

## Performance Rating of Scientists (Junior Level)

Name & Rank of IO: \_\_\_\_\_ Name & Rank of RO: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Work output (40%)</b>							
Attributes	Rating X	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	Rating Y
1. SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS/ ASSIGNMENTS	Excellent at carrying out project/assignments	.	.	.	.	.	Hardly any project activities
2. WORK QUALITY	Exceptionally good quality of work	.	.	.	.	.	Poor Quality of work
3. WORK QUANTITY	Exceedingly good at experimental or practical work	.	.	.	.	.	Poor at experimental or practical work
4. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES	Highly Productive	.	.	.	.	.	Very low at work output
Signature/Date		IO Total					Grand Total: <b>Work Output RO X 5 X .4 =</b>
Signature/Date		RO Total					

<b>Personal Attributes (30%)</b>							
1. ATTITUDE	Objective and impartial	.	.	.	.	.	Pessimistic
2. RESPONSIBILITY	Sense of responsibility and conscientiousness	.	.	.	.	.	Unreliable , lazy & shirken
3. INITIATIVE	Takes initiative to improve his own field/ learn new skills	.	.	.	.	.	Makes no effort to improve upon in his own field.
4. COMMITMENT TO WORK AND THE ORGANISATION	Completely trusted to fulfill assignments or commitments	.	.	.	.	.	Can't be trusted upon with an assignment or commitment
5. ADAPTABILITY	Well behaved & pleasant temperament while working in the organization	.	.	.	.	.	Arrogant , discourteous, lack of mannerism
6. COMMUNICATION SKILLS	Ability to communicate and receptive to ideas of others	.	.	.	.	.	Unreceptive / incoherent / unclear in communication skills.
7. DISCIPLINE	Ability to adhere to office timings, completing the projects / assignments on time	.	.	.	.	.	Casual for deadlines
8. RESOURCEFULNESS	Excellent in managing resources	.	.	.	.	.	Poor in resource management
9. CREDIBILITY & ACCOUNTABILITY	Highly credible	.	.	.	.	.	Least credible
10. TEAM WORK	Cooperative while working in project teams.	.	.	.	.	.	Uncooperative and difficult to work
Signature/Date		IO Total					Grand Total: <b>Personal Attributes RO x 2 x .3)</b>
Signature/Date		RO Total					

<b>Functional Competency (30%)</b>							
1. SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE	Very good in scientific knowledge	.	.	.	.	.	Very poor in scientific knowledge
2. EXPERIMENTAL OR PRACTICAL ABILITY	Exceptionally thorough and up to date professional knowledge in the scientific work.	.	.	.	.	.	Moving towards obsolescence.
3. FULFILLMENT OF SET COMMITMENTS	Produces many new & original ideas/approaches in achieving targets	.	.	.	.	.	Seldom original or ideas/approaches unsound or routine type.
4. UPDATING OF KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS	Excellent interaction with other disciplines	.	.	.	.	.	Poor interaction with other disciplines
5. KNOWLEDGE OF RULES AND REGULATIONS	Can be fully depended upon to fulfill the commitments	.	.	.	.	.	Cannot be relied upon
Signature/Date		IO Total					Grand Total: <b>Functional Competency RO x 4 x .3 =</b>
Signature/Date		RO Total					

<b>Work Output Score:</b>		<b>Personality Attributes Score:</b>		<b>Functional competency score:</b>		<b>Grand Total:</b>	
<b>Final Grading by Head of Establishment :</b>				<b>Signature of Head of Estb.</b>			

**\*Outstanding (5), Very Good (4), Average (3), Below average (2) and Poor (1)**

## Performance Rating of Scientists (Middle Level)

Name & Rank of IO: \_\_\_\_\_ Name & Rank of RO: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Work output (40%)</b>							
Attributes	Rating X	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	Rating Y
1. <b>SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS/ASSIGNMENTS</b>	Exceptionally wide , thorough & up-to-date professional knowledge	•	•	•	•	•	Restricted & superficial knowledge
2. <b>WORK QUALITY</b>	Accepting job challenges and identify with larger goals of the organization	•	•	•	•	•	Very low work output
3. <b>WORK QUANTITY</b>	Exceptionally good quality of work	•	•	•	•	•	Poor Quality of work
4. <b>ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES</b>	Aware of subsequent laws and order of own organisation	•	•	•	•	•	Poor awareness of the subsequent rules & regulations
Signature/Date	IO Total						Grand Total:
Signature/Date	RO Total						<b>Work Output</b> RO X 5 X .4 =

<b>Personal Attributes (30%)</b>							
1. <b>ATTITUDE</b>	Optimistic	•	•	•	•	•	Pessimistic
2. <b>TRUST WORTHINESS</b>	Develop as a trustworthy member of the organization	•	•	•	•	•	Difficult to rely upon
3. <b>FUTURE PERSPECTIVE</b>	Forthcoming perspective of approach upright	•	•	•	•	•	Unclear in approach. No innovativeness
4. <b>LEADERSHIP SKILLS</b>	Outstanding in planning & organizing	•	•	•	•	•	Poor in planning & organizing
5. <b>SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT</b>	Excellent mentor	•	•	•	•	•	Not able to guide in an appropriate manner
6. <b>MONITORING</b>	Ability to communicate and receptive to ideas of others	•	•	•	•	•	Tend to be partial & biased
7. <b>MEETING DEADLINES</b>	Adhere to the timings & capacity to work with deadlines	•	•	•	•	•	Poor time management
8. <b>RESOURCEFULNESS</b>	Highly resourceful	•	•	•	•	•	Poor in arranging resources
9. <b>TACTFUL HANDLING OF CONFLICTS</b>	Able to resolve conflicts within organization	•	•	•	•	•	Unable to resolve conflicts within organization
10. <b>TEAM BUILDING</b>	Able to develop excellent project team	•	•	•	•	•	Unable to develop project team
Signature/Date	IO Total						Grand Total:
Signature/Date	RO Total						<b>Personal Attributes</b> RO x 2 x .3 =

<b>Functional Competency (30%)</b>							
1. <b>SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE &amp; ITS APPLICATIONS</b>	Keep updated with scientific knowledge	•	•	•	•	•	Feeling of obsolescence
2. <b>CLARITY OF GOALS</b>	Clear & objective about the projects in hand	•	•	•	•	•	Unclear goals
3. <b>STRATEGIC PLANNING</b>	Produces many new & good ideas for the growth of the scientists & organization	•	•	•	•	•	Seldom come with original ideas
4. <b>DECISION MAKING ABILITY</b>	Excellent interaction with other disciplines	•	•	•	•	•	Poor interaction with other disciplines
5. <b>ADMINISTRATIVE INITIATIVES &amp; KNOWLEDGE</b>	Remarkably good at assessing & coming out with resolutions	•	•	•	•	•	Poor at assessing & unable to resolve
Signature/Date	IO Total						Grand Total:
Signature/Date	RO Total						<b>Functional Competency</b> RO x 4 x .3 =

<b>Work Output Score:</b>		<b>Personality Attributes Score:</b>		<b>Functional competency score:</b>		<b>Grand Total:</b>	
<b>Final Grading by Head of Establishment :</b>		<b>Signature of Head of Estb.</b>					

**\*Outstanding (5), Very Good (4), Average (3), Below average (2) and Poort (1)**

## Performance Rating of Scientists (Senior Level)

Name & Rank of IO: \_\_\_\_\_ Name & Rank of RO: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Work output (40%)</b>							
Attributes	Rating X	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	Rating Y
1. SCIENTIFIC & TECHNOLOGICAL VISION	Excellent visualization with latest scenario in national & international context	•	•	•	•	•	Carry forward the already existing assignments
2. ORGANISATIONAL CONTROL	Excellent control on the organisation	•	•	•	•	•	Poor internal systems
3. HR GROWTH	Develop the organizational human resources & able to manage the second line growth	•	•	•	•	•	Self centered & not able to develop organizational leaders
4. LAB/ESTABLISHMENT INITIATIVES	Able to develop lab infrastructure , new setups	•	•	•	•	•	Stagnant
Signature/Date _____ IO Total							Grand Total: <b>Work Output RO X 5 X .4 =</b>
Signature/Date _____ RO Total							

<b>Personal Attributes (30%)</b>							
Attributes	Rating X	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	Rating Y
1. MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS	Excellent man & material management	•	•	•	•	•	Carry forward the already existing assignments
2. ORGANISATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY	Excellent sense of ownership towards organisation	•	•	•	•	•	Poor internal systems
3. DEVELOPMENT OF SUCCESSORS	Transfers the responsibilities & authorities to the second line	•	•	•	•	•	Stagnant
4. TRUSTWORTHINESS	Maintains transparency in the organization	•	•	•	•	•	Confusion all around
5. PRESENCE IN THE LAB	Spends 70% time in the lab	•	•	•	•	•	Spends 70% of the time outside the lab
Signature/Date _____ IO Total							Grand Total: <b>Personal Attributes RO x 4 x .3 =</b>
Signature/Date _____ RO Total							

<b>Functional Competency (30%)</b>							
Attributes	Rating X	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*	Rating Y
1. TECHNOLOGY JUDGEMENT	Discerns the essence of the problem and selects the best line of attack	•	•	•	•	•	Fail to list what is important and what is not
2. IMAGE BUILDING OF ORGANISATION	Concerns towards productivity	•	•	•	•	•	No concern towards recent development
3. ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGEMENT	Excellent judgment & foresight in administration including cost & budget aspects	•	•	•	•	•	Judgment can not be relied upon
4. SCIENTIFIC NETWORKING (interaction with outside world)	Interaction with scientific community	•	•	•	•	•	No interaction with scientific community
5. STRATEGIC DECISION MAKING	Exceptionally good in making strategic planning for organization	•	•	•	•	•	No plans for strategic moves for the organizational growth
Signature/Date _____ IO Total							Grand Total: <b>Functional Competency RO x 4 x .3 =</b>
Signature/Date _____ RO Total							

<b>Work Output Score:</b>		<b>Personality Attributes Score:</b>		<b>Functional competency score:</b>		<b>Grand Total:</b>	
<b>Final Grading by Head of Establishment :</b>				<b>Signature of Head of Estb.</b>			

**\*Outstanding (5), Very Good (4), Average (3), Below average (2) and Poort (1)**