Performance Appraisal Policy

CONTENTS

- Objective

- Scope

- Period of assessment and performance index

- Performance appraisal scoring system report

- Components of assessment

- Computation of academic performance indicator

- Implementation of the system

- Conclusion

I. OBJECTIVE:

It is proposed to introduce a transparent Faculty Performance Appraisal and Development System (FPADS) for members of faculty against established Institute criteria and in accordance with the mission and goals of the department and college, starting from the academic year 2017-18. The objective of this scheme is to motivate each member of faculty to perform better and better in delivering quality education and research. An essential part of IES College of Engineering's professional development framework is the Faculty Self-Appraisal. This document functions as a thorough tool intended to support a critical assessment of a faculty member's administrative, research, and academic accomplishments across the course of several academic years.

The results of this assessment shall be used for the following purposes:

(i) Award of annual increment in the pay scale.

(ii) Rewards in recognition of superior performance.

(iii) Monitoring and recording the regular growth of each member of faculty for ready reference.

(iv) Identifying training, development and career needs and ensuring that individual contribution is valued and recognized.

II. Scope:

The appraisal process will apply to all Faculties who have successfully completed their probationary period.

III. PERIOD OF ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE INDEX

Assessment shall be carried out every academic year preferably in the month of April. The overall performance of a Faculty during an academic year is reflected through a single index termed as "**A**cademic **P**erformance **I**ndicator (**API**)" which is based on the following ratings:

Outstanding: If the score is > 91
Very Good: If the score is between 81 to 90
Good: If the score is between 61 to 80
Satisfactory: If the score is between 51 to 60
Scope for improvement: If the score is <50

IV. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORING SYSTEM REPORT

To facilitate performance assessment, a well-structured Performance and Potential Assessment Form is provided to every faculty Member for self-evaluation (copy enclosed). The report comprises three parts.

Part A: Academic Performance Assessment

Part B: Assessment by HOD for Staff / Assessment by Principal for HOD

V. COMPONENTS OF ASSESSMENT

Phase 1: Faculty Self-Assessment (Part A)

The method starts with each faculty member recording their performance on a total of 100 marks across a number of important variables.

- General & Academic Profile: Faculty members share their personal information and educational background. Three points are awarded for enrolling in or continuing to work toward a Ph.D.

- Experience Documentation:
  - Academic Experience: Scored based on tenure, ranging from 2 marks (under 5 years) up to 5 marks (over 15 years).
  - Industrial Experience: Any relevant industry tenure earns 2 marks.

- Teaching & Results:
  - Workload: Detailing courses taught, including extra hours and morning/evening duties (up to 8 marks).
  - Innovations: Contributions to teaching-learning methodologies earn 3 marks.
  - University Results: A significant weight of 25 marks is assigned based on the pass percentages of the last four course results.

- Professional & Research Growth:
  - Development: Attending (min. four) or organizing (min. two) programmes like FDPs, workshops, or seminars earn 5 marks each.
  - Research: Marks are awarded for journal publications (UGC CARE/Scopus/SCI), conference papers, and patents/copyrights.
  - Student Projects: Includes students project supervision (3 marks) and mentoring activities (5 marks).

- Institutional Contribution: Documenting extension work, professional body memberships, and department responsibilities (e.g., Class Advisor, Lab Incharge).

- o Contributions toward accreditation (NAAC/NBA) and duties in sports, arts, or tech fests.
- o Submission: The faculty member signs the report and includes suggestions for institutional improvement before submitting it to the Head of Department (HOD).

Phase 2: Departmental Review (Part B)

Once submitted, the HOD evaluates the faculty member's qualitative performance.

- Attribute Assessment: The HOD rates the faculty on 10 specific attributes, including:
  - o Knowledge in the sphere of work and quality of output.

  - o Communication skills, initiative, and adaptability.
  - o Ability to inspire/motivate and supervisory skills.
  - o Interpersonal relations, integrity, and general conduct.

- Final Scoring: The HOD calculates the Total Marks (Out of 100), adds specific comments, and signs the document.

Phase 3: Administrative & Management Verification

The completed report moves from the department to the central administration for final oversight.

1. Principal Review: The HOD forwards the report to the Principal for review and signature.
2. Management Verification: The document is then moved to the management level.
3. Final Approval: The President and General Secretary perform the final verification and sign off on the appraisal for official record-keeping.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SYSTEM

The Performance Appraisal Scoring System is processed every year when all the required information is available. Every member of faculty will have to fill up the Faculty Performance Appraisal Form and submit to the Head of the Department on or before the last day announced. While filling up the form, the faculty member shall give all the details pertaining to the activities and achievements and enclose copies of document in support of the claim. The faculty members shall also compute and present the Academic Performance Indicator (API) which quantifies the overall performance of the member during the period.

The Head of the Department shall verify all the statements made by the faculty member, by checking the enclosed documents and the API computed by the member. The FPADS Report shall be forwarded by the HOD to the Principal and he/she shall review the FPADS Reports received and finalize the API's of the various members of faculty.

If the performance of the faculty meets the target fixed by institute, they are recommended for awards/rewards. Further, the head of the institution recommends for special increment to the management. They will be Motivated for their new initiatives. Teaching faculty, who has scored less than 60% in the faculty appraisal evaluation form, will be counselled by the HOD and the Principal for their improvement in performance in the next Academic year. They will be given suggestions for their improvement. Their performance will be monitored periodically by the HOD and the Principal.

VII. CONCLUSION

This Performance and Potential Assessment system gives an opportunity to every faculty Member to know their strength and weakness. The triumph of this evaluation process is the development of the institution along with self-growth of every faculty member. The proposed Performance Appraisal system may be reviewed periodically for possible improvement.

Encl: A copy of "Faculty Performance Appraisal Form".