PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL: Designing of a Standardized Format for R&D Organization

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REPORT (APAR) FOR SCIENTISTS (Junior Level)

Name of the Scientist	 Discipline
Grade	 Sub Discipline
Lab/Estt	 Year

Guidelines to fill up the form

- 1. For the organisation to realize its mission and objectives, every member of the organisation needs to perform to his/her potential. R&D organization values appraisal to have tremendous motivational impact on people through goal setting, meaningful feedback, and recognition. The present appraisal system has been designed to integrate individual goals with organization's mission and objectives.
- 2. Initial discussions are required to be done between the Initiating Officer (IO) and the scientists to set the targets for next year and discuss the previous year's performance, followed by impediments and facilities, facts at work place.
- 3. In part IV, IO shall be grading the scientist on all the sub-attributes. Reviewing Officer (RO) can modulate the final score given by IO on each category i.e. Work output, Personal attributes, Functional Competency. Finally the Head of the establishment can modulate the final grading in the end if there is any significant variance in the IO and RO score.
- 4. APAR has got the provision for representation within 15 days. If the concerned APAR Section does not receive any information from the assessee on or before 15 days from the date of disclosure, the APAR will be treated as final.
- 5. The competent authority for considering unfavorable or adverse remarks shall consult the Accepting authority and decide the matter objectively within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the representation. The competent authority after due consideration may reject/accept the representation and modify the APAR accordingly. The decision of the competent authority and the final grading shall be communicated to the assessee reported upon within 15 days of receipt of the decision of the competent authority by the concerned APAR Section.
- 6. Next year's targets shall be broadly finalized during at the beginning of the Annual term and copy of it to be retained by Initiating officer, the candidate and the office.
- 7. Targets can be changed on new project assignments, or transfer from one lab to other lab, in consultation with IO/or can be reviewed half yearly.
 - Spacing can be increased/decreased as per the Individual/organizational requirements

PART-I

(To be filled by Office)

1.	Name and grad	le of the Scien	tist :				
2.	Laboratory/ Es	tablishment	:				
3.	Period of Repo	rt	:				
4.	Date of Birth		:				
5.	Date of Posting	g to present La	b/Estt:				
6.	Date of Appoir	ntment to prese	ent post:				
7.	Present Basic (Grade Pay & Γ	Date of acquiring	g it:			
8.	Reasons for tak	king leave other	er than CL, EL,	Medical :			
9.	Academic Qua	lifications		:			
	De	gree	Institution/	University	Year	Gra	nde/Division/CGPA
		ical order (from Sc/M.A) onwards			From - To		
10.	Association wi	th Scientific B	odies				
11.	Details of appo	vintments held	including the c	urrent one:(iı	n chronological orde	r)	
P	osition	Grad	e	Lab/Estt/D	te Fro	om	То

PART- II

I am rep	orting to
----------	-----------

Tasks Completed	Set targets	Accomplishments	Comments & remarks by Initiating officer (IO)

Guidelines

- Projects/ Assignments Accuracy of the S&T work report
- Publication in journals Scientific merit of the work done
- Scientific study report Lectures delivered
- Consultancy Books edited or written
- Preparation of Technical manuals Annual reports prepared
- S&T outputs from workshops/ seminars Awards /membership of
- S&T Management Course Institutions/Academies

Candidate's viewpoint

- Satisfaction with work
- Working environment
- Change required, if any

Date:	Date:
Signature of the Assessee	Signature of the IO:

PART- III

Performance Review Conversations

(This part is associated with motivational component and anything discussed in this section, either positive or negative shall not have any adverse consequences on the overall assessment)

(To be filled in by the Initiating Officer)

(Duration: A minimum of 30 minutes)

Key issues discussed with respect to:

(Accomplishments of	targets, facilitating factors/ impediments to performa	nce etc.)
) APTITUDES, TRAI	INING AND DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF TH	F ASSESSE TO EXCEL I
	INING AND DEVELOTMENT NEEDS OF THE	E ASSESEE TO EACEL I
FIELD		
PERSONALITY AT	TRIBUTES	
(Tomporoment attitud	le, behavior etc. and corrections suggested, if any)	
(Temperament, attitut	ie, behavior etc. and corrections suggested, if any)	

Part III (Contd)

d) TARGETS SETTING OF THE NEXT YEAR:

S. No.	TARGETS Projects/Assignments/Assignments, Publications

Signature of the assessee:	Signature of the IO:
Name of assessee:	Name of the IO:
Date of conduct of performance review conversations:	<u>T</u> o be filled by IO

Copy to:

- Initiating Officer
- Candidate
- Current APAR
- Next APAR

PART- IV

Performance Rating of Scientists (Junior Level)

Name & Rank of IO:	Name & Rank of RO:	

Attributes	Ratin	g X	5*	4*	3*	2*	1*		Rating Y	
I. SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS/ ASSIGNMENTS	Excellent at carrying or project/assignments	ıt	٠	٠	•	٠		Hardly an	y project activities	3
2. WORK QUALITY	Exceptionally good qua	lity of work	•	•	•	•	•	Poor Qua	lity of work	
3. WORK QUANTITY	Exceedingly good at expractical work	perimental or		•	•		•	Poor at e	xperimental or pra	actical work
4. ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES	Highly Productive						•	Very low	at work output	
Signature/Date		IO Total						Grand	Work Output RO X 5 X .4 =	
Signature/Date		RO Total						Total:	KU A 3 A .4 =	
Personal Attributes (30%	•									
I. ATTITUDE	Objective and impartial		•	•	•	•	•	Pessimist	tic	
. RESPONSIBILITY	Sense of responsibility conscientiousness	and	•	•	•	•	•	Unreliable , lazy & shirken		
3. INITIATIVE	Takes initiative to impre learn new skills	ove his own field/	٠	٠	٠	٠	٠	Makes no effort to improve upon in his own field.		
. COMMITMENT TO WORK AND THE ORGANISATION	Completely trusted to for commitments	ulfill assignments or	٠	٠	•	•	•	Can't be trusted upon with an assignment or commitment		
. ADAPTABILITY	Well behaved & pleasa while working in the org		٠	٠	•	٠	•	Arrogant , discourteous, lack of mannerism		
6. COMMUNICATION SKILLS	Ability to communicate ideas of others	and receptive to	٠	٠	•	٠	٠	Unreceptive / incoherent / unclear in communication skills.		
7. DISCIPLINE	Ability to adhere to offic completing the projects time	ce timings, :/ assignments on	•	•	•	•	•	Casual for deadlines		
3. RESOURCEFULNESS	Excellent in managing	resources						Poor in re	source managem	ent
CREDIBILITY & ACCOUNTABILITY	Highly credible						•	Least cre	dible	
D. TEAM WORK	Cooperative while work teams.	king in project		•	•	•	•	Uncooperative and difficult to work		
Signature/Date		IO Total						Grand Total:	Personal Attr	ibutes RO
Signature/Date		RO Total						rotal.	x 2 x .3)	
unctional Competency										
SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE	Very good in scientific k	nowledge		•	•	•	•	Very poor	in scientific know	edge
PRACTICAL ABILITY	Exceptionally thorough a professional knowledge		•	•	•	•	•	Moving to	wards obsolescen	ce.
FULFILLMENT OF SET	work. Produces many new & o ideas/approaches in act								iginal or ideas/ap or routine type.	proaches
	Excellent interaction with								raction with other	disciplines
KNOWLEDGE OF RULES	Can be fully depended เ commitments	upon to fulfill the						Cannot be	relied upon	
Signature/Date		IO Total						Grand	Functional Co	
Signature/Date		RO Total						Total:	RO x 4 x .3 =	
Work Output Score: Personality Attributes Score:				Func	tional o	ompete	ncv sco	re:	Grand Total:	

PART- IV (contd.)

DEV	πA	RKS	\mathbf{RV}	IO.
K D. I		K 13.7	nı	11 7

ntegrity and moral fibre of assessee:	BEYOND DOUBT/ DOUBTFUL
ttitude towards Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tr	ibes, Weaker Sections of the society:
Comment on understanding of the problems of	Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, Weaker Sections of the society
e/she is dealing with their development and prot	ection) PARTIAL/ IMPARTIAL
Adverse remarks, if any:	
Date:	Signature of the RO:
	PART- V
temarks of RO: Reference to strengths/weakness	s. Please record your observations other than the points already covered l

PART VI

REMARKS OF ACCEPTANCE OFFICER / HEAD OF THE ESTT

The head of the Estt will give the final rating and normalize as per the table given below:

APAR – NUMERICAL GRADING (X)		RATING	GRADINGS AWARDED
Outstanding	90-100		
Very Good	80-90		
Average	70-80		
Below average	40-70		
Poor	< 40		

- APARs graded between 90 to 100 will be rated as 'Outstanding' and will be rounded off accordingly 90 or 95 for the purpose of calculating average scores for empanelment or promotion.
- APARs graded between 80 and 90 will be rated as 'Very good' and will be given a score of 85.
- APARs graded between 70 and 80 will be rated as 'Average' and will be given a score of 75.
- APARs graded between 40 and short of 70 will be rated as 'Below average' and will be given a score of 60.
- APARs graded below 40 will be rated as 'Poor' and will be given a score of 40.

(Please comment on reasons for awarding less than 70% marks)	
Any adverse remarks, if any, been communicated to the	ne assessee? If yes, then details
Accepting	Officer/Head of the Estt.
Date :	Name :
Station :	Designation:

PART VII

DECLARATION

FORMAT FOR F	Place: Place: ART VIII REPRESENTATION
FORMAT FOR F Name and grade of the Scientist : Laboratory/ Establishment : Period of Report :	ART VIII REPRESENTATION
FORMAT FOR F Name and grade of the Scientist : Laboratory/ Establishment : Period of Report :	ART VIII REPRESENTATION
Name and grade of the Scientist : Laboratory/ Establishment : Period of Report :	
Laboratory/ Establishment : Period of Report :	
Period of Report :	
	
Grievances:	
Signature of the Assessee	Date
Remarks of the representing authority if applica	able