



## Procedure 17

### MONITORING AND MEASUREMENT

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
Date approved : January 10, 2017  
Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
Revision No. : 00  
Revision Date :  
Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto – BOD Chairperson

## 1.0 OBJECTIVES

- 1.1 To measure performance of the QMS, its ability to meet concessionaires' satisfaction and be able to determine where continual improvements can be made.

## 2.0 SCOPE

This procedure defines the sources of data, the method and frequency of collection, analysis and reporting including the responsibilities and authorities.

## 3.0 REFERENCES

- 3.1 ISO 9001:2015 Section 9-9.1.3  
3.2 Procedure for Management Review  
3.3 Procedure for Complaint and Grievance

## 4.0 RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES

ISO Coordinator, DCO, General Manager

## 5.0 PROCESS

### 5.1 Sources of Data

a. SMWD analyses and evaluate appropriate data and information arising from monitoring and measurement. The results of analysis shall be used to evaluate:

1. Conformity of products and services;
2. The degree of customer satisfaction;
3. The performance and effectiveness of the quality management system;
4. If planning has been implemented effectively;
5. The effectiveness of actions taken to address risks and opportunities;
6. The performance of external providers;
7. The need for improvements to the quality management system.



## Procedure 17

### MONITORING AND MEASUREMENT

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
Date approved : January 10, 2017  
Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
Revision No. : 00  
Revision Date :  
Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto – BOD Chairperson

#### a.1.1 Suppliers

- a) Other useful information from suppliers

#### a.1.2 Data Collection and Analysis

- a) The ISO Coordinator on annual basis will gather all data generated as a result of monitoring and measurement from other relevant sources referred but not limited to above.
- b) The ISO Coordinator will analyze collected data, identify problems that affect the overall performance of the company and the QMS using any problem-solving technique (e.g. cause-and-effect analysis such as fish bone or Ishikawa diagram, tree diagram, etc.).
- c) The ISO Coordinator will report to the General Manager the outcome of data analysis and recommend where continual improvements can be made using any statistical tool (e.g. Pareto's Principle for making priority improvements, etc.)
- d) The General Manager will review and approve the recommendations for continual improvements which may include changes that could affect the QMS.

Any changes that could affect the QMS will also be discussed during the management review meeting.

#### a.2 Computation of Data

- 5.3.1 The passing grade for evaluation of suppliers and of all SMWD assessment tool shall be carried out. Make a scale from 1-5; this scale shall have an equivalent interpretation



**Procedure 17**  
**MONITORING AND MEASUREMENT**

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
Date approved : January 10, 2017  
Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
Revision No. : 00  
Revision Date :  
Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto – BOD Chairperson

5.3.2 Scale for over-all rating

4.6-----5-	equivalent to Excellent	} Passing grade
3.7----4.5-	equivalent to Very good	
2.8----3.6-	equivalent to Good	
1.9----2.7	equivalent to Fair	
1----- 1.8	equivalent to Poor	

HPS-LPS

5-1=4

4/5=8

(To get the interval of scale)

Legend:

LPS-Lowest possible score

HPS-Highest possible score

Formula:  $HPS-LPS/5$

Highest possible score (HPS)-Lowest possible score (LPS) divided by the number of scale (usually 5).

To get the mean add the total score divided by the number of questions and you get the equivalent interpretation.

a.3 Quality Management System Effectiveness

SMWD designed system in order to measure the effectiveness of its QMS. As for the exact measurement percentage in given to areas such as:

Criteria	Percentage
Concessionaires Satisfaction	20%
No. of Complaints Attended	20 %
Quality of water (Passing the Physical Chemical Test and Bacteriological Test)	15%
Percentage of risk reduced the likelihood	15%
Percentage of risk that occur	15%
Rating of OPCR, DPCR & IPCR	15%





## Procedure 17

### MONITORING AND MEASUREMENT

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
 Date approved : January 10, 2017  
 Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
 Revision No. : 00  
 Revision Date :  
 Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto – BOD Chairperson

## Rating Scale

### A. QUANTITY OF WORK

Various rating scales may be used for specific sets of measures. However, in general there shall be five-point rating scale (1 to 5), 5 being the highest and 1, the lowest.

Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
5	Outstanding	Performance exceeding targets by 30% and above of the planned targets. Performance represents an extraordinary level of achievement and commitment in terms of quality and time, technical skills and knowledge, ingenuity, creativity and initiative
4	Very Satisfactory	Performance exceeding targets by 15% to 29% of the planned targets. Numerical Rating Adjectival Rating Description Performance exceeded expectations. All goals, objectives, and targets were achieved above the established standards.
3	Satisfactory	Performance 100% to 114% of the planned targets. Performance met expectations in terms of quality of work, efficiency and timeliness. The most critical annual goals were met.
2	Unsatisfactory	Performance of 51% to 99% of the planned targets. Performance failed to meet expectations in terms of quality work, efficiency and timeliness. The most critical goals were not met.
1	Poor	Performance failing to meet the planned targets by 50% or below. Performance was consistently below expectations, and/or reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Significant improvement is needed in one or more important areas

*The 130% and above range for Outstanding rating and the 50% and below range for Poor rating are based on the ranges prescribed under CSC Memorandum Circular No 13, s. 1999. The 90% to 114% range for Satisfactory rating is based on Executive Order No. 80, s. 2012 (Directing the Adoption of a Performance-Based Incentive System for Government Employees).*



## Procedure 17

### MONITORING AND MEASUREMENT

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
 Date approved : January 10, 2017  
 Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
 Revision No. : 00  
 Revision Date :  
 Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto - BOD Chairperson

#### A. TIMELINESS

Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
5	Outstanding	Task Completed within the first 30% or more of the time before the deadline or scheduled time of completion  Task completed ahead of the planned time by 30% for non-routine duty
4	Very Satisfactory	Task Completed in 15-29% of the time before the deadline or scheduled time of completion  Task completed ahead of the planned time by 15-29% for non-routine duty
3	Satisfactory	Task Completed on the deadline or up to 14% of the time before the deadline or scheduled time of completion  Task completed on deadline or planned time or earlier but not more than 14% for non-routine duty  3 reminders issued by rated for repetitive/routine duty
2	Unsatisfactory	Task completed 51-99% of the time after the deadline or scheduled date of completion  Task completed after the deadline or planned time by 51% to 99%  4 or 5 reminders issued by rated for repetitive/routine duty
1	Poor	Task not accomplished at all or completed 50 or more of the time after the deadline or scheduled date of completion  Task not completed after the deadline or planned time by 50% or more for non-routine duty  6 or more reminders issued by rated for repetitive/routine duty



**Procedure 17**  
**MONITORING AND**  
**MEASUREMENT**

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
Date approved : January 10, 2017  
Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
Revision No. : 00  
Revision Date :  
Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto – BOD Chairperson

**A. QUALITY OF WRITTEN WORK**

Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
5	Outstanding	No mistakes or deficiency; every aspect of work assignment well covered; clearly presented; well organized;  No lapse in grammar or errors in content
4	Very Satisfactory	One or two minor errors or deficiencies; work in accordance with instructions; clearly presented; well organized;  1 or 2 errors in grammar or errors in content
3	Satisfactory	One or two minor errors or deficiencies; work in accordance with instructions; clearly presented; well organized;  3 lapses errors in grammar or errors in content
2	Unsatisfactory	One or two major errors or deficiencies; major revision needed  4 or 5 lapses errors in grammar or errors in content
1	Poor	Work nor acceptable; needs total revision;  5 or more lapses in grammar or errors in content





**Procedure 17**  
**MONITORING AND MEASUREMENT**

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
Date approved : January 10, 2017  
Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
Revision No. : 00  
Revision Date :  
Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto – BOD Chairperson

**A. QUALITY OF NON-WRITTEN WORK**

Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
5	Outstanding	Excellent results; all aspects of work assignment thoroughly covered;  No mistake in performing the duty
4	Very Satisfactory	One or two minor errors in the execution of work assignment results still very good
3	Satisfactory	More than two minor errors or deficiencies in the execution of work assignment; results are acceptable;  3 mistakes in performing the duty
2	Unsatisfactory	One major errors or deficiencies that can be overcome with help from supervisor  4 or 5 mistakes in performing the duty
1	Poor	Haphazard or careless execution or work assignment; unacceptable results;  6 or more mistakes in performing the duty

**Rating Computation**

At the end of the rating period, the supervisor and employee accomplish the IPCR form by filling up all the necessary columns.

- Individual employee (rate) determines accomplishment based on target for each key performance measure
- Supervisor and employee rate each accomplishment by comparing the target against the accomplishment.
- Compute for the percentage of accomplishment for each quantitative target using the following formula:

$$\text{Percentage of Accomplishment} = \frac{\text{Accomplishment}}{\text{Target}} \times 100$$

Example:  $\frac{4}{3} \times 100 = 133\%$



## Procedure 17

### MONITORING AND MEASUREMENT

Date prepared : January 6, 2017  
Date approved : January 10, 2017  
Effectivity Date : January 11, 2017  
Revision No. : 00  
Revision Date :  
Control No. : **PM17-01**

Reviewed by: Engr. Carlos N. Santos, Jr. - GM

Approved by: Dir. Miguela G. Pleyto - BOD Chairperson

- d. Determine the point score using the level of performance.
- e. Add all the scores under Quality, Efficiency, and Timeliness and divide by numbers of entries to get the Average Point Scores.
- f. Add all the Average Point Scores and divide by number of entries to get the Final Average Rating.
- g. Determine the Final Numerical Performance Rating and Adjectival Rating.

## 6.0 DOCUMENTED INFORMATION

- 6.1 Concessionaire's Evaluation
- 6.2 Meeting Minutes
- 6.3 OPCR
- 6.4 DPCR
- 6.5 IPCR