UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTING





AACCUP LEVEL 1 ACCREDITATION

AREA X
ADMINISTRATION

I.3. The SDP is implemented, monitored, evaluated, reviewed and updated regularly.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Document No.	USM– PDO-002-Rev.2.2020.07.01	Rev. No.	2	Page 1 of 6

EFFECTIVE DATE	REV. NO.	REVISION TYPE	CHANGE DESCRIPTION	PAGE AFFECTED	ORIGINATOR
July 01, 2020	2	Partial	Change Code	ALL	RENEL M. ALUCILJA / CATHERINE A. MAMONDAS
February 15, 2018	1	New	Revised in accordance to the Quality Management System requirements	ALL	EIMER M. ESTILOSO / CATHERINE A. MAMONDAS
July 04, 2016	Ø	New	Newly established in accordance to the Quality Management System requirements	ALL	EIMER M. ESTILOSO / CATHERINE A. MAMONDAS

UNCONTROLLED

Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:	DCC USE ONLY			
			DOCUMENT CONTROL INDICATOR			
RENEL M. ALUCILJA, RPAE CATHERINE A. MAMONDAS Name and Signature	ANITA C. SORNITO, EdD Name and Signature	JENNIFER E. SINCO Name and Signature	MASTER	2020.07.01	COPY	

ELECTRONICALLY RELEASED

2020.11.26

This document is a sole property of UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO. Any disclosure, unauthorized reproduction or use is strictly prohibited except with permission from USM.
Only documents with standard signatories of USM are considered official.

1.0 PURPOSE

The Performance Evaluation Procedure aims to establish and maintain a documented procedure for Quality Management System of the University of Southern Mindanao. The Performance Evaluation Procedure also aims to define the controls needed to ensure that individual performance of personnel must be cascaded to office performance. The functions and activities set in their Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) Form and units' Office Performance Commitment and Review (OPCR) Form must be monitored, evaluated/reviewed semi-annually in accordance with the criteria/targets.

2.0 SCOPE

This procedure applies to all functional units of University of Southern Mindanao.

3.0 DEFINITION OF TERMS

3.1 Efficiency - the extent to which targets are accomplished using the minimum amount of time or resources. Efficient performance applies to continuing tasks or frontline services. It involves the following elements

- **3.1.1** Standard response time
- **3.1.2** Number of requests/applications acted upon over number of requests/applications received
- **3.1.3** Optimum use of resources (e.g., money, logistics, office supplies)

3.2 General Administration and Support Services (GASS) - activities that deal with the provision of overall administrative management support to the entire agency operation.

3.3 Individual Performance Commitment Review- The IPCR is an SPMS form that is accomplished individually by employees. It details the Key Result Areas (KRAs), Success Indicators, Actual Accomplishments, Rating for Quality (Q), Efficiency (E), and Timeliness (T), and the Average (Ave), and Remarks.

3.4 Mandated Functions- the goods and services that the university is mandated to deliver to clients through the implementation of programs, projects, and activities (PPAs). The University's Mandated Functions are as follows:

- 3.4.1 Instruction
- 3.4.2 Research and Extension
- 3.4.3 Resource Generation
- 3.4.4 General Administration and Support Services (GASS)

3.5 Office Performance Commitment Review- The OPCR contains performance targets, as listed by the Office Heads. It includes the following details: Key Result Areas (KRAs), Success Indicators, Actual Accomplishments, Rating for Quality (Q), Efficiency (E), and Timeliness (T), and the Average (Ave), and Remarks.

3.6 Quality or Effectiveness – it means getting the right things done. It refers to the degree to which objectives are achieved as intended and the extent to which issues are addressed with a certain degree of excellence. Quality or effective performance involves the following elements:

- 3.6.1 Acceptability
- 3.6.2 Meeting standards
- 3.6.3 Client satisfaction with services rendered
- 3.6.4 Accuracy

3.7 General Administration and Support Services (GASS)- GASS refer to activities that provide technical and substantive support to the operations and projects of the agency. By themselves, these activities do not produce the Mandated Functions but they contribute or enhance the delivery of goods and services.

3.8 Timeliness - measures if the targeted deliverable was done within the scheduled or expected timeframe. Timely performance involves meeting deadlines as set in the work plan.

4.0 REFERENCES

2.1 Quality Management System Manual (USM-QMS-002-Rev.3.2020.02.18)
2.2 Corrective Action Procedure (USM-QMS-017-Rev.3.2020.02.18)
2.3 Continual Improvement Procedure (USM-QMS-020-Rev.2.2020.02.18)

5.0 RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

5.1 The Performance Management Team (PMT) chaired by the Vice President for Administration and Finance, with the Planning Office as Secretariat, shall:

- 5.1.1 Monitor submission of Office Performance Commitment and Review Form and schedule the review/evaluation of Office Commitments by the PMT before the start of a performance period.
- 5.1.2 Consolidate, review, validate and evaluate the initial performance assessment of the Heads of Offices based on reported Office accomplishments against the success indicators, and the allotted budget against the actual expenses. The result of the assessment shall be the basis of PMT's recommendation to the Head of Agency who shall determine the final Office rating.

This document is a sole property of UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO. Any disclosure, unauthorized reproduction or use is strictly prohibited except with permission from USM.
Only documents with standard signatories of USM are considered official.

MASTER COPY

UNCONTROLLED

5.1.3 Conduct an agency performance planning and review conference annually for the purpose of discussing the Office assessment for the preceding performance period and plans for the succeeding rating period with concerned Heads of Offices. This shall include participation of the Financial Office as regards budget utilization.

5.1.4 Provide each Office with the final Office Assessment to serve as basis of offices in the assessment of individual staff members.

5.2 The Human Resource Management and Development Office shall

5.2.1 Monitor submission of Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form by heads of offices.

5.2.2 Review the Summary List of Individual Performance Rating to ensure that the average performance rating of employees is equivalent to or not higher than the Office Performance Rating as recommended by the PMT and approved by the Head of Agency.

5.2.3 Provide analytical data on retention, skill/competency gaps, and talent development plans that align with strategic plans.

5.2.4 Coordinate developmental interventions that will form part of the HR Plan.

5.3 The Head of Academic units and Offices shall

5.3.1 Assume primary responsibility for performance management in his/her Office

5.3.2 Conduct strategic planning session with the supervisors and staff and agree on the outputs that should be accomplished based on the goals/objectives of the organization and submits the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form to the Planning Office.

5.3.3 Review and approve individual employee's Performance Commitment and Review form for submission to the HRM Office/Personnel Office before the start of the performance period.

5.3.4 Submit a quarterly accomplishment report to the Planning Office based on the PMS calendar[1]

5.3.5 Do initial assessment of office's performance using the approved Office Performance Commitment and Review form.

5.3.6 Determine final assessment of performance level of the individual employees in his/her office based on proof of performance.

5.3.7 Inform employees of the final rating and identifies necessary interventions to employees based on the assessment of developmental needs.

5.3.7.1 Recommend and discuss a development plan with the subordinates who obtain Unsatisfactory performance during the rating period not later than one (1) month after the end of the said period and prepares written notice/advice to subordinates that a succeeding Unsatisfactory performance shall warrant their separation from the service.

5.3.7.2 Provide preliminary rating to subordinates showing Poor performance not earlier than the third (3rd) month of the rating period. A development plan shall be discussed with the concerned subordinate and issue a written notice that failure to improve their performance shall warrant their separation from the service.

5.4 The Department Chairperson or equivalent shall

5.4.1 Assume joint responsibility with the Head of Office in ensuring attainment of performance objectives and targets

5.4.2 Rationalize distribution of targets/tasks

5.4.3 Monitor closely the status of the performance of their subordinates and provide support and assistance through the conduct of coaching for the attainment of targets set by the Division/Unit and individual employee.

5.4.4 Assess individual employees' performance

5.4.5 Recommend developmental intervention

5.5 The Individual Employees shall

5.5.1 Act as partners of management and their co-employees in meeting organizational performance goals

UNCONTROLLED

This document is a sole property of UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO. Any disclosure, unauthorized reproduction or use is strictly prohibited except with permission from USM.
Only documents with standard signatories of USM are considered official.
MASTER COPY

6.0 PROCEDURE DETAILS

6.1 Performance Planning and Commitment

6.1.1 Determine the University's Mandated Functions:

6.1.1.1 The Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) links staff performance with organizational performance. As such, it is important to understand the organization's mandate and strategic priorities. During the period of performance planning and commitment, the first thing to do is to understand the University's Mandated Functions (MFs). MFs are delivered by core processes of operating offices/units. However, offices/units that do not directly deliver goods and services to external clients contribute to the delivery of the university's MFs through General Administration and Support Services (GASS) activities.

6.1.2. Identify the Success Indicators of Each Mandated Function (MF):

6.1.2.1 The university must agree on the performance standards on which they want to be measured. The success indicators can be determined by referring to the following documents:

6.1.2.1.1 Citizen's Charter
6.1.2.1.2 RA 6713 (Code of Ethics and Ethical Standards
6.1.2.1.3 OPES Reference Table
6.1.2.1.4 Accomplishment Reports (for historical data)
6.1.2.1.5 Benchmarking Reports
6.1.2.1.6 Stakeholders' Feedback Reports

6.1.2.2 Success indicators must be Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-bounded (SMART). Performance targets and standards are continuously reviewed and refined. As such, determine specific targets and success indicators for each year in the annual work plan.

6.1.3 Identify the Performance Goals of the respective office

6.1.3.1 In most cases, one or several offices will be contributing to one Mandated Function. It is also possible that one office will be contributing to two MFs. If the respective office/unit is not directly delivering goods and services to external clients, that office/unit is implementing General Administration and Support Services (GASS) activities. As such, it should have its own SMART performance targets or success indicators from the office/unit level down to the individual staff level.

6.1.4 Identify the Performance Goals of the Departments under the Office/College

6.1.4.1 Units under an office must contribute towards achieving a specific MF through a set of performance goals or success indicators. As such, the performance goals of the different units must be aligned with the performance goals of the office.

6.1.5 Identify the Performance Goals of Individuals under Each Department

6.1.5.1 Each department will be staffed by at least one individual employee. The performance goals of each individual employee must contribute and align with the performance goals of the department

6.1.6 Develop the Rating Scale

6.1.6.1 Developing the Rating Scale involves two sub-steps:

6.1.6.1.1 Determining the dimensions on which performance or accomplishments are to be rated.
6.1.6.1.2 Operationalizing the numerical and adjectival ratings.

6.1.6.2 The three dimensions of performance or accomplishments are quality, efficiency, and timeliness.

6.1.6.3 Not all performance accomplishments need to be rated along all three dimensions of quality, efficiency, and timeliness. Some accomplishments may only be rated on any combination of two or three dimensions. In other cases, only one dimension may be sufficient. Depending on how success indicators are stated, an employee can rate a performance along the dimensions of quality, efficiency, and/or timeliness. The rating needs to be discussed within the unit and between the supervisors and staff (i.e., raters and ratees) to clarify the expected outputs at the beginning of the performance monitoring period. Because performance is

This document is a sole property of UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO. Any disclosure, unauthorized reproduction or use is strictly prohibited except with permission from USM.
Only documents with standard signatories of USM are considered official.

UNCONTROLLED COPY

measured within a scheduled monitoring period, all accomplishments always involve the dimension of time. As such, performance is always rated on either efficiency and/or timeliness.

6.1.6.4 On each dimension of quality, efficiency, and timeliness, rate performance using a numerical scale ranging from 1 to 5—with 1 as the lowest and 5 as the highest. The table below explains the meaning of each rating:

Rating		Description
Numerical	Adjectival	
5	Outstanding	Performance exceeded expectations by 30% and above of the planned targets. Performance demonstrated was exceptional in terms of quality, technical skills, creativity, and initiative, showing mastery of the task. Accomplishments were made in more than expected but related aspects of the target.
4	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeded expectations by 15% to 29% of the planned targets.
3	Satisfactory	Performance met 90% to 114% of the planned targets. However, if it involves deadlines required by law, it should be 100% of the planned targets.
2	Unsatisfactory	Performance only met 51% to 89% of the planned targets and failed to deliver one or more critical aspects of the target. However, if it involves deadlines required by law, the range of performance should be 51% to 99% of the planned targets.
1	Poor	Performance failed to deliver most of the targets by 50% and below.

6.2. Performance Monitoring and Coaching

6.2.1 Develop the Performance Monitoring and Coaching Tools

6.2.1.1 It is important to regularly monitor the performance of offices, departments, and employees. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and tools must be in place so that timely and appropriate steps can be taken towards meeting performance targets and organizational goals. Supervisors and coaches play a critical role at this stage by providing an enabling environment, introduce interventions to improve team performance, and develop individual potentials.

6.2.2 Develop the Performance Evaluation Tools

6.2.2.1 Monitoring tools shall be used to establish commitment and evaluate accomplishments in a semi-annual period. The following essential elements shall be incorporated in the evaluation tool:

6.2.2.1.1 Name, position, and signature of the Unit Head or individual staff being evaluated (ratee)
6.2.2.1.2 Rating period
6.2.2.1.3 Date when evaluation was completed
6.2.2.1.4 Name, signature, and position of supervisors that approve the completed evaluation form and the date when they made the approval
6.2.2.1.5 Mandated Function that the office and department are contributing to
6.2.2.1.6 SMART performance targets or success indicators
6.2.2.1.7 Actual accomplishments v is-à-v is performance targets
6.2.2.1.8 Ratings on quality, efficiency and/or timeliness on a scale of 1 to 5
6.2.2.1.9 Remarks of supervisor
6.2.2.1.10 Name, position and signature of Head of the Performance Management Team
6.2.2.1.11 Name, signature, and position of rater and date when evaluation was completed.

6.2.3 To reflect the cascading approach of the SPMS towards achieving organizational goals, three kinds of forms are used:

6.2.3.1 Office Performance Commitment and Review (OPCR) Form is accomplished by University Directors/Heads of Offices and Department Heads.
6.2.3.2 Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) Form is accomplished by individual staff in all the units of the organization.

This document is a sole property of UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO. Any disclosure, unauthorized reproduction or use is strictly prohibited except with permission from USM.
Only documents with standard signatories of USM are considered official.
MASTER COPY

6.3 Performance Review and Evaluation

6.3.1 Submission of OPCR and IPCR

6.3.1.1 The Vice Presidents, College Deans, Unit Directors/Heads shall submit their targets at the start of the rating period and their accomplishments with self-evaluation ratings at the end of the rating period.

6.3.1.2 The OPCRs shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Office on or before the deadline.

6.3.1.3 Failure to submit means issuance of Corrective Action Request (CAR) from the Planning and Development Office.

6.3.1.4 The IPCRs shall be submitted to the Human Resource and Development Office (HRMDO) with the summary of individual ratings of faculty and staff under a certain department/unit/college.

6.3.1.5 The Planning and Development Office shall be furnished by the head of unit/college with the summary of individual ratings.

6.3.2 Use the Performance Evaluation Tools.

6.3.2.1 At the end of the performance monitoring period, use the forms—OPCR and IPCR—to review performance from the office/colleges and department levels down to the individual staff level. All entries in the forms must be filled up.

6.3.3 Compute numerical ratings

6.3.3.1 Get the average rating for a particular accomplishment by adding the ratings and dividing it by the number of dimensions used and get the final average rating.

6.4 Performance Evaluation and Development Planning

6.4.1 Use of the Results of the Performance Evaluation

6.4.1.1 The focus of discussion of evaluation results must be on strengths, competency-related performance gaps, and the opportunities to address these gaps, career paths, and alternatives. In coordination with the HRMD Office, the Heads of Office and supervisors must introduce appropriate developmental interventions based on the results of the performance evaluation especially for employees with Unsatisfactory and Poor performance ratings.

6.4.1.2 The results of the performance evaluation/assessment shall serve as inputs to the following:

6.4.1.2.1 Heads of Offices in identifying and providing the kinds of interventions needed based on identified professional development needs.

6.4.1.2.2 University HRMD Office in consolidating and coordinating development interventions that will form part of the HR Plan and the basis for rewards and incentives.

6.4.1.2.3 Performance Management Team in identifying potential PRAISE Awards nominees for various awards categories.

6.4.1.2.4 PRAISE Committee in determining top performers of the agency who qualify for awards and incentives.

7.0 RECORDS RETENTION AND DISPOSAL

7.1 Plans are kept in file as reference for future planning that can be the basis for targeting.

7.2 Quarterly accomplishment reports submitted by functional units are disposed once the Annual Report is already produced.

7.3 Other reports are kept in file and stored.

8.0 FORMS AND RECORDS

8.1 IPCR (USM-HRD-F51-Rev.1.2020.07.01)

8.2 OPCR (USM-PDO-F01-Rev.1.2020.07.01)

UNCONTROLLED

This document is a sole property of UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MINDANAO. Any disclosure, unauthorized reproduction or use is strictly prohibited except with permission from USM.
Only documents with standard signatories of USM are considered official.
MASTER COPY

E. Summary List of Individual Performance Ratings

Office A **Performance Assessment: Very Satisfactory**

Division A	Rating	
	Numerical	Adjectival
Division A Rating	4	Very Satisfactory
Employee 1	4	Very Satisfactory
Employee 2	5	Outstanding
Employee 3	3	Satisfactory
Employee 4	4	Very Satisfactory
Employee 5	4	Very Satisfactory
No. of Employees = 5 Average ratings of staff	20/5=4	Very Satisfactory

Division B	Rating	
	Numerical	Adjectival
Division B Rating	3	Satisfactory
Employee 1	3	Satisfactory
Employee 2	4	Very Satisfactory
Employee 3	2	Unsatisfactory
Employee 4	3	Satisfactory
No. of Employees (Including DC) = 4 Average ratings of staff	12/4=3	Satisfactory

Division C	Rating	
	Numerical	Adjectival
Division C Rating	**5**	Outstanding
Employee 1	5	Outstanding
Employee 2	4	Very Satisfactory
Employee 3	5	Outstanding
Employee 4	4	Very Satisfactory
No. of Employees (Including DC) = 4 Average ratings of staff	18/4=4.5	Outstanding

Summary:			
	Division A	4	Very Satisfactory
	Division B	3	Satisfactory
	Division C``	5	Outstanding
	Average 12/3=	4	**Very Satisfactory**

F. SPMS PROCESS FLOWCHART

