



Performance Evaluation Policy Guidelines

Document Reference: EOMS-HRMO-PE-POL-001

Revision Number: 000

Confidentiality Level: Internal

Approval Date: January 27, 2025

Review Cycle: 3 years

Effectivity Date: January 27, 2025

I. Objective

The policy guidelines are established to be able to determine the work/teaching performance of employees for purpose of rehiring, regularization, promotion, rewards and recognition, self-development and possible corrective measures.

II. Owner

The Human Resource Management Office (HRMO)

III. Scope

These guidelines cover all faculty members, teachers, staff, administrators/administrative services personnel, and employees with special assignment of De La Salle University-Dasmariñas.

IV. Definition of Terms

1. **Performance Management** – a process used to communicate organizational strategic goals, reinforce individual employee accountability for meeting those goals, and track and evaluate individual and organizational performance results.
2. **Performance Evaluation** – is a measure used by the University to determine the teaching/service competence and effectiveness of the employees.
3. **Feedback** – refers to constructive, timely, and respectful information given to employee – whether faculty, staff, or administrators – regarding their work performance. It aims to affirm strengths, address areas for improvement, and promote continuous professional growth.

V. General Policy

1. All regular employees must be appraised as scheduled:
 - 1.1 Faculty Members and Teachers
 - 1.1.1 Regular – Once a year
 - 1.1.2 Part-time/Probationary – Twice a year or every semester
 - 1.2 Staff
 - 1.2.1 Regular – Once a year
 - 1.2.2 Probationary – Twice in the duration of the probationary period
 - 1.2.3 Contractual – None
 - 1.2.4 For Transfer/Promotion – Once during the trial period
 - 1.3 Administrators and Employees with Special Assignment – Once a year
2. The existing evaluation tools to be used shall be based on employment classification.
 - 2.1 For Faculty Members and Teachers – evaluation tools may vary depending on faculty assignment/workload.

Prepared by: (SGD) RENLYN N. CARRANZA, RPm Assoc. Director, Performance Evaluation	Reviewed by: (SGD) DR. EPITACIO B. MENDIOLA JR. Director, HRMO	Approved by: (SGD) DR. SONIA M. GEMENTIZA Chief Administrative Officer
--	--	--



Performance Evaluation Policy Guidelines		
Document Reference: EOMS-HRMO-PE-POL-001	Revision Number: 000	
Confidentiality Level: Internal	Approval Date: January 27, 2025	
Review Cycle: 3 years	Effectivity Date: January 27, 2025	

2.1.1 For College Faculty

2.1.1.1 Academic Service Faculty (Academic Support Personnel) - evaluation tools are distinct for every position based on their specific job functions.

2.1.1.2 Academic Teaching Faculty

- 2.1.2.1 Blended Classes
- 2.1.2.2 Physical Education Classes
- 2.1.2.3 CLAC Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.4 CEAT-Engineering Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.5 CEAT-Architecture Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.6 CEAT-GMD Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.7 COS-Science Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.8 CCJE Laboratory Classroom
- 2.1.2.9 CICS-ITD Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.10 CICS-CSD Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.11 CTHM Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.12 NSTP 101 Classes
- 2.1.2.13 NSTP 102 Classes
- 2.1.2.14 College of Law
- 2.1.2.16 College of Professional Education and Graduate Studies
- 2.1.2.17 School of Governance, Public Service and Corporate Leadership
- 2.1.2.18 Faculty Peer Evaluation (for ATF)

2.1.2 Basic Education Teachers

- 2.1.2.1 Lecture Classes
- 2.1.2.2 Computer Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.3 Kitchen Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.4 Science Laboratory Classes
- 2.1.2.5 Physical Education Classes
- 2.1.2.6 Research Classes
- 2.1.2.7 Elective Classes
- 2.1.2.8 Teachers' Peer Evaluation

2.2 For Administrators/Senior Administrative Services Personnel – evaluation tools are distinct for every position based on their specific job functions.

2.3 For employees with Special Assignments/Junior and Middle AdSP – generic evaluation tool which consists of general items

2.4 For Staff – generic evaluation tool which consists of general items

3. The DLSU-D evaluation follows a 360-degree (multi-rater) system:

- 3.1 Head
- 3.2 Peer

Prepared by: (SGD) RENLYN N. CARRANZA, Rpm Assoc. Director, Performance Evaluation	Reviewed by: (SGD) DR. EPITACIO B. MENDIOLA JR. Director, HRMO	Approved by: (SGD) DR. SONIA M. GEMENTIZA Chief Administrative Officer
---	---	---

	Performance Evaluation Policy Guidelines	
	Document Reference: EOMS-HRMO-PE-POL-001	Revision Number: 000
	Confidentiality Level: Internal	Approval Date: January 27, 2025
	Review Cycle: 3 years	Effectivity Date: January 27, 2025

- 3.3 Student
- 3.4 Subordinate
- 3.5 Identified servicing units are also evaluated by clients (internal and external)
- 4. Evaluation Results
 - 4.1 ATF/ASF/Administrators/Administrative Services Personnel/ Employees with Special Assignments/Staff – HRMO-Performance Evaluation process the performance evaluation results. The results are being forwarded to HRMO- Rewards Management, HRMO-Talent Acquisition and Immediate Head of all employees.
 - 4.2 Personal copies are given to concerned employees
 - 4.3 For servicing units – results are being handled and processed by immediate heads of the concerned units.
 - 4.4 Scheduled administration and processing of evaluation is being disseminated accordingly.
 - 4.5. Finality of Submitted Evaluation Results – All submitted evaluation results shall be considered final. Once an individual has completed their evaluation, no revisions, re-evaluations shall be accommodated, particularly after the results have been processed and disseminated. Raters are therefore advised to carefully review their inputs before submission, ensuring that ratings and feedback provided are accurate, objective, and reflective of actual performance. This upholds the integrity, fairness, and timeliness of the performance evaluation process.

VI. Review and Revision of Evaluation Tools and Guidelines

To ensure, relevance, accuracy, and alignment with institutional goals, evaluation tools and guidelines are subject to regular review and revision.

- 6.1 Regular Review Cycle – Evaluation tools and guidelines shall be formally reviewed at least once every three (3) years by the HRMO-Performance Evaluation in coordination with relevant stakeholders.
- 6.2. Need for Revision – the revision of tools and guidelines may be initiated under the following conditions:
 - 6.2.1 When significant changes occur in job descriptions, functions, and workloads
 - 6.2.2 Based on feedback from raters, ratees or immediate heads after the evaluation cycles.
 - 6.2.3 When inconsistencies and redundancies in the tools are identified.
 - 6.2.4 Upon recommendation from academic units, or administrative departments

Prepared by: (SGD) RENLYN N. CARRANZA, Rpm Assoc. Director, Performance Evaluation	Reviewed by: (SGD) DR. EPITACIO B. MENDIOLA JR. Director, HRMO	Approved by: (SGD) DR. SONIA M. GEMENTIZA Chief Administrative Officer
---	---	---



Performance Evaluation Policy Guidelines

Document Reference: EOMS-HRMO-PE-POL-001

Revision Number: 000

Confidentiality Level: Internal

Approval Date: January 27, 2025

Review Cycle: 3 years

Effectivity Date: January 27, 2025

6.3 Review and Revision of Tools – the evaluation tools shall be assessed for content validity, clarity and usability and inclusivity and Equity.

6.4 Committees on the Review and Revision of Tools and Guidelines – the review of the evaluation tools and guidelines is carried out by the following committees:

6.4.1 **For College and GS:**

- Vice Provost for Academics
- Representative from the College Deans
- Representative from the Department Chairs
- Representative from College of Professional and Graduate Studies
- Representative from Office of the Chief Lasallian Mission Officer
- Representative from the Faculty Organization
- Representative from the University Student Government
- Director of the Center for Innovative and Learning Program

6.4.2 **For Basic Education Division:**

- Principal
- Associate Principal for Academics and Research
- Associate Director for HR BED Services
- Academic Coordinators (SHS – HAT, SIT and Core Education Clusters) Academic Coordinator (JHS)

6.4.3 **For Administrators and Special Assignments:**

- Representative from the Office of the President
- Representative from the Office of Provost
- Representative from the Office of Chief Administrative Office
- Representative from the Office of the Chief Lasallian Mission Officer
- Representative from the Basic Education
- Representative from the Administrative Service Personnel
- Representative from the employees with Special Assignment

6.4.4 **For Academic Support Personnel:**

- **Core Group:**
- Representative from the Aklatang Emilio Aguinaldo-Information Resource Center
- Representative from the Information and Communications Technology Center
- Representative from the Student Wellness Center
- Representative from the University Lasallian Family Office
- Representative from the Lasallian Community Development Center
- Representative from offices with below 5 (ASFs) Academic Support Personnel
- Representative from the Faculty Organization

Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
(SGD) RENLYN N. CARRANZA, Rpm Assoc. Director, Performance Evaluation	(SGD) DR. EPITACIO B. MENDIOLA JR. Director, HRMO	(SGD) DR. SONIA M. GEMENTIZA Chief Administrative Officer

	Performance Evaluation Policy Guidelines	
	Document Reference: EOMS-HRMO-PE-POL-001	Revision Number: 000
	Confidentiality Level: Internal	Approval Date: January 27, 2025
	Review Cycle: 3 years	Effectivity Date: January 27, 2025

Note: The core group will review and revise the Part 1 of our evaluation tool for ASP. For the second part of the evaluation tool (specific job functions), this will be completed by the HRMO Director, HRMO Performance Evaluation personnel, immediate head of each department with ASPs, along with the ASPs who hold these positions.

6.4.5 For Staff:

- Representative from the Immediate Heads
 - Office of the Provost
 - Office of the Chief Administrative Officer
 - Office of the Office of the Chief Lasallian Mission Officer
- Representative from the Staff
 - From the Office of Provost
 - From the Office of Chief Administrative Officer
 - From the Office of Chief Lasallian Mission Officer
- Representative from the Kabalikat ng DLSU-D
- Representative from the Human Resource Management Office (Rewards Management)

Note: The committee should also include a **Language Specialist**, to ensure that the tools are clear and easy to understand; a **Statistician**, to verify that the metrics are reliable and accurate; and an **I/O Psychologist**, to ensure a fair and equitable performance evaluation based on psychological principles.

Each committee is responsible for creating and developing, reviewing, and revising the performance evaluation tools and guidelines used to measure the performance of employees at DLSU-D. These committees were tasked with ensuring that the performance evaluation is fair, accurate, and aligned with the requirement of each of the position.

6.5 Revision Process – the revision process followed a structured approach that includes consultation with stakeholders, data gathering and drafting of proposed changes. Final revisions are refined based on feedback and then endorsed for approval.

6.6 Approval of the Revised Tools and Guidelines – revised tools and guidelines must undergo formal approval before implementation:

- 6.6.1 Endorsed by members of the committees on the revision of evaluation tools and guidelines
- 6.6.2 Reviewed and Recommended by the Director of HRMO
- 6.6.3 Approved by the Provost/Chief Administrative Officer

Upon approval, the revised tools and guidelines shall be communicated to the relevant units and implemented in the next applicable evaluation cycle.

VII. Evaluation Feedback

Prepared by: (SGD) RENLYN N. CARRANZA, Rpm Assoc. Director, Performance Evaluation	Reviewed by: (SGD) DR. EPITACIO B. MENDIOLA JR. Director, HRMO	Approved by: (SGD) DR. SONIA M. GEMENTIZA Chief Administrative Officer
--	--	--

	Performance Evaluation Policy Guidelines	
	Document Reference: EOMS-HRMO-PE-POL-001	Revision Number: 000
	Confidentiality Level: Internal	Approval Date: January 27, 2025
	Review Cycle: 3 years	Effectivity Date: January 27, 2025

As part of the performance evaluation process, the HRMO-Performance Evaluation shall provide evaluation results to all employees and their respective immediate head/s to promote transparency, accountability and professional growth.

- For the employees – encourages self-awareness and continuous improvement.
- For the immediate heads – provides basis for coaching, mentoring, and performance planning. Immediate heads are responsible and required to provide feedback on the evaluation results through a one-on-one session with their respective personnel. This process supports employee growth and ensures alignment with DLSU-D's performance standards and Lasallian values.
- For the institution – supports a culture of excellence, aligns individual performance with organizational goals, and enhances overall service quality and employee engagement.

VIII. Utilization of Evaluation Results

1. Reports are being generated for reporting and performance managements' action such as training and development programs, hiring and re-hiring, regularization, promotions, rewards and recognition, self-development and possible corrective measures.
 - 1.1 Rewards and Recognition
 - 1.1.1 For Regular Faculty (Faculty Manual)
 - One-time cash incentive for three (3) consecutive year of outstanding rating across raters
 - 1.1.2 For Regular Staff (Implementing Guidelines for the Salary Scale and Merit Increase)
 - Regular merit for at least Very Satisfactory rating for two (2) consecutive years and with no rating lower than Satisfactory from any raters prior to promotion.
 - Merit increase for three (3) consecutive year of outstanding rating (newly regularized staff should have two (2) consecutive years of performance evaluation to qualify for a merit increase)
 - 1.1.3 Categories/Qualifications for Outstanding Employee of the Year
 - For Staff (Staff Manual) – memento, plaque of recognition, Lasallian medal and monetary incentive
 - For AdSP – plaque of recognition and monetary incentive
 - 1.1.4 Good attendance for Staff (Staff Manual)
 - Monetary incentive, certificates and plaque of recognition (Consistent good attendance for seven (7) years)
 - 1.1.5 Candidates for Outstanding for Staff and AdSP (Staff Manual)
 - Certificate of recognition
2. Training and Development – The Associate Director for Learning and Development uses consolidated performance evaluation data to design training programs, addresses skill gaps, and support continuous professional development.

Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
(SGD) RENLYN N. CARRANZA, Rpm Assoc. Director, Performance Evaluation	(SGD) DR. EPITACIO B. MENDIOLA JR. Director, HRMO	(SGD) DR. SONIA M. GEMENTIZA Chief Administrative Officer



Performance Evaluation Policy Guidelines

Document Reference: EOMS-HRMO-PE-POL-001

Revision Number: 000

Confidentiality Level: Internal

Approval Date: January 27, 2025

Review Cycle: 3 years

Effectivity Date: January 27, 2025

- 2.1 Individual results – used for coaching, mentoring, and personalized development planning.
- 2.2 Summary results – used to identify organizational training needs.
- 2.3 Outstanding performance may be selected for advanced development programs or leadership pipelines.
- 2.4 Those needing improvements may be referred for targeted interventions.

IX. Confidentiality and Access to Results

Performance evaluation results are confidential and shall be accessed only by the employee concerned, the immediate heads, and designated HRMO personnel.

However, relevant portions of evaluation results may be shared with authorized personnel or committees under the following conditions:

- For grievance handling - upon request by the grievance committee or university authorities.
- For awards and recognition programs, to determine eligibility and qualification – access limited to the designated selection or review committee.
- For institutional accreditation or quality assurance purposes, where summary or representative performance data is required by accreditors – data shall be shared in summarized or anonymized form when possible to protect individual confidentiality.

In all cases, access must be limited to those with a legitimate need and must observed with strict confidentiality.

Revision History		
Revision No.	Filing Date	Summary of Change/s
00		First issue of the document.
01		

Prepared by: (SGD) RENLYN N. CARRANZA, Rpm Assoc. Director, Performance Evaluation	Reviewed by: (SGD) DR. EPITACIO B. MENDIOLA JR. Director, HRMO	Approved by: (SGD) DR. SONIA M. GEMENTIZA Chief Administrative Officer
--	--	--