



Magandang Agrikultura,  
Matatag na Ekonomiya

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
**BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH**

ROMIC Bldg., Filinvest Road corner Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City 1104  
(+632) 8461 2800 and (+632) 8461 2900 • r4d@bar.gov.ph

Reference No. 2025-77  
February 24, 2025

**MEMORANDUM FROM THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR AND CHAIRMAN OF THE  
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT)**

**TO : ALL PERMANENT AND CONTRACT OF SERVICE (COS) PERSONNEL**

**SUBJECT : SUBMISSION OF 2024 2ND SEMESTER ACCOMPLISHMENT WITH  
RATINGS AND 2025 1ST SEMESTER TARGETS FOR INDIVIDUAL  
PERFORMANCE AND COMMITMENT REVIEWS (IPCR)**

In the interest of service and to ensure the regular monitoring of targets vis-a-vis accomplishments of all employees in line with the bureau's goals, all Permanent and Contract of Service (COS) personnel are enjoined to submit their individual performance and commitment review (IPCR) **accomplishments with ratings for the 2nd Semester of 2024 and 1st Semester targets of 2025 (original and photocopy)** to the Human Resource Management Unit (HRMU) **on or before March 3, 2025, Monday.**

Please take note that the accomplishments and ratings for your respective IPCRs for the 2nd Semester of 2024 should be written on the photocopies of your submitted and approved IPCR targets which will be distributed by the HRMU **on or before February 26, 2025.**

The individual accomplishments with ratings documents shall be used for the updating of DA-BAR's PCR files. This will also serve as reference for the bureau's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of individual performance indicators.

Attached is the rating scale from the Department of Agriculture (DA) SPMS Guidelines, which must be strictly followed in the evaluation process.

Furthermore, please be reminded that unless justified and accepted by the PMT, non-submission of the IPCR to the PMT shall be a ground for:


1. Employee's disqualification for performance-based personnel actions which would require the rating for the given period such as promotion, training, scholarship grants and all forms performance enhancement incentives—if the failure of the submission of the report form is the fault of the employees;
2. An administrative sanction for violation of reasonable office rules and regulation and simple neglect of duty for the supervisors or employees responsible for the delay or non-submission of the division and individual performance commitment and review report; and



3. Failure on the part of the Division Head to comply with the required notices to their subordinates for their unsatisfactory or poor performance during rating period shall be grounds for administrative offense for neglect of duty.

Should you have any concerns or clarifications, you may contact the PMT Secretariat. You may reach **Ms. Aiko Monique C. Del Mundo** of the Planning and Monitoring Unit (PMU) or **Ms. Lissy Ann H. Cantillon** of the Human Resource Management Unit (HRMU) at local number **3123** and **1107**.

For your guidance and strict compliance.

  
**JOELL H. LALES**



## Rating Scales

Various rating scales may be used for specific sets of measures. However, in general, there shall be five-point rating scale (1-5), 5 being the highest and 1, the lowest:

Rating		Adjectival	Description
Numerical			
5.00	5	Outstanding	Performance represents an extraordinary level of achievement and commitment in terms of quality and time, technical skills and knowledge, ingenuity, creativity, and initiative. Employees at these performance levels should have demonstrated exceptional job mastery in all major areas of responsibility. Employee achievement and contributions to the organization are of marked excellence.
4.00 – 4.99	4	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeded expectations. All goals, objectives, and targets were achieved above the established standards.
3.00 – 3.99	3	Satisfactory	Performance met expectations in terms of quality of work, efficiency, and timeliness. The most critical annual goals are met.
2.00 – 2.99	2	Unsatisfactory	Performance failed to meet expectations, and/or one more of the most critical goals were not met.
1.00 – 1.99	1	Poor	Performance was consistently below expectations, and/or reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas.

For further guidance, below are rating scale per QET dimension/measure:

### Q: Quality/Effectiveness (Written Work)

Rating		Adjectival	Description
Numerical			
5.00	5	Outstanding	No mistakes or deficiency, every aspect or work assignments well covered, clearly presented, well organized, no lapse in grammar or error in content
4.00 – 4.99	4	Very Satisfactory	One or two minor errors or deficiencies, work in accordance with instructions, clearly presented, well organized, 1 or 2 errors in grammar or errors in content
3.00 – 3.99	3	Satisfactory	More than two minor errors or deficiencies, partial minor revision needed, 3 lapses in grammar or errors in content

2.00 - 2.99	2	Unsatisfactory	One or two major errors or deficiencies, major revision needed 4 or 5 lapses in grammar or errors in content
1.00 - 1.99	1	Poor	Work not acceptable, needs total revision, 6 or more lapses in grammar or errors in content

**Q: Quality/Effectiveness (Non-Written Work)**

Rating		Adjectival	Description
Numerical			
5.00	5	Outstanding	Excellent results, all aspects of work assignment thoroughly covered, and no mistake in performing the duty or 96-100% accuracy
4.00 - 4.99	4	Very Satisfactory	One or two minor errors in the execution of work assignment, results still very good, 1 or 2 mistakes in performing the duty or 91%-95% accuracy
3.00 - 3.99	3	Satisfactory	More than 2 minor errors or deficiencies in the execution of work assignments, results are acceptable. Three (3) mistakes in performing the duty or 80-90% accuracy
2.00 - 2.99	2	Unsatisfactory	One major error or deficiency that can be overcome with help from supervisor; 4 or 5 mistakes in performing the duty or 75-79% accuracy
1.00 - 1.99	1	Poor	Haphazard or careless execution of work assignment, unacceptable result

**E: Efficiency/Quantity = (Accomplishments / Targets) x 100**

Rating		Adjectival	Description
Numerical			
5.00	5	Outstanding	Performance exceeding targets by 30% and above of the planned targets
4.00 - 4.99	4	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeding targets by 15%-29% of the planned targets
3.00 - 3.99	3	Satisfactory	Performance of 100% to 114% of the planned targets
2.00 - 2.99	2	Unsatisfactory	Performance of the 51%-99% of the planned targets
1.00 - 1.99	1	Poor	Performance failing to meet the planned targets by 50% or below



**T: Timeliness**

Rating		Adjectival	Description
Numerical			
5.00	5	Outstanding	Task completed within 1/2 of the time required to finish it
4.00 - 4.99	4	Very Satisfactory	Task completed within 2/3 of the time required to finish it
3.00 - 3.99	3	Satisfactory	Task completed on the deadline
2.00 - 2.99	2	Unsatisfactory	Task completed 1 working day after the deadline set. Task partially completed at the deadline.
1.00 - 1.99	1	Poor	Task not accomplished at all or completed 2 working days or more after the deadline set. Task not yet begun at the expected date of completion.

