

PERCENTAGES OF FINAL RATING

A. PERCENTAGE ALLOCATION FOR OFFICE PERFORMANCE COMMITMENT AND REVIEW (OPCR)

Unit Heads/ Deans / Directors

Strategic Priority	30%
Core Functions	50%
Support Functions	20%
Total	100%

B. PERCENTAGE ALLOCATION FOR INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE COMMITMET AND REVIEW (IPCR)

Faculty

	Teaching (+TER)	Research	Extension	Total
Associate Prof to Prof VI	50%	35%	15%	100%
Asst. Prof and Below	70%	15%	15%	100%

Admin Staff

Core Functions	50%
Support Functions	30%
Critical Factors	20%
Total	100%

RATING COMPUTATION

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

Numerical Rating	Adjective Rating	Description or meaning of Rating
5	Outstanding (Exceeds expectations in all targets)	Performance exceeded expectations by 30% (or 130%) and above of the planned targets. Performance demonstrated was exceptional in terms of quality, technical skills, creativity, and initiative, showing mastery of the task. Accomplishments were made in more than expected but related aspects of the target.
4	Very Satisfactory (Exceeds expectations in some targets)	Performance exceeded expectations by 15% (or 115%) to 29% (or 129%) of the planned targets.
3	Satisfactory (Meets expectations / acceptable)	Performance met 90% to 114% of the planned targets. However, if it involves deadlines required by law, it should be 100% of the planned target.
2	Unsatisfactory (Needs mentoring/coaching)	Performance only met 51% to 89% of the planned targets and failed to deliver one or more critical aspects of the target. However, if it involves deadlines required by law, the range of performance should be 51% to 99% of the planned targets.
1	Poor(Needs improvement / close monitoring)	Performance failed to deliver most of the targets by 50% and below.

Note: Not all performance accomplishments need to be rated along all three dimensions of quality, efficiency, and timeliness. Some accomplishments may only be rated on any combination of two or three dimensions. In other cases, only one dimension may be sufficient. Consider all the elements involved listed in each dimension and use them as guides to determine how performance will be rated.

MINDANAO STATE UNIVERSITY – MARAWI CITY
STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (SPMS)

PART 1 THE SPMS

I. Background

The Mindanao State University having a special mandate of integrating the cultural communities into the nation's socio-cultural and political life aims to provide opportunities for quality and relevant public education needed for development. In order to attain the mission and vision of the agency, the university has to adopt measures in order to promote and establish an efficient and effective delivery of public service to be done with quality and accuracy in the highest level of public service performances.

In the year 1963, CSC Memorandum Circular No. 6 has provided the guidelines in developing a system of Performance Rating (PR) to measure performances of government employees, which was later revised in 1978 as New Performance Appraisal System (NPAS) and was crafted to measure employee's performances and behaviors in the work environment. In 1989, the CSC gave the Autonomy of agencies in developing their Performance Evaluation System in which employee's accomplishment in performances and behaviors are monitored weekly. Later on, CSC MC No. 12, s. 1993, the Performance Evaluation System (PES) was established providing specific guidelines on setting the mechanics of the rating system. In 2001 through CSC MC No. 2001, Agency Heads were given the discretion to utilize the approved PES or devise a Performance Evaluation System. Lately, in 2005, PMS-OPES was designed which sought to align individual performances with organizational goals.

The above-named mechanics of previous performance evaluation systems were proven to be too complex and tedious resulting to inconsistencies and subjectivity of the results of evaluation. Therefore, as constitutionally mandated, MSU-Marawi adheres to adopt in pursuance to Memorandum Circular No. 06, s. 2012, the **Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS)** which was crafted to address the gaps and weaknesses therein.

The MSU SPMS is intended to enhance productivity of university employees' individual performances attuned to organizational goals and mandates. Generally, SPMS will serve as a basis in assessing the University's performances through collective effort and performances on shared commitments between employees and the university management. The MSU SPMS is envisioned to strengthen the individual and organizational performances in line with public service thrust and accountability.

II. The SPMS Concept

The SPMS pertains to involving individual performances of employee's/personnel to the University's mandates and goals. It is a systematic tool designed to ensure completion and fulfillment of delivery of public service as well as motivating individual performances of employees.

The MSU-Marawi SPMS adheres to the principle of performance-based security of tenure providing motivation and basis for incentives to performers and applies sanctions to non-performers.

In the strategic plan of the University, the SPMS will serve as a tool to assess individual performances in achieving the objectives set herein and will result to the achievement of the University's mandate in providing advanced instruction in the academe and further enriching the culture therein.

The SPMS is the determinant of the Administration Planning Office and the Human Resource Management on its planning and decision making.

In order to successfully administer the SPMS, the University has adapted the CSC'S four-stage PMS cycle, namely: performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewarding and development planning.

Further, to support the system, the following enabling mechanisms shall be applied and maintained:

- A committee to identify competencies and other qualifications for a specific office position or function;
- Rewards and Incentive System;
- Mentoring and Coaching Program;
- Information and Communication Technology to support the documentation, monitoring and evaluation;
- Change Management Program; and
- Policy Review and Formulation.

III. General Objectives

The SPMS shall be prepared and administered to:

- a. Continuously foster improvement of employee performance and efficiency;
- b. Enhance organizational effectiveness and productivity; and
- c. Provide an objective performance rating that will serve as basis for personnel actions, incentives and rewards, and administrative sanctions.

IV. Basic Elements

The following are the basic elements to be included in the SPMS cycle:

- a. Goal Aligned to University Mandate and Priorities. Established goals and performance measurement are aligned to the national development plans, University mandate/vision/mission and strategic priorities and/or organizational performance indicator framework. Standards are pre-determined to ensure efficient use and management of inputs and work processes. These standards are integrated into the success indicators as organizational objectives are cascaded down to operational level;
- b. Outputs/ Outcomes-Based. The system puts premium on major final outputs that contribute to the realization of the University's mandate, mission/vision, strategic priorities, outputs and outcomes;
- c. Team-Approach to Performance Management. Accountabilities and individual roles in the achievement of the University's goals are clearly defined to give way to collective goal setting and performance rating. Individual's work plan or commitment and rating form is linked to the division/unit/office work plan or commitment and rating to establish clear linkage between the University's performance and personnel performance;

- d. User-Friendly. The forms use for both the organization and individual performance are similar and easy to accomplish. The organization and individual major final outputs and success indicators are aligned to facilitate cascading of the University's goals to the individual staff members and the harmonization of organizational and individual performance ratings;
- e. Information System Supports Monitoring and Evaluation. These are the vital components of the SPMS in order to facilitate linkage between organizational and employee performance and will ensure generation of timely, accurate, and reliable information for both performance monitoring/tracking, accomplishment reporting, program improvement and policy decision-making; and
- f. Communication Plan. A program to orient University officials and employees on the new revised policies on SPMS shall be implemented. This is to promote awareness and interest on the system, generate employees' appreciation for the University SPMS as a management tool for performance planning, control and improvement, and guarantee employees' internalization of their role as partners of management and co-employees' in meeting organizational performance goals.

V. Key Players and Responsibilities

- a) **Chancellor/President.** He is the SPMS Champion who is primarily responsible and accountable for the establishment and implementation of the SPMS. He
 - Sets MSU performance goals/objectives and performance measures;
 - Determines University target setting period;
 - Approves office performance commitment and rating; and
 - Assesses performance of offices.
- b) **Performance Management Team (PMT).** A committee to be designated by the SPMS Champion with the following composition:
 1. Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance - Chairperson;
 2. Head of Human Resources Management Office who is directly responsible for human resource management, directly responsible for personnel training and development, and will serve as the PMT Secretariat;
 3. Head of the Finance Office directly responsible for financial management; and
 4. President of the accredited employee association/ union in the university or any authorized representative of rank and file.

The heads of offices are automatic members of the PMT during the review of their subordinates, performance targets and standards, and performance ratings. The PMT shall have the following functions and responsibilities:

- Sets consultation meeting of all heads of offices/divisions/units in collaboration with the deans of colleges for the purpose of discussing the targets set in the Office Performance Commitment and Rating (OPCR) Form;
- Ensures that office performance targets and measures, as well as the budget are aligned with those of the University and that work distribution among offices/units is rationalized;

- Recommends approval of the OPCR rating to the Chancellor/President;
- Identifies potential top performers and provides inputs and recommendation to the Promotion and Selection Board (PSB) for grant of awards and incentives; and
- Adopts its own internal rules, procedures and strategies in carrying out the above responsibilities including schedule of meetings and deliberations, and delegations of authority to representatives in case of absence of its members.

c) Office of the Vice Chancellors

- Monitors submission of OPCR Form, and schedule the review/evaluation of Office Performance Commitment by the PMT before the start of a performance period;
- Consolidates reviews, validates and evaluates the initial performance assessment of the heads of offices based on reported office accomplishments against the success indicators, and the allotted budget against the actual expenses. The result of the assessment shall be the basis of PMT's recommendation to the Chancellor/President who shall determine the final office rating;
- Conducts an agency performance planning and review conference annually for the purpose of discussing the office assessment for the preceding performance period and plans for the succeeding rating period with concerned Heads of Offices. This shall include participation of the Financial Office in regard to budget utilization; and
- Provides each office with the final office assessment to serve as basis of offices in the assessment of individual staff members.

d) Human Resources Management Office

- Monitors submission of Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) Form by Heads of Offices;
- Reviews the Summary List of Individuals Performance Rating to ensure that the average performance rating of employees is equivalent to or not higher than the Office Performance Rating as recommended by the PMT and approved by the Chancellor/President;
- Provides analytical data on retention, skill/competency gaps, and talent development plans that align with strategic plans; and
- Coordinates developmental interventions that will form part of the HR Plan.

e) Heads of Offices/Deans

- Assumes primary responsibility for performance management in his office;
- Conducts strategic planning session with his staff and agree on the outputs that should be accomplished based on the goals/objectives of the University and submits the OPCR Form to the OVCAF;
- Reviews and approves IPCR Form for submission to HRM Office before the start of the performance period;
- Submits a quarterly accomplishment report to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance based on the PMS calendar (Annex E);
- Does initial assessment of office's performance using the approved OPCR Form;
- Determines final assessment of performance level of the individual employees in his office based on proof of performance;

- Informs employees of the final rating and identifies necessary interventions to employees based on the assessment of developmental needs;
- Recommends and discusses a development plan with the subordinates who obtain unsatisfactory performance during the rating period not later than (1) month after the end of the said period and prepares written notice/advice to subordinates that a succeeding unsatisfactory performance shall warrant their separation from the service; and
- Provides preliminary rating to subordinates showing poor performance not earlier than the third (3rd) month of the rating period, discusses a development plan with the concerned subordinates, and issues a written notice that failure to improve their performance shall warrant their separation from the service.

f) Division Chief or its Equivalent

- Assumes joint responsibility with the Head of Office in ensuring attainment of performance objectives and targets;
- Rationalizes distribution of targets/ tasks;
- Monitors closely the status of the performance of their subordinates and provides support and assistance through the conduct of coaching for the attainment of targets set by the Division and individual employee;
- Assesses individual employees' performance; and
- Recommends developmental intervention.

g) Individual Employees

- Works in collaboration with the Administration in ensuring the implementation and attainment of the University's objectives and targets.

PART 2 THE SPMS PROCESS

I. The SPMS Cycle

The MSU-SPMS shall follow the same four-stage SPMS cycle that underscores the importance of performance management.

Stage 1: Performance Planning and Commitment

This is done at the start of the performance period where Heads of Offices meet with the supervisors and staff and agree on the outputs that should be accomplished based on the goals/objectives of the organization.

During this stage, success indicators are determined. Success indicators are performance level yardsticks consisting of performance measures and performance targets. This shall serve as bases in the office and individual employee's preparation of their performance contract and rating form.

Performance measures need not be many. Only those that contribute to or support the outcomes that the University aims to achieve shall be included in the office performance contract, i.e. measures that are relevant to University's core functions and strategic priorities. The performance measures must be continuously refined and reviewed.

Performance measures shall include any one combination of, or all of the following general categories, whichever is applicable:

Category	Definition
Effectiveness / Quality	<p>The extent to which actual performance compares with targeted performance.</p> <p>The degree to which objectives are achieved and the extent to which targeted problems are solved.</p> <p>Relates to getting the right things done.</p>
Efficiency	<p>The extent to which time or resource is used for the intended task or purpose. Measures whether targets are accomplished with a minimum amount of time, or least quantity of waste expense, or unnecessary effort.</p>
Timeliness	<p>Measures whether the deliverable was done on time, based on the requirements of the law and /or clients/ stakeholders.</p> <p>Time – related performance indicators evaluate such things as project completions deadlines, time management skills, and other time-sensitive expectations.</p>

The Chancellor/President shall cause determination of the “university target setting period,” a period within which the office and employees’ targets are set and discussed by the raters and the ratees, reviewed and concurred by the head of the division or office and submitted to the PMT.

The University Strategic Plan shall be the basis of the targets of offices. Aside from the office commitments explicitly identified under each Strategic Priority in the Road Map, Major Final Outputs that contribute to the attainment of organizational mission/vision which form part of the core functions of the office shall be indicated as performance targets.

The targets shall take into account any combination of, or all of the following:

- **Historical data.** The data shall consider past performances.
- **Benchmarking.** This involves identifying and comparing the best agencies or institutions or units within the University with similar functions or processes. Benchmarking may also involve recognizing existing standards based on provisions or requirements of the law.
- **Client demand.** This involves a bottoms-up approach where the office sets targets based on the needs of its clients. The office may consult with stakeholders and review the feedback on its services.
- **Top Management Instruction.** The Chancellor/President may set targets and give special assignments.
- **Citizen’s Charter under the Anti- Red Tape Act R.A.9485.**
- **Future Trend.** Targets may be based from the results of the comparative analysis of the actual performance of the office with its potential performance.

In setting work targets, the office shall likewise indicate the detailed budget requirements per expense account to help the Chancellor/President in ensuring a strategy driven budget allocation and in measuring cost efficiency. The office shall also identify specific division/ unit/group/individuals as primarily accountable for producing a particular target output per program/ project/activity. These targets, performance measures, budget and responsibility centers are summarized in the OPCR Form (Annex A).

The approved OPCR Form shall serve as basis for individual performance targets and measures to be prepared in the IPCR (Annex B) and Department/ Division Performance Commitment and Review (DPCR) (Annex C).

Unless the work output of a particular duty has been assigned pre-set standards by management, its standards shall be agreed upon by the supervisors and the raters. Individual employees' performance standards shall not be lower than the agency's standards in its approved OPCR Form.

Stage 2: Performance Monitoring and Coaching

During the performance monitoring and coaching phase, the performance of the offices and every individual shall be regularly monitored at various levels: i.e., the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Directors, and Heads of Offices/Deans, Division Chiefs/ Unit Heads and individual, on a regular basis.

Monitoring and evaluation mechanism should be in place to ensure that timely and appropriate steps can be taken to keep a program on track and to ensure that its objectives or goals are met in the most effective manner. Also, a very vital tool of management at this stage is an information system that will support data management to produce timely, accurate and reliable information for program tracking and performance monitoring/reporting.

Supervisors and coaches play a critical role at this stage. Their focus is on the critical function of managers and supervisors as coaches and mentors in order to provide an enabling environment/intervention to improve team performance, and manage and develop individual potentials.

Stage 3: Performance Review and Evaluation (Office Performance and Individual Employee's Performance)

This phase aims to assess both office and individual employees' performance level based in performance targets and measures as approved in the office and individual performance commitment contracts. The result of assessment of office and individual performance shall be impartial owing to scientific and verifiable basis for target setting and evaluation.

- **Office Performance Assessment**

The Office of the Planning Officer or any responsible unit in the university shall consolidate, review, validate and evaluate the initial performance assessment of the Heads of Offices based on reported office accomplishments against the success indicators, and the allotted budget against the actual

expenses. The results of the assessment shall be submitted to the PMT for calibration and recommendation to the Chancellor/President who will then determine the final rating of offices/units.

A University performance review conference shall be conducted annually by the Planning Office for the purpose of discussing the office assessment with concerned Heads of Offices. This shall include participation of the Financial Office as regards budget utilization. To ensure complete and comprehensive performance review, all offices shall submit a quarterly accomplishment report to the Planning Office based on the SPMS calendar (Annex E).

Any issue/appeal/protest on the office assessment shall be articulated by the concerned Head of Office and decided by the Chancellor/President during this conference; hence the final rating shall no longer be appealable/contestable after the conference.

The Planning Office shall provide each office with the final Office Assessment to serve as basis of offices in the assessment of individual staff members.

- **Performance Assessment for Individual Employees**

The immediate supervisors shall assess individual employee performance based on the commitments made at the beginning of the rating period. The performance rating shall be based solely on records of accomplishment; hence there is no need for self-rating.

The SPMS puts premium on major final outputs towards realization of organizational mission/vision. Hence, rating for planned and/or intervening tasks shall always be supported by reports, documents or any outputs as proofs of actual performance. In the absence of said bases or proofs, a particular task shall not be rated and shall be disregarded.

The supervisor shall indicate qualitative comments, observations and recommendations in the IPCR Form to include competency assessment and critical incident which shall be used for human resource development purpose such as promotion and other interventions.

Employee's assessment shall be discussed by the supervisor with the concerned ratee prior to the submission of the individual employee's performance commitment and review form to the campus/division directors.

The head of office shall determine the final assessment of performance level of the individual employees in his office based on proof of performance. The final assessment shall correspond to the adjectival description of Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Poor.

The Head of Office may adopt appropriate mechanism to assist him to distinguish performance level of individual, such as but not limited to peer ranking and client feedback.

The average of all individual performance assessment shall not go higher than the collective performance assessment of the office.

The Head of Office shall ensure that the employee is notified of his final performance assessment and the Summary List of Individual Ratings(Annex F) with the attached IPCRs are submitted to the HRM Office within the prescribe period.

Stage 4: Performance Rewarding and Development Planning

Part of the individual employee's evaluation is the competency assessment vis-à-vis the competency requirements of the job. The result of the assessment shall be discussed by the Head of Office and supervisors with the individual employee at the end of each rating period. The discussion shall focus on the strengths, competency-related performance graph and the opportunities to address these gaps, career paths and alternatives.

The result of the competency assessment shall be treated independently of the performance rating of the employee.

Appropriate developmental interventions shall be made available independently of the performance rating of the employee.

A professional developmental plan to improve or correct performance of employees with unsatisfactory and poor performance ratings must be outlined, including timeliness, and monitored to measure progress.

The result of the performance evaluation/assessment shall serve as inputs to the:

- a. Heads of Offices in identifying and providing the kinds of interventions needed, based on the developmental needs identified;
- b. University HRM Office in consolidating and coordinating developmental interventions that will form part of the HR plan and the basis for reward and incentives;
- c. PMT in identifying potential PRAISE awards nominees for various awards categories; and
- d. PRAISE Commitment in determining top performers of the University who qualify for awards and incentives.

II. Rating Period

Performance evaluation shall be done semi-annually and must be submitted HRMO every July 15 (for the first rating period) and January 15 (for the second rating period). However, if there is a need for a shorter or longer period, the minimum appraisal period is at least ninety (90) calendar days or three (3) months while the maximum is no longer than one (1) calendar year. The average rating of every individual will be considered as the Final Rating for the performance year. However, the average of all individual performance assessment shall not be higher than the relative performance assessment of the office with respect to other offices.

The percentages of Individual Performance that make up the Final Ratings for the Administrative Staff are presented below:

Part I – Performance (80%) – is the evaluation of actual accomplishment versus the planned level of performance in terms of Effectiveness/Quality, Efficiency and Timeliness against the agreed performance measures and budget, if applicable, broken down as follow:

Core Functions	-	50%
Support Function	-	30%

Part II – Critical Factors (20%) – are the behavioral dimensions that affect job performance of an employee as rated by the supervisor /head of office. The following behavioral dimensions will be evaluated:

- **Courtesy** – Polite, kind and thoughtful behavior toward the public / clientele in manners of speech and actuations;
- **Human Relations** - Integrates concerns for people at work, office clientele, and supervisors – subordinate relationship into work situations;
- **Punctuality and Attendance** – Observed behavior of coming to office on time or to be present at work to complete assigned responsibilities;
- **Initiatives** - Starts action and projects, and performs assigned tasks without being told and under minimal supervision;
- **Leadership** – The manner of guiding-influencing, motivating and developing confidence to work as a team and accomplish assigned tasks. Leading the office to achieve its goals and objectives enthusiastically; and
- **Stress Tolerance** – Stability of performance under pressure or position.

Intervening Tasks

Intervening tasks with or without pay are those which are assigned in addition to the regular functions of the employee after the performance target shall have been set.

Said task is not within the regular functions of the employee or the work program / performance contract of their divisions or units.

The performance of intervening or additional tasks is duly considered if this is done over and above the planned targets.

There is urgency in the completion of the intervening task which has an impact on the organizational unit concerned;

Non-compliance / performance of the intervening task will unduly prejudice the service; and

Employees' planned targets were all accomplished and rated at least satisfactory.

Employee's performance of intervening tasks may be given a maximum of 0.5 additional points for an aggregate of 176 hours.

The formula is:

$$\text{ITS} = \frac{0.5 \times \text{nhrs}}{176\text{hrs}}$$

Where:

ITS is IT Score;

Nhrs is the number of hours rendered; and

176hrs = 22 working days x 8 hours per day.

SPMS Rating Scale

Numerical	Rating Adjective	Description
5	Outstanding	Performance represents an extraordinary level of achievement and commitment in terms of quality and time, technical skills and knowledge, ingenuity, creativity and initiative. Employees at this performance level should have demonstrated exceptional job mastery in all major areas of responsibility. Employees achievement and contribution to the organization are of marked excellence. (Performance exceeding targets by 30% and above of the planned targets)
4	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeded expectations. All goals, objectives and targets were achieved above the established standards. (Performance exceeding targets by 15% to 29% of the planned targets)
3	Satisfactory	Performance met expectations in terms of quality of work, efficiency and timeliness. The most critical annual goals were met. (Performance of 100% to 114% of the planned targets. For accomplishments requiring 100% of the targets such as those pertaining to money or accuracy of those which may no longer be exceeded, the usual rating of either 5 for those who met targets or 2 for those who failed or fell short of the targets shall still be enforced.)
2	Unsatisfactory	Performance failed to meet expectations, and /or one or more of the most critical goals were not met. (Performance of 51% to 99% of the planned targets)
1	Poor	Performance was consistently below expectations, and/or reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas. (Performance failing to meet the planned targets by 50% or below)

Any enhancement and/or amendment of the CSC-approved MSU SPMS shall be submitted to the Office of the Chancellor/President for approval.

III. SPMS Implementation

The Chancellor/President shall:

1. Constitute a Performance Management Team (PMT)
2. Review the existing Performance Evaluation System being presently implemented evaluating its conformity with the new SPMS features;
3. Amend and develop the University's Performance Management System and submit to the CSC for review and approval. This is to promote awareness and interest on the system, generate employees' appreciation for the University SPMS as a management tool for performance planning, control and improvement, and guarantee employees' internalization of their role as partners of management and co-employees in meeting organization performance goals.
4. Administer the approved University SPMS in accordance with these guidelines/standards.
5. Provide the Civil Service Commissions Regional/Field Office concerned with a copy of the consolidated Individual Performance Review Reports indicating alignment of the collective individual rating with the Organizational/Office Performance Rating.

IV. Uses of Performance Rating

1. Security of tenure of those holding permanent appointments is not absolute but is based on performance;

Employees who obtained Unsatisfactory rating for one rating period or exhibited poor performance shall be provided appropriate developmental intervention by the Office Head and supervisor in coordination with the HRM Office, to address competency-related performance gaps.

If after advice and provision of developmental intervention, the employee still obtains Unsatisfactory or Poor ratings in the immediately succeeding rating period, he may be dropped from the rolls. A written notice/advice from the Head of Office at least 3 months before the end of the rating period is required.

2. The PMT shall validate the outstanding performance ratings and may recommended concerned employees for performance-based awards. Grant of performance-based incentives shall be based in the final ratings of employees as approved by the Head of Office;
3. Performance ratings shall be used as basis for promotion, training and scholarship grant and other personnel actions. Employees with Outstanding and Very Satisfactory performance ratings shall be considered for the above mentioned personnel actions and other related matters;
4. Officials and employees who shall be on official travel, approved leave of absence or training or scholarship programs and who have already met the required minimum rating period of 90 days shall submit the performance commitment and rating report before they leave the office; and
5. Employees who are in details or seconded to another office shall be related in their present or actual office, with copy furnished to their mother office. The ratings of those who were detailed or seconded to another office during the rating period shall be consolidated in the office, either the mother (plantilla) office or present office, where the employees have spent majority of their time during the rating period.

Part 3 MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

I. Sanctions

Unless justified and accepted by the PMT, non-submission of the OPCR Forms to the PMT, and the IPCR Forms to the HRM Office within the specified dates shall be in a ground for:

- a) Employees' disqualification for performance-based personnel actions which would require the ratings for the given period such as promotion, training or scholarship grants and performance enhancement bonus, if the failure of the submission of the report form is the fault of the employees;
- b) An administrative sanction for violation of reasonable office rules and regulations and simple neglect of duty for the supervisors or employees responsible for the delay or non- submission of the office and individual performance commitment and review report;
- c) Failure on the part of the Head of Office to comply with the required notices to their subordinates for their unsatisfactory or poor performance during a rating period shall be a ground for administrative offense for neglect of duty; and
- d) Non-submission of University SPMS to Civil Service Commission for review/approval shall be a ground for disapproval of promotional appointments.

II. Appeals

- a) Office performance assessment as discussed in the performance review conference shall be final and not appealable. Any issue/appeal on the initial performance assessment of an office shall be discussed and decided during the performance review conference;
- b) Individual employees who feel aggrieved or dissatisfied with their final performance ratings can file an appeal with the PMT within ten (10) days from the date of receipt of notice of their final performance evaluation rating from the Head of Office. An office/unit or individual employee, however, shall not be allowed to protest the performance ratings of other office/unit or co-employees. Ratings obtained by other office/unit or employees can only be used as basis or reference for comparison in appealing one's office or individual performance rating.

The PMT shall decide on the appeal within one (1) month from receipt. The decision of the PMT may be appealed to the Chancellor/President.

Appeals lodged at any PMT shall follow the hierarchical jurisdiction of various PMTs in an agency. For example, the Decision of the Campus PMT is appealable to the University wide PMT which decision is in turn appealable to the Chancellor/President; and

- c) Officials or employees who are separated from the service on the basis of Unsatisfactory or Poor performance rating can appeal their separations to the CSC or its regional office within 15 days from receipt of the order or notice of separations.

III. Effectivity

This SPMS shall be utilized not beyond six (6) months after its approval by the MSU-Marawi Chancellor/President.

MACAPADO A. MUSLIM, Ph.D.
Chancellor MSU Marawi/President MSU System