

SYSTEM OF RANKING OPAPP UNITS
Guidelines on the Computation of Ratings

TOTAL UNIT RATING

The computation for Unit Rating is composed of three components, namely (1) Actual Unit Accomplishment; (2) Organizational Rating, and; (3) Rating of the Executives. Of the aggregate Unit Rating, Actual Accomplishment and Organizational Rating make up 70% and the Rating of Executives makes up the remaining 30%.

1. Computing for the Actual Accomplishment of OPAPP Units.

Actual Unit Accomplishment is based on the unit targets set for the Fiscal Year (FY) versus the unit's actual activities for the said year. Each of the units' activities is graded using the Level of Performance scoring adapted from the CSC. These are then given percentage weights for each activity. Scoring is done through a self-assessment basis for all of the units.

2. Computing for the Organizational Rating.

The Organizational Rating is based on the OPAPP targets as set in the FORM B (Presidential Priority Programs and Projects) versus the agency's actual accomplishment for the applicable year. Each Peace Process Table (MILF, MNLF, CNN, CPLA and RPA) accomplishment is graded using the level of performance scoring adapted from CSC. Likewise, a percentage weight is given to the level of significance for each of the Peace tables. These two values are decided upon by the Executive Committee.

Level of Performance

The Peace Process table and units shall be assessed and rated on the basis of the levels of performance set below:

UNIT RATING SCALE			
PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTION	NUMERICAL RATING	ADJECTIVAL RATING	PERCENTAGE RATING
Performance exceeding targets by 11% to 20% and above of the planned targets. <i>Performance represents extraordinary level of achievement and commitment in terms of quality, quantity, time. Achievement and contributions to the OPAPP are of marked excellence.</i>	10	Outstanding	111% - 120% and above

UNIT RATING SCALE			
PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTION	NUMERICAL RATING	ADJECTIVAL RATING	PERCENTAGE RATING
<p>Performance exceeding targets by 1% to 10% of the planned targets.</p> <p><i>Performance exceeded expectations. All targets and objectives were achieved above the established standards.</i></p>	8	Very Satisfactory	101% - 110%
<p>Performance meeting 100% of the planned targets.</p> <p>For accomplishments requiring 100% of the targets pertaining to money or accuracy or those which may no longer exceed, <u>the usual rating of 10 points applies for those who met targets or 4 points for those who failed or fell short of the targets.</u></p> <p><i>Performance met expectations in terms of quality of work, efficiency and timeliness. The most critical goals were met.</i></p>	6	Satisfactory	100%
<p>Performance meeting 90% to 99% of the planned targets.</p> <p><i>Performance failed to meet expectations and/or one or more of the most critical goals were not met.</i></p>	4	Fair	90% - 99%
<p>Performance failing to meet the planned targets by 89% or below.</p> <p><i>Performance was consistently below expectations and/or reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas.</i></p>	2	Poor	89% below

3. Computing for the Executive Committee's Rating.

The Executive offices have been covered to utilize and submit its Office Performance Commitment and Review Forms (OPCR) and review the operational efficiency of its respective clusters based on the OPAPP targets set and actual unit accomplishments under each cluster. The rating of the OPCR will be the rating of the OPAPP Executive using the same level of performance scoring.