Employee Performance Appraisal Policy (Teaching Faculty)

1. Objective of the Policy

The institution has established a structured and transparent Performance Appraisal Policy to ensure **quality enhancement, accountability, and continuous professional development among teaching faculty**. The policy aims to:

- Strengthen teaching-learning processes
- Promote research culture and innovation
- Encourage professional competency development
- Ensure alignment of individual performance with institutional goals

2. Scope

This policy is applicable to:

- All **Teaching Faculty** (Permanent/Ad-hoc/Contractual)

3. Appraisal Framework

The institution follows a **multi-criteria, evidence-based appraisal system**, covering the following domains:

A. Teaching-Learning Effectiveness

- Subject Knowledge
- Teaching Methodology
- ICT-enabled Teaching
- Student Engagement

Focus: Enhancing learning outcomes and academic quality.

B. Research and Academic Contribution

- Quality Publications
- Indexed Journal Publications
- Conference Participation
- Research Projects

Focus: Knowledge creation, academic excellence, and institutional visibility.

C. Professional Development

- Faculty Development Programmes (FDPs)
- Workshops/Seminars

Focus: Continuous up-skilling and academic enrichment.

D. Institutional Responsibilities

- Committee Participation
- NAAC/IQAC Activities
- Administrative Roles

Focus: Institutional governance and quality assurance.

E. Student Support and Engagement

- Mentoring System
- Student Support Services

Focus: Holistic student development and retention.

F. Examination and Evaluation Responsibilities

- Internal Question Paper Setting
- Invigilation Duties
- Answer Script Evaluation

Focus: Academic integrity and timely evaluation.

G. Innovation and Best Practices

- Innovative Teaching Pedagogies
- Implementation of Best Practices

Focus: Adoption of modern teaching approaches and quality enhancement practices.

4. Scoring and Performance Indicators

- The appraisal system follows a **quantitative scoring mechanism** with defined weightages for each domain subject to UGC guidelines.

5. Appraisal Process

The institution adopts a **structured appraisal mechanism** to ensure **objectivity, transparency, and comprehensive evaluation** of employee performance.

Step 1: Reporting Authority Evaluation

- Performance assessment is carried out by the **Head of Department/Reporting Officer** based on:
  - Teaching effectiveness
  - Research and academic contributions
  - Institutional responsibilities
  - Student engagement and examination duties
- Evaluation is supported by **documentary evidence and performance records**

Step 2: Review and Validation

- The appraisal is reviewed and validated by:
  - HR Manager
  - IQAC Coordinator
- This step ensures:
  - Consistency in evaluation
  - Fairness and reduction of bias
  - Alignment with institutional standards

Step 3: Feedback Mechanism

- Constructive feedback is provided to the employee(s), including:
  - **Strengths**
  - **Areas for improvement**
  - **Developmental suggestions**

6. Performance Feedback and Development

The appraisal system incorporates a **continuous improvement approach**:

Commendations

- Recognition of excellence in teaching, research, and institutional contribution

7. Linkage with Institutional Policies

The appraisal outcomes are systematically linked to:

- Career Advancement and Promotions
- Annual Increments
- Confirmation and Service Continuation
- Nomination for FDPs and Leadership Roles

8. Documentation and Evidence-Based Assessment

The institution ensures **transparency and objectivity** through:

- Mandatory submission of documentary proof
- Maintenance of appraisal records
- Verification through institutional data and reports

9. Review and Quality Assurance

- The policy is periodically reviewed by **IQAC**
- Feedback from stakeholders is incorporated
- Continuous refinement ensures alignment with **NAAC quality benchmarks and institutional vision.**

10. Policy Outcome and Impact

The implementation of this appraisal policy results in:

- Enhanced **teaching-learning quality and student outcomes**
- Strengthened **research culture and academic productivity**
- Improved **institutional participation and governance**
- Promotion of **innovation and best practices in pedagogy**
- Development of a **motivated, accountable, and high-performing teaching workforce**

METAS ADVENTIST COLLEGE SURAT ATHWALINES

Employee Performance Appraisal Policy (Non-Teaching Staff)

1. Objective of the Policy

The institution has established a structured and transparent Performance Appraisal Policy for non-teaching staff to ensure **efficiency, accountability, and continuous professional development**. The policy aims to:

- Enhance administrative efficiency and service delivery
- Promote a culture of responsibility and accountability
- Encourage skill development and capacity building
- Align individual performance with institutional objectives

2. Scope

This policy is applicable to:

- All **Non-Teaching Staff** (Administrative, Technical, and Support Staff – Permanent/Ad-hoc/Contractual)

3. Appraisal Framework

The institution follows a **multi-criteria, evidence-based appraisal system**, covering the following domains:

A. Work Efficiency and Performance

- Timely completion of assigned tasks
- Accuracy and quality of work
- Ability to meet deadlines

Focus: Ensuring productivity and operational effectiveness.

B. Technical and Functional Competence

- Job-related knowledge and skills
- Use of technology and office systems
- Ability to handle assigned responsibilities

Focus: Enhancing functional capability and service quality.

C. Discipline and Professional Conduct

- Punctuality and attendance
- Adherence to institutional rules and procedures
- Professional behaviour and work ethics

Focus: Maintaining institutional discipline and integrity.

D. Institutional Contribution

- Participation in institutional activities
- Support during events, admissions, examinations, and accreditation processes (NAAC/NIRF, etc.)
- Initiative in institutional development

Focus: Strengthening institutional functioning and teamwork.

E. Teamwork and Interpersonal Relations

- Cooperation with management, staff, and faculty
- Communication skills
- Ability to work in teams

Focus: Promoting a collaborative and harmonious work environment.

F. Student and Stakeholder Support

- Responsiveness to student needs
- Service orientation towards stakeholders
- Problem-solving and grievance handling

Focus: Improving stakeholder satisfaction and service quality.

G. Innovation and Initiative

- Adoption of improved work practices
- Suggestions for process improvement
- Initiative in handling responsibilities

Focus: Encouraging efficiency and continuous improvement.

4. Scoring and Performance Indicators

- The appraisal system follows a **quantitative scoring mechanism** with defined weightages for each domain subject to UGC guidelines.

5. Appraisal Process

The institution adopts a **structured evaluation process**:

Step 1: Self-Appraisal

- Submission of work report and responsibilities handled

Step 2: Reporting Authority Evaluation

- Assessment by Administrative Head / Section In-charge

Step 3: Review and Validation

- Evaluation by Appraisal Committee (Principal/Administrator/IQAC Representative)

Step 4: Feedback Mechanism

- Constructive feedback including:
  - Strengths
  - Areas for improvement
  - Skill development needs

6. Performance Feedback and Development

The appraisal system promotes a **continuous improvement culture**:

Commendations

- Recognition of efficiency, discipline, and contribution

Areas for Improvement

- Enhancement of technical skills
- Improved time management and responsiveness
- Greater initiative in institutional responsibilities

7. Linkage with Institutional Policies

The appraisal outcomes are linked to:

- Annual increments and performance-based incentives
- Confirmation and continuation of service
- Role enhancement and responsibilities
- Nomination for training and skill development programmes

8. Documentation and Evidence-Based Assessment

The institution ensures **transparency and objectivity** through:

- Maintenance of service records and attendance
- Work reports and task completion records
- HR evaluation reports

9. Review and Quality Assurance

- The appraisal system is periodically reviewed by **IQAC**
- Feedback from staff and administrators is incorporated

10. Policy Outcome and Impact

The implementation of this appraisal policy results in:

- Improved **administrative efficiency and service delivery**
- Strengthened **accountability and discipline**
- Enhanced **staff competency and skill development**
- Better **stakeholder satisfaction and institutional support systems**
- Development of a **responsible, efficient, and motivated non-teaching workforce**

METAS ADVENTIST COLLEGE SURAT ATHWALINES