



SRI MANAKULA VINAYAGAR ENGINEERING COLLEGE
(An Autonomous Institution)

Puducherry - 605 107



**PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL POLICY
FOR TEACHING AND NON-TEACHING STAFF**

Version 2.0



SRI MANAKULA VINAYAGAR ENGINEERING COLLEGE
(An Autonomous Institution)

Puducherry - 605 107

NOTIFICATION

Ref: **SMVEC / IQAC / ACAD / JAN 2023**

Date: **10-01-2023**

In the pursuance of the resolution passed by the Governing Body Meeting at its meeting held on December 31, 2022 in its resolution no. GB 2022.05.09 and the decision was taken by the Management of SMVEC

It is hereby notified for information of all concerned that the Sri Manakula Vinayagar Engineering College, Puducherry has published the Performance Appraisal Policy for Teaching and Non-Teaching staff. This will come into force with immediate effect.


Dr. AA. Arivalagar
IQAC coordinator


Dr. AA. Arivalagar
Dean Academics (Core)


Dr. S. Anbumalar
Dean Academics (Circuit)


Dr.V.S.K. Venkatachalapathy
Director cum Principal

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL POLICY FOR TEACHING AND NON- TEACHING STAFF OF SRI MANAKULA VINAYAGAR ENGINEERING COLLEGE, PUDUCHERRY

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL POLICY FOR TEACHING STAFF:

The performance appraisal (PA) is one of the performance management tool that is used to measure the productivity of academic employees in different contexts.

In Sri Manakula Vinayagar Engineering College, the performance appraisal formats are developed for both teaching and non-teaching staff.

Performance appraisal for teaching staff:

The faculty appraisal is undertaken with following objectives:

- To assist teachers in their professional development and career planning.
- To assist teachers to reflect their potential and to carry out their duties more effectively
- To provide judgment to support promotions, demotions, transfers, confirmation or termination.
- To provide feedback to staff about their behaviour, attitudes, skills or subject expertise
- To recognise the achievements of teachers and help them to identify ways of improving their knowledge, skills, attitudes and ultimately performance.
- To improve the quality of education for students. In short, it would be utilized as a tool to facilitate growth, development, efficiency and effectiveness of the teaching-learning process in the institution.

The process of faculty appraisal:

The process of appraisal would be scheduled towards the end of the academic year. This is to enable the faculty to reflect their performance across the two semesters of the academic year. Additionally, the analysis would provide a pathway for the institution to take necessary measures to incentivize or bring in supportive processes to enhance the performance of the faculty.

The process of appraisal comprises of three parts:

A. Self-appraisal format to be filled by every faculty

B. Appraisal by HoD and Academic Performance Evaluation Committee: This would involve a review of the self-appraisal documents submitted by the faculty.

A. SELF APPRAISAL FORMAT:

The self-appraisal format developed has both quantitative and qualitative. The self-appraisal format encompasses the following domains of skills

1. General Information
2. Part-A: Teaching - Learning and Evaluation-Related Aspects, this section has 9 items (450 Points)
3. Part-B: Research, Development and Extension Activities, this section has 11 items (450 Points)
4. Part-C: Administrative and Extra-Curricular Activities, this section has 3 items (Maximum of 100 Points)

To make the process of appraisal more objective, detailed grade descriptors have been provided for every item under each section. The faculty are given the same along with the self-appraisal format to be filled. The maximum score a teacher can arrive is 1000.

A format of the same is attached in the Appendix 1.

General guidelines for faculty when undertaking the responsibility of self-appraisal:

1. Faculty are expected to highlight their accomplishments and recollect milestones in their Professional development across the academic year.
2. Faculty are expected to be professional when writing self-assessments.
3. Faculty have to undertake the responsibility of self-appraisal seriously. They are expected to work individually and not be influenced by any colleague or peers during the process.
4. The HoD would assure the confidentiality of the process.

NOTE: All appraisal forms are submitted by the faculty to the Head of the Institution through HoD and will be in the custody of Head of the Institution.

B. APPRAISAL BY HoD AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee follows exactly the same format as the above for appraisal. In fact, to make it more concise, the self-appraisal format also has a column to be filled by the HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee which runs parallel to the column where the faculty scores are entered. (Refer Appendix 1)

The maximum score a teacher be given by the HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee is 1000.

General guidelines for HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee when undertaking the responsibility of appraisal of faculty:

1. The assessor has to ensure that the focus is on the person without any prejudice.
2. The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee should focus on job performance and related factors.
3. The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee is expected to review thoroughly the job requirements, the teacher's strengths, accomplishments and areas of improvement.
4. The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee shall maintain the confidentiality of the Process strictly.
5. The information will be utilized for professional development only.

ANALYSIS OF APPRAISAL AND CONSOLIDATION:

1. Self-appraisal by teachers:
 - The total score given by the faculty is calculated as per the rating scale.
 - The actual milestones reached/achievements of the teacher in that academic year are identified and noted.
2. Appraisal by HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee:
 - The total score received by the faculty and independent assessment by the HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee is calculated
 - The actual milestones reached/achievements of the teacher in that academic year are identified and noted by the HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee
 - The areas of improvement are identified.

The discrepancy in the scores (if present) are identified and the possible reasons for the same are reflected and noted by the HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee.

 - The areas of improvement are identified.

Based on these two scores a detailed analysis is undertaken on the performance of each faculty during the said academic year. The strengths, responsibilities undertaken, achievements are consolidated and identified. Additionally, the areas of improvement are listed along with the challenges in professional skills/interpersonal skills are noted.

The progress based on the previous year's feedback is also reviewed. (From both perspectives- a positive growth or decline)

COMMUNICATING THE ANALYSIS OF APPRAISAL

- After a consolidation of the appraisal across academic year has been undertaken, the faculty would be invited for an individualized meeting to discuss the same.
- The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee is expected to set aside adequate block of uninterrupted time to permit a full and complete discussion.
- The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee is expected to give the faculty adequate advance notice so that he /she can prepare for the discussion.
- The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee needs to be prepared to cite observations for each point discussed.
- The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee is expected to acknowledge and appreciate achievements, encourage and motivate the faculty to further improve or convey the implications of poor performances as the case may be.
- The possible course of actions both positive and negative has to be conveyed clearly to the faculty.
- Both the HoD / Performance Evaluation Committee and the Faculty are expected to maintain professional etiquettes and behaviours during the course of the meeting.
- A brief record of the discussion points would be maintained with appropriate signatures.

COMMUNICATING AND REPORTING TO THE HEAD OF THE INSTITUTION AND MANAGEMENT:

- The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee shall make a report of the appraisal highlight with appropriate evidences:
 - ✓ Faculty who has demonstrated excellence in teaching practices, have taken responsibilities beyond the scope of their regular work and shown their commitment to the growth of the institution.
 - ✓ Faculty who has the capacity to improve their skills and competencies and the pathways suggested to them for the same.
 - ✓ Faculty who has underperformed and not shown any indication of improvement or who have not demonstrated the professional etiquettes across the academic year
- The HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee is expected to maintain appropriate documents connected to the same and it will be in the custody of the office/ Head of the Institution.

- The Head of the Institution and management would take necessary action as per the policy of the institution based on the report submitted by HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL POLICY FOR NON-TEACHING STAFF:

- The performance appraisal (PA) is one of the performance management tool that is used to measure the productivity of academic employees in different contexts.
- In Sri Manakula Vinayagar Engineering College, the performance appraisal formats are developed for both teaching and non-teaching staff.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL POLICY FOR NON-TEACHING STAFF

Performance appraisal for non-teaching staff

- The employee appraisal is undertaken with following objectives:
- To assist employees to reflect about their potential and to carry out their duties more effectively
- To provide judgment to support promotions, demotions, transfers, confirmation or termination.
- To provide feedback to staff about their behaviour, attitudes, skills or subject-expertise
- To recognise the achievements of employees and help them to identify ways of improving their knowledge, skills, attitudes and ultimately performance.
- To assist employees in their professional development and career planning.
- In short, it would be utilized as a tool to facilitate growth, development, efficiency and effectiveness of the administration and facility management process in the institution.

The process of appraisal:

- The process of appraisal would be scheduled towards the end of the academic year.
- The process of appraisal comprises of two parts:

A. Self-appraisal format to be filled by every non-teaching faculty

The format encompasses the following sections

1. General Information and list of responsibilities undertaken

2. Rating scale on the following: (Select items are differentiated for office employees and attenders/housekeeping staff as the nature of work differs. The directions for choice of questions are provided in the form itself)

- a. Professional Competence: This section has 5 items to be rated on a scale of 4. (Maximum 20)
- b. Quality of work: This section has 4 items to be rated on a scale of 4. (Maximum 16)
- c. Personal Characteristics: This section has 3 items to be rated on a scale of 4. (Maximum 12)

3. A descriptive section to write any special contribution by the staff during the period. (Maximum 2 points)

- The rating scale ranges from 1 to 4 as follows
- 1 is poor
- 2 is satisfactory
- 3 is good
- 4 is Excellent

The maximum score a staff can arrive at is 50. A format of the same is attached in the **Appendix 2.**

B. Appraisal by HoD / Section Incharge:

- The format of appraisal utilized by the HoD/Section Incharge is exactly the same as the self-appraisal format. This would be filled by the HoD/Section Incharge with consultation of senior employees.
- The HoD/Section Incharge would review a self-appraisal document submitted by the non-teaching faculty.
- The HoD/Section Incharge is expected to rate their performances and generate a report.
- The HoD/Section may undertake this task in consultation with senior employee
- The HoD/Section is also expected to facilitate an individualized meeting with each of the non-teaching staff to communicate an appraisal of their performances and the action undertaken.
- This is to enable the employees to reflect their performance across the previous academic year.
- Additionally, the analysis would provide a pathway for the institution to take necessary measures to incentivize or bring in supportive processes to enhance the performance of the staff.

General guidelines for HoD / Section In-charge when undertaking the responsibility of appraisal of faculty:

1. The assessor has to ensure that the focus is on the person without any prejudice.
2. The HoD/Section In-charge should focus on job performance and related factors.
3. The HoD/Section In-charge is expected to review thoroughly the job requirements, the individual's strengths, accomplishments and areas of improvement.
4. The information will be utilized for professional development only.
5. The HoD/Section In-charge would maintain the confidentiality of the process.

NOTE: All appraisal forms will be in the custody of the Head of the Institution.

ANALYSIS OF APPRAISAL:

- The total score received by the staff is computed by adding the scores in self-appraisal and the scores from the independent assessment by the HoD/Section In-charge.
- Appropriate grades would be given based on the band descriptor provided.
- The strengths, responsibilities undertaken, achievements are consolidated and identified.
- Additionally, the areas of improvement are listed along with the challenges in professional skills/interpersonal skills are noted.
- The progress based on the previous year's feedback is also reviewed. (from both perspectives - a positive growth or decline)

COMMUNICATING THE ANALYSIS OF APPRAISAL

- After a consolidation of the appraisal across academic year has been undertaken, the staff would be invited for an individualized meeting to discuss the same.
- The HoD/Section Incharge is expected to set aside adequate block of uninterrupted time to permit a full and complete discussion.
- The HoD/Section Incharge is expected to give the faculty adequate advance notice so that he /she can prepare for the discussion.
- The HoD/Section Incharge needs to be prepared to cite observations for each point discussed.
- The HoD/Section Incharge is expected to acknowledge and appreciate achievements, encourage and motivate the staff to further improve or convey the implications of poor performances as the case may be.

- The possible course of actions both positive and negative has to be conveyed clearly to the staff.
- Both the HoD/Section Incharge and the staff are expected to maintain professional etiquettes and behaviours during the course of the meeting.
- A brief record of the discussion points would be maintained with appropriate signatures.

COMMUNICATING AND REPORTING TO THE HEAD OF THE INSTITUTION AND MANAGEMENT:

- The HoD/Section Incharge shall make a report of the appraisal highlight with appropriate evidences:
 - ✓ Employees who have demonstrated excellence in their work output, have taken responsibilities beyond the scope of their regular work and shown their commitment to the growth of the institution.
 - ✓ Employees who have the capacity to improve their skills and competencies and the pathways suggested to them for the same.
 - ✓ Staff who have underperformed and not shown any indication of improvement or who have not demonstrated the professional etiquettes across the academic year
- The HoD/Section Incharge is expected to maintain appropriate documents connected to the same and it will be in the custody of the office/ Head of the Institution.
- The Head of the Institution and management would take necessary action as per the policy of the institution based on the report submitted by HoD and Performance Evaluation Committee.

Appendix – 1

SELF-APPRAISAL FORM FOR FACULTY (A.Y: 2023-24)(The details are required from 1st July 2023 to 30th June 2024)

Name of the Department	:	
Name of the Faculty	:	
Present Designation	:	
D.O.B & Age	:	
Date of Joining in SMVEC	:	
Mobile No.	:	
Email ID	:	
Gross Salary (Rs.)	:	

PART-A**TEACHING- LEARNING & EVALUATION-RELATED ASPECTS (450 Points)****A.1 Educational Qualifications ((Max. 20 Points)**

(Ph.D – 20 points, PG – 10 points)

Degree	Branch/ Specialization	College	University	Year of completion	%	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

A.2 Experience Details (Chronological Order only) ((Max. 15 Points)

(If Experience >15 years and above – 15 marks, Experience 10 years to 15 years – 10 marks , Experience 5 years to 10 years – 5 marks)

S.No.	Position held	Institution/Industry	Period		Exp. in Years	Score given by	Score given by HoD
			From	To			
Total							

A3. Student Feedback on Teacher Performance (Max. 75 Points)

(Points equal the Percentage of feedback)

Programme/ Dept	Semester	Course	Feedback	Average Feedback	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD
			3.5	3.5	75	
			3.5			
			3.5			
			3.5			

Feedback collected from the students on the subjects for both semesters in QCM meeting.

Total number of 4's, 3's, 2's, 1's in each subject and class

Out of 4, >3.5 - 75 Points

>3 to < 3.5 60 Points

>2.5 to < 3 - 50 Points

<2.5 - 35 Points

A.4 Result Analysis (Max. 100 Points)

(Points equal the Result Percentage)

Program/Dept.	Semester	Course	Result	Average Result	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

A.5 Online Certification Courses (NPTEL etc..) (Max.: 75 points)(Necessary proofs to
be enclosed)

Allocation of Points

per Course :

(Toppers: 75 points; Elite+Gold: 65 points; Elite+Silver: 55 points;

Elite: 45 points & Successfully completed: 35 points)

Course Title	Duration	Awarding Institution	Grade	Score obtained	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

A.6 FDPs/Training Activities/ STTPs/ Symposia/Conferences/Workshops Attended (Max.:75 points)

(Necessary proofs to be enclosed)

Allocation of points:

(For IITs/NITs/Universities: 1 day: 25 points, 2 to 5 days: 50 points, >5 days: 75 points,

For other institutions, 60% of the score shall be considered including in-house programmes, i.e. 1 day: 15 points, 2 to 5 days: 30 points, >5 days: 45 points)

Title of the programme	Duration	Organized by	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

A.7 FDPs/Training Activities/ STTPs/Symposia/Conferences/Workshops Conducted as Convener/Co-ordinator etc. (Max.: 20 points)

(Necessary proofs to be enclosed)

(Govt. sponsored programme: 20 points, Self-sustained programme: 10 points)

Title of the programme	Duration	Acted as	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

A.8 Additional Significant achievements (Max.: 50 Points)

(Necessary proofs for each category to be enclosed)

Item		Max. Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD
i.	Remedial classes/Bridge courses/Study Hours in Hostels and Technical Trainings (GATE etc.)	15		
ii.	Usage of MOODLEs /developing blog	15		
iii.	Innovation/Prototype Developed/New Experiments Designed for Lab	20		

A.9 Books/Chapters Published (Max.:20 points)

(First page of the book/chapter to be enclosed)

(Books: International: 20 Points, National: 15 points, Chapter:10 points)

Title of the book/chapter	Authors	Publisher	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

PART-B

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES (450 Points)

Cut-off points: (Engineering/MBA-- Professor: 225 points, Associate Professor: 175 points, Assistant Professor: 100 points), (FED-- Professor: 150 points, Associate Professor: 100 points, Assistant Professor: 75 points)

B.1 Research Guidance (Max.: 50 points)

(Necessary proofs to be enclosed)

(Ph.D.: 50 Points per scholar, PG: 25 points per student, UG- each project batch: 25 for 'A' grade project and 20 for other grade projects)

Category	No. of scholars/No. of batches	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD
Ph.D.				
PG/UG				

B.2 Sponsored Research Projects/Grants (Max.: 50 points)

(Sanctioned letter to be enclosed)

(Projects worth 1 to 5 Lakhs: 15 Points, 5 to 10 Lakhs: 25 Points, > 10 Lakhs: 50 points)

(Other Grants: 1 to 2 Lakhs: 10 Points, 2 to 3 Lakhs: 15 Points, >3 Lakhs: 25 points) Projects under review: 20 points

Category	Agency	Sanctioned Amount in INR	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.3 Consultancy (Max.: 25 points)

(Necessary proofs to be enclosed)

(Sanctioned amount \geq 5 Lakhs: 25 points, 1 to 5 Lakhs: 20 points)

Category	Agency Details	Amount in INR	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.4 Patents Published/Awarded (Max: 25 points)

(Necessary proofs to be enclosed)

(Patent awarded: 25 points, Patent published: 20 points)

Title of the patent	File Number	Status (published/awarded)	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.5 Research Publications (Max.: 150 points)

(Front page of publication to be enclosed) (SCI journal: 100 points, SCOPUS: 50 points, UGC care – 25 points, Others – 10 points)

SCI/Scopus / UGC care / Others	Title of the Publication	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.6 Linkages/ Collaborations with Premiere Institution (Max.: 25 points) (Collaborative Publication, Faculty Exchange Programmes etc.)

Nature of Linkage	Details	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.7 Member/Reviewer in Editorial Boards of Referred Journals (Max.:25 points)

(Reviewer for SCI journal: 25 points, SCOPUS journal: 15 Points, Member of organizing committees in International/ National conferences etc.: 15 points)

Name of the journal/conference	Publisher/Committee	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.8 Award/Honour/Fellowships/Recognitions (Max.: 25 points)

(The necessary proofs to be enclosed)

Award/Honour	Details of Awarding Agency	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.9 Resource Person/Invited Speaker/Conference Chair/Judge (Max.: 25 points)

(The necessary proofs to be enclosed)

Topic Description	Name of organization	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.10 Memberships in Professional Societies/Bodies etc. (Max.: 25 points)

(The necessary proofs to be enclosed)

Name of the Professional Society/Body	Category	Membership number	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

B.11 Papers Presented in Conferences (Max.: 25 points)

(Necessary proofs to be enclosed)

(International conference abroad: 25 points, India: 15 points, National: 10 points)

Title of the Paper	Name of the Conference and dates	Organized by	Invited/Oral/poster	Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD

PART-C
ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES (Maximum of 100 Points)

Category of Administrative Work		Max. points	Mention the Administrative Work	Score (X)	Score given by staff $y = (100 \cdot X) / 225$	Score given by HoD
C.1	Administrative Assignments (Dean, IQAC Co-ordinator, CoE, HOD, Professor-In-charge etc.)	100				
C.2	Central Committee Member/Co-ordinator/In-charge (NAAC, NBA, NIRF, ISO, NPTEL, R&D, Exam Cell, Alumni, Faculty Club, Bus In-charge, Discipline, Sports, NSS, NCC, Yoga, Women's Grievance Cell, Anti Ragging, Professional Bodies, Skill development, Incubation, etc)	75				
C.3	Departmental Committee Member/Co-ordinator/In-charge (BOS, PAC, DAC, CRC, CCC, MCC, Academic Audit, Class teacher, Mentor, Research Group Co-ordinator, Internships, Lab In-charge, Projects, Industrial visits, NAAC, NBA, ISO, NPTEL, R&D, Exam Cell, Alumni, Faculty Club, Discipline, Sports, NSS, NCC, Yoga, Women's Grievance Cell, AntiRagging, Professional Bodies, Skill development, Incubation, etc)	50				

Note: Any other claim in support of self-appraisal may also be submitted

(Briefly list out the involvement / contribution in developing the Department and institution – enclose the relevant proofs)

Signature of the Faculty Member

Signature of HOD

Summary of Self-Appraisal Score (A.Y: 2023-24)Name of the Faculty :
Designation :

Department:

Category		Max. Score	Score given by staff	Score given by HoD
Part-A	Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Related Activities			
	A.1	Educational Qualifications	20	
	A.2	Experience Details	15	
	A.3	Student Feedback on Teacher Performance	75	
	A.4	Result Analysis	100	
	A.5	Online Certification Courses (NPTEL etc.)	75	
	A.6	FDPs/Training Activities/ STTPs/WorkshopsAttended	75	
	A.7	FDPs/Training Activities/ STTPs/Workshopsconducted as a Convener/Co-ordinator etc.	20	
	A.8	Additional Significant Expertise	50	
	A.9	Books/Chapters Published	20	
Total Score (Part-A)		450		
Part-B	Research, Development and Extension Activities			
	B.1	Research Guidance	50	
	B.2	Sponsored Research Projects/Grants	50	
	B.3	Consultancy	25	
	B.4	Patents Published/Awarded	25	
	B.5	Research Publications	150	
	B.6	Linkages/ Collaborations with Premiere Institution	25	
	B.7	Member/Reviewer in Editorial Boards of ReferredJournals	25	
	B.8	Awards/Honours/Fellowships/Recognitions	25	
	B.9	Resource Person/Invited Speaker/ConferenceChair/Judge	25	
	B.10	Memberships in Professional Societies/Bodies etc.	25	
B.11	Papers Presented in Conferences	25		
Total Score (Part-B)		450		
Part-C	Administrative and Extra Curricular Activities			
	C.1	Administrative Assignments	100	
	C.2	Central Committee Member/Co-ordinator/ In-charge	75	
	C.3	Departmental Committee Member/ Co-ordinator/ In-charge	50	
Total Score (Part-C)		100		
Total Score (Part-A + Part-B + Part-C)		1000		

Signature of Faculty

Signature of HoD

Signatures of APEC
MembersSignature of Dean
Academics

Signature of Head of the Institution

*Academic Performance Evaluation Committee (APEC)

Appendix - 2

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF NON – TEACHING STAFF

Year of Appraisal: 2023-2024

Name of the Department / Section	:	
Name of the Faculty	:	
Present Designation	:	
D.O.B & Age	:	
Qualification	:	
Date of Joining in SMVEC	:	
Mobile No.	:	
Email ID	:	
Gross Salary (Rs.)	:	
Details of current responsibilities:	:	
Any other contribution made by the employee:	:	

Date:

Signature of the Staff

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF NON – TEACHING STAFF

NAME			
DESIGNATION			
DEPARTMENT / SECTION			
APPRAISAL CATEGORY	Appraisal Point: 4- Excellent, 3-Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1-Poor		
	Appraisal by Non – Teaching Staff	Appraisal by HoD / Section Incharge	
		Points	Total Points
1. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE (Maximum 20 Points)			
** Knowledge of rules, regulation and procedure			
Ability to organize work and carry it out			
Ability and willingness to take up additional load in times of exigencies			
Ability to learn new duties			
**Capacity to supervise			
*Response to instructions and guidance of supervisor			
*Response to feedback of supervisor			
2. QUALITY OF WORK (Maximum 16 Points)			
**Ability to maintain Files/ Records			
Accuracy & Speed of work			
Neatness & tidiness of work			
Completion of work on schedule			
*Execution of work with team spirit			

3. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS (Maximum 12 Points)			
Regularity			
Punctuality			
Interaction with colleagues and students			
4. SPECIAL CONTRIBUTION BY THE STAFF DURING THE PERIOD			
(Maximum 2 Points)			
GRAND TOTAL			
Grading based on Points: 40 and above – Excellent, 35-39 – Good, 26 -34 – Satisfactory, below 25 - Poor			
GRADE			

** Not applicable for Attenders and Housekeeping Staff

* Applicable for Attenders and Housekeeping Staff

HoD / Section Incharge

Head of the Institution