

Section

I

ANNUAL CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS/ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REPORTS (Copies of CSIR OMs/Letters)

1

Copy of DO letter No.17(66)/94-PPS dated 9th November, 1994 from Dr. S.K.Joshi, DG., CSIR to Directors/heads of all the national Labs./Instts (by name)

***Sub; Guidelines for writing the APARs**

I have been receiving a number of representations from the Scientists from different Laboratories/Institutes regarding the APAR gradings, alleging bias and subjectivity in reporting the awarding of the grades. In some cases the persons concerned have also gone to the Courts. As such the matter regarding evolving a system to avoid such representations and unnecessary frustration amongst the employees has been under consideration for some time. After careful consideration it has now been decided that the following guidelines may be followed with immediate effect for writing the APARs :

1. The normalisation of the APAR gradings should be done at the Lab./Instts. level by a Committee consisting of Senior Scientists under the Chairmanship of the Director and the normalised grade finally awarded by the Committee should only be communicated to the employee concerned;
2. Tasks should be assigned to all the S&T personnel in advance in the beginning of the reporting year for the sake of objective evaluation/assessment of the performance of the concerned employee against these assigned tasks at the time of writing/reviewing the reports ;
3. The approved guidelines laid down in MANAS should be scrupulously followed without any change or deviation at the Lab./Instt. level ;
4. The reports should be written by the immediate supervisor of the employee concerned and the reporting and reviewing both should not be done by the same person, save in exceptional circumstances;
5. The S&T work in the Lab/Instt. should be structured in such a way that the Reporting/Reviewing authorities at least upto the level of Scientist E-I or equivalent are below the level of the Head of th Lab. or designated authority so that disputes if any, arising in future are settled at the level of the Head of the Lab./Instt. Wherever the Head of the Lab./Instt. is required to act as the Reporting/Reviewing authority in the case of the Scientist E-II and above, disputes if any arising should be referred to DGSIR with detailed comments of the Head of the Lab./Instt. on the different points raised by the aggrieved employee;

Copy of CSIR letter No. 3(80)/85-O&M dated 9.10.2000(Serial Circular No.41) addressed to l Director, RRL Thiruvanthapuram.with copy to all Heads of Labs./Divisions

Sub: Procedure to be followed in respect of incomplete APARs

Please refer to your letter No. 105-Admn(153)RM/99-E.II dated 19.6.2000 regarding the procedure to be adopted to update the APAR dossier in respect of S/T staff whose APAR forms were left incomplete/not returned to Lab./Instt. administration by respective Reporting /Reviewing Officer within the prescribed time limit on their demitting the office due to retirement/resignation etc.

2. The following procedure may be adopted :-

- (a) In the absence of Reviewing Officer not completing his portion in the APAR form, the report written by Reporting Officer may be placed before the APAR Normalisation Committee and the grading as awarded by 'APAR Normalisation Committee' be communicated to the employee concerned as in any other case when report has been reviewed by the Reviewing Officer.
- (b) In the absence of both reporting and reviewing in the APAR for any particular year, an 'averaged grading' on the basis of all the APARs available for past years in the same group and grade held by the individual may be taken for calculating the APAR marks for that particular year for which APAR was not filled in; and
- (c) The APAR for any particular period cannot be filled in at a later stage by any officer who had not been authorised to act as Reporting or Reviewing Officer during that relevant period in respect of the concerned scientist. Such cases may be regulated as per item 2 (a) or (b) above as the case may be.

The best course, will always be to ensure that all the reports which are due are filled in by both the Reporting and Reviewing Officers. In this connection your attention is also invited to DO letter No. 17/66/8/94-PPS dated 25.8.2000 from the DG, CSIR underlining, inter alia, the need for timely completion of APARs/ACRs.

completed, should be sent to CSIR HQs. by the 30th June of every year positively.
Kindly acknowledge receipt and also keep me informed of the action taken in your Laboratory in the matter. These instructions may also kindly be brought to the notice of your Controller of Administration/Administrative Officer for strict compliance.

* Subject provided by editors.

2

Copy of CSIR letter No. 17/66/94-PPS dated 23.5.1995

Sub: Annual Performance Appraisal Report (APAR) constitution of the Normalisation Committee.

I am directed to invite your kind attention to DO letter of even number dated 9th November 1994 from the DG, CSIR on the above subject and to state that in partial modification of the guidelines for constitution of the Committee for normalisation of the APAR gradings the competent authority has been pleased to decide that the normalisation committee should be constituted under the Chairmanship of the seniormost Scientist of the Lab./Instt. so that the dispute if any relating to the gradings awarded by the Committee could be considered by the Director at the Lab./Instt. level in his capacity as the appellate/decision making authority.

Further with the introduction of the normalisation of the gradings by the Committee as above the critical appraisal and the grade awarded by the Committee will now be communicated to the scientists. In view of the revised procedure, the proforma for recording the appraisal by the Reviewing Officer has also accordingly been modified. A copy of the revised proforma is enclosed herewith for your information and necessary action.

The above revised procedure to be implemented starting with the APAR for the reporting year 1994-95 will be applicable to the employees in Group IV and Group III(3) to III(6).

It is requested that the above revised guidelines may kindly be brought to the notice of all concerned in your Labs./Instt. for their information, guidance and compliance.

Annexure

NORMALISATION OF APAR FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31ST MARCH _____

Name of the Officer reported upon: _____ Division _____ Group _____

APPRAISAL BY THE REVIEWING OFFICER

(a) Critical appreciation by the Reviewing Officer:

Note:

1. The critical appreciation and grad awarded by the Normalisation Committee shall be communicated to the employee. If the employee has any representation to make against the grading communicated to him, he/she may respond in writing within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of communication by him/her. The representation thus made will be considered by the competent authority and the employee will be informed of the final decision, wherever necessary. The employee may seek an interview with the competent authority. However, no further representation will lie against the final decision of the competent authority.
2. If the employee has served under more than one Reporting Officer during the period, appraisal by each Reporting Officer should be given.

3

Copy of CSIR letter No. 17/66/8/94-PPS dated 10.7.1995

Sub: Normalisation of APAR Grades.

I am directed to invite your kind attention to this office letter of even number dated 23.5.95 on the above subject, and to state that references have been received in this office from some of the Labs./Instt. seeking clarification about the normalisation of the gradings in respect of the APAR reviewed by the Heads of the Labs./Instts.

The matter has been considered and it is accordingly clarified that the Heads of the Labs./Instts. themselves being the decision making authority in respect of any disputes arising out of the gradings awarded by the Normalization Committee, the APARs reviewed by them will not be subject to any further normalisation/review by the Committee. In such cases the gradings awarded by the Heads of the Labs./Instts. will only be communicated to the employees concerned.

In the above context it may also be pertinent to reiterate that as also already communicated vide this office circular letter No. 17(66)/99-PPS dated 9.11.94, the S&T work in the Lab./Instt. should be structured in such a way that the Reporting /Reviewing authorities at least upto the level of Scientist EI or equivalent are below the level of the Head of the Lab. or designated authority so that disputes if any, arising in future are settled at the level of the Head of the Lab./Instt.

The above clarification may kindly be brought to the notice of all concerned for their information, guidance and necessary action.

4

Copy of CSIR letter No. 17/66/9/94-PPS dated 21.8.1995

Sub: Annual Performance Appraisal Report (APAR)

Copy of CSIR letter No. 17/65/(P-42)/90-PPS dated 12.9.1995

Sub: Annual Performance Appraisal Report (APAR) Proforma.

I am directed to invite a reference to this office letters of even number dated 8.1.1991 and 19.4.1991 enclosing therewith the APAR proformae for Group I & II and Group III, IV V(A) and V(B) and to state that references are being received in this office from some of the Labs./Instts. seeking clarification regarding applicability of Part IV in the APAR Proforma for Groups III, IV and V(A).

The matter has been considered and it is accordingly clarified that Part IV pertaining to the final marks in APAR to be computed by apportioning the marks in part II and III is applicable to all categories of S&T staff and as such may kindly be made a part of the APAR Proformae prescribed for the employees in all the S&T Group I to IV and V(A).

The above clarification may kindly be brought to the notice of all concerned in your Lab/Instt. for information, guidance and necessary action.

Enclosure

COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC & INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Part IV : Final Marks in
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REPORT

Laboratory/Institute _____

Period from _____ to _____.

1. Name of the Employee (in block letters)
2. Final marks (to be computed by apportioning relating marks of Part II and III).
Marks in Part II (out of 75)
Marks in Part III (out of 25)
Total Marks (Out of 100).

Signature of Reviewing Authority
Or Designated Authority with date.

Copy of CSIR letter No.3/1/71-O&M-II dated 23.5.2000

**Sub:-Writing of the ACRs in respect of Common Cadre Officers-Amendment in Bye-law 17-
Procedure reg.**

I am to invite a reference to CSIR O.M.No.6/1/99-Cte dated 4th June, 1999 and circular No.17/66/94-PPS dated 5th July, 1999 regarding amendment made in Bye-law 17 and clarification thereof.

the Reviewing Officer.

A doubt has been raised whether in the absence of Sr. COA/COA/Sr. F&AO/SO(F&A) or Dy. SPO as per their availability in the concerned Lab./Instt. would advise the Director directly or not and also whether due to the incumbent senior officer proceeding on leave/transfer and the post remaining vacant for a long time, whether the Director of the Lab./Instt. is to function as Reporting Officer in respect of the junior officers directly reporting to him.

The matter has been examined and it is now clarified that the Confidential Reports of the Officers functioning as Incharge of different areas viz. Gen. Administration, Finance or Stores & Purchase in a Lab./Instts. irrespective of the level of the officer will be written by the Directors of the concerned Lab./Instt. if they are reporting to him directly and such ACRs will then be reviewed by DG, CSIR.

It is further clarified that it is mandatory to conform to the policy of line of reporting, to satisfy the provisions of the amended bye-law 17, on account of the fact that the decision is of the GB. It is, therefore, essential that the senior most officer in position in the Lab./Instt. in the respective cadre will function as incharge of that area and accordingly will be the advising officer of that area. It is not open to practise any alteration in the schedule of Reporting Officer/Reviewing Officer as stated in para 2 to 4 above.

It is requested that these requirements may kindly be ensured for strict compliance.