



PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL POLICY

Academic Year 2024- 25

1. Introduction

This policy outlines the performance appraisal system for the faculty and staff of Fairfield Institute of Management and Technology (FIMT). The objective is to ensure continuous professional growth, quality assurance, accountability, and institutional development in line with NAAC/IQAC recommendations and NEP 2020.

2. Objectives of the Appraisal System

- To evaluate and enhance the performance of teaching and non-teaching staff.
- To identify training and development needs.
- To promote a culture of academic excellence, innovation, and accountability.
- To ensure alignment of individual performance with institutional goals.
- To enable eligibility for promotion, increments, and recognitions.

3. Applicability

This policy applies to:

- All full-time and part-time teaching faculty
- Non-teaching, administrative and support staff

4. General Rules and Guidelines

1. The performance appraisal cycle is based on Academic year.
2. The performance appraisal for all employees under probation shall be done on completion of one year from their date of joining, upon which their employment will be confirmed or terminated or probation may be extended, based on their performance evaluation.
3. The performance appraisal of faculty and staff shall be done every year in the month of August.
4. Annual Increments & promotions for all staff shall be granted based purely on performance of the individual.
5. All employees shall be appraised by the immediate superior / reviewing authority.



6. The training needs of the employee shall also be discussed during the performance review and recorded in writing.
7. The performance appraisal copies to be filed in the personal file employee.

5. Components and Procedure of Teaching Staff Appraisal

The performance appraisal system at the college is a comprehensive, structured mechanism designed to assess the professional effectiveness and contributions of both teaching and non-teaching staff. It serves as a critical tool for quality assurance, institutional planning, and individual professional development.

The appraisal system for teaching faculty at Fairfield Institute of Management and Technology (FIMT) is designed to assess academic performance, institutional contributions, research output, and professional conduct. The evaluation is carried out annually through a comprehensive **Self-Appraisal Form**, verified by Academic In-Charge and reviewed by Directors and IQAC.

1. Appraisal Components and Marking Scheme

The maximum attainable score is 150 marks.

Criteria	Explanation	Marks
Educational Qualifications	Ph.D. – 5 marks, 2 Marks if pursuing) M.Phil/UGC NET – 2 marks; D.Lit/ Post Doc or other professional qualification – 2 marks	Max: 10
Total Teaching Experience	2 marks per year of teaching at UG, PG, research, or other teaching roles	Max: 10
Experience within FIMT	1 mark per year of service at FIMT, verified by Academic Head	Max: 5

NAAC ACCREDITED



FAIRFIELD

Institute of Management & Technology

Affiliated to GGSIP University & an 'A' Grade College by DHE, Govt. of NCT Delhi
Approved by AICTE, BCI & NCTE, Recognised under 2(f) of UGC Act of 1956



Teaching Lecture Duly Completed	1 marks per course paper handled; includes UG/PG levels and offline/online modes	Max: 5
Additional Teaching Through ASL Program	Up to 5 hours- 2 marks For next 5 to 10- 3 marks For more than 10- 5 marks	Max: 5
Departmental/Class-Level Activities	Based on academic engagements, mentoring or student involvement programs; grades assigned by participation and effectiveness	Max: 10
Student Feedback	Scored by Director in consultation with Academic In-Charge, based on structured student feedback	Max: 10
Academic Result	Based on Pass Percentage of Analytical /Theory Subject	Max: 10
Examination Duties	Includes question paper setting, invigilation, evaluation, etc.	Max: 10
Institutional Event Leadership	Faculties who organise events as Conveners/Co-Conveners (moots, conferences, seminars, FDPs, etc.) will be awarded additional points per event organised	Max: 15
Research & Development	Participation in FDPs, conferences, paper publications, book/chapter writing; verified by Research Cell	Max: 30 (5 per item)
Administrative Responsibilities	2 marks for each role (Dean, Coordinator, Program In-Charge, etc.)	Max: 10



FAIRFIELD

Institute of Management & Technology

Affiliated to GGSIP University & an 'A' Grade College by DHE, Govt. of NCT Delhi
Approved by AICTE, BCI & NCTE, Recognised under 2(f) of UGC Act of 1956



Additional Responsibility	Participation in NACC/NIRF/Admission Support/Branding of Institute	Max: 10
Professional Behaviour	Evaluated by HR based on: team coordination, timeliness, attitude toward policies, professional attire, respectful and ethical conduct	Max: 10

5.2 Appraisal Procedure

Self-Appraisal Submission

Each teaching staff member fills out the form annually, providing verifiable records of their academic and institutional contributions.

Verification and Remarks

- i. Academic In-Charge verifies performance details and student feedback.
- ii. Research Cell verifies publications and scholarly activities.
- iii. HR provides professional behavior remarks.

Evaluation and Grading

The Director of the particular school and Institutional Director will provide independent remarks and final grades.

IQAC Oversight

The IQAC compiles the appraisal data for institutional benchmarking, feedback analysis and planning of faculty development initiatives.

6. Components and Procedure of Non -Teaching Staff Appraisal

The performance appraisal system for non-teaching (administrative, technical, and support) staff at Fairfield Institute of Management and Technology (FIMT) is designed to evaluate job performance, skill development, accountability, and contribution to institutional efficiency. It ensures that every staff member is aligned with the institution's values of transparency, effectiveness, and service excellence.

The appraisal process is conducted annually through an **appraisal mechanism**, reviewed and assessed by immediate supervisor and finally evaluated by the Institutional Director or Principal. IQAC oversees the overall monitoring and feedback.

6.1 Appraisal Components and Marking Scheme

The performance appraisal for non-teaching staff is based on a 100-mark system covering key areas like daily work performance (30 marks), discipline and punctuality (20 marks), job-related skills (20 marks), teamwork (10 marks), participation in college events (10 marks) and training attended (10 marks). This structured process ensures fair evaluation, encourages professional growth, and recognizes both work quality and behavior. It supports a culture of accountability, improvement, and alignment with the institution's goals and values.

Criteria	Explanation	Marks
Job Performance and Work Efficiency	i. Timeliness and punctuality in task completion ii. Accuracy, consistency, and attention to detail iii. Initiative and problem-solving attitude iv. Task ownership and follow-through	30 Marks
Discipline and conduct	i. Attendance, punctuality, and leave management ii. Adherence to institutional policies and rules iii. Professional behavior and Integrity	20 Marks
Technical / Office Skills	i. Proficiency in tools like MS Office, ERP, data entry software ii. Record maintenance (files, registers, digital records) iii. Ability to handle correspondence and communication	20 Marks
Teamwork and Interpersonal Skills	i. Ability to work collaboratively with colleagues and departments ii. Effective communication and coordination with team members iii. Willingness to support and assist others when required	10 Marks
Participation in Institutional Activities	i. Contribution during events, admissions, exams, etc. ii. Volunteering for extra duties or institutional initiatives	10 Marks
Training and Skill Enhancement	i. Participation in skill development workshops ii. In-house training, ICT literacy programmes, etc.	10 Marks



6.2 Appraisal Procedure

Self-Appraisal Submission

Each non-teaching staff member fills out the prescribed Self-Appraisal Form, listing their roles, responsibilities, and accomplishments during the year.

Verification and Ratings by Supervisor

Immediate supervisors review and validate claims regarding job performance and participation in institutional activities and give scores to the performance.

Final Evaluation by Director

The institutional head reviews the overall score and provides a final grade with remarks for improvements, recognition, or further training.

IQAC Review and Record Keeping

IQAC consolidates the data to identify training needs, recognize outstanding performance, and track institutional HR development.

7. Confidentiality and Grievance Redressal

All appraisal records are confidential. In case of disagreement, a grievance redressal committee (including Director, senior faculty members, HR representative, and IQAC Coordinator) will review the case impartially.

8. Non-Retaliation Clause

No employee shall face discrimination or retaliation for raising a genuine grievance in good faith. The institution encourages open communication and transparency in performance evaluation processes.

9. Documentation and Record-Keeping

All performance appraisal records, including self-appraisal forms, supervisor evaluations, feedback reports, and final scores, shall be securely maintained by the **IQAC office** in coordination with the **Human Resource Department**. These records will be preserved for a minimum period of **five academic years** to ensure continuity, transparency, and audit readiness. Digital copies may also be maintained in a secure institutional database with restricted access.

10. Review and Policy Updates

This policy shall be reviewed biennially by the IQAC in consultation with the management and academic council to ensure relevance and effectiveness.



Considerations while preparing Inquiry Report

While preparing the findings/recommendations, following are considered:

1. Whether the language used (written or spoken), visual material or physical behaviour alleged by the complainant was of sexual nature
2. Whether the allegations or events follow logically and reasonably from the evidence
3. Credibility and consistency in the statements of complainant, respondent and witnesses and evidences recorded
4. Other similar facts etc. for e.g. if there have been any previous accounts of harassment pertaining to the complainant/respondent
5. Other cases filed before any other fora/agency/department and the result or report, whether having some basis or just to harass or humiliate or for some ulterior motive(s)
6. Both parties have been given an opportunity of being heard
7. A copy of the statements was made available to both parties enabling them to make representation against the findings