

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

(when completed)

INDIVIDUAL POST-PROJECT/INITIATIVE ASSESSMENT

Used for assessment of an individual's performance upon completion of a project or initiative.

IPPA

Form DK2.4.7.3
Version 1.0

MEMBER IDENTIFICATION AND ACTIVITY OVERVIEW

NAME	SAMPLE Two	
PROJECT/INITIATIVE	Project X	ENGAGEMENT DATES 2 April – 8 Aug 2010
ROLE(s)	TEAMSITE DEVELOPER; content manager, content deployer, defect reviewer	

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	NA	U	NORMAL RANGE			VH	
			NI	N	H		
Supervision & Leadership	X						<p>"Two" was a good team player when he was around; however, his working schedule made it sometimes difficult for the team to rely on him for time-critical tasks.</p> <p>With his past experience in Teamsite and the NewCorp environment "Two" was very well placed in this project to provide technical guidance and development on Teamsite as well as advice and insight into NewCorp's internal workings.</p> <p>He needs to work on improving his initiative by anticipating, planning ahead and preparing for future requirements. "Two" also needed to put more attention into analyzing new tasks and seeking solutions vs simply dismissing them as not being doable and returning them to the team lead.</p> <p>Again, as a result of his working schedule it was sometimes difficult to rely on him since it was not always clear what time he would be available.</p>
Teamwork & Cooperation			X				
Following Direction				X			
Job Knowledge & Skills					X		
Initiative			X				
Problem Solving				X			
Organization & Planning				X			
Innovation & Creativity				X			
Attention to Detail				X			
Verbal & Written Communications				X			
Accountability & Reliability			X				
Honesty & Integrity				X			
Dedication & Work Ethic				X			
Timeliness			X				
Coping with Stress & Change				X			
Accept Criticism and Guidance				X			

GENERAL/OVERALL ASSESSMENT

"Two's" broad technical skills and background knowledge allowed him to serve as a key advisor and trouble-shooter to various teams throughout the project. He has good knowledge of Teamsite and the NewCorp website. He was able to provide guidance and direction to the project teams, especially for the re-skin team who had the difficult task of working on a large number of pages that they were not familiar with. Afterwards he became part of the Teamsite development team. Technically - he has solid skills and they have benefited the project. An effort was made to accommodate his specific work schedule for this project by finding work that he could perform offline/remote from the rest of the team. Sometimes this remote-work and irregular schedule impacted how he integrated with the rest of the team. "Two" proved to be an effective instructor/guide on Teamsite – providing coaching to NewCorp staff.

SUPERVISOR	S. Pervisor	Signature	Date (at signing)
-------------------	-------------	-----------	-------------------

POTENTIAL AND RECOMMENDED FUTURE ENGAGEMENTS

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	NA	L	N	AA	O	
Communications			X			
Planning			X			
Technical Skills & Challenges			X			
RANKING AMONG PEERS	N/A					

OVERALL PROJECT/ INITIATIVE LEAD	B. Boss	Signature	Date (at signing)
---	---------	-----------	-------------------

REVIEW WITH MEMBER

Signature	Date (at signing)
-----------	-------------------

Signature of the member indicates that this report has been reviewed and discussed; it does not constitute agreement with this assessment. This form should be completed within a SINGLE page. Instructions for completing the form are found on the reverse.

INDIVIDUAL POST-PROJECT/INITIATIVE ASSESSMENT – COMPLETION GUIDE

GENERAL

This form is PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL when completed; all efforts should be made to safeguard printed and electronic copies.

The assessment should be kept to a single page; no attachments or supplemental assessment sheets are permitted.

DATA FIELDS

Data is entered in all fields containing BLUE text (with the exception of the assessment grids that are blank – but an “X” is entered to show the scoring for that element).

Existing comments/prompts (from the blank form) are to be removed.

There is NO requirement to convert text to black when complete.

IDENTIFICATION/OVERVIEW SECTION

Enter data in all fields as indicated, noting the following:

- **Engagement Dates.** These are the engagement dates for the member on the project/initiative; not the overall dates of the engagement.
- **Role(s).** Indicate (first) the PRIMARY role of the member (in UPPERCASE), followed by any secondary roles/functions. If necessary, use the role that the member performed for the majority of their engagement if they had multiple/concurrent roles.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

This section is used by the member’s supervisor to assess their performance during the project/initiative. The following should be considered when evaluating each category:

- **Supervision & Leadership.** How well did the member provide guidance and direction to their team? Did they make appropriate follow-ups without micro-managing the team or undermining subordinate leaders? Did they inspire and direct their team to the task at hand?
- **Teamwork & Cooperation.** How well did the member promote integration of efforts between team members; did he/she support or undermine team unity? Did they facilitate activities/communications and cooperation?
- **Following Direction.** Did the member follow directives and policies correctly and thoroughly; did they resist guidance and direction? Did they question policies or directives in an appropriate manner that did not undermine senior management? Did they seek out appropriate guidance when required?
- **Job Knowledge & Skills.** Were the member’s technical and professional skills up to the standard expected of someone with a similar role and experience? Did they make effective use of their skills/knowledge?
- **Initiative.** Was the member a self-starter, seeking out and initiating activities for the betterment of the project/initiative at large, or did they wait for direction and did not advise when they are ready for new work or challenges?
- **Problem Solving.** Could the member resolve unique problems and situations – seeking out appropriate guidance and knowledge and developing a solution as required?
- **Organization & Planning.** Has the member organized their work/activities/team and planned out their course of action, or did they stumble upon solutions accidentally? Did they handle situations as they occurred, or did they make reasonable efforts to plan and anticipate problems before they occurred?
- **Innovation & Creativity.** Did the member show unique insight into problems and the development of solutions; were the results unique and innovative – bringing better return than conventional techniques/methods/solutions?
- **Attention to Detail.** Was the member appropriately attentive to all details in their assignments, or did they require additional supervision to ensure that all details were addressed?
- **Verbal & Written Communications.** Could the member effectively communicate thoughts, ideas, concerns and concepts both verbally and in writing?
- **Accountability & Reliability.** Did the member take ownership of tasks and errors - if they occurred? Could they be entrusted with tasks so that they required only minimal supervision and follow-up?
- **Honesty & Integrity.** Was the member truthful, and did they adhere to generally accepted ethical standards for their profession/environment?

- **Dedication & Work Ethic.** Was the member committed to the overall mission/task at hand? Did they make reasonable efforts to see the task to completion? Did they maintain a cooperative attitude/approach throughout?
- **Timeliness.** Did the member arrive to work on-time/within expectations? Was their work delivered on schedule? Did they deal with issues in a timely manner - before they escalated beyond their control?
- **Coping with Stress & Change.** Could the member work effectively under pressure? Did they adapt appropriately to change?
- **Accept Criticism and Guidance.** How well did the member accept feedback with respect to work performance, quality, conduct, etc. Did they learn from mistakes and adjust accordingly?

Each of the performance criteria/domains listed above are assessed on the following scale:

- **U – Unsatisfactory.** The member’s performance was substantially below the standard expected of his or her role to the point that remedial training is required; failure to make immediate improvements may necessitate reassignment and/or release from employment.
- **NI – Needs Improvement.** The member’s performance met the minimum expectations for their trade/role, but personal/professional improvement is required to meet their full effectiveness within the organization on their next assignment.
- **N – Normal.** The performance of the member has been satisfactory and met the commonly accepted expectations of someone with similar experience in a similar role.
- **H – High.** The member’s performance in the given area has been above that of their peers, often setting an example for others and showing they are ready for new/additional challenges.
- **VH – Very High.** The member’s performance has been exceptional and well beyond the normal expectations of someone of similar experience/skills. They have set the standard within their team/organization and demonstrated a level of seniority and maturity normally expected of someone much more senior.

Place a single “X” (capitalized) in the column that best represents the assessment of the member’s skill for that performance criteria item.

In some cases the performance criteria may not have been observed due to that element not being part of the members job-function at the time, there was insufficient time to assess the skill or it simply was not observed by the reviewer.

In such cases the performance criteria will be marked as **NOT ASSESSED (NA)**. Note that only a few criteria may be designated this way; others (such as “Following Direction” or “Honesty & Integrity”) must always be assessed – and as such, there is no “NOT ASSESSED” box for those items.

SUPPORTING NARRATIVES

For each of the performance assessment criteria – additional comments/examples should be provided in the narrative section to the right of the assessment grid. Note that this area is NOT intended to serve as an overall assessment of the member’s performance; it is only used to highlight specific examples that support/substantiate the scores on the assessment grid.

“NORMAL” assessments do not require comments.

Comments/justification is recommended for items rated “NEEDS IMPROVEMENT” or “HIGH” but are not obligatory.

Any items rated “UNSATISFACTORY” or “VERY HIGH” must have specific examples described /itemized within the narrative section (usually just in point form). Further explanation/assessment details may be contained within the overall performance assessment section.

GENERAL/OVERALL ASSESSMENT

This is a full narrative (ie- formal paragraph/sentences) that describes the member’s overall performance/contribution to the project/initiative. Items that were “UNSATISFACTORY” or “VERY HIGH” should be highlighted within the overall description of their performance. Recommendations on subsequent assignments are not to be made here; the focus is on the past-performance.

POTENTIAL AND RECOMMENDED FUTURE ENGAGEMENTS

This section is a forwarding-looking assessment of the member’s potential and is where recommendations for training and subsequent engagements (or termination) may be made.

Usually this section is developed in consultation with the overall project/initiative lead (or account manager).

The assessment criteria for potential are as follows:

- **Leadership.** Does the member exhibit skills associated with the leadership and management of others? Are they ready for expanded leadership challenges and initiatives?
- **Communications.** Assess the member’s skills with respect to communicating complex concepts and ideas to team members and customers/clients. How effectively can they sort and disseminate information to others? How are they suited for instruction/mentoring of others?
- **Planning.** Evaluate the member’s ability to anticipate and plan for events/activities, including insight that helps develop unique/more effective solutions to problems.
- **Technical Skills & Challenges.** Evaluate the members technical/professional skills relative to their peers and their ability to tackle new/complex technical/integration challenges.

The rating of each of the above factors is similar to that for performance:

- **NA – Not Assessed.** The potential of the member for this particular area was not evaluated/assessed (this should be relatively rare).
- **L – Low.** The potential of the individual is below that of someone with similar experience in this role; remedial training/mentoring may be required.
- **N – Normal.** The potential is normal for someone with similar experience; they should continue to be engaged in similar roles/responsibilities and develop normally with their peers..
- **AA – Above Average.** The members potential is above that of their peers and warrants that they be considered for more challenging opportunities, improved compensation or training to further hone their skills.
- **O – Outstanding.** The member exhibits exceptional potential in this domain and future assignments should be selected that further enhance, develop or use this ability. Promotion, improved compensation and additional responsibility/challenges are warranted and should be considered in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As with the performance assessment, there is a space beside the potential-assessment grid to be used to provide a brief comment on items scored above or below “NORMAL” for potential.

This narrative should include any recommendations for employment/engagement, promotion and/or training after the current project/initiative.

Note that these are recommendations only – subject to review and acceptance by management and subject to availability.

RANKING AMONG PEERS

This is an optional section that is only used when there are more than 5 peers for the member within the organization.

Generally the member is rated as being within the TOP or MIDDLE 1/3 of their peer group.

No ranking does not necessarily mean that the members performance was sub-standard; in some situations, due to unique skills, qualifications or other factors – its not appropriate to rate members against each other.

FINAL DISPOSITION/HANDLING OF THE ASSESSMENT FORM

The form is signed by the immediate supervisor and the overall project/initiative lead prior to an individual review with the member.

This review session is attended by the immediate supervisor at the minimum, with the overall project/initiative lead optionally present.

The member is expected to sign the assessment form on the understanding that signing does not necessarily constitute agreement with the assessment or any of its recommendations.

The member is permitted to have a copy of the assessment form. This copy **must** be accompanied with a copy of these instructions.

The original copy is to be submitted to HR for review/retention on the employees personnel file.