

10 May 2018

MEMORANDUM

FOR : All Officials And Employees
Department of Social Welfare and Development

FROM : The Undersecretary for Policy and Plans Group and
Chairperson, Performance Management Technical Working
Group


SUBJECT : ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NO. 11, SERIES OF 2018 ON THE
GUIDELINES FOR THE DSWD STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

We are furnishing you, herewith, copy of the Administrative Order No. 11, Series of 2018, dated 08 May 2018, on the Guidelines for the DSWD Strategic Performance Management System.

For your information and ready reference.


FLORITA R. VILLAR

Certified True Copy:


NICOMEDES P. SULLER
Director, Administrative Service



09 May 2018

DIRECTOR JUDITH A. DONGALLO-CHICANO
Civil Service Commission, National Capital Region
No. 25 Kaliraya Street
Banawe, Quezon City

ORD MAY-10-2018 03:36PM

Dear **Director Chicano**:

Cordial greetings!

In compliance with the Civil Service Commission's Memorandum Circular No. 6, Series of 2012 (MC 6, s. 2012), or the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) which mandates the establishment of performance evaluation system in every department or agency and CSC Memorandum Circular dated 01 April 2016, may we submit the revised DSWD's Strategic Performance Management System (DSPMS).

We hope that you find this document in order and shall await for your response regarding its approval.

Thank you.


Sincerely,

EMMANUEL A. LEYCO
DSWD Officer-in-Charge

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) adopted the processes and procedures prescribed in the Civil Service Commission (CSC) MC No. 6 Series of 2012¹ and CSC MC No. 13 Series of 1999².

This certification is being issued this 9th of May 2018, in Quezon City, Philippines.



Emmanuel A. Leyco
Officer-In-Charge, DSWD

¹ Guidelines in the Establishment and Implementation of Agency Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS)

² Revised Policies on the Performance Evaluation System

DSWD – PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

RESOLUTION No. 2018 – 01

WHEREAS, pursuant to Civil Service Commission's Memorandum Circular No. 6, Series of 2012 (MC 6, s. 2012), or the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) which mandates the establishment of performance evaluation system in every department or agency, the Department of Social Welfare and Development has established the DSWD's Strategic Performance Management System (DSPMS) under Administrative Order No. 11, Series of 2015;

WHEREAS, in compliance with the MC 6, s. 2012, DSWD submitted the Administrative Order No. 11, Series of 2015, to Civil Service Commission-National Capital Region (NCR) on 01 July 2015;

WHEREAS, the result of CSC-NCR's evaluation dated 21 July 2015 was DSWD's SPMS substantially complied with the CSC MC 6, s.2012 and need refinement on the following:

1. There is no office order issued by the Head of Agency constituting the Performance Management Team (PMT);
2. There is no provision in the DSWD SPMS guidelines which provide that the average rating of individual staff member should not go higher than the collective performance assessment of the office;
3. The ranges of rating (in terms of percentages of accomplishments) for Efficiency/Quantity for all levels of performance indicated in the DSWD SPMS rating scale are not in accordance with CSC MC No. 13, s. 1999. Likewise, there is no separate and clear standards to measure Quality/Effectiveness and Timeliness;
4. There is no SPMS calendar submitted which contains activities, unit/person responsible thereto, and timeframe for each phase of the four (4)-stage SPMS cycle which includes the following activities, to wit: Officials and employees are required to submit their commitments prior to the start of the rating period, time allotted for Performance Management Team (PMT) review and recommendation of the Performance Commitment / Individual Performance Commitment, feedback session on the performance of the offices as well as officials and employees, orientation of officials and employees on the new and revised policies on the SPMS, SPMS pilot test and Annual Performance Review Conference;
5. Under the SPMS guidelines, individual performance is rated solely on accomplishment of work outputs to be measured using the success indicators that are identified for every output. As such, the performance measures should be treated independently from the behavioral dimensions. Hence, the Leadership and Managerial Competencies and attendance to flag ceremony should not be included in the computation of the individual performance rating. However, the same may be considered for purposes of developmental interventions;

6. The grant of PIB and PBIS should be deleted in the DSPMS since said incentives are governed by the GAA and EO No.80, s. 2012, respectively. Moreover, the discussion relative to the PRAISE should also be deleted in the DSPMS since this should be a separate personnel mechanism; and
7. With regard to the coverage of the DSPMS (Individual Personnel) the same may be applied to those hired under MOA, Contract of Service Workers, Job Orders whose renewal of Contracting Services shall be based on performance. However, they should be excluded from the ranking for purposes of granting PBB and other performance-based incentives since they are not considered as government employees.

WHEREAS, in 27 November 2015, the DSWD through Human Resource Development Service (HRDS) responded to CSC-NCR's observations and sought for further clarifications on the SPMS rating scale, rating period, calendar, Job Order (JO) and Contract of Service (CoS) workers' inclusion, and provisions on PBIS;

WHEREAS, CSC-NCR responded dated 01 April 2016 to DSWD's comments/clarifications and reiterated that DSWD still have to address their observations;

WHEREAS, the PMTWG Secretariat conducted benchmarking with other government agencies, such as Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of Transportation (DOTr), and Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), and based on information gathered, these agencies adopted the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) guidelines set forth in CSC Memorandum Circular No. 6, Series of 2012, hence, their SPMS was approved by the Commission;

WHEREAS, in order to comply with CSC's comments to AO 11, s. 2015, Human Resource Development Service and Policy Development and Planning Bureau prepared a draft of DSPMS based on CSC Memorandum Circular No. 6, s. 2012, for approval of the PMTWG members;


WHEREAS, the draft DSPMS, which is based on CSC Memorandum Circular No. 6, s. 2012, was presented on the 17th PMTWG meeting dated 10 April 2018;

WHEREAS, during the discussion of the draft DSPMS on the 17th PMTWG meeting, the PMTWG members approved the proposed DSPMS which is based on CSC Memorandum Circular No. 6, s. 2012, thus, the tools and forms attached thereto shall be used by DSWD nationwide;

NOW, THEREFORE, the PMTWG, RESOLVES as it hereby RESOLVED to recommend the approval of the DSPMS in accordance with the CSC Memorandum Circular No. 6, s. 2012, for and in consideration of the above.

Signed this 8th day of May 2018, in Quezon City, Philippines.

2018 DSWD Performance Management Technical Working Group Members:




FLORITA R. VILLAR

Undersecretary for PPG and PMTWG Chairperson




RODOLFO M. SANTOS

Assistant Secretary for GASSG and OIC-OUSGASSG and PMTWG Vice Chairperson




HOPE V. HERVILLA

Undersecretary for DRM



MARIA LOURDES TURALDE- JARABE

Undersecretary for Promotive OPG



CAMILO G. GUDMALIN

Undersecretary for SPIM



VIRGINIA N. OROGO

Undersecretary for SC



LUZVIMINDA C. ILAGAN

Undersecretary for LLA & SPDM



MAE FE ANCHETA-TEMPLA

Undersecretary for Protective OPG



ALELI DULCE B. BAWAGAN

Assistant Secretary for OSG

MARCO DOMINIC M. DELOS REYES

Head Executive Assistant for OSEC



CESAR A. AQUINO

OIC-Director, HRDS



RHODORA G. ALDAY

OIC-Director, PDPB

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER

No. 11

Series of 2018

**SUBJECT: GUIDELINES FOR THE DSWD STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

I. RATIONALE

In order to continuously foster the improvement of employee performance and efficiency, enhance organizational effectiveness and productivity and provide and provide an objective performance management system which shall serve as basis for incentives and rewards, promotion, training and development, human resource actions and administrative sanctions, the following policies have been put in place, reinforcing previous policies and ensuring the alignment of individual performance with the organization's vision and mission resulting to the accomplishment of the Department's organizational outcomes (OOs):

- Establishment of a unified and integrated Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) across all agencies within the Executive Branch pursuant to Administrative Order (AO) No. 25, Series of 2011¹; and
- Establishment of a Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS) that will motivate higher performance and greater accountability in the public sector to ensure the accomplishment of commitments and targets set forth in EO No. 43, Series of 2011.

Consistent with these directives, this Administrative Order describes the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) anchored on the Organizational Performance Indicator Framework (OPIF) used by the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) to measure agency performance; the RBPMS; and the planning, monitoring and evaluation system of the Department's Strategic Plan.

II. LEGAL BASES

- A. Rule X of the Omnibus Rules Implementing Book V of EO No. 292, Series of 1987²** mandating the Civil Service Commission (CSC) to establish a performance evaluation system in every department or agency, as follows:

"The system shall be so designed and administered to continuously foster improvement of employee performance; enhance organizational effectiveness and productivity; and

¹ Administrative Order No. 25 s.2011 Creating an Inter-agency Task Force on the Harmonization of National Government Performance Monitoring, Information and Reporting Systems issued on December 21, 2011

² Executive Order No. 292 s. 1987 Instituting The Administrative Code of 1987 issued on July 25, 1987

provide an objective performance rating which shall serve as basis for incentives and rewards.”;

- B. Joint Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives No. 4, Series of 2008** authorizing the modification of the compensation and position classification system for personnel in the bureaucracy in order to motivate personnel and invigorate public service. The Resolution also provides for the establishment of a performance incentive scheme that integrates individual and organization performance;
- C. Administrative Order No. 25 series of 2011** aimed at establishing a unified and integrated Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) across all departments and agencies within the executive branch incorporating a common set of performance scorecard, and at the same time, creating an accurate, accessible, and up-to-date government-wide, sectoral, and organizational performance information system;
- D. CSC Memorandum Circular No. 06, series of 2012³** focusing on the strategic alignment between the organization's goals and the day-to-day operations of the units, specifically with regard to each individual in the organization. It also provides a mechanism for assessing organizational performance and the collective performance of individuals therein. This is to ensure organizational effectiveness and improvement of individual employees by cascading institutional accountabilities to the various levels of organization anchored on the establishment of rational and factual bases for performance targets and measures; and
- E. Career Executive Service Board (CESB) Resolution No. 1136, series of 2014** dealing with the documentation of accomplishments and managerial competence of officials in the agency in the context of the agency's strategic objectives.

III. OBJECTIVES

This Administrative Order seeks to achieve the following:

- A.** Enhance performance of the Department towards the attainment of its mission, vision and medium and long-term goals by providing guidance on performance management at all levels of the organization;
- B.** Ensure achievement of organizational outcomes by effectively cascading DSWD commitments, priorities and institutional accountabilities to various levels of the organization through identification of appropriate performance indicators and targets; and
- C.** Concretize linkage of organizational performance with the Department's Strategic Plan.
- D.** Create an enabling environment for the promotion of equal opportunities and non-discrimination on account of gender, civil status, disability, religion, ethnicity, or political affiliation in all phases of performance management and in its processes.

³ CSC Memorandum Circular No. 6 s. 2012 Guidelines in the Establishment and Implementation of Agency SPM issued on March 16, 2012.

IV. COVERAGE

A. All of Agency

This refers to the whole of the organization as represented by the Secretary and collectively by its Executive Committee (EXECOM) and Management Committee (MANCOM).

Attached Agencies (AAs) under the technical supervision of the DSWD are not covered by these guidelines unless a resolution is issued to adopt the guidelines.

B. Central Office - Offices, Bureaus and Services (CO-OBSs) and Field Offices (FOs)

These are the Department's service delivery units represented by the appointed or designated Head/Official.

C. Individual Personnel

All Officials and the Rank and File shall be collectively referred to as "employees or personnel" in this document who are incumbents of career, non-career, casual and contractual positions in the Department:

- 1) Officials – Incumbents of third level positions or its equivalent provided they are designated to perform in this capacity regardless of their current position.
- 2) Rank and file Employees – Incumbents of positions with salary grade 24 and below.

V. THE DSWD STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The DSWD SPMS is focused on linking individual performance with the agency's vision, mission and organizational objectives. It is a technology composed of strategies, methods and tools to ensure the fulfillment of functions of the offices and its personnel as well as to assess their accomplishments.

Furthermore, a mechanism ensuring that the employees achieve the objectives set by their Offices and the organization, by extension, achieves the objectives it has committed in its medium-term Strategic Plan.

The DSWD SPMS follows the performance management cycle (Annex A) which has four phases: (a) Performance Planning and Commitment; (b) Performance Monitoring and Coaching; (c) Performance Review and Evaluation; and (d) Performance Rewarding and Development Planning. All actors engaged in all phases of the performance management cycle shall be acquainted on equal opportunity principles for these to govern the processes of the DSPMS.

A. Phase 1: Performance Planning and Commitment

The DSWD planning process is facilitated through a consultative approach; necessitating the participation of all DSWD Offices to ensure the interoperability of existing DSWD systems for a purposive and realistic setting of commitments and targets. This planning process begins with a review of the Department's internal and external context as well as ensuring that the DSWD plans are anchored on the pertinent international and national commitments of the Department. Three levels of planning then follow to ensure effective cascading of performance commitments and targets:

1) Department Level⁴

For every planning period, ideally spanning for six years, the DSWD develops its Strategic Plan which serves as a guidepost to align the programs, projects and services of all DSWD OBSs and FOs. The objectives of the Department which are translated into outcome and output level performance indicators are specified in the Strategic Results Matrix of the Strategic Plan along with their corresponding targets. Strategic initiatives identified to address gaps in the implementation of programs, projects and services, are also included in the plan.

As such, the DSWD Strategic Plan shall serve as the Department's medium-term performance contract while its Annual Plan which contains outcome and output level performance targets and critical activities to operationalize strategic initiatives for a specific year shall serve as the Department's annual performance contract.

All personnel from every level of the organization shall contribute to the identified outcomes, outputs and strategic initiatives laid out in the Strategic Plan.

2) Office Level

Anchoring on the DSWD Strategic Plan, the DSWD OBSs and FOs prepare their Office Performance Contracts (OPCs) by committing performance indicators and targets related to the mandate and core functions of their respective Offices. Attached as Annex B is the OPC template for CO-OBSs and the FOs.

2.1) Central Office – OBSs

Following the thrust of the Department towards a harmonized results-based planning and monitoring system, the performance contracts of all DSWD Offices shall be aligned to the medium-term DSWD Strategic Plan. It is then imperative that the indicators identified in the Strategic Results Matrix be the same set of indicators indicated in the respective OPCs.

⁴ Separate guidelines shall be issued for the planning, monitoring and evaluation system of the DSWD Strategic Plan that shall capture the preparation of all department-level plans and reports.

However, given that each CO-OBS has its own set of key results areas (KRAs), and that only the most crucial assignments/functions of the CO-OBSs are reflected in the Strategic Results Matrix, only "MUST" indicators are identified for inclusion in the OPCs of the CO-OBSs.

These "MUST" indicators shall be the minimum set of indicators to be included in the OPCs of the CO-OBSs, and additional indicators shall be identified by the CO-OBSs depending on their respective KRAs.

2.2) Field Offices

Considered as "mini-DSWDs", the OPC of the FOs will mirror the overall DSWD Performance Contract, i.e., the DSWD Strategic Plan, as they perform all functions of the Department only at a smaller scale. However, to preserve the conciseness of the FOs' OPCs, performance indicators of some mandated functions particularly for support and administrative services are delegated to the Division Performance Contracts (DPCs).

Further, given that the DSWD Field Offices perform identical set of functions albeit at different regional contexts, the performance of the FOs will be measured using an identical set of performance indicators consolidated into a Harmonized FO-OPC.

An accompanying document of the Harmonized FO-OPC is the Rating Guide which operationalizes the indicators to be committed for the plan year. The Rating Guide (Annex C) contains all targets and criteria in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness for each performance indicator. Hence, this document shall serve as the basis during office performance contracting and performance review and evaluation (PRE).

The targets and criteria indicated in the Rating Guide is provided by all concerned Central Office-OBSs in consultation and agreement with their regional counterparts.

2.3) Divisions

For a more holistic view of the Office's mandate and KRAs, and to ensure that all deliverables are accounted for including those for support and administrative concerns, the Offices shall delegate commitments to its Divisions. These Divisions shall be held as primarily accountable for producing designated target outputs for each program, project and activity. These targets, performance measures, budget and accountability centers are summarized in the Division Performance Contract (DPC). Attached as Annex D is the DPC template.

3) Individual Level

From the approved OPCs and DPCs, cascading of performance targets to DSWD personnel shall be facilitated through the preparation of Individual Performance Contracts (IPCs) of rank and file employees. Attached as Annex E is the IPC template.

The IPCs highlight the personnel's mission – critical outputs to be delivered according to their roles and functions. All personnel who have rendered at least three uninterrupted months of service in a particular Office shall be required to submit an IPC.

In the crafting of the IPC and in performance targeting, the supervisor and subordinate shall both be mindful in their respective roles for an enabling environment that would ensure equal opportunity principles in responsibly meeting performance targets flourish.

At both the Office and individual level, performance indicators shall include any one, combination of, or all of the following general categories, whichever is applicable:

Category	Description
Quantity	The extent to which time or resources is used for the intended task or purpose. Measures whether targets are accomplished with a minimum amount or quality of waste expenses or unnecessary effort.
Quality	The extent to which actual performance compares with targeted performance. The degree to which objectives are achieved and the extent to which targeted problems are solved.
Timeliness	Measures whether the deliverable was done on time based on the requirements of the law and/or clients/stakeholders. Time-related performance indicators evaluated such things as project completion deadlines, time management skills and other time-sensitive expectations.

B. Phase 2: Performance Monitoring and Coaching

During the performance monitoring and coaching phase, the performance of the Offices and every individual shall be regularly monitored. 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.

In performance monitoring and coaching, supervisors shall consider empowerment principles in order to motivate subordinates/team mates in the achievement of performance results.

Monitoring of performance and accomplishments can be facilitated through regular meetings (EXECOM, MANCOM, General Staff Assembly), one-on-one discussions and review of pertinent documents such as reports, among others. This shall be documented using Performance Monitoring and Coaching Journal (Annexes F-H). The Offices shall also prepare Quarterly Accomplishment Reports to track and ensure timely completion and quality execution of deliverables. Accomplishments of employees related to the fulfilment of IPC commitments shall also be submitted on a quarterly basis. Attached as Annex I is the template for the Individual Accomplishment Report.

During the monitoring phase, performance checkpoints are conducted after the first semester to identify missed deliverables and re-plan activities to address the delay in the attainment of the commitments. These performance checkpoints are conducted at both Office and individual level. Attached as Annexes J-L are the templates for the Performance Checkpoint forms.

The use of gender-fair language shall also be used in all performance management tools and forms.

C. Phase 3: Performance Review and Evaluation

In this stage, accomplishments are assessed based on the attainment of the commitments identified during the planning process (Phase 1). Similar with performance planning and commitment, there are three levels of performance review and evaluation (PRE):

1) Department Level

The DSWD Strategic Plan shall be updated and enhanced based on the results of a mid-term review while assessment of annual targets shall be facilitated through the preparation of Semestral Assessment Reports.

2) Office Level

Performance review and evaluation at the Office level shall be conducted semi-annually through a performance assessment session which aim to determine the performance ratings of the DSWD Offices by assessing the Offices' performance and accomplishments vis-à-vis the physical and financial targets committed during the year. Attached as Annex M is the Office Performance Contract Review (OPCR) template.

The results of the Office performance assessment shall serve as the basis of assessing individual employees. As such, all individual performance ratings shall not go higher than the collective performance assessment of the Office.

Any issue/appeal/ protest on the Office assessment shall be articulated by the concerned Head of Office and decided upon during the performance assessment session, hence the final rating shall no longer be appealable/contestable once the session has been concluded.

2.1) Central Office – OBSs

For Central Office – OBSs, the performance assessment sessions shall be led by the respective Cluster Head with the draft OPCR form prepared by the Office to serve as the basis for the negotiation.

The CO-OBS, through the Director or Officer-in-Charge, shall present the accomplishments and proposed rating for each performance indicator. The ratings shall be negotiated with the Cluster Head who shall provide the final rating for each performance indicator. The resulting OPCR form from the session, agreed upon by the Cluster Head and Head of Office, shall contain the final Office performance rating.

Final OPCR performance ratings shall be consolidated to prepare the Summary of Office Performance Ratings (Annex N) of each cluster for onward submission to the PDPB within the prescribed period for review and validation.

2.2) Field Offices

For Field Offices, the performance assessment sessions shall be led by a panel composed of designated members of the Performance Management Team (PMT) with the assistance of the OPC Secretariat.

As pre-work, the FOs shall submit proposed self-ratings for each performance indicator following the criteria stipulated in the approved Rating Guide. These self-ratings together with the proposed ratings provided by the CO-OBSs shall be consolidated into comparative rating matrices which shall serve as the basis for the negotiation. Attached as Annex O is the Template for the Comparative Rating Matrix.

Only ratings for performance indicators not agreed upon by the FO and the CO-OBSs (as indicated in the comparative rating matrix) shall be deliberated upon. The FO, through the Regional Director or the Officer-in-Charge, shall present the accomplishments and proposed ratings for each performance indicator. These ratings shall be negotiated with the concerned OBS, and deliberated upon by the Panel who shall provide the final rating for each indicator. The resulting OPCR form from the session, agreed upon by the panel and Head of Office, shall contain the final Office performance rating.

2.3) Divisions

At the Division level, the Division Chief shall prepare their respective Division Performance Contract and Review (DPCR) within the prescribed performance assessment timeline. Attached as Annex P is the DPCR template. The Head of the Office shall conduct a performance assessment

session for each Division for the purpose of discussing the Division's accomplishments and determining the final Division performance ratings.

Final DPCR ratings shall be consolidated to prepare the Office's Summary of Division Performance Ratings (Annex Q) for onward submission to the PDPB within the prescribed period for review and validation.

3) Individual Level

The immediate supervisor or Division Chief shall assess individual employee performance based on the commitments made at the beginning of the rating period. Attached as Annex R is the Individual Performance Contract Review (IPCR) template. The performance rating shall be based on records of accomplishments such that rating for planned and/or intervening task shall always be supported by reports, documentation or any outputs as proof of actual performance. In the absence of said bases or proofs, a particular task shall not be rated and shall be disregarded. It is also expected that the immediate supervisor keeps documents and evidence on the kind of outputs of individual employees which shall be used as bases for employee assessment.

Employee's assessment shall be discussed by the supervisor or Division Chief with the concerned ratee prior to the endorsement of the IPCR to the Head of Office who shall determine the final performance ratings of the employees based on proof of performance. The Head of Office may adopt appropriate mechanisms to assist him/her in ensuring fairness and transparency in gauging performance level of individuals, such as but not limited to peer ranking and client feedback.

Final IPCR ratings shall be consolidated to prepare the Summary of Individual Performance Ratings (Annex S) for onward submission to the HRDS within the prescribed period for review and validation.

At both the Office and individual level, a five-point rating scale—5 being the highest 1 the lowest—shall be used to determine the performance ratings. The final performance assessment ratings shall correspond to the adjectival description of Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Poor:

Rating		Description
Numerical	Adjectival	
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. Employee achievement

		and contributions to the organization are marked excellence.
4	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeded expectations. All goals, objectives and targets were achieved above the established standards.
3	Satisfactory	Performance met expectations in terms of quality of work, efficiency and timeliness. The most critical annual goals were met.
2	Unsatisfactory	Performance failed to meet expectations, and/or one or more of the most critical goals were met.
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.

Specific criteria to determine the rating of each performance indicator in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness is indicated in Annex T.

D. Phase 4: Performance Rewarding and Development Planning

Part of the individual employee's evaluation is the competency assessment vis-a-vis the competency requirements of the job. The result of the assessment shall be discussed by the Heads 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 gaps and the opportunities to address these gaps, career path 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 by the Head of Office and supervisors in coordination with the HRDS mindful of the employee's individual circumstances, enabling him/her to contribute more fully in achieving and accounting for office/agency performance results.

An Individual Development Plan (Annex U) to improve or correct performance of employees with Unsatisfactory or Poor performance ratings must be outlined, including timeliness, and monitored to measure the progress.

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

- 1) Heads of Offices in identifying and providing the kinds of interventions needed, based on the developmental needs identified;

- 2) HRDS in consolidating and coordinating developmental interventions that will form part of the HR Plan and the basis for rewards and incentives;
- 3) Office PRAISE Committee in identifying potential PRAISE Award nominees for various awards categories; and,
- 4) PMT in determining top performers of the Agency who qualify for awards and incentives.

VI. TIMELINES

The DSWD SPMS cycle shall follow the timeline listed in the table below.

Activity	Timeline
Performance Planning and Commitment	
Development of the Annual Plan	Every 20 th August of the year prior to the plan year
Crafting of the Office and Division Performance Contracts	Every November of the year prior to the plan year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office: 10th November • Division: 20th November
Crafting of the Individual Performance Contracts	Every 10 th December of the year prior to the plan year:
Performance Monitoring and Coaching	
Preparation of Individual Quarterly Accomplishment Reports	Every 5 th of the 1 st month of the succeeding quarter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q1: April of the plan year • Q2: July of the plan year • Q3: October of the plan year • Q4: January of the year after the plan year
Preparation of Division Quarterly Accomplishment Reports	Every 10 th of the 1 st month of the succeeding quarter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q1: April of the plan year • Q2: July of the plan year • Q3: October of the plan year • Q4: January of the year after the plan year
Preparation of Office Quarterly Accomplishment Reports	Every 20 th of the 1 st month of the succeeding quarter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q1: April of the plan year • Q2: July of the plan year • Q3: October of the plan year • Q4: January of the year after the plan year
Conduct of Performance Checkpoint	Every 1 st -3 rd week of July of the plan year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office: 1st-3rd week of July • Division: 25th July • Individual: 30th July

Performance Review and Evaluation	
Conduct of Performance Assessment Sessions for Offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Semester: Every 1st-3rd week of July of the plan year • 2nd Semester: Every 1st-3rd week of February of the year after the plan year
Conduct of Performance Assessment for Individual Employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Semester: Every 3rd-4th week of July of the Plan Year • 2nd Semester: Every 3rd-4th week of February of the Year After the Plan Year
Performance Rewards and Development Planning	
Crafting of the Individual Development Plan	Every 10 th December of the year prior to the plan year

VII. APPEALS

- 1) Office performance ratings as discussed in the performance assessment sessions shall be final and not appealable. Any issue/appeal on the initial performance assessment of an Office shall be discussed and decided during the sessions.
- 2) Individual employees who are 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 rating from the Head of Office. An Office or individual employee, however, shall not be allowed to protest the performance ratings of other Offices or co-employees.
- 3) The PMT shall decide on the appeals within one month from receipt.

Appeals lodged at any PMT shall follow the hierarchical jurisdiction of various PMTs in the Department. For example, the decision of the Regional PMT appealable to the National/Central Office PMT.

The decision of the PMT at the Central Office may be appealed to the Secretary.

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

VIII. SANCTIONS

Unless justified and accepted by the PMT, non-submission of the Office Performance Contract Review forms to the PMT, and the Individual Performance Contract and Review forms to the HRDS within the specified dates shall be a ground for:

- 1) Employees' disqualification for performance-based personnel actions which would require the rating 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.

- 2) An administrative sanction for violation of reasonable office rules and regulations for the delay or non-submission of the office and individual performance commitment and review report.
- 3) Failure on the part of the Division Chief/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 an administrative offense for neglect of duty (CSC MC 6, s. 2012 – Part 3, II, c).

IX. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

A. SPMS Champion - DSWD Secretary

Functions and Responsibilities:

- Directs/oversees the formulation, establishment and implementation of the SPMS;
- Sets agency performance goals/objectives and performance measures;
- Determine agency target setting period;
- Assesses performance of offices; and
- Approves office performance commitment and rating.

B. DSWD Performance Management Team (PMT)

The DSWD PMT shall be composed of:

Chairperson	Undersecretary of the General Administration and Support Services Group (GASSG) and the Policy and Plans Group (PPG) shall act as Chairperson and Vice Chairperson on an alternating basis every two (2) years.
Vice Chairperson	
Members	All Members of the Executive Committee (EXECOM)
	Director, Policy Development and Planning Bureau (PDPB)
	Director, Human Resource Development Bureau (HRDS)
	Director, Social Welfare Institutional Development Bureau (SWIDB)
	Director, Financial Management Service (FMS)
	Regional Program Manager
	President of the Social Welfare Employees Association of the Philippines (SWEAP) or the accredited employees' association.

Functions and Responsibilities:

Oversee tasks related to the effective implementation of the DSPMS, specifically:

- Take the lead in defining and reviewing the agency's long-term goals, medium term plans and other performance frameworks and systems used that will define organizational outcomes, performance indicators and strategic initiatives;
- Ensure the implementation of a results-based DSWD SPMS that is anchored on the agency's mandate and Strategic Plan;
- Ensure translation, alignment and cascading of organizational commitments to the different levels in the agency;
- Develop an internal performance-based incentive scheme which will reward exemplary employees/officials and well performing DSWD units both at the CO and FO level;
- Propose a synchronized calendar for DSPMS activities, in consultation with various OBSUs and FOs; and
- Act as a body to discuss and resolve performance management-related issues as well as issues on operational policies, guides, protocols to ensure that the DSWD SPMS meets its objectives.

There will be a separate issuance, a DSWD Special Order, on the creation of the PMT. As far as practicable, the membership of the PMT shall consider equal representation of women and men.

C. Regional Performance Management Team (RPMT)

Chairperson	Assistant Regional Director (designated by Regional Director)
Vice-Chairperson	Division Chief or Highest Officer of the General Administration and Support Services Division
Members	Division Chief/Highest Officer of Policy and Plans Division or Planning Unit
	Division Chief/Highest Officer of Human Resource Division/Unit
	Division Chief/Highest Officer of Financial Management Division/Unit
	Division Chief/Highest Officer of Social Welfare Institutional Development Division/Unit
	Representative, Employees Union

Functions and Responsibilities:

- Ensure that office performance targets and measures, as well as the budget are aligned with those of the agency and that work distribution of Office is rationalized;
- Conduct consultation meetings to discuss performance commitments and targets;
- Act as appeals body and arbiter for performance management issues;
- Identifies potential top performers and provide inputs to PRAISE Committee for the grant of awards and incentives;

- Bring to the attention of the PMT at the Central Office any observation or concern that requires clarification or may have an impact on existing PMS policies, protocols and standards and;
- Adopt its own internal rules, procedures and strategies in carrying out the above responsibilities including schedule of meetings and deliberations, and delegation of authority to representatives in case of absence of its members.

Each DSWD Field Office shall prepare a separate issuance, a Regional Special Order, on the creation of the RPMT. As far as practicable, the membership of the RPMT shall consider equal representation of women and men.

D. Secretariat

The Policy Development and Planning Bureau (PDPB) and Human Resource Development Service (HRDS) shall constitute the Central Office (CO) Secretariat.

All Field Offices (FOs) shall constitute their own Secretariat to be composed of the Planning Division/Unit and Human Resource Division/Unit.

Functions and Responsibilities:

D.1. Planning Bureau/Division/Section

The PDPB shall be responsible for leading and overseeing the implementation of the DSWD SPMS at the organizational (all of agency) and Office level. The PDPB and its FO counterpart shall perform the following:

- Assist in the formulation of Department Strategic Plans and conduct of its review as necessary;
- In coordination with the FMS, assist OBS in defining short term (annual) goals/outputs by organizing consultation meetings (e.g. work and financial planning) of all OBS to discuss performance targets for the coming year. Ideally, this is to coincide with the annual Work and Financial Plan;
- Monitor and report status of accomplishments of the Department to the Secretary, EXECOM and as required by pertinent oversight agencies;
- Ensure that OBS' performance targets, measures, and budget are aligned with those of the Department and that work distribution among OBS are rationalized;
- Guide HOBS and provide technical assistance to FOs in the preparation of the OPCs and OPCR forms;
- Provide technical and secretariat services during the conduct of Office Performance Checkpoint and Office Performance Assessment sessions of both CO-OBSs and FOs as needed;

- Organize an annual agency performance planning and review conference to discuss results of the office performance assessments in the preceding performance period and use these as input to the performance planning for the current rating period; and
- Issue directives, guides or protocols to facilitate the implementation of the DSWD SPMS.

D.2. Human Resource Development Service/Division/Section

The HRDS shall be responsible for leading and overseeing the implementation of the DSPMS at the individual (employees) level. The HRDS and its FO counterpart shall perform the following:

- Provide assistance and issue reminders in the preparation of IPC and IPCR forms including the computation of scores/performance ratings and the accomplishment of other related forms;
- Review/Validate the computation of Individual Performance rating;
- Prepare appropriate reports relative to the implementation of the DSPMS at the Individual level and submit to appropriate authorities;
- Analyze performance of officials and personnel and assist the supervisor in identifying areas of competence, improvement, and gaps and recommend possible interventions to leverage and manage these. As far as practicable, an analysis of such performance trends shall be borne out of a sex-disaggregated database and shall progressively consider gender-related information and possible emerging gender and other related issues which may be addressed by the agency;
- Collect, organize and maintain files or records of performance ratings of officials and employees;
- Coordinate with the Career Executive Service Board (CESB) to comply with the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES) of Officials and other concerned individuals in accordance with pertinent CESB rules and regulations; and
- Coordinate with the CSC as needed to ensure proper and effective implementation of the DSWD SPMS.

E. Heads of Office including the Cluster Heads or Equivalent

- Assume primary responsibility for performance management in his/her Office;
- Conduct planning sessions with the supervisors and staff to agree on the outputs that should be accomplished based on goals/objectives of the organization;
- Prepare and submit accomplished OPC and OPCR Forms to the PDPB;
- Submit quarterly accomplishment reports;
- Conduct initial performance assessment of Office performance using the approved OPCR Form;
- Review and concur/approve IPC and IPCR Forms of employees;

- Inform employees (in writing) of their final ratings in coordination with immediate supervisor and identify necessary interventions for employees based on the assessment of developmental needs;
- Recommends and discuss a developmental plan with the subordinates who obtain Unsatisfactory performance during the rating period not later than one 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.
- Provides preliminary rating to subordinate showing Poor performance not earlier than three (3) months after the rating period. A developmental plan shall be discussed with the concerned subordinate and issue a written notice that failure to improve their performance shall warrant their separation from the service.
- Identify potential top performers and provide inputs to the PRAISE Committee for grant of awards and incentives;
- Designate an Office PMS focal person for matters involving the implementation of the DSWD SPMS;
- As needed, provide inputs (e.g. records, reports, data) to the Rater to support the accomplishment claimed by an Office, Bureau or Service in the Department;
- Upon request of a Rater, participate as resource person in the performance assessment exercise of an Office, Bureau or Service.

F. Division Chiefs or Equivalent

- Assume joint responsibility with HOBS in ensuring attainment of performance objectives and targets;
- Rationalize distribution of targets/tasks among subordinates in the Division;
- Monitor the performance of subordinates and provide support/assistance through coaching in order to meet performance targets;
- Evaluate employees' performance/accomplishments;
- Recommend developmental intervention/s if needed and provide support/guide the employee during its implementation; and
- Provide feedback with regard to the implementation of the DSWD SPMS and recommendations to improve it.

G. PMS Focal Persons

Each OBS and FO shall assign one (1) Focal Person and (1) Alternate Focal Person to jointly perform the following functions:

- Attend meetings and other activities related to DSWD SPMS implementation, review and enhancement;

- Re-echo instructions, requirements, plans and agreements in the PMS-related meetings and activities within his/her OBS/FO;
- Administer to Raters the PMS forms and ensure completion of these requirements;
- Act as secretariat on the OBS's Performance Review and Evaluation; and
- Assist the Head of Office in the submission of performance documents, i.e., O/D/IPC's and O/D/IPCR's to PDPB, HRDS and their FO counterparts.

H. Individual Employees

- Act as partner of management and their co-employees in meeting organizational performance goals by delivering expected outputs in the context of assigned roles and Terms of Reference (TOR);
- Accomplish and all required performance management forms;
- Cooperate and participate in activities or programs that will enhance ability to perform assigned job; and
- Provide feedback on the implementation of the DSWD SPMS and recommendations to improve it.

X. EFFECTIVITY AND REPEALING CLAUSE


This Order shall take effect immediately upon signing and shall supersede, amend or modify other pertinent provisions of Department orders, issuances and circulars inconsistent herewith.

Copies of this Order shall be disseminated to all the OBS at the Central Office and Field Offices. Any issues not covered in this guideline shall be raised to the PMT for resolution.


Issued in Quezon City, this 8th day of MAY 2018.


EMMANUEL A. LEYCO
 DSWD Officer-in-Charge

Certify True Copy:


MYRNA H. REYES
 OIC, Division Chief
 Records and Archives Mgt. Division

DSWD STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CYCLE



Department of Social Welfare and Development

OFFICE PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

FY _____

(OFFICE)

FIRST SEMESTER				
KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ALLOTTED BUDGET (in Php)	ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER (Divisions, Units, Individuals)
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation			
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>				
<i>Core Functions</i>				
<i>Support Functions</i>				
	100%			

Department of Social Welfare and Development
HARMONIZED OFFICE PERFORMANCE CONTRACT
DSWD FIELD OFFICES

RATING GUIDE
 FY _____

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	DESCRIPTION AND RATING CRITERIA			ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER
		Quantity	Quality	Timeliness	

Prepared by: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Recommending Approval: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Approved by: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

DIVISION PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

FY _____

(OFFICE)

(DIVISION)

FIRST SEMESTER				
KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ALLOTTED BUDGET (in Php)	ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER (Units, Individuals)
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation			
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>				
<i>Core Functions</i>				
<i>Support Functions</i>				
	100%			

SECOND SEMESTER				
KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ALLOTTED BUDGET (in Php)	ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER (Units, Individuals)
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation			
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>				
<i>Core Functions</i>				
<i>Support Functions</i>				
	100%			

I, _____, Head of the _____ commit to deliver and agree to be rated on the attainment of these targets in accordance with the indicated criteria for the period of January to December 20_____.

Head of Division

Date

Approved by: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

FY _____

Name of Ratee:	
Position:	
Designation (if applicable):	
Office:	

FIRST SEMESTER		
KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation	
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>		
<i>Core Functions</i>		
<i>Support Functions</i>		
	100%	

SECOND SEMESTER		
KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation	
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>		
<i>Core Functions</i>		
<i>Support Functions</i>		
	100%	

I, _____, commit to deliver and agree to be rated on the attainment of these targets in accordance with the indicated criteria for the period of January to December 20_____.

Ratee

Date

Recommending Approval: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

Approved by: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

ANNEX F

Performance Monitoring and Coaching Journal

	1 st	Q U A R T E R
	2 nd	
	3 rd	
	4 th	

Name of Division: _____

Head of the Division: _____

Number of Personnel in the Division: _____

Activity	Mechanisms			Remarks	
	Meeting		Memo		Others (Pls. Specify)
	One-on-One	Group			
Monitoring					
Coaching					

Please indicate the date in the appropriate box when the monitoring was conducted.

Conducted by:	Date:	Noted by:	Date:
Immediate Supervisor		Head of Office	

Department of Social Welfare and Development

**Performance Monitoring and Coaching
(Tracking Tool for Monitoring Assignments Template)**

Performance Monitoring Form						
TASK ID No.	Subject	Action Officer	Output	Date Assigned	Date Accomplished	Remarks
<i>Document No. or Task No. if Taken from WFP</i>	<i>Subject Area of the Task or the Signatory of the Document and Subject Area</i>			<i>Date the task was assigned to the drafted</i>	<i>Date the output was approved by the approver</i>	

Department of Social Welfare and Development

INDIVIDUAL ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT
FY _____, _____ QUARTER

KEY RESULTS AREA	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ACCOMPLISHMENTS
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>		
<i>Core Functions</i>		
<i>Support Functions</i>		

Prepared by: _____
Position:
Date:

Recommending
Approval: _____
Position:
Date:

Approved by: _____
Position:
Date:

Department of Social Welfare and Development

OFFICE PERFORMANCE CHECKPOINT

FY _____

(OFFICE)

ORIGINAL PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Based from Approved OPC)	PROPOSED AMENDMENT	JUSTIFICATION	REMARKS OF RATER	ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER
#			<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:	
##			<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:	
###			<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:	

Prepared by: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

Recommending Approval: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

Approved by: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

DIVISION PERFORMANCE CHECKPOINT

FY _____

(OFFICE)

(DIVISION)

	ORIGINAL PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Based from Approved DPC)	PROPOSED AMENDMENT	JUSTIFICATION	REMARKS OF RATER	ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER
#				<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:	
##				<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:	
###				<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:	

Prepared by: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Approved by: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE CHECKPOINT
FY _____

Name of Ratee:		
Position:		
Designation (if applicable):		
Office:		

ORIGINAL PERFORMANCE INDICATOR (Based from Approved IPC)	PROPOSED AMENDMENT	JUSTIFICATION	REMARKS OF RATER
#			<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:
##			<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:
###			<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved Remarks:

Prepared by: _____
Position: _____

Date: _____

Recommending Approval: _____
Position: _____

Date: _____

Approved by: _____
Position: _____

Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

OFFICE PERFORMANCE CONTRACT REVIEW

FY _____, _____ SEMESTER

(OFFICE)

KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Quantity, Quality Timeliness)	RATING				REMARKS
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation			Qn	QI	T	Ave	
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>								
<i>Core Functions</i>								
<i>Support Functions</i>								
	100%							
				FINAL RATING				
				ADJECTIVAL RATING				

Prepared by: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Recommending
 Approval: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Approved by: _____
 Position: _____

Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development
SUMMARY OF OFFICE PERFORMANCE RATINGS
FY _____, FIRST SEMESTER
(CLUSTER)

OFFICE	RATING	
	Numerical	Adjectival
(Office 1)		
(Office 2)		
(Office 3)		
...		
AVERAGE		

Prepared by: _____
 Position: _____
 Date: _____

Approved by: _____
 Position: _____
 Date: _____

SUMMARY OF OFFICE PERFORMANCE RATINGS
FY _____, SECOND SEMESTER
(CLUSTER)

OFFICE	NUMERICAL RATING			ADJECTIVAL RATING
	FIRST SEMESTER	SECOND SEMESTER	ANNUAL <i>(Average of 1st & 2nd Sem. rating)</i>	
(Office 1)				
(Office 2)				
(Office 3)				
...				
AVERAGE				

Prepared by: _____
 Position: _____
 Date: _____

Approved by: _____
 Position: _____
 Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

OFFICE PERFORMANCE CONTRACT REVIEW
COMPARATIVE RATING MATRIX

FY _____, _____ SEMESTER

(OFFICE)

KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Quantity, Quality Timeliness)	SELF-RATING				OBS-RATING				ACCOUNTABLE OBS	REMARKS
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation			Qn	QI	T	Ave	Qn	QI	T	Ave		
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>													
<i>Core Functions</i>													
<i>Support Functions</i>													
	100%												
FINAL RATING													
ADJECTIVAL RATING													

Prepared by: _____	Date: _____
Position: _____	
Recommending Approval: _____	Date: _____
Position: _____	
Approved by: _____	Date: _____
Position: _____	

Department of Social Welfare and Development

DIVISION PERFORMANCE CONTRACT REVIEW

FY _____, _____ SEMESTER

(OFFICE)

(DIVISION)

KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Quantity, Quality Timeliness)	RATING					REMARKS
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation			Qn	QI	T	Ave	Weighted Average	
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>									
<i>Core Functions</i>									
<i>Support Functions</i>									
	100%								
FINAL RATING									
ADJECTIVAL RATING									

Prepared by: _____	Date: _____
Position: _____	
Approved by: _____	Date: _____
Position: _____	

Department of Social Welfare and Development
SUMMARY OF DIVISION PERFORMANCE RATINGS
 FY _____, FIRST SEMESTER
 (OFFICE)

DIVISION	RATING	
	Numerical	Adjectival
(Division 1)		
(Division 2)		
(Division 3)		
...		
AVERAGE		

Prepared by: _____
 Position:
 Date:

Approved by: _____
 Position:
 Date:

SUMMARY OF DIVISION PERFORMANCE RATINGS
 FY _____, SECOND SEMESTER
 (OFFICE)

DIVISION	NUMERICAL RATING			ADJECTIVAL RATING
	FIRST SEMESTER	SECOND SEMESTER	ANNUAL <i>(Average of 1st & 2nd Sem. Rating)</i>	
(Division 1)				
(Division 2)				
(Division 3)				
...				
AVERAGE				

Prepared by: _____
 Position:
 Date:

Approved by: _____
 Position:
 Date:

Department of Social Welfare and Development
 INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE CONTRACT REVIEW
 FY _____, _____ SEMESTER

Name of Ratee:	
Position:	
Designation (if applicable):	
Office:	

KEY RESULTS AREA		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Quantity, Quality, Timeliness)	ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Quantity, Quality Timeliness)	RATING					REMARKS
Objective, Program, Project, Activity	Weight Allocation			Qn	QI	T	Ave	Weighted Average	
<i>Strategic Priorities</i>									
<i>Core Functions</i>									
<i>Support Functions</i>									
	100%								
FINAL RATING									
ADJECTIVAL RATING									

Prepared by: _____	Date: _____
Recommending Approval: Position: _____	Date: _____
Approved by: Position: _____	Date: _____

Department of Social Welfare and Development

SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS
FY _____, FIRST SEMESTER

(OFFICE)

DIVISION A	RATING	
	Numerical	Adjectival
(Employee 1)		
(Employee 2)		
(Employee 3)		
...		
AVERAGE		

DIVISION B	RATING	
	Numerical	Adjectival
(Employee 1)		
(Employee 2)		
(Employee 3)		
...		
AVERAGE		

DIVISION C	RATING	
	Numerical	Adjectival
(Employee 1)		
(Employee 2)		
(Employee 3)		
...		
AVERAGE		

Prepared by:
Position:
Date:

Approved by:
Position:
Date:

SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS
FY _____, SECOND SEMESTER

(OFFICE)

DIVISION A	NUMERICAL RATING			ADJECTIVAL RATING
	FIRST SEMESTER	SECOND SEMESTER	ANNUAL <i>(Average of 1st & 2nd Sem. Rating)</i>	
(Employee 1)				
(Employee 2)				
(Employee 3)				
...				
AVERAGE				

DIVISION B	NUMERICAL RATING			ADJECTIVAL RATING
	FIRST SEMESTER	SECOND SEMESTER	ANNUAL <i>(Average of 1st & 2nd Sem. Rating)</i>	
(Employee 1)				
(Employee 2)				
(Employee 3)				
...				
AVERAGE				

DIVISION C	NUMERICAL RATING			ADJECTIVAL RATING
	FIRST SEMESTER	SECOND SEMESTER	ANNUAL <i>(Average of 1st & 2nd Sem. Rating)</i>	
(Employee 1)				
(Employee 2)				
(Employee 3)				
...				
AVERAGE				

Prepared by: _____
 Position: _____
 Date: _____

Approved by: _____
 Position: _____
 Date: _____

DSWD STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT RATING CRITERIA

A. QUANTITY

Numerical Rating	Fixed Targets/As Need Arises (ANA) Quantity	Non-Fixed Targets or Quota-Based Quantity
5	100% accomplished	130% accomplished and above
4	76-99% accomplished	115-129% accomplished
3	51-75% accomplished	100-114% accomplished
2	26-50% accomplished	51-99% accomplished
1	25% and below accomplished	50% and below accomplished

B. QUALITY

Numerical Rating	Percentage	Adjectival Rating	Indicators
5	(130% and Above)	Outstanding	Key result/Performance is exceptional and extends beyond the assignment. Output is considered a model for excellence
4	(115-129%)	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeds the standards/expectations and extends beyond the assignment.
3	(100-114%)	Satisfactory	Performance fully met the required standards/expectations in all areas.
2	(51-99%)	Unsatisfactory	Performance does not consistently meet expectations/targets. Output needs improvement. Only a few critical goals met and would require close supervision by direct supervisor in the next rating period.
1	(50% - below)	Poor	Performance was consistently below expectations, and/or unjustifiable. Progress toward critical goals were not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas.

Since quality measures are nuanced in nature, the rating guide provided is in general terms, and rating scales for the quality of specific indicators may be adopted. The specific rating scale used for indicators must be agreed upon by both rater and ratee, and must be indicated in the OPC/IPC.

C. TIMELINESS

Numerical Rating	Performance Percentage	Indicators
5	130% and above	Task completed within the first 30% or more of the time before the deadline or scheduled time of completion; Task completed ahead of the planned time by 30% for non-routine duty.
4	115 – 129%	Task completed in 15% to 29% of the time before the deadline or scheduled time of completion; Task completed ahead of the planned time by 15% to 29% for non-routine duty.
3	100 – 114%	Task completed on the deadline or up to 14% of the time completion; Task completed on deadline planned time or earlier but not more than 14% of the planned time for non-routine duty.
2	51 – 99%	Task completed in 51 % to 99% of the time after the deadline or scheduled time completion. Task completed after the deadline or planned time by 51% to 99%.
1	50% and below	Task not accomplished at all or completed 50% or more of the time after the deadline or scheduled date of completion; Task not completed after the deadline or planned time by 50% or more for non-routine duty.

Rating Scale for Time with Voluminous Outputs

Numerical Rating	Indicators
5	130% accomplished and above on time
4	115-129% accomplished on time
3	100-114% accomplished on time
2	51-99% accomplished on time
1	50% and below accomplished on time

Department of Social Welfare and Development

INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FY _____

Name of Ratee:	
Position:	
Designation (if applicable):	
Office:	

Aim:	
-------------	--

JOB REQUIREMENTS						
	Current Status	Target Status	Proposed Interventions to be Undertaken	Target Date	Results of Target	Remarks/ Next Steps
Education:						
Training:						
Eligibility:						
Experience:						

CORE LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT COMPETENCIES						
	Current Competency Level	Target Competency Level	Proposed Interventions to be Undertaken	Target Date	Results of Target	Remarks/ Next Steps
Competencies:						

FUNCTIONAL TASKS						
	Current Competency Level	Target Level of Accomplishment	Proposed Interventions to be Undertaken	Target Date	Results of Target	Remarks/ Next Steps
Functional Tasks (IPCR-based):						

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____
Position: _____

Recommending
Approval: _____ Date: _____
Position: _____

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
Position: _____