



03 January 2023

MEMORANDUM NO. 02
Series of 2023

T O: All Vice Presidents, Chancellors and Deans

R E: Consultations to Recommend Heads of Departments/Offices/Units and Directors for Research Centers/Institutes

You are hereby directed to conduct consultations with your colleges/departments/centers/offices/units under your supervision to come up with a recommendation on who will serve as head of each department/office/unit and director of each research center/institute for this Year 2023. Please submit your top 3 candidates on or before January 15, 2023.

In making consultations, you may use the attached SPMS tool of evaluation and choose relevant indicators of performance for those who have already served as administrators and the leadership potential of new faculty/staff.

Please be guided accordingly.


EDGARDO E. TULIN
President

Guide in giving ratings per SPMS

- A. These indicators shall be evaluated in any one, combination of, or all of the following general categories, whichever is appropriate:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Effectiveness/Quality	<p>The extent to which actual performance compares with targeted performance.</p> <p>The degree to which objectives are achieved and the extent to which targeted problems are solved.</p> <p>In management, effectiveness related to getting the right things done.</p>
Efficiency	<p>The extent to which time or resources is used for the intended task or purpose. Measures whether targets are accomplished with a minimum amounts or quantity of waste, or unnecessary effort.</p>
Timeliness	<p>Measures whether the deliverable was done on time based on the requirements of the law and/or clients/stakeholders.</p> <p>Time-related performance indicators evaluate such things as project completion deadlines, time management skills and other time-sensitive expectation.</p>

1. To enable the university to distinguish performance levels of individuals, other factors shall be given additional points by the heads of units, the Vice Presidents and the University President in addition to the individual employee's rating indicated in the summary list of individual performance ratings. Recommendations to give additional points should have prior approval from the University President before said points be indicated in the IPCR with said approval to form part of the IPCR of the employee concerned. The following factors which may be given additional points if approved by the President (except

for punctuality which shall be based on record at the PRPEO) are the following:

▪ **Punctuality** (based on records at the PRPEO)

Employees with zero under time in a rating period shall be given a maximum of additional .2 rating. Every under time recorded shall correspond to a .001 rating deduction in the additional points under punctuality.

▪ **Rendering work even beyond office hours** in the exigency of the service without pay. Eight hours of overtime work requested by the President or the Vice Presidents for the accomplishment of the university goals and objectives will entitle the employee to a .01 rating in addition to the rating he earned as indicated in the summary list

▪ **Performing additional functions** even if not inherent of his/her position. The maximum of .1 rating may be given, the exact additional rating will be recommended by the Vice Presidents or given by the University President himself.

❖ **Rating Scales**

The university uses a five-point rating scale (1 to 5), 5 being the highest and 1, the lowest. The rating scale is described below:

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. Employees at this performance level should have demonstrated exceptional job mastery in all major areas of responsibility. Employee achievement and contributions to the organization are of marked excellence

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 reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas

In determining the final equivalent adjectival rating of the employee, the range of overall point scores is converted as follows:

4.6 - 5.0	Outstanding
3.8 - 4.5	Very Satisfactory
3.0 - 3.7	Satisfactory
2.2 - 2.9	Unsatisfactory
2.1 & below	Poor