

COMPUTATION OF FINAL INDIVIDUAL RATING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Name of Administrative Staff:

ARGIE SINGSON

| Particulars (1) | Numerical Rating (2) | Percentage Weight (3) | Equivalent Numerical Rating (2x3) |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Numerical Rating per IPCR | 4.66 | 70% | 3.262 |
| 2. Supervisor/Head's assessment of his contribution towards attainment of office accomplishments | 4.75 | 30% | 1.425 |
| | TOTAL NU | MERICAL | 4.687 |

| TOTAL NUMERICAL RATING: Add: Additional Approved Points, if any: TOTAL NUMERICAL RATING: | 4.687 | - |
|--|-------|---|
| FINAL NUMERICAL RATING | 4.687 | |
| ADJECTIVAL RATING: | 0 | |
| Prepared by: MARIO C. BANTUGAN Name of Staff | | Reviewed by: MARIO LILIO VALENZONA Department/Office Head |
| | | Recommending Approval: Chairman, PMT |
| | | Approved: EDGARDO E. TULIN President |

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT & REVIEW FORM (IPCR)

I, ARGIE P. SINGSON of the WATER AND SEWERAGE SYSTEM MAINTAINANCE UNIT commits to deliver and agree to be rated on the following targets in accordance with the indicated measures for the period: January to June 2016

Approved:

Ratee

Rating

Head, WSSMU

Actual

| | | | TARCET | A | | | Mating | | Remarks |
|---|---|--|--------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|----------------|---------|
| MFO & Performance Indicators | Program/Activities/Projects | Tasks Assigned | TARGET | Accomplish ment | Q ¹ | E ² | T³ | A ⁴ | Kemana |
| MFO1-Water distribution | PI 1.1 No. of water distribution systems in new and renovated/implemented academic and research buildings | Repairs water distribution system in VSU | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.6666667 | |
| repairs/ renovations | PI 1.2 No. of water distribution systems in new and renovated/implemented administrative buildings | main cumpus | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.666667 | |
| | PI 1.3 No. of water distribution systems in new and renovated/implemented IGP buildings and structures | | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.666667 | |
| MFO 2 Plumbing systems improvement and maintenance inside buildings | PI 1.4 No. of water distribution systems in new and renovated Student/ Staff Housing units | | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.666667 | |
| | PI 2.1 No. of plumbing systems improvements/repairs inside academic and research buildings | | 25 | 35 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.666667 | |
| | PI 2.2 No. of plumbing systems improvements/repairs inside administrative buildings | Repairs water distribution system in VSU main Campus | 30 | 33 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.666667 | |
| | PI 2.3 No. of plumbing systems improvements/repairs inside IGP buildings and structures | | 15 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.666667 | |
| | PI 2.4 No. of plumbing systems improvements inside Student/staff housing units | | 15 | 18 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4.6666667 | |

| MFO3, Water distribution | PI 3.1 No. of water distribution lines repaired | | 15 | _ | _ | 1 | 4.6666667 | |
|-------------------------------|---|----|----|---|---|---|-----------|--|
| systems repair and | | 10 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.0000007 | |
| maintenance outside buildings | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | - | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 1 | 42.00 | |
| Total Over-all Rating | | | | | | | | |

| (Total Control of Calculation 4) | 4.6666667 | Comments & Recommendations |
|---|-----------|----------------------------|
| Average Rating (Total Over-all rating divided by 4) | | for Development Purpose: |
| Additional Points: | | · |
| Punctuality: | | |
| Approved Additional point (with copy of approval) | 4.6666667 | |
| FINAL RATING | 4.000007 | |
| ADJECTIVAL RATING | | |

Received:

Calibrated by:

PMT

Recommending Approval:

REMBERTO A. PATINDOL

Vice President

Approvedby:

President A

Instrument for Performance Effectiveness of Administrative Staff

| | | Rating Period: | lan-June | 2616 |
|----------------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------|
| Name of Staff: | Argie | Singrom | Position: | Geman |

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 | 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 | The 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 requirements. | | | |
| 1 | Poor | The staff fails to meet job requirements | | | |

| | Commitment (both for subordinates and supervisors) | 1 | | Sca | le | |
|------|---|---------------|-----|-------|----|----|
| 1. | Demonstrates sensitivity to client's needs and makes the latter's experience in transacting business with the office fulfilling and rewarding. | $\binom{5}{}$ | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | Makes self-available to clients even beyond official time | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | Submits urgent non-routine reports required by higher offices/agencies such as CHED, DBM, CSC, DOST, NEDA, PASUC and similar regulatory agencies within specified time by rendering overtime work even without overtime pay | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. | Accepts all assigned tasks as his/her share of the office targets and delivers outputs within the prescribed time. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. | Commits himself/herself to help attain the targets of his/her office by assisting co- employees who fail to perform all assigned tasks | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | -1 |
| 6. | Regularly reports to work on time, logs in upon arrival, secures pass slip when going out on personal matters and logs out upon departure from work. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. | Keeps accurate records of her work which is easily retrievable when needed. | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. | Suggests new ways to further improve her work and the services of the office to its clients | (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9 | Accepts additional tasks assigned by the head or by higher offices even if the assignment is not related to his position but critical towards the attainment of the functions of the university | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 0. | Maximizes office hours during lean periods by performing non-routine functions the outputs of which results as a best practice that further increase effectiveness of the office or satisfaction of clientele | 5 | (4) | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 1. | Accepts objective criticisms and opens to suggestions and innovations for improvement of his work accomplishment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. | Willing to be trained and developed | 5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | Total Score | | 1 | 7 | | |
| B. L | eadership & Management (For supervisors only to be rated by higher upervisor) | | | Scale | 9 | |
| 1. | Demonstrates mastery and expertise in all areas of work to gain trust, respect and confidence from subordinates and that of higher superiors | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | |
| 2. | Visionary and creative to draw strategic and specific plans and targets of the office/department aligned to that of the overall plans of the university. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | , |
| 3. | Innovates for the purpose of improving efficiency and effectiveness of the operational processes and functions of the department/office for further satisfaction of clients. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. | Accepts accountability for the overall performance and in delivering the output required of his/her unit. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. | Demonstrates, teaches, monitors, coaches and motivates subordinates for their improved efficiency and effectiveness in accomplishing their assigned tasks needed for the attainment of the calibrated targets of the unit | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | Total Score | | | | | _ |
| | | | | | | |

| Overall recommendation | | |
|------------------------|---|------------------|
| | | XXXI. |
| | English Service Committee Co. methodologica | ARMANDO ALBANICO |
| | | THE TOTAL TOTAL |

Name of Head



EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

| Name of Employee: | ARGIE SINGSON |
|--|---|
| Performance Rating: | Outstanding |
| Aim: | |
| Proposed Interventio responsibilities: | ns to Improve Performance and/or Competence and Qualification to assume highe |
| Date: | Target Date: |
| First Step: | |
| | |
| Result: | |
| | |
| Date: | Target Date: |
| Next Step: | |
| | |
| Outcome: | |
| Final Step/Recomme | ndation: |
| | |
| | Prepared by: |
| | |

Unit Head