment and supplies; no non-priority items purchased; fairness observed in allocation of travel funds so that all officials enabled to perform work efficiently; all needs of personnel, units provided satisfactorily; no excess of personnel but no savings realized.</p>	8
<p>3. All funds judiciously utilized observing priorities in the purchase of supplies and equipment but evidences of either some unfairness in allocation of travel funds or non-maximization of existing positions or personnel</p>	
<p>or</p>	
<p>Travel funds allocated fairly and existing positions/ personnel maximally utilized but cases of one or two purchases of non-priority equipment/supplies noted.</p>	6
<p>4. A want of fairness seen in allocation of travel funds so that certain personnel have not been enabled to perform their functions</p>	
<p>or</p>	
<p>Cases of 2 or more purchases of non-priority items noted; a number of under-utilized personnel/positions noted without sufficient justification.</p>	4

Indicators

Rating

5. **Gross mis-allocation of funds; items purchased of no immediate use; activities like supervision hampered by lack of funds; critical supplies requirement not provided for.**

2

For Item C- Promptness/Accuracy in Submission of Required Reports/Statistics

<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. All required reports, statistics, budget proposals submitted <u>before date due</u> with all required information, accurately given, no revision necessary; no discrepancies or inconsistencies noted.	10
2. All required reports, statistics, budget proposals submitted <u>on the date due</u> with not more than one instance of inaccuracy, incompleteness, or necessity for revision.	8
3. All required reports, statistics, budget proposals submitted on time with not more than 4 instances of incompleteness, inaccuracy, or discrepancies or two instances requiring revision.	
or	
All required reports complete and accurate requiring no revision in not more than 3 cases, did not meet deadline set, without, however being subjected to a call-up.	6
4. Given not more than 3 call-ups for reports or report not submitted on time but with 5 or more instances (but not exceeding 8) of necessity for review, revision or rechecking due to inaccuracies or incompleteness.	4
5. Given more than 3 call-ups for overdue reports or attention called more than 8 times for inaccuracies in or incompleteness of reports.	2

<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Rating</u>
1. All problematic matters that can be resolved at their level satisfactorily acted on; no such matters elevated to a higher office. Evidence of workable solutions attempted on critical, urgent matters generally beyond their level of decision at least to minimize effects of the problem; absence of any problems in the division/region left without corrective action; no complaints submitted to higher offices regarding problems in the area. (Note: All these factors should be present to merit a rating of 15.)	15
2. All problems that can be resolved at their level satisfactorily acted on; no problem left without corrective action; no complaints that could be settled at their level elevated to higher offices; but no evidence of attempts at workable solution on critical, urgent matters usually beyond their level of decision.	12
3. Not more than two cases of problems that can be resolved at their level elevated to a higher office; or not more than two instances of complaints elevated to higher office for non-action on the part of the ratee's office; but evidence seen of effort to resolve problems that emerge in the area of service.	9
4. More than two but not more than five cases of problems that can be resolved at their level elevated to a higher office; or more than two but not more than five instances of complaints elevated to higher office for non-action on the part of the ratee's office. Problems in the area, generally beyond their level of decision, allowed to remain or become more acute by non-action such as bringing the matter to the attention of authorities concerned.	6

Indicators

Rating

5. More than five cases of problems that can be resolved at their level elevated to a higher office; or more than five instances of complaints elevated to higher office for non-action on the part of the ratee's office; problems in the area, beyond their level of decision, allowed to remain or become more acute by non-action on the part of the ratee.

3

<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<p>1 Personnel matters like appointments, salary adjustments, promotions, etc. promptly attended to. No complaints on unjustified delays in salary;</p> <p>Work targets/policies clearly communicated to subordinate units or personnel;</p> <p>Motivation/incentives and support provided at all times to enable subordinates to achieve targets effectively; support given in terms of advice, ideas, structures or process;</p> <p>Systematic programs to develop personnel instituted/ implemented such as training programs, scholarships, special assignment for those with potential, counselling or coaching to those who need it;</p> <p>Efficient control mechanism set up to check or monitor progress of subordinates' work; feedback provided to units on the quality of their work;</p> <p>Employee welfare programs instituted;</p> <p>Has full confidence and support of subordinates.</p>	25
<p>(All these indicators should be present to merit a rating of 25)</p> <p>-----</p>	
<p>2. Personnel matters like appointments, adjustments in salaries, promotions, etc. promptly attended to; no complaints on unjustified delays in salaries especially of teachers;</p> <p>Work targets/policies clearly communicated to subordinate units or personnel;</p> <p>A program of development set up for personnel such as training, coaching, apprenticeship but no welfare program for employees instituted. Generally, except in one or two instances, motivation, incentives, and support provided as well as assistance in terms of advice or mechanisms to enable subordinates to achieve performance goals;</p>	

<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<p>Efficient management control system set up to check on or monitor programs of subordinates' work but feedback not always provided;</p> <p>Has full confidence and support of subordinates.</p>	20

<p>3. All personnel matters like appointments, adjustments in salaries, promotions promptly and properly attended to; no complaints on unjustifiable delays in salaries of teachers;</p> <p>Not more than two instances of failure to communicate clearly targets, policies, goals, clearly to subordinate personnel;</p> <p>Implemented a program for development of personnel/ or provided leadership for personnel development programs for certain groups;</p> <p>Not more than 3 instances of failure to provide motivation, incentives, or assistance in terms of ideas or support mechanics, to enable subordinates to achieve their goals;</p> <p>Only sometimes institutes management control mechanisms to check or monitor programs of subordinates' work;</p> <p>Has full trust and confidence of most of his subordinates.</p>	15

<p>4. Generally, all personnel matters like appointments, adjustment in salaries, promotions, transfers promptly and properly attended to but cases of at least three justified complaints on personnel matters such as delays or unfairness in appointment, delays in salaries, etc.;</p> <p>Policies, targets or goals seldom clearly communicated to subordinate personnel;</p> <p>Minimal measures for employee development or welfare;</p> <p>Subordinates only sometimes provided motivation, incentives or support measures to enable them to achieve targets;</p> <p>Very seldom utilize feedback or monitoring mechanisms to check on progress of work of subordinates;</p>	

Indicators

Rating

Enjoys only partially, the trust and confidence of most of his subordinates.

10

5. A number of justified complaints from the division/region on personnel matters like adjustment in salaries, promotions, assignments, etc.;

No systematic effort to communicate targets/policies to subordinates;

No measures instituted for employee development and welfare;

Seldom provides incentives, motivation or assistance in the form of advice or support mechanisms to enable subordinates to achieve targets.

No control or monitoring mechanism on progress of work of subordinates.

Majority of subordinates do not have faith or confidence in his leadership.

5

(NOTE: For rating this portion, the attached questionnaire may be used to obtain inputs from subordinates, in addition to other sources such as observations, etc.)

For Item F - Public Relations and Community Involvement

<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<p>1. Has excellent public image in the community as well as among peers in other agencies. Gives full cooperation in implementation of regional programs of government;</p> <p>Is held in highest regard by leaders in socio-civic agencies and by members of his various publics, including parents, religious leaders, etc.;</p> <p>Facilitative in action.</p> <p>(NOTE: All these indicators should be present to merit a rating of 10.)</p> <p>-----</p>	10
<p>2. Has very satisfactory image in the community;</p> <p>Most of the peers in various agencies hold him in high regard for his cooperation in various government programs;</p> <p>Generally in high regard by most of the leaders in socio-civic agencies and organizations, teachers, parents and other sectors.</p> <p>-----</p>	8
<p>3. Has good image, generally, in the community;</p> <p>Peers from other agencies satisfied with his cooperation in the implementation of government thrusts and programs;</p> <p>Most of the leaders of socio-civic agencies regard him as average in his public relations.</p> <p>-----</p>	6
<p>4. Although generally has good image in the community, there were at least two instances of adverse observations in his behavior;</p> <p>A number of peers from other agencies not satisfied with his involvement or cooperation in the implementation of certain government programs;</p>	

Indicators

Rating

Not very well regarded by socio-civic leaders,
parents and other sectors.

4

5. Very poor public image in the community. Has been the subject of a number of complaints from peers or socio-civic leaders, or parents relating to his professional conduct;

Peers from other agencies see him as uncooperative and a difficult person to deal with;

Cannot get the cooperation of other agencies/sectors in activities of education.

2

(NOTE: The attached questionnaire/rating sheet may be used for obtaining inputs from community on the ratee's public relations and community involvement.)

Attachment to Item on Leadership

EVALUATION ON LEADERSHIP
(To be accomplished by subordinates)

Instruction: Using a scale of 1 to 10, 1 for very poor and 10 for outstanding, please rate _____
on the following items: (name)

<u>I t e m s</u>	<u>Rating Scale</u> <u>of 1 - 10</u>
<u>Targets</u> How effectively did he communicate work targets/requirements to you?	_____
<u>Motivation</u> To what extent did he provide ideas for more effective output on your part? How effectively did he provide motivations and incentives to you and your unit to enable you to work more efficiently?	_____
<u>Work Structure</u> How effectively did he set up structures/processes so that targets could be efficiently realized?	_____
<u>Controls</u> How effectively did he implement management control mechanisms like indicating target dates, checking or monitoring progress of your unit, giving you feedback, etc. to support your unit's work?	_____
<u>Development of Subordinates</u> To what extent did he provide opportunities for your development - e.g., through delegation, training programs, assignment to task force, special assignments, coaching, counselling, job review?	_____

I t e m s

Rating Scale
of 1 - 10

Overall Rating

How would you rate your superior/
supervisor on his overall leadership and managerial
effectiveness?

Name and Signature

Designation

Attachment for Rating Public Relations and Community Involvement

RATING FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
(To be accomplished by Non-MEC Raters)

Instructions to Rater

Using a scale of 1 to 10; 10 for outstanding and 1 for very poor,
please rate _____
on the following items: _____ (name)

<u>I t e m s</u>	<u>Rating Scale</u> <u>of 1 - 10</u>
<u>Cooperation</u> Extent to which he supported regional/provincial programs and cooperated in their implementation as well as quality of participation.	_____
<u>Political Sensitivity</u> Skills in perceiving effects of his action on other sectors of government/community, or other sectors of the population.	_____
<u>Public Relations</u> Degree of participation/involvement in social activities, civic programs, associations, etc. Skills in dealing with various publics.	_____
<u>Integrity and Morality</u> Level of his integrity and morality as perceived by the public.	_____
Overall rating in public relations, political sensitivity and community involvement.	_____

Signature

Designation/Position

Claims for PLUS FACTOR should be supported by Documents or Justifications

PLUS FACTORS	<u>Points</u> 5	<u>Rating</u>
--------------	--------------------	---------------

A ratee may be given additional five points for:

- a. Decisive judicious action in a crisis or emergency situation where such action had significant effects.

The criteria of seriousness of situation and extent/permanence of effect may be used as guide.

- ✓ b. Introducing an innovation in curricular programs, delivery system, curriculum materials, cost-saving methodologies where such innovation contributed significantly to the efficiency of the system.
- c. Acts of heroism and courage beyond the normal call of duty.
- d. Distinguished contribution/involvement in activities of other agencies of government or socio-civic organizations.