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In order to understand the existing practices of assessing scientists working in Public Sector Undertakings (PSU), the researcher collected information from a large number of PSUs. The researcher made sincere attempts to collect relevant information from a large number of organisations to collect data. However, only 10 organisations responded and made available the adequate information. Hence, the systems present in these ten organisations are alone presented in this Chapter. The organisations whose performance appraisal system is described in this chapter are:

1. Advanced Research Centre for Powder Metallurgy and New Materials International (ARCI)
2. Department of Atomic Energy (DAE)
3. Department of Ocean Development (DOD)
4. Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO)
5. Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR)
6. Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR)
7. Indian Institute of Remote Sensing (IIRS)
8. Indian Oil Corporation (IOC)
9. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC) and,
10. Steel Authority of India (SAIL)
3.1. Advanced Research Centre for Powder Metallurgy & New Materials

ARCI, located in Hyderabad, is a state-of-the-art facility for research and development in advanced materials, and associated processing technologies. With its origin in the Integrated Long Term Programme on Cooperation in Science & Technology (ILTP) signed by the erstwhile USSR and India in the late 1980s, ARCI became operational in April 1995. Today, ARCI functions as a grants-in-aid institution of the Government of India's Department of Science & Technology. Thrust Areas at ARCI include surface engineering, ceramics, powder metallurgy, and laser processing of materials. The organization has matured into a technology development and transfer centre of repute. Despite the disintegration of the Soviet Union, cooperation between the laboratories/institutions of CIS countries and ARCI has continued to thrive. This is amply reflected in the wide array of technologies that are now available through ARCI for adoption by Indian industries. Consistent with the demands imposed by globalization, the Centre is also consciously developing a world-centric vision and embarking on new initiatives to forge mutually beneficial alliances with premier laboratories and institutions not just in India and CIS countries but also elsewhere in the world.

The details of performance appraisal at ARCI consist of five parts. Part I deals with personal details. Part II deals with project work and assignment actually done. This also includes comments by the assessing officer. Part III consists of a report filled in by an Assessing Officer under two leadership: (1) Work output – (a) quantum of work in a 60-point scale, (b) quality of work in a 60-point scale; and (2) Attributes – 10 point
scales for each of (a) intellect, (b) theoretical/experimental/managerial, (c) originality/innovativeness, (d) Knowledge in own field, (e) attitude towards work, (f) perseverance and resourcefulness, (g) communication skills and (h) interpersonal relationship. Part IV to be filled in by Division Head consists of general assessment by division head and special assignments. Finally, Part V to be filled in by Director. A performance appraisal system of forced distribution method is adopted at ARCI. In this system, in each group/grade, only a limited number of employees are allowed to proceed for promotion. Accordingly, the employees are categorized as the top 20%; next 30%; next 30%; and the rest 20% for promotion. The minimum eligibility for promotion is also spelt out. The meritorious get quicker promotions. The rest wait for their turn.

**Assessment Criteria for Scientists at ARCI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>% of employees who can be graded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientist B to C</td>
<td>255 and above over 3 yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>320 and above over 4 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350 and above over 5 yrs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>390 and above over 6 yrs</td>
<td>6 &amp; above</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist C to D</td>
<td>340 and above over 4 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist D to E</td>
<td>400 and above over 5 yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>450 and above over 6 yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>490 and above over 7 yrs</td>
<td>7 &amp; above</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scientist E to F
Scientist F to G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>% of employees who can be graded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>425 and above over 5 yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480 and above over 6 yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 and above over 7 yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 and above over 8 yrs</td>
<td>8 &amp;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Criteria for technical staff (Technical Officer, Technical Assistant & Technician) at ARCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>% of employees who can be graded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 and above over 5 successive yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 and above over 6 successive yrs.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490 and above over 7 successive yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520 and above over 8 successive yrs.</td>
<td>8 &amp;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2. Department of Atomic Energy

The Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) was established in 1954 with headquarters in Bombay and a Branch Secretariat in New Delhi. The functions of DAE emanate from the following mandate:

1. Increasing the share of nuclear power through deployment of indigenous and other proven technologies, and also develop fast breeder reactors and thorium reactors with associated fuel cycle facilities;
2. Building and operation of research reactors for production of radioisotopes and carrying out radiation technology applications in the field of medicine, agriculture and industry;

3. Developing advanced technologies such as accelerators, lasers, supercomputers, advanced materials and instrumentation, and encouraging transfer of technology to industry;

4. Support to basic research in nuclear energy and related frontier areas of science; interaction with universities and academic institutions; support to research and development projects having a bearing on DAE’s programme and international cooperation in related advanced areas of research and contribution to national security.

DAE, being a scientific department, has from its inception followed a policy in promotion of officers in scientific and technical grades based on the need to develop a cadre of competent scientists and technologists. This scheme is known as Merit Promotion Scheme. The success of the scheme in identifying and ensuring promotion of talented scientists at a faster rate to reach the top at the shortest possible time has been proved during the last 25–30 years. Promotions are made in DAE from one grade to a higher grade not on the basis of vacancies but on the basis of development and work of the individual scientific-research/technical personnel. Under the scheme, a Scientific Officer/Engineer or a technical personnel deserving promotion because of the merit of his work is never denied for want of vacancy. A suitable post will always be created at the level required for accommodating the promoted employee. While creating such posts,
the lower posts vacated by the personnel concerned are abolished. Normal increments and promotions of scientific and technical personnel in DAE take place on fixed dates in a year, either on 1st February or 1st August in the case of scientific category and on 1st May or 1st November in the case of technical staff.

3.3. Scientific Promotions

There are several checks and balances built into the system to ensure that evaluations and recommendations for promotions are done in a systematic and balanced manner. For example, there is a system of confidential report, originating from the candidate assessed by the immediate superior, reviewed and countersigned by the Head of the Division or Director of the Group. In the assessment form there is enough scope to reflect on the work carried out by the officer as well as his individual qualities. On the basis of the confidential report, a Standing Screening Committee recommends the cases for promotion on the basis of standards and guidelines prescribed and it is ensured that no deserving person has been overlooked. Confidential dossiers are made available to the Screening Committee for assessing the outstanding abilities, achievements and managerial experience of the officer. The Screening Committee is composed of immediate supervisors and balancing members from other Divisions/Units of the Department so that uniformity exists in the entire Department. Based on the recommendations of the Screening Committee, a Selection Committee interviews the individuals. During the interview, a detailed assessment of the candidate is made and suitable recommendations are made. One important aspect of the Merit Promotion Scheme is that the seniority of an individual officer is not a criterion. Generally, a list of
candidates arranged according to the number of years they have spent in a particular grade is made available to the Screening Committee. Based on the gradings obtained in Confidential reports (CR) and personal interview, the brighter candidates pass through every grade in the shortest possible time to reach higher levels even ahead of his colleagues who may; have joined before him or along with him. This has been accepted by the scientific and technical community in this Department. Therefore the normal definition of seniority and inter-se seniority do not apply to the promotion policy for scientists, engineers and technical personnel in this Department.

The performance appraisal format Part–A consists of personal details. Self-appraisal is made by the appraisee, which includes work done in brief, contribution of the officer vis-à-vis those of the other collaborators, if any, and publications other than routine reports. Only reference numbers need to be quoted in the case of secret reports. Significant achievements outside the scope of the official’s duties may also be specified. Name(s) and designation(s) of person(s) to whom the officer is reporting should be indicated and the report should be signed (with date) at the end of each page. Global essay type is used by the appraisee to describe his achievement. The assessment is done by the Reporting Officer on a graphic rating scale. On the one end of the scale level X applies and on the other level Y applies. Exceptionally high knowledge levels are denoted by X and exceptionally low levels are denoted by Y. The gradings are made as: X applies, tendency to X, normal, tendency to Y, and Y applies. The factors assessed are: Part–I intellect and Part–II professional ability. Under professional ability, the following factors are assessed: theoretical ability, experimental or practical ability, originality, technical judgment, power of expression and professional knowledge? Part–III is
devoted to assessing work output for the year, including factors of work quality and productivity. Part-IV assesses administrative ability including factors such as administrative judgment, organizing ability, ability to assess subordinates and leadership qualities. Part-V concerns personal qualities: personality, cooperativeness, consciousness, fulfillment of commitment and self-reliance. The overall assessment is done on gradings consisting of A+ (exceptionally brilliant), A1 (outstanding), A2 (very good), A3 (good), B+ (average), B (below average), C (indifferent but just worth retaining), and D (not worth retaining in service).

3.4. Department of Ocean Development

The Department of Ocean Development (DOD) was created in July 1981 as part of the Cabinet Secretariat directly under the charge of the Prime Minister and came into existence as a separate Department in March 1982. The DOD has been functioning as a nodal department for organizing, coordinating and promoting ocean development activities in the country. The underlying philosophy of the programmes and activities undertaken by the Ministry of Earth Sciences is one of sustainable and environment-friendly exploration and utilization of marine living and non-living resources for the socio-economic benefit of the country. The performance appraisal system in DOD consists of five parts. Part-I contains personal details. Part-II contains details of self-report by the Officer concerned, like academic qualifications, nature of work during the period of report (papers published in technical journals or presented at symposia, particulars of seminars/symposia attended, particulars of training courses attended, etc.) and specific achievements outside the scope of official duties. Self appraisal is given by
the assessee in an essay form. Part–III contains assessment by Reporting Officer – length of service, security lapses if any and state of health. The assessment is done on a graphic rating scale. A scientist is assessed on the following scale, i.e., at one end of the scale, i.e. X, one is exceptionally bright and on the other end, i.e. Y, he is rated as very dull. Between the two extremes lies assessment characteristics like X applies, tendency to X, normal, tendency to Y, and Y applies. A scientist is assessed on any one of the five anchors. Performance characteristics assessed are (1) intellect, (2) professional ability. Under the professional ability, the parameters assessed are theoretical ability, experimental or practical ability, originality, technical judgement, power of expression, general professional knowledge, programme formulation/implementation ability and evaluation ability. Part–III deals with managerial/administrative capacity/personal qualities. The parameters assessed are administrative judgement, organizing ability, leadership, zeal and initiative, work output, quality of work, perspective and visualisation of future directions, order and discipline, objectivity, personality, co-operativeness, consciousness, and self-reliance. General comments about commitment to the task assigned, human relations, public relations capacity to guide scientists working under him are also included. The overall performance of the scientists is assessed on the following grading: outstanding, very good, good, average and, Poor. Part-IV is devoted to remarks by the Reviewing Officer and deals with length of service, and whether the Reviewing Officer agrees with the comments, if any, of the Reporting Officer. The Reviewing Officer has to spell out in case of disagreement and then the Reporting Officer is again requested to assess the officer on the following grades: outstanding, very good, good, average and, poor. The Reviewing Officer is also requested to his comments if the
grading is good or below and whether he would recommend a change of assignment and
the type of area where the appraisee is best suited for. General remarks are also solicited
from the Reviewing Officer. Part-V deals with action on unfavourable remarks and,
remarks, if any, to be communicated.

3.5. Defence Research and Development Organisation

DRDO was formed in 1958 by the amalgamation of the then already functioning
Technical Development Establishment (TDEs) of the Indian Army and the Directorate of
Technical Development & Production (DTDP) with the Defence Science Organisation
(DSO). DRDO was then a small organisation with 10 establishments or laboratories.
Over the years it has grown multi-directionally in terms of the variety of subject
disciplines, number of laboratories, achievements and stature.

Today, DRDO is a network of 51 laboratories engaged in developing defence
technologies covering various disciplines like aeronautics, armaments, electronics,
combat vehicles, engineering systems, instrumentation, missiles, advanced computing
and simulation, special materials, naval systems, life sciences, training, information
systems, and agriculture. Presently, the organisation is backed by over 5000 scientists and
about 25,000 other scientific, technical and supporting personnel. Several major projects
for the development of missiles, armaments, light combat aircrafts, radars, electronic
warfare systems, etc: are on hand and significant achievements have already been made
in several such technologies.
Two sets of forms were collected, one for Scientists B and C and the other for Scientist F. Part–I deals with personal details. Part–II performance appraisal concerns project/assignment, set targets, achievements, comments and remarks by the signature of the assessee. The assessee is given a free hand to write about his job satisfaction, working environment and desired/suggested change in the nature of work recently handled. Part–III deals with performance review discussion and the, time spent in the performance. The assessor spends at least half an hour with each assessee. Key issues such as (a) performance accomplishment of targets and facilitating factors/impediments to performance, (b) demonstrated aptitudes and training, and development needs of the assessee, and (c) personality attributes (temperament, attitude, behaviour, etc.) and corrections suggested if any. Part–IV on targets for the next year and project/assignment carries the signature of the assessee, signature of the assessing officer and date of conduct of the performance review discussion. Part–V consists of a rating sheet to be completed by the assessing officer, reporting officer, and the head of the laboratory/establishment contains and a general observation of the assessing officer. This is done in terms of work output (50-point scale), attributes (50-points) with five points for each factor. The factors assessed are intellect, technical and professional knowledge, updating of knowledge and skills, responsibility, innovation, initiative, commitment to work and to the organization, adaptability, commutation skills and team work. Part VI on remarks by the reviewing officer contains comment on reasons for awarding less than 60% marks. The, total score, agreed or awarded by Head of the Laboratory and adverse remarks, if any, complete Part–VI.
The second form for Scientist F is similar to the Form for Scientists B & C. Part-I consists of personal details. Part-II consists of targets, achievements by the assessee and assessor, general remarks reported upon particulars expressed, job satisfaction, working environment, training/specialization needed, time spent on project work, capability to take up additional workload and any change of specialization in work area. Part-III is to be filled by the assessing officer and the reviewing officer. This consists of (1) Contributions—quantum of work (35 points) and quality of work (35 points), (2) intellect (10-point scale), (3) professional abilities (10-point scale each), professional knowledge, knowledge in related fields, originality/innovativeness, technical judgement, (4) leadership qualities (10-point scale each), vision, motivating ability, decision making, tenacity and (5) management skills (10-points scale each) under (a) planning and directing, (b) interactive ability, (c) communication skills, and (d) shared values. This part ends with general remarks by assessing officer, and special assignments, characteristics, if any. Part-IV is a report by the reviewing officer, and deals with integrity and moral fibre, adverse remarks, if any, general assessment with reference to strength and weakness, total score and percentage, reasons for awarding score below 60%, remarks of the Director, and marks awarded.

3.6. Indian Council of Agricultural Research

The Union Minister of Agriculture is the President of the ICAR. Its principal officer is the Director-General. He is also the Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Agricultural Research and Education (DARE). The General Body, the supreme authority of the ICAR, is headed by the Minister of Agriculture, Government of
India. Its members include the Minister of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries and senior officers of the various state governments, representatives of the parliament, the agro-industries, scientific organisations and farmers. Agricultural Scientists' Recruitment Board (ASRB) is an independent recruiting agency of the ICAR for its Agricultural Research Services (ARS) and equivalent technical posts and also for research management positions. The Council has a National Academy of Agricultural Research Management (NAARM), which provides required training to new entrants to the ARS. This vast network of ICAR which includes institutes, bureaux, national research centres and project directorates, has a manpower of about 30,000 out of which nearly 7,000 are engaged in active research and management. Thirty eight agricultural universities (SAUs) employ about 26,000 scientists for teaching, research and extension education; of these over 6,000 scientists are employed in ICAR-supported coordinated projects. ICAR has a chain of research institutions throughout the length and breadth of the country devoted mainly to research in agriculture. The score card for assessment of scientists is used for promotion of scientists. The card is scientifically designed and there is provision for assessing the merit of the scientists by adopting quantified ratings.

### Score Card Guidelines for Senior Scientists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Academic qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One mark each for standing first or award of medal (in School/Board/College/University at 10+2, Graduate, MSc and PhD levels) (Maximum of 4 marks)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two marks each for Jawaharlal Nehru Award for MSc/PhD thesis (Maximum of 4 marks)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doctoral fellowship—Minimum one year duration—one mark for each completed year (maximum of 2 marks)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional university degree of desirable qualification—only if relevant to the post (maximum of 2 marks)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One mark for first class or equivalent, half mark for second class or equivalent in graduation (maximum of 1 mark)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One mark for first class or equivalent, half mark for second class or equivalent—in Masters (maximum of 1 mark)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Employment Record &amp; Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience shall get marks only when the candidate has put in more of number of years in service over and above the prescribed number of years required for a particular post. For example, for the post of Senior Scientist, five years experience (excluding the period spent for PhD) is required as scientist with PhD qualification. However, if a candidate with PhD qualification has 10 years experience (excluding the period spent for PhD) as scientist, marks shall be assigned for the extra five years experience. 1 mark for each year of service over and above the prescribed qualifying years of required experience for the post. Maximum of 5 marks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Service in Remote Areas</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, service rendered in the Andamans, Nicobar, Lakshadweep, Minicoy and Amindivi islands, states/union territories in the North Eastern region, Ladakh Division of J&amp;K, Sikkim, Poanagi sub-division of Chamba, and Lahual and Spiti districts of Himachal Pradesh is considered service in “remote area”. However, a view based on availability of facilities for research to a particular place could also be a guide for allocation of these marks. The decision for classification of a place of earlier posting of a candidate as “remote area” would solely rest with the screening committee members in consultation with chairman/members of ASRB.  - Half mark for each year of completed service in a remote area (maximum of 4 marks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>In-service Award/Recognition</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One mark each for national/international award (recognized as ICAR, CSIR, DBT, Ministries of State or Central Government, FAO of the UN, etc.) Or Half mark each for institutional or recognized professional society’s awards / recognition, and recognition such as president/chairman/member/member secretary of important committees and other decision/policy-making bodies. (Note – conference prizes/medals such as best paper or best posters are not to be given any mark) If the award/recognition is an individual effort, it shall carry marks as suggested above. If it is an award/recognition jointly received, it shall carry half the marks in comparison to an individual’s effort. (maximum of 3 marks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>Teaching/Extension</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half mark for individual effort or 1/4th mark for collaborative effort for each of the accomplishments related to the following criteria:  1. Design of innovative course curriculum-new course(s) added or course(s) revised.  2. Publication of textbook, authored/edited books, teaching or extension aid/manual/bulletin, review chapter, chapter in a book or proceedings of a seminar/symposium, other publication of value, etc.  3. Guidance of student(s) for award of university degrees.  4. Success of students in terms of their recognition for awards (e.g., Jawaharlal Nehru Award) or by qualifying in ARS/SRF/NET, etc.  5. Popularisation of new technologies  6. Innovation in teaching, extension technology and methods.  7. Trainings conducted and farmers benefited through awareness generation.  8. Examples created for enhanced income generation by farmers, or employment generation in students.  9. Production of inputs and supplies of ultimate use by farmers.  10. Any other success story (maximum of 8 marks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Special Attainments

1. One mark each for novel technology development, patent, prototype, genetic stock variety process, concept, methodology, etc.
2. Half mark each for any other specific attainment of merit or special assignments (international organizations, overseas and special national assignments) not covered anywhere else.
3. Half mark for other attainment of merit to highlight salient research accomplishments.
4. Half mark for other attainments of merit to highlight salient research accomplishments. If the attainment is an individual effort, it shall carry marks as suggested above. If it is a collaborative effort, it shall carry half the marks in comparison to an individual effort.

(maximum of 4 marks)

### Externally Funded Projects

Only projects funded from sources other than the regular budget of the organization should be mentioned. Projects supported by ICAR under Agricultural Produce Cess Fund Scheme and projects secured through Competitive Grant Scheme under the World Bank aid will also be considered as externally funded projects in addition to projects funded by other national/international organizations/agencies. Only projects with funding of more than Rs. 5 lakhs will be included.

1. One mark for being a principal investigator (PI) for every externally funded project.
2. Half mark for being a co-principal investigator (Co-PI) or key liaison officer for each externally funded project.

(maximum of 2 marks)

### Organization of Winter School/Summer School/Refresher Course/Seminar/Symposium

1. Half mark for each of the courses organized as course director or course-coordinator (marks shall be given only for organization of winter school/summer school/refresher course as the course director or co-coordinator of course of not less than 21 days)
2. 1/4th mark for seminar/symposium with significant participation in its organizations (workshops/trainings organized as part of duty of the post. Simple participation, delivering lecture or presentation of paper will not be considered)

(maximum of 1 mark)

### International Exposure

Experience of working in internationally important organizations/laboratories with an exposure of minimum of three months will only be considered. An international exposure towards obtaining Masters or PhD degree and Post-doctoral experience will be not be considered here, as it is included separately under ‘Academic Qualifications’.

Half mark for every three months spent in an overseas laboratory or international organisation.

(maximum of 1 mark)

### Institution Building

Only clearly defined contributions as a leader in institutional building shall be considered. For example, creation of totally new institution, laboratory, field facility, etc. which has a bearing on improved standards or resources generation can be given. Like wise, in case of adding new equipment, mention can be made as to how many other scientists are benefited by such addition. Similarly, encouraging HRD, plan implementation and or monitoring of progress to show better results, successful execution of major projects can be given.

Half mark each for any of the above criteria.

(maximum of 1 mark)
Inter-institutional projects

Only projects as principal investigator or coordinator or key liaison office will be considered. For each such project, the funding should be more Rs. 10 lakhs. Half mark for each such project.

(maximum of 1 mark)

Publications

Ten best research publications will be allocated scores according to NAAS JRN ID on a scale of 0.5 to 4.0. The total score obtained in such research publications shall be multiplied by 3/8 to obtain the actual marks to be given from these 15 marks. For research publications where NAAS JRN ID is not available, the committee screening the application shall be empowered to give appropriate rating. It is, however, important that a maximum of 10 best research publications only have to be considered for allocation of marks out of 15 total marks.

(maximum of 15 marks)

GRAND TOTAL

60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>HOD/HRC/PC I NC I ZC / JD</th>
<th>PD/ADG/ JDNI</th>
<th>DIN / ND / DDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Academic qualification</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Experience</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Service in remote areas</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D In-service award/recognition</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Teaching/extension</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Special attainments</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Externally-funded project</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Seminars/symposia courses organized</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I International exposure</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Institution building</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Inter-institutional Project(s)</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Publications</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (A-L)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS-Senior Scientist, PS-Principal Scientist, HOD-Head of Division, HRS-Head of Regional Station, PC-Project Coordinator, NC-National Coordinator, ZC-Zonal Coordinator, JD-Joint Director, PD-Project Director, DIR-Director, ADG-Assistant Director General, JDNI-Joint Director of National Institute (includes Deemed Universities and NAARM); DNI-Director of National Institute (includes Deemed Universities and NAARM); ND-National Director, DDG-Deputy Director General,
ICAR follows transparent yardsticks for different levels of scientists for further promotion.

3.7. Indian Council of Medical Research

The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), New Delhi, the apex body in India for the formulation, coordination and promotion of biomedical research, is one of the oldest medical research bodies in the world. The Council's research priorities coincide with national health priorities such as control and management of communicable diseases; fertility control, maternal and child health; control of nutritional disorders; developing alternative strategies for health care, delivery; containment within safety limits of environmental and occupational health problems; research on major non-communicable diseases like cancer, cardiovascular diseases, blindness, diabetes and other metabolic and hematological disorders; and mental health research and drug research (including traditional remedies). All these efforts are undertaken with a view to reducing the total burden of disease and to promote health and well-being of the population. The Council promotes biomedical research in the country through intramural as well as extramural research. Over the decades, the base of extramural research and also its strategies have been expanded by the Council. Intramural research is carried out currently through (i) the 21 Permanent Research Institutes/Centres of the Council, which are mission-oriented national institutes located in different parts of India and address research on specific areas such as tuberculosis, leprosy, cholera and diarrhoeal diseases, viral diseases including AIDS, malaria, kala-azar, vector control, nutrition, food & drug toxicology, reproduction, immunohaematology, oncology, medical statistics, etc. and (ii) the Council's six Regional Medical Research Centres which address regional health
problems, and also aim to strengthen or generate research capabilities in different geographic areas of the country. In addition to research activities, the ICMR encourages human resource development in biomedical research through (i) research fellowships (ii) short-term visiting fellowships, (iii) short-term research studentships, and (iv) training programmes and workshops conducted by ICMR institutes and headquarters.

In the context of the changing public health scene, balancing research efforts between different competing fields, especially when resources are severely limited, is a typical problem encountered in the management of medical research particularly in developing countries. Infectious diseases and excessive population growth have continued to constitute major priorities to be addressed in medical research throughout the past several decades. In addition to tackling these issues, in recent years research has been intensified progressively on emerging health problems such as cardiovascular diseases, metabolic disorders (including diabetes mellitus), mental health problems, neurological disorders, blindness, liver diseases, hearing impairment, cancer, drug abuse, accidents, disabilities etc. Research on traditional medicine/herbal remedies was revived with a disease-oriented approach. Attempts have been made to strengthen and streamline Medical Informatics and Communication to meet the growing demands and needs of the biomedical community. The Council is alert to new diseases and new dimensions of existing diseases, as exemplified by the rapid organisation 1986 of a network of Surveillance Centres for AIDS in different parts of India.

The performance appraisal system of ICMR consists four parts. Part-I contains personal details about the officer concerned. Part-II contains details of Scientific Officers
working at the ICMR Headquarters, and covers aspects of additional qualifications or training acquired during the year, major areas dealt with in descending order of priority, nature of programmes/activities engaged in (like project planning, project reviews, project monitoring, data analysis, report writing, organisation of scientific meetings, preparation of minutes, processing and preparation of Council’s publications (such as ICMR Bulletin, ICMR Patrika, etc.), number of projects dealt with Task Force, ad-hoc research schemes, fellowships, Major research programmes, and major accomplishments, if any. Any other academic/scientific activities performed during the year may also be mentioned. A list of scientific conferences attended and papers presented, a list of publications during the year, honours/awards, received during the year, administrative assignments, difficulties experienced, and a summary in about of about 300 words of the work by the officer during the year. Part–II (B) of the form deals with staff in ICMR institutes/Centres. This consists of additional qualifications or training acquired in India/abroad during the year under report, research programmes engaged in descending order or priority and time allocated to each priority with priority ranking, research programme and time allocation, nature of research activities, project planning, laboratory work, clinical work, field work, data analysis, report writing, a brief resume of each priority programme mentioned with objectives of the projects, assignments carried out by the officer on the project, any major progress/accomplishments utilisation, etc. of the work done, shortfalls, if any, and reasons for the same. Part-III is an assessment by reporting officer in a graphic rating scale (Likert scale) under outstanding, above average, average, below average, unsatisfactory and not applicable for the different parameters consisting (i) personal qualities/attributes, (ii) professional competence, and (iii)
organizational ability. The overall assessment of the scientists is given in the following grades: (i) outstanding, (ii) very good, (iii) good, (competent) with special initiative, (iv) average (reasonably competent but without special ability or initiative), (v) below average and unable to work without constant supervision, (vi) indifferent, but just worth retaining in present grade, and (vii) not worth retaining in the present grade. The special characteristics of the officer is brought out in Serial No. 7, which contain suggestions, suitable for guidance if any, given to the officers and any other characteristics. The reporting officer is free to express his comments in an open format. Part-IV is an assessment by the reviewing officer as to whether he agrees with the comments. In case of disagreement, the reporting officer has to spell out the reasons therefore. Then the reviewing officer is requested to state give whether the scientists is fit for promotion or not.

For officers in managerial level like Director, Senior Deputy Director General or equivalent heading ICMR institutes, the information is solicited. Part-I deals with personal details. Part - II consists of additional qualifications acquired, fellowships availed, scientific conference/seminars attended, list of papers, books, etc. published, prizes, awards, etc. received and a brief resume of achievements during the year indicating difficulties, if any, experienced. Part-III deals with assessment by reporting officer, a check-list form of method of appraisal is used, whether the officer agrees or does not agree with the statements of the officer reported upon, amenability to discipline, knowledge of rules, regulations and procedures, quality of supervision, readiness to assume more responsibility and control and management of staff. The reviewing officer then gives his comments whether he agrees, with the reporting officer
or not, and whether the officer reported upon is fit for promotion to the next grade or any other special characteristic for promotions.

### 3.8. Indian Institute of Remote Sensing

Indian Institute of Remote Sensing (IIRS) under the National Remote Sensing Agency, Department of Space, Government of India is a premier training and educational institute set up for developing trained professionals in the field of remote sensing, geoinformatics and GPS technology for natural resources and disaster management.

The main areas of focus of the institute are capacity building through technology transfer among user communities, education at the post-graduate level in the application of remote sensing and geoinformatics for natural resources management, and promotion of research in remote sensing and geoinformatics. The institute provides value-added services in the field of natural resources management, remote sensing, GIS and GPS technology.

The performance appraisal system consists of four parts. Part–1 consists of self-assessment by the assessee including academic qualifications, nature of work in a global essay form. Part–2 consists of assessment by reporting officer, general remarks in the graphic rating scale (X applies and Y applies: X is on the high scale and Y is on the low scale). Assessment is made as: X applies, tendency to X, normal, tendency to Y, and Y applies. Factors assessed are (1) intellect, (2) professional ability and (3) managerial/administrative capacity/personal qualities. The factors assessed in Professional ability are (a) theoretical ability, (b) experimental or practical ability, (c)
originality, (d) technical judgement, (e) power of expression, and (f) general professional knowledge. Factors assessed under managerial/administrative capacity/personal qualities are (a) administrative judgement, (b) organizing ability, (c) leadership, (d) zeal and initiative, (e) work output, (f) quality of work, (g) perspective and visualization of future direction, (h) order and discipline, (i) objectivity, (j) personality, (k) co-operativeness, (l) conscientiousness, and (m) self-reliance. Part–3 consists of remarks by the reviewing officer. The final gradings of the assessee is done under gradings A+: exceptionally brilliant, A: outstanding, AA-: very good, A-: well above average standard, B+: good average man, B: average man, B-average man just worth retaining, and C: not worth retaining in the present grade. Part–4 covers remarks of the countersigning officer. This is followed by remarks of the chairman, NRSA G B/ Secretary, DOS, whose remarks are made where he is not the reporting/reviewing/countersigning officer.

3.9. Indian Oil Corporation

Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (Indian Oil) was formed in 1964 through the merger of Indian Oil Company Ltd. (estd. 1959) and Indian Refineries Ltd. (estd. 1958). It is currently India’s largest company in terms of sales with a turnover of Rs. 1,83,204 crores (US $ 41 billions) and profits of Rs. 4,915 crores (US $ 1.10 billions) for fiscal 2005. Indian Oil is also the highest ranked Indian company in the prestigious Fortune ‘Global 500’ listing, having moved up 17 places to the 153rd position this year based on fiscal 2005 performance. It is also the 21st largest petroleum company in the world and the # 1 petroleum trading company among national oil companies in the Asia-Pacific region.
R&D Mission: (a) Provide leadership to corporate business through research & development (b) Develop environmentally safe petroleum products and processes, (c) ensue commitment to petroleum and energy conservation, and customer’s trust and satisfaction (d) foster a culture of participation, creativity and quality in work, and (e) be a center of excellence in petroleum technology.

The performance appraisal details of scientists consisting of Part–I Appraisee has to make self appraisal of assignment handled by him. Part–II contains contributions made and claims by appraisee with comments of reporting and reviewing officers. Part–III contains of performance counseling about the appraisee’s strengths, areas of improvement, and any other observation. The appraisee’s response is duly made with the appraisee’s signature, reporting officer’s signature and reviewing or countersigning officer’s signature. Part –IV contains appraisal of quantified targets with a minimum of five targets managed with reference to the R&D statement of vision. Achievement is assessed on 0–5 scale with 5 points for the highest achievement, substantial progress by self assessment with reason for under achievement. This is followed by assessments by reporting officer and reviewing officer. Part–V on appraisal of job-related attributes makes use of a behavioural anchored rating scale (BARS) with a 6-point scale, excellent: 5 points, good: 4 points, adequate: 3 points, slightly short of requirement: 2 points, inadequate for requirement: 0 point. Job-related attributes, examined are job knowledge experimental work, quality of work, planning and organisation, safety consciousness, reading and library habits, data interpretation and report writing, Imitative and risk taking, team working, creativity, communication, and dependability. The assessment is done by self, reporting officer as well as by reviewing officer. Part–VI consists for
appraisal of managerial attributes, excellent: 3 points, adequate: 2 points, found wanting 1 point. Factors assessed are Leadership, concern for people, customer orientation, willingness to accept responsibility, and conference capabilities. The assessment is done by self, reporting and reviewing officer. If the assessee gets an overall grading of 81 and above he is declared as outstanding, 66-80: very good, 51-65: satisfactory, 41-50: Fair, and below 40: unsatisfactory. Part-VII consists of conduct, strength and weakness-integrity, which consists of disciplinary action, finding and propriety. Part-VIII consists of potential and profile, achievements, areas of strength, areas requiring improvement, specific justifications for extreme rating (outstanding or unsatisfactory), and potential to next grade (very high, high, average and ready for promotion) Part-IX consists of overall performance. The grades awarded are outstanding, very good, satisfactory, fair, unsatisfactory which are to be adjudged by the reporting officer, reviewing officer and countersigning officer.

3.10. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd

After independence, the national government realized the importance oil and gas for rapid industrial development and its strategic role in defense. Consequently, while framing the Industrial Policy Statement of 1948, the development of petroleum industry in the country was considered to be of utmost necessity. Until 1955, private oil companies mainly carried out exploration of hydrocarbon resources in India. In Assam, the Assam Oil Company was producing oil at Digboi (discovered in 1889). Oil India Ltd. (a 50% joint venture between the Government of India and Burmah Oil Company) was engaged in developing two newly discovered large fields at Naharkatiya and Moran in
Assam. In West Bengal, the Indo-Stanvac Petroleum Project (a joint venture between the Government of India and Standard Vacuum Oil Company of USA) was engaged in exploration work. The vast sedimentary tract in other parts of India and adjoining offshore remained largely unexplored.

In 1955 the Government of India decided to develop oil and natural gas resources in various regions of the country as a public sector development. With this objective, an Oil and Natural Gas Directorate was set up towards the end of 1955 as a subordinate office under the then Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research. The department was constituted with a nucleus of geoscientists from the Geological Survey of India.

ONGC has one set of performance appraisal system for officers/scientist with the rank of E-1 to E-3 – (Form 1) and another for officers/scientists in the rank of E-4 to E-6 – (Form II). In the form for E-1 to E-3, Part-I contains personal details. Part-II is a personal perception form/perception evaluation form, which is filed by the assessee and is assessed by the reporting officer. The perceptual factors considered are (1) awareness of role within the organization, (2) job satisfaction, (3) clarity of objectives in relation to job, (4) achievement of objectives, (5) peer support/quality of support from colleagues, (6) encouragement, guidance and counseling from senior colleagues, (7) work environment and infrastructural facilities, (8) availability of job-related information and access thereto, (9) professional freedom to accomplish task, (10) participation in decision making, (11) opportunity for training and development, and (12) prospects for self growth within the organization. The assessee is assessed in terms of less than adequate, adequate and good. Similarly, the reporting officer has also to assess in terms of less than
adequate, adequate and good. The assessee as well as the reporting officer has to sign the form. Part-III is a mobility sheet, dealing with the number of transfers, service in ERBC, promotion history, promotion during last 6 years, specific medical problems of self/family/dependents, whether the medical problem would be a constraint for future career growth, present promotion, present posting, willingness to accept foreign assignments, and willingness for transfers, if yes preferences thereof. The assessee is also requested to give any change in the present assignment with details, preferences and reasons. Part-IV consists of assessment by reporting officer where the reporting officer is instructed to be objective, to ensure that the assessment is his own and not hearsay, to weigh each factor of assessment on its own, (not letting isolated instances influence his rating), to give the employee the kind of indulgence he would like for himself, and to complete the assessment in a relaxed frame of mind. In ONGC, the reporting officer is to be instructed to be away from biases like halo effect, regency effect, the error of central tendency, and strictness error which are normally observed. The reporting officer is instructed to be as objective as he is expected to be. Factors assessed are (1) guidance and supervision of subordinates to accomplish given jobs, (2) ability to produce desired result of required quality, (3) understanding and knowledge of the job, (4) seeking alternative courses of action for job accomplishment, (5) ability to make correct decisions under stress, (6) degree to which the individual can be relied upon to fulfill assignments both under routine and difficult circumstances, (7) extent to which the individual functions as an effective member of a team, (8) ability to promote group harmony and motivate others to accomplish task collectively, (9) peer respect and recognition, (10) extent to which the individual commands confidence among his colleagues, (11) ability
to delegate, (12) ability to exhibit self example for achieving excellence, (13) ability to 
guide and develop own people, (14) extent to which the individual expresses himself 
clearly both in speech and in writing, (15) ability to put across ideas effectively, (16) 
ability to draw out ideas from others, (17) conference skills, (18) adherence to safety 
regulations, (19) inclination for maintaining neat and clean working environment, (20) 
eatness in personal habits and appearance, (21) approach towards job in planning 
targets, systematic handing of work within desired time interval, (22) degree of self 
motivation and desire for excellence, (23) extent of knowledge of latest developments in 
his own and related field/areas of work, (24) extent to which the individual is open to 
change and accepts new ideas/openness to suggestions, and (25) ability to adjust to new 
situations

For each factor, the reporting/reviewing officer is to use the following gradings:

exceptional: 9 marks, 201-230; above average: 8 or 7 marks, 151-200; average: 6, 5 or 4 marks, 76-150; Below average: 3, 2 or 1 mark, 76-150. If the overall 
gradings comes in the range 201 to 230, the officer is adjudged as exceptional; if it comes 
between 151 to 200, the officer is adjudged as above average; if it is between 76 and 150, 
the officer is adjudged as average; and for a grading below 75, he is judged as below 
average. The reporting officer is also requested to give a brief about ability, 
professionalism, personality and expected growth of the officer. The potential indicators 
scheme is also done by the reporting officer in areas like training, development; and 
inter-functional modes. Advice, if any, should be given which should not be considered 
as adverse remarks. Any adverse remarks are also to be indicated. In case of any 
variation, the reviewing officer has to give reasons. Assessment is done by the Head of
the Region, Assessment by the Regional Director, General Manager of the Region in ONGC. It is observed that multiple raters are involved in rating the officers. The assessment of higher Officers is done according to Form II. The appraisal for the higher officers (E-4 to E-6) is the same as that for E-1 to E-4. Form II comprises (1) self assessment and nature of work in a global essay form, (2) significant / outstanding contributions made, (3) objectives that have been achieved or not achieved, (4) factors beyond the officer’s control, (5) general constrains, (6) suggestions made, (7) improving help he may need from superiors, (8) special project/committee/task force working on, (9) merit certificate obtained, if any, (10) functional areas to gain experience, (11) organizational assignments that may be highlighted, (12) name of superior with designation, supervisory work, (13) designation and number of persons who supervised directly and (14) additional skills, books, journals read related to ONGC, papers published, contributions to other assignments considering the qualification, skills and training. The next part (Para-II) is a self assessment career planning profile in which the factors are assessed (1) functional area of interest, (2) cultural activities, (3) sports activities, (4) training courses he would like to attend [(a) managerial courses, (b) technical courses in his line of development, (c) courses other than in his line], (5) weakness, according to the officer’s own perceptions: [(a) leadership skills, (b) negotiating skills, (c) labour relations, (d) communication, (e) decision making /problem-solving, (f) time management, (g) presentation skills, (h) fellowship], (6) strengths, (7) areas of his subject he should be exposed to further, and (8) areas listed under Paras 5 & 6 in which the officer has made improvement during the year. Part-III is a mobility Sheet dealing with (1) posting and promotion history during the last six years, (2)
whether the medical problem(s) would be a constraint for [(a) future career growth, (b) present promotion, (c) present posting, and (d) transfer], (3) whether the officer is willing to accept a foreign assignment, (4) whether the officer is willing for a transfer and preferences thereof, (5) whether the officer would like a change in his place of posting, and if so, details, preferences and reasons, (6) whether the officer has any constraint on mobility, (7) career goals, and (8) preferences regarding work assignment. The bias normally observed in performance appraisal systems such as halo effect, horn effect, central tendency, error of strictness, and contrast error are avoided. Factors assessed are grouped under five clusters: achievement cluster, leadership cluster, influence cluster, job-knowledge cluster, and sensitivity cluster.

1. Achievement Cluster

The following are considered under this cluster:

(i) productivity management [(a) accomplishes at any cost, (b) maintains quality while achieving challenging goals, (c) calculates cost benefits of alternative courses of action before deciding a line of action, (d) does not have to be reminded, and (e) follows until successful completion], (ii) financial and physical resource management [(a) establishes cost control measures, (b) manages with available resources rather than optimum resources, (c) develops cost and conservative attitude among employees, (d) improvises, where necessary, and (e) fills any idle-time with positive action]; (iii) administrative management [(a) follows established policies and procedures, (b) maintains records and files, (c) coordinates efforts with others, (d) meets deadlines, and (e) pays attention to details]; and (iv) human resource management [(a) develops a
competent work force, (b) creates a favourable and effective work climate, (c) identifies training needs properly and gets the employees adequately trained, (d) supports the organisation’s HRG and training programmes, and (e) provides feedback and counsels employees]

II. Leadership Cluster

This cluster is divided into five subsets. Considerations under each subset are given below:

i) planning: (a) assesses future plans adequately in advance, (b) develops contingency plans to avoid slippages, (c) cultivates planning competence among subordinates, (d) keeps organizational goals always as objectives, and (e) sets higher level achievable internal targets, ii) Organisation: (a) delegates responsibility and authority, (b) holds employees accountable for results commensurate with their position and authority delegated, (c) builds up team spirit, (d) chooses the right man for the right job, and (e) identifies personnel correctly and without bias for career advancement; iii) accountability: (a) accepts responsibility, (b) accepts additional responsibility, (c) analyses trends and information to take corrective measures at the appropriate time, (d) maintains effective M.I.S, and (e) discusses and conducts regular meetings to discuss objectives, for plans and steps to achieve targets and the main decision; (iv) decision making: (a) judges correctly and acts on the right priorities, (b) acts with a sense of urgency, (c) gathers realistic data and develops a range of options before selecting the best option, (d) involves supervisors in the problem solving process, and (e) involves subordinates in the problem solving process; (v) time
management: (a) works on correct priorities, (b) does not waste his own time, (c) does not waste other’s time, (d) manages jobs within specified time, and (e) trains subordinates on time management.

**III. Influence Cluster**

This cluster has three subsets, each with a multitude of considerations.

(i) peer and inter-personal equation: (a) demonstrates ability to work with a variety of styles, personalities, ages and values, (b) separates social from work site relationship, (c) accepts positive change and does not personalize issues, (d) respects knowledge, ability and integrity of others, and (e) is respected and trusted by others; (ii) communication: (a) effectively communicates in meetings and groups, (b) written work is clear, precise and accurate, (c) gives clear, precise instructions, (d) is aware of his own strengths and weaknesses, and (e) weighs things carefully and does not jump to conclusions; (iii) morale building: (a) understands and solves subordinates’ problems, (b) motivates and encourages subordinates, (c) understands and communicates corporate goals, (d) encourages self-development in subordinates, and (e) shows willingness to accept new suggestions from the group.

**IV. Job-knowledge Cluster**

These are two subsets under this cluster: job knowledge and expertise. The considerations are (i) Job-knowledge: (a) keeps abreast of new development, (b) solutions to problems have a high degree of job-knowledge and accuracy, (c) can take legitimate criticism and improve, (d) supports his views and proposes with valid data, and (e) has courage of conviction to express his judgement; (ii) Expertise: (a) is
regarded as an expert, (b) is an expert in a specialized field within his subject, (c) has expertise in operational area, (d) has expertise in managerial functions, and (e) has expertise in staff functions (with a brief note on his expertise)

V. Sensitivity Cluster

Here again considerations are made under three subsets, namely, sensitivity, diplomacy and stress management. (i) Sensitivity : (a) is pro-active to the requirements of members of his group belonging to weaker sections of society like SC/ST, (b) has constraints of domestic/personal problems effecting the requirement of organization, (c) has physical stamina to carry out arduous jobs, (d) remains calm under stress, and (e) brings in extraneous pressures to achieve his personal objectives; (ii) Diplomacy : (a) can conceptualise and anticipate problems, (b) can forestall a crisis by advance action, (c) can tackle a crisis by sauve mannerisms, (d) by entrepreneurial drive can manage efficiently, and (e) works to minimize risks; (iii) Stress Management : (a) produces high quality work even under stress, (b) stays calm and maintains steady output, (c) loses effectiveness when pressures mount, (d) gets frustrated when more than one assignment is given at a time, and (e) loses equanimity under stress.

Promotability

Considered under this area are (a) exceptional potential for advancement to general managerial responsibility, (b) promotable with further potential, (c) promotable but limited subsequent potential, (d) fit for promotion, and (e) not fit for promotion. The assessment is done by the reporting officer and the reviewing officer on the following scale: 9 marks are awarded for exceptional; 8 or 7 marks are awarded for above average; 6, 5 or 4 are awarded for average; 3, 2 and 1 are awarded for below average. The overall
assessment is made under (a) exceptional (561 and above), (b) above average (421 to 560), (c) average (211 to 420), and (d) below average (upto 210). Part-V deals with assessment by the reviewing officer and also by the Project Head / Institute / Regional Head and also the concerned administrative members, functional members, followed by acceptance by Chairman. It has been observed that multiple raters are involved in assessing senior scientists of ONGC. Part-E deals with communication of adverse remarks, details of representation received. Part-VI deals with the training and development needs of the officer to be filed by assessee as well as to be recommended by the reporting officer.

3.11. Steel Authority of India Limited

Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL) is the leading steel-making company in India. It is a fully integrated iron and steel maker, producing both basic and special steels for domestic construction, engineering, power, railway, automotive and defence industries and for sale in export markets. Ranked among the top ten public sector companies in India in terms of turnover, SAIL manufactures and sells a broad range of steel products, including hot and cold rolled sheets and coils, galvanised sheets, electrical sheets, structural steel, railway products, plates, bars and rods, stainless steel and other alloy steels. SAIL produces iron and steel at five integrated plants and three special steel plants, located principally in the eastern and central regions of India and situated close to domestic sources of raw materials, including the company's iron ore, limestone and dolomite mines. SAIL's wide range of long and flat steel products is much in demand in the domestic market as well as in the international market. This vital responsibility is
carried out by SAIL’s own Central Marketing Organisation (CMO) and the International Trade Division. CMO encompasses a wide network of 38 branch offices and 47 stockyards located in major cities and towns throughout India.

SAIL has a well-equipped research and development centre for Iron and Steel (RDCIS) at Ranchi which helps to produce quality steel and develop new technologies for the steel industry. Besides, SAIL has its own in-house Centre for Engineering and Technology (CET), Management Training Institute (MTI) and Safety Organisation at Ranchi. Its captive mines are under the control of the Raw Materials Division in Calcutta. The Environment Management Division and Growth Division of SAIL operate from their headquarters in Calcutta. Almost all the plants and major units are ISO certified.

Two sets of systems are used to assess the performance of service executives, one for E-1 to E-4 grade and the other for higher officials in E-5 grade and above. The performance appraisal system for executives of the level E-1 to E-4 consists of the following: Part-I deals with personal details. Part-II is presented in four minor parts, A, B, C and D. Part II-A on self assessment deals with a self appraisal by the scientist, duly indicating direct key performance areas, tasks and targets and time frame. The scientist is also requested to mention constraints faced and suggestions for improvement. Part-II-B is a mid-term performance review and planning which is done during October of each year, and concerns comments on targets, targets fulfilled, discussion on development needs, and discussion on major strengths and thrust areas for the next six months. This is done jointly sitting by the appraisee and the reporting officer. Action for the next six months about fulfillment of tasks/targets and constraints faced, facilitating resources, highlights of performance, major strengths, and development needs are done by the
particular officer and his immediate superior. Annual performance review and planning is
done during April and this indicates comments on tasks and a target fulfilled, discussion
on development need, discussion for major strengths, thrust areas for next year, and is
duly signed by the appraisee and the reporting officer. Performance assessment is done
in Part II-C which assigns different weights according to various performance factors
including quantity of output, quality of output, cost control, job knowledge and skill,
team spirit and lateral coordination, discipline, development and quality of assessing
subordinates, and special relevant factors. Rating is done on a scale of 1 to 5. The
potential factors are next assessed which interalia covers communication, initiative,
commitment and sense of responsibility, problem analysis and decision making, planning
and organizing, and management of human resources. The potential factors are assessed
on a rating scale of 1 to 5. The reporting officer and reviewing officer are required to
give their grading. Comments on the overall performance/potential are assessed, while
comments on extreme ratings are made by the reporting officer and the reviewing officer.
The grading of the officer is awarded based on different performance factors and
potential factors which have different weights, on a rating scale of 1 to 5. The overall
score is obtained, i.e., (rating X weight). Overall, the marks are worked out for 100. Part
II – D deals with developmental plan and Training needs and is done by the reporting
officer as well as by the reviewing officer and both have to recommend training, if any,
required for the assessee. A training department has to make a follow up plan and action
taken and that is also reflected in the performance appraisal system. Under development
plan, job rotation and job enrichment are also considered by the reporting and reviewing
officers. The final assessment is done by way of the average marks of the reporting and
reviewing officers. The final assessment is done on a grading of O, A, B and C. If the final grading is ‘C’, committee records whether the appraisee is promotable or not.

The system for executives of the level E-5 and above is essentially the same as that for executives from E-1 to E-4 in as much as Part A deals with self appraisal including tasks, targets fulfilled, facilitating resources, suggestions for improvement, mid-term review, development needs, etc. and discussion on development if any. The performance factors and potential factors, however, vary. The performance factors assessed are quantity of output, quality of output, cost control, lateral coordination, team spirit, discipline, development and quality of assessing subordinates and special relevant factors which have different weights than those for executives E-1 to E-4. The potential factors carries the following considerations-commitment and sense of responsibility, planning and organizing, management of human resources, problem analysis and decision making, and communication. These have different weight factors. For each factor the rating is to be done on a scale of 1 to 5. The overall factor weight of 20 is multiplied by 5 to yield 100. The appraisee is assessed by the overall marks of 100 by the reporting officer and reviewing officer. Recommendations of the reviewing officer is done based on whether the appraisee exhibits a potential to grow in his own line of specialization or general management position, any other function the appraisee should work on now or in due course and suggestions are to be given accordingly. Developmental and training needs are also assessed. A training department acts and monitors the follow up action. Development plan, job rotation and job enrichment are also made. The final assessment is done in Part II-E on a grading scale of O, A, B and C. In case a candidate’s grading is C, a committee decides whether he is promotable or not.
3.12. Summary

All the organizations followed the standard pattern with Part I containing personal details and a global essay form of writing is used to describe the nature of the task performed by the officials.

ARCI

Part I - Personal details. Part II - Project work, assignment work done. Part III - assessing officer does assessment on (1) work output: (a) quantum of work, 60 points and (b) quality of work, 60 points; (2) attributes on a 10-point scale each for (a) intellect, (b) theoretical/experimental/managerial, (c) originality/innovativeness, (d) knowledge in own field, (e) attitude towards work, (f) perseverance and resourcefulness, (g) communication skills, and (h) interpersonal relationship. Reporting and review by Director. For promotion forced distribution method is followed. There is a qualifying mark for eligibility for promotion from one grade to another.

DAE

Part I-Personal details; global essay type is used by the appraisee to describe the scope of duties. The rating is done by the reporting officer and a graphic rating scale from X applies to Y applies as the two extremes of the scale. Part II-factors assessed are (i) intellect, (ii) professional ability, which includes (a) theoretical ability, (b) experimental or practical ability, (c) originality, (d) technical judgement, (e) power of expression and (f) professional knowledge. Part III-Work output for the year: factors of work quality and productivity are assessed. Part IV-Administrative ability, administrative judgement, organizing ability, ability to assess subordinates and leadership qualities are assessed. Part V-Personal qualities: personality, cooperativeness, consciousness, fulfillment of
commitment and self reliance are assessed. Overall assessment is done as - A+: exceptionally brilliant; A1: outstanding; A2: very good; A3: good; B+: average; B: below average; C: indifferent but just worth retaining; and D: not worth retaining in service.

**DOD**

Part-II-Self assessment by reporting officers and includes academic qualifications, specific achievements outside the scope of official duties with reference to targets, viz., higher contribution as well as shortfalls, if any, as expressed by the assessee. Part III- Assessment by reporting officer in a graphic rating scale from X to Y applies, as two extremes of the scale. Parameters assessed are (i) intellect, (ii) professional ability, and (iii) managerial ability/personal qualities. Overall grading is given from outstanding to poor.

**DRDO**

Part I - Personal details. Part II - Performance appraisal is assessed for project/assignment, targets, job satisfaction, working environment, suggested change in the nature of work. Reporting officer to discuss with the assessee about (a) performance, (b) accomplishment of targets, (c) facilitating factors, (d) personality attributes, (e) attitude, behaviour, etc. Targets for the next year project and performance review discussion are done and targets are fixed. Rating sheet is done by the assessing officer and reporting officer. Work output carries 50 points and attributes carries 50 points. The factors assessed are (a) intellect, (b) technical and professional knowledge, (c) updating of knowledge and skills, (d) responsibility, (e) innovation, (f) initiative, (f) commitment to work and organization, (g) adaptability, (h) communication skills, and (i) team work. For senior scientists the assessment is done on (a) quantum of work which carries 35
points and (b) quality of work which carries another 35 points, (c) intellect, 10 points, (d) professional abilities, 10 points (professional knowledge, knowledge in related fields, originality/innovativeness, technical judgement), (e) leadership qualities, 10 points (vision, decision making and management skills), and (f) management skills, 10 points (planning and directing, interactive ability, communication skills). Final assessment is done on calculation of marks.

**ICAR**

Score card is given for senior scientists for assessment promotion: (a) academic qualification, 15 marks, (b) employment record and experience, 5 marks, (c) service in remote areas, 4 marks, (d) in-service award/recognition, 3 marks, (e) teaching/extension, 8 marks, (f) special attainments, 4 marks, (g) externally funded project, 2 marks, (h) organisation of seminars/symposia, 1 mark, (i) international exposure, 1 mark, (j) institution building, 1 mark, (k) inter-institutional projects, 1 mark, and (l) publications, 15 marks. Scientists at different levels have to acquire different thresholds according to their status. Weightage varies according to the level of the scientists like: SS-Senior Scientist, PS-Principal Scientist, HOD-Head of Division, HRS-Head of Regional Section, PC-Project Coordinator, NC-National Coordinator, ZC-Zonal Coordinator, JD-Joint Director, PD-Project Director, Dir-Director, ADG-Assistant Director General, JDNl-Joint Director of national institutes-includes deemed Universities and NAARM; DNI-Director of national institutes-includes deemed Universities and NAARM; ND-National Director, and DDG-Deputy Director General. Interview carries 40-60 marks for promotion.
ICMR

Part I personal details. Part II Professional aspects: areas of research like project planning, project reviews, project monitoring, data analysis, report writing, organization of scientific meetings, preparation of minutes, major research programmes, and major accomplishments, if any, difficulties experienced, if any, self appraisal by the assessee.

Part-III-assessment by reporting officer in a graphic rating scale from outstanding to unsatisfactory. The different parameters assessed are (i) personal qualities/attributes, (ii) professional competence, and (iii) organisational ability.

IIRS

Part I-self-assessment by the assessee includes academic qualifications, nature of work on a global essay form. Part II- Assessment by reporting officer on a graphic rating scale from X applies to Y applies as the two extremes of the scale. Factors assessed are (i) intellect, (ii) professional ability, which includes (a) theoretical ability, (b) experimental or practical ability, (c) originality, (d) technical judgement, (e) power of expression, and (f) professional knowledge; (iii) managerial/administrative capacity, which includes (a) administrative judgement, (b) organizing ability, (c) leadership, (d) zeal and initiative, (e) work output, (f) quality of work, (g) perspective and visualization of future direction, (h) order and discipline, (i) objectivity, (j) personality, (k) co-cooperativeness, (l) conscientiousness, and (m) self-reliance. Part III is done by the reviewing officer. The final grading is given as A+: exceptionally brilliant; A: outstanding; AA:very good; A-: well above average standard; B+: good average man, B: average man; B-:average man just worth retaining; and C: not worth retaining in the present grade.
IOC

Self appraisal of quantified targets is done by the appraisee with regard to R&D statement of vision. Achievement is assessed on 0 – 5 scales and reporting and reviewing are done. Job-related attributes are assessed on a behavioural anchored rating scale from 0 to 5. The attributes are (1) job knowledge, (2) experimental work, (3) quality of work, (4) planning and organization, (5) safety consciousness, (6) reading and library habits, (7) data interpretation and report writing, (8) imitative and risk taking, (9) team working, (10) creativity, (11) communication, and (12) dependability. The assessment is done by the self, reporting officer as well as reviewing officer. Managerial aspects are also assessed, which includes (1) leadership, (2) concern for people, (3) customer orientation, (4) willingness to accept responsibility, and (5) conference capabilities. This is also done by self, the reporting officer and the reviewing officer. The grading is done on a quantified basis. 81 and above : outstanding; 66-80 : very good; 51-65 : satisfactory; 41-50 : fair; below 40 : unsatisfactory. Part VII consists of conduct, strengths and weaknesses, (a) integrity, (b) disciplinary action, and (c) findings. Part VIII consists of potential and profile, achievements, areas of strength, areas requiring improvement, specific justifications for extreme rating (outstanding or unsatisfactory) and potential to next grade and are assessed by the reporting officer. Part IX consists of overall performance. The gradings given are. Outstanding, very good, satisfactory, fair, unsatisfactory to be adjudged by the reporting officer and the reviewing officer.

ONGC

Part I Personal details and self assessment by the assessee. Part II- Perception : evaluation by the assessee as well as by the reporting officer. The factors are (1)
awareness of role within the organization, (2) job satisfaction, (3) clarity of objectives in relation to job, (4) achievement of objectives, (5) peer support/quality of support from colleagues, (6) encouragement, guidance and counseling from senior colleagues, (7) work environment and infrastructural facilities, (8) availability of job-related information and access thereto, (9) professional freedom to accomplish task, (10) participation in decision making, (11) opportunity for training and development, and (12) prospects for self growth within the organization. Part III - Mobility sheet: number of transfers undergone, promotion history, medical problem of self/family/dependents, willingness for transfer, foreign assignment and suggestions for change in present assignment, (preferences and reasons solicited from the employee). Part IV- Reporting officer assesses factors such as (1) guidance and supervision to subordinates to accomplish given job, (2) ability to produce desired result of required quality, (3) understanding and knowledge of the job, (4) seeking alternative courses of action for job accomplishment, (5) ability to make correct decisions under stress, (6) degree to which individual can be relied upon to fulfill assignments both under routine and difficult circumstances, (7) extent to which individual functions as an effective member of a team, (8) ability to promote group harmony and motivate others to accomplish task collectively, (9) peer respect and recognition, (10) extent to which individual commands confidence among colleagues, (11) ability to delegate, (12) ability to exhibit self example for achieving excellence, (13) ability to guide and develop own people, (14) extent to which individual expresses himself clearly both in speech and in writing, (15) ability to put across ideas effectively, (16) ability to draw out ideas from others, (17) conference skills, (18) adherence to safety regulations, (19) inclination for maintaining neat and clean working environment, (20) neatness in
personal habits and appearance, (21) approach towards job in planning targets, systematic handling of work within desired time intervals, (22) degree of self motivation and desire for excellence, (23) extent of knowledge of latest developments in own and related field/areas of work, (24) extent to which the individual is open to change and accepts new ideas/openness to suggestions, and (25) ability to adjust in new situations. The final grading is given on a quantified marks scale and the assessee is assessed as exceptional, above average, average and below average. The reporting officer also does the potential assessment. In ONGC, multiple raters are involved in the appraisal. At higher levels, the assessment is done with career planning profile, mobility sheet, which includes (1) posting and promotion history and (2) medical problems [for (a) future career growth, (b) present promotion, and (c) present posting]. Factors assessed include clusters like achievement cluster (which includes (i) productivity management, (ii) financial and physical resource management, (iii) administrative management, and (iv) human resource management), leadership cluster (which includes (i) planning, (ii) organisation, (iii) accountability, (iv) decision making, and (v) time management), influence cluster (which includes (i) peer and inter-personal equation, (ii) communication, and (iii) morale building), job-knowledge cluster (which includes (i) job-knowledge, and (ii) expertise), sensitivity cluster (which includes (i) sensitivity, (ii) diplomacy, and (iii) stress management). Assessment is done by the reporting and reviewing Officers on a quantified basis and then the overall assessment is done as exceptional, above average, average, and below average. Multiple raters are involved in assessing senior scientists. No down-the-line hierarchy is involved. Training and developmental needs are also assessed and recommended by the reporting officer.
SAIL

Part II-There is a mid-term performance review and planning which is done in October each year about comments on targets fulfilled, discussion on development needs, and discussion on major strengths and thrust areas for the next six months by joint sitting of the appraisee and the reporting officer. During April, an annual performance review is done. Performance assessment is done for various parameters having different weightages. Potential factors are also assessed. Part D-Developmental plan and training needs are also assessed by the reporting officer as well as the reviewing officer. Final assessment is done on gradings of O, A, B and C. A Committee normalise the gradings.

While devising a new performance appraisal system for CSIR, factors like mid-term review, annual interview before assessment, counseling and feedback, potential appraisal and 360 degree appraisal by subordinates, peers and the immediate supervisor shall also be taken into consideration.