**Kudumbashree-NRO**

**Performance Appraisal of Personnel 2019**

Performance Appraisal of NRO personnel will be carried out in five stages.

1. Self Appraisal
2. Evaluation
3. Peer Review
4. Review
5. Acceptance

The appraisal responsibilities shall be as follows. The Executive Director shall be the accepting authority in all cases.

| **Category of Persons** | **Evaluation** | **Review** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| COO | Executive Director | Executive Director |
| Programme Managers, Finance & Administration Manager | COO | Executive Director |
| State Project Coordinators, Thematic Anchors, Field coordinators | Committee of Programme Managers | COO |
| Accountant, Administration Assistant, Office Assistant | Finance & Administration Manager | COO |

Self Appraisal

Each person will conduct the self appraisal in the prescribed format. This will include descriptive assessment and quantitative grading of one's performance.

Evaluation

The Evaluation will be carried out as per the structure detailed earlier, in the prescribed format. Evaluation will consist of commenting on the descriptive assessment done by each appraisee and quantitative ranking.

Review

The review will be a collective process, anchored by the Reviewing Authority. The appraisee, evaluator and reviewer will sit together to conclude the appraisal process and forward recommendation to the Executive Director. The appraisee and evaluator will have the opportunity to justify their assessment done during the previous stages.

Acceptance

The Executive Director may accept the recommendation forwarded by the Reviewing Authority or revert the appraisal to be repeated from any stage as considered necessary.

**Performance Parameters**

Performance parameters against which the performance appraisal is to be done will vary according to positions. The parameters are categorized based on the performance requirements that NRO has from persons occupying the positions towards achievement of the overall mandate of the NRO. The three categories of performance parameters are the following.

* Professional Integrity and Team contribution parameters
* Knowledge parameters
* Responsibility fulfilment parameters

For knowledge parameters, there will be some factors that are common to all positions and some factors that will be specific to some positions.

In designing the performance parameters, distinction has been made between programme and administrative functions of the NRO. Positions of Finance & Administration Manager, Accountant, Administration Assistant and Office Assistant are administrative functions and all the remaining positions are programme functions. The performance appraisal formats for both programme and administrative functions are given at the end of the guidelines.

**Appraisal format**

The NRO Performance Appraisal form is designed as follows.

| **Component of Appraisal** | **Self Appraisal** | **Evaluation** | **Review** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Descriptive assessment of performance, achievements and challenges | Description of how responsibilities were carried out, result achieved | Comments on self appraisal | Agreement or otherwise with self appraisal and evaluation |
| Quantitative grading on performance parameters | Self grading | Evaluation grading | Review grading |
| Timeliness and quality of reporting | Report by Administration section on timeliness of submission of reports; assessment of quality of reports by respective Programme Manager | | |
| Peer Review | Assessment by peers of the appraisee | | |
| Recommendation of review | Recommendation based on review of self appraisal, peer review and evaluation and conduct of review exercise | | |
| Acceptance of appraisal | Acceptance or non-acceptance of review recommendation. If accepted, closure; if not accepted, repeat of process | | |

**Process of conduct of the performance appraisal**

The steps in the NRO Performance Appraisal shall be as follows:

1. As and when the performance appraisal becomes necessary the appraisee will fill relevant portions of Sections 1, 2 and 3.
2. This will be forwarded (as soft copy) to the Evaluation Authority, who will add the relevant portions.
3. The Evaluation Authority will send the form (in soft copy) to the Reviewing Authority who will fill in relevant portions.
4. Section 4 will be carried out as an online assessment using tools developed for the same. The summary report of the peer review for each appraisee will be generated
5. Once all portions of Sections 1, 2 and 3 have been filled in, the Review Authority will call for the review discussions.
6. The performance appraisal format will be printed during the review discussions and signed by all concerned (Appraisee, Evaluation Authority, Review Authority). –
7. Section 5 will be filled by the Review authority after this and printed.
8. The printed document with necessary signatures will be forwarded to the Accepting Authority.

**Instructions for peer review**

Peer review of each appraisee will be conducted. For the purpose of the NRO Performance Appraisal, peer for each category of appraisee is defined as follows.

| **Category of Appraisee** | **Categories of Peer** |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Manager | COO, Programme Manager, TAs, SPCs, FCs in the team |
| State Project Coordinator | Programme Manager, Thematic Anchors, FCs assigned to the State |
| Thematic Anchor | Programme Manager, State Project Coordinator, Thematic Anchors, FCs in the team |
| Field coordinators | PM, SPC, TA, FCs in state with whom they have worked |

The list of peers for conduct of the review of each appraisee will be informed.

**Performance Appraisal – Format for Programme Personnel**

**1. Basic information**

| Name |  |
| --- | --- |
| Position |  |
| Period under review |  |
| Date from which position occupied |  |
| Any other position occupied during the review period: If so, what position and during what period |  |
| Evaluation authority |  |
| Reviewing Authority |  |

**2. Descriptive Assessment**

**2.1 Self Appraisal**

Provide information in the following table, related to all responsibilities and tasks assigned to you during the period under review

| **Deliverables as per approved JD** | **Qualitative Assessment** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Self Appraisal**  (Self appraisal based on the indicators in the approved JD) | **Evaluation**  (Mention if in agreement with the self-appraisal; if not give reasons) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**2.2 Comments and observations of the Review Authority**

| *Review comments on agreement or otherwise with self appraisal and evaluation to be written here; if disagreement, then reasons to be given* |
| --- |

**3. Grading against performance parameters**

*Grading will be done by the appraisee, evaluation authority and review authority. Against each parameter, the grading will be done as follows:*

| ***Nature of performance assessment*** | ***Points to be awarded*** |
| --- | --- |
| *Outstanding* | *10* |
| *Excellent* | *8* |
| *Good* | *6* |
| *Average* | *4* |
| *Poor* | *2* |

**3.1 Professional Integrity and Team Contribution parameters**

| **#** | **Parameter** | **Points Awarded** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Self** | **Evaluation** | **Review** |
| 1 | Ability to manage and maintain inter-personal relationships in a professional manner |  |  |  |
| 2 | Trust-worthiness and task sensitivity demonstrated by the appraisee |  |  |  |
| 3 | Clarity of thoughts and appropriateness of written and oral communication |  |  |  |
| 4 | Ability to adjust to different and/or difficult circumstances and changes in work contexts |  |  |  |
| 5 | Demonstrated leadership qualities in identifying opportunities, developing ideas and guiding team members |  |  |  |
|  | **Total** |  |  |  |

***Comments***

| *Self – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading* |
| --- |
| *Evaluation – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading. Justification for differing substantially with the self-appraisal (if made on any parameter)* |
| *Review – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading* |

**3.2 Knowledge Parameters**

*(Some of the parameters listed below may be relevant for specific positions. In cases where the parameter is not relevant to one's position from amongst those not marked as applicable to All, the corresponding points awarded cells should be marked '*X*”.)*

| **#** | **Parameter** | **Applicability** | **Points Awarded** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Self** | **Evaluation** | **Review** |
| 1 | Knowledge of the larger development context of Kerala and the working of Kudumbashree in the State, to the extent of being capable of explaining the same to someone from outside the State | All |  |  |  |
| 2 | Knowledge of the working of the Panchayati Raj system in Kerala, to the extent of being capable of explaining the same to someone from outside the State | All |  |  |  |
| 3 | Knowledge of programmes of Kudumbashree Mission, to the extent of being capable of explaining the same to someone from outside the State | All |  |  |  |
| 4 | Knowledge of schemes and programmes for poverty alleviation, livelihoods development and empowerment of poor communities, to the extent of being capable to explain specific activities to personnel from the partner-States | All |  |  |  |
| 5 | Knowledge of the context of the partner-State for which the appraisee is responsible, to the extent of being capable to enable NRO to develop context-specific responses | SPC & FC |  |  |  |
| 6 | Knowledge of the thematic area for which the appraisee is responsible, to the extent of being capable to explain specific activities to personnel from the partner-States | TA |  |  |  |
|  | **Total** |  |  |  |  |

***Comments***

| *Self – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading* |
| --- |
| *Evaluation – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading. Justification for differing substantially with the self-appraisal (if made on any parameter)* |
| *Review – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading* |

**3.3 Responsibility Fulfilment parameters**

*(The responsibility fulfilment parameters will be based on the approved JD of the appraisee).*

| **#** | **Quantitative Measure indicators approved in the JD** | **Points Awarded** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Self** | **Evaluation** | **Review** |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Total (in 100)** |  |  |  |

| *Self – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading* |
| --- |
| *Evaluation – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading. Justification for differing substantially with the self-appraisal (if made on any parameter)* |
| *Review – Comments, if any on grading done on above parameters. Supporting observations for justifying outstanding or poor grading* |

**3.4 Timeliness and quality of reporting**

| **Timeliness in submission of reports** | **Weekly Reports** | **Monthly Reports** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Submission within prescribed timeframe (% of instances) – to be provided by Administration Section  *the prescribed timeframe for submission for weekly reports is before the end of the following week, and, for monthly reports within the 10th of the following month* |  |  |
| Overall % score for timeliness  *equal weightage for weekly and monthly reports* |  | |
| Score for timeliness |  | |

| **Quality** | **Score** |
| --- | --- |
| Completeness of reports in terms of providing accurate and relevant information on work done by the person |  |
| Quality of reflection in monthly reports, in providing relevant feedback on the work in the field |  |
| Overall Score for Quality |  |

| ***Timeliness %*** | ***Points to be awarded*** | ***Quality Parameter*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *More than 91%* | *10* | *Outstanding* |
| *76% - 90%* | *8* | *Excellent* |
| *51% - 75%* | *6* | *Good* |
| *41% – 50%* | *4* | *Average* |
| *Less than 41%* | *2* | *Poor* |

**4. Peer Review**

| **Parameters** | **Max** | **Assigned Score** | | | | | | | | | | | **Total Score** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1** | **P2** | **P3** | **P4** | **P5** | **P6** | **P7** | **P8** | **P9** | **P10** | **Mean** | | **Std. Dev** |
| **Team-work abilities** | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 1. Contribution to the Group work – Relevant subject-matter inputs in the group 2. Interpersonal conduct – Maintaining professional work relations in the team keeping away personal bias and prejudice against others 3. Team-level communication – Timely sharing of work for feedback, experience sharing, status update, including any kind of issues/challenges faced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Professional Qualities** | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 1. Responsibility – Taking ownership of the work assigned/delegated 2. Commitment to work – Seriousness towards work, including punctuality 3. Adaptability – Adjusting to situations/immediate requirements in work/demand of circumstances 4. Initiative – Voluntary willingness to take up tasks within the framework of assigned works 5. Empathy – Rendering support to team-mates/others in office outside assigned work commitments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Personal Qualities** | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 1. Approachability – Extent of being accessible to team-mates (by email/phone/ in person) and responsiveness to the same 2. Tolerance to criticism – Openness to accepting feedback on works in a healthy way, incorporating the necessary suggestions in the same 3. Ability to critique – Sharing feedback/ comments/ suggestions on the work shared by a team member | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | **100** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |

**5. Summary of review and recommendations**

**5.1 Overall comments from review discussions**

| *Reviewing authority to note comments from the review discussions with appraisee and evaluation authority. Any major points of differing opinion between the two parties need to be recorded here. Reviewing authority may add her/his point of view and justification for any decision taken in the matters.* |
| --- |

**5.2 Summary of Quantitative grading**

| **Category** | **Maximum Score** | **Achieved Score** | | | **Final Score Assigned and comments, *if any*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Self** | **Evaluation** | **Review** |  |
| Professional Integrity and Team Contribution parameters | 50 |  |  |  |  |
| Knowledge Parameters | 50 |  |  |  |  |
| Responsibility Fulfilment parameters | 100 |  |  |  |  |

**5.3 Reporting**

| **Category** | **Maximum Score** | **Achieved Score** | **Remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Timeliness | 10 |  |  |
| Quality of reporting | 10 |  |
| **Total** | **20** |  |

**5.4 Peer Review**

| **Category** | **Maximum Score** | **Achieved Score (mean)** | **Standard Deviation** | **Remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|
| Team work ability | 30 |  |  |  |
| Professional Qualities | 50 |  |  |
| Personal Qualities | 20 |  |  |
| **Total** | **100** |  |  |

**5.4 Feedback to Appraisee –**

| Areas of strength of the appraisee that needs to be nurtured | *Assessment of the reviewing authority to be recorded here* |
| --- | --- |
| Areas where the appraisee needs to take action for improvements, and suggested steps | *Assessment of the reviewing authority to be recorded here* |

**5.5 Recommendation**

| Suitability for continuing the services of the appraisee | *Recommendation of the reviewing authority to be recorded here* |
| --- | --- |
| Suitability of the appraisee for higher responsibilities (if applicable) | *Recommendation of the reviewing authority to be recorded here (if appraisee is being considered for a higher role* |
| Suitability of the appraisee for higher pay | *Recommendation of the reviewing authority to be recorded here (if provision is available for increment/increased pay)* |

*Signature, Date*

*Name & Designation of the Reviewing Authority*

**Reviewing Authority**

**6. Acceptance**

The following recommendations made by the Performance Appraisal of *(Name), (Position)* are accepted or not accepted as indicated below.

| **Point to be considered** | **Recommendation of the Performance Appraisal** | **Accepted/Not Accepted** | **If not accepted, what action is to be taken?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Suitability for continuing the services of the appraisee | *To be taken from 5.5 above* |  |  |
| Suitability of the appraisee for higher responsibilities (if applicable) | *To be taken from 5.5 above* |  |  |
| Suitability of the appraisee for higher pay | *To be taken from 5.5 above* |  |  |

*Signature, Date*

**Executive Director**

**Accepting Authority**