



## **Support to the anti-corruption strategy of Azerbaijan (AZPAC)**

### **Technical Paper on Performance Evaluation System (PES) For Civil Servants in Azerbaijan**

**Prepared by:  
Hans-Joachim Rieger (Germany)**

**PC -TC (2008) 53**

*Support to the Anti-corruption Strategy of Azerbaijan (AZPAC)*

*A project supported by USAID and implemented by Council of Europe in cooperation with the Commission on Combating Corruption of Azerbaijan*

*For more information, please contact:*

<i>Technical Co-operation Department Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs Council of Europe 67075 Strasbourg CEDEX France</i>	<i>Tel: + 33 3 88 41 29 76 Fax: + 33 3 90 21 56 50 Email: <a href="mailto:lado.lalicic@coe.int">lado.lalicic@coe.int</a></i>
--	--

*This document has been produced with the financial support of the USAID. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinions of the Council of Europe.*

## Performance Evaluation System (PES)

This Technical Paper was produced as a follow up of the AZPAC Project "Training on Ethics and Performance Evaluation" held in Baky on 15-16 September 2008.

Bellow is the summary of the expert's opinion on the draft Civil Service Commission (CSC) Regulations for Evaluating the Performance of Civil Servants (PES).

The legal background of the PES is described sufficiently. The following recommendations are forwarded regarding the draft Regulation and its implementation.

1. I recommend describing the Objective of the Performance Evaluation System more precisely. The objective of the system is the basis of the system. The objective of the system might be:

- for salary increase or rewards on top of the existing salary (backwards performance evaluation).
- performance (backwards performance evaluation combined with potential criteria).
- for HR Development and career planning (backwards performance evaluation combined with strong potential analyzes not only through performance evaluation system).

How ever the decision is made it will have consequences for the design of the PES instrument; these consequences are mentioned in the brackets above.

2. The second recommendation is to mention precisely the target group of the Performance Evaluation System together with all officials that are to be excluded. The following issues should be addressed regarding who is to be included or excluded from performance evaluation:

- PES to be applied to all Public Servants of 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> degree?
- To all staff members of all ages?
- To all positions/functions of each staff members?
- To disabled staff members?
- To those who have already received a promotion in the current year?
- Only to individuals or also to teams?

3. The third recommendation is to be clear about the consequences of the results of PES. For excellent performer, good performer, satisfactory and not satisfactory performers it must be clear what they can expect out of the PES.

In the seminar the following remarks/suggestions were made:

- For good and excellent performers:
  - Premium
  - Promotion
  - Salary increase
  - For satisfactory
  - Discussion with supervisor about improvement of performance and needed assistance
  - Training needs
  - Sharing development ideas
  - For not satisfactory
  - Analyse of gaps
  - Positive assistance programme:

- Training offer
- Assistance offer
  
- For poor performers
  - Strict control
  - Critical feedback
  - Warnings
  - Disciplinary proceedings

4. The fourth recommendation is about the process of performance evaluation. The time period and the frequencies for evaluation are clarified already. The following remarks/recommendations were made:

- Will there be any exceptions?
- It is important that every evaluation will be based only on the impressions and measures of the last year.
- Only supervisors who have received training should be allowed to evaluate their staff.
- It is important for the acceptance of the system that the evaluation is done and explained in a participatory way. Therefore I suggest that the supervisor should introduce the evaluation process to all staff members together. This will increase the transparency of the system.
- It should be also mentioned that the supervisor only is responsible for the evaluation and he/she is independent especially from his/her supervisors.
- If there is a premium for good performance, it is important to specify how the calculation done and when is the payment executed.
- It must be clarified how to deal with conflicts and disagreements in the evaluation.

5. The fifth recommendation is to base the performance evaluation system on job profiles/priority tasks observed. After description of the job profiles/priority tasks by the particular supervisor a selection of relevant criteria related the job profiles/priority tasks have to be done. Relevant questions for the description of the job profiles/priority tasks are:

- What are the specific (precisely defined) tasks of the civil servant?
- Which are the extraordinary tasks (arising within the evaluation period) of the civil servant?
- What are the critical success factors in the civil servant's job?
- It is helpful to limit the priority tasks to a maximum of five.

6. The sixth recommendation is about the criteria for performance evaluation.

- The criteria in the proposal are a mixture of input, output and potential criteria. It is necessary to divide the set of criteria into performance relevant criteria (input/output) and potential criteria (the latter used generally only for promotion).
- The criterion "work discipline" is difficult to grade on a performance evaluation-type scale. If there are problems with the work discipline it should lead to disciplinary consequences, not be integrated as a component of performance evaluation.
- It is easiest (and therefore recommended) to focus on the following three criteria: quantity; quality; behaviour and communication.
- A definition of each criteria - whether it is a performance (input or output) or a potential one - is needed.

7. The seventh recommendation is about the scale and standards for evaluating performance.

- The existing scale from excellent to not satisfactory is suitable.
- I would suggest to use numbers in addition to the description to calculate an overall result for the performance.
- For all criteria there must be a description developed. It should be described what performance in the particular job must be observed to receive an “excellent”, a “good”, a “satisfactory” or a “not satisfactory”.
- It is important that the description of the observation must be linked to the description of the priority task. With this it is also possible to formulate performance standards – i.e. a definition of what performance description qualifies a civil servant for which evaluation (good, satisfactory etc) in a given function/job.
- Standards can only be described if comparison groups exist. It is necessary to clearly define comparison groups (e.g. “all lawyers: or “all staff members in classification 8”).
- It is necessary for a discussion between all evaluators within a given institution to take place so that the standards are harmonised.
- With the described standards it will be possible to switch the performance evaluation system from a criteria-based one to an objective-based system (usually connected with the concept of Management by Objectives/MbO), i.e. where performance is simply evaluated on the basis of the achievement of objectives set for each civil servant.
- The best mark is “excellent”. This mark should not be given too often. I believe that with a good training and preparation it will be possible to influence the supervisors for a realistic evaluation. If this is not possible it will be necessary to define a quota for the proportion of civil servants that receive the best mark.
- Assistance and help for harmonisation should be given to the supervisors. A second evaluator (for example the head of the Human Resources Department) to harmonise standards and to overlook the evaluation of supervisors should be taken into account.
- Guidelines for the system and for the methods of evaluation should be provided to evaluators. Chapters about “How to avoid assessment mistakes”, “Taking notes, observation programme” etc should be included.
- A proposal for a training programme PES for supervisors is in the appendix to this Technical Paper. Also basic information about PES for staff members is recommended.

8. The last recommendation is about the further processing of the data.

- It must be clarified how the stock keeping (where the files and documents are kept and registered and for how long), the documentation and the filing will be handled.
- It is also important to periodically assess the results of the performance evaluation system to check they are not illegitimately biased towards a particular group (for example men or women) or department/organisational unit.

**Attachment: Proposed Agenda for Training Supervisors responsible for Performance Evaluation (Evaluators)**

**Performance Evaluation System (PES)**

**Proposed Agenda**

The overall objective is to train supervisors to implement the PES in practise.

**Target group:** up to 16 supervisors, who will execute the PES in Azerbaijan.

**Objectives:**

The training should enable participants to:

- have a clear understanding about the instrument “PES”
- describe relevant priority tasks for their staff
- operationalize the different criterion related to the described priority tasks
- communicate with their staff members about the performance evaluation and the performance expectation
- avoid mistakes in implementing the PES

**1st day (PES)**

09:00 am	<p>Official opening of the workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of trainer and participants</li> <li>• Expectations</li> <li>• Content</li> <li>• Organization</li> <li>• Timing</li> </ul> <p>The PES System</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulation</li> <li>• Procedure</li> <li>• Forms for Evaluation</li> </ul>	Trainer
10:30 – 11:00 am	Coffee break	
11:00 – 12:30	<p>Exercise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Description of priority tasks for selected jobs</li> <li>2. Presentation and discussion</li> </ol>	Trainer / groupwork

0:30-1:30 pm	Lunch break	
1:30 -3:00 pm	<p>Exercise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Choose two criterion relevant for the described task! Describe what you have to observe to give a mark "excellent", "good", "satisfactory" or "not satisfactory"?</li> <li>2. What is the standard you expect from the job holder on that particular job.</li> <li>3. Do the same Exercise with one potential criterion</li> </ol>	Trainer / groupwork
3:00 pm	Coffee Break	
3:30 – 5:00pm	Presentation of results of the exercise	Trainer

## 2<sup>nd</sup> day Psychological background

09:00 am	<p>Communication</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How to deliver the evaluation talk with a staff member</li> <li>2. Conflicts</li> <li>3. Conflict resolution</li> </ol>	Trainer
10:30 – 11:00 am	Coffee break	
11:00 – 12:30	<p>Exercise (role play):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prepare and conduct the communication with your staff member</li> <li>2. Presentation (optional with video feedback) and discussion</li> </ol>	Trainer ( group of pairs)
0:30-1:30 pm	Lunch break	
1:30 -3:00 pm	<p>Exercises:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Read the following article</li> <li>2. Which criterion can be evaluated in</li> </ol>	Trainer / Participant

	<p>this description?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. How would you evaluate the performance of the described person?</li> <li>4. Presentation and discussion about standards</li> </ol>	
3:00 pm	Coffee break	
3:30 – 5:00pm	<p>Final session</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avoiding evaluation mistakes</li> <li>2. Open questions</li> <li>3. Evaluation and closing</li> </ol>	Trainer