



**ROYAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
SPECIALIST PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORM**



**For the period:** \_\_\_\_\_ **to** \_\_\_\_\_

Agency:

Name of Employee:

Employee ID No:

Name of Supervisor:

Position Title:

Position Title:

Position Level:

Position Level:

**1. PROFESSIONAL EXCELLENCE**

A) How would you rate his depth of technical knowledge in his professional area of responsibility?

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good:               | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

B) How would you rate his knowledge on current trends, legal and professional issues, acts, and rules and regulations, within his area of professional responsibility?

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding :       | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good :              | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

C) How would you rate his timeliness and effective discharge of professional responsibilities and dependability in the performance of professional responsibilities?

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good :              | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

D) How would you rate his degree of professionalism and adherence to professional ethics?

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good :         | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good:               | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

E) How would you rate his availability, accessibility and responsiveness to needs above and beyond the minimum requirement?

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good:               | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

TOTAL RATING: \_\_\_\_\_

DIVIDE 'TOTAL RATING' BY 5 = AVERAGE RATING (A): \_\_\_\_\_

---

**2. PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP**

A) Active leadership in the field of one' profession, (it includes among others the ability to plan, prioritize, delegate, monitor, evaluate and decision making skills)

- 1. Outstanding: 3.5 – 4.00 points
- 2. Very Good: 2.5 – 3.49 points
- 3. Good: 1.5 – 2.49 points
- 4. Improvement Needed: 0 – 1.49 points

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

B) Effective leadership and coordination of professional programmes, including the ability to work effectively with other peers of other Agencies/Departments, stakeholders, superiors and clients,

- 1. Outstanding: 3.5 – 4.00 points
- 2. Very Good: 2.5 – 3.49 points
- 3. Good: 1.5 – 2.49 points
- 4. Improvement Needed: 0 – 1.49 points

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

C) Leadership in developing institutional and professional linkages and/or partnerships at the national, regional and international levels,

- 1. Outstanding: 3.5 – 4.00 points
- 2. Very Good: 2.5 – 3.49 points
- 3. Good: 1.5 – 2.49 points
- 4. Improvement Needed: 0 – 1.49 points

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

D) Management of Resources; both HR (in promoting professionalism, motivation of subordinates and effective communications skills) and facilities (in effective utilisation of facilities and equipments), and

- |                        |   |                   |                      |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding         | : | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good           | : | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good                | : | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: |   | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

E) Provision of technical inputs in making policy decisions, and planning and implementation processes.

- |                        |  |                   |                      |
|------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        |  | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          |  | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good:               |  | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: |  | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

TOTAL RATING: \_\_\_\_\_

DIVIDE 'TOTAL RATING' BY 5 = AVERAGE RATING (B): \_\_\_\_\_

**3. PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS**

A) Evidence of scholarly work: publications, including journal articles, books, book review, manuals, etc..

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good:               | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

B) Professional awards, honors, recognition, appreciation/ commendations.

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good:               | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

C) Active membership, service and leadership in professional organisations.

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 1. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Good:               | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

D) Attendance and presentation at national, regional and local conferences, seminars and workshops.

- |                        |   |                   |                      |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding         | : | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good           | : | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good                | : | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: |   | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

E) Contribution to professionally related community activities in civic, cultural, educational and benevolent organisations.

- |                        |                   |                      |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Outstanding:        | 3.5 – 4.00 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Very Good:          | 2.5 – 3.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 3. Good:               | 1.5 – 2.49 points | <input type="text"/> |
| 4. Improvement Needed: | 0 – 1.49 points   | <input type="text"/> |

Substantiate rating with at least one example:

---

TOTAL RATING: \_\_\_\_\_

DIVIDE 'TOTAL RATING' BY 5 = AVERAGE RATING (C): \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments by the Employee**

(Comment on some of your special achievement and on areas that you need to improve)

**(Signature of the Employee)**

**Comments by the Supervisor**

**(Signature of the Supervisor)**

THE HRO SHALL COMPLETE THE FINAL RATINGS CALCULATION BELOW, AND SUBMIT TO THE HRC/RCSC FOR REVIEW AND FINAL APPROVAL.

**FINAL RATINGS CALCULATION:**

Average Rating (A): \_\_\_\_\_ 40% Weightage      Average Rating (B): \_\_\_\_\_ 40% Weightage

Average Rating (C): \_\_\_\_\_ 20% Weightage

Final Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

[Calculation:  $(A \times 0.4) + (B \times 0.4) + (C \times 0.2)$ ]

Tick appropriate box to confirm the Final Rating:

3.50 – 4.00 Outstanding

1.50 – 2.49 Good

2.50 – 3.49 Very Good

0 – 1.49 Improvement Needed

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Name and Signature of the HR Officer**

**Comments by the HR Committee**

HR Committee No.:..... Date:.....

**(Signature of the Chairperson of the HR Committee)**