मुत्य मालु र ले मार्थिम भूत रहेँ मान्य ROYAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION



MANAGING FOR EXCELLENCE Manual

2018

Excellence in Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST C | F ABBR | EVIATIONS | v |
|--------|--------|---|------|
| | | DN | |
| Снар | | RELIMINARY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT | |
| 1.1. | | mance Appraisal Form for PMC and SSC | |
| | | Section A: Employee Details | |
| | | Section B: Performance Assessment (Individual Work Plan) 70% | |
| | | Section C: Competency Behavior (30%) | |
| | 1.1.4. | Section D: Performance Evaluation Score (Section B & C) | 6 |
| 1.2. | | le on how to evaluate Performance Appraisal Form | |
| 1.3. | The Pe | rformance Appraisal Form for Operational category (OC): | . 10 |
| Снар | | MECHANICS OF MODERATION EXERCISE | |
| 2.1. | | ation Exercise (ModEx) | |
| 2.2. | Agency | Categorization Framework (ACF) | . 11 |
| 2.3. | | mance Evaluation of Moderation Committee Members and | |
| | | list (ES3-ES1) | |
| 2.4. | _ | ment of scores to civil servant at various Position Level | |
| | | Executive (EX3-EX1) | |
| | | Specialist (ES3-ES1) | |
| | | Professional and Management (P1) | . 13 |
| | 2.4.4. | Professional and Management (P5-P2), Supervisory and | |
| | | support (S5-SS1) | . 13 |
| | 2.4.5. | Civil servants on Secondment, Long Term Study Leave, | |
| | | Maternity Leave, EOL and Transfer | . 13 |
| 2.5. | • | osition of Moderation Committee and Assignment of Performance | |
| | _ | to Committee Members | |
| 2.6. | | uisite for Moderation Exercise | . 20 |
| 2.7. | | nining the Distribution Percentage for assignment of | |
| | • | mance category to individual staff | |
| 2.8. | | nt Roles in the Moderation Exercise | |
| 2.9. | | eration/Criteria | |
| 2.10. | Summa | ary of ModEx process | . 24 |
| | | MANAGING FOR EXCELLENCE FOR TEACHING AND SUPPORT | |
| | | CHOOL | |
| 3.1. | | mance Appraisal Form for PMC and SSC | |
| | | Section A: Employee details | |
| | | Section B: Performance Assessment (IWP) 70% | |
| | | Section C: Competency Behavior (30%) | . 26 |
| | 3.1.4. | Section D: Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score | |
| | | (section B and C) | . 26 |

| 3.2. | Example on how to evaluate Performance Appraisal Form | |
|------|---|----|
| 3.3. | Performance Appraisal Form for Operational Category | 26 |
| 3.4. | Procedure of Moderation Exercise and Agency Categorization Framework. | 26 |
| 3.5. | Performance Rating for Moderation Committee Members | 27 |
| 3.6. | General Principle for performance evaluation rating of staff in schools | 27 |
| 3.7. | Moderation Exercise Guideline for Schools | 27 |
| Снар | TER 4: PERFORMANCE LINKED HR INCENTIVES, APPEAL SYSTEM | |
| AND | Max Calender | 28 |
| 4.1. | Performance linked HR Actions | 28 |
| 4.2. | Appeal Procedure | 33 |
| 4.3. | MaX Calendar for civil servants: Fiscal Year (July-June) | 34 |
| | MaX Calendar for civil servants in schools (Jan -Dec) | |
| Anni | EXURE | 36 |
| Anne | xure 1: Performance Appraisal Form for Professional and Management, | |
| | and Specialist Services Group | 36 |
| Anne | xure 2: Performance Appraisal Form for Supervisory and | |
| | Support Services Group | 41 |
| Anne | xure 3: Performance Appraisal for O category | |
| | xure 4: Performance Calibration through Moderation Exercise | |
| | xure 5: Sample Meeting Agenda | |
| | xure 6: Schedule A | |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APA : Annual Performance Agreement ACF : Agency Categorization Framework

APT : Annual Performance Targets

AWP : Annual Work Plan EOL : Extra Ordinary leave

DEO : Dzongkhag Education Officer

GPMS : Government Performance Management System

G : Good

HR : Human Resource

HRC : Human Resource Committee

IWP : Individual Work Plan
IC : Investigation Committee

QQCT : Quality, Quantity, Cost, and Time

MaX : Managing for Excellence
MC : Moderation Committee
ModEx : Moderation Exercise
NI : Need Improvement

OS : Outstanding

OC : Operational Category

PAF : Performance Appraisal form
PE : Performance Evaluation

PL : Position Level

PMC : Professional & Management Category
PMS : Professional & Management System
PER : Performance Evaluation Rating
PIP : Performance Improvement Plan
RCSC : Royal Civil Service Commission

SI : Success Indicators

SIP : School Improvement Plan

SPMS : School Performance Management System

SSC : Supervisory & Support Category

TRC : Teacher Resource Centres

VG : Very Good

INTRODUCTION

In 2014, the Royal Civil Service Commission identified Performance Management System (PMS) as one of the areas of reform for the Bhutanese Civil Service. In order to assess the effectiveness and efficacy of the existing PMS, an exercise was carried out in 2014 to evaluate it and the following were the findings:

- All civil servants were rated outstanding category and average PE rating was 3.82 out of 4 across all Agencies;
- The PE forms indicating the strategic planning and/or strategic involvement of civil servants were minimal; and
- All expected performance output identified lacked objective indicators and linkages to organizational objectives, if any, were weak.

Therefore, the RCSC in order to strengthen existing PMS, worked to institute procedures that strengthen performance planning, monitoring and evaluation by creating a mechanism for linking and aligning individual performance to the organizational objectives and results. Organizational objectives, in turn, are drawn from the national vision and the Five Year Plans. The title of the new PMS is "Managing for Excellence" (MaX). The objectives of MaX are:

- **Alignment**: To align individual performance targets with the organization's strategic vision/missions/objectives;
- Accountability: To ensure organizational effectiveness by cascading institutional accountabilities to the various levels of the organization's hierarchy; and
- **Differentiation**: To enhance Agency's overall performance by differentiating performer from non-performer.

The key elements of the "Managing for Excellence" framework are as follows:

- Clear organizational targets linked to national targets;
- Organizational targets cascaded down to division level and then down to individual level with clear performance targets and competency behaviors;
- Evaluation of Performance and Competency Behaviors at the end of the cycle based on agreed performance targets.
- Ranking of individuals during Moderation Exercise (ModEx) for Professional and Support Categories to Outstanding, Very Good, Good and Need Improvement categories based on the Agency Categorization Framework; and
- The results of ModEx, which is the performance rating of civil servants, will be the basis for all HR Actions.

PURPOSE

This "Managing for Excellence" Manual shall be used as a guide to the manager and employees for managing and evaluating Performance and Competency Behavior of civil servants. It shall therefore, provide a step-wise guide on the four important aspects of the MaX system elaborated in detail in its respective Chapters as given below:

Chapter 1: Preliminary Performance Assessment;

Chapter 2: Mechanics of the Moderation Exercise;

Chapter 3: Managing for Excellence Framework for Teaching Services and School Support Services; and

Chapter 4: Performance based HR Incentives & Appeal System, and MaX Calendar.

CHAPTER 1

PRELIMINARY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

The supervisor and supervisee shall jointly develop the Performance Appraisal Form (PAF) to organize and manage individual activities to effectively contribute to achieving the annual and Five Year Plan objectives of the Agency. The assessment of the Individual Work Plan (IWP) shall be conducted using the Performance Appraisal Form which shall then be input to the Moderation Exercise for assignment of the final rating.

1.1. Performance Appraisal Form for PMC and SSC

The Performance Appraisal Form shall be used to formulate division outputs, identify activities, set target values, and identify Competency Behavior (refer Annexure 1 and 2 for the Performance Appraisal Form). The Performance Appraisal Form consists of four Sections.

1.1.1. Section A: Employee Details

Section A requires civil servants to fill up the details such as Appraisal Period, Employee ID number, Name, Position Title, Position Level, Division, and Department or Ministry. The pictorial depiction is as follows:

Section A: Employee Details

| APPRAISAL PERIOD: | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| EMPLOYEE ID No. | |
| NAME OF THE EMPLOYEE: | |
| POSITION TITLE: | POSITION LEVEL: |
| DIVISION: | DEPARTMENT/AGENCY: |

1.1.2. Section B: Performance Assessment (Individual Work Plan) 70%

An Individual Work Plan is a clear plan of action for an individual in an Agency to organize and manage individual activities to effectively contribute to achieving the annual objectives of the Agency. A rigorous individual work planning exercise will ensure alignment of work done by civil servants to the higher order strategic objectives of their Agencies thereby making the individual performance appraisal more purposeful and effective. It carries 70% weightage.

In this section civil servants are required to formulate Division Output, identify performance activities and set target values.

a. Formulating Division Outputs

After Agency's Annual Performance Agreements/Annual Performance Target are signed, Divisions shall come up with clear outputs for the fiscal year based on their Departmental objectives. As such, division outputs must be clearly substantiated by Success Indicators (SI) and target values in the same format as Departmental and Agency Annual Performance Agreement/Annual Performance Target.

These division outputs are achieved as a result of activities implemented by individuals working in the Division.

b. Identifying Activities

Activities are essential work items that an individual need to execute in order to achieve the division outputs. Activities should concisely indicate how an individual intends to utilize inputs and overcome constraints to attain the outputs. Each activity listed must be related to one of the outputs, and only activities which have direct contribution to achievement of division outputs should be included in the IWP.

c. Setting the Target Values

After identifying the activities, individuals shall set a target value each to the activities that merits a rating of Level 4/Level 3/Level 2/Level 1 using the QQCT (Quantity, Quality, Cost, and Time) framework. The values are set in terms of Quantity, Quality, Cost or Time. It is not necessary to have all the four factors fitting in one target value. Either, a combination or any of the four factors from the QQCT framework should be reflected in the target values depending on the nature of activity.

It is not necessary to fill target values for all four levels. However, it is mandatory to set the target value for Level 2. If the target value for only Level 2 is drawn, the supervisor shall make the judgment on how to assess the other three levels, at the end of the appraisal period using Level 2 target value as the yardstick.

The target value shall be derived as per the definition given in the table:

| Performer Category | Definition | Rating Scale |
|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| Level 4 | Achieved exceptionally high level of performance above the requirement of the job | 3.00-4.00 |
| Level 3 | Performed at higher level than requirement of the job | 2.00-2.99 |
| Level 2 | Employee fulfilled requirement of the job | 1.00-1.99 |
| Level 1 | Results/Behaviour far below performance requirement | <=0.99 |

Following process shall apply for developing individual work plan:

All Agencies sign APA/APT with clear organizational Signing/finalization of **Agency APA/APT** objectives and targets on an annual basis. Signing of Dept./ Division The System mandates each Ministry, Dzongkhag and /Sector Level APA/APT autonomous Agency to sign APA at various levels, Department, Sector and Division level respectively. Divisions/Sector shall come up with clear outputs Formulation of **Division Outputs** for the fiscal year based on the agency's objectives. Chief of Division will have to identify Division outputs during the planning phase. **Formulating Activities** Individual to identify activities and performance and target. performance Targets Managers to vet target/activities identified by individuals.

The pictorial depiction of Section B is as follows:

SECTION B: Performance Assessment (Individual Work Plan) (70%)

| | | | Targets Values | | | Target | Employee's | |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Division Output | Activities | Level 4 =[3.00- 4.00] | Level 3 =[2.00- 2.99] | Level2 =[1.00 -1.99] | Level 1 [<=0.99] | Achieved specified by individual | Feedback/ comment/ justification | Score by Supervisor ¹ |
| 1. | 1. 1 | | | | | | | |
| | 1.2 | | | | | | | |
| 2. | 2.1 | | | | | | | |
| | 2.2 | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Score B. | | | | |
| | Total sc | ore/No. o | f activities | s = | | | | |

1.1.3. Section C: Competency Behavior (30%)

The Competency Behavior required for Professional and Management Category (PMC), and Supervisory and Support Category (SSC) are different. Refer Performance Appraisal Forms (Annexure 1 and 2) on the details of Competency Behavior for PMC and SSC.

The Competency Behaviors are used to evaluate qualitative aspect of performance of individual and this will include skills and values required to carry out performance targets indicated in Section B of the Performance Appraisal Form. It carries 30% weightage.

Please note, the lists of Competency Behaviors are an indicative list. Agencies based on the requirements can add additional competencies and customize it accordingly with the description of Competency Behavior and indicating different levels of competencies.

1.1.4. Section D: Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score (Section B & C)

This Section contains the final Preliminary Performance Score derived from Section B (70%) and Section C (30%).

Note

¹ Concrete results achieved during the year that were agreed and rate them in the scale indicated in the target values.

SECTION D: Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score [Section B &C]

| Particular | Score Received | Preliminary Score | Supervisor's Comment, if any |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| B. Performance | | 70% of Score B= | |
| C. Competency Behaviors | | 30% of Score C= | |
| Total | | | |

1.2. Example on how to Evaluate Performance Appraisal Form

Evaluating the Individual Work Plan [Section B of Performance Appraisal Form] œ.

and achieved Level 4, the corresponding rating will be between 3.00 - 4.00. Similarly, if s/he achieves "Level 3", the This section will form 70% of the total score and the following table shows an example on how to provide rating by the supervisor for the targets specified in the Individual Work Plan. For example: if he/she has performed the activity corresponding rating will be changed as per scale. However, it is not necessary to fill target values for all four levels. A minimum target value for Level 2 is sufficient. If the target value for only up to Level 2 is drawn, the supervisor shall make the judgement on how to assess at the end of the appraisal period using Level 2 as the yardstick.

SECTION B: Performance Assessment (70%): Evaluating the Individual Work Plan

| - | | | Targets Values | | Target | Employee's | |
|--|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| Activities | Level | Level | Level | Level | Achieved specified by | Feedback/ | Score by |
| 4=[3.00- 3=2.00- 4.00] 2.99] | 4=[3.00- 4.00] | 3=2.00- 2.99] | 2=[1.00 -1.99] 1[<=0.99] | 1[<=0.99] | individual | justification | |
| 1.1. Conduct moderation Exercise | yluly | August | September | Later than September 30 | September | | 1.50 |
| 2. OD 2.1 Implement recommendations approved C2 100% Implemented recommendations | 100% | %06 | %08 | Less than 80% | %08 | | 2.00 |
| | | | | | | Total | 3.50 |
| | | | | Final S | core B (Total/N | Final Score B (Total/No. of activities) $1.75 \ (3.50/2)$ | 1.75 (3.50/2) |

Evaluating Competency Behavior [Section C of Performance Appraisal Form] ٥.

This Section will form 30% of the total score and evaluation will be done as follows. The ratings of competency behavior will be based on the assessment areas that have been agreed between the supervisor and supervisee.

For example:

SECTION C: Competency Behavior (30%)

| Competency Behavior | Description | Level 4 [3.00- | Level 3 [2.00- 2.99] | Level 2 [1.00- 1.99] | Level 1 [<=.99] | Score by Supervisor with Evidence of Behavior |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1. Analytical and Intellectual Capacity | 1.1. Sense of Perspective: Demonstrates intellectual flexibility, imagination and socio-political sensitivity in developing a holistic appreciation of the situation and in generating innovative ideas and solutions that bring practical benefit. | Thinks ahead Takes to anticipate strategic step issues, and ways to identifies achieve and opportunities enhance the and appreciates achievement implications. of the target. | Takes strategic steps guidance in and ways to identifying achieve and enhance the opportunities achievement and solution of the target. towards achieving the target. | Need Is hasty in guidance in formatting identifying opinions and the opportunities taking action and solutions before assess to solve work implications at towards Focuses on dachieving the to day proble target. of longer terr planting. | Need Is hasty in guidance in formatting identifying opinions and the opportunities taking action and solutions before assessing to solve work implications and towards Focuses on day achieving the to day problems target. Of longer tern planning. | Level 3=2.5 Mr. X when assigned a task on HR Planning submitted recommendation that was approved by the Agency. |
| Competency E (Total score/n | Competency Behavior Score (Total score/number of competency behavior) | avior) | | | | 2.5/1=2.5 |

c. Evaluation of Performance and Competency Behavior

The preliminary performance rating for the individual will consist of 70% Performance and 30% Competency Behavior. With reference to the aforementioned example, the final rating will be as follows:

| Particular | Score received | Preliminary Score | Supervisor's Comment, if any |
|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Performance | 1.75 | 70% of 1.75=1.23 | |
| Competency Behavior | 2.50 | 30% of 2.50=0.75 | |
| Evaluation Score | | 1.98 | |

The scores from Preliminary Performance Assessment and Competency behavior will be used as an input during the Moderation Exercise of the employees. *Therefore, the Evaluation Score of IWP and Competency Behavior will not be the individual's final evaluation score.* Note²

1.3. The Performance Appraisal Form for Operational Category (OC)

The Performance Appraisal Form for OC consist of details of the employee and the assessment is based on competency behavior since the roles and responsibilities of civil servants under this category are routine and often repetitive. Overall, staff under this category is required to comply with set of objectives, methodology and specific assignment. They are not required to fill in online Performance Appraisal Forms (the PAF for OC is attached as Annexure 3).

Note

Agencies listed under schedule A of this manual due to their unique circumstances will be exempted from the moderation exercise. However, all civil servants in those Agencies including Executives will have to complete the appraisal forms and the evaluation score of appraisal forms will be their final performance score.

CHAPTER 2 MECHANICS OF MODERATION EXERCISE

2.1. Moderation Exercise (ModEx)

The Moderation Exercise is ranking of civil servants into different performance categories (*Outstanding, Very Good, Good* and *Need Improvement*) based on Agency Categorization Framework.

For agencies which sign Annual Performance Agreement, the performance score of their Agency/Department whichever is applicable will be used as the basis for determining the distribution of civil servants into different performance categories.

For agencies without APA, the basis for distribution of performers *into different* performance categories will be the scores assigned under the APT evaluation report.

2.2. Agency Categorization Framework (ACF)

Agency Categorization Framework (ACF) will be the basis for categorizing civil servants into different performance categories. The framework will use the APA/APT scores as the basis for distribution of employees into different performance categories. The ACF is subject to change depending on how the APA/APT is assessed.

Following categories will be used for the purpose of ranking employees into different performance categories. Agencies have the option to put lesser number of staff than the assigned numbers in *outstanding* and more number of staff than the assigned number in the *Need Improvement* i.e the assigned quota for OS and NI are the maximum and minimum numbers respectively.

Note: If the agency fails to identify the required number of staff under Need Improvement as per assigned ACF derived from APA/APT/EMS score, the Moderation Committee/TRC Members shall be all assigned NI as proxy rating.

Agency Categorization Framework to Distribute Employees in Different Performance Categories

| Agency Category | Agency's Score | Outstanding | Very Good | Good | Need Improvement |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|---------------------|
| Category 1 | 95.00-100.00 | 3% | 17% | 80% | 0% |
| Category 2 | 85.00-94.99 | 2% | 16% | 81% | 1% |
| Category 3 | 70.00-84.99 | 1% | 15% | 82.5% | 1.5% |
| Category 4 | <=69.99. | 0% | 14% | 84% | 2% |

2.3 Performance Evaluation of Moderation Committee Members and Specialist (ES3-ES1)

Civil servants at Executive and Management Levels are provided proxy scores based on the Division/Department/Agency performance. The rationale for providing proxy scores for Executives and Management level are:

- They are directly accountable for the performance of division/department/ Agency; and
- They are the members of the moderation Committee; therefore, they cannot be moderated and rank themselves.

The performance of those in management positions which include Executives, Chief of Division, Sector Head and/or members of Moderation Committee, shall be as follows:

| GPMS report/ Achievement (%) | Proxy score for moderation committee members and specialist |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 95.00% -100% | Outstanding |
| 85.00% -94.99% | Very Good |
| 70.00% -84.99% | Good |
| <=69.99% | Need Improvement |

2.4. Assignment of Scores to Civil Servant at Various Position Level

2.4.1. Executive (EX3-EX1)

- a. For Executive heading Agencies, the Agency's score will be proxy for his/her performance.
- b. For Executive heading Departments, the ratio of APA scores between Agency and Department (50:50) will be the performance rating of the executive.
- For Executives heading Agencies, which do not have Agency score, will have to complete performance appraisal forms, which will be evaluated by the Chairman of Board/Commission. Refer Annexure 6.

2.4.2. Specialist (ES3-ES1)

a. All Specialists (ES) will get the Departments or Agency's score as proxy.

2.4.3. Professional and Management (P1)

- a. Head of division at P1 or officiating head at P2 in Ministries will receive the Ministry/ Department's score as Proxy rating.
- b. Head of Sector/Division at P1 or officiating head at P2 in the Dzongkhag and Autonomous Agencies will receive the Agency's score as Proxy rating.
- c. All other P1 (Specialist) who do not head division will fall in the general pool considered for ranking purpose during the moderation exercise.
- d. Chief of Division, which do not have Agency scores, will have to complete performance appraisal form which will be evaluated by an Executives.

2.4.4. Professional and Management (P5-P2), Supervisory and Support (S5-SS1)

a. Civil servants under this category including contract employees will be ranked into different performance category during moderation exercise as per Agency's score and ACF.

2.4.5. Civil servants on Secondment, Long Term Study Leave, Maternity Leave, EOL and Transfer

2.4.5.1. Secondment

Civil servants on secondment will be given default performance rating of "Good". If the seconded Agency submits non-performance record on the civil servant during secondment, s/ he shall be put under Need Improvement Category. Employees on secondment will not be included in the pool of staff being moderated for respective Agency for the particular performance appraisal period.

2.4.5.2. Long Term Study Leave

Civil servants on long-term study will be given default performance rating of "Good" on submission of successful course completion certificate. Employees on study will not be counted in the pool of staff for moderation in the respective Agency for that particular performance appraisal period only if he/she is away for the entire assessment year.

Page | 13 |

2.4.5.3. Maternity Leave

Civil servants on maternity leave shall be included in the pool of moderation and shall be given default minimum performance rating of "Good".

For Section 2.4.5.1, 2.4.5.2 and 2.4.5.3, the default performance score is good. However, the Moderation Committee has the discretion to assign such civil servants to other performance categories based on evidence.

2.4.5.4. Extra Ordinary Leave (EOL)

Civil servants on EOL will not have Performance Evaluation for the period of EOL only if he/she is away for the entire assessment year as the duration for EOL is considered as inactive service and as such this period is not included for any HR actions.

2.4.5.5. Transfer

Any civil servant transferred during the appraisal period will be moderated in the Agency where he/she is currently serving for the appraisal period, irrespective of the length/duration.

For Civil servants receiving proxy score, proxy score of agency in which s/he has served for the fiscal year of the performance period exceeding 6 months shall be their performance score.

Note

^{1.} Civil servants from S5 to P1 Specialist need to fill in appraisal forms including Chief of Division for all Agencies.

Qualitative aspect of Managers' (Head of division/department/agency) performance will be evaluated through online leadership feedback system, which will have equal weightage) as quantitative aspect of performance score vetted through department/agency score

2.5. Composition of Moderation Committee and Assignments of Performance Rating to Committee Members

The following table outlines the various types of Agencies and within it on how employees based on their functions, lines of reporting /accountability will be clustered and moderated

| Profi | Profile/Position Title | Performance Rating | Composition of Moderation Committee | Remarks |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| 1. MINISTRY | | | | |
| Secretary of Ministry | nistry | Ministry's performance score. | NA | |
| Director/ Director General of Departments | tor General of | Equal ratio between Ministry's score and respective Department's score. | | |
| Chief of Divisic | Chief of Division/Core Division | Respective Department's score. | | |
| Chief of Divisio | Chief of Division/Secretarial Services | Ministry's performance score. | | |
| Employees | Secretariat Services/Staff Function PPD, Internal Audit Services | according to Ministry's score to different performance categories. | For Secretariat: MC will consist of: 1. Secretary of Ministry (Chairperson). 2. Director, Directorate (Member). 3. Chief of Divisions & Services (Member). 4. Chief HR Officer/HR Officer (Member Secretary). | An officiating head at P3 and below will not be a member of the MC. Secretary to represent staff directly reporting to Secretary. |

| Profi | Profile/Position Title | Performance Rating | Composition of Moderation Committee | Remarks |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Employees | Core Division/Line Function | Moderate them according to Department's score to different performance categories. | For Line Department MC will consist of: 1.Director/Director General, Department (Chairperson) 2. Chief of Division, Division (Member) 3. HR Officer (Member Secretary). | |
| Commission, A | Commission, Autonomous Agency, Thromdes | ndes | | |
| Secretary of the Commissio General/Director of Agency | Secretary of the Commission/Director General/Director of Agency | Agency's score | NA | |
| Chief of Divisions | ns | Agency's score | | |
| Employees | Secretariat Services/Staff Function. Core Division/Line Function. | Moderate them according to Agency's score. | For Agency: MC will consist of: 1. Secretary, Agency (Chairperson) 2. Director, Directorate/Secretariat (Member) 3. Chief of Division (Member) 4. HR Officer (Member Secretary) OR MC will consist of: 1. Director, Agency (Chairperson) 2. Chief of Division (Member) 3. HR Officer (Member Secretary) | An officiating head at P3 and below will not be a member of the MC. |

| Profil | Profile/Position Title | Performance Rating | Composition of Moderation Committee | Remarks |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 1. DZONGKHAG | | | | |
| Head of Dzongkhag/Dzongdag | hag/Dzongdag | Dzongkhag's performance score. | NA | 1. Sector Head at P3 and below will not be a |
| Head of Staff Fu Dungpa | Head of Staff Function/Dzongrab/ Dungpa | Dzongkhag's performance score. | | member of the MC 2. Dzongdag and |
| Dzongkhag Staff | Planning Services, DT Secretary, Legal Services, Internal Audit Services, Environment services. Sarvices, IT Services, Finance and Admin Services. Sectors/Health Sector, Education Sector, RNR Sector-Agriculture, Livestock, Census, Culture, land record. | Moderate them according to dzongkhag's performance score. | For Dzongkhag: MC will consist of: 1. Dzongdag, Dzongkhag (Chairperson) 2. Dzongrab, Secretariat (Member) 3. Drungpa, Drungkhag (Member) 4. Head of Sector/BHU I/Hospitals (Member) 5. HR Officer (Member Secretary) | written feedback from other Sector Heads who are P3 and below on their employees. |

| Profile/Position Title | Performance Rating | Composition of Moderation Committee | Remarks |
|--|--------------------|--|--|
| BHUs Grade I/Hospitals | | | 3. Medical Supervisor heading Hospitals/BHU to represent employees |
| Administrative Staff, including GAO and Gewog Accountants. | | | Dungpa shall receive written feedback from Gup, HR and Planning Services on GAO's Performance. |
| | | | 2. Dungpa shall receive feedback from Dzongkhag Accounts Officer on Gewog's Accountant's performance. |
| Sector/Education, Health and RNR- Agriculture, Livestock & Forest. | | | 3. During the ModEx the Dungpa/respective Sector Head will represent the Dungkhag sector staff. |
| | | | |

| Profi | Profile/Position Title | Performance Rating | Composition of Moderation Committee | Remarks |
|-------------|--|--------------------|--|---|
| Gewog Staff | GAO, Gewog Accountants and any other administrative staffs. | | | Dzongrab shall receive written feedback from Gup, HR and Planning on GAO's performance. |
| | Sector/Education, Health and RNR- Agriculture, Livestock & Forest. | | | 2. Sector Heads to get written feedback on individuals from Gup for the purpose of Moderation. |

Note

Specialist(ES) as the Advisor to the Department/Agency shall be the member for Moderation Committee.

Officiating head at P2 and above level will be the member of the Moderation Committee, if he/she is officiating for the following reason:

Post of Chief is vacant [there is no full fledged chief];

If the incumbent Chief is on short-term training for 3 months and more;

^{..} If the incumbent Chief is on Medical Leave exceeding 3 months; and

HR Officer as the member secretary for Moderation Committee will be asked to leave discussion when the discussion is about him/her and join as soon An officiating Head in P3 and below will not be a member of Moderation Committee. Relevant Executive will represent that Division for the ME. ii

For larger Divisions, it is recommended that the Chief shall consult with Section/Unit Heads prior to the final ModEx by constituting sub-committee within as the discussion is over and same protocol will be followed for all members of the Moderation Committee in the event there is any conflict of interest. the Division .≥

2.6. Prerequisite for Moderation Exercise

In order to carry out moderation exercise, the following prerequisites have to be considered:

a. APA/APT Assessment Report Completed; and

The GPMD will publish an annual report on the Agency's performance. Similarly, other competent Agencies will prepare report on Agencies with APT evaluated by Gross National Happiness Commission.

b. Evaluation of Performance Appraisal Form Completed.

PE Score of all civil servants will be completed online which comprise of Performance assessment (70%) and Competency Behavior (30%). The managers shall produce either print or reference the soft copy of the appraisal form from the MaX online system during the moderation exercise.

2.7. Determining the Distribution Percentage for Assignment of Performance Category to Individual Staff

The ModEx is the next step following the completed evaluation of individual Performance Appraisal Form by the supervisor. Refer Annexure 4 for guidance on performance calibration.

As explained earlier, after the evaluation of Agencies' performance the Agencies' performance is cascaded down to individuals through the process of the Moderation Exercise.

The ACF will determine the "quota" assigned to various performance categories based on Agencies' APA/APT score. When the ACF is applied, decimal figures are likely to emerge. Below is the process of rounding off of the decimal to get the differentiation for the performance category 1, 2, 3 and 4:

- Category 1 = The rounding off shall be done as follows;
 1st round off OS Category, 2nd round off VG category, rest employee in G category
- 2. Category 4 = The rounding off shall be done as follows; 1st round off - NI Category, 2nd round off - G category, rest employee in - VG category
- 3. Category 2= The rounding off shall be done as follows; and 1st round off OS category, 2nd round off NI category, 3rd round off = VG category, rest employee in G category
- 4. Category 3= The rounding off shall be done as follows:

 1st round off OS category, 2nd round off NI category, 3rd round off G category, rest employee in VG category

| For example: Total Number of Staff: |
|-------------------------------------|
|-------------------------------------|

| Agency | Agency | | Round | ding off | | Domoniko |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Category | Score | os | VG | Good | NI | Remarks |
| Category 1 | 95%- 100% | 3% of 30 (0.9=1) | 17% of 30 (5.1=6) | 80% (23) | 0% | 1 st round off OS 2 nd round off VG Rest in G |
| Category 2 | 85.00%- 94.99 % | 2% of 30 (0.6=1) | 16% of 30 (4.8=5) | 81% (23) | 1% of 30 (0.3=1) | 1 st round off OS 2 nd round off NI 3 rd round off VG Rest in G |
| Category 3 | 70.00%- 84.99 % | 1% of 30 (0.3=1) | 15% (3) | 82.5% of 30 (24.75=25) | 1.5% of 30 (0.45=1) | 1 st round off OS 2 nd round off NI 3 rd round off G Rest in VG |
| Category 4 | <=69.99% | 0 | 14% (3) | 84% of 30 (25.2=26) | 2% of 30 (0.6=1) | 1 st round off NI 2 nd round G Rest in VG |

2.8. Different Roles in the Moderation Exercise

There are three primary stakeholders in a ModEx. The Chairperson, Members of the Moderation Committee, and Secretariat (HR Division). Refer Section 2.5 for Composition.

a. Chairperson: The Chairperson will be the Secretary/Director General/ Director/ Dzongdag/Executive Secretary depending on the type of Agency.

The Chairperson shall:

- Maintain order and fairness throughout the moderation exercise;
- Ensures that all relevant considerations in the moderation process are adhered to:
- Makes the final decision to dissolve gridlocks (if any); and
- Ensure that all the members declare the conflict of interest prior to the moderation exercise.

Chairperson has the prerogative to appoint the member secretary from amongst the members of moderation committee if he/she so decides.

b. Members: The members are the Head of Division/Sectors within each Agency based on type of Agency- whether it's Ministry, Autonomous Agency, or Dzongkhags (Refer Section 2.5).

Page | 21 |

The Members shall:

- Evaluate performance appraisal forms of their employees and provide performance score to the Secretariat, prior to the Moderation Exercise;
- Prepare and collate the evidences for each employee to justify the proposed rating for him/her;
- During the preliminary assessment, the members should ideally align their assessment of respective supervisees in accordance with the Agency/Department score and its allocated quota as per the ACF;
- Take full ownership of final ranking decision and maintain confidentiality of the moderation discussions; and
- Communicate results of moderation exercise to employees, individually.

c. Member Secretary:

The HR Officer/s from HR Division/Services within the Agency shall:

- Collect Agency's score from GPMD and GNHC and work out the distribution curve using Agency Categorization Framework;
- Collate and analyze past and current Moderation Exercise data, identify pertinent issues and brief the Chairperson prior to the Moderation Exercise;
- Share the above information and brief on overall performance score collected from relevant department/division with the Chairperson prior to Moderation Exercise;
- Serve as the member secretary for Moderation Exercise and shall maintain records/minutes of discussions made during the Moderation Exercise;
- Assist the Chairperson (when appropriate) on adherence to relevant considerations during Moderation Exercise;
- Schedule Moderation Exercise in advance and publish a time-line with key dates to all managers so that they understand the preparations required for the exercise;
- Seek endorsement of primary and supplementary consideration before actual Moderation Exercise and facilitate preliminary assessment and preparatory meetings/discussions by different division/sector to prepare for final Moderation Exercise;
- Prepare to facilitate by compiling and examining performance data for the Agency/Department/Division including average ratings across critical factors, performance distributions and the identification of outliers;
- Ensure that the final performance appraisal meetings between managers and employees are conducted to convey the final moderation decisions:
- May recommend to the Chair on the need to have preparatory meetings in the run up to the final ModEx; and
- For Divisions/Dzongkhag Sectors not headed by P1/P2 Officer or

large division, the member secretary should organize preliminary/sub-committee meetings to get the views of all officiating division heads, sector heads and section/unit heads on the performance of their employees, prior to the final ModEx.

2.9. Consideration/Criteria

To ensure that the moderation exercise achieves the intended objectives, the following indicative considerations are recommended for application during the moderation exercise. The considerations are to be factored but not limited to, in the course of assigning employees to the various performance categories during the Moderation Exercise.

a. Primary Considerations

- Requirement of their IWP: The performance targets set and specified in the IWPs and achievement against it;
- The manner in which the performance targets were fulfilled: Qualitative aspect of the performance vetted in terms of competency behavior displayed during the evaluation period;
- Job sizes held by the employee vis-à-vis position level of the employee: Assess an employee against the size, volume, quality and value of work delivered vis-à-vis his/her current position and terms of reference;
- Degree of impact upon the mission of the Agency/Department/ Division: The contribution of the staff against achievement of the core mission of the Agency; and
- Reference to bouquets and brickbats but confined to the period of assessment/appraisal period: Any merits, special achievements, recognition, or otherwise any negative behaviors, which are confined to that period of assessment/appraisal period.

b. Supplementary Considerations

In the event that the principal considerations are exhausted, supplementary considerations as established by respective Agencies can be applied wherever appropriate. Some of the recommended supplementary considerations are:

- Potential of the employee: Ability of an individual to shoulder higher responsibility. This assessment should be made considering past performance i.e. beyond the current evaluation period;
- Profile of the employee: The importance and criticality of the job responsibility shouldered by individuals for meeting organization's objective and targets;
- Signaling effect: The kind of signal an Agency would want to convey for promoting different performers/groups/occupations/teams within the Agency based on set of criteria or an intuition that shall be

- in the mind of the Members that the OS/NI employee should be from that particular division; and
- Economies of Experience: Number of years of experience and contribution in achieving Agency's performance targets and other benefits to Agency concerned. An outstanding/very good worker will usually be up to speed in his/her work with fewer years of experience as compared to a less efficient staff entering at the same time or earlier who may take longer to learn.

The primary and supplementary criteria/consideration outlined above is very broad to suit all Agencies. However, they can be customized by Moderation Committees to fit their own specific needs.

2.10. Summary of ModEx Process

The moderation exercise comprises of three steps:

Step 1: Appraisal (by Manager/Member of Moderation Committee, before Actual ModEx)

The process begins with evaluation of performance appraisal forms (i.e. review of the Individual Work Plan), between the manager and each employee. Close attention should be paid to the rating scale definitions that will be used to make assessments. Managers should note specific cases/evidence to substantiate the proposed rating for the employee.

Step 2: Actual ModEx Meeting

During the ModEx meeting, Chairperson and members will moderate employees according to different performance categories, guided by the primary and supplementary considerations as well as other relevant considerations to be applied at the discretion of the moderation committee. This is to be done in addition to references made to the performance score as mentioned in Step 1 above.

Step 3: Declaration and Submission of Moderation Results in the MaX Online System (by Manager/Member of Moderation Committee)

The moderation result shall be communicated to the respective employees within three working days after the completion of the ModEx and the results are to be entered in the Max online system. The Managers shall conduct one-on-one performance review discussions with the employees. At this point, managers should have a comprehensive understanding of the organizational performance standards as well as how their team members are performing relative to others within and outside.

Sample ModEx Agenda can be referred in Annexure 5. Agencies in Schedule A will not be moderated because of their unique circumstances (Refer Annexure 6).

CHAPTER 3

MANAGING FOR EXCELLENCE FOR TEACHING AND SUPPORT SERVICES IN SCHOOL

The principal and the subordinates shall jointly develop the Performance Appraisal Form to organize and manage individual activities to effectively contribute to achieving the six key areas of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The assessment of individual shall be conducted using the Performance Appraisal Form which shall be input to the moderation exercises for assignment of final rating.

3.1. Performance Appraisal Form for PMC and SSC

The Performance Appraisal Form shall be used to formulate school outputs, identify/develop activities, set target value and identify competency behavior by the employees in schools (refer Annexure 1 and 2). The form consist of four sections.

3.1.1. Section A: Employee details

For details, refer Section 1.1.1

3.1.2. Section B: Performance Assessment (IWP) 70%

The School Performance Management System (SPMS) shall be the basis for developing the IWP of the principals, teachers and support staff in schools.

a. Formulating School Output

The following six key areas of School Improvement Plan (SIP) shall be used as the school outputs. However, an individual can choose only those relevant outputs that he/she contributes:

- Leadership and Management Practices;
- ii. Green School domain;
- iii. Curriculum Practices: Planning and Delivery;
- iv. Holistic Assessment;
- v. Broader Learning Domain; and
- vi. School Community Vitality.

b. Identifying Activities

While developing IWP, a civil servant needs to identity individual activities that will contribute to the achievement of the output. The list of indicators from the SIP is recommended to use as guideline to formulate activities. Each activity listed must be related to one of the output, and only those activities which have direct contribution to the achievement of the output should be included in the IWP.

c. Setting Target Value

After identifying the activities, individuals shall set a target value each to the activities that merits a rating of level 4/level3/level 2/level 1 using the QQCT (Quantity, Quality, Cost and Time) framework. It is not necessary to have all the factors fitting in one target value. Either a combination or any of the four factors from the QQCT framework should be reflected in the target values depending on the nature of activity. It is also not necessary to fill the target value for all four levels. However, it is mandatory to set a target value for level 2. If the target value for only level 2 is drawn, the supervisor shall make the judgment on how to assess the other three levels at the end of the appraisal period using level 2 as the yardstick.

The target areas from the SIP indicators shall be used as the guide to frame the target value for each activity. For determining target value for the activities, refer Section 1.1.2 (C).

3.1.3. Section C: Competency Behavior (30%)

List of Competency behavior as per Annexure 1 and 2 are recommended for Professional and Management Category and Supervisory & Support Services Group respectively.

The competency behaviors are used to evaluate qualitative aspect of performance of individual and this will include skills and values required to carry out performance target indicated in section B of the Performance Appraisal Form. It carries 30% weightage.

Please note, the lists of competency behaviors are an indicative list. The schools based on the requirement can add additional competencies and customize it based on the relevancy and need of the schools.

3.1.4. Section D: Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score (Section B and C)For performance evaluation, refer Section 1.1.4

3.2. Example on how to Evaluate Performance Appraisal Form Refer Section 1.2

3.3. Performance Appraisal Form for Operational Category (OC)

Refer Section 1.3

3.4. Procedure of Moderation Exercise and Agency Categorization Framework

Following Agency Categorization framework based on School Performance report will be used to determine bell curve to identify performance categories for schools:

| Category | TRC score | Outstanding | Very Good | Good | NI |
|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|-------|------|
| Category 1 | 95.00%-100.00% | 3% | 17% | 80% | 0% |
| Category 2 | 85.00%-94.99% | 2% | 16% | 81% | 1% |
| Category 3 | 70.00%-84.99% | 1% | 15% | 82.5% | 1.5% |
| Category 4 | <=69.99% | 0% | 14% | 84% | 2% |

Note: TRC score is the average PMS score of all schools under the TRC.

3.5. Performance Rating for Moderation Committee Members

The performance rating of moderation committee members shall be:

| EMD report/ Achievement (%) | Principals |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 95.00-100.00 | Outstanding |
| 85.00-94.99 | Very Good |
| 70.00-84.99 | Good |
| <=69.99. | Need Improvement |

3.6. General Principle for Performance Evaluation Rating of staff in Schools

a. Principal

 Principal shall receive 50% of his school PMS score and 50 % of the TRC score as proxy.

b. Vice Principal, Teachers and Support Staff

- All staff in the schools shall be moderated as per TRC performance score and agency categorization framework.
- Moderation pool shall comprise of both regular and contract employees

c. Operational-Level

• Evaluated by immediate supervisor based on the standard Performance Evaluation Forms as per Annexure 3.

3.7. Moderation Exercise Guideline for Schools:

Schools shall be clustered based on Teacher Resource Centre (TRC). The Education Monitoring Division shall provide school cluster performance report. Moderation Exercise shall be conducted based on TRC score. The moderation Committee for school shall be as follows:

- Chief DEO will be the chairperson;
- All principals at P2 and above under each TRC shall serve as members;
 and
- HR Officer as the member secretary.

Refer Chapter 2 on Procedures for the Moderation Exercise and roles of Chairperson, Member and Member Secretary.

CHAPTER 4

PERFORMANCE LINKED HR INCENTIVES, APPEAL SYSTEM AND

MAX CALENDER

4.1. Performance linked HR Actions

| | | | | HR Actions | SI | |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------|---|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Management | Position Level | Profile | Outstanding | Very Good | Poog | Need Improvement |
| Chairperson/ | EX3-EX1 / | Head of | Recommend | Targeted Leadership | • Targeted | Will be on Waiting |
| members of | ES3-ES1 | Agency, | appropriate Civil | Trainings. | Leadership | list. (Relevant |
| moderation | | Head of | Service Award for | Consider/ | Trainings. | Clauses from BCSR |
| committee | | Department, | Excellent Service for | recommend for next | | on waiting list |
| who will be | | Dzongdag. | minimum of three years | level promotion. | | apply). |
| given Agency | | | consecutive outstanding | | | |
| score as their | | | performance. | Other conditions as | | |
| performance | | | Consider/ recommend | per Promotion rule | | |
| score. | | | for next level | shall apply. | | |
| | | | promotion. Other | | | |
| | | | conditions as per | | | |
| | | | Promotion rule shall | | | |
| | | | арріу. | | | |
| | | | Targeted Leadership | | | |
| | | | Trainings. | | | |

| | | | | HR Actions | SI | |
|------------|-------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Management | Position Level | Profile | Outstanding | Very Good | рооб | Need Improvement |
| | P1 | Chief of Division, Dzongrab, Dungpa, Sector Heads, School Principals . | Recommend appropriate Civil Service Award for Excellent Service for minimum of three years consecutive outstanding performance. Eligible for open competition. Targeted Leadership Trainings. | Eligible for open competition. Provide Targeted Leadership Trainings. | Not eligible for open competition. | Not Eligible for executive Positions for next 2 years. Refer him/ her to relevant authority based on reason falling under NI. Targeted capacity development program (incountry). |
| | Others | Officiating Chief of Department/ Divisions, Sector Heads, school principals. | Recommend appropriate Civil Service Award for Excellent Service for minimum of three years consecutive outstanding performance. Award full mark for PE Score during open competitions. | Award 95% marks for PE rating during open competitions. Normal Promotion. | Award 80% marks for PE rating during open competition. Normal Promotion. | Not eligible to participate in any open competition for next one year. Not allowed to head the Agency/sector Provide in country targeted capacity development program. Refer him/her to relevant authority. |

| | | | | HR Actions | SI | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| Management | Position Level | Profile | Outstanding | Very Good | Bood | Need Improvement |
| Specialist | ES3 - ES1 | Proxy Score | Recommend appropriate Civil Service Award for Excellent Service for minimum of three years consecutive outstanding performance. Consider/ recommend for next level promotion. Targeted Leadership Training. Other conditions as per Promotion rule shall apply. | Targeted specialized Trainings. Normal Promotion. Other conditions as per Promotion rule shall apply. | Targeted specialized Trainings. Normal Promotion. Other conditions as per Promotion rule shall apply. | Will be on Waiting list. (Clauses from BCSR on waiting list shall apply). Refer him/ her to relevant authority. |
| Pool for Moderation Exercise | Pooled Employees (S5 - P1(s) | P1 specialist position not heading division, Others | Meritorious Promotion if 3 consecutive years of outstanding performance. Other conditions as per Promotion rule shall apply for P1 Specialist. Award full mark for PE rating during open competitions. | Award 95% marks for PE rating during open competitions. Normal Promotion Other conditions as per Promotion rule shall apply. | Award 80% marks for PE rating during open competitions. | NI year to be considered as inactive year for the purpose of promotion only. Award 40% marks for PE rating during open competitions for long term training. |

| | | | | HR Actions | suc | |
|------------|-------------------|---------|--|------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Management | Position Level | Profile | Outstanding | Very Good | Poog | Need Improvement |
| | | | Recognition with | | Normal | Provide basic |
| | | | Certificate and other | | promotion. | capability |
| | | | awards by the Agency | | | development |
| | | | through HRC. | | Other | opportunities |
| | | | May be assigned as | | conditions as | for performance |
| | | | mentor/guide in the | | per Promotion | improvement. |
| | | | Agency to co-work | | rule shall | Attach the |
| | | | with the NI category. | | apply. | employees to a |
| | | | | | | mentor within |
| | | | | | | the Agency/ |
| | | | | | | Dept./ Division |
| | | | | | | for Mentoring, |
| | | | | | | coaching and |
| | | | | | | guidance. |
| | | | | | | Refer him/her to |
| | | | | | | relevant authority. |
| | | | | | | Redeploy/Retrain |
| | | | | | | the employee |
| | | | | | | wherever his/ |
| | | | | | | her skills are |
| | | | | | | appropriate. |
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | HR Actions | ns | |
|-------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Management | Position Level | Profile | Outstanding | Very Good | Good | Need Improvement |
| Operational | 04-01 | Driver, | | | | |
| Category | | Dispatcher, | 1. Rating of Good and above, eligible for normal promotion | e, eligible for normal p | romotion | |
| | | Telephone Operator) | 2. NI year to be considered as inactive year for the purpose of promotion only. | s inactive year for the | purpose of promoti | on only. |

Note

through RCSC.

Civil servants can be put under Waiting List for reasons other than performance as per relevant sections of BCSR.

For all Promotion, relevant clauses on promotion from the BCSR shall apply

All Meritorious promotion for civil servants in schedule A (non-moderation Agencies) and Operational category civil servants shall be processed All civil servants falling under "Need Improvement" category for three consecutive years shall be Compulsorily Retired t. 0; ω 4.

4.2. Appeal Procedure

A civil servant who is not satisfied with the decision of the Moderation Committee can appeal to the relevant authority as detailed below. However, the appeal submitted shall be supported by sufficient evidence of injustice.

4.2.1 Appellate Authority to Review Appeal Cases of Moderation Exercise

- a. The HRC of the respective Agency shall be the first level to review and decide the appeal pertaining to Moderation Exercise.
- b. RCSC shall be the highest appellate authority to review the decision rendered by the HRC of the Agency, if there is any appeal against the decision of HRC.

4.2.2. Appeal Period

- a. Aggrieved civil servant shall appeal to respective HRC within 10 working days from the declaration of moderation results.
- b. Any appeal to RCSC against the decision of HRC shall be submitted within 10 working days from the day the decision of HRC is conveyed formally.

4.2.3. Appeal Process

4.2.3.1. HRC of the Working Agency

- a. The HRC of the working Agency shall deliberate on the appeal within 5 working days from the date of the appeal received, and form Investigation Committee.
- b. The investigation, if required, shall be conducted within 10 working days after the formation of the Investigation Committee.
- c. The Investigation Committee shall submit investigation report within 5 working days after the investigation.
- d. The HRC, after receiving the investigation report, shall render final decision within 5 working days.
- e. The HRC shall convey the decision to the appellant.

4.2.3.2. Royal Civil Service Commission

- a. A civil servant aggrieved by the decision of the HRC of the Agency shall appeal to the RCSC within 10 working days after receiving the decision of the HRC.
- b. The RCSC shall deliberate on the appeal within 15 working days from the date of the appeal received, and assign an Investigator or form an Investigation Committee, if required.
- c. The Investigator/Investigation Committee shall submit investigation report within 5 working days after completion of the investigation.
- d. The RCSC, after receiving the investigation report, shall render final decision within 15 working days.
- e. The decision of the RCSC shall be final and binding.

3 MaX Calendar for Civil Servants: Fiscal Year (July-June)

| SI. No | Activities | Responsible | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr May | Jun |
|--------|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|-----|
| н | Develop IWPs and core competencies for the fiscal year. Submit Appraisal Form online. | Supervisor and concerned civil servants | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Mid-Year Review of Appraisal Form | Supervisor and concerned civil servants | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ĸ | Evaluation of Performance Appraisal Form for preceding fiscal year | Supervisor | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Moderation Exercise for the evaluation of performance for preceding fiscal year | Moderation Committee | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Update Score of ModEx on MaX online System | HRD | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Performance linked HR Actions | HRD | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

4.4. MaX Calendar for Civil Servants in Schools: Calendar Year (January-December)

| SI. | Activities | Responsible | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Мау | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Н | Develop IWPs and core competencies for the current year | Supervisor and concerned civil | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Submit Appraisal Form online | servants | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Mid-Year Review of Appraisal Form | Supervisor & concerned civil servants | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| က | Evaluation of Appraisal Form for the current year | Supervisor | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Moderation Exercise for the evaluation of performance for the preceding year | Moderation Committee | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Update Score of ModEx on MaX online System | HRD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Performance linked HR Actions | HRD | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Annexure 1: Performance Appraisal Form for Professional and Management, and Specialist Services Group

Section A: Employee Details

APPRAISAL PERIOD:

| EMPLOYEE ID No. | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| NAME OF THE EMPLOYEE: | |
| POSITION TITLE: | POSITION LEVEL: |
| DIVISION: | DEPARTMENT/AGENCY: |

Assurance on Accuracy of CV: I have verified my CV in CSIS and hereby declare that the information is correct as of (dd/mm/yy)

SECTION B: Performance Assessment (70%)

| | | | Targets \ | /alues* | | Target | Employee's | Score |
|--------------------|------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Division Output | Activities | Level 4=[3.00- 4.00] | Level 3=2.00- 2.99] | Level 2=[1.00 -1.99] | Level 1[<= 0.99] | Achieved specified by individual | Feedback/ comment/ justification | by Super- visor ⁴ |
| 1 | 1.1 | | | | | | | |
| 1. | 1.2 | | | | | | | |
| 2. | 2.1 | | | | | | | |
| 2. | 2.2 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | | | |
| | 9 | Score B (To | tal score, | /No. of ac | tivities) | | | |

^{*}It is not necessary to fill target values for all four Levels. However, it is mandatory to set the target value for Level 2.

SECTION C: Competency Behavior (30%)

| Potential Assessment Area | Quality & Description | [3.00-4.00] | [2.00-2.99] | [1.00-1.99] | [<=.99] | Score by supervisor with |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| | | Level 4 | Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 | Evidence of Behavior |
| 1.Analytical and Intellectual Capacity | 1.1. Sense of Perspective Demonstrates intellectual flexibility, imagination and socio-political sensitivity in developing a holistic appreciation of the situation and in generating innovative ideas and solutions that bring practical benefit. | Thinks ahead to anticipate issues, identifies opportunities and appreciates implications. Exercises imagination and creativity to generate a range of alternative solutions. Takes strategic perspective when formulating proposals and recommendations. | • Takes strategic steps and ways to achieve and enhance the achievement of the target. | Need guidance in identifying the opportunities and solutions to solve work towards achieving the target. | • Is hasty in forming opinions and judgment taking action before assessing implications and focuses on day to day problems at the expense of longer term planning. | |
| | 1.2 Analysis and Judgment Demonstrates power of analysis and a sense of reality in the context of complex issues and solutions. | Analyses situations and problems in a systematic and logical manner to identify key issues. Makes sound judgment based on rigorous, independent thinking. Makes good use of background knowledge. | Proposes strong judgmental. recommendation towards overall issues for a realistic achievement. | • Limited to supervisory directives in tackling the problems and issues and does provide any strong judgmental. recommendation to owns issues. | Makes assumption based on superficial analysis. Spends too long on analysis and deliberating at the expense of responding in a timely fashion. | |

| Potential Assessment Area | Quality & Description | [3.00-4.00] | [2.00-2.99] | [1.00-1.99] | [<=:99] | Score by supervisor with |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| | | Level 4 | Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 | Evidence of Behavior |
| 2.Influence & Collaboration | 2.1.Influencing and Inspiring Persuades, motivates and inspires others, developing a sense of purpose and unity. | Puts team's success ahead of personal success. Works to resolve conflict among team members by showing respect for others' opinions and working toward mutually agreeable solutions. | Maintains wide network of good working relationship with peers, subordinates, supervisor, customer and clients. Makes consistent efforts to generate trust and co-operation to foster positive and productive team spirit. | Sticks to good working relationship with most of the peers, subordinates, supervisor and the clients. Initiates encouragement of trust and cooperation among others. | Blame others for mistakes and/ or setbacks that negatively affect team results. | |
| | 2.2 Collaboration & Engagement Takes lead in communication and consultation, engaging with a wide range of supervisors, peers and stakeholders across division, department, and Agencies. | Helps to keep team performance and morale high even during periods of intense pressure or heavy workload. Actively seeks development opportunities for team. | • Demonstrate to work in a team and foster sharing of workloads while he/she is not utilized. | • Confines to his/ her own assigned task and does not extend and seeks support to collaborate and engage in a team. | Work only to serve self-interests and meet personal goals. Blame others for mistakes and/ or setbacks that negatively affect team results. | |

| Potential Assessment Area | Quality & Description | [3.00-4.00] Level 4 | [2.00-2.99] Level 3 | [1.00-1.99] Level 2 | [<=.99] Level 1 | Score by supervisor with Evidence of Behavior |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| 3. Motivation for Excellence | 3.1. Achieving Results Strives hard to achieve five year and annual targets by focusing on national interest to ensure efficiency and high standards of delivery. 3.2 Commitment and Accountability Demonstrates personal integrity and commitment to serving Bhutan's national interest. | Achieves all targets set within the allocated resources without compromising on the quality. Minimizes waste of his Agency and Nation's resources Upholds both explicit and implicit terms and understandings he has with the Royal Government, public, family, Agency, superiors, peers, subordinates and clients. Ready and willing to take additional responsibility by one's own initiatives. | Always looks towards achieving the result with best quality within the resources under his/her control. Demonstrate strong bond towards the Royal government and uphold the belongingness towards the Nation as a family. Needs guidance to take the initiatives. | Work hard towards achieving the results but needs extra resources to achieve it. Upholds the belongingness towards the Nation as a family as and when required only and resist to take initiatives. | Does not deliver as per the set targets and budget allocated. Wastes his Agency and nation's resources. Breach the norms and values of the society. Speaks and acts in a way that is not in conformity to the Civil Service Values of integrity, professionalism, honesty, impartiality, accountability, loyalty, and leadership. Does not participate n any extra assignments. | |
| | | | Total | | | |
| | Score | re C (Total score/No. of competency behavior) | npetency behavior) | | | |

SECTION D: Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score [Section B &C]

| Particular | Score received | Preliminary Score | Supervisor's Comment, if any |
|----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| B. Performance | | 70% of Score B= | |
| C. Competency Behaviors | | 30% of Score C= | |
| | Total | | |

Employee Signature Date

Supervisor Signature Date

Overall Rating Table:

| Performer category | Definition | Rating scale |
|--------------------|--|--------------|
| 1. Level 4 | Achieved exceptionally high level of performance | 3.00-4.00 |
| 2. Level 3 | Performed at higher level than required | 2.00-2.99 |
| 3. Level 2 | Employee fulfilled requirement of the job | 1.00-1.99 |
| 4. Level 1 | Results/Behavior far below performance requirement | <=0.99 |

Note: The Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score shall be an input to the Moderation Exercise for assigning the final rating.

14018

Annexure 2: Performance Appraisal Form for Supervisory and Support Services Group

Section A: Employee Details

APPRAISAL PERIOD:

| EMPLOYEE ID No. | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| NAME OF THE EMPLOYEE: | |
| POSITION TITLE: | POSITION LEVEL: |
| DIVISION: | DEPARTMENT/AGENCY: |

Assurance on Accuracy of CV: I have verified my CV in CSIS and hereby declare that the information is correct as of (dd/mm/yy)......

SECTION B: Performance Assessment (Individual Work Plan) (70%)

| | Activities | Targets Values* | | | | | Employ- | |
|---|------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Division Output | | Level 4=[3.00- 4.00] | Level 3=2.00- 2.99] | Level 2=[1.00 -1.99] | Level 1[<= 0.99] | Target Achieved specified by individual | ee's Feedback/ comment/ justifica- tion | Score by Supervi- sor |
| 1 | 1.1 | | | | | | | |
| 1. | 1.2 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.1 | | | | | | | |
| 2. | 2.2 | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | |
| Score B (Total score/No. of activities) | | | | | | | | |

^{*}It is not necessary to fill target values for all four levels. However, it is mandatory to set the target value for Level 2.

SECTION C: Competency Behavior (30%)

| Score by supervisor [<=0.99] with Level 1 Evidence of Behavior |
|--|
| [1.00-1.99] Level 2 |
| [2.00-2.99] Level 3 |
| [3.00-4.00] Level 4 |
| Description |
| Competency Behavior |

| Score by supervisor with Evidence of Behavior | | ج re | o la l |
|---|---|--|---|
| [<=0.99] Level 1 | Waits for supervisory intervention to resolve issues. | Initiates assigned work with reminder only. | Works only to serve self- interest and meet personal goals. |
| [1.00-1.99] Level 2 | Submits problems without recommendation on time. | Any assigned work are done but requiring a minimum supervision. | Achieves individual performance with limited relationship within and outside Agency. |
| [2.00-2.99] Level 3 | Submits problems and recommended solutions on time for supervisory advice. | Work assigned are taken with strong responsibility to be completed. | Achieves individual performance with good relationship within but limited level of interpersonal skills outside Agency. |
| [3.00-4.00] Level 4 | Submits problems and recommended solutions before time for supervisory intervention. | Initiates assigned works pro-actively, identifies and tries to solve bottlenecks in his/her own area of work. | Achieves individual performance targets while maintaining friendly relationship within and outside Agency |
| Description | Demonstrates sound judgment to identify and recognize problems and solutions, and escalate them to appropriate authority. | Demonstrates urgency and pro- actively takes lead in assigned work activities and solicits support. | Demonstrates ability to work in teams and garner support, build relationship and develop congenial work environment. |
| Competency Behavior | 3.Decisiveness | 4.Leadership &Influencing Skills | 5.Interpersonal Skill |

| ior) | npetency Behavi | Score C (Total score/No of Competency Behavior) | Sc | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Total | TC | | | | | |
| | Does not articulate information that is clear and concise. | Articulates information to other in limited language limited unto his/her level of understanding. | Articulates information to other in languages that is understandable. | Articulates information to others in language that is clear, concise and easy to understand. | 6.Oral/ Written communication conding to articulate sability articulates to articulate one's ideas, views and others in la communication concisely both in concise and in writing. | 6.Oral/ Written communication |
| Score by supervisor with Evidence of Behavior | [<=0.99] Level 1 | [1.00-1.99] Level 2 | [2.00-2.99] Level 3 | [3.00-4.00] Level 4 | Description | Competency Behavior |

SECTION D: Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score [Section B &C]

| Particular | Score Received | Preliminary Score | Supervisor's Comment, if any |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| B. Performance | | 70% of Score B= | |
| C. Competency Behaviors | | 30% of Score C= | |
| Total | | | |

Employee Signature Date

Supervisor Signature Date

Overall Rating Table:

| Performer Category | Definition | Rating Scale |
|-----------------------|--|--------------|
| 1. Level 4 | Achieved exceptionally high level of performance | 3.00-4.00 |
| 2. Level 3 | Performed at higher level than required | 2.00-2.99 |
| 3. Level 2 | Employee fulfilled requirement of the job | 1.00-1.99 |
| 4. Level 1 | Results/Behavior far below performance requirement | <=0.99 |

Note: The Preliminary Performance Evaluation Score shall be an input to the Moderation Exercise for assigning the final rating.

Page | 45 |

Annexure 3: Performance Appraisal Form for Operational Category

APPRAISAL PERIOD:

| EMPLOYEE ID No. | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| NAME OF THE EMPLOYEE: | |
| POSITION TITLE: | POSITION LEVEL: |
| DIVISION: | DEPARTMENT/AGENCY: |

Assurance on Accuracy of CV: I have verified my CV in CSIS and hereby declare that the information is correct as of (dd/mm/yy)

| Competency Behavior | Description | Rating by Supervisor (0-4) | Comments |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------|
| 1.Ethics & Integrity | Earns others' trust and respect through consistent honesty and professionalism in all interactions | | |
| 2.Communication Skills | The ability to convey information to others effectively and efficiently | | |
| 3.Service Focus | Values and delivers quality service to all | | |
| 4.Team Work | Promotes cooperation and commitment within a team | | |
| 5.Self- Management | Manages own time, priorities, and resources to provide quality services | | |
| 6.Safety Focus | Adheres to all workplace and work safety laws, regulations, standards, and practices | | |
| | Total Rating | | |
| | Average Rating = Total Rating/6 | | |

(Signature of Employee)

(Name and Signature of Supervisor)

Overall Rating Table:

| Performer category | Definition | Rating scale |
|------------------------|--|--------------|
| 1.Outstanding | Achieved exceptionally high level of performance | 3.00-4.00 |
| 2. Very Good | Performed at higher level than required | 2.00-2.99 |
| 3. Good | Employee fulfilled requirement of the job | 1.00-1.99 |
| 4.Needs Improvement | Results/Behavior far below performance requirement | <=0.99 |

Annexure 4: Performance Calibration through the Moderation Exercise

Moderation Exercise is a process in which managers within an Agency, a Department or Division, whichever is applicable convenes together to discuss the performance of employees and establish consensus on ratings. The practice of Moderation Exercise refers to the steps taken to make sure that members of the Moderation Committee apply a consistent set of standards in finalizing ratings. The Moderation Exercise ensures:

Differentiation of Categories of Performers;

One of the primary goals of the Moderation Exercise is to effectively differentiate high performers from average or poor performers so that high performers can be rewarded and retained, and non-performance are given targeted intervention. The performance score provided by managers on performance targets and Competency Behavior in the Performance Appraisal Forms are important data points in HR and leadership decision making. This data not only have an impact on promotion and compensation, but are considered in succession planning and the allocation of developmental resources.

Improves the Objectivity and Accuracy of Performance Ratings;

Moderation Exercise serves to increase the objectivity and accuracy of performance ratings provided by managers. The moderation process helps to ensure that all employees are evaluated on the same criteria. The collective discussion regarding performance allows managers to have new insight into the performance of employees and reduce potential bias. Peer-to-peer discussion brings about transparency - calling attention to an individual manager's tendency to rate leniently or harshly. Managers become accountable to each other for the performance appraisal ratings made for all employees.

• Clarifies Criteria for Performance Categorizations; and

Moderation Exercise clarifies and reinforces the criteria for performance categorizations across the management team. During the Moderation Exercise, managers will discuss the supporting reasons for the performance categorization ratings provided. This type of discussion builds a common language around defining performance expectations across all managers. As a result, managers will be better prepared to discuss the reasons behind ratings with employees and create development plans for ongoing performance improvement and career development. The support reasons can be presented in accordance to the discretion of the manager. One suggested format that could be applied by the manager when citing specific cases to substantiate the proposed performance categorization for the employee is as follows:

- Brief description of the incident/case. Appraisal Forms can be used to note such incidences;
- Description of the action taken by the employee (include the key challenges the employee had to overcome where appropriate); and

Description of the impact of the action taken by the employee. Quantify the impact where possible and establish link to the mission and/or core values of the organization.

• Increases Perceptions of Fairness.

Together, the accuracy of performance categorization and the clarification of performance criteria increase the likelihood for those employees to perceive the performance appraisal process is fair. Since compensation, promotion and succession decisions are based in part on performance categorizations, it is important that employees believe that they are being fairly evaluated by their Manager.

Annexure 5: Sample Meeting Agenda

Introduction

- Desired Outcomes of Meeting
- Joint Ownership
- Confidentiality

The information discussed and the resulting outcomes should be kept confidential by all managers involved. Participants should be reminded of the expectation regarding confidentiality at the start of the meeting.

Clarify Standards

Review of the ratings scale/s and scale definitions used in the performance evaluation process.

Performance Trends of Agency/Department/Division

Examination of the performance distribution of the Agency/Department/Division including how the distribution compares to the previous performance period and/or desired distribution.

Alignment with Agency/Department/Division Results

Discussion of the linkage between initial performance ratings with the results produced by the Agency/Department/Division.

Individual Presentation

Review of each employee's performance rating/s and the supporting rationale behind the rating/s.

Moderation

Moderation of ratings as necessary to accurately reflect performance over the performance period.

Discussion Records

Secretariat to minute the details and evidences relating to the decisions leading to assignment of performance ratings, especially for Outstanding and Need Improvement Categories. Chairperson of meeting to vet and approve minutes.

Next Steps in the Performance Management Process

Communication of finalized performance rating with the employee and discuss on follow-up developmental plans where appropriate (e.g. those rated as Need Improvement).

Page | 49 |

Annexure 6: Schedule A

Agencies under Schedule A are:

- 1. His Majesty's Secretariat;
- 2. His Majesty the Fourth Druk Gyalpo Secretariat;
- 3. Office of Gyalpoi Zimpon;
- 4. Anti-Corruption Commission;
- 5. Royal Audit Authority;
- 6. Office of the Attorney General;
- 7. Supreme Court of Bhutan;
- 8. High Court;
- 9. District Court;
- 10. Dungkhag Court;
- 11. Bhutan Olympic Committee;
- 12. Bhutan National Legal Institute;
- 13. Royal Privy Council;
- 14. Bhutan Health Trust Fund;
- 15. Civil Society Organization Authority; and
- 16. Bhutan Medical Health Council.

Note: For any open competition for scholarship or promotion at any level, the RCSC shall establish equivalency for PE rating of the civil servants under Schedule A during the selection process.