

Government of Zimbabwe
Results Based Management Program



Guidelines to the Completion of the Appraisal Form(s)

Section A

Procedures for completing the Appraisal Form(s)

Section 1: Personal Details

To be completed by the appraisee.

Section 2: Performance Targets

2.1 Refer to Departmental Work and Performance Monitoring Plan to extract relevant activities, outputs, outcomes and budget information.

2.2 Allocate weightage accordingly and total weightage should add up to 100%.

2.3 The appraiser and appraisee should establish relevant standards for the results on each of the agreed performance dimensions and this should be endorsed by the reviewer.

2.4 The appraiser and appraisee must agree to the work plan and sign on the same date and this must be endorsed by the reviewer.

Section 3: Training and Development Needs

3.1 The appraiser and appraisee should utilize the Review Sessions to identify the appraisee's training needs which are directly relevant to the job requirements and this should be recorded in the relevant section of the form.

3.2 The appraiser and appraisee should agree on strategies to address the identified training needs and the Human Resources Department should come up with training programmes for the identified training needs. Training should be provided as soon as possible in cases where in-house training is required.

3.3 If there are any skills that cannot be provided through in-house training, then these should be submitted to the Ministry's Human Resources Department for consolidation and submission to the Public Service Commission's Manpower, Planning & Development Agency in the form of the Ministry's Human Resources Development Plan.

Section 4: Performance Progress Reviews

4.1 Appraisee and appraiser must review progress against set targets for each quarter following the schedule below:-

Deadline	Action	Expected Results
Mid January	Agreement of performance targets	Work plan outlining targets and standards
First week of April	First interim progress review	Comments on actual performance versus set targets
First week of July	Second interim progress review	Comments on actual performance versus set targets
First week of October	Third interim progress review	Comments on actual performance versus set targets
Mid December	Final appraisal	Final rating and comments on performance achievements versus set targets

4.2 Modifications to the performance work plan can only be done when there are major changes during the performance cycle which could be due to special assignments, critical incidences or changes to the mandate of the organization.

4.2.1 Any modifications to the work plan and justifications thereof should be indicated in Section 4B or 4C of the appraisal form. However, for the purpose of performance assessment, the adjusted performance targets should be captured in the correct format in Section 2 of the appraisal form.

4.2.2 On promotion, transfer and regrading, which entails change of job description, a member is expected to draw new work plans in line with the new responsibilities.

4.3 During the Performance Cycle, the appraiser must continuously monitor the appraisee's performance progress.

4.4 The review discussions should relate to the progress being made towards the achievement of the appraisee's performance targets and any other necessary adjustments. Comments at review stages should be on the agreed performance targets to ensure that maximum productivity and standards are met.

4.5 The appraisee must be given an opportunity to comment during performance Reviews and both the appraisee and the appraiser should sign. During progress reviews the reviewer should only intervene and comment in cases where the appraisee and the appraiser disagree. If the parties involved do not agree on work plans or the final rating, the issue should be referred to the Head of Ministry or may be dealt with as a normal grievance.

Section 5: Final Performance Assessment and Rating

- 5.1 The appraiser must formally assess and rate the performance of the appraisee by Mid December of each year. The assessment should be based on the agreed Performance targets for the year.
- 5.2 During the final review, the appraisee should be given an opportunity to comment again. The appraisee and the appraiser should sign and this should be endorsed by the reviewer.

5.3 Rating Scale

A rating scale of 1 to 6 will be used to rate individual member's performance at the end of the cycle.

Rating of '1' represents the lowest level of performance with the rating of '6' being The highest score which clearly surpasses set targets.

It is important to refer to the rating of '4' to measure how far the appraisee's performance falls above or below the set targets. The rating scale is interpreted as follows:

RATING	DESCRIPTION
6	Clearly Exceeds Set Targets – beyond variance
5	Performance Above Set Targets – but within variance
4	Met All Agreed Set Targets
3	Performance Below Set Targets – but within variance
2	Performance Below Set Targets - below variance
1	Nothing was accomplished

Section B

Guidelines for the Computation of Ratings for Members in Band A & B

1. Introduction

Apportionment of weights to activities is indicated below: -

PERFORMANCE DIMENSION	WEIGHT	MAXIMUM SCORE
Activities	100%	6.0
Total	100%	6.0

2. Activities Performance Targets Rating

The activities performance target achievements constitute 100 % of the final rating. For Band A & B, the performance target assessment shall be based on performance in terms of activity completion. Each Activity identified shall be assigned a weight according to the importance of that Activity relative to the other Activities. For each Activity identified, the weight assigned will be distributed according to four dimensions, i.e. quantity, quality, timeliness and cost. The dimension of cost will be applied only where it is applicable.

An example of the tabulation of the Activities and weights assigned is as follows:

OUTPUT (1)	WEIGHT BY DIMENSION (2)	ALLOWABLE VARIANCE (3)	ACTUAL VARIANCE (4)	RATING AWARDED (5)	WEIGHTED SCORE (6) (2 x 5)
Activity "A" (50%)	Quantity 15%	+/- 10%	+12%	6	0.90
	Quality 10%	+/- 10%	- 8%	3	0.30
	Timeliness* 10%	+/- 10%	+20%	2	0.20
	Cost* 15%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.60
Activity "B" (50%)	Quantity 15%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.60
	Quality 10%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.40
	Timeliness* 15%	+/- 10%	- 8%	5	0.75
	Cost* 10%	+/- 5%	+6%	2	0.20
TOTAL	100%				3.95

Note: Variances can be either negative or positive.

For the dimension of 'timeliness' and 'cost' a negative variance denotes good performance.

SECTION C

Guidelines for the Computation of Ratings for Members in Band C, D, E & F

1. Introduction

Apportionment of weights to outputs is indicated below: -

PERFORMANCE DIMENSION	WEIGHT	MAXIMUM SCORE
Output Targets	100%	6.0
Total	100%	6.0

2. Performance Targets Rating

The performance target achievements constitute 100 % of the final rating. For Band C, D, E, and F the performance target assessment shall be based on performance in terms of agreed outputs. Each output identified shall be assigned a weight according to the importance of that output relative to the other outputs. For each output identified the weight assigned will be distributed according to four dimensions, i.e, quantity, quality, timeliness and cost. The dimension of cost will be applied only where it is applicable.

An example of the tabulation of the outputs and weights assigned is as follows:

OUTPUT (1)	WEIGHT BY DIMENSION (2)	ALLOWABLE VARIANCE (3)	ACTUAL VARIANCE (4)	RATING AWARDED (5)	WEIGHTED SCORE (6) (2 x 5)
Output "A" (50%)	Quantity 15%	+/- 10%	+12%	6	0.90
	Quality 10%	+/- 10%	- 8%	3	0.30
	Timeliness* 10%	+/- 10%	+20%	2	0.20
	Cost* 15%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.60
Output "B" (50%)	Quantity 10%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.40
	Quality 15%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.60
	Timeliness* 15%	+/- 10%	- 8%	5	0.75
	Cost* 10%	+/- 05%	+6%	2	0.20
TOTAL	100%				3.95

Note: Variances can be either negative or positive.

For the dimension of 'timeliness' and 'cost' a negative variance denotes good performance.

SECTION D

Guidelines for the Computation of Ratings for Heads of Departments

1. Introduction

Apportionment of weights to output, outcome, and budget utilization has been standardized as indicated below: -

PERFORMANCE DIMENSION	WEIGHT	MAXIMUM SCORE
Output Targets	60%	3.60
Outcome Targets	30%	1.80
Budget Expenditure Performance	10%	0.60
Total	100%	6.0

It should be noted that ‘Output’ has a higher weight compared to outcomes because outputs constitute a major controllable aspect of the member’s performance while outcomes are sometimes subject to external influences.

2. Output Performance Targets Rating

The output performance constitutes 60% of the final rating. For Heads of Departments, the performance target assessment shall be based on performance in terms of agreed outputs. Each output identified shall be assigned a weight according to the importance of that output relative to the other outputs. The 60% is further apportioned to the applicable attributes of outputs, that is, quality, quantity and timeliness and cost as indicated below:

Example of the tabulation of the outputs and weights:

OUTPUT (1)	WEIGHT BY DIMENSION (2)	ALLOWABLE VARIANCE (3)	ACTUAL VARIANCE (4)	RATING AWARDED (5)	WEIGHTED SCORE (6) (2 x 5)
Output “A” (30%)	Quantity 10%	+/- 10%	+12%	6	0.60
	Quality 10%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.40
	Timeliness* 5%	+/- 10%	+20%	2	0.10
	Cost* 5%	+/- 10%	0%	4	0.20
Output “B” (30%)	Quantity 10%	+/- 10%	+50%	6	0.60
	Quality 5%	+/- 10%	- 15%	2	0.10
	Timeliness* 10%	+/- 10%	+8%	3	0.30
	Cost* 5%	+/- 5%	+10%	2	0.10
TOTAL	60%				2.30

Note: Variances can be either negative or positive.

For the dimension of ‘timeliness’ and ‘cost’ a negative variance denotes good performance.

3. Outcome Performance Rating

Since the Head of Department is responsible for ensuring the outcomes of the Department, outcome achievement will constitute 30% of final rating.

OUTCOME (1)	WEIGHTAGE (2)	ALLOWABLE VARIANCE (3)	ACTUAL VARIANCE (4)	RATING ON OUTCOME (5)	WEIGHTED SCORE (6) (2 x 5)
Outcome 1	15%	+/- 10%	+15%	6	0.90
Outcome 2	10%	+/- 5%	+4%	5	0.50
Outcome 3	5%	+/- 5%	0%	4	0.20
Total	30%				1.60

4. Budget Utilization Rating

Budget utilization rating is based on budget Expenditure.

Expenditure Performance is assessed on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 representing expenditure above agreed target and 5 representing efficient utilization of financial resources where actual expenditure is below the targeted expenditure.

The rating scale and possible scores as well as adjusted weighted rates are shown in the table below:

Rating (1)	Description (2)	Weight (3)	Weighted Score (4) (1) x (3)	Adjusted Score (5) (4 ÷ 5) x 6
5	Expenditure below the targeted expenditure and below the variance	10%	0.5	0.60
4	Expenditure below targeted expenditure but within variance	7%	0.28	0.34
3	Targeted expenditure	6%	0.18	0.22
2	Above the targeted expenditure but within variance	4%	0.08	0.096
1	Above targeted expenditure & above variance	2%	0.02	0.024

Assuming that this person scores a rating of “5” for Expenditure Performance, he/she will get an adjusted score of **0.6**

6. Computation of the Final Rating

Final Performance Rating = Score on achievement of output targets + Score on the outcome targets + Score on Budget Utilization.

Example of Computation of Final Rating:

	Performance Rating Focus	Score	Maximum Score Possible
1	Output Performance Rating	2.30	3.60
2	Outcome Performance Rating	1.60	1.80
3	Budget Utilization Rating	0.60	0.60
Final score		4.50	6.0