

ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

Evolving Performance Management in the GOP Civil Service Commission Phase I

Background

Initially, the project approved by the United Nations Development Fund was "*Enhancing the Performance Evaluation (PES) in the Civil Service.*" (Annex A - TOR.) As the central personnel agency of the Philippine bureaucracy, the Civil Service Commission (CSC) is constitutionally mandated to establish a career service and adopt measures to promote morale, efficiency, integrity, responsiveness, and courtesy in the bureaucracy.

Widely, PES remains underutilized and unutilized. In many parts of the bureaucracy, the PES is used principally to comply with civil service rules on promotion or personnel movement and determine the productivity incentive bonus (PIB) of personnel. Scarcely is PES established for individual accountability and productivity. Compounding this is its seeming unfriendly application with cumbersome and complicated internal systems that add to its eroding value.

There are two primary objectives of the UNDP approved project on PES. First is to make a diagnosis of past and present use of the performance appraisal system and practices in the civil service and integrate the experiences of the CSC and various government agencies as input to further improve the PES. Second is to develop an enhanced PES design to be initially piloted in the CSC, and to other selected agencies later on.

However, along the way, CSC realized that a much better way to enhance the PES is to look at performance at a macro point of view. Hence, the move to look at the performance management of employees as a whole. The original PES project described above metamorphosed into a system with the complete cycle

of performance management - - - from performance planning to employee development planning. The project title was changed to ***“Evolving and Pilot-Testing Performance Management System in the Philippine Civil Service – Phase 1.”***

This does not mean however, that the two primary objectives of the original PES project shall be taken aside. A special project of the Commission’s Personnel Policies and Standards Office (PPSO) shall pilot-test PES models developed by five pilot offices in the CSC Central Office using the proposed revisions on CSC MC 13, s. 1999. The results of PPSO’s project and the UNDP funded PMS project shall then be analyzed and evaluated to come up hopefully, with a more effective performance management system for the bureaucracy.

PROJECT BRIEF

Rationale

Human resources are an agency’s most valuable asset. They define the efficiency, effectiveness and over-all quality of service in any industry.

The government sector is no exception. The need to establish an effective system that accurately evaluates the capabilities of its workers for the purpose of determining tenure, transfers or promotions, and appropriate incentives is of absolute urgency.

While policies and systems for employee performance evaluation have long been in place in government, there has been increasing demand to review the existing system, i.e. demand for public servants to produce tangible results (*“making a difference” instead of just “keeping busy”*), demand for increased accountability (*performing the mandate of the organization*), the need to correct the notion that a permanent appointment guarantees security of tenure (and, hence, that

security of tenure is the shield and protector of incompetence in the bureaucracy). Hence, the call for the Philippine Civil Service Commission (PCSC), as the HR (human resource) manager of government, to revisit and, as necessary, re-invent the performance management system of the bureaucracy.

To begin, the PCSC decided to design and test within the PCSC itself a pilot “Performance Management System” or PMS which would meaningfully and objectively link employee performance vis-à-vis the agency’s Organizational Vision, Mission and Strategic Goals. ‘Performance management’, as used in the corporate world, refers to a process or a set of processes for establishing shared understanding about what will be achieved (and how it will be achieved), and managing people in a way that increases the probability that it will be achieved.

Use of Performance Contracting

The demand to produce tangible results and the clamor for increased accountability makes it imperative for PCSC to take interest in performance contracts.

In the private sector, performance contracting, also known as *pay-for-performance*, is the practice of linking pay to performance indicators mutually agreed upon by the contractor and contractee. In business, CEOs are paid on the basis of their performance – they get a bonus if profits increase; a decrease for ailing financial results. The use of performance contracts, at least insofar as the business sector is concerned, has demonstrated – repeatedly and frequently – how accountability and consequently, results are assured when pay is tied to performance.

At the end of the day, the objective of the pilot is to demonstrate the efficacy of performance contracting in the public sector, particularly as a tool to

institutionalize performance-based, that is contribution- and competency-based, security of tenure.

PCSC views the use of performance contracts as a way of holding the DCs accountable for their Division's targets and the Directors accountable for the collective targets of the DCs under their supervision. The goals are to exact accountability and ensure alignment of division targets and outputs with the broader organizational goals that flow from and reflect the Directors' and ultimately, the Commission's management objectives.

Ideally, the cascading effect of performance contracts insofar as accountabilities and alignment of outputs are concerned should roll out, starting from the DCs, to the lowest rung of division's hierarchy.

To require, however that performance contracts – detailing the specific outputs/share of the workload including the minimum acceptable standard of performance for each output – be prepared for every member of the division might be futile at this point. Without a demonstration of its effectiveness in ensuring accomplishment of targets, the move will at its best generate mere compliance with the directive. At its worst, it will be brushed off as another competency assessment model, which will go the way its predecessors have gone – back to the drawing board for ineffectiveness.

Hence, there is a need to pilot-test the use of performance contracts to demonstrate its effectiveness in the public sector and ultimately, groundswell appreciation of its power to exact accountability and guarantee delivery of outputs.

Why Focus on the Division Chiefs?

Division Chiefs, as middle managers, are pivotal in the organization's success. They are the fulcrums – providing both support and balance – in agency operations.

Situated at the intersection of the vertical flow of information within an organization, they provide the vital communication link between top management and front-end personnel. Top management creates the vision, Division Chiefs, as the heads of the smallest organizational unit in the agency, develop the concrete concepts that employees in the lower rungs of the hierarchy can understand and implement.

Moreover, in the process of actualizing the vision they are tasked to manage both people and results. This requires a constant balancing of, on the one hand, the expectation of management to execute strategy and deliver results and on the other the expectation of subordinates to develop, lead, motivate and inspire them to perform exceptionally.

Ultimately, the qualities with which agency commitments are accomplished are dependent on how competent middle managers are. Because they are at the intersection of almost all vertical and horizontal transactions in an agency, it is crucial that accountability begins with them.

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED

Development of the System and Forms

The technical team developed the PMS system and designed the forms (Annex B.) to be used for the pilot-test. Orientation materials (Annex C) were also prepared.

Conduct of Orientation

A one and a half day orientation on the proposed PMS was conducted on October 9 and 10, 2003 at the CSC Function Room with no less than the PCSC Chairperson Karina Constantino-David as the resource person. Thirty-six (36) Division Chiefs/Officers-in-Charge, 21 Heads of Offices and a few observers attended the orientation.

Initial Evaluation of the Performance Contracts Submitted by the DCs

Submission of the performance contracts came in trickles. Despite the extension on the original deadline set, a remarkable number of DCs failed to submit their performance contracts on time.

The PMS Team went over the performance contracts submitted by the DCs and found that they encountered difficulty in some areas of the system particularly in:

1. Writing down of technical outputs both in the performance contracts and the Office Work Plan;
2. Allocating weights;
3. Developing performance standards continuum; and
4. Writing outcome statements

In order to obtain a thorough and unbiased assessment of the system, though, the Commission sought the professional evaluation of a consultant.

3rd Party Evaluation of the PMS System and the Performance Contracts

The Civil Service Commission employed the services of the Development Dimensions International, Inc. (DDI). A contract (Annex D) was signed between the Commission and the DDI for the latter to conduct an analysis of the output of

the initial phase of the Pilot-Test of the Performance Management System (PPMS) and the PMS guidelines and tools.

DDI consultants reviewed all available information describing the PPMS guidelines, procedures, and tools. This step entailed reviewing DDI research and professional research relevant to ensuring a successful implementation of a performance management system.

Following are the outputs of the consultant as stipulated in the project proposal of the DDI (Annex E):

1. Comments on each of the thirty-six (36) performance contracts submitted by the Division Chiefs.
2. Report that presents the:
 - Analysis of the quality of the performance contracts and possible factors which explain these results;
 - Analysis of the PPMS as designed vis-à-vis other available models and/or best practice;
 - Recommendations to improve the PPMS and boost its effectiveness.

RESULTS OF THE 3RD PARTY EVALUATION

Executive Summary (taken from the Evaluation Report submitted by DDI)

The Civil Service Commission (CSC) recently launched its pilot Performance Management System. Using the new system, Division Chiefs were guided through the Performance Planning phase to prepare their individual performance plans or Performance Contracts. SGV-Development Dimensions International (SGV-DDI) was commissioned to help CSC evaluate the performance contracts. The purpose of the engagement was two-fold. The first was to determine the level of conformance of the performance contracts with the system design. This

was done by checking each performance contract against a list of CSC guidelines on performance contract writing. The second objective was to identify opportunities for system improvement to ensure that the system is effective prior to adopting it organization-wide, and eventually, government-wide. To fulfill this objective, the system design, its standards, and procedures, were compared with best qualities and practices that DDI research has shown to be determinants of system effectiveness.

Evaluation of the performance contracts revealed that there was high compliance in sections that relied on the Division Chief's familiarity with Division functions, such as listing outputs and classifying them into routine and project, and enumerating the activities and deliverables associated with an output. Conversely, low compliance was observed in allocating weights, specifying outcomes of outputs, and developing performance goals and performance standards. Based on the orientation materials, Division Chiefs were trained on these processes. However, their performance contracts suggest that there may still be knowledge and skill gaps that need to be addressed.

Comparative analysis of the system design with best practices revealed that some elements of the design are already in line with best practices. The use of the system is driven by senior management involvement and the design promotes employee participation in defining success measures. However, the system's effectiveness can be further enhanced by increasing its accuracy, establishing managerial accountability, and simplifying some processes.

A system is accurate when it yields data that is reflective of actual performance levels. Developing realistic performance standards is one way to ensure accurate performance data. However, the system-prescribed rating scales are potential barriers to setting realistic standards.¹ Establishing managerial accountability helps ensure that the system is implemented appropriately, but

¹ See discussion under *System Design*.

very few Division Chiefs listed performance management responsibilities in their performance contracts. Finally, a system's effectiveness can be greatly enhanced by having processes that are easy to understand and simple to follow. However, it was observed that some guidelines could be subject to misinterpretation. This limitation may have also contributed to the low compliance observed in some sections of the performance contract.² The recommendations in this report aim to address those aspects of the system that are not yet aligned with best practices as well as discrepancies between performance contracts and system guidelines.

PROJECT STATUS

Phase 1 of the pilot PMS covered the design of the system, a general orientation among the Directors and Division Chiefs (DC's) based in the central office, and the testing of the system among the thirty six (36) DCs to cover their performance from October to December 2003. Phase 1 intended to include (i) performance planning (including formulation of work plan and contracts by DCs), (ii) performance monitoring, (iii) performance review and feedback, (iv) performance evaluation and development planning. However, the learning curve for performance contracting was more difficult than anticipated. The Division Chiefs encountered difficulties in accomplishing individual performance contracts particularly in setting targets and standards. Consequently, Phase 1 was only able to cover performance planning. To date, draft contracts have been completed and were assessed by consultants from the DDI. Any refinements/enhancements to the system and the forms will be integrated prior to proceeding with the cycle.

Given the progress on Phase 1, resources obtained from the UNDP for the Phase 2 (Annex G – TOR based on the PMS Phase 2 Project Proposal) shall be used to complete the entire pilot cycle for Division Chief PMS as well as further enhance

² For example, based on orientation materials, the difference among immediate, intermediate, and ultimate

the performance-contracting tool to include competencies (core and functional) and not just contribution-based performance measures which were the focus of contracts produced in Phase 1. The primary objective of Phase 2 therefore is to develop and integrate competencies into the PMS and to proceed to apply/test this enhanced PMS to Division Chiefs.

FOLLOW-THROUGH ACTIVITIES AFTER 3RD PARTY EVALUATION

Based on the evaluation report submitted by the DDI, there is a need for follow-through activities, the purpose of which is the development of model PCs. Six (6) DCs were chosen to participate in the said activities. The follow-through activities has two major sessions as follows:

- Initial interview with the six DCs and reorientation on performance management cycle and performance planning; and
- Mentoring/coaching session on preparing work plans and contracts.

The improved PCs of the DCs who participated in the follow-through activities will serve as guides for the improvement of the PCs of all the CSC Division Chiefs.

The development of model PCs will conclude Phase I of the PMS Project. This will likewise mark the beginning of Phase II of the same Project.



PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

PC-1

This contract made and entered into by and between:

_____, head of the _____ (_____) hereinafter known as the **Rater**;

and

_____, **Division Chief of the _____ (_____) of the _____** hereinafter known as the **Ratee**;

WITNESSETH THAT:

WHEREAS, the Commission contemplates the institutionalization of performance-based security of tenure in the government as a means of professionalizing the Civil Service and thereby redeeming the perverted notion of security of tenure being the shield and protector of incompetence in the bureaucracy;

WHEREAS, it is the recognized task of the Division Chief to be accountable for the targets of his/her division in the same way that the Heads of Offices shall assume accountability for the collective targets and commitments of all divisions under them, which in turn will be the Commission's basis for evaluating their performance;

WHEREAS, the Commission hopes to achieve this through a performance contract, which embodies a set of expectations between the Rater and the Ratee on the work to be done, results to be attained and the attributes and competencies required to achieve these results, as well as measures to monitor, review and assess performance;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto have agreed, as they hereby agree, to enter into this Performance Contract for the period October 1 to December 31, 2003. Provided further, that:

1. The Ratee, recognizing management's expectations from them as the head of the smallest operational unit in the Commission to execute strategies, deliver results and develop, lead, motivate, and inspire subordinates to perform exceptionally, agrees to be rated based on the attainment of targets and commitments contained in the division's Work and Financial Plan;

2. **The Rater is expected to support the Ratee in the performance of his/her functions since the Ratee's performance ultimately reflects on the Rater's managerial competence;**
3. **The Work and Financial Plan per Division for the aforementioned period shall be the basis for the expected outputs of the Ratees and is hereto attached as PC-2;**
4. **The Expected Outputs and Performance Standards for the aforementioned period are agreed upon by both parties as specified and is hereto attached as PC-1a;**
5. **The Performance Standard Continuum developed, which is hereto attached as PC-3, shall be used as the performance measure/indicator in evaluating the accomplishments of the Ratee;**
6. **That in case of additional assignments or modifications in the Expected Outputs and Performance Standards, said modification must be effected in writing through the accomplishment of the Supplemental Contract, which is hereto attached as PC-6;**
7. **The Ratee's outputs shall be monitored and documented by the Rater through the accomplishment of the Output Tracking Slip, which is hereto attached as PC-4; and**
8. **The performance of the Ratee shall be reviewed accordingly by the Rater through the accomplishment of the Performance Review Report, which is hereto attached as PC-5.**

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties herein signed this Performance Contract this _____ day of _____ 2003 in Quezon City, Philippines.

Ratee:

Rater:

Division Chief

Head of Office

KARINA CONSTANTINO-DAVID
Chairperson

PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

PC-1a

Weight Allocation (100%)	EXPECTED OUTPUTS and PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
20 %	I. MANAGERIAL
	Management of Work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Establish course of action for self and others to accomplish specific goals; plan and execute proper work distribution</u> • <u>Set appropriate work standards and establish systems/procedures to monitor delegated assignments/ projects</u> • <u>Troubleshoot; make prompt and sound decisions</u>
	Management of People <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote employee development • Observe fairness and impartiality, and maintain discipline • Lead, guide and motivate individual/group towards task completion
	Management of Funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate funds appropriately; utilize funds efficiently

80 %	II. TECHNICAL						
A. Routine							
	OUTPUT # 1 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 15%;">Quantity</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Quality</i></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Timeliness</i></td><td></td></tr> </table>	Quantity		<i>Quality</i>		<i>Timeliness</i>	
Quantity							
<i>Quality</i>							
<i>Timeliness</i>							
	OUTPUT # 2 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 15%;">Quantity</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Quality</i></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Timeliness</i></td><td></td></tr> </table>	Quantity		<i>Quality</i>		<i>Timeliness</i>	
Quantity							
<i>Quality</i>							
<i>Timeliness</i>							
B. Project							
	OUTPUT # 1 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 15%;">Quantity</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Quality</i></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Timeliness</i></td><td></td></tr> </table>	Quantity		<i>Quality</i>		<i>Timeliness</i>	
Quantity							
<i>Quality</i>							
<i>Timeliness</i>							
	OUTPUT # 2 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 15%;">Quantity</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Quality</i></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Timeliness</i></td><td></td></tr> </table>	Quantity		<i>Quality</i>		<i>Timeliness</i>	
Quantity							
<i>Quality</i>							
<i>Timeliness</i>							
	OUTPUT # 3 <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 15%;">Quantity</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Quality</i></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td><i>Timeliness</i></td><td></td></tr> </table>	Quantity		<i>Quality</i>		<i>Timeliness</i>	
Quantity							
<i>Quality</i>							
<i>Timeliness</i>							

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS CONTINUUM

PC-3

RATING SCALE FOR QUANTITY			Performance Standards Continuum for QUANTITY
Exceeded Expectations	10	190 % of targets accomplished	
	9	170 % of targets accomplished	
	8	150 % of targets accomplished	
	7	130 % of targets accomplished	
	6	110 % of targets accomplished	
On Target	5.5	100 % of targets accomplished	
Did Not Meet Expectations	5	90 % of targets accomplished	
	4	70 % of targets accomplished	
	3	50 % of targets accomplished	
	2	30 % of targets accomplished	
	1	10 % of targets accomplished	

RATING SCALE FOR QUALITY			Performance Standards Continuum for QUALITY
Exceeds Expectations	10	EXCEPTIONAL (9.01 – 10.00)	
	9	COMMENDABLE (7.01 – 9.00)	
	8	VERY EFFICIENT (5.51 – 7.00)	
	7	GOOD SOLID PERFORMANCE	
	6	FAIR (4.00 – 5.49)	
Meets Expectations	5.5	GOOD SOLID PERFORMANCE	
Falls Below Expectations	5	INEFFICIENT (2.00 – 3.99)	
	4	UNACCEPTABLE (0.00 – 1.99)	
	3		
	2		
	1		
REMARKS :			

RATING SCALE FOR TIMELINESS			Performance Standards Continuum for TIMELINESS
Exceeded Expectations	10	... 10 % of the time	
	9	... 30 % of the time	
	8	... 50 % of the time	
	7	... 70 % of the time	
	6	... 90 % of the time	
On Target	5.5	Targets accomplished in ... 100 % of the time	
Did Not Meet Expectations	5	... 110 % of the time	
	4	... 130 % of the time	
	3	... 150 % of the time	
	2	... 170 % of the time	
	1	... 190 % of the time	



- Name of Office -

OUTPUT TRACKING SLIP

TASK:	
Output(s):	
Assigned by:	Date Assigned to AO:
Assigned to:	Date Received by AO:

EVALUATION	
1st Draft	Date Submitted by AO
	Date Returned to AO
<i>Remarks/Instructions</i>	
2nd Draft	Date Submitted by AO
	Date Returned to AO
<i>Remarks/Instructions</i>	
3rd Draft	Date Submitted by AO
	Date Returned to AO
<i>Remarks/Instructions</i>	

Final Assessment of the Rater	Rating
<i>Quantity</i>	
<i>Quality</i>	
<i>Timeliness</i>	
Final Rating	
Signature of the Rater	

Assessment of the Commission	Rating
<i>Quantity</i>	
<i>Quality</i>	
<i>Timeliness</i>	
Final Rating	

KARINA CONSTANTINO-DAVID
Chairperson

PERFORMANCE REVIEW REPORT Rating Period: _____
PC-5

Employee Name	Position	Head of Office	Position
---------------	----------	----------------	----------

I. MANAGERIAL (20%)			
INDICATORS OF MANAGERIAL COMPETENCE	R A T I N G		
	Head of Office (60%)	Division Chief (20%)	Subordinates (20%)
	Weight	Weight	Weight
1. Management of Work			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish course of action for self and others to accomplish specific goals; plan and execute proper work distribution 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set appropriate work standards and establish systems/procedures to monitor delegated assignments/projects 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Troubleshoot; make prompt and sound decisions 			
2. Management of People			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote employee development 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observe fairness and impartiality, and maintain discipline 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead, guide and motivate individual or group towards task completion 			
3. Management of Fund			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate funds appropriately; utilize funds efficiently 			
TOTAL POINT SCORE (TPS)			
EQUIVALENT POINT SCORE (EPS)			
TOTAL EQUIVALENT POINT SCORE (TEPS)			

II. TECHNICAL (80%)			
Weight Allocation	ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Based on the Output Tracking Slip (PC-4))	R A T I N G	
		Score	Weight
	1. Routine		
	•		
	•		
	•		
	2. Projects		
	•		
	•		
	•		
TOTAL EQUIVALENT POINT SCORE (TEPS)			

III. FINAL RATING (100%)	
TEPS for Managerial Part	
TEPS for Technical Part	
Overall Weighted Score	

Division Chief	
Signature and Date	
Head of Office	
Signature and Date	

Comments/Recommendations (may include appropriate recognition/rewards, developmental needs, promotional potential, strengths and weaknesses, etc.)

	Superior
	Self
	Subordinate

--

--

MANAGERIAL OUTPUT RATING FORM

PC-5a

Name of Ratee	Position	Rating Period

INDICATORS OF MANAGERIAL COMPETENCE	RATING
1. Management of Work	
▪ Establish course of action for self and others to accomplish specific goals; plan and execute proper work distribution	
▪ Set appropriate work standards and establish systems/procedures to monitor delegated assignments/ projects	
▪ Troubleshoot; make prompt and sound decisions	
2. Management of People	
▪ Promote employee development	
▪ Observe fairness and impartiality, and maintain discipline	
▪ Lead, guide and motivate individual/group towards task completion	
3. Management of Fund	
▪ Allocate funds appropriately; utilize funds efficiently	
TOTAL POINT SCORE	
AVERAGE	

Rating Scale

	SCALE	BEHAVIORAL FREQUENCY
Exceeds Expectations	10 8	Always (8.20-10.00) Consistently (6.40-8.19)
Meet Expectations	6	Usually (4.60-6.39)
Falls Below Expectation	4 2	Occasionally (2.80-4.59) Rarely (1.00-2.79)

Name and Position of Rater
Date _____

SUPPLEMENTAL PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

WHEREAS, the undersigned agree to add the following output(s) contained in Table 1 to the performance contract of _____[Division Chief]_____ for the rating period _____;

Table 1. ADDITIONAL OUTPUT(S)

ADDITIONAL OUTPUT(S) AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS		Estimated Person Hours for Completion
Output:		
<u>Quantit</u>		
<u>Y</u>		
<i>Quality</i>		
<i>Timeliness</i>		

WHEREAS, the said additional task necessitates change in weight allocation and/or quantity and timeliness standards for the expected outputs agreed upon in original contract;

WHEREFORE, the outputs and standards agreed upon in the said contract shall be adjusted as follows:

Table 3. ADJUSTED PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

Weight Allocation	EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
	Output #1
	Output #2
	Output #3
	Quantity
	<i>Timeliness</i>
	Output #4

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties herein sign this Supplemental Performance Contract this _____ day of _____, 2003, Quezon City, Philippines.

Division Chief	Head of Office	Chairperson
----------------	----------------	-------------

SUPPLEMENTAL PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

WHEREAS, the undersigned agree to add the following output(s) contained in Table 1 to the performance contract of _____ [Division Chief] _____ for the rating period _____;

Table 1. ADDITIONAL OUTPUT(S)

ADDITIONAL OUTPUT(S) AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS		Estimated Person Hours for Completion
Output:		
Quantity		
<i>Quality</i>		
<i>Timeliness</i>		

WHEREAS, the said additional task is being accommodated in lieu of the output(s) found in Table 2;

Table 2. REPLACED OUTPUT(S)

Weight Allocation	EXPECTED OUTPUT(S) AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
	Output:
	<i>Quantity</i>
	<i>Timeliness</i>
Action on the replaced output(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> deferred/postponed indefinitely <input type="checkbox"/> to be incorporated in the next rating cycle <input type="checkbox"/> withdrawn/dropped <input type="checkbox"/> transferred to Division _____

WHEREFORE, the expected output and performance standard agreed upon in the original contract shall be adjusted as follows:

Table 3. ADJUSTED PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

Weight Allocation	EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
	Output #1
	Output #2
	Output #3
	Quantity
	<i>Timeliness</i>
	Output #4

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties herein sign this Supplemental Performance Contract this _____ day of _____, 2003, Quezon City, Philippines.

Division Chief	Head of Office	Chairperson
----------------	----------------	-------------