



Republic of the Philippines  
**NUEVA ECIIA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**  
Cabanatuan City

**NEUST STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT  
REVIEW SYSTEM**

**Introduction**

As an institution of higher learning and as mandated in its charter, R.A. 8612 the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST) mission is stated as follows:

1. To primarily provide advanced instruction, professional training in arts, science and technology, education and other related fields, undertake research and extension services, and provide progressive leadership in these areas (Section 2); and,
2. To offer graduate, undergraduate and short-term technical courses within areas of specialization and according to its capabilities, considering the needs of the province, the Region and the country (Section 3).

The University therefore, ensures that the requirements of business, industry, services and other sector of local, regional and national development for high quality professionals and highly skilled and well-educated middle-level manpower are addressed.

In the realization of the NEUST mission, Section 2 of the NEUST Code states the following objectives:

(Article 10) The University shall primarily provide advanced instruction and professional training in arts, science and technology, education and other related fields, undertake research and extension services, and provide progressive leadership in these areas;

(Article 11) The University shall offer graduate, undergraduate and short-term technical courses within its areas of specification and according to its capabilities, as the Board of Regents may deem necessary to carry out its objectives, particularly in order to meet the needs of the province and the region.

Guided by the above cited mission, goals and objectives, the NEUST adopts specific performance standards for faculty members. These are the guidelines that will measure the extent of the achievement of the goals and objectives set for each college or campus in line with the University's mission and objectives.

The attainment of the University's mission, goals and objectives is grounded on the performance and quality of service provided by the individual member of each unit of the whole institutional system. The input of each member or unit of the total working force is important just as a single inaccuracy has an impact and effect on the whole organizational context. Hence, this performance management system will enable the faculty member to realize how he/she contributes to the attainment of the institution's goals and objectives and what measures can he/she employ to make every single effort or service worthwhile to the organization and in pursuit of a highly commendable public service.

On the whole, performance management system is a critical measure that will provide administrative officials basis for decision and support to the human resource system on matters such as training, career development, leadership development, placement, promotion, and rewards management.

For an objective assessment of the performance of each regular faculty member, an evaluation instrument is hereby devised. The NEUST Performance Management and Review System is basically a more specific performance standard based on the Civil Service Commission (CSC) Circular No. 6, s. Of 2012 and CSC Resolution No. 1200481, promulgated on March 16, 2012.

Specifically, the NEUST Strategic Performance Management and Review System aims for the following:

1. Concretize the goals and objectives set forth in the Philippine Development Plan, the University's Strategic Goals and Objectives and the Performance Commitment and Review System;
2. Set performance expectations and goals for team and individual efforts towards achieving the University's mission and objectives;
3. Provide tools for performance monitoring and coaching by immediate heads on their faculty and staff;
4. Direct faculty and staff in a consistent and high level work performance;
5. Serve as supplemental basis for promotion, transfer, reassignment, demotion and rewards such as in the PEI, PBB and PRAISE and other incentives; and,
6. Reinforce desired behaviors or redirect inappropriate ones in the organization.

### **The NEUST Strategic Performance Management and Review Framework**



Figure above shows the Performance Management Review Framework as having four components which are the following: 1) setting of individual and team goals and objectives; 2) tools for performance monitoring and coaching; 3) performance review; and, 4) rewards incentives. These components are geared towards the attainment of exceptional job performance of individual faculty member in all major areas of responsibility.

The first component pertains to the formulation of individual goals and objectives which is aligned to the goals and objectives set by the College or department. Through an effective communication system, the faculty member, his/her colleagues and the immediate head/supervisor create the conditions necessary for the attainment of their combined objectives.

A tool for monitoring and basis for coaching will guide immediate heads and supervisors for an objective assessment and evaluation. Such tool will set the standards for exemplary performance. A corresponding rating scale from Poor (or 1) to Outstanding (or 5) will describe the degree of performance of individual faculty.

During the Performance Review, a close monitoring with open communication scheme will settle beforehand any form of conflict that might arise. It will be required of the supervisor to extend a listening ear to his/her faculty member in times of clarification. With the use of the evaluation tool, a series of close supervision or observation of the faculty where suggestions/recommendations can be placed at hand must be conducted. The concerned faculty member who obtains a poor performance rating will be recommended for retooling or training opportunities.

Through an efficient and objective performance evaluation concerned higher officials will have basis for determining the recipients of incentive rewards. The evaluation tool will also be used as reference for reinforcement purposes and motivator to encourage faculty members to obtain higher level competencies.

### **The Performance Management Commitment and Review Rating Scheme**

The NEUST Performance Management Commitment and Review Rating Scale is described as follows:

Numerical	Rating		Description
	Numerical	Adjectival	
5		Outstanding	Performance represents an extraordinary level of achievement and commitment in terms of quality and time, technical skills and knowledge, ingenuity, creativity, and initiative.
4		Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeded expectations. All goals, objectives, and targets were achieved above the established standards.
3		Satisfactory	Performance met expectations in terms of quality of work, efficiency and timeliness. The most critical annual goals were met.
2		Unsatisfactory	Performance failed to meet expectations, and/or one or more of the most critical goals were not met.
1		Poor	Performance was consistently below expectations, and/or one or more reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas.

In order to achieve the desired exemplary performance from faculty members, the NEUST Administration shall provide the equivalent administrative support in the following manner:

- Institute parameters and appropriate recognition for exemplary performance;
- Provide scholarship and training opportunities for faculty members who need such support
- Provide essential but highly expensive resources needed for instruction; funding support for research; mechanism for extension program;
- Provide supportive mechanism for faculty members on matters pertaining to their rights and responsibilities under the performance review system of the University.

### **The Performance Management Review Process**

#### **1. Rating Period**

Period for performance evaluation should be at least three months after the start of each semester and should not be more than one year. There will be two evaluation periods in one academic year.

## 2. Mechanics of the Evaluation Process

2.1 Individual and group objectives shall be formulated jointly by the Dean and the concerned faculty members of the College. Specific and broader goals shall be discussed by all members of the College identifying the appropriate standards of action, measures and interventions necessary for the attainment of the College's goals and objectives.

2.2 The Dean conducts regular monitoring through observation of classes, individual conference with the faculty members, consultation with area chairs and students and other forms of action as may be necessary.

2.3 The faculty member concerned shall be informed of the progress and result of evaluation and given opportunity to discuss his/her side on certain matters and to rectify whatever shortcomings or wrongdoings might have been committed in lieu of the standards established for the purpose.

## 3. Mechanics of Rating

3.1 Using the instrument for Individual Performance Commitment and Review Instrument, the faculty member indicates his own work performance. Documents will suffice to establish the reliability of the facts indicated by the faculty during self-evaluation.

3.2 All information needed in the instrument must be supplied and said form must be submitted before the last day of each semestral period.

3.3 The Dean of the College or Area Chair the and the faculty member shall conduct a preliminary discussion on the self-evaluation where justification as may be needed can be made by the faculty concerned.

3.4 The individual evaluation form shall be submitted to the Dean's Office. The dean/s concerned shall collate and submit a summary of the evaluation to the Office of the Academic Affairs and a copy of the same shall be furnished the HRM officer for records purposes.

3.5 The specific set of measures are as follows:

- Core Functions – are the fourfold functions as mandated in the University Charter.
- Strategic Functions – are the major programs and projects instituted by the University through its Colleges/Campuses
- Support Functions – are the auxiliary functions and activities necessary to effectively carry out the objectives of the College and of the University.

## 4. Mechanics for Computation

### 4.1 General Rating Scale

Rating		Description
Numerical	Adjectival	
5	Outstanding	Performance exceeding targets by 30% and above of the planned targets
4	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeding targets by 15% to 29% of the planned targets.
3	Satisfactory	Performance of 100% of the planned targets.
2	Unsatisfactory	Performance of 51% to 99% of the planned targets
1	Poor	Performance failing to meet the planned targets by 50% or below.

4.2 Critical factors affecting the delivery of work output shall be reflected and computed/averaged (A) in the columns provided for in the OPCR Form using the standards for Quality/Effectiveness (Q), and the above rating scales for Efficiency (E), and Timeliness (T).

4.3 In computing the final rating of the office and individual performance, the following weight allocation shall be followed:

### Faculty with Designations

Designations	Core Functions	Strategic Functions	Support Functions
	(Designations)	[Instruction, Research/ Extension/ Production]	
Vice Presidents	85%	10%	5%
Deans/Directors	75%	15%	10%
Associate Dean/	57%	33%	10%
Technical Asst.	43%	47%	10%
Area Chairs	57%	33%	10%
Coordinators	15%	75%	10%

### Faculty without Designations

Rank	Core Functions (Instruction)	Strategic Functions			Support Functions
		Research/Extension/Production/Involvement in Quality Assurance Processes			
Instructors to Asst./Assoc. Professors	70%	Research/ Extension/ Production		Processed	5%
		20%			5%
Professor	60%	Research	Extension/Production	Quality Assurance Processed	
		20%	10%	5%	5%

### REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

#### INSTRUCTION

IPCRF/OPCRF

PES

#### RESEARCH/PRODUCTION

Certification of the VPRET

#### EXTENSION

Extension Program/Project/Activity Documents

MOA

Invitation

### **Rewards and Development Planning**

1. Performance evaluation is essential inasmuch as the outcome will identify the areas of deficiency and will determine what competencies/skills needed to be developed in each individual faculty. Programs can be designed as well to address the specific needs of the members of the teaching force. After that identification of the needs for improvement has been completed, the administrators can devise immediate or short-term or even long term plans for teacher-competency development program.
2. Interventions will be planned and executed after that performance evaluation has been done by and between the faculty and the dean/area chair/associate dean of the College concerned. For an outstanding performance, the PRAISE Committee of the University will identify the top performers and the appropriate rewards and incentives that may be given.

3. Performance ratings shall be used as basis for promotion, training, scholarship grants and other personnel actions. The members who will comprise the committee on Evaluation include the following: VP for Academic Affairs, VP for RET, VP for Administration, Business and Finance, Deans/Directors of the College, and Area Chairs or designated persons. The University President as the approving officer shall send a notice or advice to the concerned faculty member for the final and appropriate action on the recommendation of the said Committee.
4. Faculty members who are on approved leave of absence or training or scholarship program, but who have met the required minimum number of days during the evaluation period shall use their performance ratings obtained during the preceding rating period.
5. Faculty members who are seconded to another college shall be rated in their present or actual office/college where they have greater number of teaching hours.

Republic of the Philippines  
**NUEVA ECIJA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**  
 Cabanatuan City

**INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT AND REVIEW FORM  
 FOR FACULTY**

COVERAGE OF EVALUATION: From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_ 2015

**NAME OF FACULTY:** \_\_\_\_\_

**COLLEGE/DEPT. :** \_\_\_\_\_

**POSITION :** \_\_\_\_\_ **EMPLOYEE NO.:** \_\_\_\_\_

**AREA/DIVISION:** \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_, of the \_\_ (name of office/division/college), commit to deliver and agree to be rated in the following targets in accordance with the indicated measures for the period \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

**PART I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**I. INSTRUCTION**

**1. Classroom Performance**

**Numerical Rating**

**Descriptive**

1.1 Latest Student Evaluation

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

1.2 Latest Peer Evaluation

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

1.3 Latest Supervisor Evaluation

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Performance in Job-Related Activities:**

2.1 Other Functions Being Held

Position

Period Covered

2.1.1 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2.1.2 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2.1.3 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**PART II. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Output	Success Indicators (Targets + Measures)	Actual Accomplishments	Rating				REMARKS
			Q	T	E	AVE	
<b>A. Strategic Priorities</b>							
(MFOs/PAPs)							
<b>B. Core Functions</b>							
(Based on the Performance-Based Evaluation Instrument for Faculty)							
<b>C. Support Functions</b>							

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Faculty  
**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by:	
Name:	
Position:	
Date:	
Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating
5	Outstanding
4	Very Satisfactory
3	Satisfactory
2	Fair
1	Poor



Republic of the Philippines  
**NUEVA ECIJA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**  
 Cabanatuan City

**OFFICE/COLLEGE PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT AND REVIEW FORM**

**COVERAGE OF EVALUATION: FROM \_\_\_\_\_ TO \_\_\_\_\_ 2015**

**NAME OF DEAN/DIRECTOR:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**POSITION :** \_\_\_\_\_

**OFFICE/COLLEGE :** \_\_\_\_\_  
**DIVISION/SECTION:** \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_, Head of the \_\_\_\_\_, commit to deliver and agree to be rated in the following targets in accordance with the indicated measures for the period \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

Name of Chief of Office/College

Position/Designation

Date

Reviewed and Recommended for Approval by:

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 VP for Academic Affairs

\_\_\_\_\_  
 President

Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating
5	Outstanding
4	Very Satisfactory
3	Satisfactory
2	Fair
1	Poor

Bases for specific points/scores:

**INSTRUCTION (50%)**

a. (25%) \_\_\_\_\_

1. Average number of regular teaching hours Note: below 18 hrs. = 1 point; 18 hrs. = 2 points; Plus 1 point for every 3 hrs. In excess of 18 hrs.	No. Of Hrs.	Score
a. Second semester, AY _____ b. First Semester, AY _____		
2. Innovations	Title	
a. Instructional materials (other than thesis/dissertation paper)		
• Module (1 point each)		
• Manuak (1 point each)		
• Book (with ISBN, 3 points each book divided by the number of authors)		
b. Compendium of reading materials (1 point each)		
c. Laboratory facilities (applicability/usability to be certified by the Chair or Dean; without manual = 1 point with manual = 2 points each)		
3. Attendance		
Note: 1 point for perfect attendance for the period covered 0.95 with ½ day absence (with or without official leave) 0.9 with 1 day absence 0.8 with 2 days absence 0.7 with 3 days absence 0.6 with 4 days absence 0.5 with 5 days or more absences		
4. Additional Assignment/Designation 2 points = National Event 1 point = Outside University to Region 0.5 = University Event  For events outside the University, additional score for: Champion = 1 point 2nd place = 0.5 point 3rd place = 0.25 point	Title	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asst. Dean</li> <li>• Area/Department Chair</li> <li>• Coordinator</li> <li>• Coach</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trainer</li> <li>• Adviser</li> <li>• Committee/Task Force Chair</li> <li>• Committee/Task Force Member</li> <li>• Representative to different bodies</li> </ul>		
<b>B. PES (25%)</b>	Rating	
a. Second Semester, AY _____		
b. First Semester, AY _____		

**RESEARCH (20%)**

**(Conducted, Completed, Submitted, Published, Presented during the Period Covered, FY \_\_\_\_\_)**

	Title of Research	Score
1. Number of completed researches (2 points each)		
2. Number of articles/research outputs published (Include publisher) (for more than one publications of the same research, use whichever is higher)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refereed journal (5 points)</li> <li>• International journal (5 points)</li> <li>• National journal (4 points)</li> <li>• Regional journal (3 points)</li> <li>• Institutional journal (2 points)</li> <li>• Departmental journal (1 point)</li> </ul>		
Number of researches applied for patenting (5 points each)		
3. Number of researches applied for patenting (5 points each)		
4. Number of Research Outputs Copyrighted (3 points each)		
5. Participation in the Agency In-house review		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presenter (2 points each divided by number of researchers)</li> <li>• Coach/Adviser (1 point each divided by number of coaches/advisers)</li> </ul>		
6. Presentation of research outputs in different fora: (include organizer or sponsor, date, venue) For more than one presentations of the same research, use whichever is higher		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International (5 points)</li> <li>• National (4 points)</li> <li>• Regional (3 points)</li> </ul>		
7. Number of cited researches (1 point per citation)		
8. Participation and involvement in research undertakings (max. 2 pts.)		

**EXTENSION and TRAINING (20%)**  
**(Conducted during the Period covered, FY \_\_\_\_\_)**

	Title of Activity/Project	Score
<b>1. Participation in the extension and training activities as:</b> a. Resource person/lecturer (2 points each) b. Facilitator (1 point per activity) c. Coordinator (1 point per activity) d. Organizer (1 point for local event 2 points for regional event 3 points for national event To be divided by number of organizers) e. Trainer (2 points per activity)		
2. Attendance to University echo seminars (1 point)		
<b>3. Technical assistance/consultancy services provided to community (Approved by the University Administrators)</b> 1 point per person served 5 pints per group served di vided by number of consultants		
4. Participation and involvement in extension activities (max. 2 points)		

**INVOLVEMENT (10%)**  
**(FY 20\_\_)**

Involvement/Participation to Different Activities (max. Point = 1)	Score

Criteria	Score	Percentage	Total Score
Instruction			
Research			
Extension and Training			
Involvement			
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			

Rated by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature over Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Designation

## CAMPUS/COLLEGE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Name of Campus/College: \_\_\_\_\_

Period Covered : \_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of Regular Faculty \_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of Temporary Faculty \_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of LOHB \_\_\_\_\_

### INSTRUCTION (50%)

#### 1. Profile of Faculty

Highest Degree Attained	Percentage of Faculty (# of faculty earned degree/total # of regular faculty)	Score (1%-20%) = 1 (21%-40%) = 2 (41%-60%) = 3 (61%-80%) = 4 (81%-100%)= 5
Ph.D./Ed.D.		
MA/MS/MAT		

#### 2. Total Number of Students

Course/Level	Total No. Of Students (20__)	Total No. Of Students (20__)	Percentage of Increase	Score (1%-20%) = 1 (21%-40%) = 2 (41%-60%) = 3 (61%-80%) = 4 (81%-100%)= 5
<b>TOTAL</b>				

#### 3. Total Number of Graduates

Course	Total No. Of Graduates (20__)	Total No. Of Graduates (20__)	Percentage of Increase	Score (1%-20%) = 1 (21%-40%) = 2 (41%-60%) = 3 (61%-80%) = 4 (81%-100%)= 5
<b>TOTAL</b>				

4. **Percentage of graduates who finished academic program according to the prescribed time frame**

Course	Total No. Of Graduating Students (March 20__ Oct. 20__)	Total No. Of Graduates (March 20__ Oct. 20__)	Percentage of Graduates	Score (1%-20%) = 1 (21%-40%) = 2 (41%-60%) = 3 (61%-80%) = 4 (81%-100%)= 5

5. **Passing Percentage in Licensure Examination**

Course	Date of Exam.	No. Of First Takers		No. Of Passers (First Takers)		Passing Percentage	
		NEUST	National	NEUST	National	NEUST	National

6. **Accreditation**

Accredited Program	Score (5 pts. Per accredited program; plus 1 point per level of accreditation)
<b>TOTAL</b>	

7. **Instructional Materials Developed**

Instructional Materials	Percentage (number of materials/total # of faculty)	Score (1%-20%) = 1 (21%-40%) = 2 (41%-60%) = 3 (61%-80%) = 4 (81%-100%)= 5
Manuals		
Modules		
Books		
Journals		
Device/Gadget		
<b>TOTAL</b>		

8. **Awards Received from Different Competitions**

Title	Place/Award	Level	Score NEUST: 1st = 3 pts. 2nd =2 pts. 3rd = 1 pt. OUTSIDE: 1st = 5 pts. 2nd =4 pts. 3rd= 3 pts.
<b>TOTAL</b>			



5. Participation in the Agency In-House review		
6. Participation of research outputs in different fora: (include organizer or sponsor, date, venue) For more than one presentations of the same reseazrch, use whichever is higher: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International</li> <li>• National</li> <li>• Regional</li> </ul>		
7. Number of cited researches (1 point per citation) (with supporting documents)		

**EXTENSION and TRAINING (20%)**  
(Conducted during the period covered, FY 20\_\_)

**1. Partner Community/Institution**

Name of Community/Institution	Score (1 point per institution)
-------------------------------	------------------------------------

**2. Extension/Training Conducted**

Title of Training	Number of Trainees	Date Requested	Date Responded	% of trainees who rated the training as good or better (include absolute value)	Duration (date/s)	Score (20 & below)=1 (21-40)=2 (41-60)=3 (61-80)=4 (above 80)=5

**3. Technical/Advisory/Consultancy Provided**

**A. Individual**

Name	Address	Nature of Service Provided	Date of Consultation	Date Requested	Date Responded	Rating given to the service provided (best, better, good, fair, poor)	Score (1 pt/person)

**B. Institutional**

Name	Address	Nature of Service Provided	Date of Consultation	Date Requested	Date Responded	Rating given to the service provided	Score (5pts/institution)



						(best, better, good, fair, poor)	
--	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------	--

**4. Seminar Organized/Conducted**

Level	Number of Participants		% of trainees who rated the training as good or better	Score (20 & below)=1,2,3,4,5 (21-40)=2,3,4,5,6, (41-60)=3,4,5,6,7 (61-80)=4,5,6,7,8 (above 80)=5,6,7,8,9
	Students	Nonstudents		
Institutional				
Local				
Regional				
National				
International				
<b>Total</b>				

**5.a Trainings Attended with Certificate of Completion**

Level	Percentage of participants (no. of attendees/total no. of faculty)	Score (1%-20%) = 1,2,3,4,5 (21%-40%) = 2,3,4,5,6 (41%-60%) = 3,4,5,6,7 (61%-80%) = 4,5,6,7,8 (81%-100%)= 5,6,7,8,9
Institutional		
Local		
Regional		
National		
International		
<b>Total</b>		

**INVOLVEMENT/OTHER RELATED FUNCTIONS (10%)**

Involvement/Participation to Different Activities	Percentage (# of participants/total # of faculty)	Score (1%-20%) = 1 (21%-40%) = 2 (41%-60%) = 3 (61%-80%) = 4 (81%-100%)= 5
<b>TOTAL</b>		

**SUMMARY OF SCORES**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Instruction</b>			
<b>Research</b>			
<b>Extension &amp; Training</b>			
<b>Involvement</b>			
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			

Rated by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature over printed name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Designation

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR  
DEANS AND DIRECTORS

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Period Covered: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Academic Rank: \_\_\_\_\_ Designation : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Campus/College/Department/Area: \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Accomplishment of Target**

Target	Accomplishment	Percentage of Accomplishment	Score (1%-20%) = 1 (21%-40%) = 2 (41%-60%) = 3 (61%-80%) = 4 (81%-100%)= 5

**B. Other Functions/Involvement**

**1. Membership to different committee/task force**

Committee	Position	Score (1 point per committee)

**2. Membership to other organization/association**

Organization/Association	Position	Score per Organization Local = 1 Regional = 2 National = 3 International = 4

**C. Timeliness /Submission of Report**

Report	On time	Late	Score On time = 2 points Late = 1 point

**D. Resource Generation and Mobilization**

**1. Materials**

Materials	Number of items	Score (1 point per item)

**2. Financial**

Amount	Score (5,000-10,000) = 1 ; 31,000-40,000) = 4 (11,000-20,000)=2 ; (41,000-50,000) =5 (21,000-30,000)=3 ;(more than 50,000)=6

**E. Innovation**

Innovation	Score (1 point per innovation)
------------	-----------------------------------

**F. Leadership (25% PES)**

**G. Involvement**

Involvement /Participation to Different Activities (1 point per activity)	Score
TOTAL	

**SUMMARY OF SCORES**

Criteria	Score	Percentage	Total score
<b>A. Accomplishment of Target</b>			
<b>B. Other Functions/Involvement</b> 1. Membership to different committee/task force 2. Memberhip to other organization/association		<b>15%</b>	
<b>C. Timeliness/Submission of Report</b>		<b>10%</b>	
<b>D. Resource Generation and Mobilization</b> 1. Materials 2. Financial		<b>10%</b>	
<b>E. Innovation</b>		<b>10%</b>	
<b>F. Leadership</b>		<b>25%</b>	
<b>G. Involvement</b>		<b>10%</b>	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			

Rated by: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature over printed name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Designation

**INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT AND REVIEW FORM  
FOR NON-TEACHING PERSONNEL**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, of the NUEVA ECIJA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, office of \_\_\_\_\_ commit to deliver and agree to be rated in the targets in accordance with the attainment of the following indicated measures for the period \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

Ratee

\_\_\_\_\_

Date:

\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor

Head of

Office

Output	Success Indicator (Target + Measure)	Actual Accomplishment	Rating				Remarks
			Q1	E2	T3	A4	
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES							
Strategic Priority:							
Core Function:							
Final Average Rating							

Comments and Recommendations for Development Purposes					
Discussed with	Date	Assessed by:	Date	Final Rating by	Date
		I hereby certify that I have discussed with the employee my assessment on his/her performance.			
_____		_____		_____	
Personnel		Supervisor		Head of Office	

OFFICE PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT AND REVIEW FORM

I \_\_\_\_\_ of the NUEVA ECIJA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, Office of the \_\_\_\_\_, commit to deliver and agree to be rated in the targets in accordance with the attainment of the following indicated measures for the period of \_\_\_\_\_.

VP for \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_

Head of Office

Rating Scale	5 – Outstanding	3 – Satisfactory	1 – Poor
	4 – Very Satisfactory	2 - Unsatisfactory	

MFO/PAP	Success Indicator (Target + Measure)	Alloted Budget	Office/ Individual Accountable	Actual Accomplishments	Rating				Remarks
					Q	E	T	A	
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES									
Strategic Priority									
TOTAL OVERALL RATING									
FINAL AVERAGE RATING									
Final Rating by:									
Position :			_____						
Date :			Head of Office						