

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GANDHINAGAR

GUIDELINES ON ANNUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORTS FOR STAFF

Any top-class Institution must have a robust system for performance evaluation. Unlike faculty or student evaluation, which usually includes several measurable parameters, such parameters are limited in the case of staff performance evaluation. The evaluation of staff performance is more subtle and depends heavily on the reporting officer to make an objective assessment of the performance of the staff member. The Institute expects its reporting officers to exhibit highest level of objectivity, consistency and integrity in evaluating annual performance of the staff reporting to them. Some specific expectations in this regard are listed below:

1. The reporting/reviewing authorities should rate the staff against a large population of his/her peers currently working in the Institute. Inconsistent staff evaluations across the Institute, undermine the processes of staff awards and promotions.
2. Comments must be given within the framework of governance philosophy and ethos at IITGN, and not be coloured by the experience of the reporting officer in their prior jobs. For instance, IITGN lays great emphasis on (a) integrity and loyalty to the Institute, (b) team work and inter-personal skills, and (c) hard work. Special attention must be given to evaluate the staff on these parameters.
3. Undue “protectionism” of a staff at a personal or a department level is very detrimental to the entire purpose of performance appraisal. Such “protectionism” not only vitiates the staff assessment process but also reflects poorly on the Reporting Officer. Some examples of such undesirable “protectionism” are:
 - a. This person is working under me, and hence, I must protect him.
 - b. I must take care of my people and reward them with outstanding/ very good performance appraisal (*so they will remain loyal to me!*), regardless of the performance.
 - c. If I evaluate him/ her correctly, he may lose the job or promotion (*It is hard to get a job these days!*). Hence, I will personally reprimand him and try to improve him but I must not hurt his future prospects by writing a weak appraisal.
4. Mixing of different issues must be avoided. For instance, an otherwise competent staff may have an abrasive personality. His/ her evaluation should clearly highlight both aspects, viz., competence on one side and abrasive personality on the other side.
5. Although formal performance appraisal is a year-end process, the Reporting Officers are expected to review performance at regular intervals and take corrective steps by way of oral advice/counselling, written communication, etc.
6. The Reviewing Officer should clearly express his/ her agreement or disagreement with the remarks made by the Reporting Officer. This is particularly so with regard to adverse remarks or with outstanding grade. He/ she may also make his/ her own remarks and points, not mentioned by the Reporting Officer, particularly, when the report is vague and cryptic. The Reviewing Officer is in fact expected to personally find out about the work and conduct of the appraisee before making his/ her own judgment.
7. The entire assessment report will be reviewed by the Director (as the Accepting Authority) before deciding the final grading for an employee. He may choose to seek additional 360-degree view before assigning the grade.