CASE STUDY 1
Sri Lanka—Performance Improvement and Personal Development Appraisal (PIPDA) in the Community Development and Livelihood Improvement “Gemi Diriya” Project

**What**
The Performance Improvement and Personal Development Appraisal (PIPDA) is an innovative system designed by the team of Sri Lanka’s Community Development and Livelihood Improvement “Gemi Diriya” Project. It features: (i) the selection of staff based on soft skills; (ii) a “360 degree” feedback-based performance appraisal system, and (iii) intensive training for staff capacity building.

**Why**
The experience of the Gemi Diriya project demonstrates that a well-designed staff performance appraisal and development program can help to achieve project goals and targets, while also raising staff morale, especially on issues of recruitment.

**How**
The PIPDA follows four steps (see figure below):

(i) Setting performance targets
(ii) Mapping core competencies
(iii) Conducting performance assessments based on “360 degree” feedback (in which individual and team targets were given, achievements documented, and colleague feedback was provided on core competencies)
(iv) Finalizing overall rank or grade. These were linked to rewards or actions to be announced by the management.

---

**Performance Improvement and Personal Development Appraisal (or PIPDA) System in the Gemi Diriya Project**

1. **Setting Performance Targets**
   - Performance Assessment
     - Performance Analysis
       - Individual Performance
         - Achieving individual targets (KPIs), quality delivery, value added activities
       - Team Performance
         - Achieving team targets, web uploading, assessment of internal efficiency
     - Core Competencies Analysis
       - Nine Core Competencies
         - 360 degree feedback assessment by Self (90); Senior colleague, one to one discussion (90); Junior colleague, confidential (90); Peer, confidential
   - Performance gap
     - Performance improvement plan
   - Competence gap
     - Personal development plan
   - Overall assessment—grading/ranking

(Continued next page)
Case Study 1 (continued)

| When and Who | Staff performance appraisal cycles and evaluation follow HR policy. Using this approach, staff performance results from this project indicated that 70% of staff performed at Grade A annually beginning at year two. Village wide, at least 70% of the villages participating were rated high (as A or B grades) due to this type of performance monitoring, analysis and feedback. |

Source: Sri Lanka Community Development and Livelihood Improvement “Gemi Diriya” Project.
CASE STUDY 2
Sri Lanka—Staff Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRM) in the Community Development and Livelihood Improvement “Gemi Diriya” Project

What
In Sri Lanka’s Community Development and Livelihood Improvement “Gemi Diriya” Project, grievances were resolved through a three-level process that outlined the roles and responsibilities of those involved. At each level, if after an internal review the matter was still not resolved, the grievance would be raised to a higher level.

Why
Initially, there was no grievance redress mechanism in place in the Gemi Diriya project. Instances of staff complaints were kept to a minimum by maintaining strong elements of openness, accountability, teamwork, and transparency in the project environment. Moreover, the project’s staff performance appraisal system (PIPDA) facilitated opportunities for one-on-one interactions between staff and senior colleagues, and for recognizing people for their hard work and achievements. However, it came to light that a process for enabling people to approach their seniors with issues or complaints was needed. A staff GRM was therefore established and maintained throughout project implementation.

How
Staff Grievance Redress System in Sri Lanka’s Community Development and Livelihood Improvement (“Gemi Diriya”) Project—Flow Chart

(Continued next page)
Case Study 2 (continued)

| When and Who | In the first instance, grievances relating to one’s employment would be raised with the immediate supervisor in the hope that the matter could be resolved at this level. This was desirable because: (i) the supervisor knows the staff member best and the circumstances related to the matter, and (ii) it is in the interest of both parties to resolve the matter then and there and reinforce the relationship. Discussing the grievance with the aggrieved staff member would ideally take place within three working days. |
| Scale | At the time the system was put in place, the project was large and growing. It included almost 470 staff members in various positions at different levels and locations. |

Source: *Sri Lanka Community Development and Livelihood Improvement “Gemi Diriga” Project*. 
When it comes to recruitment, first and foremost, the Social Development Foundation (SDF) clearly defines qualifying characteristics in the human resources it desires to have – not just educational qualifications and length of experience. It also diagnoses what kind of capability is required to perform a job by dissecting it into four areas: knowledge, skills, attitude and values (KSAV framework). It also defines what “relevant experience” is, as required by SDF in the future. Before embarking on any recruitment, the qualifications and desired criteria are defined for each position. To ensure the right fit between the job requirements and the potential staff member, the candidate could be sent to the field to assess his/her aptitude and attitude for the job.*

Secondly, the salaries offered are in tune with market rates. Recruitment should be based on hiring the best available talent, rather than on simplistic comparisons with organizations that appear to be similar, but may have very different mandates and histories. Benchmarking surveys on salaries and benefits are carried out and salary structures are reviewed periodically to ensure that SDF remains an attractive place to work for the best talent in Bangladesh.

Thirdly, while SDF is responsible for staff selection, the process is conducted through an independent well-regarded professional agency, not an independent panel. Since the qualifying criteria would also assess the behavioral/attitudinal attributes of a candidate, a qualified human resources agency would be suited for this task. Yet, final accountability remains with SDF.

Fourthly, the recruitment and selection process should encompass a broad base of candidates, from recent university graduates to professionals from the private sector, not just people with government and NGO experience. The idea is “to get the best person at the most competitive salary.” SDF also looks to recruit fresh candidates (with relevant educational backgrounds) through campus recruitment from reputable colleges and universities.

Fifthly, forecasted demands for hiring new people at a later date should be made part of the annual HR plan, to be presented to the Governing Body and Management for thorough discussion and approval.

* This relates to questions such as: “Can s/he work in the project environment? Does s/he have sympathy with those in vulnerable situations? Would s/he put forth the commitment and time needed to get the job done, rather than having a tendency to stick to a “9 to 5” schedule?”