



| | | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Memorandum Circular | GUIDELINES ON THE RANKING AND RATING OF PERSONNEL FOR THE PERFORMANCE-BASED BONUS OF CY2021 (PBB2021) | DATE: |
| Number: MC-2021-010 | | 30 September 2021 |
| | | Page: 1 of 16 pages |

1. REFERENCES

- 1.1. GCG MC 2021-02 Good Governance Conditions (GCGs) and Other Conditions and Requirements (OCRs) for the Grant of Interim Performance Based Bonus (PBB)
- 1.2. AO 25 MC No. 2021-01 Guidelines on the Grant of the PBB for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 under Executive Order (EO) 80 s 2012 and EO 201 s 2016
- 1.3. Presidential Decree No.205: DAP Charter;
- 1.4. COA Circular No.97-002 Rules and Regulations on the Granting, Utilization, and Liquidation of Cash Advances
- 1.5. GCG MC No.2019-02: Interim PBB;
- 1.6. Executive Order 80 s. 2012 Directing the Adoption of a Performance Based Incentive System for Government Employees
- 1.7. Exec Order No.77 dated March 15, 2019 Prescribing Rules and Regulations and Rates of Expenses and Allowances for Official Local and Foreign Travels of Government Personnel

2. RATIONALE AND AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITIES

- 2.1. Pursuant to GCG MC No.2019-02 (Interim PBB), Section 4 (Eligibility of a GOCC to Grant the PBB), "*The grant of PBB shall be based on the overall GOCC performance, and then distributed to individual Officers and Employees based on their performance ranking.*" In order to be eligible to grant the PBB to its qualified Officers and Employees, the GOCC must:
 - 2.1.1. Achieve a weighted-average score of at **least 90%** in its Performance Scorecard;
 - 2.1.2. Satisfy 100% of the Good Governance Conditions (GCGs)
 - 2.1.2.1. Conditions Specific to GOCCs:
 - 2.1.2.1.1. The GOCC has satisfied all statutory liabilities, including:
 - 2.1.2.1.1.1. Payment of all taxes due to the Government as certified/validated by the Bureau of Internal Revenue;
 - 2.1.2.1.1.2. Declaration and payment of all dividends to the State as of the end of the applicable calendar year, whenever applicable, as certified/validated by the Department of Finance (DOF);
 - 2.1.2.1.1.3. Payment of NG Advances as certified/validated by the DOF; and;

2.1.2.1.4. Remittance of mandatory contributions as certified/validated by the following agencies: GSIS or SSS, Pag-IBIG, and PhilHealth.

2.1.2.1.2 Maintain/update and implement the GOCC's "*Manual of Corporate Governance*" and "*No Gift Policy*" approved by the GCG and uploaded on the GOCC's website pursuant to the "*Code of Corporate Governance for GOCCs*" and amendments thereto;

2.1.2.1.3 Compliance with all the requirements mentioned in the "*Revised Whistleblowing Policy for the GOCC Sector*" and amendments thereto;

2.1.2.1.4 Compliance with the Executive Order on Freedom of Information: Executive Order No. 2, s.2016 as certified/validated by the Presidential Communications Operations Office (PCOO);

2.1.2.1.5 Compliance with posting on the GOCC's website the information enumerated under Section 43 of the "*Code of Corporate Governance for GOCCs*" and amendments thereto; and,

2.1.2.1.6 Compliance with the applicable financial reporting framework (e.g. PFRS, PPSAS) as certified/validated by the Commission on Audit (COA).

2.1.2.2 Non-compliance with any of the GGCs will render the entire GOCC ineligible for the PBB.

2.1.3. Comply with Other Conditions and Requirements (OCRs):

2.1.3.1 Maintain and/or attain certification on the GOCC's Quality Management System (QMS) or its equivalent certification;

2.1.3.2 Timely submission and posting of Annual Procurement Plans (APP) and results of the Agency Procurement Compliance and Performance Indicator (APCPI) system pursuant to applicable rules and regulations;

2.1.3.3 Timely submission of Corporate Operating Budgets (COBs) to the Department of Budget and Management (DBM);

2.1.3.4 Submission to the GCG of audit observations and notices of disallowances within seven (7) working days from the time it was received from the COA, all written communications between the GOCC and COA on such matters, which shall include, but not limited to, the concrete and time bound actions plans for addressing the audit observations and notices of disallowances;

2.1.3.5 Compliance and submission of reports through the Integrated Corporate Reporting System (ICRS) pursuant to the policies and guidelines under "*Policies and Guidelines on the Integrated Corporate Reporting System (ICRS) for the GOCC Sector*" and amendments thereto;

2.1.3.6 Compliance by all Appointive Directors of the Governing Board with the submission of all required forms for the Director Performance Review (DPR) pursuant to the "*Performance Evaluation for Directors (PED)*" and amendments thereto;

2.1.3.7 Timely submission of the year-end financial statements and other related financial reports to the COA; and,

2.1.3.8 Other conditions common to National Government Agencies and GOCCs as stated in the applicable AO 25 IATF PBB Circular, including but not limited to:

2.1.3.8.1 Updating of Transparency Seal (TS);

2.1.3.8.2 Updating of Citizen's or Service Charter;

2.1.3.8.3 PhilGEPS posting of all invitations to bid and awarded contracts;

2.1.3.8.4 Implementation of the prior year's audit recommendations; and,

2.1.3.8.5 Undertaking of early procurement activities.

2.1.3.9 Officials and employees responsible for the compliance and implementation of the OCRs, shall not be entitled to the PBB for the applicable year if the GOCC fails to comply with any of these requirements.

2.2 Further, Section 6.2.1. (Rates of PBB) of GCG MC No.2019-02, stipulate that the rate of incentives shall be a *"multiple of the individual's monthly basic salary (MBS) as of 31 December of the applicable year, based on the table below, but not lower than P5,000."*

| Table 01: PERCENTILE of CLUSTER POPULATION | PBB as % of MBS |
|---|------------------------|
| • TOP: Maximum 10% | 65% |
| • NEXT: Maximum 25% | 57.5% |
| • REMAINING: Minimum 65% | 50% |

3 COVERAGE:

This Memorandum Circular covers the officers and employees of the DAP's Groups, Centers, Departments, Divisions, and Offices holding plantilla positions. Excluded from the coverage herein are individuals engaged without employer-employee relationship or the Non-Plantilla Personnel.

4 ELIGIBILITY of INDIVIDUAL OFFICERS and EMPLOYEES

In conformance with GCG MC No. 2019-02, *"all Officers and Employees of GOCCs who occupy regular, casual or contractual positions with employer-employee relationship shall be entitled to full grant of the PBB from their employer at the time of the release of the PBB; Provided, they have rendered an aggregate of at least nine (9) months of service in the public sector for the applicable PBB year. Officers and Employees who do not meet the 9-month service requirement but have served at least 3 months of service shall be entitled to PBB on a pro-rata basis."*

4.1 Employees belonging to the First, Second, Third and Fourth Levels should receive a rating of at least "Satisfactory" based on the agency's SPMS;

4.2 Personnel on detail to another government agency for six (6) months or more shall be included in the ranking of employees in the recipient agency that rated his/her performance. Payment of the PBB shall come from the mother agency;

4.3 Personnel who transferred from one government agency to another agency shall be rated and ranked by the agency where he/she served the longest. If equal months were served for each agency, he/she will be included in the recipient agency;

4.4 Officials and employees who transferred from government agencies that are non-participating in the implementation of the PBB, shall be rated by the agency where he/she served the longest; the official/employee shall be eligible for the grant of PBB on a pro-rata basis corresponding to the actual length of service to the participating implementing agency, as stated in Section 5.1.6 of GCG MC No.2019-02;

4.5 An official or employee who has rendered a minimum of nine (9) months of service during the fiscal year and with at least a "Satisfactory" rating is eligible to the full grant of the PBB;

4.6 An employee who rendered a minimum of three (3) months but less than nine (9) months of service and with at least a "Satisfactory" rating shall be eligible for the grant of the PBB on a pro-rata basis corresponding to the actual length of service rendered, as follows:

| Table 02: Length of Service for the Year | % of PBB |
|---|-----------------|
| • 8 months but less than 9 months | 90% |
| • 7 months but less than 8 months | 80% |
| • 6 months but less than 7 months | 70% |
| • 5 months but less than 6 months | 60% |
| • 4 months but less than 5 months | 50% |
| • 3 months but less than 4 months | 40% |

4.7 An employee, who is on vacation or sick leave with or without pay, for the entire applicable year, is not eligible to the grant of the PBB;

4.8 Personnel found guilty of administrative and/or criminal cases in the applicable year by formal and executory judgment shall not be entitled to the PBB. If the penalty meted out is only a reprimand, such penalty shall not cause the disqualification to the PBB;

4.9 Officials and employees who failed to submit the latest Statement of Assets, Liabilities, and Net Worth (SALN) as prescribed under applicable CSC rules; or those who are responsible for the non-compliance with the establishment and conduct of the review and compliance procedure of SALN, shall not be entitled to the PBB of the applicable year;

4.10 Officials and employees who failed to liquidate all Cash Advances received in the applicable year within the reglementary/prescribed period, as stated in relevant and prevailing COA Circulars, shall not be entitled to the PBB for the same year;

4.11 Officials and employees who failed to submit their complete SPMS Forms, or its equivalent, shall not be entitled to the PBB of the applicable year;

4.12 Officials and employees responsible for the implementation of the prior year's audit recommendations, QMS certification, or posting and dissemination of the agency's system of performance ranking, shall not be entitled to the FY2021 PBB if the agency fails to comply with any of these requirements;

4.13 Any person who was charged with any **administrative case** and has not been resolved in compliance to 2017 Rules on Administrative Cases in Civil Service (2017 RACCS), or with an appointment that has been recalled by Civil Service Commission (CSC) shall be included in the determination of the amount due him/her but shall not be released up until the case has been resolved in favor of the person. The resolution of any case that will be decided against or not in favor of the concerned person shall be forfeited. The allotment for the person/s shall revert to the Academy's corporate funds.

5 EXCLUSIONS:

Excluded from the grant of the PBB are those hired without employer-employee relationships, or paid from non-Personnel Services budgets as follows:

- 5.1 Consultants and experts hired to perform specific activities or services with expected outputs;
- 5.2 Laborers hired through job contracts (pakyaw) and those paid on a piecework basis;
- 5.3 Student laborers and apprentices; and,
- 5.4 Individuals and groups of people whose services are engaged through job orders, contracts of service, or others similarly situated.

6 GROUPING OF PERSONNEL:

In determining the distribution of the PBB among qualified DAP officers and employees, all eligible employees are subdivided into the following grouping of personnel in compliance with GCG MC 2019-02:

- 6.1 **SENIOR MANAGEMENT <All bonafide and designated Senior Vice Presidents including the designated Dean>**. This refers to the executive officers of the Academy, who are primarily involved in the development, evolution, and approval of long-term vision across a function or area of specialization, who lead the development of function strategy, implement and maintain policies of the organization for their area of responsibility.

The DAP President & CEO has the prerogative to avail of either the Performance-based Incentive (PBI) under the applicable MC on the PBI, or the PBB but not both. If the CEO is included in the PBB application, he/she must meet the eligibility requirements for the PBI and shall be ranked separately on his/her own and shall not be included in the ~~forced~~ ranking of Officers and Employees.

- 6.2 **MIDDLE MANAGEMENT <All designated Vice-Presidents and Managing**

Directors of Centers > This covers those whose work is primarily achieved through others, with direct accountability for setting direction and deploying resources. They are responsible for people management including performance evaluation and pay reviews, and typically hire/fire decisions. This includes individual contributors who are recognized as subject matter experts with in-depth technical knowledge, project management, and significant influence skills in the area of expertise.

6.3 PROFESSIONAL/SUPERVISORY/TECHNICAL <All designated Directors, Managers, and Technical Staff> This level comprises the personnel whose work is primarily achieved by an individual or through project teams. It requires the application of expertise in professional or technical area(s) to achieve results. Individuals grouped in this level typically have a university degree or equivalent work experience that provides knowledge and exposure to fundamental theories, principles, and concepts. This level includes Office Directors, Managers, Supervisors, and Junior Management who were assigned to exercise management authority over particular undertakings of the Academy.

6.4 CLERICAL AND GENERAL STAFF <REST OF THE STAFF> This category includes all clerical, administrative, and secretariat staff with little or no supervisory responsibility but who contribute independently to the organization. This also covers basic computing/data processing staff such as operators, customer service assistants, and skilled craftsmen/technicians.

7 RATING and RANKING PERFORMANCE of SENIOR MANAGEMENT

For purposes of ranking, all qualified personnel shall be awarded points on a scale of “1” to “10” in accordance with predetermined formulas, tables, and weights appropriate to their levels.

7.1 SENIOR MANAGEMENT. The following designated group heads are considered as “Senior Managers” of the Academy:

7.1.3 The Senior Vice President of the Program Operations Group;

7.1.4 The Senior Vice President of the Services Group;

7.1.5 The Dean of the Graduate School of Public & Development Management; and,

7.1.6 The Vice President of the Corporate Concerns Center.

The DAP President & CEO has the prerogative to avail of either the Performance-based Incentive (PBI) under the applicable MC on the PBI, or the PBB but not both.

7.2 The group heads shall be awarded points based on three (3) dimensions:

| Table 03: Dimensions for designated Senior Management officers | | Weight |
|---|---|---------------|
| A. | Accomplishment of Group Scorecard/ Office Performance Commitment Report (OPCR) <i>(excluding the Financial Perspective)</i> | 50% |
| B. | Financial Performance | 20% |

| Table 03: Dimensions for designated Senior Management officers | | Weight |
|---|---|---------------|
| C. | Impact of Group Performance to DAP Performance <i>(rated by the DAP President & CEO)</i> | 30% |
| Total | | 100% |

7.3 Calculating Individual Points for Senior Management

7.3.3.1 **DIMENSION A:** ACCOMPLISHMENT OF NON-FINANCIAL TARGETS ON GROUP SCORECARD / OPCR (50%).

This dimension recognizes the Senior Manager's achievement of planned targets. The score will be based on the achievement of targets of the Group's validated accomplishments for the subject year, based on their Scorecard.

Assigning of point for the Group Accomplishment shall be based on the Group's accomplishment of their non-financial targets as reflected in their Scorecard, as indicated in the following matrix:

| Table 04: %ACCOMPLISHMENT ON GROUP SCORECARD (AS CALCULATED BY CCC-COSM) | EQUIVALENT POINTS |
|---|--------------------------|
| a) 130% and above | 10 |
| b) 115%-129% | 8 |
| c) 90%-114% | 6 |
| d) 51%-89% | 4 |
| e) 25%-50% | 2 |
| f) Below 25% | 0 |

7.3.2 **DIMENSION B:** - FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE (20%).

Calculating the Financial Performance of Revenue Groups.

The Financial Performance dimension recognizes the Senior Manager's contribution to the Academy's bottom line. Performance is determined by taking the ratio of a Group's Revenues less Project-related Expenses to the DAP-wide values for the same. The formula, called Net Income Efficiency Ratio (NIER) is defined as follows:

$$\text{NIER}_{Grp} = 100 \times \frac{[A]_{Grp} \text{ minus } [B]_{Grp}}{[C]_{DAP} \text{ minus } [D]_{DAP}}$$

where:

NIER_{Grp} = computed Financial Score to a Revenue Group

100 x = a multiplier to convert the measure into %

[A]_{Grp} = (Total Accrued Revenues of the Revenue Group)

[B]_{Grp} = (Project Related Expenses of the Revenue Group)

[C]_{DAP} = (Total Accrued Revenues of DAP for the Year)

$$[D]_{DAP} = (\text{Total Project Expenses of All Revenue Groups})$$

NOTE: DATA USED IN THE FORMULA IS DERIVED FROM AUDITED FINANCIAL REPORTS OF THE SUBJECT YEAR.

Calculating the Financial Performance of Support Offices

For Support Offices (non-revenue), the applicable formula is **Savings Efficiency Ratio (SER)** as follows:

$$SER_{Grp} = 100 \times \frac{[E]_{Grp} \text{ minus } [F]_{Grp}}{[G]_{DAP} \text{ minus } [H]_{DAP}}$$

where:

SER_{Grp} = Financial Score assigned to a Support Group

100 x = a multiplier to convert the measure into %

[E]_{Grp} = (Total Budget Approved for the Support Group)

[F]_{Grp} = (Project Related Expenses of the Support Group)

[G]_{DAP} = (Total Approved Budget for All of the Support Groups)

[H]_{DAP} = (Total Project Expenses of All Support Groups)

NOTE: DATA USED IN THE FORMULA IS DERIVED FROM AUDITED FINANCIAL REPORTS OF THE SUBJECT YEAR.

7.3.3 ASSIGNMENT OF POINTS FOR GROUP FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

| Table 05: NIER or SER Share of Group | Point |
|--------------------------------------|-------|
| ✓ Above 30% | 10 |
| ✓ Above 25% to 30% | 9 |
| ✓ Above 20% to 25% | 8 |
| ✓ Above 15% to 20% | 7 |
| ✓ Above 10% to 15% | 6 |
| ✓ Above 0 to 10% | 5 |
| ✓ (Negative) | 0 |

7.3.4 **DIMENSION C: IMPACT OF GROUP PERFORMANCE ON DAP PERFORMANCE (30%).** This dimension recognizes the leadership of the Senior Manager in the development of innovations and their critical contribution to overall government reforms and performance. The rating is done by the DAP President & CEO using a scale of 1-10, where “10” is considered as an outstanding impact & significance and “1” is poor or undesirable impact and significance:

Scoring Group Head's Impact will be based on the following matrix:

| Table 06: Description of Performance <as rated by the President & CEO> | SPMS score | Equivalent Point |
|---|---------------|------------------|
| ✓ Outstanding | 5 | 8.00 - 10.0 |

| Table 06: Description of Performance <as rated by the President & CEO> | SPMS score | Equivalent Point |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| ✓ Very Satisfactory | 4 | 6.00 – 7.99 |
| ✓ Satisfactory | 3 | 4.00 – 5.99 |
| ✓ Unsatisfactory | 2 | 2.00 – 3.99 |
| ✓ Poor/Undesirable | 1 | 0.0 – 1.99 |

7.3.5 CALCULATING EARNED WEIGHTED POINTS FOR GROUP HEADS

| Table 07: Dimensions for SENIOR MANAGEMENT CLUSTER | Earned SCORE | Weight | Earned Weighted Points |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| a) Accomplishment of Group Scorecard <i>(excluding the Financial Perspective)</i> | J | 50% | 0.50* J |
| b) Financial Performance | K | 20% | 0.20* K |
| c) Impact of Group Performance to DAP Performance <i>(rated by President & CEO)</i> | L | 30% | 0.30* L |
| Group Head's Individual Score = (0.5J+0.2K+0.3L) | | | |

7.3.6 ASSIGNING GROUP PERFORMANCE POINTS FOR THE PERSONNEL CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE MIDDLE MANAGEMENT, THE PROFESSIONAL & SUPERVISORY, AND THE CLERICAL & GENERAL STAFFS. In recognition of the contributions made by individuals *(below the senior managers, as defined in this MC)*, the Senior Manager's earned points shall be cascaded as a component of the point that the Middle Management (Dept/Center Heads), the Professional & Supervisors, as well as the Clerical & General Staff earned.

7.3.7 The ranking of Group Heads is given the following equivalent points.

| Table 08: Group Head's (<i>Senior Management cluster</i>) Ranking | Group Perf Points |
|--|------------------------------|
| ✓ Top (10%) | 10 |
| ✓ Next (25%) | 8 |
| ✓ Remaining (65%) | 6 |

8 RATING and RANKING PERFORMANCE of MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

For purposes of ranking, all qualified personnel shall be awarded points on a scale of "1" to "10" in accordance with predetermined formulas, tables, and weights appropriate to their levels.

8.1 MIDDLE MANAGERS. The following designated officers are considered as "Middle Managers" of the Academy:

- 8.1.1** Managing Director of IMC, under group "Corporate"
- 8.1.2** Managing Director of COD, under group "Corporate"
- 8.1.3** Vice President/Managing Director of PDC, under group "Programs"
- 8.1.4** Vice President/Managing Director of CFG, under group "Programs"

- 8.1.5 Managing Director of PMDP, under group “Programs ”
- 8.1.6 Managing Director of DSM, under group “Programs”
- 8.1.7 Vice President/Managing Director of DAPCC, under group “Services”
- 8.1.8 Vice President/Managing Director of Admin Dept, under group “Services”
- 8.1.9 Managing Director of HRMDD Dept, under group “Services”
- 8.1.10 Managing Director of Finance Dept, under group “Services”

8.2 Ranking of Middle Managers shall be based on the four (4) dimensions with the following weights:

| Table 09: Dimensions for designated Middle Management cluster | | Weight |
|--|---|---------------|
| a) | Accomplishment of Center Scorecard <i>(excluding the Financial Perspective)</i> | 25% |
| b) | Financial Contribution to Academy Performance | 15% |
| c) | Impact of Center Performance to Group Performance <i>(rated by Group Head)</i> | 35% |
| d) | Group Performance Points <i>(the final points earned by the Group Head)</i> | 25% |
| Total = | | 100% |

8.2.1 Calculating Individual Points for Middle Managers:

8.2.1.1 DIMENSION A: - ACCOMPLISHMENT OF CENTER SCORECARD /DPCR (25%). This dimension recognizes the Middle Manager’s stewardship of their Center’s resources to achieve planned targets. Data is based on the Center’s validated of accomplishments for the subject year, based on their Scorecard.

| Table 10: %ACCOMPLISHMENT OF CENTER/DEPARTMENT SCORECARD FOR MIDDLE MANAGEMENT CLUSTER <AS CALCULATED BY COSM> | EQUIVALENT POINTS |
|---|--------------------------|
| ✓ 130% and above | 10 |
| ✓ 115%-129% | 8 |
| ✓ 90%-114% | 6 |
| ✓ 51%-89% | 4 |
| ✓ 25%-50% | 2 |
| ✓ Below 25% | 0 |

8.2.1.2 DIMENSION B: - FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE (15%). The Financial Performance Dimension of Revenue Centers recognizes the Center’s financial contribution to overall DAP financial performance. Data is provided by the Finance Department. Scores are calculated as follows:

8.2.1.3 Calculating the Financial Performance of Revenue Units. The Financial Performance Dimension recognizes the Middle Manager’s contribution to the

Academy's bottom line. Performance is determined by taking the ratio of a Center's Revenues less Project-related Expenses to DAP-wide values of all revenue centers. The formula, called Net Income Efficiency Ratio (NIER) is defined as follows:

$$\text{NIER}_{ctr} = 100 \times \frac{[\text{J}]_{ctr} \text{ minus } [\text{K}]_{ctr}}{([\text{L}] \text{ minus } [\text{M}]_{all\ Ctrs})}$$

where:

NIER_{ctr} = Financial Score assigned to a Revenue Center

100 x = a multiplier to convert the measure into %

[J]_{ctr} = (Total Accrued Revenues of the Revenue Center)

[K]_{ctr} = (Project Related Expenses of the Revenue Center)

[L] = (Total Accrued Revenues of All Revenue Centers for the Year)

[M] = (Total Project Expenses of All Revenue Centers)

NOTE: DATA USED IN THE FORMULA IS DERIVED FROM AUDITED FINANCIAL REPORTS OF THE SUBJECT YEAR.

8.2.1.4 Calculating the Financial Performance of non-revenue units

For support offices (non-revenue), which are the next sub-units of a group, the applicable formula is **Savings Efficiency Ratio (SER)** defined as follows:

$$\text{SER}_{ctr} = 100 \times \frac{[\text{N}]_{ctr} \text{ minus } [\text{O}]_{ctr}}{([\text{P}] \text{ minus } [\text{Q}]_{DAPwide})}$$

where:

SER_{ctr} = computed Financial Ratio assigned to a sub-unit of a Support Group

100 x = a multiplier to convert the measure into %

[N]_{ctr} = Total Budget Approved for a sub-unit of a Support Group

[O]_{ctr} = Project Related Expenses of the sub-unit of a Support Group

[P]_{dap} = Total Approved Budget for the Year for All sub-units of All Support Group

[Q]_{dap} = Total Project Expenses of All sub-units of All Support Group

NOTE: DATA USED IN THE FORMULA IS DERIVED FROM AUDITED FINANCIAL

 REPORTS OF THE SUBJECT YEAR.

8.2.1.5 Assignment of Points for Center / Dept Financial Performance

| Table 11: NIER or SER ratio of the Center /Department for Middle Management cluster | Equivalent Point |
|--|-------------------------|
| ✓ Above 30% | 10 |
| ✓ 25.01% to 30% | 9 |
| ✓ 20.01% to 25% | 8 |
| ✓ 15.01% to 20% | 7 |
| ✓ 10.01% to 15% | 6 |
| ✓ 0 to 10% | 5 |
| ✓ (Negative) | 0 |

8.2.1.6 DIMENSION C. - Impact of Center Performance on Group Performance (35%). This dimension recognizes the strategic significance of the Center /Dept's projects and accomplishments to the overall impact of Group performance. The "impact" is based on a rating done by the Group Head of the Middle Manager. When a one to five-point scale is used, the highest performance score "5" is set to an equivalent of "10" points. Any "impact-score" shall be multiplied by 2 to convert the rating to an equivalent 10-point system.

Scoring the impact of the Center / Department head will be done by the respective Group Heads based on the following matrix:

| Table 12: Description of Impact of Performance for Middle Managers <rated by the Group Head> | Group Head Rating | Earned Weighted Point |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| ✓ Outstanding | 5 | 10.0 |
| ✓ Very Satisfactory | 4 | 8.0 |
| ✓ Satisfactory | 3 | 6.0 |
| ✓ Unsatisfactory | 2 | 4.0 |
| ✓ Poor | 1 | 2.0 |

8.2.1.7 DIMENSION D. – CENTER / DEPT PERFORMANCE POINTS (25%). As presented earlier, the rating scheme recognizes that Center Heads (*as well as the staffs in general*) are the key contributors to group results. The Group Performance Points as earlier described is given as the input to arrive at the weighted score for this dimension.

8.2.1.8 Calculating Individual Points of Middle Managers

| Table 13: Dimensions for Middle Managers | Perf SCORE | Weight | Earned Weighted Points |
|--|-------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| A. Accomplishment of Center Department's Scorecard <i>(excluding the Financial Perspective)</i> | R | 25% | 0.25*R |
| B. Financial Performance | S | 15% | 0.15*S |
| C. Impact of Center Performance to Group Performance <i>(rated by the Group Head)</i> | T | 35% | 0.35*T |
| D. Group Performance Point <i>(based on Table 08: Group Head's <Senior Management cluster> Ranking)</i> | U | 25% | 0.25*U |
| <i>Earned Weighted Points (EWP) = (0.25R+0.15S+0.35T+0.25U)</i> | | | |
| NOTE: Use of EWP of Middle Managers. The Individual Score of the Center/Dept Head shall be equivalent to the Center/Dept's performance-points that will be cascaded to the "Professional/Technical Staff" as well as to the "Clerical & General Staff". | | | |

9 RATING and RANKING PERFORMANCE of PROFESSIONAL, SUPERVISORY & TECHNICAL (PST)

For purposes of ranking, all qualified personnel shall be awarded points on a scale of "1" to "10" in accordance with predetermined formulas, tables, and weights appropriate to their levels.

9.1 PROFESSIONAL, SUPERVISORY, AND TECHNICAL STAFF. COVERAGE: DESIGNATED DIRECTORS, MANAGERS, AND TECHNICAL STAFF:

| Table 14: Dimensions <for Professional/Supervisory/Technical personnel> | Weight |
|---|---------------|
| a) Individual Performance and Commitment Report (IPCR) <i><as validated by the Group Head></i> | 50% |
| b) Center/Department Performance Points <i><based on the points per Table 13: Dimensions for Middle Managers></i> | 30% |
| c) Group Performance Point <i>(based on Table 08: Group Head's <Senior Management cluster> Ranking)</i> | 20% |
| total | 100% |

9.2 CALCULATING INDIVIDUAL POINTS FOR DESIGNATED DIRECTORS, MANAGERS, TECHNICAL STAFF:

9.2.1 DIMENSION A – IMPACT OF IPCR TO CENTER SCORECARD (50%). This dimension recognizes the individual performance of the overall center /department /program's performance. The individual performance commitment rating (IPCR) submitted by group heads is converted to a 10-point system. When a one to five-point scale is used, the highest performance score "5" is set to an equivalent of "10" points. Any IPCR-score shall be multiplied by 2 to convert the IPCR-score to an equivalent 10-point system.

| Table 15: Description of Performance of Professional/Supervisory/Technical personnel | IPCR score | Earned Weighted Point |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------|
| ✓ Outstanding | 5 | 10.00 |
| ✓ Very Satisfactory | 4 | 8.00 |
| ✓ Satisfactory | 3 | 6.00 |
| ✓ Unsatisfactory | 2 | 4.00 |

9.2.2 DIMENSION B. - CENTER/DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE POINTS (30%). As presented earlier, the rating scheme recognizes the staff as the key contributors to the department/center's accomplishments. The center/department performance points, as earlier described, is considered as the input to arrive at the weighted score for this dimension.

9.2.3 DIMENSION C. - GROUP SCORECARD PERFORMANCE POINTS (20%). The rating scheme recognizes that Professional, Supervisory, and Technical Staff are the key contributors to the group's performance /results. The group performance points, as earlier described, shall be considered as an additional input to arrive at the weighted score for the entitled Professional /Supervisory /Technical personnel.

9.2.4 THE FINAL EARNED WEIGHTED POINTS (EWP). - for Professional, Supervisory, and Technical staff's EWP is computed as follows:

| Table 16: Dimensions for Professional / Supervisory /Technical personnel | SCORE | Weight | Earned Weighted Points |
|---|--------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| a) Individual Performance and Commitment Report (IPCR) <i><validated by the Group Head></i> | V | 50% | 0.5*V |
| b) Center/Department Performance Points <i><based on the points per Table 13: Dimensions for Middle Managers></i> | W | 30% | 0.3*W |
| c) Group Performance Point <i>(based on Table 08: Group Head's <Senior Management cluster> Ranking)</i> | X | 20% | 0.2*X |
| Professional/Supervisory/Technical personnel's Individual Score = (0.5V+0.3W+0.2X) | | | |

10 RATING and RANKING PERFORMANCE OF CLERICAL & GENERAL STAFF

For purposes of ranking, all qualified personnel shall be awarded points on a scale of "1" to "10" in accordance with predetermined formulas, tables, and weights appropriate to their levels.

10.1 CLERICAL AND GENERAL STAFF (CGS). Coverage: Rest of the

Staff

| Table 17: Dimensions <for Clerical & General Staffs> | | Weight |
|---|--|---------------|
| a) | Individual Performance and Commitment Report (IPCR) <i><as validated by the Group Head></i> | 50% |
| b) | Center/Department Performance Points <i><based on the points per Table 13: Dimensions for Middle Managers></i> | 30% |
| c) | Group Performance Point <i>(based on Table 08: Group Head's <Senior Management cluster> Ranking)</i> | 20% |
| total | | 100% |

10.2 CALCULATING INDIVIDUAL POINTS FOR THE CLERICAL AND GENERAL STAFF (CGS).

10.2.1 DIMENSION A – IMPACT OF IPCR TO CENTER SCORECARD (50%). This dimension recognizes the individual performance of the overall center /department /program's performance. The individual performance commitment rating (IPCR) submitted by center/dept heads is converted to a 10-point system. When a one to five-point scale is used, the highest performance score "5" is set to an equivalent of "10" points. Any ICPR-score shall be multiplied by 2 to convert the IPCR-score to an equivalent 10-point system.

| Table 18: Description of Performance of Clerical & General Staff | IPCR score | Earned Weighted Point |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------|
| ✓ Outstanding | 5 | 10.00 |
| ✓ Very Satisfactory | 4 | 8.00 |
| ✓ Satisfactory | 3 | 6.00 |
| ✓ Unsatisfactory | 2 | 4.00 |
| ✓ Poor | 1 | 2.00 |

10.2.2 DIMENSION B. -CENTER / DEPT / PROGRAM PERFORMANCE POINTS (30%). As presented earlier, the rating scheme recognizes the staff as the key contributors to the department/center/programs' accomplishments. The center/department/program performance points, as earlier described, is considered as the input to arrive at the weighted score for this dimension.

10.2.3 DIMENSION C. -GROUP SCORECARD PERFORMANCE POINTS (20%). The rating scheme recognizes that Clerical & General Staff are contributors to the group's performance results. The group performance point, as earlier described, is considered as an additional input to arrive at the weighted score for the entitled personnel categorized as Clerical & General Staff.

10.2.4 The **EARNED WEIGHTED SCORE (EWP)** for the Clerical and General Staff's Individual Score is computed as follows:

| Table 19: Dimensions for Clerical & General Staffs | | SCORE | Weight | Earned Weighted Point |
|--|--|-----------|--------|-----------------------|
| a) | Individual Performance and Commitment Report (IPCR) <i><as validated by the Group Head></i> | AA | 50% | 0.5* AA |
| b) | Center/Department Performance Points <i><based on the points per Table 13: Dimensions for Middle Managers></i> | BB | 30% | 0.3* BB |
| c) | Group Performance Point <i>(based on Table 08: Group Head's <Senior Management cluster> Ranking)</i> | CC | 20% | 0.2* CC |
| Clerical & General Staff's Individual Score = (0.5AA+0.3BB+0.2CC) | | | | |

11 SUMMARY.

For the quick overview of determining the EWP of each individual, the differentiation of bases for ranking purposes are as follows:

| Performance Dimension | Table 20: Summary of Earned Weighted Points per PERSONNEL CLUSTER | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Senior Management. | Middle Management | Professional/ Supervisory/Tech | Clerical & General Staff |
| A | DAP Scorecard Group-level =50% | Unit Scorecard Center-level =25% | Individual Rating IPCR =50% | Individual Rating IPCR =50% |
| B | Group-level Financial Perf =20% | Center-level Financial Contrib =15% | NONE | NONE |
| C | Impact as rated by the Pres & CEO =30% | Impact as rated by the Group Head =35% | Center Performance Point =30% | Center Performance Point =30% |
| D | NONE | Group Performance Point =25% | Group Performance Point =20% | Group Performance Point =20% |
| TOTAL POINTS: | 100% = 0.5A+0.2B+0.3C | 100% = .25A+.15B+.35C+.25D | 100% = .5A+.3C+.2D | 100% = .5A+.3C+.2D |

12 EFFECTIVITY.

This Memorandum Circular shall take effect immediately and shall remain in force unless modified or superseded by another issuance. All previous issuances inconsistent with the provisions of this Circular are hereby amended, repealed, and superseded.


Atty. ENGELBERT C. CARONAN, JR., MNSA
 President and Chief Executive Officer