Republic of the Philippines
CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE BOARD
No. 3 Marcelino Street, Holy Spirit Drive, Diliman, Quezon City 1127
Tel Nos. 951-4981 to 85 (Trunkline) / 951-3306 (Fax)
www.cesboard.gov.ph

GUIDELINES/ RULES AND REGULATIONS
OF THE CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM (CESPES)
X ---------- X

Resolution No. 661

WHEREAS, Presidential Decree No. 1, as amended, (Part III, Article IV, Sections 2 and 5) created the Career Executive Service Board (CESB) "to serve as the governing body of the Career Executive Service" and mandated it to "promulgate rules, standards and procedures on the selection, classification, compensation, and career development of members of the Career Executive Service";

WHEREAS, the Board, has adopted the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES) for all officials in the Career Executive Service (CES);

WHEREAS, there is a need to revise the existing rules, guidelines and procedures of the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES) to make it more responsive, meaningful, systematic, accountable and practicable, with the purpose of contributing to the fulfillment of the Board's mandate to form a continuing pool of well selected and development-oriented career administrators who shall provide competent and faithful service in the Career Executive Service (CES);

WHEREAS, a set of Guidelines/ Rules and Regulations for the CESPES shall greatly facilitate appreciation for the new instrument as well as allow for the smooth regular conduct of the CESPES;

WHEREFORE, foregoing premises considered, the Board **RESOLVES,** as it is **HEREBY RESOLVED,** to adopt the attached Guidelines/ Rules and Regulations on the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES);

APPROVED this 23rd day of January 2007 in Quezon City, Philippines.

Approved by:

signed
KARINA CONSTANTINO-DAVID
Chair

signed
BERNARDO P. ABESAMIS
Member

signed
MARIA PAZ W. FORONDA
Member

signed
ELMOR D. JURIDICO
Member

signed
ANTONIO D. KALAW JR.
Member

signed
ROLANDO L. METIN
Member

signed
JAIRUS D. PAGUNTALAN
Member

signed
CARINA S. VALERA
Member

Attested by:

signed
BETTINA MARGARITA L. VELASQUEZ
Acting Board Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GUIDELINES/ RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM (CESPES)

RULE I
Title

Section 1. Title. These rules shall be known and cited as "The Guidelines/ Rules and Regulations of the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES)".

RULE II
Purpose and Components of the CESPES

Section 1. Purpose. The CESPES results shall be used as bases for official personnel actions such as:

A. Original or promotional appointment to CESO ranks;

B. Grant of merit-based incentives, awards, and other forms of recognition;

C. Career planning and development; and

D. Accreditation and availment of incentives granted by the Civil Service Commission (CSC).

Section 2. Components. The CESPES shall have the following components:

A. Performance Contract

The Performance Contract measures and assesses the Ratee's performance on the basis of work target commitments established and actually accomplished and completed by the Ratee. These commitments are initially formalized by the Ratee through discussions and in agreement with a Superior Rater in the department/ agency. The Performance Contract is accomplished using the Performance Contract and Review Form (PC) to generate the PC Rating for the Ratee. The PC rating shall comprise eighty percent (80%) of the overall CESPES Rating of the Ratee.

The Ratee's commitments are the lists of milestones or resulting outputs intended to be accomplished by the Ratee within a given period of time. Milestones are specific, tangible and measurable outputs (e.g., policies, programs, projects, processes and procedures). They are formulated as statements of outputs which have already occurred or been accomplished for an envisaged target at a specified time. They are stated in terms of the following essential dimensions:

1. Time - answers the questions "when, how long, or how soon" the output will occur or be accomplished;

2. Quantity – answers the questions "how many or how much" of the output will occur or be accomplished;

3. Quality – answers the questions "how well; in what form/ manner" the output will occur or be accomplished;

4. Target Stakeholder Affected – answers the question "for whom; who will receive/ have access to; who will be influenced by" the output once it has occurred or been accomplished.

Milestones are categorized either as: 1) Leading and Innovating Milestones (LIM) or as 2) Regular/ Routine Milestones (RRM).

1. Leading and Innovating Milestones (LIM)

The LIM are outputs resulting from tasks/ functions under the Ratee's scope of responsibilities that the Ratee conceives, initiates and primarily undertakes in the department/ agency. LIM are usually purposive innovations and reforms which aim to improve the quality of the department/agency's structures, systems, operations and resources. They are "value added" measures which ultimately focus on enhancing organizational effectiveness. They are developed and completed within a given period of time – with a definite start and end. Once institutionalized – adopted, mainstreamed and sustained – in the work plan of the department/ agency, LIM are converted as Regular Routine Milestones.

2. Regular/ Routine Milestones (RRM)

The RRM are outputs resulting from the tasks/ functions within the accountability of and performed by the Ratee on a regular basis in the work setting. These tasks/ functions refer to the standard and prescribed technical and administrative work performed by the Ratee needed to conduct and sustain the day-to-day work operations in the department/ agency.

B. Behavioral Competence

Behavioral Competence refers to an assessment of the Ratee's executive leadership and managerial competence in the work setting. The assessment shall be determined from scores obtained from different sets of behavioral rating scales accomplished by the Ratee's Superiors and Subordinates. Behavioral Competence is measured using the Behavioral Competency Scale (BCS) to come up with the BC Rating of the Ratee. The BC Rating shall comprise twenty percent (20%) of the overall CESPES Rating of the Ratee. The scales are composed of positive and negative statements on various observable behaviors and attributes in the following dimensions. :

1. Creativity and Innovation – the ability to act as a creative resource for others by challenging the status quo, offering innovative approaches, and by promoting an environment conducive to creative and innovative thinking.

2. Critical and Systemic Thinking – the ability to demonstrate high cognitive capacity, quickly grasp and synthesize information, and to assess complex ideas and situations.

3. Environmental Acumen - the ability to understand and align the department/ agency's performance with the structures, functions and objectives of the government and the broader economic, political and administrative mechanisms in which it operates.

4. Honesty and Integrity - the ability to model the highest standards of personal and professional behavior, help in fostering a politically impartial and incorrupt public service, and to harmonize public responsibilities and good citizenship with management practices.

5. Judgment - the ability to gain a broad perspective from all available resources, develop a keen understanding of a situation, reach sound conclusions and decisions based on information gathered, and use intuition as well as common sense and logical analysis in generating and evaluating action plans.

6. Leadership - the ability to develop, communicate and pursue a clear, inspiring and relevant vision and direction that is linked to the overall government strategy. It is also the ability to: 1) act as a catalyst for organizational change by initiating strategies to meet the department/ agency's changing environment; and 2) use appropriate interpersonal styles to gain consensus and cooperation of various stakeholders within and outside the department/ agency to facilitate achievement of organizational goals.

C. Area(s) for Improvement

The Area(s) for Improvement is a feedback component of the CESPES. It identifies specific aspects of the Ratee's work performance which fall below the expected quality standards and which need to be improved through the conduct of purposive and appropriate education, training, or other capacity building interventions. The Area(s) for Improvement are discussed by the Rater in the Critical Incidents (CI) and Areas for Improvement (AI) Form and do not contribute to the Ratee's overall CESPES Rating.

D. Critical Incident(s)

The Critical Incident(s) is another feedback component of the CESPES. It is composed of one (1) or more significant anecdotes drawn by the Rater from the Ratee's actual work performance. These anecdotes must be based on incidents actually observed and validated by the Rater who cites and uses them as reference to justify the PC and BC ratings given to the Ratee. The Critical Incidents are discussed by the Rater in the Critical Incidents (CI) and Areas for Improvement (AI) Form and do not contribute to the Ratee's overall CESPES Rating. To ensure fair and fact-based discussion of the Critical Incidents, these anecdotes must be discussed in terms of the:

1. S (Situation) – serves the context for the Ratee's exercise of leadership and/ or management functions;

2. T (Task) – identified and expected to be performed by the Ratee in the aforementioned situation;

3. A (Action or Activity) - actually performed by the Ratee in response to the aforementioned situation;

4. R (Results) - referring to the output produced and the outcome (effect/ impact) caused by the action taken by the Ratee on relevant stakeholders.

E. Incentive Points (IP)

The IP are additional merit points accruing to the overall CESPES Rating of the Ratee. These points which are "earned" by the department/ agency are commensurate to the status of accreditation accorded to the department/ agency based on its overall performance in the CSC accreditation scheme as provided for in CSC Memorandum Circular No. 11, series of 2005. The scheme designed and implemented by the CSC accords different accreditation levels to a department/agency for a fixed period of time after the CSC assesses the extent of completion and the quality of implementation of the department/ agency's Performance Management System (PMS).

RULE III
Coverage and Rating Period

Section 1. Coverage. The CESPES shall cover all incumbents of CES positions in various departments and agencies of the national government, including government-owned and controlled corporations (GOCCs) with original charters, for an uninterrupted period of at least three (3) months. Division Chiefs and those occupying lower positions shall be covered by the CESPES provided they are:

A. Career Executive Service (CES) eligibles; Career Service Executive (CSE) eligibles or Career Executive Officer (CEO) eligibles; and,

B. Designated in an Acting or Officer-In-Charge (OIC) capacity.

Section 2. Ratee Information Sheet (RIS). The RIS is the complete, updated and officially certified list of all Raters (i.e., Superiors and Subordinates) who are qualified and designated to rate each individual Ratee's work performance in a given Rating Period. The RIS should be regularly updated by the CESPES Coordinator of the department/ agency. (Please see Annex – A).

The RIS shall be officially certified and submitted by the CESPES Coordinator on or before the fourth quarter of the Rating Period (i.e., October – December of the current year) in preparation for the Performance Rating in January of the following year.

No Ratee shall be allowed to undertake the CESPES without his/ her RIS submitted to and received by the Career Executive Service Board (CESB).

Section 3. Rating Period. The Rating Period, which refers to the twelve (12) - month year covering January to December, shall embody the time period during which the overall performance of the Ratee shall be the focus and subject of measurement and assessment.

Section 4. CESPES Forms. The CESPES shall be composed of the following instruments:

A. Performance Contract and Review Form (PC) (Please see Annex – B);

B. Supplemental Performance Contract Form (SCF) – to indicate any changes in the milestones and the corresponding weight allocation adjustments (Please see Annex – C);

C. Adjusted Performance Contract and Review Form (APC) – is a revised and updated PC reflecting all of the changes indicated in the SCF (Please see Annex – D);

D. Critical Incidents (CI) and Areas for Improvement (AI) Form (Please see Annex – E);

E. Behavioral Competency Scale (BCS) for Superior Raters (Please see Annex – Fa), and;

F. Behavioral Competency Scale (BCS) for Subordinate Raters (Please see Annex – Fb);.

The CESB shall provide the CESPES Coordinator with electronic copies of the said CESPES instruments. The CESPES Coordinator shall provide the Ratees with electronic or hard copies, as the case may be, of the PC, SCF, APC and the CI and AI Forms.

The CESPES Coordinator shall reproduce hard copies of the BCS for Superior and Subordinate Raters depending on the total number of Raters of all the Ratees in the department/ agency. The CESPES Coordinator shall assign a control number to each form and countersign the same. Each Rater in the department/ agency, whether Superior or Subordinate, shall be given only one (1) BCS form with the assigned control number. The CESPES Coordinator shall keep a record of the control number of the BCS form assigned to each Rater.

RULE IV
Frequency and Period of Conduct

Section 1. Frequency and Period of Conduct. The CESPES shall be implemented simultaneously to all covered departments/ agencies according to a schedule prepared by the CESB, on an annual basis, commencing in the month of January of the Rating

Period, and fully completed not later than the last working day of the month of April of the year succeeding the given Rating Period.

RULE V
The Roles and Responsibilities in the CESPES

Section 1. Administration. The CESB shall primarily administer the CESPES in coordination with the CESPES Coordinator.

Section 2. The CESPES Coordinator. The Human Resource Management and Development Director or the equivalent official heading the unit/ service administering and responsible for the CESPES in the department/ agency shall be designated as the CESPES Coordinator by the Department Secretary/ Head of the Agency concerned. The CESPES Coordinator shall lead all efforts in and be primarily responsible for preparing and capacitating the entire department/ agency in the installation, implementation, monitoring and maintenance of the CESPES.

Section 3. Roles of CES Officials. All CES officials covered by the CESPES shall strictly comply with and uphold all policies, rules, guidelines, standards, procedures and mechanisms of the CESPES.

RULE VI
The CESPES Performance Evaluation Cycle and Stages

Section 1. CESPES Performance Evaluation Cycle. The CESPES Performance Evaluation Cycle shall be composed of the following stages:

A. Performance Planning Stage

B. Performance Monitoring Stage

C. Performance Review and Feedback Stage

D. Performance Evaluation and Development Planning Stage

Subtitle I
Performance Planning Stage

Section 2. Performance Planning Stage. The Performance Planning Stage shall be undertaken as follows:

A. The Ratee and the Superior Rater shall meet anytime within the first quarter (January – March) of the Rating Period or within the first three (3) months of the assumption of office by the Ratee.

B. The Ratee shall discuss and come to an agreement with the Superior Rater on his/ her Leading and Innovating Milestones (LIM) and Regular/ Routine

Milestones (RRM). The LIM and RRM shall serve as work performance targets which the Ratee shall commit to accomplish.

C. Once discussed and mutually agreed upon by both the Ratee and the Superior Rater, the said LIMs and RRMs shall be posted by the Ratee under the column – "Milestones/ Performance Objectives" - in his/ her Performance Contract and Review Form (Refer to Annex - B) for the Rating Period concerned.

D. The Ratee shall also complete the "Weight Allocation" column of the PC after discussing and coming to an agreement with the Superior Rater on the specific percentage weight to be assigned to each milestone.

E. The CESB shall prescribe the allowable range of percentage weights which may be allocated to LIMs and RRMs for different positions/ levels in a department/ agency. A Department/ Agency shall determine and officially adopt a percentage weight allocation scheme based on the following ranges:

Kinds of Milestones	**Percentage Weight Allocations for Different Positions / Levels Prescribed by the CESB**	
	Director I to III	**Director IV to Undersecretary**
Leading and Innovating	30 – 50%	60 – 80%
Regular/ Routine	50 – 70%	20 – 40%
TOTAL	100%	100%

F. The Superior Rater shall affix his/ her signature first, followed by the Ratee, at the first "Concurrence" portion of the PC, and indicate the date of said action. The presence of both signatures indicates the conclusion of all discussions and the validation of all agreements made by both parties.

G. Upon completion of the agreements, the Ratee shall submit the PC to the CESPES Coordinator, who shall reproduce it and provide duplicate copies of the PC for the Ratee, Rater and for himself/ herself.

Subtitle II
Performance Monitoring Stage

Section 3. Performance Monitoring Stage. The Ratee and the Superior Rater shall meet during the Rating Period after the Performance Planning Stage to hold regular consultation meetings/ dialogues. These meetings shall have the objective of monitoring/ tracking the Ratee's performance; studying problems, issues and concerns affecting said performance; and enabling the Superior Rater to provide and discuss analysis, advice and other forms of assistance through coaching, mentoring and feedback.

Section 4. Use of the Supplemental Performance Contract Form (SCF). The use of the SCF shall be governed by the following rules:

A. Every time and at any given time within the Rating Period, when at least one (1) milestone/ performance objective for the Ratee has to be changed, deleted or added, the Supplemental Performance Contract Form (SCF) (Refer to Annex – C) shall be accomplished.

B. Revisions/ modifications and the corresponding changes/ adjustments in the percentage weight allocations shall be discussed and agreed upon by the Ratee and the Superior Rater in accomplishing the SCF, following all the procedures and guidelines provided in the Performance Planning Stage.

C. The SCF may be accomplished and completed by the Ratee and the Superior Rater within the given Rating Period at a frequency of not more once (1) every three (3) months and not later than the month of September of the Rating Period.

D. Every time that an SCF is accomplished, the Ratee shall submit the same to the CESPES Coordinator, who shall reproduce and provide duplicate copies for the Ratee, Rater and for himself/ herself.

Section 5. Use of the Adjusted Performance Contract and Review Form (APC). The use of the APC shall be governed by the following rules.

A. The Adjusted Performance Contract and Review Form (APC) (Refer to Annex – D) shall be completed in the same manner and process as the PC. Once completed and submitted, the APC shall be considered and used as the official replacement of the submitted PC.

B. The APC shall incorporate all changes to be indicated in the PC, based on all completed SCF(s), and those made after September of the Rating Period. The APC shall be submitted not later than the last month of the Rating Period (i.e., December), and shall follow the prescribed policies, rules and guidelines as provided in the Performance Planning Stage.

C. Upon completion of the APC, the Ratee shall submit the same to the CESPES Coordinator, who shall:

1. Check if the contents of the APC completely and accurately reflect all changes that must be indicated in the PC, based on all completed SCF(s) previously submitted by the Ratee; and countersign the APC if it is in order;

2. Reproduce and provide duplicate copies of the APC for the Ratee, Rater and for himself/ herself.

D. The APC, submitted to and received by the CESPES Coordinator, shall be considered as the basis of the performance review and feedback process for the Rating Period.

Subtitle III
Performance Review and Feedback Stage

Section 6. Completion of the PC or the APC. The completion of the PC or the APC shall be undertaken as follows:

A. The Ratee and the Superior Rater shall meet not later than January or the first month after the Rating Period. The objective of this meeting is to conduct the performance review and feedback.

B. The Ratee and the Superior Rater shall discuss and come to an agreement on all the milestones/ performance targets actually achieved by the Ratee, and the status or quality of completion of each of these accomplishments. To facilitate and enhance this process, the Ratee may provide the Superior Rater samples of the actual accomplishments, related evidences, and other supporting data to describe and validate the performance targets actually accomplished.

C. The Superior Rater shall evaluate the status and quality of completion of each of the Ratee's accomplishments based on a review and analysis of the data posted by the Ratee under the columns – "Milestones/ Performance Objectives", "Accomplishments" and "Status" - in the PC/ APC.

D. For each milestone, the Superior Rater shall indicate a score using the CESPES Rating Scale (Please see Annex – G) as reference to reflect his/ her evaluation of the status and quality of the Ratee's actual accomplishments. The Superior Rater shall post the said scores under the column – "Raw Score" of the PC/ APC.

E. The Superior Rater shall determine the weighted scores by multiplying each raw score with the corresponding percentage weight allocation for each milestone/ performance objective. The sum total of all the posted scores under the "Weighted Score" column of the PC/ APC shall then be computed to arrive at the Total Equivalent Point Score, which corresponds to the PC/ APC rating of the Ratee.

F. The Superior Rater shall affix his/ her signature first, followed by the Ratee, at the second "Concurrence" portion of the PC/ APC, and indicate the date of the said action. The presence of both signatures indicates the conclusion of all reviews and evaluations made by both parties.

G. The Superior Rater shall also accomplish the Critical Incidents (CI) and Areas for Improvement (AI) Form (Refer to Annex – E) in relation to the Ratee.

H. Upon completion of the said forms, the Ratee shall submit the fully accomplished PC/ APC and CI and AI Form to the CESPES Coordinator, who

shall reproduce and provide duplicate copies of the same for the Ratee, Rater and for himself/ herself.

Section 7. Completion of the Behavioral Competency Scales (BCS). The completion of the BCS shall be undertaken as follows:

A. The Superior Rater and a pre-determined number of Subordinate Raters of the Ratee in the department/agency, as indicated and verified in the RIS, shall be identified. They shall rate the Ratee based on the review and evaluation of specific behaviors manifested by the Ratee and actually and personally observed by the Superior Rater and the Subordinate Raters.

B. Key behaviors, classified under several dimensions, shall be measured and scored on a scale using the Behavioral Competency Scale (BCS) Form. Depending on the Rater, the said BCS Form has two (2) variations, namely:

1. Superior Rating Form (for use by the Superior Rater) (Refer to Annex Fa), and the;

2. Subordinate Rating Form (for use by Subordinate Raters) (Refer to Annex Fb).

C. All Subordinate Raters of each Ratee shall be randomly selected using a reliable procedure by the department/ agency CESPES Coordinator from the Ratee's RIS. The number of Ratees shall be in accordance with the table below:

Total Number of Line/ Staff Subordinates	**Total Sample Size of Chosen Raters**
10 subordinates or less	100%
11 – 15	11
16 – 20	12
21 – 25	13
26 – 30	14
31 and above	50%

D. The accomplishment of the BCS Form by the Raters may be conducted through a workshop where the Raters gather in one venue to give their ratings.

The Raters may be allowed to accomplish the BCS Forms outside the workshop conducted by the CESPES Coordinator, provided that they officially state a valid reason for not making it during the scheduled CESPES conduct (e.g. being sick or on Official Business for the duration of the CESPES conduct). In such instances, the accomplished BCS Form shall be sent to the CESB in a sealed envelope, together with a certification by the CESPES Coordinator that the conduct of the CESPES outside the workshop is in accordance with these rules. Absence of the said certification from the CESPES Coordinator shall invalidate the CESPES rating of such Rater.

E. All Superior and Subordinate Raters shall indicate their complete names, positions/ designations, other required data, and affix their signatures on the BCS Forms to fully accomplish them. BCS Forms without signatures and/ or incomplete data shall be deemed invalid. Substitute Subordinate Raters (i.e., outside of those in the Ratee's RIS) shall be absolutely prohibited.

F. The CESB shall prescribe the allowable range of percentage weights which may be allocated for the sum total of the BCS ratings of the Superior and Subordinate Raters in a department/ agency. A department/ agency shall determine and adopt a percentage weight allocation scheme based on the following range:

Superior	**Subordinate**
50 – 80%	20 – 50%

G. The BCS Forms shall be accomplished and submitted by the Superior and Subordinate Raters to the CESPES Coordinator under conditions of strict privacy, full confidentiality, and freedom from any or all forms of duress.

H. The Subordinate Raters shall also accomplish the Critical Incidents (CI) and Areas for Improvement (AI) Form (Refer to Annex – E) in relation to the Ratee.

I. Upon completion of the performance rating process for all the Ratees in the department/ agency, the CESPES Coordinator shall collect, organize, document, and secure all BCS Forms and CI and AI Forms. The CESPES Coordinator shall reproduce copies of the BCS Forms and CI and AI Forms for his/ her reference.

The CESPES Coordinator is strictly prohibited from viewing the accomplished BCS Forms of his/ her Subordinate Raters when he/ she is a Ratee.

Section 8. Submission of Accomplished CESPES Forms. Submission of accomplished CESPES Forms shall be in accordance with the following rules:

A. All accomplished individual PC/ APC, BCS, and CI and AI Forms of all Ratees in the department/ agency shall be submitted by the CESPES Coordinator to the CESB for the computation of the performance ratings not later than the last working day of February or two (2) months after the Rating Period. Submissions after the said period shall no longer be received nor entertained by CESB and shall cause the Ratee to have no CESPES rating for the Rating Period.

B. No CESPES performance rating processes, outside of the CESB prescribed period herein specified, shall be conducted without prior approval of the CESB. All requests for the conduct of the special CESPES shall be made in writing and addressed to the CESB, specifying the significant circumstances that would justify the conduct of the special CESPES.

C. All Raters, Ratees and CESPES Coordinators shall abide by the following schedule:

Activity	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Performance Planning (Year 1)												
Performance Monitoring (Year 1)												
Cut-off for Accomplishing the SCF (Year 1)												
Submission of the RIS (Year 1)												
Performance Review and Feedback (Year 2)												
Submission of the Forms to CESB (Year 2)												
Processing of the Forms by the CESB (Year 2)												
Sending of Feedback Reports (Year 2)												

Section 9. Replacement of Superior and/or Subordinate Raters. In cases where there are no Superior and/or Subordinate Raters, the following rules shall apply:

A. Superior Raters

The Superior, who is higher in rank to the immediate superior of the Ratee, and who currently or may have exercised direct or indirect supervision and control over the Ratee in the performance of tasks/ functions, for a certain period of time, shall replace the original Superior Rater in undertaking and completing the CESPES.

B. Subordinate Raters

The remaining Subordinate Raters of the Ratee as identified in the Ratee's RIS shall be engaged and randomly selected to undertake and complete the CESPES.

Subtitle IV
Performance Evaluation and Development Planning Stage

Section 10. The CESPES Overall Performance Feedback Report. The CESPES Overall Performance Feedback Report provides a summary of the Ratee's performance ratings and shall be accomplished in accordance with the following rules.

A. The CESB shall generate the CESPES Overall Performance Feedback Report for each Ratee. The said Report shall contain the following:

1. Summary of Ratings – which indicates the PC score; the BC score; the scores on the different BC dimensions; and the overall CESPES Rating, which is the sum of the PC and the BC scores.

2. Adjusted Score – which is the score of the Ratee after it has been subjected to normalization. Normalization is the process of statistically

analyzing individual ratings against the group's overall performance. In this way, the statistical mean of all ratings shall be used as the basis for determining the "average rating". The process assures the normal distribution of ratings and maintains the rating's relative position from the mean. It is done by taking the following steps:

a. Getting the measures of central tendency (i.e., mean, maximum score, minimum score, and the standard deviation) of the group.

b. Converting the final ratings into Z-scores. The Z-score converts the final score into a score relevant to its distance from the mean.

c. Computing the adjusted score. The adjusted score is obtained by comparing the Z-score with the mean and the maximum score (if the final rating falls above the mean) or minimum score (if the rating falls below the mean).

3. Adjectival Rating – is the qualitative description of the adjusted score based on the following scale:

Outstanding	-	5.84 - 7.00
Very Satisfactory	-	4.63 - 5.83
Satisfactory	-	3.42 - 4.62
Unsatisfactory	-	2.21 - 3.41
Poor	-	1.00 - 2.20

4. Summary of data indicated in the CI and AI Form submitted by the Raters.

B. The CESPES Coordinator shall reproduce the said Report for filing and storage in the Ratee's 201File and forward the original copy to the concerned Ratee.

C. The Ratee and the Superior Rater shall again meet to discuss the said Report with the objective of analyzing the status, issues and factors which have affected the Ratee's performance, as well as formulating strategies and measures to address areas for improvement to improve overall performance.

D. The CESB shall provide the Department Secretary/ Head of the Agency with a summary of the performance ratings of all Ratees in the department/ agency.

Section 11. Computation of Incomplete Ratings of a Ratee. The following rules shall apply in case of incomplete ratings of a Ratee:

A. The CESB may allow the computation and evaluation of the CESPES ratings of a Ratee who has incomplete ratings, only when the said ratings in question can no longer be obtained due to any or a combination of the following circumstances affecting the source of the ratings:

1 Death;

2. Retirement;

3. Resignation;

4. Approved official leave availed of for a long term;

5. No substitute Raters are available from the Ratee's RIS.

6. All other reasons that will qualify that the ratings can not be obtained, or that the source of the ratings is impossible to reach within the allowable and reasonable duration of time for the conduct of the CESPES.

B. For the BCS Form, the ratings given by the actual Subordinate Raters shall be provided equal percentage weight allocations.

C. For the PC/ APC, the Superior Rater may be replaced by the appropriate substitute, as indicated in Rule VI, Subtitle III, Section 9A of these rules.

D. In case of the total absence of Raters (i.e., no Superior and Subordinate Raters are available to rate the Ratee), the Ratee shall make an official request in writing addressed to the CESB for an independent evaluation of his/ her work performance and managerial competence for the given Rating Period. The Ratee shall attach to the said request samples of the actual accomplishments, related evidences, and other supporting data to describe and validate the performance targets actually accomplished.

Section 12. Multiple Superior Raters. In case a Ratee has Multiple Superior Raters, the following rules shall apply:

A. Pro-rated percentage weights shall be allocated for each of the performance ratings obtained from each Superior Rater based on the length of the time during which the Ratee is under the direct supervision and control of the specific Rater in the performance of tasks/ functions.

B. In the BCS Form, individual performance ratings obtained from each Superior Rater shall be allocated equal percentage weights and averaged to arrive at the Superior BCS Rating.

Section 13. Consecutive Positions in a Rating Period. The following rules shall apply in case a Ratee has consecutively occupied more than one CES position in a given Rating Period:

A. A Ratee, who has consecutively occupied more than one CES position of different levels and/ or of different departments/ agencies, shall have the corresponding PC and BCS ratings per position occupied in a given Rating Period, provided he/ she has been in the said position for at least three (3) months.

B. In the event that a Ratee consecutively occupied more than one CES position of equivalent level in the same department/ agency in a given Rating Period, the computation of the PC and BCS rating shall be pro-rated based on the number of months that the Ratee occupied the said position.

RULE VII
Requests, Complaints, Disputes, Anomalies and Irregularities in the CESPES

Section 1. Requests, Complaints, Disputes, Anomalies and Irregularities on the CESPES. The department/ agency shall implement policies, guidelines, rules and regulations at the department/ agency level to facilitate and support the effective, systematic and proper administration and use of the CESPES. All requests, petitions, complaints, disputes, anomalies and irregularities in the implementation and use of the CESPES shall be referred to, managed, and resolved by the Grievance Committee duly constituted by the department/ agency.

Section 2. Elevation of the Case to the CESB. After the department/ agency Grievance Committee has decided on the matter, but the Ratee still finds valid and reasonable bases to pursue the same complaint and/or to seek satisfactory resolution of any unresolved issue on the case, he/ she may elevate the said case to the CESB.

The Ratee's complaint for CESB's review and resolution of the case must be: 1) officially made in writing and addressed to the CESB within seven (7) calendar days from the Ratee's receipt of the questioned decision; and, 2) accompanied by a certification from the Department/ Agency Grievance Committee that the said case has been previously referred to it, with a narration of all actions taken by it and that despite all efforts, it has been unable to arrive at a resolution of the case acceptable to all parties concerned.

Section 3. Annulment of the CESPES. The CESB shall have the authority to annul or declare a failure of the CESPES performance rating process undertaken. The annulment of the CESPES shall include, but not be limited, to the following offenses:

A. Coercion

Defined as a pre-meditated, purposive and targeted use of physical and/ or moral force such as by threat, intimidation, and/ or similar acts of duress to compel individuals or groups (e.g., Superior and/ or Subordinate Raters) to think and act according to the will of others (e.g., the Ratee);

B. Collusion

Defined as a conspiracy or agreement by and between individuals and/ or groups for an ill-intentioned or deceitful purpose(s), contrary to the purposes, objectives and uses of the CESPES (e.g. predetermined ratings);

C. Tampering

Defined as the willful altering of the CESPES official forms with the objective of manipulating ratings and/ or other given data.

D. Breach of Confidentiality

Which shall include, but are not limited to, the following acts:

1. Conferring of the Ratee with the Subordinate Raters on matters concerning Ratee's CESPES rating(s) while the Raters are accomplishing the rating forms;

2. Taking a glimpse of or glancing at the rating forms accomplished by the Subordinate Raters;

3. Giving undue influence to the Subordinate Raters, in whatever capacity it may be.

E. Such other offenses, which are contrary to the purposes, objectives and uses of the CESPES.

Annulment or declaration of failure of the CESPES shall cause the Ratee involved to have no CESPES rating for the Rating Period, without prejudice to the filing of the appropriate administrative and/ or criminal cases against him/ her.

Section 4. Authority of the CESB. The CESB shall have the power and authority to:

A. Investigate, review, deliberate and decide on cases referred to it by the department/ agency involving requests, petitions, complaints, disputes, anomalies and/ or irregularities with regard to the implementation and use of the CESPES.

B. Deputize the department/ agency's CESPES Coordinator and/ or a representative of the Grievance Committee, or any officer(s) from the concerned department/ agency, to conduct investigations and inquiries and to gather, receive and secure evidence, in aid of its review and deliberations.

C. File administrative charges against any person and/ or group with proven accountability and/or involvement in any anomaly or irregularity.

Section 5. Promulgation of CESB Decision and Recommendation. The CESB shall render its decision and recommendation on the said case within a period of sixty (60) official working days, after receipt of the complaint.

RULE VIII
Violations

Section 1. Violatons. Any violation of any provision in this Resolution shall be dealt with in accordance with existing Civil Service laws, rules and regulations.

RULE IX
Final Provisions

Section 1. Separability Clause. If any section or part of this resolution shall be held to be invalid, the remaining provisions shall be given full force and effect as if the part held invalid had not been included therein.

Section 2. Repealing Clause. All existing CES rules and regulations, circulars and memoranda inconsistent with this resolution are hereby repealed or amended accordingly.

Section 3. Effectivity. This resolution shall take effect fifteen (15) days after publication in a newspaper or general circulation or in the Official Gazette.

ANNEX—A

CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE BOARD

Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES)
RATEE INFORMATION SHEET
For CY _____

IMPORTANT:
If you have been assigned to another CES position for at least (3) three months during the year, it is important that another Ratee Information Sheet be accomplished for that position so we can get the assessment of your performance by your immediate superior and subordinates in that positon.
All data in this document are subject to further verification by the CESB staff.

Please type or print all responses.
Use additional sheets if necessary.

_____
PRINTED NAME OF INCUMBENT

_____
(Title of Position)
(If you are an OIC, please also indicate your original plantilla position)

_____
(Inclusive Dates in Present Position)

_____
(Office / Department)

_____
(Complete Office Address / Telephone No.)

Name (s) of Immediate Superior (s)	**Positon Title (s)**
_____	_____
_____	_____

Name (s) of Subordinate (s)	**Position Title (s) (per plantilla and organizational hierarchy)**
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Prepared by:

_____
Signature of Incumbent Official

_____
Date

I hereby certify to the best of my knowledge that the above information are true, complete, accurate and updated.

_____
Printed Name of Administrative/Personnel Officer

_____
Signature

_____
Date

ANNEX - B

Performance Contract and Review Form

Name of Ratee: _____

Position/ Location: _____

RATING SCALE

7 – Exceptional
6 – Commendable
5 – Above Average
4 – Good Solid Performance
3 – Solid Performance
2 – Below Average
1 - Unacceptable

	MILESTONES / PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	WEIGHT ALLOCATION	ACCOMPLISHMENTS	STATUS	RATING	
					RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE
LEADING AND INNOVATING MILESTONES						
	(Use additional sheets if necessary)					
REGULAR / ROUTINE MILESTONES						
	(Use additional sheets if necessary)					
	TOTAL PERCENTAGE	**100%**	**TOTAL EQUIVALENT POINT SCORE**			

CONCURRENCE:

_____ _____ _____

Signature over Printed Name of Superior / Supervisor | Signature over Printed Name of Ratee | Date

_____ _____ _____

Signature over Printed Name of Superior / Supervisor | Signature over Printed Name of Ratee | Date

ANNEX - C

Supplemental Performance Contract Form

Name of Ratee: _____

Position/ Location: _____

Part I. Additional Outputs

MILESTONES / PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	WEIGHT ALLOCATION
LEADING AND INNOVATING FUNCTIONS	
REGULAR / ROUTINE FUNCTIONS	

Part II. Replaced/Discontinued Targets

MILESTONES / PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	WEIGHT ALLOCATION	ACTION ON THE REPLACED / DISCONTINUED MILESTONES
LEADING AND INNOVATING FUNCTIONS		
REGULAR / ROUTINE FUNCTIONS		

CONCURRENCE:

_____ _____ _____

Signature over Printed Name of Superior / Supervisor | Signature over Printed Name of Ratee | Date

ANNEX - D

Adjusted Performance Contract and Review Form

Name of Ratee: _____

Position/ Location: _____

RATING SCALE

7 – Exceptional
6 – Commendable
5 – Above Average
4 – Good Solid Performance
3 – Solid Performance
2 – Below Average
1 - Unacceptable

	MILESTONES / PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	WEIGHT ALLOCATION	ACCOMPLISHMENTS	STATUS	RATING	
					RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE
LEADING AND INNOVATING MILESTONES						
	(Use additional sheets if necessary)					
REGULAR / ROUTINE MILESTONES						
	(Use additional sheets if necessary)					
	TOTAL PERCENTAGE	**100%**	**TOTAL EQUIVALENT POINT SCORE**			

CONCURRENCE:

_____ _____ _____

Signature over Printed Name of Superior / Supervisor | Signature over Printed Name of Ratee | Date

ANNEX - E

Critical Incidents (CI) and Areas for Improvement (AI) Form

NAME OF OFFICIAL TO BE RATED	
POSITION DURING THE RATING PERIOD	
DEPARTMENT/AGENCY	
BUREAU/ SERVICE/ DIVISION	
RATING PERIOD	

CRITICAL INCIDENTS

S - SITUATION	T- TASK	A - ACTION	R - RESULT
Use additional sheets if necessary			

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

SPECIFIC ASPECTS/ AREAS OF WORK PERFORMANCE NEEDING IMPROVEMENT	EXPECTED/ APPLIED QUALITY NORMS AND STANDARDS	RECOMMENDED INTERVENTIONS/ ACTIONS
Use additional sheets if necessary		

SIGNATURE OVER PRINTED NAME OF RATER	
POSITION DURING RATING PERIOD	
DEPARTMENT/ AGENCY	
BUREAU/ SERVICE/ DIVISION	
DATE ACCOMPLISHED	

ANNEX F – a

Republic of the Philippines
CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE BOARD
✉ No. 3 Marcelino St., Holy Spirit Drive, Diliman, Quezon City
951-49-81 to 88

CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE Performance Evaluation System
Behavioral Competency Scale (BCS) for Superior Raters

OFFICIAL TO BE RATED:
POSITION DURING THE RATING PERIOD :
OFFICE/AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:
OFFICE ADDRESS:
RATING PERIOD:

Read the sentences and rate the ratee in terms of how often you have observed the behavior being described.

Kindly encircle the number that best represents your assessment of the ratee's behavior.

Unable to Rate/ **Unsure** of Answer	**Never** Shows the behavior Being Described						**Always** Shows the behavior Being Described
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**

Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer	Never						Always
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Creativity and Innovation								
1	Recommends and implements reforms contributing to the attainment of the office goals and objectives.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Does not suggest a new perspective of looking at things, be they policies, programs, projects or problems.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Does not say much in meetings and does not contribute to the discussion. When s/he speaks, it will just be in terms of agreeing to what is being proposed.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	When an innovation is introduced s/he builds on it by adding his/her ideas or makes adjustment for better implementation or acceptance of the change.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	When given a problem to solve, sees it as a challenge and gets excited at the chance of being able to work on it.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Never						Always

ANNEX F – a

Critical and Systemic Thinking									
6	Does not explore other ways of doing things and resigns to prevailing circumstances.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	Anticipates changes along the way particularly when planning a project and makes contingency plans.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	Systematically analyzes and evaluates problems and issues as basis for recommending and implementing effective solutions.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Does not check the nature and sources of data or information before deciding.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Environmental Acumen									
10	Blames limited government resources for inability to meet service quality standards.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	Does not maximize the use of scarce government resources to achieve expected outputs.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	Does not network and establish strategic alliances with stakeholders to achieve goals/objectives.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	Sees opportunities when to effectively pursue his/her unit's/department's goals.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Willingly attends to activities that would entail relating to other stakeholders including LGUs, clients, and development agencies.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Honesty and Integrity									
15	Lets work pile up on desk and unmindful of set deadlines for tasks.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Does not report to work regularly.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	Works expeditiously to achieve results on time.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	Makes use of official time and resources wisely.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Judgment									
19	Listens to hearsay and does not look at all angles.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	Weighs matter judiciously and takes necessary action for his/her decision to be carried out.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	Knows how to set priorities. Is not easily overwhelmed if assigned multi-tasks because s/he has a defined set of criteria by which s/he assesses his/her tasks.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Never						Always

ANNEX F – a

22	Makes sound decision by gathering all pertinent information and goes through a logical analysis of these.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	Does not study all angles of a matter. During instances when s/he is uncertain, s/he does not solicit for ideas and information from subordinates, peers and superiors.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Leadership									
24	Knows own limitations and consults peers and subordinates on certain matters.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25	No passion for work, for the organization, or for the agency's clientele.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	Effectively monitors and evaluates office performance to ensure alignment with organizational/national goals and objectives.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	Does not set realistic goals.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	Does not set time frame for task to be done.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	Provides no substantive contribution to the organization's performance.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	Inspires a sense of purpose that unifies co-workers through a shared vision.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31	Develops the skills, knowledge and abilities of subordinates for effective work performance. Mentors subordinates to maximize their leadership/managerial potentials.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	Is versatile and humble enough to perform even staff functions when the need arises.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	Plans, organizes and executes the programs using a systematic process.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34	Does not set priorities, goals and objectives that the team should work for.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35	Is not open to suggestions, comments and inputs from all sides.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SIGNATURE OVER PRINTED NAME OF RATER

POSITION:
OFFICE/AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:
DATE ACCOMPLISHED:

ANNEX F – b

Republic of the Philippines
CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE BOARD
✉ No. 3 Marcelino St., Holy Spirit Drive, Diliman, Quezon City
951-49-81 to 88

CAREER EXECUTIVE SERVICE Performance Evaluation System

Behavioral Competency Scale (BCS) for Subordinate Raters

OFFICIAL TO BE RATED:
POSITION DURING THE RATING PERIOD :
OFFICE/AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:
OFFICE ADDRESS:
RATING PERIOD:

Read the sentences and rate the ratee in terms of how often you have observed the behavior being described.

Kindly encircle the number that best represents your assessment of the ratee's behavior.

Unable to Rate/ **Unsure** of Answer	**Never** Shows the behavior Being Described						**Always** Shows the behavior Being Described
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**

Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer	Never						Always
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Creativity and Innovation									
1	Does not provide new ideas and approaches to a project or a problem.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	S/he does not initiate change in the office. Does not think of ways to improve systems, procedures and employee welfare.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Comes up with new ways of looking at a situation. Contributes alternatives to issues and problems.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Critical and Systemic Thinking									
4	Knows the nuances of the job. Knowledgeable and has the technical expertise to handle his/her tasks.	**Unable to Rate/ Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ANNEX F – b

			Never						Always
5	Does not understand the details of the papers submitted and signs even without completed staff work.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Comes up with innovative ideas and shares this with his/her subordinates, colleagues and superiors.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Environmental Acumen									
7	Cannot navigate the politics involved in his/her job. Unable to manage pressures to ensure that appropriate course of actions are followed.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	Has the ability to implement projects successfully through proper utilization of resources. Makes wise use of resources and savings are applied to improving our work environment.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Maintains the continuity and stability of operations of the agency notwithstanding changes in leadership and policies.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Honesty and Integrity									
10	Passes all work to staff or other units even if these would need his/her inputs and interventions.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	Spends office time unproductively. S/he has no concrete contribution to unit performance.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	Has good works ethics. Delivers on targets and works hard on tasks.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Judgment									
13	Does not implement office policies consistently.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Does not look at all angles of the situation before acting and deciding.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	Studies all angles of a matter. During instances when s/he is uncertain, s/he solicits for ideas and information.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Makes firm and principled decisions.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Leadership									
17	Does not mentor subordinates to enhance their knowledge and skills.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	Has good communication skills. Provides examples. Can simplify complicated concepts and makes sure that subordinates or the other party understands. Often asks for questions and feedback.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	Inspires subordinates to reach unit organization objectives. Makes his/her unit staff excited about reaching the objectives of the unit.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ANNEX F – b

			Never						Always
20	Does not provide clear instructions on assigned tasks and sets no standards for the output.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	Unable to harness the expertise of his/her staff. Delegates tasks to staff that does not match his/her capabilities.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22	S/he is seen in the office doing his/her work. If s/he is away, the staff knows when and how s/he can be consulted on important matters.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	Has a clear picture of what the organization should be and what goals it should attain in the long term, and steers it in that direction.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	Informs subordinates of changes in the plans with enough lead time.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25	Regularly monitors work of subordinates.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	Shows indifference and does not support subordinates in need of assistance.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	Does not give clear instructions to subordinates and vaguely discusses accountabilities on expected results.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	Does not inspire and challenge subordinates to do their best.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	Does not mingle with subordinates and is regarded as unapproachable.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	Promotes the holistic development of self and others. Unit has timetable for staff enhancement and development such as sessions for reflection, spiritual nourishment and relaxation, inputs or learning of new knowledge and skills.	**Unable to Rate / Unsure of Answer**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SIGNATURE OVER PRINTED NAME OF RATER

POSITION:
OFFICE/AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:
DATE ACCOMPLISHED:

ANNEX - G

Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES) Rating Scale

ASSUMPTIONS	QUANTITY - Established baseline to compare the difference TIMELINESS - Established target time frame or deadline QUALITY - Mechanisms are in place to measure the ff: - Impact: within unit; outside unit, within agency; outside agency - Savings, revenues or new resources generated - Award or commendation received - Replicated, established as best practice - Positive feedback from publics; customer satisfaction

RATING SCORE	ADJECTIVAL RATING	INDICATORS						
		QUALITY					QUANTITY	TIMELINESS
		Actual Performance vs. Targets	Impact of Performance	Consistency/ Quality of Performance	Comparability of Performance with Others with Same Function/ Position	Application of Knowledge and Skills		
7	Exceptional	Substantially surpasses targets and standards	Contributions or innovations have impact outside his/her agency/ department	Consistently shows commendable performance Exceptionally reliable, produces outputs that are accurately and thoroughly accomplished	Highest level of exemplary performance notably excelling and rarely occurring in the public service	Exceptional capacity of applying wide range of knowledge and skills to achieve organizational targets, showing consistent behavior that harnesses and inspires the best performance from his/her unit	Above 150%	25% and below
6	Commendable	General performance exceeded expectations most of the time	Makes clear/identifiable contributions to the attainment of agency/ department goals Introduces innovation to unit that elevates standards of performance to a higher level	Can be relied on to deliver even on very difficult tasks and contribute to critical areas Very good performance in almost all areas of responsibilities	Overall performance quality significantly better than those of others in the same level or performing the same functions across the entire public sector	Knowledge, skills and behavior goes beyond what is expected of his/her position	150%	50%

RATING SCORE	ADJECTIVAL RATING	INDICATORS						
		QUALITY					QUANTITY	TIMELINESS
		Actual Performance vs. Targets	Impact of Performance	Consistency/ Quality of Performance	Comparability of Performance with Others with Same Function/ Position	Application of Knowledge and Skills		
5	Above Average	Performance is above expectations Performance represents a level of accomplishment that goes beyond acceptable limits	Goes beyond her own tasks and responsibilities to insure that the unit attains all its goals and objectives.	Quantity and quality of work is beyond the average Can be relied on to deliver thorough and accurate outputs Effective and efficient in work performance	Overall performance is comparatively better than most officers of the same rank/position in the agency	Application of knowledge and skills is above average	125%	75%
4	Good Solid Performance	Adequate and acceptable work performance	Does all his/her tasks and contributes his/her share to attainment of unit goals/objectives	Shows consistently reliable, sound and acceptable performance Performs regular tasks and functions thoroughly Can handle difficult assignments and delivers satisfactory performance	Performance expected of the great majority of government officials	Effective application of knowledge and skills Shows positive behavior and attitude to work and responsibilities	100%	100%
3	Solid Performance	Adequate and acceptable work performance	Meets expectations and fully meets requirements of the position	Most of the time delivers consistently reliable work outputs	Comparable to others in the same level or position	Sufficient knowledge, skills and positive behavior	75%	125%
2	Below Average	Performance is below expectation but can still be improved with much effort Outputs are less than acceptable or less than the target set	Commits minor mistakes that undermines unit's overall performance	Inefficient Performance does not consistently meet expectations or targets	Marginal work performance	Inadequate knowledge and skills	50%	150%

RATING SCORE	ADJECTIVAL RATING	INDICATORS						
		QUALITY					QUANTITY	TIMELINESS
		Actual Performance vs. Targets	Impact of Performance	Consistency/ Quality of Performance	Comparability of Performance with Others with Same Function/ Position	Application of Knowledge and Skills		
1	Unacceptable	Poorest level of performance Falls short of expectations/ requirements of the position	Demoralizes other staff and undermines overall unit achievement	Deadlines not met Incomplete and inaccurate outputs	May warrant removal from position	Limited skills and knowledge and has no initiative to improve them	Below 50%	Above 150%