Performance Mapping

of

Curators

National Council of Science Museums

Kolkata – 700 091

Contents

1. Introduction

Once an annual ritual, performance appraisal has become a continuous process by which an employee understands Council's goals and his or her progress towards contributing to them are measured. Performance measurement is an ongoing activity for all <u>Curators</u> in the scientific grade.

Performance measurement uses the following indicators/parameters of performance, as well as assessments of those indicators.

i. **Quantity:** The number of units earned is a good objective indicator of performance. One needs to be careful of placing too much emphasis on quantity, lest quality suffer.

ii. **Quality:** The quality of work performed can be measured by several means. The percentage of work output that must be redone or is rejected is one such indicator. In a research or support environment, the percentage of studies/services converted to effective output and outcomes is an indicator of Curator's quality, capacity, competence and ability.

iii. **Timeliness:** How fast work is performed is another performance indicator that should be used with caution. In the field of science communication, this has to be weighed against the centres/Council's average and overall performance.

iv. **Cost-Effectiveness:** The cost of work performed should be used as a measure of performance only if the employee has some degree of control over costs.

v. **Absenteeism/Tardiness:** An employee is obviously not performing when he or she is not at work. Other employee's performance may be adversely impacted by absences, too as most of the measure of success of projects in NCSM are a team effort.

vi. **Creativity:** It can be difficult to quantify creativity as a performance indicator, but in exhibit development and educational activities and related R&D tasks, it is vitally important. <u>Curators</u> and team leaders/project leaders/Division Heads should keep track of creative work examples and attempt to quantify them.

vii. **Adherence to Policy/Vision/Mission**: This may seem to be the opposite of creativity, but it is merely a boundary on creativity. Deviations from policy/vision/missions indicate an employee whose performance goals are not well aligned with those of the Council.

viii. **Personal Habits:** They may not seem performance-related to the employee, but some personal habits, like gossip, can detract from task/work performance and interfere with the performance of other team members. The specific behaviors should be defined, and goals should be set for reducing their frequency.

ix. **Work ethics:** Most people know how to conduct themselves for work with work ethics, however there is a possibility that someone needs to be told. Examples of inappropriate appearance and conduct should be spelled out, their effects upon the employee's

performance and that of others explained, and corrective actions defined.

2. APAR/AWR & MFCS Revision Committee

One of the main reasons for revision in procedure was due to the DoPT circular regarding review of the MFCS scheme in order to rework the output indicators so as to simplify and streamline capturing of qualitative dimensions so that the excellence of a Curator is brought out and only the deserving Curator(s) get promoted. A Review Committee under the chairmanship of Prof. Sibaji Raha, Member Governing Body, NCSM was constituted by the GB, NCSM for the purpose. The Committee revisited the existing system vis-a-vis the objectives of NCSM and core activities being conducted by the Curators in the scientific grade in NCSM. A system has been proposed to ensure objective methods of assessment. The system proposed is flexible and is intended to be made online for timely filling up and overall evaluation by the competent authorities of NCSM, so that the assessment process is completed timely.

3. Present System:

The Assessment process in the present system goes through the following three Stages of evaluation:

       I.   **Self-Appraisal**

      II.   **Appraisal by Reporting Officer**

      III.   **Appraisal by Reviewing Officer**

I.   Self-Appraisal:

The Curator appraises his or her own performance, in many cases comparing the self-appraisal to reporting officer's review. Often, self- appraisals can highlight discrepancies between what the employee and management think are important performance factors and provide mutual feedback for meaningful adjustment of expectations.

The employee gives both qualitative and quantitative description of the Tasks assigned to him during the assessment year and the actual outcomes against each task. This report is then reviewed by the reporting officer who evaluates the employee based on the tangible and intangible deliverables of the employee.

Performance indicators must be assessed by some means in order to measure performance itself. Here are some of the ways in which performance is assessed from the aforementioned

indicators.

II.   Appraisal by Reporting Officer:

The Director of each zone is the reporting officer of the Curators in that zone who appraises the employee's performance and delivers the appraisal to the employee through the Reviewing Officer i.e. Director General, NCSM. Appraisal by Reporting Officer is through critical examination and study of the work report submitted along with the self-appraisal form.

III.   Appraisal by Reviewing Officer:

The reviewing Officer in case of all Curators is the Director General, NCSM who objectively looks at the self-appraisal of the candidate, report provided by the corresponding Reporting Officer and the overall performance of the of the employee. Based on these inputs, a critical appraisal is made to agree or, to upgrade or downgrade the marks awarded with recording of justification for such an action. The entire appraisal with its contents is communicated to the employee.

4. Proposed System

NCSM is a scientific organization and has adopted FCS and MFCS based on the approval by Ministry of Culture. The Committee also felt that there is a need to review the appraisal system of Curators in NCSM, who are doing different kind of activities for Science Communication including R&D, public interactions, outreach activities, development of technology etc. Many times the efforts done by Curators for undertaking the maintenance activities of exhibits, public interactions, especially in smaller centres, are not truly and objectively reflected in the present assessment system of NCSM. The committee felt that NCSM should encourage research activities and quality publications by Curators in order to make it more relevant as a scientific organization, which should be captured in the new appraisal system. The Committee also deliberated on a Performance Mapping System of Council of Scientific & Industrial Research (CSIR), which gives due weightage to number of activities including research, publication, outreach activities etc. After reviewing the appraisal system and policies of NCSM and similar systems in other scientific organizations like CSIR, it is strongly felt that the self-appraisal methodology is the best form of evaluation that is completely transparent and can be made highly objective. In the new system, the concept of reporting officer and reviewing officer has been done away with. This would make the process of assessment easier, simpler and straightforward.

A novel method has been designed to capture the work outputs and outcomes of the scientist through a questionnaire given below. The scientists are expected to provide detailed/additional relevant information at appropriate places as Annexures suitably marked/identified which in their opinion truly reflects the measure of performance.

The proposed system also has three stages of evaluation which are as follows:

Stage I : Self Appraisal by Curator (by filing a questionnaire);

Stage II : Evaluation by Collegium which is done by assigning marks based on the inputs provided by the Curator through the Self-Appraisal Questionnaire;

Stage III : Evaluation by Empowered Committee based on the inputs provide by the Collegium;

Individual forms have been designed to be filled by the Curator, the Collegium and the empowered committee.

4.1   Stage I: Self-Appraisal

The purpose of the self-appraisal is to seek relevant information in a manner that would clearly bring out the contributions/achievements, etc. of the Curator for objective evaluation by the Collegium.

Goals of the Appraisal Process
*   facilitate communication of all aspects of performance between the Curator and the Collegium/Empowered Committee
*   identify areas in which improvement and learning will help the Curator become more successful in the future, allowing him/her to make further contributions to NCSM
*   identify individual development needs, desires and plans
*   establish a permanent record of the employee's work history, which is as straight-forward and objective as possible
*   serve as one of the basis for assessment for promotion and
*   incorporate goals for meeting career development plan of the Curator.

Considering the above, a questionnaire has been designed for the Curator. This has two parts. Part I has 2 questions common to Curator in Pay Level 10 to Level 14 of the 7th CPC scale. Part I captures most important achievements of the Curator sector- wise for the past year. The Curator has to list sector-wise contribution in one or more areas: public goods/private goods/strategic goods/societal goods. The broad definitions of Public, Private, Social and Strategic Goods are detailed below:

I.   **Public**

Research as reflected through publications, articles, development of standards, databases, etc. related to the core objectives of NCSM, could be classified under public goods as they meet the criteria of non-rivalry and non- excludability.

II.   **Private**

Consultancy services, certification and testing services, and sponsored activities are considered as private goods as beneficiary preferences is reflected in their willingness to pay for these services. Intellectual property, particularly patents, technologies, products, processes and copyrights are in the private domain, but public funds have been used both at their generation (project) stage and at the patenting stage.

III. **Social /Societal**

Social/Societal good element is evident in science communication activities, which is intended to create science & technology awareness amongst the general public including children both in the museum/science centre and outside specially in outreach activities. Delivering of Popular science lectures, science demonstration lectures, mentoring students in the Innovation hubs and other similar activities are part of Curator's job profile. These activities may also result in generating interest in science & innovation amongst the public and children in particular. Maintenance of the exhibits, collection of S & T artefacts, their preservation and restoration for the future generation is also an important area of work of the Curators.

IV. **Strategic**

Strategic goods are those that are visible in the activities directly related to achieving self-reliance by generation of sponsorship for activities and programmes, development of display technologies and services that meet the national/indigenous needs for various categories of museums for which no solution is available or it is a novel solution and enables creating technological options and 'resource centers', 'spin-offs', etc.

Part II has 3 questions that need to be answered by Curators only those in Level 13 and above. The Curators have to fill the Questionnaire as detailed in Appendix-A and have to provide detailed information through annexures wherever required along with other basic details based on the Work Report format provided in Appendix-B. *It is not expected that all sections of Appendix-B will be relevant* to *the concerned Curator and will be filled-in.* ONLY those sections/sub-sections that are closely relevant to the concerned Curator need to be responded to or filled-in. This entire set has to be forwarded to the Chairman of the Collegium.

Questionnaire - Part 1

Common to all (those in Pay Level 10 to 12 & Pay Level 13 & above scales)

Sl. No.	Question (Provide additional supporting information as annexures in the Work Report format as per Appendix-B wherever necessary. It is not expected that all sections of Appendix-B will be relevant to the concerned Curator and will be filled-in ONLY those sections/sub—sections that are closely relevant to the concerned Curator need to be responded to or filled-in.)
1.	What do you consider to be your most important achievements sector-wise for the past year? List sector-wise contribution in one or more areas. (Public goods/private goods/strategic goods/societal goods).
2.	Define your major knowledge portfolio — state whether you are involved in Knowledge Generation, Knowledge Development or Knowledge Management. Please elaborate by filling in the appropriate sections of the form provided in Appendix B.

Questionnaire- Part II
(for those who are in Pay Level 13 & above scales)

3	How has your contribution enhanced the prestige of the Museum/Centre/Council?
4	In light of your current capabilities, your performance against past objectives, and your future personal growth and/or job aspirations, what activities and tasks would you like to focus on during the next year? Again, also think of development and experiences outside of job skills related to personal aims, fulfillment, passions, etc.
5	What sort of training/experiences would benefit you in the next year? Not just job-skills - also your natural strengths and personal passions you'd like to develop - you, your work and team can benefit from these training/experiences.

4.2 Stage II: Collegium

After submission of the self-appraisal by the scientist, the Committee recommends two-level evaluation process to be followed. The first level of evaluation is by a Collegium to be duly constituted by the **DG, NCSM** in case for different grades/levels of Curators and the second level of evaluation is through an Empowered Committee.

The following is the proposed composition of the Collegiums for evaluation of Scientists in their respective Grades to be constituted by the **DG, NCSM.**

Collegium No	Curator Grade	Composition of Collegium	
		Group/Grade	Nos.
I	Curator 'B' and Curator 'C'	Curator E/F in the zone	1
		Director of the Zone	1
		One member of the Empowered Committee other than DG, NCSM	1
II	Curator 'D', 'E'	Curator F/G	1
		Director of the Zone	1
		One member of the Empowered Committee other than DG, NCSM	1
III	Curator 'F' & 'G' other than DDG, Directors of the Museum/Centre	Director of the zone	1
		Two member of the Empowered Committee other than DG, NCSM	2

DDG/Directors of NCSM shall submit the Appraisal Report to the Empowered Committee whose constitution is detailed in 4.3.1.

The Collegium should segregate the self-appraisal forms received as per the major knowledge portfolio defined by the Curator. The evaluation of the Curator will be based on the knowledge portfolio defined herein.

Director from the zone or the Director/DDG nominated from the Empowered Committee, whoever is Senior, will act as the Chairman of the Collegium. However, it may be seen that total number of members in the Collegium including the Chairman should be odd.

4.2.1 Computation of Resultant Score of Curator:

The Collegium evaluates the responses provided by the concerned Curator to the Questionnaire (Part I or Parts I & II as the case may be) and assigns a score after careful study. Depending on the performance of the individual, the score of the candidate assigned by the collegium will be in the band of 0.5 to 1.0 (both included and exceptions in cases as applicable/explained later).

It is recommended that the score assigned should relate to the overall performance of the Museum/Centre. DG, NCSM may choose through consultations and discussions among the members of Empowered Committee and Collegium a robust and reasonable method to determine performance average museum/centre score that is normalized to a score of 1.0 before start of this exercise.

Sr. No.	Possible resultant Individual Score	Equivalent to	Grade
1.	1.1	Exceptional	Exceptional forms part of Outstanding
2.	1.0	90 & Above	Outstanding
3.	0.9	85-89	Excellent
4.	0.8	70-84	Very Good
5.	0.7	60-69	Good
6.	0.6	50-59	Satisfactory
7.	0.5	40-49	Need Improvement

Individuals within the Museum/Centre with exceptional performance or "outlier" can be given an individual score of 1.1. It may be noted that "outlier" or "Exceptional" forms part of the "outstanding" but is known as the "exceptional" among outstanding. At the same time if the performance of the candidate is far below par and far away from the Centre/Council average, he may be graded below 0.7 stating clearly the reason that would be communicated to the candidate.

A general explanation of the grades but not necessary exact is given below:

Exceptional: Though "Exceptional" forms part of "outstanding", these cases are "exceptional among outstanding "; these cases* will be put up by the Museum/Centre to the Empowered Committee for listing as "Jewels of NCSM". Individuals within the Council with exceptional performance or "outlier" can be given an individual score of 1.1. Exceptional means the performance is exemplary and falls into the top 16% of the Curators. Besides his performance in all round sectors/goods (public, private, societal, strategic, etc.), should have also received recognition in the form of prestigious awards, fellowship of Academy, etc.

Outstanding (90 and above): Outstanding means **significantly exceeds NCSM's expectations.** This is reserved for those whose performance during the review period falls into the top 33% of the Curator at their level. As a motivating factor and as a strong support to pursue the outstanding work the candidate receiving the "Outstanding" grade will be a potential candidate for assessment ahead of the normal residency period* in his present Curator grade if the same consistency is maintained.

Excellent (85-89): Excellent means **significantly exceed expectations** of the **Museum/Centre/Council**. This is for those whose performance during the review period is found to be above the average performance of the laboratory Museum/Centre.

Very Good(70-84): Very Good means that candidate **just meets expectations of the Museum/Centre/Council**; however there is scope for making significant contributions that would exceed the expectations.

Good (60-69): Good means the candidate just **falls short of expectations** of the **Museum/Centre/Council** and in achieving NCSM's superior standards.

Satisfactory (50-59): Needs to demonstrate additional effort and or undertake further skill development. Identifies an area that would benefit from additional attention and resources and requires specific recommendations for areas of development.

Need Improvement (40-49): Does not meet expectations of the **Museum/Centre/Council** and well-below average. Requires an immediate improvement plan with specific deadlines to meet goals to bring performance up to an acceptable level.

" The normal residency period and all related qualifying criteria including earlier/delayed assessment for a curator in his corresponding grade is governed by the policy adopted by NCSM.

The form designed for the Curator to be filled-in is given in Appendix - A, whereas the form for evaluation by the Collegium is presented in Appendix-C. The Collegium also evaluates the following Behavioral aspects and assesses the Curators accordingly. Please note that this is only a qualitative evaluation and therefore no marks are to be awarded.

A.   PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

1. Personality
2. Maturity and logical thinking
3. Level of self-confidence
4. Initiative and drive
5. Mental alertness

B.   PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

1. Perception of organizational role
2. Competence to handle the job
3. Ability to Communicate (both in speech and writing)
4. Dedication and commitment to the job
5. Comprehension and appreciation of new development related to his job

C.   MANAGERIAL CAPABILITIES

1. Ability to get along with colleagues
2. Willingness to accept responsibility
3. Decision making ability
4. Crisis handling
5. Qualities of Leadership

This is also presented as a part of Appendix-C for evaluation by the Collegium. The Collegium will state its comments on the overall qualities of the Curator including areas of strengths and if necessary areas needing improvement. Along with the evaluation of the Curator, the Collegium will also submit its opinion on the integrity of the scientist. The integrity and ethics part is mandatory

as per the GOI OM No. 51/ 5/72 –Estt "A" 20 May 1972 which is reproduced in Appendix- E. The evaluation report of the Collegium is then submitted to the Empowered Committee which does the final evaluation.

4.3   Stage III : Empowered Committee

The assessment of the Collegium would be reviewed by a duly constituted Empowered committee.

4.3.1   Constitution of the Empowered Committee

The Empowered Committee will be constituted by the Director General, NCSM. The Empowered Committee will consist of 2/4/6 Directors of NCSM. The Chairman of the empowered Committee will be DG, NCSM. However, it may be seen that the total number of members including Chairman in the Committee should be odd.

The inputs of the Collegium are then carried forward to the Empowered Committee which can give its final evaluation and assign a suitable grade. This grade is communicated to the Curator. The Empowered Committee can revise the marks awarded by the collegium citing clear and unambiguous justification. It is recommended that any upgrade or downgrade of marks at this stage can be considered based on the following:

  i) **Level of the Museum/Centre (National/Regional/SRSC/DSC level)**
  ii) **Average performance of the Museum/Centre**

The forms designed for the empowered committee are given at Appendix-D. Forms generated as a result of the evaluation by the concerned collegium and the Empowered Committee as per Appendices C and D are communicated to the employee.

4.3.2.   Empowered Committee for Deputy Director General, NCSM / Directors of museums/centres

The Empowered Committee for DDG, NCSM/Directors of Museums will consist of three members: i. DG, NCSM as Chairman and ii. Two members from the Governing Body, NCSM.

4.3.3. The Appraisal of APAR of DG, NCSM shall be done by the Chairman, Governing Body, NCSM.

5. Concluding Remarks

It is proposed to integrate the performance evaluation procedure described in this document with the proposed NCSM ERP solution that will further automate the acquisition of information such as leave records, publication and scientific contribution details through modules like OASIS or any other equivalent portal.

This is proposed to be made available as a web based application with a back end data base that can serve as a repository for compiling information which can be very useful for Curators during their review/assessment for the corresponding residency period for submission to Level I screening Committee for assessment under MFCS as may be amended from time to time.

National Council of Science Museums

Name of the Museum/Centre: _____

Performance Mapping of Curators

Assessment Year _____ To _____

BASIC INFORMATION

Identification Information :

Name of Employee :

Employee ID :

Group/Grade   :

Date of Birth :

Division   :

Date of Joining   :

Category   :

Email ID   :

Mobile No.   :

About the Evaluation Period

 Status   :

 Part year or full year   :

 Members-Collegium   :

 Members-Empowered Committee   :

 Have you filled the annual return on immovable property
 during this evaluation period   :   Yes/No

Categories information (for the period under evaluation)

 NCSM Core Subject Area :

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT(S)

Qualification	Specialization/Subject(s)	Year	Division(0-Not Applicable)	University/Institute	Additional Information

EMPLOYMENT DETAILS

Grade/ Post	Estt./Lab/Instt.	Duration From	Duration to	Remarks

LEAVE RECORD

Please list leave record for the year being evaluated (include all leave)

Sl. No	Type of Leave	No. of Days

Verified by COA/AO employee

Signature of the

Date:

Date:

Questionnaire - Part I

Common to all (those in Pay Level 10 to 12 & Pay Level 13 & above scales)

Please provide detailed/ additional relevant information at appropriate places as Annexures suitably marked/ identified in the Work Report format as per Appendix-B wherever necessary. It is not expected that all sections of Appendix-B will be relevant to the concerned scientist and will be filled-In. ONLY those sections/sub-sections that are closely relevant to the concerned Curator need to be responded to or filled-in.

1. What do you consider to be your most important achievements sector-wise for the past year? List sector-wise contribution in one or more areas (Public goods / Private goods/ Strategic goods/ Societal goods).

2. Define your major knowledge portfolio - state whether you are involved in Knowledge Generation, Knowledge Development or Knowledge Management. Please elaborate by filling in the appropriate sections of the form provided in Appendix B.

<u>Signature of the Employee</u>

Place:

Date:

<u>**Questionnaire — Part II**</u>

(For only those in Pay Level 13 & above scales)

1.   How has your contribution enhanced the prestige of the Centre/Museum/Council?

2.   In light of your current capabilities, your performance against past objectives, and your future personal growth and/ or job aspirations, what activities and tasks would you like to focus on during the next 2-3 years. Again, also think of development and experiences outside of job skills- related to personal aims, fulfillment, passions, etc

3.   What sort of training/experience would benefit you in the next year? Not just job- skills-also your natural strengths and personal passions you'd like to develop - you, your work and team can benefit from these

<u>Signature of the Employee</u>

Place:
Date :

WORK REPORT FORMAT

(It is not expected that all sections/sub-sections of Appendix-B will be relevant to the concerned Curator and will be filled-in.

ONLY those sections/sub-sections that are closely relevant to the concerned Curator need to be responded to or filled)

Section I

Kindly ensure that there   is no repetition **while providing information.**

1.1   Participation in the "R&D/R&D Managerial activities" of the Museum/Centre:

SI. No.	Title of Project	Project Category	Participating Agencies	Your Role as defined

1.2   Participation in "major programmes" and/ or facility/exhibit/exhibition creation" identified at the District/Sub-Regional/Regional/National level:

SI. No.	Title of the Project	Coordinating Agency	Contribution being made by you as representative of your organization*

1.3   Acquisition of new artefacts and conservation/renovation of old artefacts, operation and maintenance of "major facilities" of the Museum/Centre:

SI. No.	Title of the Facility	Your role in brief*	Beneficiaries

1.4.   Enlist notable contributions (upto ten, indicating status like individual achievement, output of a team work/collaborative work etc.)
(not exceeding 150 words)

1.5   Highlight the significance/impact of your work on Council/Society/ Environment/ Industry/Nation as a whole

*(not more than 100 words) *not more than ten words.*

<div align="center">Section II</div>

1. Publications

1.1 Papers published in Journals (during the year):

(i) In peer reviewed/SCI Journal *(Indicate the total Impact Factor and citations of your publications)*
(ii) In non-peer reviewed Journal
(iii) Review papers (non SCI Journal)

SI. No	Authors	Title of the Article	Year of Publication	Name of Journal	Country	Vol No. Issue, Pages	DOI

Note: Curator is fully responsible for the accuracy of their references. All references must include:
- Author/editor last name plus initials (for six or fewer authors; if there are more than six authors, use "et al." after the sixth) or authoring agency
- Year of publication
- Full title of article or chapter (lowercase)
- Title of journal (abbreviated according to standard engineering journal) or book/proceedings in title case
- City/state/country of publication and name of publisher
- Volume and inclusive page numbers
- DOI number, if available.

1.2 Papers published in Conference Proceedings

SI. No.	Authors	Title of the Article	Date/Year	Name of Conference	Venue	Vol No. Pages	Publisher

1.3 Contribution to Books *(indicate total number of chapters and pages)*

SI. No.	Editors	Title of the chapter	Year of Publication	Title of Book	Country	Edition No.	Publisher

1.4 Enlist institutional publications brought out:
(specifying the nature like Technical brochures, Feasibility reports, Training manuals, Publicity brochures, Organizational plans, Annual reports, Performance reports, Protocols, Brochures, IPR documents, documentation of artefacts, Innovation declaration form etc.)

2. **Patents filed and granted during the assessment period** *(indicate separately* total/ *number of national and international patents filed and granted, also provide details as per format given below).*

SI No.	Title	Country	Filed on (Date)	Granted on (Date)	Names of other inventors

3. **Financial Contribution:**

   3.1 Consultancy/Sponsorship project undertaken during assessment period:

SI. No.	Title of the project	Project Type/Category	Amount received with your initiative	Govt./ Industry	Internal Reserve generation

   3. 2 Technology / Process / Know-how transferred, if any:

SI. No	Title	Period during which developed	Date of transfer	Organization/Industry	Total Fees realized	Your Role*

4. **Technology / Process / Product development:**

SI. No	Title	Year of Development	Your contribution in the development*

   not more than ten words.

5. **Others** *(specify, if any)*

   In case your work such as 'spin-offs' etc., cannot be depicted in terms of the above parameters, you may like to quantify your contributions in your own way and while doing so you may refer No *'Section/Para No (s), in case such points are already reflected elsewhere in this report.*

Section III

Kindly provide details on the following, whatever applicable, total information being within 300 words:

1. Outreach activities/Field world undertaken indicating the number of days involved during the year.

2. External Cash Flow (ECF) catalyzed (i.e. funds received from Govt. Departments/agencies etc. to carry out specified task) and budget handled (NCSM & other Agencies).

3. Participation and contributions made for strategic sector

4. Have you been able to create / add new clients to the organization

5. Contribution to indigenous technology / component / product/ device/ engineering systems design & development

6. Activities leading to foreign exchange saving

7. S&T Cooperation established with other countries including regional collaboration

8. Assistance provided for national / international institution building

9. National / International training programs organized

10. Your contribution towards upliftment of science & technology awareness in the country

11. Any other point, not covered so far, to complete the spectrum of your achievements

Section IV

Kindly provide information on following lines, whatever applicable, within 300 words:

1. Participation in policy formulation and / or decision making

2. Formulating/ amending existing rules/procedures (or better effective functioning of the organization

3. Interacting within NCSM, with other R&D Organizations, Govt. Departments, reputed NGOs, Industry and / or International Agencies for project formulation or meeting effectively the objectives of identified programmes

4. Obtaining/processing for financial approval and associated management for implementing megaprojects.

5. Providing major service to your organization/any other organization assigned by the Ministry in its efficient functioning & image building.

6. Membership in organizational /national/international committees.

7. Important administrative responsibilities taken within NCSM & in other organizations and success achieved.

8. Major events organized as leader / coordinator.

9. Major initiative taken towards better positioning of your organization.

10. Any other dimension of your contribution essentially depicting your leadership quality.

EVALUATION- COLLEGIUM
National Council of Science Museums
(Name of your Museum/Centre)
Performance Mapping of Scientists

Assessment Year _____ to _____

Employee Name _____   Employee ID _____

Pen Picture- Behavioral Aspects

(Please note that this is only a qualitative evaluation by ticking and therefore no marks are to be awarded)

Sl. No	Category	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Needs to be improved
A	**PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES**				
1	Personality				
2	Maturity and logical thinking				
3	Level of Self Confidence				
4	Initiative and drive				
5	Mental alertness				
B	**PROFESSIONAL ATTRIBUTES**				
1	Perception of organizational role				
2	Competence to handle the job				
3	Ability to communicate (both in speech & writing)				
4	Dedication and commitment to job				
5	Comprehension and appreciation of new development related to his job				
C	**MANAGERIAL CAPABILITIES**				
1	Ability to get along with colleagues				
2	Willingness to accept responsibility				
3	Decision making ability				
4	Crisis Handling				
5	Qualities of leadership				
D	**INTIGRITY AND ETHICS**				
	(Please refer Appendix 'E" before filling this column)	Impeccable ☐ Beyond Doubt ☐ Tobe Monitored ☐			
E	**Basis for gradation**				
F	**Any Adverse Comment**	(if yes, give details separately)			

Total Individual Score   :   _____

(Member 1)   (Member 2)   (Member 3)
                              Members Collegium

Place :   Date:

Evaluation – Empowered Committee
National Council of Science Museums
(Name of the Museum/Centre)
Performance Mapping of Scientists

Assessment year _____ To _____

Employee Name _____   Employee ID_____

We concur with the individual score as   :   _____
assigned by the collegium

The individual score may be upgraded to   :   _____

Give reasons justifying the upgradation of in   :   _____

The score may be downgraded to   :   _____

Give reasons justifying the down gradation of
the final score   :   _____

Final score of the individual   :   _____

General Comments on Appraisal   :   _____

Grade
Assign equivalent score out
Of the corresponding range.   _____
Please refer adjoining table

Individual Score	Equivalent %
1.1	100
1.0	90-99
0.9	85-89
0.8	70-84
0.7	60-69
0.6	50-59
0.5	40-49

(Member 1)   **(Member 2)**

(DG, NCSM & Chairman, Empowered Committee)

Place: Date:

Integrity and Ethics: Please read the following guidelines before evaluating the employee for integrity and ethics.

Guidelines issued by the Government of India. Department of Personnel, regarding, 'Integrity.'. vide O.M. No.51/5/72-ESTT 'A ' dared 20 Moy 1972.

In every form of confidential Report there should be a column regarding integrity to enable the Reporting Officer to make his remarks on the integrity of the Government servant reported upon. The following guidelines should be followed in the manner of making entries in the column relating to integrity:

a) Supervisory officer should maintain a confidential diary in which instances which create suspicion about the integrity of a subordinate should be noted from time to time and action to verify the truth of such suspicion should be taken expeditiously by making confidential enquiries departmentally or by referring the matter to the special police establishment. At the time of recording the Annual Confidential Report his diary should be consulted and the materials in it utilized for filing. In the column relating to integrity, If the column is not filled on account of the unconfirmed nature of the suspicious, further action should be taken in accordance with the Following sub-paragraphs.

b) The column pertaining to integrity in the character Roll should be left blank and a separate secret note about the doubts and suspicions regarding the Government servant's integrity should be recorded simultaneously and followed up.

c) A copy of the secret note should be sent together with the character roll to the next superior officer who should ensure that the follow up action is taken expeditiously.

d) If as a result of the follow-up action, a Government servant is exonerated, his integrity should be certified and an entry made in the character roll.

e) If suspicions regarding his integrity are confirmed, this fact can also be recorded and duly communicated to the Government servant concerned.

There are occasions when a reporting officer cannot in fairness to himself and to the government servant reported upon, either certify integrity or make an adverse entry or even be in possession of any information which would enable him to make a secret report to the head of the department. Such instances can occur when a government servant is serving in a remote station and the reporting officer has not had occasion to watch his work closely or when a government servant has worked under the reporting officer only for a brief period or has been on a long leave etc. In all such cases, the Reporting officer should make an entry in the integrity column to the effect that he has not watched the government servant's work for sufficient time to be able to make any definite remark or that he has heard nothing against the government servant's integrity, as the case may be. This would be a factual statement which there can be no objection. But it is necessary that a superior officer should make every effort to form a definite judgment about the integrity of those working under him, as early as possible, so that he may be able to make a positive statement.