

**POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES**  
Sta. Mesa, Manila

**Performance Evaluation System**  
For Academic Area

**Rationale**

Evaluation is a management function which is positioned on the concept that personnel development is better directed by an initial analysis of the present personnel situation. The results of the performance evaluation therefore will serve as a guide in improving the individual personnel even as it defines and identifies the level and quality of his performance in a stated period.

**Objective of the Performance Evaluation**

The PUP Performance Evaluation for academic personnel hopes to:

- find out the level of classroom performance of the faculty based on the student, area chairperson and dean's assessment
- discover the level of performance of the faculty in teaching-related activities
- know individual faculty output in research, teaching/testing materials, educational devices, inventions/discoveries

**Conceptual Framework**

1. Level of faculty performance shall be classified as outstanding very satisfactory, fair and poor.
2. Classroom performance shall be base on ratings given by students, area chairpersons and deans\*
  - 2.1 Student ratings shall be drawn from the results of the PUP Students Evaluation Instrument administered to four (4) classes/sections in the case of full-time faculty and two (2) classes in the case of part-time faculty.
  - 2.2 Rating of the area chairpersons and deans shall be drawn from observations or other strategies which shall be agreed upon in the College.

3. Performance in teaching-related activities shall be based on documents covering:
  - 3.1 Attendance in University functions/assignments like:
    - 3.1.1 Commencement Exercises
    - 3.1.2 Academic Council Meeting
    - 3.1.3 University Foundation Activities
    - 3.1.4 University Seminar/Workshops
    - 3.1.5 University entrance Examination
  - 3.2 Timely submission of accurate reports, like:
    - 3.2.1 Grade Sheets
    - 3.2.2 Enrolment reports
    - 3.2.3 Committee reports
    - 3.2.4 Daily Time Record
    - 3.2.5 Other reports required by the College/University
4. Research/Writing Output shall be based on:
  - 4.1 Relevant research report submitted
  - 4.2 Teaching materials submitted for use in the Department
  - 4.3 Testing materials, validated or in the process of validation submitted to the Department
  - 4.4 Original/Modified educational devices submitted
  - 4.5 Inventories, discoveries related to field of study submitted.
5. An enhancement factor like those cited below may be given an additional 5% over and above the total ratings:
  - 5.1 Voluntary assistance in college activities.
  - 5.2 Enrolment in graduate school without reducing efficient performance in the classroom and job-related activities.
  - 5.3 Tangible contribution to the University without lowering efficient performance in the classroom and job-related activities.

**Measure**

1. Over all Descriptive and Quantitative Evaluation

<b>Descriptive</b>	<b>Overall Rating</b>
Outstanding	Above 80% - 100%
Very Satisfactory	Above 60% - 80%
Satisfactory	Above 50% - 60%
Fair	Above 20% - 50%
Poor	20% and below

2. Performance Rating Weight

2.1	Classroom Performance	60%
2.1.1	Weight of Student Evaluation	30%
2.1.2	Weight of Area Chairperson's Evaluation	15%
2.1.3	Weight of Deans Evaluation	15%
2.2	Performance in Job-Related Activities	30%
2.2.1	Attendance in University Function	15%
2.2.2	Submission of Reports	15%
2.3	Output in Research/Writing/Invention/Discoveries	10%

3. Operational Interpretation of Performance Rating

3.1 Classroom Performance

	O	VS	S	F	P
3.1.1 Student Evaluation	30	24	18	12	6
3.1.2 Area Chairperson's Evaluation	15	12	9	6	3
3.1.3 Dean's Evaluation	15	12	9	6	3
Sub-total	60	48	36	24	12

3.1.4 Range for classroom performance

Outstanding	More than 48 to 60
Very Satisfactory	More than 36 to 48
Satisfactory	More than 24 to 36
Fair	More than 12 to 24
Poor	12 and less

3.1.5 Performance in Job-related Activities

3.2.1 \*Perfect Attendance Outstanding  
Zero Attendance Poor

\*VS to F should be based on No. of official University/College activities during the semester and number of attended/unattended activities.

3.2.2 \*\*Timely submission of accurate reports Outstanding  
Non-submission one Month after due date Poor

\*\*VS to F should be based on number of reports submitted/not submitted on time and number of reports accurately/inaccurately done.

3.2.3 Equivalentents

	O	VS	S	F	P
3.2.3.1 Attendance in University Function (15%)	15	12	9	6	3
3.2.3.2 Submission Of reports (15%)	<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>
Sub-total	30	24	18	12	6

3.2.4 Range for Rating in Job-Related Performance

Outstanding more than 24 to 30  
Very Satisfactory more than 18 to 24  
Satisfactory more than 12 to 18  
Fair more than 6 to 12  
Poor 6 or less

3.3 Output in research, etc.

Evaluation should be based on quality and quantity of output, emphasis being on quality

### 3.3.1 Range for Rating

Outstanding	more than 9 – 10
Very Satisfactory	more than 6 – 8
Satisfactory	more than 4 – 6
Fair	more than 2 – 4
Poor	less than 2

### 3.4 Summary of Maximum Points per Level of Performance

	O	VS	S	F	P
Classroom Performance	60	48	36	24	12
Performance in Job Related Activities	30	24	18	12	6
Output in Research /Writing, etc	10	8	6	4	2
Total, Maximum For Each Level	100	80	60	50	20

### 3.5 Range Based on Total Points

Outstanding	above 80 to 100
Very Satisfactory	above 60 to 80
Satisfactory	above 50 to 60
Fair	above 20 to 50
Poor	20 and below

### **Frequency of Evaluation**

Performance appraisal in the academic area shall be done at every end of the term – first semester and second semester. A schedule shall be set up by the College for the purpose.

### **Appeal**

Any dissenting view on the final assessment rating should be discussed and settled at the College level between the faculty and the area chairperson or the Dean within two (2) weeks after the release of the ratings. The faculty has the right to appeal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for legitimate complaint.