INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
KRISHI BHAVAN : NEW DELHI

F.No. 2(3)/96-Per.IV Dated: the 21st April, 2011

To

The Directors/Project Directors/Zonal Coordinators/Project Directorates/Project Coordinators/National Bureaus of ICAR Institutes.

Sub: Revision of Proforma for Annual Performance Appraisal Report (APAR) for Scientists – reg.

Sir,

The existing ACR Proforma for ARS Scientists was devised by NAARM, Hyderabad after extensive deliberations. This was notified by ICAR vide Council's letter No. 2(3)/96-Per.IV dated 5.11.2003. This proforma is now required to be revised in the light of the DOPT OM No. 21011/1/2005-Estt.(A)(Part II) dated 23.7.2009. The NAARM, Hyderabad was again requested to undertake the exercise of revision of proforma and forward a draft of the revised proforma to the Council. The NAARM has now forwarded the draft proforma of the APAR which is being uploaded on the ICAR website. You are requested to look into the draft APAR critically and forward your comments and suggestions, if any, to the undersigned latest by 25th May, 2011 through Speed Post/Fax/E.mail (ID No. vijay_1961@rediffmail.com) for further consideration of the matter.

Yours faithfully,

(V.K. Sharma)
Under Secretary (Per.IV)

Copy to:

1. All DDGs
2. PD, D-KMA for ICAR website
3. CDN Section for giving index number

(V.K. Sharma)
Under Secretary (Per.IV)

Revision of

Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR)
For Scientific Personnel of ICAR

National Academy of
Agricultural Research Management
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad – 500 407

November 2010

Contents

Revision of Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) System
For Scientific Personnel of ICAR

I. Prologue

Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) is one of the largest scientific organizations devoted to agricultural research and education in the country. Through its vast network of institutions spread across the entire length and breadth of the country, it caters to the research and educational needs in agriculture at the national level. It takes pride in having the highly qualified scientific manpower, numbering around 5000, who bring laurels to the country in general and to ICAR in particular. Its contribution towards making the country self-sufficient in food production has received universal recognition. Besides its basic role in increasing agricultural production and productivity through appropriate technologies and in developing the high quality scientific manpower through its relevant academic/training activity, it provides policy support to the Government on all matters relating to agricultural research and education.

The ICAR largely owes its achievements to the devotion and untiring efforts of its scientific community. Over the years, it has evolved dynamic systems to evaluate the achievement of scientists against the targets set for various tasks and suitably reward them based on their level of performance. One of the basic components of the evaluation system is the preparation and documentation of Annual Assessment Report (AAR). From a mere subjective assessment of the performance of scientists, an improved AAR system has been developed by the Council so as to infuse more objectivity through a process of quantification and grading of their achievements. The revised AAR form for the scientific personnel has been introduced for adoption from the assessment year 2003 – 2004 (vide ICAR letter no. 2(3)/96-Per.IV dated 5th November 2003).

The Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT) of the Government of India has developed guidelines for the preparation and maintenance of Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) in respect of All India Services (vide DoPT letter no. 21011/1/2005-Estt (A) (Pt-II) dated 23rd July 2009), wherein the format for numerical grading of the achievements of Group 'A' Officers by the Reporting and Reviewing Authority has been elaborated. The ICAR endorsed this guidelines and communicated to its Institutes for information and further guidance (vide ICAR letter no. 21-23/2009-CDN dated 17th August 2009). As a follow-up, the National Academy of Agricultural Research Management (NAARM) has been asked to revise the existing AAR system currently in vogue for the scientific personnel of ICAR.

In this context, ICAR has asked NAARM to review and revise the existing Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) form in respect of scientists in accordance with DoPT guidelines. Accordingly, the existing AAR system has been revised after thorough review and interaction with some Senior Officers at NAARM. Apart from DoPT guidelines, the APAR system followed for the scientific personnel of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), as well as the score card system adopted by the Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board (ASRB) for promotion of

scientists under the Career Advance Scheme (CAS) of ICAR have also been consulted during revision.

II. Revision of Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) System

Keeping the aforesaid points in view, the existing APAR system followed in ICAR has been revised by incorporating the DoPT guidelines and the salient features of the assessment system followed in CSIR institutes, as well as the prevailing ASRB score card system adopted for the promotion of ICAR scientists. The basic principle followed for revision including the process envisaged and the content modified; and the revised APAR form for the scientific personnel of ICAR are presented along with necessary guidelines in the following section.

A. Principle

It is in the interest of all categories of ICAR scientists that they should know how well or otherwise they are performing their job. Genuine feedback information from periodical assessment of their performance would facilitate them to plan their career development in a systematic manner. Knowing their deficiency in time, if any, would enable them to take special efforts to overcome their shortcomings keeping in view their career advancement in the long run.

The performance of scientists is assessed regularly on an annual basis (April - March) through Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR). It is an important document which provides the basic and vital inputs for assessing the suitability of individual scientists for their further career advancement. The APAR is a means to an end and not an end itself. It should be considered as a true indicator of the achievement of scientists and not as a mere controlling tool. It is not meant to be a fault finding tool but a development tool for career planning of scientists.

Performance assessment should be considered as a human resource development tool in order to enable the scientists to realize their true potential. It is meant to be a joint exercise between the scientist reported upon and the Reporting Officer who supervises his/her work. At the beginning of the year, the Reporting Officer has to set quantitative/ physical targets in consultation with each of the scientists working under them. It is the duty of the Reporting Officer to give the scientists a clear understanding of the tasks to be performed and to provide them with the required resources to effectively perform the tasks assigned to them. It is for the scientists to contribute to the best of their ability through better achievement of the given tasks, both in quantity and quality, by making optimum use of the resources provided.

It is of vital concern both for the Reporting Officer and the Reviewing Officer to write the APAR of their scientists in an objective and impartial manner. Their objective assessment would not only assist them in providing proper guidance for those scientists who perform below expectations, but also in taking credit for the good work done by their scientists. They should have a clear perception of the objectives of performance assessment, i.e., i) to improve the performance of scientists in their present job; and ii) to

assess the potentialities of scientists and prepare them through appropriate feedback and guidance for their career opportunities in future.

The basic principle of the revised assessment system demands that the full APAR including the overall grade and general assessment by the Reporting Officer be communicated to the concerned scientist after it is completed with the remarks of the Reviewing Officer. The scientist reported upon to be given the opportunity to make representation against the entries and final grading given in the APAR, if he/she is not fully in agreement with the assessment made by the Reporting and Reviewing Officers. The competent authority may then consider the representation of the grieved scientist, if necessary, in consultation with the Reporting Officer and/or Reviewing Officer. After due consideration, the competent authority may accept and modify the APAR or reject it. The decision of the competent authority will be final.

B. Process

A series of time-bound steps are involved in the preparation and documentation of APAR for the scientific personnel of ICAR, as under:

- Distribution of APAR form to the Scientist to be reported upon, after completion of Part 1 by the Administrative Office.
- Submission of self-assessment of activities and accomplishments by the Scientist reported upon in Part 2 to the Reporting Officer.
- Submission of report by the Reporting Officer in Part 3 to the Reviewing Officer, after evaluating the self-assessment submitted by the Scientist reported upon and awarding numerical grade as per the specific guidelines set for the purpose.
- Completion of report by the Reviewing Officer and sending it to APAR Section/ Cell, after recording critical remarks on the evaluation by the Reporting Officer and awarding own numerical grade, as per the guidelines, in Part 3.
- Disclosure of the evaluation including the numerical grade awarded and the critical comments made by the Reporting and Reviewing Officers to the Scientist reported upon for information.
- Receipt of representation, if any, on the completed APAR from the Scientist reported upon by the APAR Section/ Cell.
- Forwarding of representation received by the APAR Section/ Cell to the Competent Authority for redress.
- Disposal of representation by the Competent Authority, either by accepting it and suitably modifying the APAR or rejecting it.
- Communication of the decision of the Competent Authority on the representation received to the APAR Section/ Cell.
- End of entire process and finally taking the APAR on record.

The entire APAR process starts on 31st March and ends on 30th November, as annexed to the revised APAR form.

C. Content

The revised Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) form essentially has three distinct parts, as under:

- Part 1: General particulars of the Scientist reported upon – to be filled in by the Administrative Office.
- Part 2: Self- assessment of performance – to be filled in by the Scientist reported upon. It provides ample opportunity for the individual scientists to indicate the relative time spent on each of the tasks assigned to them as well as to evaluate one's own performance and document the achievements. In this part, the Scientist specifies the targets set for various tasks performed, achievements under each target, the shortfalls (if any), constraints encountered and specific areas where achievements have been greater.
- Part 3: Assessment by the Reporting and Reviewing Officers. Their evaluation and comments provide opportunity to every Scientist to receive an honest and constructive critique on past performance and suggestions for improvement and career growth in future.

Since the assessment of any scientist should in principle be determined not only by the work output in the preceding year but also to some degree his/her capabilities and potentials, the revised APAR system considers three major parameters, namely, 'Work Output', 'Personal Attributes' and 'Functional Competence', with different weight factor assigned to each one of them in accordance with job description. Achievements of the scientist are to be graded (scored) against relevant indicators of assessment included under each of these three parameters by the supervising officers to arrive at the overall grading of the scientist. The weight factor concept permits the possibility of the three different parameters being valued differently for scientists in different job categories with varied functions. A freshly recruited scientist who has been busy in creating facilities at the new Regional Stations/ Institutes may have to be assessed with greater emphasis on personal attributes and functional competence rather than an emphasis on work output. Since management skills become increasingly important as the scientist climbs up in the organizational ladder, the personal attributes and functional competence assume greater importance in the overall grading owing to his/her increased managerial and leadership roles.

Once the scientist completes the self-assessment part, numerical grading are to be awarded by the Reporting Officer for the work output, personal attributes and functional competence of the scientist reported upon, that need to be agreed or disagreed and modified with reasons by the concerned Reviewing Officer. Accomplishments of the Scientist against the group of indicators included under each of these three parameters are to be graded (scored) individually on a scale of 1–10, where 1 refers to the lowest grade

and 10 to the highest. The overall grading will be based on addition of the mean value of each group of indicators in proportion to the weight factor assigned.

III. Epilogue

In order for the revised APAR system to succeed, the Supervising Officers/ Heads of Institutes/ Research Managers have to play a key role by observing the following:

- The APAR has to be filled with due care and attention, and also after devoting adequate time.
- Ensuring that all scientists are familiar with and understand the basic tenets of the APAR form and know how to fill it correctly (probably through an institute-level short exposure).
- Working with the Senior Officers Team at the Station/Institute to create enabling atmosphere and mechanism, and also make available the required resources and facilities to the extent possible so that the scientists could perform to the best of their ability.
- Making the internal mechanism for addressing any grievances of the scientists more effective.
- Ensuring that the scientists receive timely feedback on their more significant as well as lesser strengths, including suggestions for improvement.
- Since APARs are vital for proper management and development of scientists, it is essential to see that they are completed within a time frame.

It is with sincere hope and expectation that the existing APAR system has been revised to provide opportunity for the Supervising Officers to recognize and suitably reward the performance of scientists, as well as to allow the ICAR Institutes to promote institutional goals by rewarding excellence and evolving appropriate strategies to overcome poor performance of the scientists towards achieving the institutional goals.

***

IV. Revised Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) Form

INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Annual Performance Assessment Report for Scientific Personnel of the ICAR

Report for the year/period ending…….

PART - 1: General Particulars (to be filled in by the Administrative Office)

1. Name of the Scientist:
2. Date of birth:
3. Research Station/ Institute in which working:
4. Date of entry in the ICAR service:
5. Present designation:
6. Date of joining the Present Grade:
7. Present pay:
8. Academic qualification acquired during the year reported upon (In case no academic qualification has been acquired, the highest degree along with specialization need be given):

Degree	Year	Subject(s)	Institution

9. Period on leave during the year:

PART - 2: Self – Assessment (to be filled in by the Scientist reported upon)

Activities and Achievements:

1. Activities approved and accomplished (Please choose whichever is applicable to you):

S. No.	Activities Planned and Targets*	Time Spent** (%)	Achieved*** (%)	Reasons for Shortfall/Constraints, if any
(i)	Research • • • • •			
(ii)	Teaching • • • • •			
(iii)	Training • • • • •			
(iv)	Transfer of technology • • • • •			
(v)	Organizing conferences/ workshops/ seminars/ meetings • • • • •			

(vi)	Institutional support (Management and maintenance of genetic/soil/ water/ animal/ farm/ database/ facilities/ intellectual property; Administration/ Management/coordination)			
(vii)	Other activities (Reports/ publicity/ special assignments within or outside the institute/ ICAR, etc.)			

* *Give short title or phrase. As proposed by the scientist and approved by the Reporting Officer (attach as in Annexure II).*

** *Total should add up to 100%*

*** *Extend and also indicate whether achieved within the time-frame set for the purpose*

2. Outputs: *(For the activities shown above). Please choose whichever is applicable and attach a summary report (about 400 words) on the most significant accomplishments during the year reported upon (as Annexure).*

S. No.	Activity	Contribution (Number)
1.	Research: a) Technology generation *(Varieties/breeds/tree species released; Management practices developed; Process/concept/methodology developed; Any other – please specify)* b) Publications/ presentations/ documentation *(i) Papers in research journals (National/International)* *(ii) Technical/popular articles* *(iii) Books (Authored/edited)* *(iv) Book chapters/technical bulletins/manuals* *(v) Working/concept papers* *(vi) Scientific/teaching reviews* *(vii)Presentation in workshops seminars/symposia/ conferences* *(viii)Compilation/documentation* *(ix) Any other (please specify)* c) Product development *(Crop-based; Animal-based, including vaccines; Biological – biofertilizer, biopesticide, etc; IT based – database, software; Any other – please specify)*	

	d) Intellectual property generation *(Patents; Copyrights; Designs; PPV- registered only)*	
2.	Teaching/ Academic activity: a) Courses designed and taught b) Students guided c) Resource material/methodology developed d) Any other (please specify)	
3.	Training: a) Programmes developed and organized b) Resource material developed c) Any other (please specify)	
4.	Transfer of technology: a) Technology assessed and refined b) Trainings organized c) Demonstration/ exhibition/ field day/ farmers fair d) Inputs supplied e) Innovative methodology developed f) Any other (please specify)	
5.	Organizing Workshops/ seminars/ symposia/ conferences: a) Conceptualized and organized b) Served as convener or co-convener/ coordinator c) Invited as key speaker in scientific meetings *(National/International)* d) Any other (please specify)	
6.	Institutional support: a) Member Secretary – RAC/ IRC/ IMC/ PME Cell/ IPR Cell/ Technical Cell/ HRD Cell/ CPC/ QRT b) Editorship – Annual report/ institute publications c) I/c Central facilities d) Admn/Management/Coordination	
7.	Special assignments: a) Special assignments - National b) Special assignments - International c) Other general institutional activities (reports/ publicity/ special assignments within or outside the institute/ ICAR, etc.)	

3. Peer Recognition:

S. No.	Activity	Number
1.	Awards/ fellowships received *(National; International; Institutional/ Professional Societies; Best paper/ poster; Any other – please specify)*	
2.	Professional Societies *(Membership; Editorship for journals; Any other – please specify)*	
3.	Review of papers/reports/proposals, as referee	
4.	Any other (please specify)	

4. Resource Generation*

S. No.	Activity	Number
1.	Contract research	
2.	Special national/ international projects	
3.	Commercialization of technology	
4.	Summer or Winter Schools	
5.	Any other (please specify)	

** In terms of rupees*

5. Accomplishment of exceptional work/unforeseen tasks performed (please specify) Number:

6. Professional growth and development: *Please give details of the programmes attended within India and on deputation abroad.*

S. No.	Programme Attended	Institute and Place	Period
1.	Training / Refresher Courses/ Summer/Winter Schools		
2.	Seminars/ Workshops/ Symposia		
3.	Conferences/ Meetings		

Signature of the Scientist reported upon

Place and Date

Part - 2.1: Additional information to be filled in by the Directors/ Project Directors/ Joint Directors/ HoDs/ Heads of the Regional Stations of the Institutes.

S. No.	Activity	Targets (Institutional)	Achievements	Reasons for Shortfall, if any
1.	Human resource management:			
	a) Recruitment			
	b) Assessment			
	b) Human resource development			
2.	Financial management: *(Division/ Station/ Institute)*			
	a) Resource generation			
	b) Budget utilization			
	c) New externally funded projects			
3.	Delegation of power			
4.	Intellectual property management:			
	a) Identification and protection			
	b) Technologies commercialized			
5.	Management/ promotion of scientific collaboration			
	a) National			
	b) International			
6.	Conducting meetings and follow-up action: IRC/ RAC / ITMU / IMC / QRT/ International events, etc			
7.	Public relations building *(Publicity/ Interaction)*			
8.	Visit to provide guidance and support *(Regional Stations/ Centers)*			
9.	Completion of activities in time *(Annual Report)*			

Signature of the Scientist reported upon

Part - 2.2: Additional information to be filled in by the Project Coordinators.

S. No.	Activity	Targets	Achievements	Reasons for Shortfall, if any
1.	Visits made to Cooperating Centres for guidance and support			
2.	Monitoring of the progress of work at the Centres *(Technical and physical)*			
3.	Financial management:			
	a) Fund release to Centres			
	b) Utilization of funds *(Whole project)*			
	c) Submission of monthly expenditure statements *(Whole project)*			
4.	Annual/ Biannual workshops/ Group meetings conducted			
5.	Implementation of Workshop recommendations (if any) *(Follow-up action)*			
6.	Significant technologies released to the farmers			
7.	Establishment of inter-project linkages			

Signature of the Project Coordinator reported upon

Part - 2.3: Additional information to be filled in by the Deputy Directors General/ Assistant Directors General at the ICAR Headquarters.

S. No.	Activity	Achievements	Constraints, if any
1.	Policy support provided to ICAR/ Government		
2.	Representation of ICAR/ Country in international fora *(on policy matters; for image building and publicity)*		
3.	Number of foreign aided projects formulated/ processed		
4.	Number of EFC/SFC memos processed/ cleared		
5.	Action taken on items concerning AGM/ GB/ Directors' Conference/ Vice Chancellors' Conference/ SFC/ Regional Committees/ IMC/ RAC/ QRT		
6.	Visits to Institutes/ Project Directorates/ National Research Centres under charge during the year *(Guidance and support)*		
7.	Deputation of scientists abroad *(Training/ Higher study/ Conference attendance)*		
9.	Representation in policy making bodies of ICAR Institutes/ Agricultural Universities/ other Scientific Institutions		

Signature of the Research Manager reported upon

PART – 3: Assessment by the Reporting Officer

3.1 Length of service of the Scientist being reported under your supervision

3.2 Comments on Part – 2:

Please make an objective comment on Part 2 (from 1 to 3), and Part 2.1 or 2.2 or 2.3 (as the case may be), as well as on the summary report made by the Scientist. While commenting, please take due note of the shortfalls / constraints mentioned by the Scientist.

3.3 Assessment of Significant Achievements.

Please score individually the group of indicators under each of the three parameters on a scale of 1-10, ten being the highest grade and 1 the lowest. Grading on each of the parameter of assessment is the mean score of all the indicators included under it *(Please follow the guidelines given in Annexure III A & B for grading).*

Indicators under each Assessment Parameter	**Grading (1: Lowest and 10 Highest)***
A. Work Output**	
i) Accomplishment of planned work/ work allotted as per the subjects allotted	
ii) Outputs (Quantity)	
iii) Quality of output	
iv) Professional knowledge, skills and analytical ability	
v) Accomplishment of exceptional work/ unforeseen tasks performed	
Grading on Work Output [Mean score] [(i+ii+iii+iv+v)/5]***	

B. Personal Attributes**	
i) Attitude to work	
ii) Innovativeness and initiative	
iii) Sense of responsibility	
iv) Maintenance of discipline	
v) Communication skills	
vi) Leadership qualities	
vii) Inter-personal relations	
Grading on Personal Attributes [Mean score] [(i+ii+iii+iv+v+vi+vii+viii+ix)/9]***	
C. Functional Competence**	
i) Knowledge of rules/ regulations/ procedures in the area of function and the ability to apply them correctly	
ii) Strategic planning ability	
iii) Decision making ability	
iv) Coordination ability	
v) Ability to motivate and develop scientists and others	
vi) Resource generation	
vii)Budget utilization	
Grading on Functional Competence [Mean score] [(i+ii+iii+iv+v+vi+vii+viii)/8]***	

(Adapted to suit ICAR System)

* *Grading to be done as per the level of achievement/ capability against each indicator (see Annexure III A)*

** *Weight factor to be assigned as per the job category of the Scientist (see Annexure III B)*

*** *To be worked out as per the number of indicators applicable to the Scientist*

Overall Grading of the Scientist:

$$\text{Overall Grade} = \frac{(GWO * WWO) + (GPA * WPA) + (GFC * WFC)}{100}$$

Where: GWO is Grading on Work Output
GPA is Grading on Personal Attributes
GFC is Grading on Functional Competence
WWO is Weight factor for Work Output
WPA is Weight factor for Personal Attributes
WFC is Weight factor for Functional Competence

S. No.	Grade	Category
1.	8.5 – 10.0	Outstanding
2.	7.0 – 8.4	Very Good
3.	5.5 – 6.9	Good
4.	4.0 – 5.4	Average
5.	< 4.0	Below Average

(Adapted to suit ICAR System)

Note: Against work output/ personal attributes/ functional competence, and overall grade:

(i) Any grading of 1 or 2, and 'Below Average' to be adequately justified by way of specific failures.

(ii) Any grading of 9 or 10, and 'Outstanding' to be justified with respect to specific accomplishments.

(iii)Rating should be done against a large population of peer group of Scientists that may be currently working under the Reporting Officer.

3.4 General Assessment:

(i) Please comment on the state of health of the Scientist.

(ii) Please comment on the integrity of the Scientist by circling one of the following options:

- ❖ Beyond doubt
- ❖ Nothing adverse heard against
- ❖ Doubtful

Note: Instructions of Government of India to be followed in case of adverse remarks

(iii) Please comment on the attitude of the Scientist towards Scheduled Caste / Scheduled Tribe / Weaker Sections of the Society; his / her understanding and willingness to deal with them.

(iv) Please comment on the major strengths of the Scientist

(v) Suggested area of training/skill upgradation

3.5 Overall Grading:

Outstanding/ Very Good/ Good/ Average/ Below Average

(Based on the overall grade obtained at 3.3)

Signature of the Reporting Officer ……

Name (in Block Letters)……

Designation……

Place & Date

3.6 Remarks and Overall Grading by the Reviewing Officer.

3.6.1 Length of service of the Scientist under your supervision and guidance.

3.6.2 Do you agree with the comments made by the Reporting Officer in 3.2? Is there anything you wish to modify? Please give reasons.

	Yes	No	Remarks
3.2			
3.3			
3.4			
3.5			

3.6.3 **Grading:** Outstanding/ Very Good/ Good/ Average/ Below Average

Justification if different from Reporting Officer

Signature of the Reviewing Officer ……

Name (in Block Letters)……

Designation……

Place & Date

Guidelines

Annexure I. Filling of Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) Form

1. The Annual Performance Assessment Report (APAR) form for the Scientific Personnel is to be filled by the concerned Administrative Office, the Scientist reported upon, the Reporting Officer and the Reviewing Officer.

2. Part-1 of the APAR is to be filled by the Administrative Office of the Institute/ Headquarters where the Scientist has been working in the period reported upon. Since this part involves details of the service of the scientist at various Institutes, his/her academic qualification and the nature of leave availed by him/her, he/she is required to submit all such information to the concerned Administrative Office from time to time.

3. Part-2 of the APAR proforma endeavours at the self-assessment of the Scientist reported upon. The targets set and the achievements made, along with time spent, against each activity should be given. Also, the constraints faced in accomplishing these targets, if any, should be highlighted.

4. The Scientist being reported upon is required to submit a summary report in about 400 words on the most significant accomplishments during the year reported upon.

5. Part-2 is required to be filled by each category of Scientists; and Part 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 by those Scientists who are holding specific positions such as Director/ Project Director/ Joint Director/ Head of the Regional Stations of the Institutes, Project Coordinator, and Research Management Positions (DDG and ADG) at the ICAR Headquarters, respectively.

6. In Part-3.1 of the APAR proforma, the Reporting Officer is required to write the grade (score) on 1 – 10 scale against each of the listed indicators under the three parameters in order to more objectively assess the achievements of the Scientist reported upon. The grading on each of the three parameters is arrived at by calculating the mean value of the group of indicators (as applicable to the Scientist) included under each of them. The overall grading of the Scientist is worked out by adding the mean value of each group of indicators in proportion to the weight factors assigned for each job category of the Scientists.

7. In this part, the Reporting Officer also has to offer his/her comments on general assessment and assign overall grading for the Scientist reported upon.

8. In Part-3.2 of the APAR proforma, the Reviewing Officer shall express his/her agreement or suggest modifications on the assessment made by the Reporting Officer and then indicate his/her final grading.

Annexure II: Setting Targets

This is one of the basic requirements that is vital for proper assessment of the performance of scientists in ICAR. Quality of assessment can be greatly enhanced by paying due attention to this critical activity. This has to be necessarily a joint exercise by the Scientist reported upon and the Reporting Officer concerned. While the Scientist proposes targets for the coming year, in terms of distinct activities, the Reporting Officer accords concurrence. On this premise, the following form has to be completed within first 15 days of the reporting period to set realistic and acceptable targets. Also as a mid-year exercise, the targets agreed upon at the beginning of the year have to be reviewed again during September/October and minor changes are to be made wherever necessary.

Please indicate the major activities planned along with expected key outputs.

S. No.	Major Activities Planned	On-going or New	Time Requirement (%)*	Expected Key Outputs**
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

(Adapted from CSIR System)

* *Total should add up to 100%*

** *Please quantify wherever possible*

Accepted by the Reporting Officer

Signature with date…….

Name……

Designation…….

Proposed by the Scientist

Signature with date……..

Name……

Designation……

Annexure III: Grading of Scientists by Reporting and Reviewing Officers

A. Grading: Following guidelines may be observed to award grade (score) against each of the indicators included under the three major parameters considered for assessment.

1. Work Output

i) Accomplishment of planned work / work allotted as per objects allotted *(level of meeting expected output).*

Far below expectation		→		Meets expectation		→		Consistently exceeds expectation	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

ii) Outputs *(quantum of various work outputs from research, education and extension activities like technologies, publications, academic programmes, training, transfer of technology, products developed, etc.).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

iii) Quality of output *(how well meets the objectives; accuracy and thoroughness in handling the assigned work).*

Poor quality		→		Assignments carried out well and in time		→		Exceeds all measures for expected quality	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

iv) Professional knowledge and skills and analytical ability *(depth and uniqueness of knowledge and skills; ability to identify cause of the problem by reducing it to significant components in a logical and systematic manner, and use realistic approaches to solve it after systematic synthesis).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

v) Accomplishment of exceptional work/ unforeseen tasks performed *(peer recognition of results of exceptional quality from tasks not included in the targets set at the beginning; special awards and rewards received).*

No recognition		→		Moderate recognition		→		Very high recognition	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

2. Personal Attributes

i) Attitude to work *(interest shown towards job; industrious and hard working, passion for excellence; readiness to accept change).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

ii) Innovativeness and initiative *(ingenuity and creativity to evolve new ideas and concepts, and handle unusual situations; ability to recognize what needs to be done and organize things on the own to get started).*

Very poor		→		Moderate		→		Very good	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

iii) Sense of responsibility *(commitment to institutional goals; exhibiting accountability for the assignments taken up).*

Very low commitment and accountability		→		Moderate commitment and accountability		→		Very high commitment and accountability	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

iv) Maintenance of discipline *(acceptance and delivery of assignments with a high sense of responsibility; punctuality; following institutional norms and procedures).*

Highly indisciplined		→		Disciplined		→		Very highly disciplined	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

v) Communication skills *(ability to listen; effectively organize, present and sell ideas and information orally and by writing to others).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

vi) Leadership qualities *(ability to develop vision, foresight and judgment; properly judge and delegate assignments to others; create and maintain suitable work climate to get the best out of people; maintain poise under pressure).*

Very poor		→		Moderate		→		Exceptional	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

vii) Inter-personal relations *(tact, courtesy and sincerity in personal contacts; friendliness and helpfulness to secure cooperation from others without positional authority).*

Very poor		→		Moderate		→		Very good	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Functional Competence

i) Knowledge of rules/ regulations/ procedures in the area of function and ability to apply them correctly *(aptitude and potential for general administration).*

Very poor		→		Moderate		→		Very good	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

ii) Managerial skills *(ability to plan, schedule and organize work by making effective use of available resources; set realistic goals and workable course of action; effectively monitor the progress and evaluate the results).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

iii) Strategic planning ability *(evolving appropriate strategies, plans and schedules and making adjustments as per the emerging needs while still maintaining the overall effectiveness).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

iv) Decision making ability *(developing alternative courses of action based on collection and analysis of factual information, and willingly taking decisions in a timely and effective manner).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

v) Coordination ability (*coordinating various purpose-oriented activities undertaken by ensuring active participation and cooperation of people associated with them).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

vi) Ability to motivate and develop the scientists and other staff working with them *(encouraging the scientists and other staff by according due recognition to their efforts and suitably rewarding them; developing and executing necessary HRD plans for their professional and personal growth and development).*

Very low		→		Moderate		→		Very high	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

vii) Resource generation *(ability to mobilize additional funds through outside projects, consultancy services and commercialization of technologies).*

None		→		Something		→		Appreciable	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

viii) Budget utilization *(extent of utilization of budgetary allocation to various activities approved by the competent authority).*

Less utilized		→		Partly utilized		→		Fully utilized	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

(Adapted from CSIR System)

B. Weight Factors for Various Categories of Scientists

The weight factor varies for each job category as per the functional requirements. The weight factors for the three major parameters of assessment should add up to 100. Accordingly, the following weight factors are suggested for each job category:

S. No.	Job Category	Weight Factors for each Job Category		
		Work Output	Personal Attributes	Functional Competence
1.	Scientists, Senior Scientists and Principal Scientists.	80	10	10
2.	Directors, Project Directors, Joint Directors and Heads of the Regional Stations of the Institutes.	50	20	30
3.	Deputy Directors General, Assistant Directors General and Project/ Zonal Coordinators.	30	30	40

Note: *Weight factors for the freshly recruited scientists filling up the APAR for the first time (only the first year) may need to emphasize more on Personal Attributes and Functional Competence than on Work Output.*

Annexure IV: Time Schedule for Preparation/ Completion of APAR
(Reporting Year – Financial Year)

S. No.	Activity	Date by which to be Completed
1.	Distribution of APAR form to the Scientist to be reported upon after completion of Part-1 by the Administrative Office.	31st March (This may be completed even a week earlier)
2.	Submission of self-assessment by the Scientist reported upon in Part-2 to the Reporting Officer.	15th April
3.	Submission of report by the Reporting Officer after general assessment and numerical grading in Part-3.1 to the Reviewing Officer.	30th June
4.	Completion of report by the Reviewing Officer with critical remarks and numerical grading in Part 3.2 and sending it to APAR Section/ Cell.	31st July
5.	Disclosure of the evaluation including the numerical grade awarded by the Reporting and Reviewing Officers to the Scientist reported upon.	1st September
6.	Receipt of representation, if any, on the completed APAR from the Scientist reported upon by the APAR Section/ Cell.	15th September
7.	Forwarding of representation received from the Scientist reported upon by the APAR Section/ Cell to the Competent Authority.	21st September
8.	Disposal of representation by the Competent Authority, with concurrence or rejection.	Within one month from the date of receipt of representation
9.	Communication of the decision of the Competent Authority on the representation received to the APAR Section/ Cell.	15th November
10.	End of entire process, after which the APAR will be finally taken on record.	30th November

***