



Republic of the Philippines
DEPARTMENT of AGRARIAN REFORM

2

3

4

5

MEMORANDUM CIRCULAR No. 01
Series of 2013

6

7

8

TO : ALL ADJUDICATORS

9

10

11

12

13

**SUBJECT : GUIDELINES IN EVALUATING THE
PERFORMANCE OF DARAB ADJUDICATORS
USING A COMPREHENSIVE RATING SYSTEM**

14

15

16

PREFATORY STATEMENT

17

18

19

20

21

In order to expedite the disposition of agrarian disputes and cases, the Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board (DARAB) had intensified its efforts to initiate and adopt ways to improve, among others, its decision-making process and systems.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

One of the innovations and interventions designed to increase the average rate of resolution of cases is a unique but comprehensive rating system to evaluate the performance of the Adjudicators, hereafter referred to as the "Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Cards (APEC) Rating System". The APEC is instituted to enable the Board to closely monitor and evaluate the performance of each Adjudicator in all levels, whether regional or provincial, nationwide. This is instituted as a governance and management tool forming part of the performance evaluation system which consists of a set of quantifiable measures, targets, and weighted points that can facilitate or encourage the achievement of breakthrough results and performance through the effective and efficient monitoring and coordination of all Adjudicators.

35

36

37

38

39

40

Compared with other Presidential appointees, Adjudicators are the only third-level officials who are not covered by any performance evaluation system, such as the Career Executive Service Performance Evaluation System (CESPES) for Career Executive Service Officers (CESOs).

41

42

The proper monitoring of the Adjudicators' performance is necessary and vital in identifying who among the Adjudicators are

1 mostly efficient and effective in the disposition of cases, or who among
2 them has developed expertise in the resolution of particular types of
3 cases and can thus best be assigned to places encountering a deluge
4 of cases involving problematic landholdings. This rating system
5 accordingly aims to establish a more concrete criteria/basis in personnel
6 movements or for the reconsideration of one's place of assignment
7 (Adjudicator's sala), ascertain whether there is a need to recognize or
8 streamline the existing set up, and likewise serve as the quantifiable
9 basis in the grant of incentives, recognition, and promotion to deserving
10 Adjudicators.

11
12 Consistent with the goal of developing and strengthening the
13 Adjudicators' performance, the APEC Rating System is intended to
14 encourage creativity, innovativeness, efficiency, integrity, and
15 productivity in the public service by recognizing and rewarding
16 Adjudicators for their suggestions, superior accomplishments, and other
17 personal efforts and initiatives which contribute to the effectivity and
18 improvement of Department operations.

19
20 **SECTION 1. Coverage.** — This Memorandum Circular shall apply to all
21 Regional and Provincial Adjudicators (RARADs and PARADs) who are
22 handling cases in at least one (1) sala.

23
24 **SECTION 2. Definition of Terms.**

- 25
26 1. **Adjudicator's Performance Evaluation Card (APEC)**
27 **Rating System** – is the rating system adopted by DARAB
28 to evaluate the performance of its Adjudicators, on a
29 semestral basis, which consists of the following criteria:
30 Operational (resolution of cases/caseload management
31 and quality of decisions /social impact of the decisions),
32 Administrative (administrative work and support to
33 operations/others), and Behavioral (cooperation,
34 professionalism, initiative and integrity); and, for RARADs,
35 Supervision and Monitoring criteria;
36
37 2. **Administrative Criteria** – is part of the APEC Rating
38 System Criteria which bears a weight of thirty percent
39 (30%) of the over-all evaluation percentage for the
40 Adjudicator, which consist of administrative work and
41 support to operations of the different sectors of the
42 Department;
43

- 1 3. **APEC Individual Rating** – refers to the particular Rater or
- 2 Ratee’s raw score;
- 3
- 4 4. **APEC Average Rating** - refers to the total average score
- 5 of a particular Rater or Ratee;
- 6
- 7 5. **APEC Final Rating** – refers to the tabulated total score of
- 8 all the Raters and the Ratee;
- 9
- 10 6. **Behavioral Criteria** - is part of the APEC Rating System
- 11 Criteria which bears a weight of fifteen percent (15%) of the
- 12 over-all evaluation percentage, pertaining to the
- 13 cooperation, professionalism, initiative, and integrity of the
- 14 Adjudicator;
- 15
- 16 7. **Decisions with Social Impact** – mean timely-rendered
- 17 decisions involving the resolution or settlement of agrarian
- 18 disputes in highly controversial / flashpoint / urgent agrarian
- 19 cases, which carry social relevance;
- 20
- 21 8. **Grading Rate Scale** – refers to the manner by which the
- 22 Adjudicators’ evaluation shall be done, in accordance with
- 23 the following numerical ratings, guided by their
- 24 corresponding adjectival ratings:
- 25

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% -84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

- 26
- 27 9. **LCMS** - refers to the web-based “Legal Case Monitoring
- 28 System” of the Department;
- 29
- 30 10. **Operational Criteria** - is part of the APEC Rating System
- 31 Criteria which bears a weight of fifty five percent (55%) of
- 32 the total over-all evaluation percentage, covering all
- 33 aspects of the resolution of cases/caseload management,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

- as well as the quality of work/social impact of decisions rendered;
- 11. **PARAD** - refers to the Provincial Agrarian Reform Adjudicator;
 - 12. **Personnel Staff** – are the three (3) personnel of the Adjudicator consisting of the Clerk, Sheriff, and Legal Officer/Stenographer;
 - 13. **Radiating Adjudicator** – refers to an Adjudicator handling at least two (2) salas;
 - 14. **RARAD** - refers to the Regional Agrarian Reform Adjudicator;
 - 15. **Ratee** – refers to the Adjudicator himself assessing his/her semestral performance based on the APEC Rating System;
 - 16. **Rater** – refers to the individuals, other than the Ratee, who may either be the Personnel Staff, RARAD or PARAD as the case may be, Board Secretariat, and the Board, who shall each evaluate the performance of the Ratee in accordance with the APEC Rating System;
 - 17. **Sala** – refers to the Regional and Provincial Adjudication Office having the power to try and decide agrarian disputes and cases within its territorial jurisdiction;
 - 18. **Secretariat** – refers to the Office of the DARAB/Board Secretariat;
 - 19. **Temporary Radiating Adjudicators** – are those who are designated to handle sala/s for a period of less than thirty (30) days due to the absence or inability of the regular Adjudicator; and
 - 20. **The Board** – for purposes of this Rating System only, refers primarily to the three (3) Regular Members of the DARAB.

1 **SECTION 3. Statement of Policies.**

- 2 1. The APEC Rating System gives due regard to the
3 Adjudicator's accomplishment, quality of work, social
4 impact of his or her decisions, administrative competence,
5 cooperation with and support to other sectors of the
6 Department, professionalism, initiative, integrity, and, in the
7 case of Regional Adjudicators (RARADs), supervision and
8 monitoring of Provincial Adjudicators (PARADs).
9
- 10 2. The APEC Rating System is hereby implemented to foster
11 the improvement of individual efficiency, as well as the
12 promotion of organizational effectiveness.
13
- 14 3. The APEC Rating System involves the rating of the PARAD
15 by the following: himself or herself, the Personnel Staff of
16 the Adjudicator concerned, the RARAD exercising
17 supervision over him or her, the Board Secretariat, and the
18 Board. In turn, the RARAD shall be rated by all of the
19 foregoing, with the PARADs under him or her, rating the
20 extent and effectiveness of his/her monitoring and
21 supervisory efforts.
- 22 4. The applicability of the results of the APEC Rating System
23 is material for, but not limited to, promotion, movement,
24 designation, and incentives, as well as the basis for
25 corrective action.
26
- 27 5. The entire rating process of the APEC and the results
28 thereof shall be treated as highly confidential information.
29
- 30 6. Each PARAD who is assigned to a sala shall submit his/her
31 individual APEC as a Ratee, and shall rate his/her RARAD
32 in the criteria of supervision and monitoring of Provincial
33 Adjudicators as above-mentioned.
34
- 35 7. The Radiating Adjudicator, with two or more salas, shall
36 submit a number of APECs equivalent to the salas being
37 handled, *i.e., the RARAD radiating as PARAD shall submit*
38 *such number of APECs for RARAD and PARAD at the*
39 *same time, or a PARAD handling two or more salas shall*
40 *submit such number of APECs for each sala handled.*
41

- 1 8. The RARAD radiating as PARAD in a region, however,
2 shall not rate, as Rater, his/her own performance, either as
3 RARAD or PARAD.
4
- 5 9. The Adjudicator concurrently assigned to DARCO shall
6 submit an APEC only for the regional/provincial sala/s
7 being handled.
8
- 9 10. The Adjudicators assigned to DARCO without a designated
10 sala shall not be evaluated on the basis of the APEC
11 Rating System.
12
- 13 11. The Personnel Staff of an Adjudicator shall rate only the
14 behavioral dimension of the Adjudicator they work with.
15
- 16 12. The DARAB Secretariat shall rate only the following criteria:
17 resolution of cases/caseload management on the
18 operational dimension, administrative work on the
19 administrative dimension, and all items in the behavioral
20 dimension.
21
- 22 13. The DARAB Secretariat is principally tasked to collate and
23 compute the results/data of this System, present them to
24 the Board, monitor compliance with this Memorandum
25 Circular, and ensure the confidentiality of the APEC Rating
26 System.
27
- 28 14. The BOARD shall rate the following criteria: quality of
29 decisions/social impact of the decisions on the operational
30 dimension, attendance at meetings initiated by the Board,
31 and compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs.
32
- 33 15. For the purpose of rating the Adjudicator's performance in
34 caseload management, resolution of cases, and
35 administrative work, only the data or figures uploaded and
36 appearing in the LCMS shall be used.
37

38 **SECTION 4. Procedure.**

39

- 40 1. The Ratees and Raters shall download the pertinent APEC
41 forms from the Legal Case Monitoring System (LCMS).
42
- 43 2. The said APEC forms shall be used in rating the
44 performance of the Adjudicator concerned (as *the Ratee*,

1 *and as the Rater, as the case may be), for the preceding*
2 *semester.*

- 3
4 3. The Ratee and Raters shall accomplish rate simultaneously
5 his/her own performance and that of the Adjudicator
6 concerned, immediately after the end of each semester.

7
8 The rating of performance shall be guided by the following:

9
10 a) The PARAD who is handling a sala shall submit his/her
11 individual APEC as Ratee and shall rate his/her RARAD
12 for the criteria on (No. VII) supervision and monitoring of
13 PARADs;

14
15 b) The Radiating Adjudicator, who is handling two or more
16 salas, shall submit such number of APECs equivalent to
17 the salas being handled;

18
19 c) The RARAD shall submit his/her individual APEC as
20 Ratee, and shall also rate his/her PARADs in the region
21 using the corresponding APEC Form therefor;

22
23 d) The RARAD radiating as PARAD shall submit separate
24 APECs for RARAD and PARAD at the same time;

25
26 However, said radiating RARADs are not required to rate
27 themselves as the Rater of their performance as such in,
28 conformity with Section 3.8 hereof;

29
30 e) The Personnel Staff of the Adjudicator shall rate the
31 behavioral dimension of said Adjudicator concerned;

32
33 f) The Board Secretariat shall rate the Adjudicator only with
34 respect to the applicable criteria specified in the APEC
35 form and Section 3.12 hereof; and

36
37 g) The Board shall rate the Adjudicator only with respect to
38 the applicable criteria specified in the APEC form and
39 Section 3.14 hereof.

- 40
41 4. The accomplished APEC forms shall be transmitted to the
42 Office of the Board Secretariat through electronic mail (e-
43 mail) at darabsecretariat@gmail.com on or before the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

thirtieth (30th) day of the month after the end of each semester.

5. The results thereof will be presented in the scheduled meeting or deliberation to be determined by the Board.
6. After presentation of the results, the Board shall direct the Secretariat to prepare the final report, and forward the same to the Office of the Chairperson for the DARAB.
7. Upon approval of the final ratings by the DARAB Chairperson, the Secretariat shall prepare a feedback report to be transmitted to the concerned Adjudicator, stating therein his/her rating based on the APEC Rating System, which results shall be treated as personal and strictly confidential.
8. The Internal Audit Service (IAS) of the Department shall provide the Secretariat with a post-audit report on the correctness/veracity of the computation of the final ratings of Adjudicators.

SECTION 5. *Mechanics in Rating.*

1. The Adjudicators shall individually rate themselves as Ratees, and as Rater for the other Adjudicators, using the Grading Rate of 70% to 100%, as provided in Section 2.8 hereof and in the APEC forms.
2. The individual ratings belonging to a particular Rater shall be added to obtain the average rating.
3. The average ratings of all types/classes of Raters shall be computed using the APEC tabulation form to arrive at the final rating of each Adjudicator.

SECTION 6. *Incentive Points.*

1. The RARAD radiating as PARAD, or a PARAD with two or more salas (within the same Region or in different Regions), shall be entitled to one (1) incentive point which shall be added to the Final Rating of the RARAD or PARAD, as the case may be.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

- 2. The RARAD and/or PARAD concurrently assigned at DARCO shall also be entitled to one (1) incentive point.
- 3. The incentive points earned in paragraphs 1 and 2 hereof shall be added together to compute the APEC Final Rating of an Adjudicator.
- 4. The Temporary Radiating Adjudicator who is handling a sala for thirty (30) days or more shall be entitled to an incentive point as a regular radiating Adjudicator, provided that the said designation is by virtue of a Special Order.

SECTION 7. *Transitory Provision.* – The APEC Rating System shall be used as a management tool for performance evaluation commencing on the first semester (January 1 to June 31) of Calendar Year 2013.

SECTION 8. *Effectivity Clause.* — This APEC System shall take effect immediately.

Quezon City, JAN 02 2013

VIRGILIO R. DE LOS REYES
 Chairperson
 Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board



ATTACHMENTS:

APEC Forms for the RARAD (set)

- 1. RARAD Tabulation Form
- 2. For Ratee
- 3. For Board
- 4. For PARAD
- 5. For Secretariat
- 6. For Personnel Staff

APEC Forms for the PARAD (set)

- 1. PARAD Tabulation Form
- 2. For Ratee

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
- 3. For Board
 - 4. For RARAD
 - 5. For Secretariat
 - 6. For Personnel Staff

**Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
 Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
 Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Regional Adjudicator**

For the _____ Semestral of CY 20_____
 RARAD Tabulation Form

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Regional Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	RATER				Total	Average Grade	Ave. Weighted Grade	Overall Percentage
	Ratee	Secretariat	Board	Personnel Staff				

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

I. Resolution of Cases/Caseload Management (30%)

1. No. of cases decided/disposed
 - a. Adversarial
 - b. Non-adversarial
2. Percentage of disposed cases vis-a-vis caseload
3. No. of cases subjected to ADR
4. No. of MRs resolved/decided
5. No. of writs of execution issued
6. Accomplishment on monthly targets
7. Accomplishment on semestral targets
8. Length of time of pending cases
9. Percentage of reduction of ageing cases

0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	

II. Quality of Decisions /Social Impact of the Decisions (25%)

1. Decision with Social Impact
2. Evaluation of written work (*legal reasoning, legal basis, use of updated jurisprudence, writing style, grammar, etc.*)

0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	

ADMINISTRATIVE (30%) (III and IV)

III. Administrative Work (15%)

1. LCMS encoding/usage
2. DAR-LIS usage
3. Budget preparation (*completeness and timeliness*)
4. Submission of monthly accomplishment reports
5. Timely submission of reports
6. Monitoring of Sheriff/Clerk of the Adjudicator re the execution of final decision
7. Prompt submission of Score Card/s

0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	

IV. Support to Operations/Others (15%)

1. Attendance during oath/affirmation day
2. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RD/PARO

0	0	0	0	#REF!
0	0	0	0	

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)

1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the Board/Secretariat
2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs
3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops
4. Adoption of system to reduce case load
5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs
6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues
7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs

0	0	0	0	#REF!
0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	

VI. Integrity (5%)

1. No. of pending administrative cases (*with formal charge*)*
2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat

0	0	0	0	#REF!
0	0	0	0	

SUB-TOTAL POINTS (90%)								#REF!	
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------	--

Ratee	PARAD 1	PARAD 2	PARAD 3	PARAD 4	PARAD 5	TOTAL	Average Raw Score	Ave. Weighted Points	Overall Point Score
-------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	---------------------

VII. Supervision/Monitoring (only for RARADs 10%)

- No. of PARADs' decisions evaluated
 Monitoring of PARADs' accomplishment
 No. of assessment conferences held with PARADs
 No. of supervisory/consultative visits to PARADs

						0	0	0	0
						0	0	0	
						0	0	0	
						0	0	0	

TOTAL POINTS								#REF!	
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------	--

SCALE:

Grading Rate	Equivalent Adjectival Rating
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Regional Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 RARAD Form (to be filled up by the Ratee)

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Regional Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Ratee
----------	-------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

- I. **Resolution of Cases/Caseload Management (30%)**
- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. No. of cases decided/disposed | |
| a. Adversarial | |
| b. Non-adversarial | |
| 2. Percentage of disposed cases vis-a-vis caseload | |
| 3. No. of cases subjected to ADR | |
| 4. No. of MRS resolved/decided | |
| 5. No. of writs of execution issued | |
| 6. Accomplishment on monthly targets | |
| 7. Accomplishment on semestral targets | |
| 8. Length of time of pending cases | |
| 9. Percentage of reduction of ageing cases | |

- II. **Quality of Decisions /Social Impact of the Decisions (25%)**
- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Decision with Social Impact | |
| 2. Evaluation of written work (<i>legal reasoning, legal basis, use of updated jurisprudence, writing style, grammar, etc.</i>) | |

ADMINISTRATIVE (30%) (III and IV)

- III. **Administrative Work (15%)**
- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. LCMS encoding/usage | |
| 2. DAR-LIS usage | |
| 3. Budget preparation (<i>completeness and timeliness</i>) | |
| 4. Submission of monthly accomplishment reports | |
| 5. Timely submission of reports | |
| 6. Monitoring of sheriff/Clerk of the Adjudicator re the execution of final decision | |
| 7. Prompt submission of Score Card/s | |

- IV. **Support to Operations/Others (15%)**
- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Attendance during oath/affirmation day | |
| 2. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RD/PARO | |

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

- V. **Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)**
- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the Board/Secretariat | |
| 2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs | |
| 3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops | |
| 4. Adoption of system to reduce case load | |
| 5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs | |
| 6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues | |
| 7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs | |

- VI. **Integrity (5%)**
- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. No. of pending administrative cases (<i>with formal charge</i>)* | |
| 2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat | |

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% -84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Regional Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 RARAD Form (to be filled up by the Secretariat)

NAME: _____
 POSITION: **Regional Adjudicator**
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Secretariat
----------	-------------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

I. Resolution of Cases/Caseload Management (30%)

1. No. of cases decided/disposed	
a. Adversarial	
b. Non-adversarial	
2. Percentage of disposed cases vis-a-vis caseload	
3. No. of cases subjected to ADR	
4. No. of MRs resolved/decided	
5. No. of writs of execution issued	
6. Accomplishment on monthly targets	
7. Accomplishment on semestral targets	
8. Length of time of pending cases	
9. Percentage of reduction of ageing cases	

III. Administrative Work (15%)

1. LCMS encoding/usage	
2. DAR-LIS usage	
3. Budget preparation (<i>completeness and timeliness</i>)	
4. Submission of monthly accomplishment reports	
5. Timely submission of reports	
6. Monitoring of sheriff/Clerk of the Adjudicatorj re the execution of final decision	
7. Prompt submission of Score Card/s	

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)

1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the Board/Secretariat	
2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs	
3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops	
4. Adoption of system to reduce case load	
5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs	
6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues	
7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs	

VI. Integrity (5%)

1. No. of pending administrative cases (<i>with formal charge</i>)*	
2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat	

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Regional Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 RARAD Form (to be filled up by the Board)

NAME: _____

POSITION: **Regional Adjudicator**

PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Board
----------	-------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

II. Quality of Decisions /Social Impact of the Decisions(25%)

1. Decision with Social Impact
2. Evaluation of written work (*legal reasoning, legal basis, use of updated jurisprudence, writing style, grammar, etc.*)

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)

1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the Board/Secretariat
2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs

SCALE:

Grading Rate

- 100%
- 95% - 99%
- 90% - 94%
- 85% - 89%
- 80% - 84%
- 75% - 79%
- 70% - 74%

Equivalent Adjectival Rating

- Exceptional
- Commendable
- Good Solid Performance
- Above Average
- Average
- Below Average
- Unacceptable

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Regional Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 RARAD Form (to be filled up by Personnel Staff)

NAME: _____

POSITION: Regional Adjudicator

PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Personnel Staff
----------	-----------------

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the Board/Secretariat | |
| 2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs | |
| 3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops | |
| 4. Adoption of system to reduce case load | |
| 5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs | |
| 6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues | |
| 7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs | |

VI. Integrity (5%)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. No. of pending administrative cases(with formal charge)* | |
| 2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat | |

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% -84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Regional Adjudicator
 For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 RARAD Form for Item VII (to be filled up by the PARAD)

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Regional Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

PARAD of _____

VII. Supervision/Monitoring (only for RARADs 10%)

No. of PARADs' decisions evaluated
 Monitoring of PARADs' accomplishment
 No. of assessment conferences held with PARADs
 No. of supervisory/consultative visits to PARADs

TOTAL POINTS

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Provincial Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 PARAD Tabulation Form

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Provincial Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Ratee	RARAD	Secretariat	Board	Personnel Staff
----------	-------	-------	-------------	-------	-----------------

Total	Average Grade	Ave. Weighted Grade	Overall Percentage
-------	---------------	---------------------	--------------------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

I. Resolution of Cases/Caseload Management (30%)

1. No. of cases decided/disposed					
a. Adversarial					
b. Non-adversarial					
2. Percentage of disposed cases vis-a-vis caseload					
3. No. of cases subjected to ADR					
4. No. of IMRs resolved/decided					
5. No. of writs of execution issued					
6. Accomplishment on monthly targets					
7. Accomplishment on semestral targets					
8. Length of time of pending cases					
9. Percentage of reduction of ageing cases					

0	0	0	0
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	

II. Quality of Decisions /Social Impact of the Decisions (25%)

1. Decision with Social Impact					
2. Evaluation of written work (<i>legal reasoning, legal basis, use of updated jurisprudence, writing style, grammar, etc.</i>)					

0	0	0	0
0	0	0	

ADMINISTRATIVE (30%) (III and IV)

III. Administrative Work (15%)

1. LCMS encoding/usage					
2. DAR-LIS usage					
3. Budget preparation (<i>completeness and timeliness</i>)					
4. Submission of monthly accomplishment reports					
5. Timely submission of reports					
6. Monitoring of sheriff/Clerk of the Adjudicator re the execution of final decision					
7. Prompt submission of Score Card/s					

0	0	0	0
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	0	

IV. Support to Operations/Others (15%)

1. Attendance during oath/affirmation day					
2. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RD/PARO					
3. No. of completed case build up (<i>Cancellation of EP/CLOA per AO No. 6, Series of 2011</i>)					
4. Percentage of transmitted cancellation case folders vis-a-vis case build up load					
5. Duration of time to complete cancellation case build up					

0	0	0	#REF!
0	0	0	

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)

1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RARAD/Board/Secretariat					
2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs					
3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops					
4. Adoption of system to reduce case load					
5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs					
6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues					
7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs					

0	0	0	#REF!
0	0	0	
0	0	0	

VI. Integrity (5%)

1. No. of pending administrative cases (<i>with formal charge</i>)*					
2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat					

0	0	0	#REF!
0	0	0	

TOTAL POINTS (100%)	#REF!
----------------------------	--------------

SCALE:

Grading Rate	Equivalent Adjectival Rating
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Provincial Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 PARAD Form (to be filled up by the Ratee)

NAME: _____

POSITION: Provincial Adjudicator

PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Ratee
----------	-------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

- I. Resolution of Cases/Caseload Management (30%)**
1. No. of cases decided/disposed

a. Adversarial	
b. Non-adversarial	
 2. Percentage of disposed cases vis-a-vis caseload
 3. No. of cases subjected to ADR
 4. No. of MRs resolved/decided
 5. No. of writs of execution issued
 6. Accomplishment on monthly targets
 7. Accomplishment on semestral targets
 8. Length of time of pending cases
 9. Percentage of reduction of ageing cases
- ii. Quality of Decisions /Social Impact of the Decisions (25%)**
1. Decision with Social Impact
 2. Evaluation of written work (*legal reasoning, legal basis, use of updated jurisprudence, writing style, grammar, etc.*)

ADMINISTRATIVE (30%) (III and IV)

- III. Administrative Work (15%)**
1. LCMS encoding/usage
 2. DAR-LIS usage
 3. Budget preparation (*completeness and timeliness*)
 4. Submission of monthly accomplishment reports
 5. Timely submission of reports
 6. Monitoring of sheriff/Clerk of the Adjudicator re the execution of final decision
 7. Prompt submission of Score Card/s
- IV. Support to Operations/Others (15%)**
1. Attendance during oath/affirmation day
 2. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RD/PARO
 3. No. of completed case build up (*Cancellation of EP/CLOA per AO No. 6, Series of 2011*)
 4. Percentage of transmitted cancellation case folders vis-a-vis case build up load
 5. Duration of time to complete cancellation case build up

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

- V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)**
1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RARAD/Board/Secretariat
 2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs
 3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops
 4. Adoption of system to reduce case load
 5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs
 6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues
 7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs
- VI. Integrity (5%)**
1. No. of pending administrative cases (*with formal charge*)*
 2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Provincial Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 PARAD Form (to be filled up by the RARAD)

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Provincial Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	RARAD
----------	-------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

I.	Resolution of Cases/Caseload Management (30%)	
	1. No. of cases decided/disposed	
	a. Adversarial	
	b. Non-adversarial	
	2. Percentage of disposed cases vis-a-vis caseload	
	3. No. of cases subjected to ADR	
	4. No. of MRs resolved/decided	
	5. No. of writs of execution issued	
	6. Accomplishment on monthly targets	
	7. Accomplishment on semestral targets	
	8. Length of time of pending cases	
	9. Percentage of reduction of ageing cases	
II.	Quality of Decisions /Social Impact of the Decisions (25%)	
	1. Decision with Social Impact	
	2. Evaluation of written work (<i>legal reasoning, legal basis, use of updated jurisprudence, writing style, grammar, etc.</i>)	

ADMINISTRATIVE (30%) (III and IV)

III.	Administrative Work (15%)	
	1. LCMS encoding/usage	
	2. DAR-LIS usage	
	3. Budget preparation (<i>completeness and timeliness</i>)	
	4. Submission of monthly accomplishment reports	
	5. Timely submission of reports	
	6. Monitoring of sheriff/Clerk of the Adjudicator re the execution of final decision	
	7. Prompt submission of Score Card/s	
IV.	Support to Operations/Others (15%)	
	1. Attendance during oath/affirmation day	
	2. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RD/PARO	
	3. No. of completed case build up (<i>Cancellation of EP/CLOA per AO No. 6, Series of 2011</i>)	
	4. Percentage of transmitted cancellation case folders vis-a-vis case build up load	
	5. Duration of time to complete cancellation case build up	

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V.	Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)	
	1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RARAD/Board/Secretariat	
	2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs	
	3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops	
	4. Adoption of system to reduce case load	
	5. Advisories/observations/reports DARAB PINCs	
	6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues	
	7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs	
VI.	Integrity (5%)	
	1. No. of pending administrative cases (<i>with formal charge</i>)*	
	2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat	

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Provincial Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
PARAD Form (to be filled up by the Secretariat)

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Provincial Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Secretariat
----------	-------------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

I. Resolution of Cases/Caseload Management (30%) 1. No. of cases decided/disposed a. Adversarial b. Non-adversarial 2. Percentage of disposed cases vis-a-vis caseload 3. No. of cases subjected to ADR 4. No. of MRs resolved/decided 5. No. of writs of execution issued 6. Accomplishment on monthly targets 7. Accomplishment on semestral targets 8. Length of time of pending cases 9. Percentage of reduction of ageing cases	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> </table>										

ADMINISTRATIVE (30%) (III and IV)

III. Administrative Work (15%) 1. LCMS encoding/usage 2. DAR-LIS usage 3. Budget preparation (<i>completeness and timeliness</i>) 4. Submission of monthly accomplishment reports 5. Timely submission of reports 6. Monitoring of sheriff/Clerk of the Adjudicator re the execution of final decision 7. Prompt submission of Score Card/s	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> </table>							

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%) 1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RARAD/Board/Secretariat 2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs 3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops 4. Adoption of system to reduce case load 5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs 6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues 7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> </table>							
VI. Integrity (5%) 1. No. of pending administrative cases (<i>with formal charge</i>)* 2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="height: 15px;"></td></tr> </table>							

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Provincial Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 PARAD Form (to be filled up by the Board)

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Provincial Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Board
----------	-------

OPERATIONAL (55%) (I and II)

- II. **Quality of Decisions /Social Impact of the Decisions (25%)**
- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Decision with Social Impact | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Evaluation of written work (<i>legal reasoning, legal basis, use of updated jurisprudence, writing style, grammar, etc.</i>) | <input type="text"/> |

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

- V. **Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)**
- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RARAD/Board/Secretariat | <input type="text"/> |
| 2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs | <input type="text"/> |

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board
Adjudicator Performance Evaluation Card - Rating System
Criteria and Weighted Points to Evaluate Performance of Provincial Adjudicator

For the ___ Semestral of CY 20___
 PARAD Form (to be filled up by the Personnel Staff)

NAME: _____
 POSITION: Provincial Adjudicator
 PLACE OF ASSIGNMENT: _____

Criteria	Personnel Staff
----------	-----------------

BEHAVIORAL (15%) (V, VI and VII)

V. Cooperation, Professionalism and Initiative (10%)	
1. Attendance at meetings initiated by the RARAD/Board/Secretariat	
2. Compliance with DAR/DARAB Memos and SOs	
3. Attendance at DAR seminars/workshops	
4. Adoption of system to reduce case load	
5. Advisories/observations/reports re: DARAB PINCs	
6. Requests for or provides clarification on DARAB issues	
7. Solutions proposed re DARAB PINCs	
VI. Integrity (5%)	
1. No. of pending administrative cases (<i>with formal charge</i>)*	
2. No. of adverse audit results/findings of IAS, COA or DARAB Secretariat	

SCALE:

<u>Grading Rate</u>	<u>Equivalent Adjectival Rating</u>
100%	Exceptional
95% - 99%	Commendable
90% - 94%	Good Solid Performance
85% - 89%	Above Average
80% - 84%	Average
75% - 79%	Below Average
70% - 74%	Unacceptable

* Per definition of the revised URAC, for a pending administrative case to exist, there must be a Formal Charge issued to the respondent.

1 and as the Rater, as the case may be), for the preceding
2 semester.

- 3
4 3. The Ratee and Raters shall accomplish rate simultaneously
5 his/her own performance and that of the Adjudicator
6 concerned, immediately after the end of each semester.

7
8 The rating of performance shall be guided by the following:

9
10 a) The PARAD who is handling a sala shall submit his/her
11 individual APEC as Ratee and shall rate his/her RARAD
12 for the criteria on (No. VII) supervision and monitoring of
13 PARADs;

14
15 b) The Radiating Adjudicator, who is handling two or more
16 salas, shall submit such number of APECs equivalent to
17 the salas being handled;

18
19 c) The RARAD shall submit his/her individual APEC as
20 Ratee, and shall also rate his/her PARADs in the region
21 using the corresponding APEC Form therefor;

22
23 d) The RARAD radiating as PARAD shall submit separate
24 APECs for RARAD and PARAD at the same time;

25
26 However, said radiating RARADs are not required to rate
27 themselves as the Rater of their performance as such in,
28 conformity with Section 3.8 hereof;

29
30 e) The Personnel Staff of the Adjudicator shall rate the
31 behaviorial dimension of said Adjudicator concerned;

32
33 f) The Board Secretariat shall rate the Adjudicator only with
34 respect to the applicable criteria specified in the APEC
35 form and Section 3.12 hereof; and

36
37 g) The Board shall rate the Adjudicator only with respect to
38 the applicable criteria specified in the APEC form and
39 Section 3.14 hereof.

- 40
41 4. The accomplished APEC forms shall be transmitted to the
42 Office of the Board Secretariat through electronic mail (e-
43 mail) at darabsecretariat@gmail.com on or before the