

IICA



PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FOR GENERAL SERVICES PERSONNEL

*IICA
SDA -1
1988
Ingles*

DIRECTORATE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

1

ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS SERIES

IICA



PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FOR GENERAL SERVICES PERSONNEL

ISSN 1011-775X

A1/OC-88-006

DIRECTORATE OF HUMAN RESOURCES
ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS SERIES

1

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE

San Jose, Costa Rica

June, 1988



FOREWORD

The Inter-American Board of Agriculture, at its Third Regular Meeting, adopted Resolution IICA/JIA/Res.67(III-0/85), asking the Director General to design a new Performance Appraisal System.

The document "Performance Appraisal System for General Services Personnel" was prepared in response to this mandate. It is based on provisions for performance appraisal found in the IICA Staff Rules (Article 5.8, numbers 1 to 6) and the 1987-1991 Medium Term Plan.

The design of the new system has profited from the Institute's past experience in this area. One of its purposes is to contribute to improving the General Services Personnel by recognizing contributions made by staff members to attain the Institute's objectives. At the same time, it can be useful for identifying shortcomings and gauging the present capabilities and future potential of staff members.

Efforts have been made in designing the system to ensure that the appraisal of each staff member's performance is clearly based on the level of the position. The system also makes it possible to accommodate the natural differences among the various units of IICA.

A further purpose is to clarify the responsibility for supervision and follow-up of personnel ascribed to the Representatives in the countries and to the Directors and heads of units at Headquarters, as a means of maximizing the performance of assigned tasks.

The process of reviewing the document was enriched with valuable comments made by personnel from various units and from the Staff Association, especially the Costa Rica Chapter. We hope to receive further suggestions on improving the system, and will eventually incorporate additional changes that appear necessary when the system is put into use.

San Jose, June, 1988

**PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM FOR
INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE
GENERAL SERVICES PERSONNEL**

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Performance Appraisal System of the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture is to improve the utilization of human resources. It was designed with the following objectives: a) to measure staff efficiency; b) to reveal personal shortcomings; c) to ascertain staff members' ability to perform assigned technical and administrative duties; and d) as an aid in planning the Institute's personnel development and the improvement of the different operations centers.

The Performance Appraisal System for General Services Personnel rates staff member job performance over a specific period in terms of the Institute's objectives. Thus, the appraisal is not a personal exercise so much as an institutional process. Accordingly, the Appraisal System must be tailored to the objectives of the Institute and to the on-going development needs of its working units. This is consistent with the immediate responsibility of the heads or supervisors of each unit to organize and improve the staff working under their supervision.

The performance FACTORS and SUBFACTORS assessed in the appraisal should be reviewed periodically and attuned to the Institute's objectives for personnel development. Each staff member should be rated by the person responsible for the overall unit, working in cooperation with the immediate supervisor, to ensure that the appraisal reflects how each person rates in the general setting of the operations center.

The Institute, in order to meet the objectives entrusted to it by the Inter-American Board of Agriculture, needs its staff members to perform their duties efficiently. Nevertheless, for various reasons, some staff members fail to attain even the minimum performance levels for which they were hired, and show no evidence that they might do so in the future. Others, by contrast, exceed the Institute's normal expectations. Some regularly make contributions far beyond the obligations of their positions.

This is why the Performance Appraisal should serve as the basis for extending incentives to staff members, such as merit raises, promotions and other forms of recognition, and for deciding whether to renew or terminate an appointment or job contract.

A performance appraisal system should not be used as a mechanism for granting regular salary increases, nor should it replace the process of adjusting salary scales, even in cases where the Representative believes that General Services salaries are inferior to the levels set by the General Directorate in terms of the labor market in the country. Executive Order 7/87 was issued for this purpose and establishes the Institute's remuneration policies. It was designed to maintain the purchasing power and competitiveness of IICA salaries, consistent with commitments contracted by the Institute in the Basic Agreement with each country.

Every appraisal system is prone to subjectivity because its purpose is to measure behaviors which cannot always be quantified. The system must accommodate the subjectivity of the person being appraised, who holds a particular image of his or her own behavior and that of co-workers; the subjectivity of the appraiser, who sees that behavior in the overall context of performance by the whole group and who weighs its influence on the general operation of the unit; and finally, the subjectivity of the immediate supervisor, who is keenly aware of the value of each staff member's contributions to the final outcome of the work.

In order to minimize the impact of this subjectivity, the Performance Appraisal System for the Institute's General Services Personnel places responsibility for the appraisal in the hands of the head of each unit, who should work in cooperation with the immediate supervisor of the staff member being appraised. It also established a second-level appraisal at Headquarters, in which the General Directorate, on the proposal of the Advisory Committee on Human Resources, can review the results of the appraisal in each office or unit, approve incentives, grant promotions and generally be apprised of personnel development efforts in each unit. The system views the different offices at Headquarters as independent units, each appraising in terms of its own particular demands on staff members.

II. PROCEDURE

- A. The appraisal will be done annually, as in the past, for all employees in the General Services category who, as of April 1, have completed at least one full year in the Institute's employ. This appraisal, complete with first and second levels, should take place between the months of April and July of each year.
- B. Staff members in each office or unit are appraised independently of those in other Institute units. The appraisal reveals the judgement of the first-level evaluator concerning the performance of each staff member by comparison with that of other people working in the same operations center.
- C. The first-level appraisal is conducted by the representative, in the offices in the member countries, and by the director or supervisor in Headquarters units. This person should receive the cooperation of the immediate supervisor of the staff member being appraised and the advice of any other person he or she deems pertinent. The second level of the appraisal is performed by the Advisory Committee on Human Resources which, using documentation provided by the Directorate of Human Resources, issues a proposal to the Director General on merit raises, promotions and other incentives earned by staff members through the appraisal.
- D. The appraisal is conducted with the use of a WORKSHEET (see Appendix I) designed for measuring four FACTORS of the staff member's job performance:
 - A. Productivity.
 - B. Interest and Cooperation.
 - C. Decision-making.
 - D. Behavior.

Each of these FACTORS has been divided into five SUBFACTORS. This should facilitate the work of the appraisers by clarifying the items being evaluated, and should standardize the criteria used in all the member countries and operations centers.

- E. The SUBFACTORS (see Appendix III) to be assessed for each FACTOR are:
 - A. PRODUCTIVITY
 - 1) Quality of work.
 - 2) Volume of work (production).

- 3) Planning and organization of work.
- 4) Need for instructions.
- 5) Adherence to established job standards and procedures.

B. INTEREST AND COOPERATION

- 1) Care of assigned equipment and materials.
- 2) Demonstrated interest in increasing knowledge or skills useful for the job.
- 3) Motivation and enthusiasm for work performance.
- 4) Spirit of cooperation.
- 5) Participation in Institute activities.

C. DECISION-MAKING

- 1) Search for information needed for the job.
- 2) Follow-up of assigned work.
- 3) Need for supervision.
- 4) Initiative.
- 5) Exercise of authority on the job.

D. BEHAVIOR

- 1) Relations with supervisors and co-workers.
- 2) Respect for laws and regulations.
- 3) Compliance with instructions received from supervisors.
- 4) Dedication to the job.
- 5) Discretion on the job.

F. Each SUBFACTOR is rated on a scale from 1 to 5, according to the following criteria:

RATING OF SUBFACTORS	MEANING
1	UNSATISFACTORY. Applies to staff members who have repeatedly demonstrated that they are incapable of satisfactory performance under the SUBFACTOR being examined.
2	INADEQUATE. Applies to staff members who have not achieved normal levels of performance under the SUBFACTOR, but who could do so with personal effort or with the support of the institution.
3	SATISFACTORY. Applies to staff members whose performance meets expectations for the SUBFACTOR, in accordance with the level of the position.
4	VERY GOOD. Applied to staff members whose performance under the SUBFACTOR is superior to what is expected for the level of the position.
5	OUTSTANDING. Given to staff members whose job performance is habitually exceptional.

When staff members are rated below the level of SATISFACTORY for any SUBFACTOR, the WORKSHEET should include an explanation of the reasons why the employee did not receive the higher rating. This will guide the appraiser and the staff member in taking any measures necessary for improving performance, which in turn will lead to higher performance levels for the unit. If a high number of appraisals in any given unit reveal repeated deficiencies in the same SUBFACTORS, general measures should be taken to help improve the operation of the unit as a whole.

The staff member's rating for the FACTOR is determined by averaging the pertinent SUBFACTORS and rounding to the nearest integer (0.4 is rounded down, 0.5 is rounded up).

- G. The values obtained by the staff member for each FACTOR are then copied onto the APPRAISAL FORM included in Appendix II, and a summarized explanation for all ratings of less than three points should be given in the space provided. Using the same procedure applied in the WORKSHEET, the sum of the FACTORS is divided by four and the quotient is rounded off. The result is the first-level rating of the staff member. Using the five-point scale, it can be interpreted as follows:

One point: UNSATISFACTORY

Two points: INADEQUATE

Three points: SATISFACTORY

Four points: VERY GOOD

Five points: OUTSTANDING

Staff members who receive OUTSTANDING ratings for two consecutive years can qualify to occupy higher-level positions in the General Services category, in their same occupational fields, without participating in a competition, if an appropriate opening appears during the year immediately following the second such appraisal.

All staff members who receive at least three points in their appraisals earn a one-step increase in their personal classifications. However, a staff member who is rated as INADEQUATE on any one appraisal FACTOR forfeits this right.

Staff members who receive a rating of UNSATISFACTORY on any appraisal FACTOR will have their contracts terminated, in accordance with pertinent legislation. Two consecutive performance appraisals with ratings of INADEQUATE for the same factor will also mean termination of the employee's contract with the Institute. If two or more performance appraisal FACTORS are rated as INADEQUATE or UNSATISFACTORY on a single appraisal, the staff member's contract will be terminated in accordance with the Staff Rules and other Institute standards.

Prior to each appraisal, the General Directorate will establish figures to be used for weighting the value of each FACTOR according to its relative importance. These weights will depend on the needs of the Institute and the experience acquired in earlier appraisals. The sum of the weighted ratings shows how each staff member ranks with respect to other employees in the same office or unit, independently of other units.

The weighting factors for the 1987/1988 period are:

A. Productivity	7	35%
B. Interest and cooperation	5	25%
C. Decision-making	5	25%
D. Behavior	3	15%

The APPRAISAL FORM should be signed by the person responsible, the immediate supervisor of the staff member, as an indication that he or she participated responsibly in the process, and by the staff member being appraised. The staff member should also use the appropriate space to indicate whether he or she is in agreement with the rating or simply takes cognizance of it.

In the latter case, all points of disagreement should be presented in writing to the Representative or head of the unit, within ten working days following the appraisal, and a copy sent to the Directorate of Human Resources. The Representative or head of the unit should reply in writing, sending a copy to the Directorate of Human Resources also within ten working days. Both communications become part of the appraisal document and are taken into account for the second-level appraisal. The Directorate of Human Resources shall advise the staff member and the appraiser of the decision of the Advisory Committee on Human Resources with respect to the appeal.

A copy of the APPRAISAL FORM is given to the staff member. A second copy is kept in the employee's personal file in the pertinent office, and the original is sent to the Directorate of Human Resources.

Staff members whose second-level ratings place them in the top 40 percent of employees in each office or unit will receive a one-time monetary bonus equivalent to one-half of their monthly salary, based on the salary scale in force at the time.

The Advisory Committee on Human Resources will make recommendations to the General Directorate to approve the appraisals and any actions pursuant to them, on the basis of its analysis of the ranking of employees in each unit (as seen on the APPRAISAL FORM) and modifications to the first-level appraisal, in accordance with appeals and justifications that may have been presented in each case.

Once the entire process is complete, the documentation is kept in the staff member's personal file at Headquarters.

Any person responsible for performance appraisal of general services personnel, or anyone who is the immediate supervisor of general services staff members, upon leaving his or her position for any reason, should first appraise all subordinates, using the system in effect.

May, 1988



APPENDIX I
WORKSHEET

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF GENERAL SERVICES PERSONNEL

From _____
Period
To _____

NAME OF EMPLOYEE: _____ UNIT: _____

JOB TITLE: _____ Present classification: _____ Date of appointment: _____

FACTORS	SUBFACTORS	IMPROVEMENTS TO BE MADE FOR A RATING OF "SATISFACTORY"
---------	------------	---

A. PRODUCTIVITY

The staff member's productivity should be appropriate for the level of the position. Under this FACTOR, the following SUBFACTORS should be assessed:

A.1 Quality of work, according to the demands of a position at this level.	<input type="text"/>	_____
A.2 Volume of work performed, and effort made.	<input type="text"/>	_____
A.3 Planning and organization of work.	<input type="text"/>	_____
A.4 Need for instructions.	<input type="text"/>	_____
A.5 Adherence to established job standards and procedures.	<input type="text"/>	_____
AVERAGE OF SUBFACTORS	_____	
ROUNDED VALUE OF FACTOR	_____	

B. INTEREST AND COOPERATION

The employee should show an interest in his or her work and in Institute concerns in general. Under this FACTOR, the following SUBFACTORS should be assessed:

B.1 Care of assigned equipment and materials.	<input type="text"/>	_____
B.2 Demonstrated interest in increasing knowledge or skills useful for the job.	<input type="text"/>	_____
B.3 Motivation and enthusiasm for work performance.	<input type="text"/>	_____
B.4 Spirit of cooperation.	<input type="text"/>	_____
B.5 Participation in Institute activities.	<input type="text"/>	_____
AVERAGE OF SUBFACTORS	_____	
ROUNDED VALUE OF FACTOR	_____	

WORKSHEET (cont'd.)

FACTORS	SUBFACTORS	IMPROVEMENT TO BE MADE FOR A RATING OF "SATISFACTORY"
C. DECISION-MAKING		
The need for decision-making depends on the level of the position held by the staff member. The following SUBFACTORS should be evaluated:		
C.1 Search for information needed for the job.	<input type="text"/>	_____
C.2 Follow-up of assigned work.	<input type="text"/>	_____
C.3 Need for supervision.	<input type="text"/>	_____
C.4 Initiative.	<input type="text"/>	_____
C.5 Exercise of authority on the job.	<input type="text"/>	_____
AVERAGE OF SUBFACTORS	_____	
ROUNDED VALUE OF FACTOR	_____	

D. BEHAVIOUR

Employee behaviour reflects on the Institute's image. The following SUBFACTORS should be appraised:

D.1 Relations with supervisors and coworkers.	<input type="text"/>	_____
D.2 Respect for laws and regulations.	<input type="text"/>	_____
D.3 Compliance with instructions received from supervisors.	<input type="text"/>	_____
D.4 Dedication to the job.	<input type="text"/>	_____
D.5 Discretion on the job.	<input type="text"/>	_____
AVERAGE OF SUBFACTORS		
ROUNDED VALUE OF FACTOR		

COMMENTS: _____

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THE WORKSHEET

1. Each SUBFACTOR is rated on a scale from 1 to 5, according to the following criteria:

RATING OF SUBFACTORS	MEANING
1	UNSATISFACTORY. Applies to staff members who have repeatedly demonstrated that they are incapable of satisfactory performance under the SUBFACTOR being examined.
2	INADEQUATE. Applies to staff members who have not achieved normal levels of performance under the SUBFACTOR, but who could do so with personal effort or with the support of the institution.
3	SATISFACTORY. Applies to staff members whose performance meets expectations for the SUBFACTOR, in accordance with the level of the position.
4	VERY GOOD. Applied to staff members whose performance under the SUBFACTOR is superior to what is expected for the level of the position.
5	OUTSTANDING. Given to staff members whose job performance is habitually exceptional.

2. Each SUBFACTOR should be rated in accordance with the attached DESCRIPTIONS OF FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS.

3. The staff member's rating for the FACTOR is determined by averaging the pertinent SUBFACTORS and the result is rounded up (if the average is greater than or equal to 0.5) or down (if it is less than 0.5).

4. When staff members are rated below the level of SATISFACTORY for any SUBFACTOR, the WORKSHEET should include an explanation of the reasons why the employee did not receive the higher rating. This will guide the appraiser and the staff member in taking any measures necessary for improving performance, which in turn will lead to higher performance levels for the unit.

5. The values obtained by the staff member for each FACTOR are then copied onto the APPRAISAL FORM.



APPENDIX II
APPRAISAL FORM

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL OF GENERAL SERVICES PERSONNEL

From _____
Period
To _____

NAME OF EMPLOYEE: _____ UNIT: _____

JOB TITLE: _____ Present classification: _____ Date of appointment: _____

FIRST-LEVEL APPRAISAL

FACTORS	RATING	INDEX	SUBTOTAL
A. Productivity.	<input type="text"/> x	7	<input type="text"/>
B. Interest and cooperation.	<input type="text"/> x	5	<input type="text"/>
C. Decision-making.	<input type="text"/> x	5	<input type="text"/>
D. Behavior	<input type="text"/> x	3	<input type="text"/>
Average	_____		
Rating	_____		TOTAL: _____%
Meaning	_____		

Suggested improvements:

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____
- D. _____

Head of the Unit: _____
Name Signature Date

Immediate supervisor: _____
Name Signature Date

Employee: _____
In agreement: Cognizant: Signature Date

SECOND-LEVEL APPRAISAL

Staff member ranking: _____ of _____ employees in unit.

Recommendation: _____

Head of the Division of General Services Personnel:
Signature Date

Comments: _____

For the General Directorate: _____
Signature

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE USE AND INTERPRETATION OF THE APPRAISAL FORM

1. When the values of the FACTORS have been noted on the WORKSHEET, they are then copied onto the APPRAISAL FORM.

2. Using the same procedure applied in the WORKSHEET, the four FACTORS are averaged, and the result is rounded up (if the average is greater than or equal to 0.5) or down (if it is less than 0.5). This gives the first-level rating, which will then be reviewed at a second level by the Advisory Committee on Human Resources.

3. Prior to each appraisal, the General Directorate will establish figures to be used for weighting the value of each FACTOR according to its relative importance. These weights will depend on the needs of the Institute and experience acquired in earlier appraisals. The value obtained for each FACTOR should be multiplied by the pertinent weighting factor, as indicated on the APPRAISAL FORM. The sum of the weighted ratings shows how each staff member ranks with respect to other employees in the same office or unit, independently of other units.

4. The second level of the appraisal is conducted by the Advisory Committee on Human Resources which, using documentation received, analyzed and submitted by the Directorate of Human Resources, issues a proposal to the Director General on what actions should be taken pursuant to the appraisal.

5. In the spaces headed "Suggested Improvements," the appraiser should summarize the reasons given in the WORKSHEET as to why the ratings of the SUBFACTORS were below SATISFACTORY.

6. The APPRAISAL FORM should be signed by the person responsible (the representative or head of the unit), the immediate supervisor of the staff member, as an indication that he or she participated responsibly in the process, and by the staff member being appraised. The staff member should also use the appropriate space to indicate whether he or she is in agreement with the rating or simply takes cognizance of it. In the latter case, all points of disagreement should be presented in writing to the Representative of Head of the Unit, within ten working days following the appraisal, and a copy sent to the Directorate of Human Resources. The Representative or Head of the Unit should reply in writing, sending a copy to the Directorate of Human Resources, also within ten working days. Both communications become part of the appraisal document and are then taken into account for the second-level appraisal by the Advisory Committee on Human Resources. The Directorate of Human Resources shall advise the staff member and the appraiser of the decision of the Advisory Committee on Human Resources with respect to the appeal. The same Directorate will also inform the office or unit of the results of the overall appraisal so that pertinent actions may be taken. Copies of the WORKSHEET and the APPRAISAL FORM are given to the staff member. Second copies are kept in the employee's personal file in the pertinent office, and the originals are sent to the Directorate of Human Resources.

APPENDIX III**DESCRIPTIONS OF FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS****A. PRODUCTIVITY**

The staff member's productivity should be appropriate for the level of the position. Under this FACTOR, the following SUBFACTORS should be assessed:

A.1 Quality of work, according to the demands of a position at this level.

A.2 Volume of work performed, and effort made.

A.3 Planning and organization of work.

A.4 Need for instructions.

A.5 Adherence to established job standards and procedures.

A.1 QUALITY OF WORK, ACCORDING TO THE DEMANDS OF A POSITION AT THIS LEVEL

1 = **UNSATISFACTORY**: The staff member's work is sometimes given to others to complete because he or she has proven incapable of doing it.

2 = **INADEQUATE**: The staff member's work generally leaves much to be desired and is therefore often returned for corrections.

3 = **SATISFACTORY**: Work sometimes needs corrections, but in general, the quality is good.

4 = **VERY GOOD**: The quality of the work is very good, and therefore, corrections are rarely needed.

5 = **OUTSTANDING**: The work is of excellent quality, and corrections are not needed.

A.2 VOLUME OF WORK PERFORMED, AND EFFORT MADE

1 = **UNSATISFACTORY**: The staff member's production does not meet minimum requirements for the level of the position.

2 = **INADEQUATE**: The amount of work produced rarely meets the minimum for the level of the position.

3 = **SATISFACTORY**: The amount of work produced by the staff member meets the demands for the level of the position.

4 = **VERY GOOD**: The staff member produces more than expected for the level of the position.

5 = **OUTSTANDING**: The staff member's production greatly exceeds expectations for the level of the position.

A.3 PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member's failure to organize and plan produces constant delays in the work.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member frequently fails to plan and organize the work, or does so in a way that leaves much to be desired.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member normally organizes and plans his or her work in accordance with Institute norms.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member generally plans his or her work and organizes it very well in accordance with the demands of the position.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member's planning and organization of his or her work is always excellent.

A.4 NEED FOR INSTRUCTIONS

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member has difficulty completing his or her duties because of the constant need for detailed instructions on every task.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member's work is frequently late because he or she requires a degree of instructions which is excessive for the level of the position.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member completes his or her work, well and on time, in accordance with instructions received.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member follows instructions received and frequently completes his or her work ahead of the set time.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member follows instructions received and always finishes his or her work ahead of time.

A.5 ADHERENCE TO ESTABLISHED JOB STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member's work reveals his or her ignorance of established standards and procedures.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member is aware of established standards and procedures, but frequently fails to apply them.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member is familiar with established standards and procedures and generally applies them in his or her work.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member is familiar with established standards and procedures and always applies them in his or her work.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member is familiar with established standards and procedures, always applies them in a timely fashion and adapts them appropriately to new situations.

B. INTEREST AND COOPERATION

The employee should show an interest in his or her work and in Institute concerns in general. Under this FACTOR, the following SUBFACTORS should be assessed:

- B.1 Care of assigned equipment and materials.
- B.2 Demonstrated interest in increasing knowledge or skills useful for the job.
- B.3 Motivation and enthusiasm for work performance.
- B.4 Spirit of cooperation.
- B.5 Participation in Institute activities.

B.1 CARE OF ASSIGNED EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: The staff member's carelessness often results in damage to the equipment and materials assigned to him or her.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member's care of assigned equipment and materials generally leaves much to be desired.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff member takes appropriate care of assigned equipment and materials.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member is generally very attentive and concerned for the care of assigned equipment and materials.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member is always concerned for the proper operation of equipment and for the upkeep and proper use of assigned materials.

B.2 DEMONSTRATED INTEREST IN INCREASING KNOWLEDGE OR SKILLS USEFUL FOR THE JOB

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: The staff member never demonstrates interest in acquiring knowledge that might be useful for his or her work or for the Institute.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member rarely demonstrates interest in acquiring knowledge that might be useful for his or her work or for the Institute.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff member generally demonstrates interest in acquiring knowledge that might be useful for his or her work or for the Institute.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member always takes an interest in acquiring new knowledge and for applying it in his or her work.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member takes every opportunity provided by the Institute to acquire useful knowledge, and is always ready to seek out new sources of information.

B.3 MOTIVATION AND ENTHUSIASM FOR WORK PERFORMANCE

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member has absolutely no motivation or enthusiasm for performing his or her work or for helping to meet the objectives of the unit.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member only rarely shows enthusiasm for performing his or her work and for helping to meet the objectives of the unit.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member generally shows enthusiasm for his or her work and for meeting the objectives of the unit.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member always demonstrates great motivation and enthusiasm for the work.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member's motivation for the work is unwavering, and he or she always shows tremendous enthusiasm for helping to meet the objectives of the unit.

B.4 SPIRIT OF COOPERATION

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member never cooperates with his or her co-workers or with personnel from other offices.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member rarely cooperates with his or her co-workers or with personnel from other offices.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member generally cooperates with his or her co-workers and with personnel from other offices.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member always cooperates with pleasure with his or her co-workers and with personnel from other offices.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member displays an excellent spirit of cooperation and service in his or her unit and is always willing to cooperate with personnel from other offices, even when not specifically requested.

B.5 PARTICIPATION IN INSTITUTE ACTIVITIES

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member never participates in Institute activities or demonstrates an interest in helping to meet IICA's goals.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member rarely participates Institute activities and shows little interest in helping to meet IICA's goals.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member almost always participates in Institute activities and generally shows an interest in helping to meet IICA's goals.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member always participates eagerly in Institute activities and shows a marked interest in helping to meet IICA's goals.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member plays a highly visible role in Institute activities and shows exceptional concern for helping to meet IICA's goals.

C.3 NEED FOR SUPERVISION

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: In order to produce acceptable work the staff member needs close, constant supervision, thus adversely affecting the operations of the rest of the unit.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member frequently needs more supervision than is expected for a position at this level.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff member generally performs his or her work with a degree of supervision appropriate for a position at this level.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member needs supervision only from time to time and under circumstances in which a lack of supervision could affect the outcome of the work.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member never requires supervision in order to perform his or her duties properly, and the supervisors have complete confidence in his or her judgement.

C.4 INITIATIVE

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: The staff member totally lacks initiative for solving problems; or sometimes attempts to solve them, but not successfully, due to lack of common sense.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member only rarely shows initiative for responding to new situations and, even in these cases, needs guidance because his or her solutions are not appropriate.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff member displays an appropriate degree of initiative and common sense for applying standards and procedures to new situations, in line with expectations for a position of this level.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member almost always demonstrates a remarkable degree of initiative and has very good judgement for applying standards and procedures to new situations.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member always displays a high degree of initiative and shows excellent judgement in applying standards and procedures to unexpected situations and finding appropriate solutions to difficult problems.

C.5 EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY ON THE JOB

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: The staff member never exercises the authority that the position entails, and therefore it is difficult to identify his or her scope of responsibility.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member sometimes fails to exercise authority, and therefore his or her work is often disorderly, or internal relations suffer.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff member exercises appropriately the degree of authority entailed in the position.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member uses good judgement in exercising the authority corresponding to his or her position, and this is reflected in the outcome of the work and in his or her relations with co-workers and supervisors.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member always exercises the degree of authority conferred by the position in an optimal fashion; thus, the supervisor can have complete confidence in the staff member in his or her area of work.

D. BEHAVIOR

Employee behavior reflects on the Institute's image. The following SUBFACTORS should be appraised:

- D.1 Relations with supervisors and co-workers.
- D.2 Respect for laws and regulations.
- D.3 Compliance with instructions received from supervisors.
- D.4 Dedication to the job.
- D.5 Discretion on the job.

D.1 RELATIONS WITH SUPERVISORS AND CO-WORKERS

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member's behavior and relations with supervisors and co-workers are unacceptable and produce constant human relations problems.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member's relations with supervisors and co-workers sometimes leave much to be desired.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member generally maintains good relations with supervisors and co-workers, although at times could improve some aspects of his or her interpersonal relations.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member maintains very good relations with supervisors and co-workers, and only rarely has problems with human relations.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member maintains excellent relations with supervisors and co-workers and is known for his or her ability to tolerate difficult situations and rise above them successfully.

D.2 RESPECT FOR LAWS AND REGULATIONS

- 1 = **UNSATISFACTORY:** The staff member never meets obligations established in labor laws, and does not adhere to Institute regulations or practices.
- 2 = **INADEQUATE:** The staff member frequently fails to comply with obligations established in labor laws and Institute regulations.
- 3 = **SATISFACTORY:** The staff member normally complies fully with obligations established in labor laws and Institute regulations and practices.
- 4 = **VERY GOOD:** The staff member frequently exceeds the requirements of labor laws and Institute regulations and practices.
- 5 = **OUTSTANDING:** The staff member always greatly exceeds the obligations established in labor laws and Institute regulations and practices.

D.3 COMPLIANCE WITH INSTRUCTIONS RECEIVED FROM SUPERVISORS

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: The staff member habitually fails to perform his or her duties as planned, or in accordance with instructions received from supervisors, frequently causing delays and problems in the work.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member frequently fails to perform his or her work as planned, or in accordance with instructions from supervisors.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff member generally accepts instructions from supervisors and carries them out, completing his or her work as planned.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member always accepts instructions from supervisors, carries them out fully and completes his or her work as planned.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member always accepts instructions from supervisors with pleasure, carries them out exceptionally well, and frequently exceeds supervisor expectations for his or her work.

D.4 DEDICATION TO THE JOB

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: The staff member has little dedication to the job, constantly wasting time in conversations or personal matters unrelated to the Institute.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member's dedication to the job does not meet expectations for a position at this level; he or she frequently wastes time in conversations or personal matters unrelated to the Institute.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff member is reasonably dedicated to the job, only occasionally wasting time in conversations or personal matters unrelated to the Institute.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member's dedication to the job exceeds expectations for his or her position, and he or she very rarely wastes time in conversations or personal matters unrelated to the Institute.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member always displays exceptional dedication to his or her work and avoids wasting time in conversations or personal matters unrelated to the Institute.

D.5 DISCRETION ON THE JOB

- 1 = UNSATISFACTORY: The staff member is not discreet with information to which he or she has access on the job.
- 2 = INADEQUATE: The staff member's prudence concerning information to which he or she has access generally leaves much to be desired.
- 3 = SATISFACTORY: The staff members is generally circumspect with information to which he or she has access on the job.
- 4 = VERY GOOD: The staff member is always discreet with information to which he or she has access on the job.
- 5 = OUTSTANDING: The staff member stands out for his or her extreme discretion with information to which he or she has access on the job, to the degree that supervisors can unreservedly trust this person with other confidential information about the Institute.

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE

P.O. Box: 55 – 2200 Coronado, Costa Rica – Phone: 29-0222 – Cable: IICASANJOSE – Telex: 2144 IICA,
Electronic Mail EIES: 1332 IICA DG – FAX (506)294741 IICA COSTA RICA