Republic of the Philippines
**IFUGAO STATE UNIVERSITY**
Nayon, Lamut, Ifugao

**OFFICE ORDER NO. 8 - 2015**

**Subject : Guidelines for the Implementation of the University SPMS and Timeline thereof for 2015**

**Date : March 25, 2015**

---

1. The University SPMS (Strategic Performance Management System) Manual, approved for implementation by the Board of Regents (BOR) in 2012, has greatly facilitated the performance planning, monitoring and evaluation despite some differences and dissimilarities with the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) enunciated by the Civil Service Commission which aims to account the impact of programs/projects/activities where government funds are spent besides the integration of a fair system of awarding incentives.

2. To address some observed weaknesses and constraints in the last three years of implementation, the following Guidelines for its Implementation in CY 2015 is hereby promulgated and issued:

   a. SPMS Cycle

   To conform to the evaluation cycle for the Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) and the Performance Enhancement Incentive (PEI), the rating period for the teaching units/personnel shall now be the same with the non-teaching units/personnel which is from January to December of the year.

   b. Rating scheme

   The existing provision for the rating scheme as presented below serves as a general guideline in rating accomplishments against targets.

| Numerical | Adjectival Rating | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 5- | Outstanding | Exceeded the target by at least 30% |
| 4- | Very Satisfactory | Exceeded the target by at least 15-29% |
| 3- | Satisfactory | Met the target of 100-114% |
| 2- | Unsatisfactory | Accomplished target by 51-99% |
| 1---- | Poor | Accomplished target by 50% and below |

In cases where some targets are not measurable or that the given rating scale becomes inappropriate to apply, the PMT, in the case of the office performance, and the unit/department head, in the case of the individual performance, shall determine or set the internal rules/guidelines to measure accomplishment of targets as well as standards in target-setting. Take for example the following:

| Target | Actual | Rating | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Qn | Ql | T | A |
| Four (4) reports submitted on time with 90% accuracy. | 6 reports submitted 5 days before deadline with 100% accuracy. | 5 | 3? | ? | |

Computation:

- Quantity – 6/4 = 167% rating is 5
- Quality – 100%/90%=111% rating is 3; computation is not appropriate to the set target
- Timeliness –cannot apply the existing guideline

It is clear that the rating scheme is difficult to apply in this way of target-setting. While there is no problem with the quantity measure, application of the rating scheme for the quality and timeliness measures is inappropriate. The PMT or the unit/department head may set the standards either in target-setting and/or in setting appropriate rating scheme such as the following:

- Rating scale for submission of accomplishment reports.

| Numerical Rating | Adjectival Rating | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | Outstanding | Report submitted 4 days + before due date |
| 4 | Very Satisfactory | Report submitted 1-3 days before due date |
| 3 | Satisfactory | Submitted on schedule |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory | Submitted 1-3 days after due date |
| 1 | Poor | Submitted 4 days + after due date |

- Quality measures should not be targeted if difficult to measure (i.e. accuracy, effectiveness, efficiency, etc.) unless if they are stated objectively.
- For "Quality" measures that are stated objectively (i.e. 0 revisions, or no error) the following rating scale shall apply:

| Numerical Rating | Adjectival Rating | Description |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | Outstanding | 0 revisions; no error |
| 4 | Very Satisfactory | With 1 revision/error |
| 3 | Satisfactory | With 2 to 3 revisions/errors |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory | With 4 revisions/errors |
| 1 | Poor | With 5 or more errors/revisions |

- Accuracy of reports and performance of jobs are expected to be done at 100% accuracy, efficiency and the like. If targets and accomplishments cannot go higher than 100%, a rating of either 1 or 5 shall apply. If performance is lower than 100%, the rating is 1 and if achieved 100%, the rating is 5. This is also applicable to Quantity indicators like number of quarterly reports which is definitely 4 in a year, major exams which is 2 every semester. A non-teaching personnel who submits all 4 quarterly reports in a year gets a score of 5 for quantity or 1 if otherwise and a faculty member who administers 2 major exams during the semester earns a score of 5 or 1 if otherwise.

c. IPCR Rating of Heads of Delivery Units

As has been practiced previously, OPCR rating is used as IPCR rating of heads. However, the disadvantage of this is that the Office functions does not include all other functions of the head as an individual personnel. Say for example the Campus Director's rating was based on the achievements of the units under him/her while other functions in instruction, research and extension were not included. Thus, heads of units shall also prepare their own IPCR to allow them to include all other functions they actually perform.

d. Simplifying the Accomplishment of the OPCR Template

In accomplishing the targets and accomplishment columns in the OPCR/IPCR template, there is no need to state the targets and actual accomplishment in complete sentence. Since the performance indicator clearly describes the measure (i.e. No. of graduates; % of researches published), only the number or the percentage shall appear on the column for convenience on the part of the users like in the following example:

| MFO/PAP/PI | Target | | | | | Budget | Responsible Office/ Indl | Actual | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total / Ave | | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Total / Ave |
| No. of programs accredited | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 4 | | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| % of LET passers/NPR | 45 % | - | - | - | 45% | | | 50 % | - | - | - | 50% |

The columns for target and actual accomplishment were divided into five columns for each to present the quarterly targets and accomplishments. This is for a more convenient monitoring of performance and in the preparation of reports.

e. Dimensions/Category of Performance Measures

While the University SPMS Manual provides the following categories/dimensions of performance measures: Effectiveness/Quality; Efficiency; and Timeliness (EET), it has been observed that it is difficult to apply and measure performance using the EET rule which led most of the units using the QQT rule (Quantity, Quality, and Timeliness) because it is much easier to apply as it had been used in the old PES. Starting this year, the QQT rule shall apply. All delivery units and personnel are directed to use the QQT rule in the OPCR and IPCR template.

f. Categories of Functions

As per SPMS (p.7), it specifically provided that categories of functions shall be identified in target-setting as follows:

- Strategic Priorities
- Core Functions
- Support Functions

This categorization of functions allow offices and individuals to capture all functions, duties and responsibilities that are inherent to the office and the individuals' position/designation. As a result, it allows a fairer assessment of performance because the OPCR/IPCR reflects all the duties and responsibilities that the office or individual must perform. Hence, this categorization of functions be maintained in the template.

Based on the SPMS Manual, the three categories of functions are described as follows:

- Strategic Priorities – are functions identified as strategic priorities of the University as identified in its major goals in Instruction, Research, Extension, Resource Generation, and Administration and Governance.
- Core Functions – are functions performed by the Office which are inherent in its mandate. For individual employees, core functions are those that are assigned by virtue of their positions as identified in their duties and responsibilities provided for in their position description forms (PDF). Core functions are always in support to the University's mission and vision.
- Support Functions – are functions performed by the office/employee in support of the achievement of the goals of the University or other offices/employees but are not directly identified as its/his core functions. These may be added functions which when not performed may affect the performance of other office/employee.

<u>Clarification on the Description of the Categories of Functions:</u>

<u>Strategic Priorities</u> identified by the university are those specifically indicated in the Development Plan or Operational Plan to be achieved at the end of the year. The

indicators in the Development/Operational Plan are being used to measure the performance of the university and thus they are considered strategic priorities and therefore must be placed under Strategic Priorities. Core functions of the office/individuals should not only include the duties and responsibilities provided in their Position Description Form (PDF) but also those identified in the Terms of Reference of designated officials/personnel. The Policy Guideline (No. 68-2015) which clarifies the implementation of workload for all faculty members should also be used as guide or reference in identifying the core functions of faculty members.

Only those performance indicators from these five areas that are appropriate to the office/individual should be taken as cascaded by the heads of divisions and campuses to the delivery units (in the case of the OPCR) and by the head of delivery units to the individuals (in the case of the IPCR).

g. Submission of OPCR by Delivery Units with Various Offices/Sections

All identified bureaus/delivery units shall submit their OPCR to the PMT through the Planning Office. Bureaus/Delivery Units with various distinct offices/units shall collate OPCRs of each distinct office/unit. For example, in the bureau "Offices under the Office of the President" which has various distinct units (i.e. PAIS, NBC Zonal Center, etc), each of these distinct units shall prepare its own OPCR signed by the head of the unit and to be collated by one identified unit in the bureau. The collated OPCRs shall be submitted to the PMT through the Planning Office. This is also true with other identified bureaus with various distinct offices/sections such as the Vice Presidents, the CAO, the Campus Directors, etc. The average rating of the OPCRs of each unit/section in the bureau becomes the rating of the bureau.

h. PMT Regular Meeting

To improve the performance assessment, the following rule for PMT meetings shall apply:

- Regular PMT meetings:
  - After the initial review of targets by the Planning Office, to assess and recommend for approval the OPCR-targets as called upon by the Chairperson.
  - After the initial review of actual accomplishments by the Planning Office, to assess and recommend for approval of the OPCR-actual accomplishments as called upon by the Chairperson.
- Emergency meetings shall be called upon by the PMT Chair to discuss issues and problems that arise during the performance period.

i. Performance Assessment of Top Management Officials

In the previous years, the Office of the President, VPs/CAOs, and Campus Directors were included as separate bureaus/delivery units in which the rating of the OPCR of the Office becomes their IPCR rating. As observed, the functions being rated in their OPCR in this system is not fair as they have also other functions not included and therefore their accomplishments in these functions and targets were not rated. As in the case of the President and the VPs whose scope of functions are universitywide just as the Campus Directors are campuswide. In the previous rating system, the President's rate is the average rating of the individuals in his office (presidential staffs, etc) and not based on the University's accomplishments as a whole and the performance of his other duties and responsibilities inherent to his position/designations.

In this case, the following rules apply:

1. The various sections/units under the offices of the President, Vice President and CAO as well as the Campus Directors shall be treated distinct from the Office of the President, VP/CAO and Campus Director. (Refer to Annex B)

2. The top management officials may be grouped as one bureau because of the scope of their functions. (Refer to Annex B)

3. The OPCR of the President, VP/CAO and Campus Directors shall reflect the respective universitywide or campuswide targets and accomplishments that are in the Development Plan. (i.e. The president – all the PIs in all the 5 Goals; VP-AA – all the PIS under MFO1, Campus Director – PIs under all the 5 Goals relevant to the campus). All other functions related to their position/designation shall be reflected under Core Functions and Support Functions appropriately.

4. The OPCR rating of these top management officials as one delivery unit shall be the average of their OPCRs and shall be ranked with other identified delivery units/bureaus.

5. Their OPCRs shall serve as their own IPCRs as their OPCRs already captured all their duties and responsibilities under the three categories of functions.

6. Their OPCR rating which becomes their IPCR rating shall be ranked against each individual in their group/delivery unit.

j. Faculty members with Designations

It has been a practice that faculty members with designations were evaluated with the rating scheme for the area where they function the most. For example, an instructor designated as director is rated as non-teaching so the 30% student evaluation considered in rating teaching personnel was not applied to him/her. Some personnel designated as project managers were rated as full-time project managers and their other functions inherent to their position were not included. Refer to Policy Guideline 68-2015 also in determining the duties and functions of faculty members and those with designations.

Following the template with the three categories of functions (Strategic Priorities, Core Functions, and Support Functions) would allow inclusion of all functions a personnel performs. So even with designation or various functions, all of their functions will be reported in their IPCR and rated accordingly. Faculty members with designation and with subjects being taught, the 30% student evaluation should be included in the computation of his/her IPCR rating.

k. Preparation of Table of Reference and Internal Rules and Policies

The PMT shall come up with a Table of Reference by goal/thrust to serve as a common guide in the preparation of IPCRs of individuals especially those with similar functions in the different delivery units (i.e. faculty members in the different colleges/campuses; administrative assistants, etc.) In addition to the Table of Reference, specific guidelines, rules and policies could be drafted by the PMT to include important matters that are not in the SPMS Manual or not covered by this Office Order especially those that are distinctly necessary and appropriate to the delivery units (i.e. inclusion of attendance and tardiness among faculty members in their scheduled classes as a target to ensure quality in education, when does revision of targets allowed during the period or after approval of the targets, etc). Rules on behavioral dimensions on the performance assessment of individuals may be included in the Internal Rule and Policies.

l. Composition of the PMT:

The following shall compose the Performance Management Team that basically reviews and recommends approval of the targets and actual accomplishments of offices:

Chairperson : VP-Admin & Finance or Chief Administrative Officer
Members : Vice President for Academic Affairs or designated representative
Vice President for RDET or designated representative
Campus Directors
Planning Director
HRD Officer
Finance Director
President, IFSU-Employees Union
GAD Focal Person

The secretariat of the PMT shall be the Planning Director.

m. Cascading, Review and Assessment Processes

Annex A shows the major processes involved in the SPMS Cycle. The Development Plan of the University serves as the main reference for performance target-setting.

- The approved Operational Plan of the University by goal/division (Instruction, Research, Extension, Resource Generation, and Administration and Governance) which is based on the Development Plan shall be cascaded by the heads divisions (Vice Presidents and the Chief Administrative Officer) to the campuses.
- The targets cascaded to the campuses shall be cascaded to the different delivery units by the Campus Directors to the Heads of Delivery Units.
- Preparation of OPCRs by the heads of delivery units follows. The indicators in the OPCR are the office outputs.
- Review, assessment and approval of OPCR targets by the PMT.
- The Campus Directors, together with the Deans and Directors, Chairpersons and Section/Unit Heads, in coordination with the various Vice Presidents, shall prepare/update the Reference Table and Internal Rules and Guidelines as references for the preparation of IPCRs.
- Preparation and submission of IPCRs, followed by the review and approval of IPCR target by the head of delivery unit. The indicators in the IPCR are the through-puts that result to the outputs which are the indicators in the OPCR. In application, if the indicator "Percentage of programs accredited" is the indicator for the office output (OPCR), the individual performance indicator (IPCR) may now be "Timeliness of submission of PPP and area documents".

n. List of Delivery Units/Bureaus

Please refer to Annex B for the new list of delivery units/bureaus.

o. Submission of Actual Accomplishment

Submission of actual accomplishment is every quarter using the template (Annex E). Please refer to Annex C for the guidelines of submission of Actual Accomplishment Reports.

p. Timeline for 2015

Refer to Annex D for the schedule of submission of targets and actual accomplishment for the rating period 2015 for your guidance.

q. OPCR and IPCR Template

Annex E presents the template for OPCR and IPCR to be used. E-copy of the template is available at the Planning Office.

r. References in Target-Setting

The following are the references for target-setting:

- Development Plan 2014-2017