



Department of Defense INSTRUCTION

NUMBER 1400.25-V2011

August 14, 2009

USD(P&R)

SUBJECT: DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management

References: See Enclosure 1

1. PURPOSE

a. Instruction. This Instruction is composed of several volumes, each containing its own purpose. The purpose of the overall Instruction, in accordance with the authority in DoD Directive (DoDD) 5124.02 (Reference (a)), is to establish and implement policy, establish procedures, provide guidelines and model programs, delegate authority, and assign responsibilities regarding civilian personnel management within the Department of Defense.

b. Volumes

(1) 2000 Volume Series. The 2000 Volume series of this Instruction, in accordance with the authority in Reference (a) and DoDDs 5143.01, 1400.25, and 1400.35 (References (b), (c), and (d)), establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides guidance for DCIPS. Hereafter the 2000 Volume series of this Instruction shall be referred to as “the DCIPS Volumes.”

(2) This Volume. This Volume, pursuant to section 1601 of title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.) (Reference (e)), establishes performance management policies, assigns responsibilities, and prescribes procedures for the DCIPS performance management system. Policies regarding performance pay pool structure and funding, performance-driven pay-decision processes, and calculations related to performance payouts will be established and implemented in Volume 2006 of this Instruction.

2. APPLICABILITY. This Volume:

a. Applies to OSD, the Military Departments, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other

organizational entities in the Department of Defense (hereafter referred to collectively as the “DoD Components”).

b. Applies to members of the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive System and the Defense Intelligence Senior Level as rating officials, performance review authorities, or when performing other similar functions, unless specifically addressed in other Volumes of this Instruction.

c. Does not apply to employees covered by the Federal Wage System or equivalent, non-appropriated fund employees, or foreign national employees.

3. DEFINITIONS. See Glossary.

4. POLICY. It is DoD policy that:

a. DCIPS is an essential tool supporting the transformation of the Defense Intelligence Enterprise called for in Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) Statement of Strategic Intent (Reference (f)).

b. The DCIPS performance management system shall:

(1) Ensure the alignment of individual performance objectives to the intelligence goals and objectives of the DoD Components with DCIPS positions.

(2) Ensure ongoing feedback between employees and supervisors on progress toward accomplishment of those objectives.

(3) Provide a basis for measuring and assigning accountability for individual and organizational performance for accomplishment of those objectives.

(4) Provide a fair and equitable process for appraising and evaluating DCIPS employee performance within and across the DoD Components with DCIPS positions, and shall not permit a forced distribution of evaluations.

(5) Identify the developmental needs of DCIPS employees.

(6) Be consistent with the merit system principles set forth in chapter 23 of title 5, U.S.C. (Reference (g)).

5. RESPONSIBILITIES

a. Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)). The USD(P&R) shall, in conjunction with the USD(I), coordinate on the development of DCIPS performance management policies and monitor their effects on DoD-wide personnel readiness.

b. USD(I). The USD(I) shall, in conjunction with the USD(P&R), establish a common performance management system for DCIPS employees and positions that is in accordance with the core requirements of the intelligence community (IC) performance management framework set forth in Intelligence Community Directive Number 651 (Reference (h)).

c. Heads of the DoD Components With DCIPS Positions. The Heads of the DoD Components with DCIPS positions may issue internal policy, procedures, and guidance to supplement this Volume insofar as the supplementing issuances are in accordance with References (c), (d), and (e) and Volume 2001 of this Instruction.

6. PROCEDURES. Enclosure 2 provides procedures for DCIPS performance management. Enclosure 3 provides specific guidance for preparing supervisory and managerial objectives. Specific performance standards that operationalize performance elements to the career field and pay level of the employee will be published in Enclosure 4.

7. RELEASABILITY. UNLIMITED. This Volume is approved for public release and is available on the Internet from the DoD Issuances Web Site at <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives>.

8. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Instruction is effective 60 days from the date published.



Gail H. McGinn
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Plans)
Performing the Duties of the
Under Secretary of Defense
(Personnel and Readiness)

Enclosures

1. References
 2. Procedures
 3. Guidelines for Writing Performance Objectives
- Glossary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REFERENCES6

PROCEDURES

 GENERAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES7

 Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA).....7

 Reviewing Officials7

 Rating Officials8

 Supervisors When Not the Rating Official9

 Employees9

 THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS10

 PERFORMANCE PLANNING.....11

 Elements of Performance Planning.....11

 Annual Performance Plan11

 Annual IDP15

 Approval of Performance Plans15

 MANAGING PERFORMANCE.....15

 Monitoring15

 Active Engagement.....16

 Dialog and Feedback16

 Minimum Period of Performance16

 Adjustment of Performance Objectives During the Evaluation Period17

 Adding Performance Objectives17

 Mandatory Midpoint Performance Review17

 DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE.....18

 Employee Development.....18

 Monitoring Progress Against the IDP18

 Addressing Needs for Performance Improvement.....19

 END-OF-YEAR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION19

 Rating Performance Objectives20

 Rating Performance Elements.....22

 Performance Evaluation of Record.....23

 Reviewing Official’s Evaluation of Performance24

 PM PRA Review of Performance Evaluations of Record25

 Communicating the Performance Record to the Employee.....25

 INTERIM PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERFORMANCE
 EVALUATION PERIOD25

 Closeout Performance Evaluation.....26

 Interim or Temporary Assignment Report of Performance26

 SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.....27

 Employees Absent to Perform Military Service27

 Employees Absent on Workers’ Compensation27

 Employees Absent Due to Other Special Circumstances27

Administrative Error	27
CHALLENGING THE EVALUATION OF RECORD	27
Alternative Dispute Resolution	28
Relationship to Compensation	28
Procedures for Administrative Reconsideration	28
GUIDELINES FOR WRITING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.....	31
OVERVIEW	31
THE SMART OBJECTIVE.....	31
WRITING SMART OBJECTIVES FOR EMPLOYEES.....	32
Performance Objectives are not Duty Statements	32
Performance Objectives are Specific	32
Performance Objectives are Measurable	32
Performance Objectives are Achievable.....	33
Performance Objectives are Relevant.....	33
Performance Objectives are Timely or Time-Bounded.....	33
WRITING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS....	33
GLOSSARY	35
TABLES	
1. Performance Objectives and Element Rating Descriptors.....	21
2. Converting Average Rating to Evaluation of Record.....	23

ENCLOSURE 1

REFERENCES

- (a) DoD Directive 5124.02, "Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness USD(P&R)," June 23, 2008
- (b) DoD Directive 5143.01, "Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I))," November 23, 2005
- (c) DoD Directive 1400.25, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System," November 25, 1996
- (d) DoD Directive 1400.35, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS)," September 24, 2007
- (e) Section 1601 of title 10, United States Code
- (f) Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence Statement of Strategic Intent, "Strategic Intent for the Defense Intelligence Enterprise," August 2007¹
- (g) Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code
- (h) Intelligence Community Directive Number 651, "Human Capital Performance Management for the Intelligence Community Civilian Workforce," November 28, 2007
- (i) Director of National Intelligence Strategy, "The National Intelligence Strategy of the United States of America," October 2005²

¹ Copies are available to authorized users at https://usdi.dtic.mil/usdi_docs/keyref/dcs/keydocs/USDI_Statement_of_Strategic_Intent_10112007.pdf

² Available through the Internet at <http://www.dni.gov/publications/NISOctober2005.pdf>

ENCLOSURE 2

PROCEDURES

1. GENERAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. Performance management has one primary purpose: to achieve organizational results and mission objectives through the effective management of individual and organizational performance. To achieve that purpose, performance management shall be a priority for all Defense Intelligence executives, managers, supervisors, and employees. The performance expectations of organizations and their senior leaders shall be linked to the Director of National Intelligence Strategy (Reference (i), hereafter referred to as the “National Intelligence Strategy” (NIS)) and applicable strategies of the Department of Defense and the DoD Components with DCIPS positions. Performance expectations shall cascade from the senior levels of the organization through subordinate managers and supervisors to individual employees. Successful performance management requires commitment to performance planning, measurement, and management practices. All participants in the performance management process must invest adequate time and effort throughout the evaluation period to ensure performance management is effective.

a. Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA). The PM PRA is responsible for:

(1) Oversight of performance evaluations conducted under his or her purview to ensure the consistency of DCIPS performance management practices within the DoD Components with DCIPS positions.

(2) Ensuring compliance with merit system principles and prevention of conflicts of interest in the establishment and operation of pay pools.

(3) Final independent review of employee evaluation of record when challenged by an employee. (See section 9 of this enclosure.)

b. Reviewing Officials. Reviewing officials are the approving official for each individual evaluation of record within their purview. Reviewing officials are responsible and shall be held accountable for ensuring accuracy of performance management within the subordinate organizations and units for which they are responsible. This includes but is not limited to ensuring that:

(1) Performance and individual development plans (IDPs) are in place in accordance within established timelines for all employees.

(2) Subordinate rating officials and supervisors (when the supervisor is not the rating official) are trained in their roles. (See paragraphs 1.d. and 1.e. of this enclosure for rating official and supervisor responsibilities).

(3) Subordinate rating officials are providing performance feedback throughout the evaluation period and rating officials have documented at least one midpoint performance review feedback session with each employee.

(4) Subordinate rating officials, when not the immediate supervisor of employees for whom they are the rating official, are maintaining ongoing dialog with the immediate supervisors of those employees regarding employee performance.

(5) All evaluations of record within subordinate organizations and units are completed within established timelines.

(6) Performance standards are consistently applied among those rating officials for whom they are the reviewing official.

(7) Subordinate rating officials are executing their responsibilities consistent with merit system principles.

c. Rating Officials. Rating officials are responsible and shall be held accountable for effectively managing the performance of assigned employees. This includes but is not limited to:

(1) Executing the requirements of this Volume in accordance with the merit system principles set forth in Reference (g).

(2) Ensuring employees are trained in the performance management system.

(3) Developing and communicating performance objectives and expectations within the established timelines and holding employees accountable for accomplishing them.

(4) Preparing jointly with employees, to the extent practicable, development objectives for the performance year and recording them in an IDP.

(5) Aligning performance objectives and employee development with organizational goals and objectives.

(6) Discussing with employees the relevance of performance elements to individual performance objectives.

(7) Providing employees meaningful, constructive, and candid feedback relative to progress against performance expectations including at least one documented midpoint review.

(8) Ensuring employees are aware of the requirement to document their accomplishments at the end of the evaluation period.

(9) Fostering and rewarding excellent performance.

(10) Addressing poor performance.

(11) Making meaningful distinctions among employees based on performance and contribution.

(12) Completing closeout and interim performance evaluations as required within established timelines.

(13) Ensuring eligible employees are assigned an evaluation of record as prescribed by this Volume.

(14) Collaborating with reviewing officials to complete evaluations of record.

d. Supervisors When Not the Rating Official. Supervisors normally will be the rating official for employees under their direct supervision. However, in unusual circumstances in which rating official responsibilities are assigned to an official in the chain of supervision above the immediate supervisor, the supervisor shall be responsible and accountable for collaborating with the rating official in his or her performance management responsibilities. This includes the responsibility for:

(1) Ensuring he or she maintains ongoing dialog with the rating official regarding the employee's performance during the evaluation period.

(2) Participating with the rating official in the completion of the employee's evaluation of record.

(3) Participating with the rating official in the completion of closeout or interim performance evaluations on employees under their supervision for whom they are not the rating official.

e. Employees. Employees are accountable for:

(1) Engaging in dialog with rating officials and supervisors (when the supervisor is not the rating official) to develop performance objectives and their IDP at the beginning of each evaluation period.

(2) Identifying and recording their accomplishments and results throughout the evaluation period.

(3) Participating in midpoint performance reviews and end-of-year performance evaluation discussions with their rating officials.

(4) Preparing their end-of-year accomplishments as input to their annual performance evaluations.

(5) Understanding the link between their performance objectives and the organizational mission and goals.

(6) Accepting accountability for their actions.

2. THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

a. The DCIPS performance management process consists of three distinct phases: performance planning, managing performance throughout the evaluation period, and evaluation of performance at the end of the performance evaluation period. The standard evaluation period for DCIPS runs from October 1 through September 30 of each year unless an exception has been granted by the USD(I). The performance evaluation period officially begins on October 1 of each year with the performance planning process. During the performance planning process, rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees shall engage in dialog to establish performance objectives that they shall be expected to accomplish during the performance evaluation period. The objectives set the expectations for “what” specifically each employee is expected to accomplish during the coming year. The rating official and employee planning process shall also include discussion of the six behaviorally-based DCIPS performance elements (the “how” of performance) described in subparagraph 3.b.(2)(b) of this enclosure. These six elements are evaluated independently of the performance objectives.

b. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees shall engage in continuing dialog throughout the performance evaluation period to manage performance. Dialog shall focus on progress against performance objectives and events or obstacles that may occur during the evaluation period that could prevent successful achievement of those objectives. Any resulting modifications or formal changes in the objectives against which the employee is working should be documented at the time they are identified up to the final 90 days of the evaluation period. Additional dialog should also be ongoing throughout the evaluation period, focused on the developmental needs of the employee to increase effectiveness and on other factors within the control of the employee or supervisor that may contribute to the success of the employee and the organization. At least once during the performance evaluation period, generally at the midpoint of the period, the supervisor (in conjunction with the rating official when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall document formally the performance discussion with the employee.

c. At the end of the performance evaluation period, the employee shall document his or her accomplishments and submit them to the rating official (through the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) as an element of the formal evaluation of performance for the year. The formal evaluation of the employee’s performance shall include an evaluation of the extent to which the employee achieved his or her performance objectives, an evaluation of how the employee performed against the six performance elements that contribute to success, and an overall summary evaluation of record. The evaluation of the employee’s performance against performance elements shall consider the extent to which the employee fulfilled his or her accountabilities under paragraph 1.f. of this enclosure.

3. PERFORMANCE PLANNING

a. Elements of Performance Planning. Performance planning shall include dialog between the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and the employee to:

(1) Establish performance objectives, generally three to six, that are aligned to the goals and objectives of the NIS, the Department of Defense, and the employee's organization and that set specific performance targets for the individual.

(2) Ensure employee understanding of the relationship between the performance elements discussed in subparagraph 3.b.(2)(b) of this enclosure and the performance objectives.

(3) Establish specific developmental objectives in an IDP that are keyed to the attainment of competencies and skills critical to success in the job and the employee's career field, but that may not have been required qualifications for selection to the position.

(4) Establish the criteria against which the employee's success shall be measured.

b. Annual Performance Plan

(1) Purpose and Requirements. The annual performance plan shall be prepared as a record of the performance planning process in accordance with these requirements:

(a) Every eligible employee shall be issued a written performance plan and IDP by the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) at the beginning of the annual evaluation period each year.

(b) Employees assigned to a position at the beginning of the evaluation period shall have approved performance plans and IDPs not later than 30 days after the beginning of the evaluation period.

(c) Employees newly-appointed or newly-assigned to a position shall have approved performance plans and IDPs not later than 30 days from the date of appointment to the position.

(d) Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall establish performance plans in consultation with their employees.

(e) Reviewing officials shall review and approve each performance plan to ensure its consistency with organizational goals and objectives; appropriateness to employee experience, developmental needs, and work level; and equity with other plans within the purview of the reviewing official.

(2) Performance Objectives and Elements. The performance plan shall address:

(a) Performance Objectives. Each performance plan generally should include three to six performance objectives aligned with the objectives of the NIS, the Department of Defense, and the employee's organization.

1. Non-Supervisory Performance Objectives

a. Each non-supervisory employee shall be assigned performance objectives appropriate to the employee's pay band and career or occupational category. Each objective shall be derived from organizational goals and objectives and shall be a critical element of the employee's job. Each objective shall also be structured such that it is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bounded (SMART) in accordance with guidance provided in Enclosure 3.

b. Each performance objective shall include specific information on how achievement of the objective shall be measured.

2. Supervisory and/or Managerial Performance Objectives

a. Supervisors and managers under a DCIPS performance plan are accountable for achieving work results through subordinates. Therefore, performance objectives for supervisors and managers shall be prepared to reflect their progressively more demanding leadership role. Individual objectives shall be appropriate to the level of supervisory or managerial responsibility and pay. Objectives for the first-level supervisor should reflect responsibility for leading and managing the work and professional development of his or her direct report employees. Objectives for second- or higher-level managers should reflect their responsibility for setting the goals and direction of the unit, acquiring resources necessary for success, engaging in ongoing evaluation of results, and implementing necessary course corrections in pursuit of results. Enclosure 3 provides specific guidance for preparing supervisory and managerial objectives.

b. Rating officials shall provide subordinate supervisors and managers specific information on how achievement of objectives will be measured.

(b) Performance Elements for All Employees. All employees, both non-supervisory and those holding supervisory or managerial positions, shall be rated against the six behaviorally-based performance elements described in subparagraphs 3.b.(2)(b)1. through 3.b.(2)(b)6. of this enclosure. For supervisors and managers, the focus of each performance element shifts from the behaviors inherent in non-supervisory positions to those required of supervisors and managers responsible for leading the work of the organization. Performance expectations, even if not stated in a specific performance objective, include certain behavioral expectations that are related to an employee's conduct in the workplace and his or her approach to accomplishing specific performance objectives, including carrying out performance management responsibilities of this Volume. These aspects of an employee's performance are captured in the performance elements against which all employees shall be rated. Enclosure 4 to

this Volume will contain specific performance standards that operationalize performance elements to the career field and pay level of the employee.

1. Accountability for Results. DCIPS employees are expected to take responsibility for their work, setting and/or meeting priorities, and organizing and utilizing time and resources efficiently and effectively to achieve the desired results consistent with their organization's goals and objectives. In addition, supervisors and managers are expected to use these same skills to accept responsibility for and achieve results through the actions and contributions of their subordinates and their organization as a whole.

2. Communication. DCIPS employees are expected to effectively comprehend and convey information with and from others in writing, reading, listening, and verbal and non-verbal action. Employees are expected to use a variety of media in communicating and making presentations appropriate to the audience. In addition, DoD IC supervisors and managers are expected to use effective communication skills to build cohesive work teams, develop individual skills, and improve performance.

3. Critical Thinking. DCIPS employees are expected to use logic, analysis, synthesis, creativity, judgment, and systematic approaches to gather, evaluate, and use multiple sources of information to inform decisions and outcomes. In addition, supervisors and managers are expected to establish a work environment where employees feel free to engage in open, candid exchanges of information and diverse points of view.

4. Engagement and Collaboration. DCIPS employees have a responsibility to provide information and knowledge to achieve results. They are expected to recognize, value, build, and leverage organizationally-appropriate, diverse collaborative networks of coworkers, peers, customers, stakeholders, and teams within an organization and/or across the DoD Components with DCIPS positions and the IC. In addition, DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to create an environment that promotes engagement, collaboration, integration, and the sharing of information and knowledge.

5. Personal Leadership and Integrity. DCIPS employees are expected to demonstrate personal initiative and innovation as well as integrity, honesty, openness, and respect for diversity in their dealings with coworkers, peers, customers, stakeholders, teams, and collaborative networks across the IC. DCIPS employees are also expected to demonstrate core organizational, DoD, and IC values including selfless service, a commitment to excellence, and the courage and conviction to express their professional views.

6. Technical Expertise. DCIPS employees are expected to acquire and apply the knowledge, subject matter expertise, tradecraft, and/or technical competence necessary to achieve results.

(c) Performance Elements for Supervisors and Managers. DCIPS supervisors and managers shall be evaluated on the managerial portion of the elements in subparagraphs 3.b.(2)(b)1. through 3.b.(2)(b)4. of this enclosure. In addition, in place of those elements in subparagraphs 3.b.(2)(b)5. and 3.b.(2)(b)6. of this enclosure, they shall be covered by:

1. Leadership and Integrity. DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to exhibit the same individual personal leadership behaviors as all DCIPS employees. In their supervisory or managerial role, they are also expected to achieve organizational goals and objectives by creating shared vision and mission within their organizations; establishing a work environment that promotes diversity (of both persons and points of view), critical thinking, collaboration, and information sharing; mobilizing employees, stakeholders, and networks in support of their objectives; and recognizing and rewarding individual excellence, enterprise focus, innovation, and collaboration.

2. Managerial Proficiency. DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to possess the technical proficiency in their mission area appropriate to their role as supervisors or managers. They are also expected to leverage that proficiency to plan for, acquire, organize, integrate, develop, and prioritize the human, financial, material, information, and other resources to accomplish their organization's missions and objectives. In so doing, all supervisors and managers are also expected to focus on the development and productivity of their subordinates by setting clear performance expectations, providing ongoing coaching and feedback, evaluating the contributions of individual employees to organizational results, and linking performance ratings and rewards to the accomplishment of those results.

(3) Communicating the Performance Plan. Communications between rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees is critical to the success of the performance management process; therefore, communication between the employee and the supervisor regarding the content and expectations contained in the performance plan is critical to setting the tone for the annual performance management process. The initial dialog between the employee and the supervisor sets the stage for follow-up midpoint and evaluation reviews throughout the evaluation period.

(a) Performance objectives shall be communicated to the employee in writing within 30 days after the beginning of the evaluation period and whenever there is a need to modify an existing objective or add new objectives as a result of changes in mission priorities.

(b) Dialog on the performance plan shall include but not be limited to:

1. The relationship between the employee's performance objectives, the goals and objectives of the local work unit, and the broader strategic objectives for the current and future years contained in the NIS, Defense Intelligence guidance, and the goals and objectives of the employee's organization.

2. Examples of how the supervisor shall assess employee accomplishments against performance objectives (quantitative and qualitative).

3. The relationship between the performance elements and standards against which the employee shall be assessed and the accomplishment of performance objectives.

c. Annual IDP

(1) Every eligible employee shall be issued a written IDP by the rating official (developed in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) at the beginning of the annual evaluation period.

(2) Employees assigned to a position at the beginning of the evaluation period shall have approved IDPs not later than 30 days after the beginning of the period.

(3) Employees newly-appointed or newly-assigned to a position shall have approved IDPs not later than 30 days from the date of appointment to the position.

(4) Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall establish IDPs considering input from their employees.

(5) Reviewing officials shall review and approve each IDP to ensure its consistency with organizational goals and objectives; appropriateness to employee experience, developmental needs, and pay level; and equity with other IDPs within the purview of the reviewing official.

(6) Volume 2010 of this Instruction will contain guidance for the development of IDPs.

d. Approval of Performance Plans. The performance plan and IDP are considered approved when the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) has communicated the plan to the employee in writing following approval by the reviewing official. The rating official shall record the employee's receipt of the performance plan and IDP and the manner in which it was communicated (face-to-face, e-mail, fax, etc.) to the employee.

4. MANAGING PERFORMANCE

a. Monitoring. Rating officials are responsible for managing the performance of subordinates to achieve the goals and objectives of the organization. To be effective in their role, rating officials shall (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official):

(1) Engage in dialog throughout the evaluation period with their employees concerning their progress toward achieving performance objectives, behaviors related to successful performance, and their individual development.

(2) Hold one or more formal performance reviews with each employee during the evaluation cycle and document at least one review conducted at the midpoint of the evaluation period.

(3) Maintain performance and development information on their employees to be used to provide feedback and conduct the end-of-year performance evaluation.

(4) Update performance objectives in consultation with the employee when changing priorities or conditions beyond the control of the employee and/or supervisor indicate a need for change.

(5) Anticipate and address performance deficiencies as they appear.

(6) Acknowledge and reinforce effective behaviors demonstrated by the employee in the accomplishment of his or her job objectives.

b. Active Engagement. Actively managing employee performance during the evaluation period serves to increase the productivity and morale of the work unit by reinforcing the effective behaviors of the most productive employees and ensuring early intervention to address performance deficiencies when they may occur.

c. Dialog and Feedback

(1) Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall provide regular and timely feedback to all employees throughout the evaluation period regarding their performance. Regular dialog regarding performance is the primary means by which rating officials and employees ensure optimal accomplishment of organizational objectives. Feedback should be provided in the form of a two-way dialog during which the employee and rating official identify what is going well, how performance may be improved, and whether performance objectives require adjustment. Face-to-face is the preferred method of rating official and employee dialog. However, where geographic or other forms of separation make routine face-to-face meetings difficult or impossible, other means such as telephone or e-mail exchanges should be used to ensure that ongoing dialog takes place.

(2) Although rating officials are primarily accountable for ensuring that dialog regarding employee performance takes place, employees also have a responsibility to ensure that they receive continuing feedback on their performance. Employees may and should request periodic feedback from their rating officials to ensure there is a common understanding of expectations and progress against performance objectives.

d. Minimum Period of Performance. Unless otherwise excluded, this Volume applies to employees who at a minimum have been or are expected to be appointed or assigned to a DCIPS position and performing under an approved DCIPS performance plan for at least 90 days during the current evaluation period, but not to extend beyond the September 30 end-of-rating-period date. Periods of less than 90 days not included in the current evaluation period will be covered in the subsequent evaluation period.

(1) Only continuous performance in a DCIPS position or in an approved detail or assignment to a non-DCIPS position may be used to satisfy the 90-day minimum period described in paragraph 4.d. of this enclosure.

(2) Employees who have performed the minimum period shall be issued an evaluation of record in accordance with the procedures prescribed by this Volume.

(3) Employees who have not completed the minimum period of performance during the applicable evaluation period shall not be rated, and therefore generally will not be eligible for a performance payout except as specifically authorized by the policies and procedures in Volume 2006. Employees who are not ratable because they have not or will not have performed the minimum required period of service shall be advised by the rating official during the initial performance planning session.

e. Adjustment of Performance Objectives During the Evaluation Period. Performance objectives should be reviewed regularly by the employee and the rating official and adjusted when necessary to reflect changing priorities of the organization or when unanticipated events beyond the control of the employee and rating official make the performance objective unachievable. When adjusting performance expectations, supervisors and employees must follow the requirements for planning, communicating, monitoring, and assessing expectations established in this Volume. Adjustments to or changes in performance objectives shall be approved by the reviewing official prior to effecting any change. An employee must be assigned a modified or new objective for at least 90 days to be rated on that objective.

f. Adding Performance Objectives. When new performance objectives are assigned to an employee during the evaluation period (e.g., due to a job change, additional duties, promotion, change in organizational objectives), the new objectives must be structured such that they can be accomplished during the remaining portion of the evaluation period. New objectives must be added to the performance plan at least 90 days prior to the end of the evaluation period to be included in the annual evaluation of performance.

g. Mandatory Midpoint Performance Review. Feedback between the rating official and employee should be continuous throughout the evaluation period. However, in addition to ongoing feedback, rating officials shall conduct and document at least one formal performance review for each of his or her employees at or near the midpoint of the evaluation period. During this review, the rating official and employee shall discuss achievements to date against performance objectives and any areas for improvement. Both the supervisor and employee shall examine current performance objectives to determine whether adjustments are necessary, and shall formally document any required changes to the objectives for the remainder of the year in accordance with the instructions in paragraph 2.b. of this enclosure.

(1) For employees who are on track to meet or exceed expectations for their performance objectives, the rating official shall document and retain for the record the outcome of the midpoint review including the date on which the session took place and any changes in objectives or other summary information regarding the conversation. Any documentation will be maintained as a part of that employee's official performance record.

(2) For employees who are experiencing difficulties in achieving their objectives or are otherwise at risk of receiving a rating lower than "Successful," the rating official shall document and retain for the record all performance deficiencies and all actions the rating official and

employee will take during the period leading to the evaluation of record to improve performance to the “Successful” level. Documentation for the record shall be maintained as part of the official performance record.

(3) The employee shall be given a copy of the midpoint review document. The rating official shall record in the performance evaluation system the employee’s receipt of the midpoint review and the manner in which the review was communicated.

(4) If the rating official is not available to conduct the mandatory midpoint review, the reviewing official or other more senior management official in the employee’s direct chain of supervision with knowledge of the employee’s performance shall conduct the review.

5. DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE

a. Employee Development. Developing employee skills and abilities to contribute to the intelligence mission is an integral part of the performance management process. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) are responsible for including in performance management dialog the individual developmental needs of each of their employees.

b. Monitoring Progress Against the IDP

(1) Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees shall jointly review progress against the objectives of the IDP as part of the ongoing dialog process during the evaluation period. Volume 2010 of this Instruction will provide specific guidance on the IDP process.

(2) During the formal midpoint performance review, rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall address progress against the IDP and its relationship to accomplishment of employee performance objectives. Rating officials should make specific reference to the relationship between IDP objectives and improving competence in areas addressed by the performance elements, and to other career-group-specific and occupational-category-specific competencies from which the performance elements were derived. The performance elements and related competencies form the basis for supervisors to assist their employees with the individual development required for continued improvements in their ability to contribute to the intelligence mission.

(3) Rating officials are responsible for ensuring that employees have access to resources including internal and external training, mentoring, and assignments throughout the IC; individual coaching by the rating official (and the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official); and other resources that contribute to the success of employees when measured against their performance plans and IDPs and to improved productivity of the organization. Volume 2010 of this Instruction will provide additional guidance on development and the IDP process.

c. Addressing Needs for Performance Improvement. Rating officials are accountable for early identification of employee performance issues that may lead to an annual summary rating of less than “Successful.” They are also accountable for early identification of employees who are not on track to meet their performance expectations. Early action is essential to improving performance or setting the stage for further action when performance does not improve to the “Successful” level or higher, including adverse personnel action in accordance with procedures to be prescribed in Volume 2009 of this Instruction.

(1) Early and Frequent Dialog. At the first indication that an employee is not on track to meet his or her performance expectations for the year, the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall schedule a feedback session with the employee to explore the performance issues and set a documented course of action for improving performance during the remainder of the evaluation period. Feedback shall include:

(a) Discussion of the specific areas in which performance improvement is required including restatement of the expectations for specific results and behaviors, exploration of barriers to success, and specific actions that the employee and supervisor shall take to improve performance.

(b) Identification of resources available to improve performance including offering the employee the support that is most likely to contribute to performance improvement, such as additional job-specific training, performance coaching, frequent follow-up performance review sessions, or such other support as may be indicated.

(2) Documentation. If, in the rating official’s judgment, an employee’s performance is such that failure to improve could result in a summary evaluation of “Unacceptable” or “Needs Improvement” at the end of the evaluation period, the rating official shall document feedback sessions with the employee throughout the remainder of the evaluation period. Documentation shall be provided to the employee and shall include, at a minimum, a statement of the performance requiring improvement, the performance improvement actions that the supervisor and employee have agreed to implement, and the consequences of failure to demonstrate acceptable performance improvement.

(3) Disciplinary and Adverse Action. If the rating official believes an employee’s performance may warrant adverse action at or before the end of the evaluation period, he or she shall follow the procedures in Volume 2009 of this Instruction. Rating officials should seek advice from their servicing human resources professional on the appropriate actions to be followed in accordance with Volume 2009.

6. END-OF-YEAR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. The end-of-year performance evaluation prepared by the rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) provides the official documentation of the performance evaluation period. If done in the manner prescribed in this Volume, the evaluation of record provides an official record of the ongoing performance dialog between the rating official and employee that has taken place over the course of the evaluation period. The written evaluation

captures for the record the employee's accomplishments against agreed-upon performance objectives and his or her performance against the standards for the six performance elements, and provides an official evaluation of record that will inform the pay-setting process in the annual performance-based pay-decision process.

a. Rating Performance Objectives

(1) Employee Self-Report of Accomplishments

(a) Employees are the most knowledgeable source of their individual accomplishments against their objectives. To continue the performance dialog between supervisors and employees into the performance evaluation process, employees are expected to submit a personal report of their accomplishments for the evaluation period. The report shall address accomplishments against each performance objective. The employee self-report of his or her accomplishments should also address performance elements. It will become a part of the performance record and shall be used by the rating official as input to his or her evaluation of the employee's accomplishment in the end-of-year performance evaluation. When employees and rating officials differ in their perceptions of accomplishments, the rating official shall address the differences in the end-of-year performance dialog.

(b) To facilitate completion of the self-report of accomplishments, employees are encouraged to maintain a record of their accomplishments throughout the evaluation period.

(c) Employees will complete their self-report of accomplishments and forward it to the rating official according to a schedule determined by the Component, but not later than 15 calendar days following the end of the evaluation period. Component guidance may require that self-reports be completed prior to the end of the evaluation period, but shall ensure that all performance during the period is documented and considered in the evaluation process.

(2) Rating Official Evaluation of Performance. The rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) shall prepare a narrative and numerical evaluation for each eligible employee in accordance with guidelines prescribed in this Volume.

(a) The rating official shall prepare a brief narrative evaluation of the employee's accomplishments for each performance objective with appropriate consideration of the employee's self-report. The effects of the employee's accomplishments on the organizational goals and objectives should also be addressed.

(b) Accomplishment of performance objectives shall be rated using a 5-point rating scale as described in Table 1.

(c) Separate numerical ratings shall be assigned to each performance objective. Each numerical rating shall take into account the degree to which the objective was achieved in accordance with the guidance in Table 1. A rating of "1," "Unacceptable," on any performance

objective shall result in a summary objective rating of “Unacceptable” and an overall summary rating of “Unacceptable.”

(d) An overall rating for accomplishment of performance objectives shall be assigned by computing the arithmetic average of all assigned performance objective ratings. The overall rating for performance objectives shall be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point using standard rounding procedures.

(e) Objective ratings of “Not Rated (NR)” shall not be included in the computation of overall summary average ratings.

Table 1. Performance Objectives and Element Rating Descriptors

GENERAL STANDARDS		
PERFORMANCE RATING	OBJECTIVES DESCRIPTORS	ELEMENT DESCRIPTORS
OUTSTANDING (5)	The employee far exceeded expected results on the objective such that organizational goals were achieved that otherwise would not have been.	The employee consistently performed all key behaviors at an exemplary level on the element.
	At the summary level, the employee far exceeded expected results on all performance objectives such that organizational goals were achieved that otherwise would not have been.	At the summary level, the employee consistently performed at an exemplary level on all performance elements.
	Such exemplary achievements serve as a role model for others.	The employee served as a role model for others.
EXCELLENT (4)	The employee surpassed expected results in a substantial manner on the objective.	The employee demonstrated mastery-level performance of the key behaviors on the element.
	At the summary level, the employee surpassed expected results overall and in a substantial manner on most of the objectives with an average rating within the “Exceptional” range in Table 2.	At the summary level, the employee demonstrated mastery-level performance on most key elements with an average rating within the “Exceptional” range in Table 2.

Table 1. Performance Objectives and Element Rating Descriptors, Continued

GENERAL STANDARDS		
PERFORMANCE RATING	OBJECTIVES DESCRIPTORS	ELEMENT DESCRIPTORS
SUCCESSFUL (3)	The employee achieved expected results on the assigned objective.	The employee fully demonstrated effective, capable performance of key behaviors for the performance element.
	At the summary level, the employee achieved expected or higher results overall and on most assigned objectives with an average rating within the “Successful” range in Table 2.	At the summary level, the employee demonstrated effective, capable performance or higher on key behaviors on most performance elements with an average rating within the “Successful” range in Table 2.
MINIMALLY SUCCESSFUL (2)	The employee only partially achieved expected results on the performance objective.	The employee’s performance requires improvement on one or more of the key behaviors for the objective.
	At the summary level, the employee only partially achieved expected results for assigned objectives with an average rating within the “Minimally Successful” range in Table 2.	At the summary level, the employee’s behavior requires improvement with an average rating that falls within the “Minimally Successful” range in Table 2.
UNACCEPTABLE (1)	The employee failed to achieve expected results in one or more assigned performance objectives.	The employee failed to adequately demonstrate key behaviors for the performance element.
		At the summary level, the employee received a rating of “Unacceptable” on average for the performance elements.
NR	The employee did not have the opportunity to complete the objective because it became obsolete due to changing mission requirements or because of extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the employee and supervisor (e.g., resources diverted to higher-priority programs, employee in long-term training, deployed, on leave without pay).	Not used for performance elements.

b. Rating Performance Elements

(1) Each performance element for an employee shall be rated using the 5-point rating scale in Table 1. Performance against each element shall be rated by comparing employee performance against the narrative behavioral descriptors for each element contained in the performance standards arranged by career cluster and pay-band level. The rating for an element shall be the highest level within the standard descriptors for which the employee fully meets the letter and intent of the element rating. If the employee does not fully meet the behavioral descriptor, the rating shall be assigned to the next lower level. The “NR” rating may

not be used for performance elements. Any employee who has met the minimum requirements for receiving a performance rating shall be rated on all performance elements.

(2) The rating official shall prepare a brief narrative summary of the employee’s performance against each of the six DCIPS performance elements. The narrative shall highlight brief examples of employee actions that support the numerical rating assigned in accordance with Table 1.

(3) An employee’s overall rating against the six performance elements shall be computed by taking the arithmetic average of the individual ratings for all of the performance elements. The overall rating for performance elements shall be rounded to the nearest 10th of a point using standard rounding procedures.

c. Performance Evaluation of Record

(1) All employees shall receive an overall performance evaluation of record that reflects the combined accomplishments against objectives and performance against the six performance elements. The evaluation of record shall be computed by calculating the arithmetic average of the overall performance objectives rating and the overall performance elements rating, except when the employee has received an overall rating of “1” for accomplishment of performance objectives. This overall average rating will be the arithmetic average of the average performance objectives rating and the average performance elements rating, except that an overall summary evaluation of record of “1” shall be assigned if an evaluation of “Unacceptable” is assigned to any performance objective. The average rating shall be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point and converted to an evaluation of record rating and descriptor using the standards in Table 2 as a guide. Ratings of record will be converted to and recorded as a whole number using Table 2.

Table 2. Converting Average Rating to Evaluation of Record

AVERAGE RATING RANGE	EVALUATION OF RECORD RATING/DESCRIPTOR	GENERAL STANDARD
4.6-5.0	OUTSTANDING (5)	The employee’s overall contribution, both in terms of results achieved and the manner in which those results were achieved, has had extraordinary effects or impacts on mission objectives that would not otherwise have been achieved.
3.6-4.5	EXCELLENT (4)	The employee’s overall contribution, both in terms of results achieved and the manner in which those results were achieved, has had a significant impact on mission objectives.
2.6-3.5	SUCCESSFUL (3)	The employee’s overall contribution, both in terms of results achieved and the manner in which those results were achieved, has made a positive impact on mission objectives.
2.0-2.5	MINIMALLY SUCCESSFUL (2)	The employee’s overall contribution to mission, although positive, has been less than that expected.
<2 on any objective	UNACCEPTABLE (1)	The employee received an unacceptable rating on one or more performance objectives.

(2) Any employee who receives a summary rating of “1” on the performance objectives shall receive an evaluation of record of “1” or “Unacceptable.”

(3) Rating officials shall complete their evaluation of employee performance within 30 days following the end of the evaluation period.

d. Reviewing Official’s Evaluation of Performance

(1) The rating official shall forward the completed evaluation of record to the reviewing official prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee. The inclusion of the reviewing official in the performance evaluation process prior to providing feedback to the employee is not intended to limit ongoing dialog between the rating official and the employee. Rather, it is to ensure that the rating official has considered the perspective of the reviewing official from his or her vantage point over several organizational units to ensure there is common understanding and interpretation of expectations and standards across the organizational units.

(2) The reviewing official normally shall be the rating official’s rater; however, it may also be another official in the management chain above the rating official.

(3) Reviewing officials shall review numerical and narrative ratings provided by the supervisor for consistency with guidance provided by the reviewing official at the beginning of the evaluation period; congruence between numerical ratings assigned and supporting narrative; consistency across rating officials within the reviewing official’s organizational elements; compliance with merit system principles; and adherence to other relevant policy.

(4) On completion of his or her review, if the reviewing official agrees with the evaluation provided by the rating official, he or she shall provide concurrence and may provide additional narrative based on first-hand knowledge of the employee’s work and impact that would further clarify the employee’s contributions for consideration during the pay pool decision process.

(5) If the reviewing official does not agree with the narrative or numerical ratings provided by the rating official, the reviewing official shall return the evaluation to the rating official. The rating official and reviewing official will discuss the areas of disagreement, preferably in a face-to-face conversation. However if that is not possible, the reviewing official should provide written feedback to the rating official on the areas of disagreement and the recommended remediation. If the rating official does not accept the reviewing official’s suggested changes, the reviewing official may direct a change in the rating necessary to ensure consistency in the application of standards and guidance within the reviewing official’s purview. The basis for the directed change in rating shall be documented and maintained by the reviewing official until all actions relative to the annual performance evaluation and pay-decision processes are completed and closed.

(6) The reviewing official shall complete his or her review of all performance evaluations within his or her purview within 45 days following the end of the evaluation period.

e. PM PRA Review of Performance Evaluations of Record. Concurrent with the reviewing official's action, all evaluations of record are forwarded to the PM PRA for final review to ensure consistency across supervisors and reviewing officials and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

(1) When the PM PRA determines that there are inconsistencies requiring action, the PM PRA shall seek to resolve the apparent discrepancies with the accountable reviewing officials. The PM PRA must consult with legal counsel to ensure his or her actions conform to law.

(2) Where appropriate, the PM PRA may suggest corrective action prior to approval of ratings by the reviewing officials to ensure the integrity of the performance evaluation process.

(3) The PM PRA shall complete the performance evaluation review process not later than 45 days following the end of the evaluation period.

f. Communicating the Evaluation of Record to the Employee

(1) Rating officials are responsible for providing feedback to employees on their evaluation of record on receipt of approval of evaluations from the reviewing official and the PM PRA. The dialog on the formal performance evaluation document should represent the culmination of year-long ongoing feedback between the supervisor and employee regarding performance.

(2) Feedback provided to the employee should include a discussion of the accomplishments during the year and how work-related behaviors captured in the performance elements may have contributed to or inhibited overall success. The discussion should also focus on achievements against developmental goals for the year and what additional developmental objectives may contribute to continued improvements in employee performance.

(3) If an employee disagrees with the ratings on the performance evaluation, the employee should first contact the rating and reviewing officials within 5 days of the employee's receipt of the rating to resolve the disagreement informally. The rater and/or reviewing official are expected to respond to the employee within 5 days from the day the employee raises the disagreement. If the employee, rater, and reviewer are unable to resolve the employee's issue within this 10-day period, the employee may pursue the formal administrative reconsideration process delineated in paragraph 9.c. of this enclosure.

7. INTERIM PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PERIOD. During the annual performance evaluation period, events may occur that result either in a change of the rating official or a reassignment of the employee, or that remove an employee temporarily from direct supervision of the rating official as a result of temporary assignments or deployments that do not result in a change in the rating official. The special procedures intended to address these special situations are:

a. Closeout Performance Evaluation. When the rating official will no longer be the employee's rater, the rating official shall complete a brief narrative description of the employee's performance, accomplishments, and contributions during the current evaluation period and assign numerical evaluations to the performance elements, objectives, and overall evaluation in accordance with the end-of-year performance evaluation process. Closeout performance evaluations shall be approved by a reviewing official and reviewed by the PM PRA as with the evaluation of record. Generally, this situation exists on reassignment or separation of either the employee or rating official.

(1) A closeout performance evaluation is required only when the rating official and employee relationship has existed with an approved performance plan for a period of at least 90 days. However, closeout performance evaluations may be completed for periods of less than 90 days in accordance with Component internal policy or at the request of the employee.

(2) Closeout performance evaluations shall be completed on all employees detailed to another organization and on deployments for periods of 90 days or more. Such evaluations shall be completed by a supervisor or manager responsible for the employee's work while on detail or deployment. The completed closeout evaluation shall be forwarded to the employee's rating official for consideration in the preparation of the evaluation of record.

(3) Rating officials shall consider information contained in all closeout performance evaluations when determining the annual evaluation of record for pay-decision purposes.

(4) A closeout performance evaluation will become the final evaluation of record, rather than input in developing the final evaluation of record, in circumstances where the final evaluation of record can not be completed. When such occurs, employees must be informed and must be advised of the process to resolve disputed ratings under Section 6.f.(3) and Section 9.c. of this enclosure that apply. Timelines begin the date the employee has been informed that the closeout performance evaluation has become the evaluation of record.

b. Interim or Temporary Assignment Report of Performance. Many employees within the DoD Components with DCIPS positions are called upon to accept temporary or interim assignments and deployments in support of the national and Defense Intelligence missions. Often these assignments may be for periods of 90 days or less, but during which time the employee is making significant contributions to the mission of the Department of Defense or the IC. For such assignments it is important that the contributions of the employee be officially documented for consideration during the end-of-year performance evaluation process.

(1) For periods of deployment or temporary assignment for 90 days or less or that otherwise do not require a closeout performance evaluation, the supervisor at the location of deployment or temporary assignment who is knowledgeable of the employee's contributions to that organization shall complete a brief narrative of the employee's contributions during the deployment for submission to the employee's rating official.

(2) In their submission of accomplishments for either the full annual or close-out evaluation period, employees should include a brief summary of their accomplishments during

any deployments or temporary assignments completed during the current performance evaluation period.

(3) Rating officials are responsible for ensuring that all periods of deployment or temporary assignment in support of the DoD and IC mission are considered and documented during the end-of-year performance evaluation.

8. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

a. Employees Absent to Perform Military Service. Employees who are absent from their positions to perform military service shall be entitled to all protections of title 38, U.S.C. (Reference (h), commonly referred to as the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act).

(1) Employees who leave their positions during an evaluation period to serve a period of active military service, and who have completed at least 90 days under their performance plan, shall be entitled to a close-out performance evaluation in accordance with subparagraph 7.a.(2) of this enclosure.

(2) Employees who return to their positions following a period of military service who do not have the required 90 days of civilian service under a performance plan during the current evaluation period at the close of the evaluation period, shall be awarded a presumptive evaluation of record. The presumptive evaluation will be their last summary evaluation of record prior to departure for military service, but not less than a summary rating of “Successful” for the evaluation period that has closed.

b. Employees Absent on Workers’ Compensation. Employees absent from their positions on workers’ compensation shall be handled in accordance with the procedures in paragraph 8.a. of this enclosure.

c. Employees Absent Due to Other Special Circumstances. Employees absent from their positions on long-term training or other special circumstances shall be handled in accordance with the policies established by their DoD Components.

d. Administrative Error. Employees who would have been eligible for a rating of record pursuant to this Volume but for an administrative error shall be provided an extension to the evaluation period. The rating and payout procedures shall be in accordance with the requirements of this Volume and Volume 2012 of this Instruction to the maximum extent feasible. Such extension may not delay the effective date of the payout for either the individual employee or the pay pool.

9. CHALLENGING THE EVALUATION OF RECORD. This section describes the DoD reconsideration process for DCIPS evaluations of record. If after discussion with the rating and reviewing official as provided by subparagraph 6.f.(3) of this enclosure, or in lieu of such

discussion, the employee continues to disagree with the ratings, the employee may seek formal reconsideration of the rating by the PM PRA. The administrative reconsideration process described is the exclusive formal process by which DCIPS employees may challenge their evaluation of record pursuant to this Volume. Employees may not challenge a midpoint review or an interim assignment report of performance. Allegations that an evaluation of record was based on prohibited considerations such as race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, physical or mental disability, or reprisal; on prohibited personnel practices; or on protections against whistleblower reprisal shall be processed through the Equal Employment Opportunity discrimination complaint procedure, DoD Component administrative grievance processes, the DoD Component inspector general or office of special counsel, if applicable, or other appropriate avenues rather than the reconsideration process.

a. Alternative Dispute Resolution. Alternative dispute resolution may be pursued at any time during the reconsideration process consistent with DoD Component policies and procedures.

b. Relationship to Compensation. In the event of a decision to adjust an evaluation of record, all compensation decisions that have been made with regard to the individual based on the adjusted evaluation of record must be reviewed for adjustment as appropriate. Any adjustments to compensation shall be retroactive to the effective date of the original compensation decision. Decisions made through this process shall not result in recalculation of the payout made to other employees in the pay pool.

c. Procedures for Administrative Reconsideration

(1) An employee seeking reconsideration of the evaluation of record must submit a written request for reconsideration to the PM PRA with a copy to the rating official, the reviewing official (if different from the PM PRA), and the servicing human resources office (HRO). The request for reconsideration must state the basis for the disagreement about the ratings and explain how any discussion with the rating and reviewing official has not resolved the matter.

(a) An employee who has attempted to resolve the disagreement informally as described in subparagraph 6.f.(3) of this enclosure shall have 10 days from the date he or she receives a decision from the rater and/or reviewing official about the disagreement to initiate the formal administrative reconsideration process.

(b) An employee who has not pursued an informal resolution of the evaluation of record disagreement shall have 10 days from the receipt of the evaluation of record to initiate the formal administrative reconsideration process.

(2) An employee seeking administrative reconsideration may identify someone to act as his or her representative to assist in pursuing the reconsideration request. The employee representative may not have any conflict of interest with regard to the employee's request for reconsideration. The PM PRA shall determine whether there is any potential conflict of interest that may affect the reconsideration process.

(3) The request for reconsideration must be in writing and may include a request to personally address the PM PRA. The request must include a copy of the evaluation of record being challenged, state what change is being requested, and provide the employee's basis for requesting the change.

(4) Failure to comply with the procedures in this section may result in the PM PRA issuing a written cancellation of the reconsideration request. In this case, a copy of the cancellation shall be furnished to the servicing HRO, the employee's rating official, and the employee.

(5) The PM PRA shall review the request and confer with the rating official and reviewing official (when the reviewing official is not the PM PRA). He or she may conduct further inquiry as he or she deems appropriate. Should the PM PRA direct such additional inquiry, the employee shall be offered the opportunity to review documentation and findings developed during the course of the further inquiry.

(6) If the employee has requested an opportunity to personally address the PM PRA and the PM PRA has approved the request, the PM PRA shall set the date, time, location, and method of communication. To the extent practicable, such events shall be held during the scheduled working hours of the employee.

(7) Within 15 calendar days of the PM PRA's receipt of the employee's written request for reconsideration, the PM PRA must render a written decision. The PM PRA may extend the deadline if necessary by another 15 calendar days. The decision must include a brief explanation of the basis for the decision, and notification that the employee may request further and final reconsideration of the decision by the Head of the DoD Component. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the servicing HRO, the rating official, the reviewing official (when the reviewing official is not the PM PRA) and the employee.

(8) If an employee chooses to request further and final reconsideration of the evaluation of record, a request for reconsideration must be submitted to the Head of the DoD Component with DCIPS positions in accordance with internal Component guidelines within 7 calendar days of receipt of the notice of the PM PRA decision. Within 15 calendar days of receipt of a request for further and final reconsideration, the Head of the Component shall issue a final decision unless he or she determines that further inquiry is required. In such case, the Head of the Component shall advise the employee that a final decision shall be rendered on completion of the inquiry, but not later than 30 calendar days from the date of such notification. A decision by the Head of the Component on the request for reconsideration is final.

(9) If the final decision is to change the evaluation of record, the corrected evaluation shall take the place of the original one. A revised evaluation of record shall be prepared and entered into all appropriate records and a copy shall be provided to the employee, the servicing HRO, and the rating official. The revised evaluation of record shall be retroactive to the effective date of the original evaluation of record.

(10) When calculating time limits under the administrative reconsideration procedure, the day of an action or receipt of a document is not counted. The last day of the time limit is counted unless it is a Saturday, Sunday, legal holiday, or a day on which the employee is not regularly scheduled to work. In those cases, the last day of the time limit shall be moved to the employee's next regularly scheduled workday. All time limits are counted in calendar days.

(11) If the PM PRA or Head of a DoD Component with DCIPS positions grants the employee's request for reconsideration after the annual pay-decision process, the employee's pay decision shall be reconsidered and, if the change in rating so indicates, shall be changed to be consistent with the pay decisions for other similarly situated employees within the employee's pay pool. The new pay decision shall be made retroactive to the effective date of pay pool decisions that have been made within the employee's pay pool in accordance with Volume 2012 of this Instruction.

ENCLOSURE 3

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

1. OVERVIEW. Individual performance objectives against which employees work are critical to linking the individual employee to the mission, goals, and objectives of an organization.

a. From the perspective of the organization, each individual performance objective assigned to an employee, if prepared thoughtfully, accomplishes one element of the organization's strategic goals and objectives. Taken in sum, the aggregate accomplishment of goals assigned to the organization's workforce, from the file clerk who ensures organizational records are properly accounted for and retrievable to the senior executive responsible for leadership of a major mission area, produce mission success for the organization.

b. From the perspective of the personnel management system, the performance objective as an element of the performance system provides the means by which the individual employee understands his or her role in the organization. It also provides the means by which the supervisor is able to observe, measure, and intercede as necessary as employees work against their individual and collective performance objectives. As accomplishments are aggregated upward through the organization, the collective accomplishments against all performance objectives provide organizational leaders with direct measures of the achievements of their organizations.

2. THE SMART OBJECTIVE

a. For most supervisors and managers, providing employees with written performance objectives and a formal performance plan as part of the performance expectations discussion at the beginning of the evaluation period may seem to be a new requirement. Historically, however, supervisors generally have told employees orally what they were expected to do and achieve during the evaluation period. In some cases, this may have involved providing the employee a copy of his or her job description that laid out the duties of the position. In other cases, supervisors provided specific expectations such as production and quality standards. Such expectations most often were used in jobs that involved repetitive processing such as voucher examining, insurance claims processing, or security adjudications.

b. For DCIPS employees, performance objectives are the most important element in the pay-decision process and also influence the promotion and assignment selection processes. Consequently, employees and managers must have confidence that performance objectives are written and evaluated in a manner that ensures equity and fairness within every organization and across all career groups.

c. DCIPS employees, managers, and oversight bodies shall judge both the quality and fairness of objectives in an employee's performance plan in terms of how each objective is structured in accordance with sections 3 and 4 of this enclosure.

3. WRITING SMART OBJECTIVES FOR EMPLOYEES. For there to be a common understanding between the supervisor and employee on what the employee is expected to achieve during the performance evaluation period, individual employee objectives must be clearly identified.

a. Performance Objectives are not Duty Statements. A performance objective is significantly different from a duty statement in a position description. The duty statement sets boundaries within which an employee is expected to carry out his or her responsibilities. It is intentionally vague with regard to individual assignments because it is designed to provide a durable framework within which employees will be assigned work over time. For example, a duty statement might specify that an employee will “conduct substantive analyses of the economies of the Middle Eastern countries, providing written predictive analyses of leadership responses to existing or changing economic conditions within the region.” Such a statement provides sufficient information to judge the experience and qualifications of the type of analyst who might hold the position. It also establishes the types of work assignments that the employee in the position should expect to be assigned. However, it does not provide specificity on the priorities of the organization or on the manner in which specific analytic assignments are to be selected, carried out, or assigned. It also does not provide conditions under which the assignment shall be undertaken (as a member of a team, as leader of a team, as an individual contributor, or other conditions) or other details necessary to establish clear understanding of expectations between the supervisor and employee.

b. Performance Objectives are Specific. Performance objectives must be more specific than general duty statements. However, they should also be durable. Supervisors should strive to provide employees with three to six performance objectives for the evaluation period, with fewer generally being more effective. For example, an objective derived from the duty statement in the example in paragraph 3.a. of this enclosure would be sufficiently specific for an experienced analyst to understand the expectations for one of his or her work products during the evaluation period. The restated objective might read: “The employee shall complete by August 31 an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on the Iraqi industrial sector and present the results of that analysis in a finished and appropriately coordinated intelligence report for release to the policy-making community.”

c. Performance Objectives are Measurable. Employees must be provided the criteria against which their accomplishments will be evaluated. In the example in paragraph 3.b. of this enclosure, the work product has been described in terms sufficiently specific for an experienced analyst to understand. However, the supervisor has not yet described the criteria against which the completed work product will be reviewed to determine the extent to which it is responsive to the requirement (i.e., whether the employee has achieved or exceeded expectations). The supervisor might expand on the objective above by stating: “To achieve expectations on this objective, the completed product will make use of available intelligence from all relevant sources; will reflect engagement with other analysts, customers, and stakeholders in the subject of the analysis; will have incorporated the coordinated views of those other analysts and collectors throughout the IC; will be presented in the product style appropriate to the question;

and will be timely.” For an experienced employee, the standards outlined should be sufficient to establish the standard review methods that will be applied and any extraordinary expectations that may be added.

(1) During the planning discussion of the performance objective with the employee, it is appropriate that the supervisor discuss the specific relationship between the evaluation of the extent to which the employee has met or exceeded expectations on the objective and relevant performance elements. For example, in this critical thinking, communication and engagement and integration would all be significant in the achievement of the objective.

(2) Employees should be advised that the performance elements will be rated in their own right but will also affect the supervisor’s rating official’s judgment of the degree to which expectations have been met for the objective.

d. Performance Objectives are Achievable. All performance objectives should be appropriate to the experience, skill, and pay level of the employee. In the example in paragraph 3.b. of this enclosure, the objective may be appropriate to a full-performance or senior analyst. Supervisors may refer to duties described in employee job descriptions or other documentation describing responsibilities for analysts, or in other employee occupational categories, as the basis for establishing the appropriate difficulty for a performance objective. The employee must also have access to the necessary resources to complete the work product. For example, the analyst assigned this objective would require access to the appropriate intelligence on the issue including translation support if applicable, other analysts working the issue, supervisory guidance and feedback as appropriate to his or her experience, and appropriate production support resources. During the performance-planning phase of the evaluation period, the supervisor and employee should establish the level of support necessary to ensure that the objective is achievable.

e. Performance Objectives are Relevant. To be relevant, DCIPS performance objectives must be derived from the NIS, Defense Intelligence Guidance, and the mission objectives of the employee’s organization.

f. Performance Objectives are Timely or Time-Bounded. Performance objectives must specify the period during which the objective is expected to be achieved. In the example in paragraph 3.b. of this enclosure, the period has been specified as requiring completion and delivery of the work product by August 31 of the evaluation period.

4. WRITING SMART OBJECTIVES FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS

a. The underlying principles for writing objectives for supervisors and managers are the same as those for non-supervisory employees. However, the objectives themselves differ because the work products of the supervisor or manager are the work products of the unit, produced through the leadership of subordinate non-supervisory employees, increased workforce capability through supervisory development of subordinates and marshalling of the resources necessary to the success of the unit, and the strategic integration of the work unit into the broader Defense Intelligence and IC leadership activities.

b. Supervisory and managerial objectives are specific to the leadership roles of those holding these types of positions. The objectives for supervisors also differ from those of managers, with supervisors being more intimately involved in shaping individual work products in the unit and developing the skills of the subordinate workforce through individual interactions and coaching. At the managerial level, work activities are more focused on developing the leadership skills of subordinate supervisors, integrating the work of the unit into broader organizational contexts, and obtaining the resources (people, money, equipment) necessary to perform the mission of the work unit.

(1) Using the example for the individual analyst contributor developed in section 3 of this enclosure, the complete SMART objective for the analyst would, following from the managers' objectives through the unit supervisor to the individual employee analyst, be: "The employee shall complete by August 31 an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on the Iraqi industrial sector and present the results of that analysis in a finished and appropriately coordinated intelligence report for release to the policy-making community. To achieve expectations on this objective, the completed product will make use of available intelligence from all relevant sources, will reflect engagement with other analysts and stakeholders in the subject of the analysis, will have incorporated the coordinated views of those other analysts and collectors throughout the IC, will be presented in the product style appropriate to the question, and will be timely."

(2) For the manager of this unit, the objectives would follow from NIS Mission Objective #5.

(3) If the analyst in the example in subparagraph 4.b.(1) of this enclosure were located in a joint information operations center (JIOC) responsible for Middle Eastern intelligence operations, his or her objectives would follow from Defense Intelligence guidance and from the JIOC manager's objectives, which might include such leadership objectives as: "Develop and implement a strategy for accessing all-source intelligence relating to the JIOC area of operations, integrating the military and civilian workforce within the JIOC, and establishing JIOC objectives that will drive individual performance against the joint national and military intelligence mission, establish success measures against all JIOC objectives, and complete an initial assessment of progress against those measures by the end of the evaluation period."

(4) At the supervisory level, the employee's objectives would again follow from Defense Intelligence guidance but also from managerial objectives. For the supervisor of the analyst in the example in paragraph 3.a. of this enclosure, an objective might include such supervisory objectives as: "Develops the annual operating plan for the unit, developing and communicating specific performance objectives to all subordinate employees, establishing success measures for each objective, and conducting ongoing feedback throughout the evaluation period such that all organizational objectives are met, end-of-year performance feedback is provided to all subordinates in accordance with established guidelines, and reports of accomplishment are provided to JIOC management by the completion of the evaluation period."

GLOSSARY

DEFINITIONS

Unless otherwise noted, these terms and their definitions apply to this Volume of this Instruction and serve as the basic performance management taxonomy for DoD Components with DCIPS positions.

closeout performance evaluation. A narrative description and numeric evaluation of an eligible employee's performance under an approved performance plan when there is a change in the rating official. The closeout performance evaluation is completed by the supervisor or rating official and conveys information regarding the employee's progress toward completion of performance objectives and performance against the performance elements. A closeout performance evaluation is not an evaluation of record, but shall be used to inform the rating official of employee accomplishments and/or needed improvement for the period covered by the evaluation. A closeout performance evaluation may become the final evaluation of record where the final evaluation of record can not be completed.

evaluation of record. The summary performance rating, derived from the employee's ratings on his or her performance elements and performance objectives, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance that is used for official purposes, including decisions on pay increases as part of the DCIPS annual pay-decision process

evaluation period. The annual period from creation of the employee performance plan through completion of the annual performance evaluation and evaluation of record. For DCIPS, the evaluation period covers the period from October 1 through September 30 each year. The effective date of the performance evaluation will be the date on which the reviewer approves the rating, but not later than November 15 each calendar year.

IDP. A document prepared jointly by the supervisor and employee as part of the annual performance planning process that outlines development objectives for the employee. IDPs may include training, education, individual coaching, work assignment, or other activities designed to improve the employee's capability within his or her career field.

interim or temporary assignment report of performance. A narrative description of an employee's accomplishments prepared by a supervisor other than the rating official during an employee's interim or temporary assignment or deployment, generally for periods of 90 days or less.

performance element. A standard set of behaviors for all DCIPS positions, derived from analysis of the work being performed by employees, that are necessary for successful performance of that work.

performance evaluation. The written or otherwise recorded evaluation of performance and accomplishments rated against DCIPS performance elements and objectives.

performance feedback. Management or supervisory communication with an employee throughout the evaluation period to convey employee performance levels and progress against the employee's performance plan.

performance objectives. Information that relates individual job assignments or position responsibilities and/or accomplishments to performance elements and standards and to the mission, goals, and objectives of the DoD Component.

performance plan. All of the written or otherwise recorded performance elements, standards, and objectives against which the employee's performance is measured.

performance standards. Descriptors by performance element of "Successful" performance thresholds, requirements, or expectations for each career path and pay band.

PM PRA. A senior employee or board within the chain of supervision of employees included in the rating and performance management processes for the organization, responsible for oversight of performance management processes. The PM PRA provides merit system oversight of the ratings under its purview, ensures compliance with merit principles, and resolves individual employee requests for reconsideration of ratings. Except where the PM PRA is the Head of the DoD Component, the PM PRA should be at a level higher within the organizational hierarchy than the most senior reviewing official participating in the performance decision process. Where separation is not possible, the PM PRA shall be established as a senior employee or panel not in the chain of supervision for the performance evaluations under consideration.

rating official. The official in an employee's chain of supervision, generally the supervisor, responsible for conducting performance planning, managing performance throughout the evaluation period, and preparing the end-of-year evaluation of record on an employee.

reviewing official. An individual in the rating official's direct chain of supervision designated by the Head of the DoD Component with DCIPS positions to assess supervisor preliminary performance ratings for accuracy, consistency, and compliance with policy. The reviewing official is the approving official for each performance evaluation within his or her purview.