Annex P

COMPUTATION OF FINAL INDIVIDUAL RATING ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Name of Administrative Staff:

Apolonio M Encierto

| | Particulars (1) | Numerical Rating (2) | Percentage Weight (3) | Equivalent Numerical Rating (2x3) |
|---|---|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Numerical Rating per IPCR | 4.58 | 70% | 3.206 |
| 2 | Supervisor/Head's Assessment of his contribution towards attainment of office accomplishment | 4.58 | 30% | 1.374 |
| | | 4.58 | | |

| TOTAL NUMERICAL RATING: | 4.58 |
|--|------|
| Add: Additional Approved Points, if any: | |
| TOTAL NUMERICAL RATING: | 4.58 |
| | |
| FINAL NUMERICAL RATING: | 4.58 |
| ADJECTIVAL RATING: | VS |

Prepared by:

MARIO LIVIO VALENZONA Immediate Supervisor Recommending Approval:

Director GSD

MARIO LILIO V

Approved:

REMBERTO A. PATINDOL

Vice President

INVIDUAL PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT & REVIEW FORM (IPCR)

I, APOLONIO M. ENCIERTO of the <u>GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION</u> commits to deliver and agree to be rated on the following targets in accordance with the indicated measures for the period: <u>luly to December 2018</u>

Approved:

APOLONIO MÆNCIERTO

Ratee

MARIO LILIO P. VALENZONA
Director, GSD

| MFO & Performance Indicators | Succsess Indicators | Tasks Assigned | Target | Actual Accomplishme | Rating | | | | Remarks |
|--|---|---|--------|------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | · | | nt | Q ¹ | E ² | T ³ | A ⁴ | |
| FMO1-Program of work and cost estimates | PI 1.1 Completed program and estimates | Preparation of program and cost estimates | 12 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.67 | |
| FMO2-Project implementation | PI 1.2 Implemented projects | PI 1.2 Implemented projects | 45 | 48 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.67 | |
| FMO3-Project supervision | PI 1.3 Monthly Inspection, Evaluation and progess report | Inspection of on-going projects | 20 | 30 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | |
| FMO4-Supervision and monitoring of section personnel | PI 1.4 No. of section personnel supervised and monitored | Daily supervision of section personnel and its accomplishment | 20 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.67 | • |
| Total Over-all Rating | | | | | | | · | 18.33 | |
| Average Rating (Total Over-all rating divided by 4) | | | | 4.58 | Comments & Recommendations | | | | endations |
| Additional Points: | | | | | for Development Purpose: | | | | |
| Punctuality: | | | | | 1. Take advance courses | | | | |
| Approved Additional point (with copy of approval) | | | | | 2. Attend Trainings and Sermnare to explant Letest Technologies | | | | ed seminarc |
| FINAL RATING | | | | 4.58 | T to capital cutest rechnologies | | | | chnologies |
| ADJECTIVAL RATING | | | | VS | | | | | |

Evaluate & Rated by:

MARIO LILIO VANENZONA Supervisor Date:

1-quality

2-Efficiency

3-Timeliness

4-Average

Recommending Approval:

MARIO DELO VALENZONA

Divector, GSD

Date:

Approved by:

REMBERTO A. PATINDOL

Vice President

Date:_____

ືາex O

Instrument for Perta ...ance Effectiveness of Administrative Staff

| | Rating Period: | July-Dec. 2018 | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| Name of Staff: Apolonio M. Encierto | Position: Head, | , PESMU, Engr. III | |

Instruction to supervisor: Please evaluate the effectiveness of your subordinate in contributing towards attainment of the calibrated targets of your department/office/center/college/campus using the scale below. Encircle your rating.

| Scale | Descriptive Rating | Qualitative Description | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|------------|------------|----------|---|---|--|
| 5 | Outstanding | nding The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The staff delivers outputs which always results to best practice of the unit. He is an exceptional role model | | | | | | |
| 4 | Very Satisfactory | he performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements | | | | | | |
| 3 | Satisfactory | The performance meets job requirements | | | | | | |
| 2 | Fair | The performance needs some development to meet job requirem | ents. | | | | | |
| 1 | Poor | The staff fails to meet job requirements | | | | | | |
| . Commitme | ent (<i>both for subordinat</i> es a | nd supervisors) | | ; | Scal | е | | |
| 1 | Demonstrates sensitivity to business with the office fulfil | client's needs and makes the latter's experience in transacting ling and rewarding. | 5 | (4) | 3 | 2 | Ī | |
| 2 | Makes self-available to clier | nts even beyond official time | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | T | |
| 3 | DBM, CSC, DOST, NEDA, Frendering overtime work even | | 5 | (4) | 3 | 2 | | |
| 4 | Accepts all assigned tasks a the prescribed time. | as his/her share of the office targets and delivers outputs within | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 5 | who fail to perform all assign | | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 6 | Regularly reports to work or personal matters and logs o | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | | | |
| 7 | Keeps accurate records of her work which is easily retrievable when needed. | | | | | 2 | • | |
| 8 | Suggests new ways to further improve her work and the services of the office to its clients | | | | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 9 | not related to his position bu | signed by the head or by higher offices even if the assignment is t critical towards the attainment of the functions of the university lean periods by performing non-routine functions the outputs | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 10 | of which results as a best pr satisfaction of clientele | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | ۱ | | |
| 11 | Accepts objective criticisms and opens to suggestions and innovations for improvement of his work accomplishment | | | | 3 | 2 | 7 | |
| 12 | Willing to be trained and developed | | | | | 2 | 1 | |
| | | Total Score | | <u>07</u> | | | | |
| B. Le | | or supervisors only to be rated by higher supervisor | Scale | | | | | |
| 1 | confidence from subordinate | expertise in all areas of work to gain trust, respect and es and that of higher superiors | 5 | (4) | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 2 | | aw strategic and specific plans and targets of the that of the overall plans of the university. | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 3 | | improving efficiency and effectiveness of the operational he department/office for further satisfaction of clients. | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 4 | his/her unit. | e overall performance and in delivering the output required of | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 5 | Demonstrates, teaches, mor efficiency and effectiveness of the calibrated targets of th | nitors, coaches and motivates subordinates for their improved in accomplishing their assigned tasks needed for the attainment e unit | 5 | (4) | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | Total Score | | 22 | | | | |
| | | Average Score | | 8 ک | <u> </u> | | | |

Overall recommendation

MARIO LILIO VALENZONA
Director, GSD

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

| Name of Employee: | APOLONIO M. ENCIE | RTO | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Performance Rating: | July 1 to December 3 | 1, 2019 | | | • |
| Aim: | | | | | |
| Proposed Intervention | ns to Improve Performa | nce: | • | | |
| Date: | | Target Date: | | | · . |
| First Step: Take Adva | ance Courses, attend tr | aining and semir | nars to update late | st technologies | · |
| | | | | - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| Result: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Date: | | Target Date: | | | |
| Next Step: | | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | | | | |
| Outcome: | | | | | |
| Final Step/Recommen | dation: | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Prepared by: | , | | |
| | | • • | MARIO | LILIO VALENZONA irector, GSD | ÷ |
| • | • | | | | |