Performance Appraisal System in Academics at Professional Institutions

Divya Srivastava (Assistant Professor)
(DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, KRISHNA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR)

ABSTRACT
Although there is substantial literature on the use of performance appraisal in the for profit world, there is little literature available concerning the appraisal of faculties and staff positions in professional institutions. Performance Appraisal is a concept, started in the early 20th Century.

Employee performance has traditionally been accorded prime focus by human resource managers. As a result, a number of performance appraisal techniques have over time been devised to help establish employee's performance. It is the process of obtaining, analyzing and recording information about an employee to evaluate and improve their performance. This appraisal system has started from 90-degree to 720-degree till date. Performance appraisal is an important element of life and is widely used in many organizations. Performance appraisal is often used for performance assessment, evaluation, and review of an individual or a department. The success of an institution depends on how the performance of every faculty and staff is and how effectively the staff is appraised and managed. More knowledge is needed in this area since there is considerable research indicating that performance appraisal creates benefits to an organization and its employees. This study provides a comprehensive review of the development and use of performance appraisal in India and a detailed look at the purposes, benefits, and challenges of performance appraisal in academics at professional institutions.

I.   INTRODUCTION
A performance appraisal is a systematic and periodic process of measuring an individual's work performance against the established requirements of the job. It's a subjective evaluation of the employee's strengths and weaknesses, relative worth to the organization, and future development potential. a successful performance appraisal, you can get a handle on what the employee does best and identify areas that require improvement. Appraisals also come in handy for deciding how to fill new positions in the company structure with existing employees.

While focusing on performance appraisal as a motivational tool, studies in this field strongly suggest that performance appraisal systems can be used to enhance motivation (Chen & Eldridge, 2010; Appelbaum et al., 2011). However, the link between performance appraisal and employee motivation has often been studied in a traditional or general manner and hence the relationship tends to be blurred in nature. The traditional use of performance appraisal has for instance been criticised for the reward of —win-lose‖ results as opposed to —win-win‖ results in which the system promotes supportive and cooperative behaviour (Rowland & Hall, 2012).

THE EVOLUTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
➢ The evolution of 720 degree performances started from 90-degree appraisal involves manager evaluating the employee which offers little opportunity for appraisal discussion. 180-degree appraisal includes self-appraisal followed by superior and subordinate assessment. Later in 270-degree, peer group is added and the average bias factor is calculated and multiplied to the ratings allotted. 360 degree known as "multi rater" designed to include additional input from customers, suppliers or vendors and other interested stakeholders. 720 involves ongoing feed forward on the employee's performance. Nevertheless, 720-degree is costly and time consuming however it is suitable for new economy businesses that gives constant feedback to ensure employees reach their goals before the next appraisal .The goal of 720- degree is to create transparency and reduce biasness, prejudice and discrimination in the work place environment. Besides, 720 is also intended to support with rationalization process of employees behaviour in not committing unethical or fraudulent act. This system is

premeditated to identify and prevent the "like-dislike" rating, unrealistic goals and clash of interest.

OBJECTIVE OF THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Performance appraisal has become a term used for a variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, improve performance, and allocate rewards (Fletcher, 2001). Grote (2002) identified the following purposes of performance appraisal:

➢ Providing feedback to employees about their performance.
➢ Facilitating decisions concerning pay increases, promotions, layoffs.
➢ Encouraging performance improvement.
➢ Setting and measuring goals.
➢ Determining individual and organizational training and development needs.
➢ Confirming that good hiring decisions are being made.
➢ Provide legal support for personnel decisions.
➢ Improving overall organizational performance

Thomas and Bretz (1994) provide several additional purposes for performance appraisal including motivating employees, assessing employee potential, improving working relationships, assigning work more efficiently, and assisting in long-range planning. Generally speaking, performance appraisal serves two basic purposes: the first is evaluative (or administrative) as the term "appraisal" implies, and the second is developmental (Brinkerhoff & Kanter, 1980; McKinnon, 1993; Rynes, Gerhart, & Parks, 2005). The evaluative function refers to the extent to which there has been progress toward goals as a result of the employee's efforts.

II. LITREATURE REVIEW

The history of performance appraisal ways back to the early 20th century and can be traced to Taylor's pioneering Time and Motion studies. Though a formal appraisal programme was introduced by New York City Civil Services in 1883 before WW1, it is believed to be started for the first time during WW1. Then US army chief Walter Dill Scott, kept man-to-man rating in military establishment. According to C. Heyel (1973) "performance appraisal is the process of evaluating the performance and qualifications of the employees in terms of the requirements of the job for which they are employed. For the purpose of administration, including selection for

promotions, placement, providing financial rewards and other actions which necessitate differential treatment amongst the members of a group as distinguished from actions affecting all members equally". In the views of Wonston Oberg (1972), "Common descriptions include performance appraisal, merit rating, behavioural assessment, employee evaluation, personnel review, progress report, staff assessment, service rating and fitness report." (Abanikanta).

Comparative methods include: (a) Rank-ordering all faculties and staff members from lowest to highest in effectiveness.
(b) Alternately choosing the most effective and then the least effective staff member, moving their names to separate lists and repeating the process until all names have been removed from the initial list.
(c) Comparing each staff to every other staff and determining a final ranking based on how many times the staff was ranked above the other staff.
(d) A forced distribution where a certain percentage of the staff is classified as top performers, perhaps a second group in the next tier, and then another group assigned to the lowest performing group. Absolute standards methods have several variations including critical incidents, weighted checklists, forced choice, conventional rating, and behaviourally anchored rating scales. Critical incidents involve identifying the significant requirements of a job and the supervisor is asked to rate each staff in each category. Weighted checklists involve compiling a list of staff member's goals that the supervisor uses for each staff member to determine which of the goals was completed. Forced choice requires the supervisor to choose the most descriptive statements for each staff using a list of items that differentiate between successful and unsuccessful completion and between desirable and undesirable staff traits. Conventional rating involves rating staff traits on a form using such categories as excellent, average, and poor. Behaviourally anchored rating scales are a quantitative version of the critical incident method that uses scales anchored in descriptors of actual position behavior and specific levels of performance. The above examples of evaluation methods provide a comprehensive overview of the types of methods most often used by various organizations. They fall along a continuum between subjective and objective methods and between unstructured and structured methods.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORING SYSTEM (PASS) FOR MEMBERS OF FACULTY

It is proposed to introduce a transparent and objective Performance Appraisal Scoring System (PASS) for members of faculty based on the guidelines issued by the UGC and AICTE, starting from the academic year 2009-10. The objective of this scheme is to motivate each member of faculty to perform better and better in delivering quality education. The results of this assessment shall be used for the following purposes:

(i) Award of annual increment in the pay scale
(ii) Award of special increments and rewards in recognition of superior performance.

GRADE	GRADE DESCRIPTION	GRADE POINT
A	EXCELLENT	5
B	VERY GOOD	4
C	GOOD	3
D	FAIR	2
E	BELOW AVERAGE	1

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORING SYSTEM REPORT

To facilitate performance assessment, a "Performance Appraisal Scoring System (PASS) Report" has been specially designed. The report comprises two parts. Part A is "Self Appraisal" to be filled up by the faculty member. Part B is "Remarks of the Reporting Officer" to be filled up by the respective H.O.D.

No. Category
1.   Academic activities
2.   Research activities
3.   Extension activities
4.   Administrative activities

(i) Academic Activities
(a) Teaching
1. Semester results of Theory Courses taught
10 points
2. Student Feed back in Theory courses taught
3. Effective Utilization of allotted periods in Theory Courses
4. Performance in Academic Audit

(b) Research Activities
10 points
(i) Academic Research
Completed Ph.D. program and obtained Degree

-    Project Guidance : for each P.G. student (M.B.A/ M.tech.) who was awarded degree

(iii) Award of career advancement / promotion
(iv) Monitoring and recording the regular growth of each member of faculty for ready reference.

The study comprised 504 faculties from various private, public and deemed

PERIOD OF ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE INDEX Assessment shall be carried out every academic year after completion of the academic year ending 30th June. The overall performance of a teacher during an academic year is reflected through a single index termed as "Faculty Performance Index (FPI)" which is based on a 5-point grade system as given below:

-    Research guidance : for each candidate
Awarded degree Ph.D ,M.phil

**(ii) Research Publication
20 points**
-   Refereed Journals with impact factor 1.0 or above; for each publication
-   Refereed Journals with impact factor less than 1.0; for each publication
-   National level research paper in non-refered Journal but having ISBN / ISSN number; for each paper
-   Research monograph published by **10 points** International Publishers; for sole author book for edited chapter book
-   Research monograph published by **10 points** National Publishers with ISBN /ISSN Number
For sole author book
For edited chapter book

**(3) Extension Activities
15 points**
-   Consultancy Project carried out / on going ; Amount mobilized for every Rs 1 lakh
-   Providing Routine and Developmental Testing Services per Indian / International Standards ; Amount mobilized for every Rs 1 lakh
-   Organizing short term Intensive Courses / Summer or Winter School on topics of

relevance in thrust area / emerging area to practicing engineers or Engineering College Teachers ; for each programme organized

- Organizing Seminar / Symposium / Workshop either self-supported or funded by outside agencies on topics of relevance to industries; for each programme organized

(4) Administrative Activities
(a) At Department level
- Student Counsellor
- Class Advisor
- Lab.-in-charge for planning, development and maintenance
- Coordinator, Professional Society
- Coordinator, R & D activities
- Other similar activity

(b) At the Institution level, State / National / International level
- Institutional governance responsibilities
- Membership in Board of Studies, Academic Council etc.
- Nomination in Higher Education related committees
- Participation in policy planning for development of Technical education, industries and Research Institution.
- Other similar activity

For each activity at Institute level : **10 points**
 At State / Regional / National / International level **10 points**

CONVERSION OF TOTAL POINTS TO GRADE

Total Points obtained	Grade	Grade Point
> 50	A	5
40 – 49	B	4
20 - 39	C	3
10 - 19	D	2
Upto 9	E	1

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SYSTEM
The Performance Appraisal Scoring System may be processed in the month of August every year by which time all the required information including Academic Audit Reports will be available. Every member of faculty will have to fill up the PASS Report and submit to the Head of the Department on or before the last day announced. While filling up the Report, the faculty member shall give all the details pertaining to the activities and achievements and enclose copies of document in support of the claim. The faculty members shall also compute and present the Faculty Performance Index (FPI) which quantifies the overall performance of the member during the period.

The Head of the Department shall verify all the statements made by the faculty member, by checking the enclosed documents and the FPI computed by the member. The PASS Report shall be forwarded by the HOD to the Dean, Academic Courses, by the end of second week of August.

The Faculty Performance Assessment Committee headed by the Vice Chancellor / Registrar shall review the PASS Reports received and finalize the FPI's of the various members of faculty.

III.   CONCLUSION
As expressed by the respondent, a no. of faculties feel unsatisfied with present appraisal system in India. Employees do not feel satisfied with once in a year evaluations. They expect their managers to guide them from time to time.

Managers, on the other hand, do not have frequent performance conversations with their subordinates. Thus, employees remain unaware of missed deadlines and unachieved goals as a result.
It is a fact that employees expect a fair review process at their workplace. The evaluations should be free from any bias by all means. Manager feedback needs to be based on performance reports or employee achievements.
Old way of performance appraisals only encouraged top-to-bottom evaluation. Subordinate feedback and employee self-assessment are given less (or no) importance in such a situation. As a result, managers are unable to decide the performance of individuals. Besides, employees are never rewarded or coached during the review process.

IV.   SUGESSTION
It is advised to use reliable performance assessment software. In order to set goals, share feedback, measure day-to-day performance, identify scope of improvement and retain top talent. With an employee evaluation software, you can continuously monitor employee achievements as well as identify top performers.
The use of online evaluation software allows for more accurate and timely decision making. It also helps to:
- Set clear work expectations for all employees.
- Give positive feedback regularly and help employees if they are having problems.
- Identify and reward top performers and keep them motivated.

- Provide training to employees and create skill development plans.
- Prepare potential leaders to create a succession pipeline.
- Lead a transparent review process. Let employees feel satisfied and complete their reviews without delay.
- Improve employee motivation and engagement by linking performance to pay.

REFERENCES

[1]. Abu-Doleh, J. & Weir, D. (2007). Dimensions of performance appraisal systems in Jordanian private and public organizations. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18(1), 75-84.

[2]. Armstrong, M. (2001). Human Resource Management Practice, (8th ed.) London: Kogan Page Publishers.

[3]. Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2005). Managing Performance: Performance Management in Action. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

[4]. Broady-Preston, J. & Steel, L. (2002). Employees, customers, and internal marketing strategies in LIS. Library Management, 23(1), 384-393.

[5]. Brown, M., & Benson, J. (2003). 'Rated to Exhaustion? Reactions to Performance Appraisal Processes'. Industrial Relations Journal, 34(1): 67-81

[6]. Brown M, et al. (2010). Consequences of the performance appraisal experience: Personnel Review,39(3), 375-396

[7]. Caruth, D. L & Humphreys, J. H. (2008). Performance Appraisal: Essential Characteristics of Strategic Control. Measuring Business Excellence, 12(3), 24-32.

[8]. Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). 'Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations'. Journal of Applied Psychology,83(4): 615-633

[9]. Chiang, F. & Birtch, T. (2010, November). Appraising performance across borders: An empirical examination of the purposes and practices of performance appraisal in a multi-country context. Journal of Management Studies,47(7), 1365-1393. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.00937.x

[10]. Coens, T., & Jenkins, M. (2000). Abolishing Performance Appraisals: Why They Backfire and What to Do Instead. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers

[11]. Cook, J., & Crossman, A. (2004). 'Satisfaction With Performance Appraisal Systems: A study of Role Perceptions'. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19(5), 526-541.

[12]. Den Hartog, D., Boselie, P., & Paaiwe, J. (2004). Performance management: A model and research agenda. Applied Psychology: An International Review,53(4), 556-560.

[13]. DeNisi, A. & Pritchard, R. (2006). Performance appraisal, performance management, and improving individual performance: A motivational framework. Management and Organization Review,2(2), 253-277.

[14]. Erdogan, B. (2002). 'Antecedents and Consequences of Justice Perceptions in Performance Appraisals'. Human Resource Management Review, 12(4), 555-578.

[15]. Fletcher, C. (2001).