



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

APPROVED

Chancellor's Council
06 APR 2017

Guidelines on Performance Evaluation of Co-Academic Personnel

Rationale:

Conducting performance appraisal of every personnel in an organization is important as it provides feedback on employee's strengths and areas for improvement. It also gives an opportunity for the superior and employee to talk about his or her current job performance, discuss organizational priorities, and set his/her performance goals. It may also serve as basis for merit increases, rewards and bonuses.

Principles:

1. Principles of equity and fairness should be upheld in the evaluation process.
2. The performance evaluation process should not be used in a punitive, retaliatory or discriminatory fashion. Rather, it should provide employees with constructive comments that enable them to develop professionally and make improvements in performance.
3. An employee should have the opportunity to comment on their appraisal result.
4. Evaluation results should not be used as the sole basis for promotion, remuneration or other administrative decisions.
5. Performance evaluation results should be treated as private and confidential information.

Policies

1. Coverage:
 - 1.1 The Co-Academic Personnel (CAP) performance evaluation is conducted every 10th week of Term 3.
 - 1.2 All CAP who have been in the same position for at least six (6) months are included in the annual performance evaluation. Those who have been in the current position for less than 6 months shall be evaluated in their past position by their previous immediate superior. A special performance evaluation shall be conducted for the following:



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

- 1.2.1 Probationary personnel – 2 weeks before the end of the 3rd and 6th month of probation
 - 1.2.2 Transfer personnel – 2 weeks before the end of the 3rd month of transfer
 - 1.3 The list of CAP and their respective job titles, immediate superiors and office heads shall be obtained from the Office of Personnel Management. The OPM may request for a special performance evaluation of CAP for the purpose of permanency or any other administrative decisions.
 - 1.4. The raters shall be based on the official organizational charts provided by the Risk Management Compliance and Audit Office (RMCA).
2. Raters:
- 2.1 The raters of the CAP shall include his or her (1) immediate superior, (2) skip-level superior, (3) peers, (4) service recipients, and (5) subordinates. The superior and peer raters shall be based on the official organizational chart as per the RMCA.
 - 2.1.1 Immediate Superior rater shall be the immediate supervisor to whom the CAP reports directly.
 - 2.1.2 Skip level superior rater shall be the superior of the immediate superior of the CAP concerned.
 - 2.1.3 Peer raters shall include other Co-Academic Personnel (CAP) who report directly to the same unit head. Administrative Assistants/Office Assistants and Laboratory Technicians of research and academic units within the college shall be considered as peers (refer to Annex A).
 - 2.1.4 Service recipient raters shall include individuals who have been rendered service by the CAP concerned, which may be university personnel and/or students. These may be individuals who are external or internal to the office/group/division. Service recipients shall be identified by the superior of the CAP concerned (refer to Annex B), who will then submit the list to the Office of the Personnel Management. The official list of service recipients shall originate from the Office of the Personnel Management. A rater who is already classified as immediate superior, skip level superior,



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

peer or subordinate shall no longer be identified as service recipient.

2.1.5 Subordinates shall be university personnel who report to the ratee.

2.2 The raters must be Faculty, ASF, APSP and CAP. Contractual and Agency personnel are not included as raters.

3. Performance Evaluation Area and Rating Scale

3.1 The performance evaluation areas included in the evaluation of the CAP by immediate superior, skip level superior, peers and subordinates (if applicable) are as follows:

Performance Factors	Operational Definition
Quality of Work Produced	<i>The ability to work with accuracy and thoroughness, meeting established expectations/ standards of quality and customer service</i>
Quantity of Work/ Productivity	<i>Volume of work produced under normal conditions regardless of errors; ability to use resources efficiently and to complete work within set deadlines</i>
Job Knowledge	<i>Extent to which the employee understands and performs the duties and responsibilities required to do the job</i>
Interest in the Job	<i>Enthusiasm and eagerness in doing ones job and in contributing to the attainment of objectives</i>
Industry and Responsibility	<i>Ability and commitment to work beyond ordinary job requirements</i>
Cooperation	<i>Ability to interact and work harmoniously with superior, co- workers, faculty, students and staff</i>
Initiative	<i>The ability to assume responsibility for prompt, appropriate action in proper situations; to contribute new ideas and methods; is self-directed and resourceful</i>
Ability to Learn	<i>Interest and enthusiasm to learn new skills, to participate in activities that promote professional growth and development</i>
Judgment	<i>Ability to make correct decisions</i>
Organizational Ability	<i>Ability to use time and resources effectively, to prioritize duties and responsibilities and contribute to the image and reputation of the unit and the University</i>



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

3.2. The CAP evaluation has a 5-point scale as follows:

Rating	Description
5	employee <i>consistently exceeds</i> the job requirements/expectations
4	employee <i>frequently exceeds</i> the job requirements/expectations
3	employee <i>meets</i> the job requirements/expectations
2	employee <i>rarely meets</i> the job requirements/expectations
1	employee <i>never meets</i> the job requirements/expectations

3.3 The performance evaluation areas included in the evaluation of the CAP by the service recipients are as follows:

Performance Evaluation Areas	Operational Definition
Knowledge and Competence	Extent to which he/she demonstrates knowledge and competence in responding to queries and requests
Effectiveness in Dealing with Clients	Ability to deal with clients in order to promote and maintain healthy interpersonal and productive working relationships with them
Responsiveness to the Needs of Client	Ability to provide prompt and timely attention to the needs of the clients
Reliability in Responding to Request	Ability to provide the promised service consistently, accurately, and efficiently
Communication Skills	Ability to present ideas with clarity and to demonstrate professionalism when talking to clients
Quality of Service Provided	Extent to which he/she provides correct, accurate, complete, and relevant service/data and in visually-appealing manner
Institutional Commitment / Lasallianess	Extent to which he/she demonstrates behavior and attitude in accordance with the University policies and expectations



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

3.4 The performance evaluation results of the CAP shall comprise the following:

- 3.4.1 rating by immediate superior
- 3.4.2 rating by skip level superior
- 3.4.3 average rating by peers and subordinates
- 3.4.4 average rating by service recipients

3.5 The overall performance evaluation of CAP is computed as follows:

3.5.1 For CAP under status quo, the overall rating which is based on the existing 55% immediate supervisor's rating, shall be transmuted to equivalent points and interpreted as follows:

Overall Ratings	Equivalent Points	Interpretation
4.500 – 5.000	50.000 - 55.000	Outstanding (O)
3.600 – 4.499	41.000 - 49.999	Very Satisfactory(VS)
2.500 – 3.599	30.000 - 40.999	Satisfactory (S)
1.400 – 2.499	19.000 - 29.999	Needs Improvement (NI)
1.399 and below	18.999 and below	Poor (P)

3.5.2 For CAP who opted for the University Offer and are within the salary scale, an overall mean rating of at least **3.600** is required for step promotion.

3.5.2 For CAP who have chosen the University Offer and are off scale, an overall mean rating of at least **3.000** is required for merit increase.

3.6 The computation of the overall mean rating for CAP under the University Offer, shall be based on 50% from immediate supervisor's rating and 50% from peers' and subordinates' rating which is interpreted as follows:

Overall Ratings	Equivalent Points	Interpretation
4.500 – 5.000	95.000 - 100.000	Outstanding (O)
3.600 – 4.499	86.000 - 94.999	Very Satisfactory(VS)
3.000 – 3.599	80.000 - 85.999	Satisfactory (S)
2.500 – 2.999	75.000 - 79.999	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
1.400 – 2.499	62.000 - 74.999	Needs Improvement (NI)
1.300 and below	61.999 and below	Poor (P)



4. Evaluation Procedures:

- 4.1 CAP performance evaluation shall be conducted online through the My Lasalle (MLS) portal. Upon logging in to their account, the raters are automatically prompted by the system to accomplish the evaluation. This prompt (pop-up message) will automatically appear on the MLS page until the raters have finished the evaluation for all the personnel on their list.
- 4.2 The online evaluation facility is available for ten (10) calendar days.
- 4.3 Raters are required to give a fair rating and specify in the comment section the reasons for the ratings as well as the CAP's strengths and areas for improvement.
- 4.4 ITEO shall process the evaluation results after the end of the evaluation period and submit them to OPM.
- 4.5 The OPM shall forward the evaluation results to the Office Heads for the CAP's signature. The Office Head may request the OPM for re-evaluation not later than 1 week after receipt of the evaluation results. Re-evaluation will be subject to the approval of OPM.
- 4.6 The OPM should request ITEO for re-evaluation not later than 1 week after receipt of the request for a re-evaluation from the unit head.
- 4.7 ITEO shall process the results of all re-evaluation and submit them to OPM 1 week after evaluation period.
- 4.8 The Office Heads shall be responsible for returning all signed evaluation results to OPM.
- 4.9 The ITEO shall provide a copy of the final performance evaluation results to the following:
 - 4.9.1 In printed form:
 - Co-Academic Personnel concerned
 - 4.9.2 In CD form:
 - Chancellor (profile results of all CAP)
 - Office of Personnel Management (complete results of all CAP)



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

- Office Head (complete results of all CAP under his/her supervision)
- Immediate Supervisor of the Office Head (profile results of all CAP under his/her office)



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

APPROVED

Chancellor's Council
06 APR 2017

Annex A

Peer and Service Recipient Raters of Co-Academic Personnel

OFFICE	POSITION	RATERS	
		PEER	SERVICE RECIPIENT
President & Chancellor (OPC)	Technical Assistant/ Administrative Officer	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. VPs/VCs/Directors under President & Chancellor, respectively b. Office/Technical Assistants of offices under President & Chancellor <i>(to be identified by the President and the Chancellor, respectively)</i>
VPLM	Administrative Officer	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. DSA and Directors under VPLM b. Office/Technical Assistants of offices under VPLM <i>(to be identified by the VPLM)</i>
VP-ERIO	Office Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. <i>to be identified by the VP-ERIO</i>
VCA	Administrative Officer/ Administrative Assistant/ Technical Assistant/Office Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. Dean Office Assistants b. Department Office Assistants c. Faculty members <i>(to be identified by the VCA)</i>



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

VCRI	Administrative Officer	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. Directors under VCRI b. Office/Technical Assistants of offices under VCRI (<i>to be identified by the VCRI</i>) c. Faculty members (<i>to be identified by the VCRI</i>)
VC-Admin	Administrative Officer/ Technical Officer	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. AVCs and Directors under VC-Admin b. Office/Technical Assistants of offices under VC-Admin (<i>to be identified by the VC-Admin</i>)
VC-STC	Administrative Officer/ Office Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP in Manila & STC campuses)	a. IS Principal, IS Registrar and Directors under VC-STC (Manila & STC) b. Office/Technical Assistants of offices under VC-STC (<i>to be identified by the VC-STC</i>)
AVCs	Administrative Assistant / Technical Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. Directors under AVC b. Office/Technical Assistants of offices under AVC
COLLEGE DEAN	Administrative Assistant / Office Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP) b. Department Office Assistants within the college	a. Administrative Assistants of other College Deans b. faculty members in the college (<i>to be identified by the Dean</i>) c. students (<i>to be identified by the Dean</i>)
VICE DEAN	Academic Programming Officer/ Administrative Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP) b. Office Assistants of departments within the	a. APO/Administrative Assistants of other Vice Deans b. faculty members in the college (<i>to be identified by the Vice-Dean</i>)



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

		college	c. Chairs within and/or outside the College (to be identified by the Vice-Dean) d. Students (to be identified by the Vice-Dean)
ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT	Office Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP) b. Office Assistants of other departments within the college c. Dean's Administrative Assistant d. Vice Dean's Administrative Assistant e. Academic Programming Officer	a. all faculty members in the department
	Laboratory Technicians	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP) b. Laboratory Technicians of other departments within the college	a. all faculty members in the department
Dean of Student Affairs	Administrative Assistant / Technical Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP) b. Office Assistants of offices under DSA	a. Vice Dean of Student Affairs b. Directors under DSA c. students (to be identified by the DSA)



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

Research Centers	Office Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP) b. Office Assistants of research centers under VCRI	a. faculty members <i>(to be identified by the superior)</i>
Other Offices	Office Assistant	a. personnel within the office (CAP, ASF, APSP)	a. <i>to be identified by the superior</i>



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

APPROVED

Chancellor's Council
06 APR 2017

Annex B

Guidelines for Selecting Service Recipient Raters

Rationale:

Quality service is an organization's commitment to provide the best service to internal and external clients or customers. It entails providing efficient, quick, reliable, and friendly service, building strong relationships with the clients. How well the service is rendered by the service providers is based on the comparison between the customer's expectations about the service to be rendered on one hand and customer's experience resulting from the use of the service, on the other hand. As such, service recipients are the best source of feedback on the quality of service, which may be used as bases for the improvement and more positive performance of the service providers.

As a general rule, service recipient raters shall be identified by the superior of the administrators/ASF/APSP and Co-Academic Personnel (CAP) concerned, who will then submit the list to the Office of the Chancellor and Office of the Personnel Management (OPM), respectively. The official list of service recipients shall only originate from these offices. As such, the selection of service recipients of administrators/ASF/APSP and CAP shall be governed by the following guidelines:

Guidelines:

1. Evaluation of the quality of service rendered by university personnel shall be conducted every year as part of the performance evaluation of the administrators/ASF/APSP and Co-Academic Personnel (CAP).
2. Only the Department Chairs/Directors and lower positions shall be evaluated by the service recipients.
3. Service recipient raters shall include individuals who have frequent/recurring work-related interactions with the administrators/ASF/APSP and Co-Academic Personnel (CAP) concerned.
4. Service recipient raters shall be the direct recipients (clients) of the service, which are individuals external or internal to the office/group/division and may include the following:



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

- 4.1 administrators
 - 4.2 faculty (teaching and academic service faculty)
 - 4.3 APSP
 - 4.4 CAP (not applicable to Administrators)
 - 4.5 students (not applicable to Administrators)
6. A rater who is already classified as immediate superior, skip level superior, peer or subordinate shall no longer be identified as service recipient.