



Department of Defense INSTRUCTION

NUMBER 1400.25, Volume 2011

May 7, 2016

Incorporating Change 1, Effective July 13, 2020

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 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 DoD.

b. Volumes

(1) 2000 Volume Series. In accordance with the authority in Reference (a) and DoD Directives 5143.01, 1400.25, and 1400.35 (References (b), (c), and (d)), the 2000 volume series of this instruction establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides guidance for DCIPS. The 2000 volume series of this instruction will be referred to as “the DCIPS volumes.”

(2) This Volume. Pursuant to section 1601 of Title 10, United States Code (Reference (e)), this volume reissues Volume 2011 of this instruction (Reference (f)) to establish performance management policies, assign responsibilities, and prescribe 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 are established in Volume 2012 of this instruction (Reference (g)).

2. APPLICABILITY. This volume:

a. Applies to:

(1) 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 within the DoD (referred to collectively in this volume as the “DoD Components”).

(2) 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.

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

3. POLICY. It is DoD policy that:

a. DCIPS is an essential tool supporting the transformation of the Defense Intelligence Enterprise.

b. The DCIPS performance management system will:

(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 will not permit a forced distribution of evaluations.

(5) Identify the developmental needs of DCIPS employees.

(6) Be consistent with the merit system principles set out in Chapter 23 of Title 5, United States Code (Reference (h)).

4. RESPONSIBILITIES

a. Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. In conjunction with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness coordinates on the development of DCIPS performance management policies and monitors their effects on DoD-wide personnel readiness.

b. Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security. In conjunction with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security establishes 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 in Intelligence Community Directive Number 651 (Reference (i)).

c. DoD Component Heads With DCIPS Positions. The DoD Component heads with DCIPS positions may issue internal policy, procedures, and guidance to supplement this volume. Such supplemental material must be in accordance with References (c), (d), and (e) and Volume 2001 of this instruction (Reference (j)).

5. PROCEDURES. Enclosures 2 through 10 provide procedures for DCIPS performance management. Enclosure 11 provides specific guidance for preparing supervisory and managerial objectives.

6. RELEASABILITY. **Cleared for public release**. This issuance is available on the Directives Division Website at <https://www.esd.whs.mil/DD>.

7. SUMMARY OF CHANGE 1. The changes to this issuance:

a. Update information regarding performance-based delay of within-grade increases for DoD civilian personnel to comply with Section 1106 of Public Law 114-92 (Reference (u)) in accordance with the direction in the June 23, 2020 Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum (Reference (v)).

b. Update the title of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security in accordance with Public Law 116-92 (Reference (w)).

8. EFFECTIVE DATE. This volume is effective May 7, 2016.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brad Carson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Brad Carson
Acting Under Secretary of Defense
for Personnel and Readiness

Enclosures

1. References
2. General Roles and Duties
3. The Performance Management Process
4. Performance Planning
5. Managing Performance
6. Developing Performance
7. End-of-Year Performance Evaluation
8. Interim Periods of Performance during the Performance Evaluation Period
9. Special Circumstances
10. Challenging the Performance Evaluation of Record
11. Guidelines for Writing Performance Objectives

Glossary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ENCLOSURE 1: REFERENCES.....7
ENCLOSURE 2: GENERAL ROLES AND DUTIES.....9
 OVERVIEW9
 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW
 AUTHORITY (PM PRA).....9
 REVIEWING OFFICIALS.....10
 RATING OFFICIALS10
 SUPERVISORS WHEN NOT THE RATING OFFICIAL.....11
 EMPLOYEES12
ENCLOSURE 3: THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS13
 PHASES OVERVIEW13
 STANDARD EVALUATION PERIOD13
 PERFORMANCE PLANNING PROCESS13
 DIALOGUE.....13
 EMPLOYEE SELF EVALUATION14
ENCLOSURE 4: PERFORMANCE PLANNING15
 ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE PLANNING.....15
 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN.....15
 ANNUAL IDP19
 APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE PLANS20
ENCLOSURE 5: MANAGING PERFORMANCE21
 MONITORING.....21
 ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT21
 DIALOGUE AND FEEDBACK21
 MINIMUM PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE22
 ADJUSTMENT OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DURING THE EVALUATION
 PERIOD22
 ADJUSTMENT OF PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS DURING THE EVALUATION
 PERIOD23
 ADDING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES.....23
 MANDATORY MIDPOINT PERFORMANCE REVIEW23
ENCLOSURE 6: DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE25
 EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT.....25
 MONITORING PROGRESS AGAINST THE IDP25

ADDRESSING REQUIREMENTS FOR PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT.....25

ENCLOSURE 7: END-OF-YEAR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION27

 OVERVIEW27

 RATING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES27

 RATING PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS29

 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RECORD.....30

 REVIEWING OFFICIAL’S REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE EVALUATION OF
 PERFORMANCE31

 PM PRA REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF
 RECORD32

 COMMUNICATING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RECORD TO THE
 EMPLOYEE33

 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND WITHIN-GRADE INCREASES (WGIS).....33

ENCLOSURE 8: INTERIM PERIODS OF PERFORMANCE DURING THE
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PERIOD.....35

ENCLSOURE 9: SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES37

 EMPLOYEES ABSENT TO PERFORM MILITARY SERVICE37

 EMPLOYEES ABSENT ON WORKERS’ COMPENSATION37

 EMPLOYEES ABSENT DUE TO OTHER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.....37

ENCLOSURE 10: CHALLENGING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RECORD..38

ENCLOSURE 11: GUIDELINES FOR WRITING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES42

 OVERVIEW42

 THE SMART OBJECTIVE.....42

 WRITING SMART OBJECTIVES FOR EMPLOYEES.....42

 WRITING SMART OBJECTIVES FOR SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS44

GLOSSARY47

 PART I: ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS47

 PART II: DEFINITIONS.....47

TABLES

 1. Performance Objectives and Element Rating Descriptors.....28

 2. Converting Average Rating to Evaluation of Record30

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 and Security (USD(I&S))," October 24, 2014, as amended
- (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, as amended
- (e) Section 1601 of Title 10, United States Code
- (f) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2011, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management," August 14, 2009, as amended (hereby cancelled)
- (g) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2012, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance-Based Compensation," April 28, 2012
- (h) Chapter 23 of Title 5, United States Code
- (i) Intelligence Community Directive Number 651, "Performance Management System Requirements for the Intelligence Community Civilian Workforce," November 28, 2007, as amended
- (j) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2001, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Introduction," December 29, 2008, as amended
- (k) The National Intelligence Strategy, "The National Intelligence Strategy of the United States of America," September 18, 2014¹
- (l) DoD Instruction 5400.11, "DoD Privacy and Civil Liberties Programs," January 29, 2019
- (m) DoD 5400.11-R, "Department of Defense Privacy Program," May 14, 2007
- (n) Executive Order 13526, "Classified National Security Information," December 29, 2009
- (o) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2010, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Professional Development," December 9, 2012
- (p) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2009, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Disciplinary, Performance-Based, and Adverse Action Procedures," May 20, 2012, as amended
- (q) Section 531.405 of Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations
- (r) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2006, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Compensation Administration," March 3, 2012, as amended
- (s) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2008, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Awards and Recognition," September 12, 2012, as amended
- (t) Chapter 43 of Title 38, United States Code

¹Available at http://www.odni.gov/files/documents/2014_NIS_Publication.pdf

- (u) Public Law 114-92, “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016,”
November 25, 2015
- (v) Deputy Secretary of Defense Memorandum, “Performance-based Delay of Within-Grade
Increases for Department of Defense Civilian Personnel,” June 23, 2020
- (w) Public Law 116-92, “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020,”
December 20, 2019

ENCLOSURE 2

GENERAL ROLES AND DUTIES

1. OVERVIEW. Performance management has one primary purpose: to achieve organizational results and mission objectives through the effective management of individual and organizational performance.

a. To achieve that purpose, performance management will be a priority for all Defense Intelligence executives, managers, supervisors, and employees.

b. The performance expectations of organizations and their senior leaders will be linked to the Director of National Intelligence Strategy (Reference (k), referred to in this volume as the “National Intelligence Strategy” and applicable strategies of the DoD and the DoD Components with DCIPS positions.

c. Performance expectations will cascade from the senior levels of the organization through subordinate managers and supervisors to individual employees.

d. 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.

e. All levels of participants in the performance management process must ensure that the collection, use, maintenance, and dissemination of personally identifiable information is in accordance with DoD Instruction 5400.11 (Reference (l)) and DoD 5400.11-R (Reference (m)).

2. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE REVIEW AUTHORITY (PM PRA).

The PM PRA is responsible and will be held accountable for:

a. Oversight of the performance management process to ensure the consistency of DCIPS performance management practices within the DoD Components with DCIPS positions.

b. Final approval of all performance evaluations of record under his or her purview, directing changes when necessary to ensure compliance with merit system principles and policy requirements.

c. Review of employee performance evaluation of record when challenged by an employee through a reconsideration process (either informal or formal) and approval of any changes. See Enclosure 10 of this volume for information on challenging the performance evaluation of record.

3. **REVIEWING OFFICIALS.** Reviewing officials are responsible and will be held accountable for:

a. Approval of each individual performance plan, performance evaluation of record, and individual development plan (IDP) within their purview. This includes the requirement to direct or make changes to proposed performance evaluations of record when there is disagreement between the rating official and the reviewing official. In cases where the PM PRA directs changes to the rating and reviewing officials, the reviewing official is responsible for ensuring those directed changes from the PM PRA are accomplished and approved.

b. The 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 plans and IDPs are approved and in place in accordance with DoD Component guidance within established timelines for all employees.

(2) Subordinate rating officials and supervisors are trained on their roles, when the supervisor is not the rating official. (See sections 4 and 5 of this enclosure for rating official and supervisor responsibilities).

(3) Subordinate rating officials provide performance feedback throughout the evaluation period and rating officials document 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, maintain ongoing dialogue 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 execute their responsibilities consistent with merit system principles and DCIPS policy.

4. **RATING OFFICIALS.** Rating officials are responsible and will be held accountable for effectively managing the performance of assigned employees. Generally, the same person will not serve as both the rating official and reviewing official for an employee or set of employees. However, in cases where this is not feasible due to organizational structure or because the rating or reviewing official leaves before the end of the evaluation period, the same person may serve in both roles for a given employee or set of employees in accordance with DoD Component guidance. Rating official responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- a. Executing the requirements of this volume in accordance with the merit system principles in Reference (h).
- b. Ensuring employees are trained in the performance management system.
- c. Developing and communicating performance objectives and expectations within the established timelines and holding employees accountable for accomplishing them.
- d. Preparing jointly with employees, to the extent practicable, development objectives for the performance year and recording them in an IDP.
- e. Aligning performance objectives and employee development with organizational goals and objectives.
- f. Discussing with employees the relevance of performance elements to individual performance objectives.
- g. Providing employees meaningful, constructive, and candid feedback relative to progress against performance expectations, including at least one documented midpoint review.
- h. Ensuring employees are aware of the requirement to document their accomplishments at the end of the evaluation period.
- i. Fostering and rewarding exceptional performance.
- j. Addressing poor performance as soon as it occurs or as soon as it becomes apparent.
- k. Making meaningful distinctions among employees based on performance and contribution; forced distribution of scores or ratings is not permitted.
- l. Completing performance evaluations as required within established timelines.
- m. Ensuring eligible employees are assigned a performance evaluation of record as prescribed by this volume.
- n. Collaborating with reviewing officials to complete evaluations of record.
- o. Ensuring consistency of ratings with DCIPS performance standards.

5. SUPERVISORS WHEN NOT THE RATING OFFICIAL. Supervisors normally will be the rating official for employees under their direct supervision. However, in unusual circumstances, such as when the rating official responsibilities are assigned to an official in the chain of supervision above the immediate supervisor, the supervisor is responsible and will be held

accountable for collaborating with the rating official in his or her performance management responsibilities. This includes the responsibility to:

- a. Ensure he or she maintains ongoing dialogue with the rating official regarding the employee's performance during the evaluation period.
- b. Participate with the rating official in the completion of the employee's performance plan, performance evaluation of record, and IDP.
- c. Participate 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.

6. EMPLOYEES. Employees are responsible and will be held accountable for:

- a. Engaging in dialogue 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.
- b. Identifying and recording their accomplishments and results throughout the evaluation period.
- c. Preparing their midpoint and end-of-year employee's self-report of accomplishments as input to their midpoint and annual performance evaluations in accordance with DoD Component policy.
- d. Participating in midpoint performance reviews and end-of-year performance evaluation discussions with their rating officials.
- e. Understanding the link between their performance objectives and the organizational mission and goals.

ENCLOSURE 3

THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

1. PHASES OVERVIEW. 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.

2. STANDARD EVALUATION PERIOD

a. The standard evaluation period for DCIPS runs from October 1 through September 30 of each year unless an exception has been granted by the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security. The performance evaluation period officially begins on October 1 of each year with the performance planning process.

b. Employees starting a position with fewer than 90 calendar days remaining in the evaluation period will have these additional calendar days added to the next evaluation period, resulting in an extended initial evaluation period.

3. 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 will engage in dialogue to establish performance objectives that they will 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 evaluation period. The rating official and employee planning process will also include discussion of the six behaviorally-based DCIPS performance elements (the “how” of performance) described in paragraph 2b(3) of Enclosure 4. These six elements are evaluated independently, in relation to the performance objectives.

4. DIALOGUE. Rating officials, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, and employees will engage in continuing dialogue throughout the performance evaluation period to manage performance.

a. Dialogue should 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.

b. 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 calendar days of the evaluation period.

c. Additional dialogue 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.

d. At least once during the performance evaluation period, generally at the midpoint of the period, a midpoint review will be performed, in accordance with DoD Component guidance, which may include a self-report of accomplishments by the employee and an evaluation by the supervisor, in conjunction with the rating official when the supervisor is not the rating official. This review will document formally the performance discussion with the employee.

5. EMPLOYEE SELF EVALUATION. At the end of the performance evaluation period, the employee will document his or her accomplishments (referred to as the employee's self-report of accomplishment) 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.

a. Employee self-evaluations will 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 a performance evaluation of record.

b. The employee's self-report of accomplishments must be considered by the rating official and included in the evaluation to document the employee's input, but the rating official is not required to agree with it or adopt the language or the recommended ratings from the employee, if provided.

c. Employees' self-evaluations of their performance against performance elements will consider the extent to which the employee fulfilled his or her accountabilities in accordance with section 6 of Enclosure 2.

ENCLOSURE 4

PERFORMANCE PLANNING

1. ELEMENTS OF PERFORMANCE PLANNING. Performance planning will include dialogue between the rating official, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, and the employee to:

a. Establish at least one and generally three to six performance objectives that are aligned to the goals and objectives of the National Intelligence Strategy, the DoD, and the employee's organization and that set specific performance targets for the individual. DoD Components with DCIPS positions may standardize the number of objectives for an entire Component, or subset of a Component, according to Component guidance.

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

c. Establish specific developmental objectives in an IDP that are keyed to attaining 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.

d. Establish the criteria against which the employee's success will be measured.

2. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN

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

(1) Every employee will be issued a written performance plan and IDP by the rating official and approved by the reviewing official, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, at the beginning of the annual evaluation period each year. These should be developed in consultation with the employee.

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

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

(4) Reviewing officials will 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.

b. Performance Objectives and Elements. The performance plan must include both performance objectives and performance elements. Performance objectives may be used for multiple employees in situations where the specific objectives directly applies to the performance expectations for multiple employees at the same work category, work level, and grade or pay band.

(1) Non-Supervisory Performance Objectives

(a) Each non-supervisory employee will be assigned performance objectives appropriate to the employee's work level, work category, pay band or grade, occupational category, and work assigned. Each objective will be derived from organizational goals and objectives and will be a critical element of the employee's job. Each objective will also be structured such that it is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bounded (SMART) in accordance with guidance provided in Enclosure 11.

(b) Each performance objective will focus on the quality of the work and include specific information on how achievement of the objective will be measured.

(c) Objectives must be written at the "successful" level of performance, thereby establishing the standard of expected performance for that particular objective.

(2) Supervisory and 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 will be prepared to reflect their progressively more demanding leadership role. Individual objectives will be appropriate to the employee's work level, work category, pay band or grade, occupational category, work assigned, and the level of supervisory or managerial responsibility.

1. 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.

2. 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 11 provides specific guidance for preparing supervisory and managerial objectives.

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

(3) Performance Elements for All Employees. All employees, both non-supervisory and those holding supervisory or managerial positions, will be rated against the six behaviorally-based performance elements described in paragraphs 2b(3)(a) through 2b(3)(f) 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, including compliance with DCIPS performance management requirements and the execution of other responsibilities in support of DCIPS. 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 will be rated.

(a) Accountability for Results. DCIPS employees are expected to take responsibility for their work, setting and 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, DCIPS 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.

(b) 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 also expected to use a variety of media in communicating and making presentations appropriate to the audience. In addition, DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to use effective communication skills to build cohesive work teams, develop individual skills, and improve performance.

(c) 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 effectively inform decisions and outcomes. In addition, DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to establish a work environment where employees feel free to engage in open, candid exchanges of information and share diverse points of view.

(d) Engagement and Collaboration. DCIPS employees are expected to responsibly and proactively provide, discover, and request information and knowledge to achieve results, and in that regard are expected to recognize, value, build, and leverage diverse collaborative networks of coworkers, peers, customers, stakeholders, and teams within an organization and across the IC. In addition, DCIPS supervisors and managers are expected to create an environment that promotes engagement, collaboration, integration, and the responsible sharing of information and knowledge.

(e) 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 and IC values, including selfless service, a commitment to excellence, and the

courage and conviction to express their professional views and to constructively address or seek assistance to properly address concerns related to the protection of classified information in accordance with Executive Order 13526 (Reference (n)).

(f) Technical Expertise. DCIPS employees are expected to acquire and apply the knowledge, subject matter expertise, tradecraft, or technical competence necessary to achieve results. This includes the proper handling and protection of classified information in accordance with Reference (n).

(4) Performance Elements for Supervisors and Managers. DCIPS supervisors and managers will be evaluated on the elements in paragraphs 2b(3)(a) through 2b(3)(d) of this enclosure. In addition, in place of those elements in paragraphs 2b(3)(e) through 2b(3)(f) of this enclosure, they will be covered by paragraphs 2b(4)(a) and 2b(4)(b) of this enclosure:

(a) 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 equal opportunity, integrity, diversity (of both persons and points of view), critical thinking, collaboration, protection of classified information in accordance with Reference (n) and information sharing; mobilizing employees, stakeholders, and networks in support of their objectives; and recognizing and rewarding individual and team excellence, enterprise focus, innovation, and collaboration.

(b) 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 (including classified), and other resources to accomplish their organization's mission 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; constructively addressing or seeking assistance to properly address concerns related to the protection of classified information in accordance with Reference (n); evaluating the contributions of individual employees to organizational results; and linking performance ratings and rewards to the accomplishment of those results.

c. Communicating the Performance Plan. Communications between rating officials, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, and employees are 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 dialogue between the employee and the supervisor sets the stage for follow-up midpoint and evaluation reviews throughout the evaluation period.

(1) Performance objectives will be communicated to the employee in writing within 30 calendar days of the beginning of the evaluation period, within 30 calendar days from the date

of appointment to the position or a supervisory change, or whenever there is a need to modify an existing objective or add new objectives as a result of changes in mission priorities.

(2) Performance plans must be updated to document new rating or reviewing officials, with objectives selected or validated by the new rating official and approved by the reviewing official. Performance objectives may continue from previous performance plans at the discretion of the new rating official in the updated performance plan.

(3) Dialogue on the performance plan will include but not be limited to:

(a) 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 National Intelligence Strategy, Defense Intelligence guidance, and the goals and objectives of the employee's organization.

(b) Examples of how the supervisor will assess employee accomplishments against performance objectives (e.g., quantitative and qualitative).

(c) The relationship between the performance elements and standards against which the employee will be assessed and the accomplishment of performance objectives.

3. ANNUAL IDP

a. Every employee will develop a written IDP with the rating official, and in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, at the beginning of the annual evaluation period.

b. Employees assigned to a position at the beginning of the evaluation period will have approved IDPs not later than 30 calendar days after the beginning of the period.

c. Employees newly-appointed, newly-assigned, or newly promoted to a position will have approved IDPs not later than 30 calendar 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, will establish IDPs in consultation with their employees.

e. Reviewing officials will 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.

f. Volume 2010 of this instruction (Reference (o)) will contain guidance for the development of IDPs.

4. 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 will record the employee's receipt of the performance plan and IDP and the manner in which it was communicated (e.g., face-to-face, e-mail, fax) to the employee.

ENCLOSURE 5

MANAGING PERFORMANCE

1. 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 should, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official:

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

b. Hold one or more formal performance review with each employee during the evaluation cycle, and document at least one review conducted at the midpoint of the evaluation period.

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

d. Update performance objectives in consultation with the employee when changing priorities or conditions beyond the control of the employee or when the supervisor indicates a need for change.

e. Anticipate and address performance deficiencies as they appear.

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

2. 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.

3. DIALOGUE AND FEEDBACK

a. Rating officials, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, should provide regular and timely feedback to all employees throughout the evaluation period regarding their performance.

(1) Regular dialogue 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 dialogue during which the employee and rating

official identify what is going well, how performance may be improved, and whether performance objectives require adjustment.

(2) Face-to-face is the preferred method of rating official and employee dialogue. 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 dialogue takes place.

b. Although rating officials are primarily accountable for ensuring that dialogue 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.

4. MINIMUM PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

a. The minimum rating period of 90 calendar days is met when the employee is assigned to a DCIPS position and performs under an approved DCIPS performance plan, with the same rating official, for at least 90 calendar days during the current evaluation period.

b. 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 rating period.

c. Employees who have met the minimum period of performance requirement and have an approved performance plan in place will be issued a performance evaluation of record at the end of the evaluation period or other appropriate time in accordance with the procedures prescribed by this volume.

d. When an employee joins an organization with less than 90 calendar days remaining in the current evaluation period, that period of performance will be covered in the subsequent evaluation period. Employees who have not completed the minimum period of performance during the applicable evaluation period will not be rated, and therefore generally will not be eligible for a performance payout except as specifically authorized by the policies and procedures in Reference (g). Employees who are not ratable because they have not or will not have performed the minimum required period of performance will be advised by the rating official during the initial performance planning session.

5. ADJUSTMENT OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD

a. Performance objectives should be reviewed regularly by the employee and the rating official and adjusted when necessary to reflect changes in the employee's responsibilities; changing priorities of the organization; change in position for the employee, including moving from supervisory to non-supervisory or vice versa; a major new responsibility; or when

unanticipated events beyond the control of the employee and rating official make the performance objective unachievable.

b. 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 will be approved by the reviewing official before effecting any change. An employee must have been assigned a modified or new objective for at least 90 calendar days to be rated on that objective.

6. ADJUSTMENT OF PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD. Performance elements should be reviewed regularly by the employee and the rating official and adjusted when necessary to reflect the employee's change from a supervisor or manager to a non-supervisor or non-manager, and vice versa.

7. 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 calendar days before the end of the evaluation period to be included in the annual evaluation of performance.

8. 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 will 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.

a. During this review, the rating official and employee should discuss achievements to date against performance objectives; any areas for improvement; and examples in support of the performance elements and any areas for improvement. Both the supervisor and employee should examine the current performance plan to determine whether adjustments are necessary, and should formally document any required changes to the objectives for the remainder of the year in accordance with the instructions in section 5 of this enclosure. DoD Component guidance may include narrative write-ups from the employee, the rating official, or both, at Component discretion.

b. For employees who are on track to meet or exceed expectations for their performance objectives, the rating official will 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 in accordance with DoD Component policy.

c. For employees who are experiencing difficulties in achieving their objectives or are otherwise at risk of receiving a performance evaluation of record lower than “Successful,” the rating official should 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 performance evaluation of record to improve performance to the “Successful” level.

(1) The period of time, generally not less than 90 days, provided to the employee to improve performance is determined by the rating official. In doing so, the rating official should consider the type of work and grade or band level of the employee and the expected time period when such improvement could be noted.

(2) Documentation for the record will be maintained as part of the official performance record in accordance with DoD Component guidance. This documentation should take place at the point the difficulties are noted; rating officials should not wait until the midpoint review or the end of the performance period to initiate feedback and documentation.

(3) Rating officials must also consult Volume 2009 of this instruction (Reference (p)) for employees who are experiencing difficulties in achieving their objectives or who are otherwise at risk of receiving an “Unacceptable” rating. In all cases where there is a risk of an employee receiving a performance evaluation of record of less than “Successful,” rating officials should consult their employee relations staff or other appropriate advisors for guidance.

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

e. 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 will conduct the review.

ENCLOSURE 6

DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE

1. 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 dialogue the individual developmental needs of each of their employees.

2. MONITORING PROGRESS AGAINST THE IDP

a. Rating officials, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, and employees will jointly review progress against the objectives of the IDP as part of the ongoing dialogue process during the evaluation period. Reference (o) provides specific guidance on the IDP process.

b. During the formal midpoint performance review, rating officials, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, will address progress against the IDP and its relationship to the employee accomplishing 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.

c. 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. Reference (o) provides additional guidance on development and the IDP process.

3. ADDRESSING REQUIREMENTS FOR PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT. Rating officials are accountable for early identification of employee performance issues that may lead to a performance evaluation of record of less than “Successful.”

a. Interim Rating. If the rating official determines that the employee’s performance is minimally successful or unacceptable, then the rating official, with the concurrence of the reviewing official, will issue an interim evaluation documenting the performance issues, steps needed to raise the employee’s performance to a “Successful” level, and will assign numerical

ratings reflecting the “Minimally Successful” or “Unsuccessful” performance at the time the interim rating is issued.

b. Delay in Advancement Within DCIPS Graded Structure. The rating official will advise the employee that the period of time the employee’s performance remains at the “Minimally Successful” or “Unacceptable” level will not be creditable toward the next within-grade increase. The time after performance has reached the “Successful” level and a new interim or annual rating of record has been issued documenting that performance is now at the “Successful” level will be creditable toward the next within-grade increase.

c. Documented Feedback. The rating official will schedule and document follow-on feedback sessions periodically until performance reaches the “Successful” level, or until action is taken under Reference (p).

(1) Rating officials should document the performance concerns and issues, the feedback session and the course of action for improving performance. The format for this documentation is at the discretion of the DoD Component (e.g., memorandum for the record, documented in the performance management automated evaluation system). When appropriate, documentation such as supervisory review of work products or feedback sessions, should be provided to the employee and must 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.

(2) Rating officials are encouraged to review the information provided in Reference (p) regarding performance-based actions for information that could support such actions, if required later in the process.

d. Sustained “Minimally Successful” Performance. As a result of early engagement between the rating official and the employees, performance below or at risk of falling below “Successful” is expected to improve to the “Successful” level. If the employee’s performance remains at the “Minimally Successful” level for more than one evaluation period, rating officials must document efforts by both the employee and the rating official to improve the employee’s performance. A review of the objectives should be completed by the rating and reviewing officials to ensure that the description of the performance at the “Minimally Successful” level is not more appropriately defined as “Unacceptable.”

e. Performance-Based 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 must follow the procedures in Reference (p). Rating officials should seek advice from their servicing human resources professional on the appropriate actions to be followed in accordance with Reference (p).

ENCLOSURE 7

END-OF-YEAR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

1. OVERVIEW. 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 performance evaluation of record provides an official record of the ongoing performance dialogue 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-on performance objectives and his or her performance against the standards for the six performance elements, and provides an official performance evaluation of record that will inform the annual performance-based and pay pool process.

2. RATING PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

a. Employee Self-Report of Accomplishments

(1) Employees are the most knowledgeable source of their individual accomplishments against their objectives. To continue the performance dialogue 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 will address accomplishments against each performance objective. The employee's self-report of his or her accomplishments should also address performance elements. It will become a part of the performance record and will 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 will address the differences in the end-of-year performance dialogue.

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

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

b. Rating Official Evaluation of Performance. The rating official, in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official, will prepare a proposed narrative and numerical evaluation for each eligible employee in accordance with guidelines prescribed in this volume. The rating official's proposed input is not finalized until after it has been approved by the reviewing official and the PM PRA, including any changes they direct or make.

(1) The rating official will 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.

(2) Accomplishment of performance objectives will be rated using a 5-point rating scale, as described in Table 1, applied in the context of the employee’s work category, work level, and grade or pay band.

Table 1. Performance Objectives and Element Rating Descriptors

| GENERAL STANDARDS | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Performance Rating | Objectives Descriptors | Element Descriptors |
| Outstanding (5) | <p>The employee far exceeded expected results on the objective such that organizational goals were achieved that otherwise would not have been.</p> <p>As an overall performance objective rating, the employee far exceeded expected results on all performance objectives such that organizational goals were achieved that otherwise would not have been.</p> <p>Such exemplary achievements serve as a role model for others.</p> | <p>The employee consistently performed all key behaviors at an exemplary level on the element.</p> <p>As an overall performance element rating, the employee consistently performed at an exemplary level on all performance elements.</p> <p>The employee served as a role model for others.</p> |
| Excellent (4) | <p>The employee surpassed expected results in a substantial manner on the objective.</p> <p>As an overall performance objective rating, the employee surpassed expected results overall and in a substantial manner on most of the objectives with an average rating within the “Excellent” range in Table 2.</p> | <p>The employee demonstrated mastery-level performance of the key behaviors on the element.</p> <p>As an overall performance element rating, the employee demonstrated mastery-level performance on most key elements with an average rating within the “Excellent” range in Table 2.</p> |
| Successful (3) | <p>The employee achieved expected results on the assigned objective.</p> <p>As an overall performance objective rating, the employee achieved expected or higher results overall and on most assigned objectives with an average rating within the “Successful” range in Table 2.</p> | <p>The employee fully demonstrated effective, capable performance of key behaviors for the performance element.</p> <p>As an overall performance element rating, 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.</p> |
| Minimally Successful (2) | <p>The employee only partially achieved expected results on the performance objective.</p> <p>As an overall performance objective rating, the employee only partially achieved expected results for assigned objectives with an average rating within the “Minimally Successful” range in Table 2.</p> | <p>The employee’s performance requires improvement on one or more of the key behaviors for the objective.</p> <p>As an overall performance element rating, the employee’s behavior requires improvement with an average rating that falls within the “Minimally Successful” range in Table 2.</p> |

Table 1. Performance Objectives and Element Rating Descriptors, Continued

| Performance Rating | Objectives Descriptors | Element Descriptors |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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. As an overall performance element rating, the employee received a rating of “Unacceptable” on average for the performance elements. |
| Not Rated (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. |

(3) Separate numerical ratings will be assigned to each performance objective. Each numerical rating will take into account the degree to which the objective was achieved in accordance with the guidance in Table 1. A rating of “Unacceptable (1)” on any performance objective will result in an overall performance objective rating of “Unacceptable” and an performance evaluation of record rating of “Unacceptable.” However, the rating official must rate each objective and element in the event that later action changes the rating of “1.”

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

(5) Objective ratings of “Not Rated” will not be included in the computation of performance evaluation of record average ratings.

3. RATING PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS

a. Each performance element for an employee will be rated using the 5-point rating scale in Table 1. Performance against each element will be rated by comparing employee performance against the narrative behavioral descriptors for each element contained in the performance standards applied in the context of the employee’s work category, work level, and grade or pay band. DoD Components can review other information to support the rating decision, as long as Table 1 is applied.

(1) The rating for an element will 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 will be assigned to the next lower level.

(2) The “Not Rated” rating may not be used for performance elements. Any employee who has met the minimum requirements for receiving a performance rating will be rated on all performance elements.

b. The rating official will prepare a brief narrative summary of the employee’s performance against each of the six DCIPS performance elements. The narrative will highlight brief examples of employee actions that support the numerical rating assigned in accordance with Table 1 applied in the context of the employee’s work category, work level, and grade or pay band.

c. An employee’s overall performance element rating against the six performance elements will be computed by taking the arithmetic average of the individual ratings for all of the performance elements. The overall performance element rating will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point using standard rounding procedures.

4. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RECORD

a. All employees will receive a performance evaluation of record that reflects the combined accomplishments against objectives and performance against the six performance elements. The performance evaluation of record will be computed by calculating the arithmetic average of the overall performance objective rating, which will account for 60 percent of the performance evaluation of record, and the overall performance element rating, which will account for 40 percent of the performance evaluation of record, except when the employee has received an overall rating of “1” for accomplishment of performance objectives. The average rating, known as the overall rating, will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point and converted to a performance evaluation of record rating and descriptor using the standards in Table 2 as a guide. Evaluations of record will be converted to and recorded as a whole number using Table 2.

Table 2. Converting Average Rating to Evaluation of Record

| Overall 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 or the employee has an average rating of less than 2.0 based on the overall performance objective rating and overall performance element rating. |

b. Any employee who receives an overall performance objective rating of “Unacceptable (1)” will receive a performance evaluation of record of “1” or “Unacceptable;” however, each objective and element must be rated in the event the rating of “1” is changed.

c. Rating officials will complete their evaluation of employee performance within 30 calendar days following the end of the evaluation period.

5. REVIEWING OFFICIAL’S REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

a. The proposed performance evaluation of record must be approved by the reviewing official and PM PRA before discussing the evaluation with the employee. The inclusion of the reviewing official in the performance evaluation process before providing feedback to the employee is not intended to limit ongoing dialogue between the rating official and the employee regarding ongoing performance. 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, and any changes directed by the reviewing official or PM PRA are adopted before sharing with the employee.

b. The reviewing official normally will be the rating official’s rater; however, it may also be another official in the management chain above the rating official, and in some unusual circumstances, the reviewing and rating officials may be the same official in accordance with DoD Component guidance and this instruction.

c. Reviewing officials will review numerical and narrative ratings provided by the rating official for consistency with guidance provided by the DoD Component and 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 DCIPS and other relevant policy.

d. On completion of his or her review, if the reviewing official agrees with the evaluation provided by the rating official, he or she will provide concurrence and, if the DoD Component’s performance management automated evaluation system supports, 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.

e. If the reviewing official does not agree with the narrative or numerical ratings provided by the rating official, the reviewing official will return the evaluation to the rating official and direct that changes be made. 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,

or if necessary, make changes to ensure consistency in the application of standards and guidance within the reviewing official's purview. The basis for the directed changes will 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.

f. The reviewing official will complete his or her review of all performance evaluations within his or her purview within 45 calendar days of the end of the evaluation period but must not submit his or her final approval until after the PM PRA review and approval process is completed and he or she is advised to do so under DoD Component implementing guidance.

g. Reviewing officials are encouraged to consider support of and actions throughout the performance management process when evaluating the work performance of rating officials under their purview.

6. PM PRA REVIEW AND APPROVAL 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 and approval to ensure consistency across supervisors and reviewing officials, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

a. When the PM PRA determines that there are inconsistencies requiring action, the PM PRA will seek to resolve the apparent discrepancies with the accountable reviewing officials.

b. The PM PRA must withhold completion of this review and approval, for entire groups or individual evaluations, if ratings, narratives, or both do not support the proposed performance evaluation of record or closeout, or if there is concern regarding the merit of the proposed performance evaluation of record. The PM PRA must send back proposed evaluations of record where there is a disparity between the narrative and the proposed evaluation of each performance objective or performance element, or any indication that policy was not followed, and direct or take corrective action, as appropriate.

c. The PM PRA should initially encourage rating and reviewing officials to resolve the issues identified, but may direct that specific action be taken if the rating or reviewing officials, or both, are unwilling or unable to take the directed action to ensure the integrity of the performance evaluation process. If the rating or reviewing officials are unavailable or unwilling to make changes, the PM PRA may direct changes to ensure compliance.

d. The PM PRA will complete the performance evaluation review and approval process not later than 45 calendar days following the end of the evaluation period.

e. Evaluations of record cannot be finalized until the PM PRA completes the review of the evaluations of record, approves them, and informs the reviewing officials that the review is complete, the evaluations of record have been approved, and that reviewing officials may proceed in finalizing the evaluations of record.

f. PM PRAs are encouraged to consult with legal counsel if there are any concerns with conformance to law related to the performance management process.

7. COMMUNICATING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RECORD TO THE EMPLOYEE

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

b. 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.

c. If an employee disagrees with the ratings on the performance evaluation, employees should follow the reconsideration process outlined in Enclosure 10 of this volume.

d. Proposed evaluations of record must not be shared with employees until after completion of the review and approval by the reviewing official and the PM PRA and the DoD Component has advised that the evaluations of record are final and can be shared.

8. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND WITHIN-GRADE INCREASES (WGIS).

WGIS are awarded to employees in the GG pay series and serve to reward employees with a step increase for sustained performance at the “Successful” level or above. DCIPS awards WGIS to employees based on the evaluations of record provided for in this volume, with “Successful” level and above evaluations of record equating to the required acceptable level of competence determination. WGIS are awarded up to and including the Step 10 at each grade level, following waiting periods provided for in section 531.405 of Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (Reference (q)). WGIS are not awarded to permit employee salaries to be set in the DCIPS extended pay range provided for in Volumes 2006 and 2008 of this instruction (References (r) and (s)). Rating officials should seek advice from their servicing human resources professional.

a. To earn a WGI, the employee’s performance must be at an acceptable level of competence. To meet this requirement, an employee’s most recent performance evaluation of record must be at least a “Successful.” Employees who have not had sufficient time to earn a performance evaluation of record will be presumed to have performed at least at the “Successful” level, unless the rating official has documented that performance appears to be at a level below “Successful.”

b. DoD Components will establish a process for identifying and withholding the next scheduled WGI based on performance being observed or documented as being at a level below “Successful.” In all cases where there is a risk of an employee receiving a performance evaluation of record of less than “Successful,” rating officials should consult their employee relations staff or other appropriate advisors for guidance.

c. Employees will be informed when a negative determination regarding acceptable level of competence has been made and his or her WGI has been or will be delayed in accordance with DoD Component timelines. This notification to the employee will include necessary actions for the employee to take to improve performance to an acceptable level of competence and the timeline for the review to determine if the employee has raised the level of competence, as measured against the performance standards, for a sustained period of time to justify granting the WGI.

d. DoD Components will establish a process for reviewing employee performance and determining if the performance has reached the “Successful” level and is being sustained at that level. DoD Component processes will include the requirement that an evaluation should occur within 90 calendar days of the date the WGI was withheld and subsequent reevaluations at 90 day intervals, if needed. If an employee’s performance remains below “Successful” for 52 weeks from the original eligibility date for the WGI, a new withholding determination will be made, including new notification to the employee as noted in paragraph 8c of this enclosure.

e. When it is determined that the employee’s performance has improved and is sustained at the “Successful” level, DoD Components must grant the WGI for the employee. Sustained performance in this context is performance documented and observed in accordance with DoD Component guidance as the norm, vice a single episode of improvement. The effective date of the WGI is the first day of the first pay period after the acceptable determination is made.

ENCLOSURE 8

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 procedures intended to address these situations are:

a. Closeout Performance Evaluation. When the rating official has been the employee's rater for at least 90 calendar days and there are at least 90 calendar days remaining in the performance period but the rating official will no longer be the employee's rater, the rating official will 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 an overall rating in accordance with the end-of-year performance evaluation process. Closeout performance evaluations will be approved by the reviewing official and the PM PRA as with the performance 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 calendar days.

(2) Closeout performance evaluations will be completed on all employees detailed to another organization for periods of 90 calendar days or more whose assignments or deployments end with at least 90 calendar days remaining in the evaluation period. Such evaluations will be completed by a supervisor or manager responsible for the employee's work while on detail or deployment. The completed closeout evaluation will be forwarded to the employee's rating official for consideration in the preparation of the performance evaluation of record. DoD Components are responsible for developing and sharing guidance with gaining supervisors for providing closeouts, including for those employees on deployments.

(3) Rating officials will consider information contained in all closeout performance evaluations when determining the performance evaluation of record.

(4) A closeout performance evaluation will become the final performance evaluation of record, rather than input in developing the final performance evaluation of record, in circumstances where the final performance evaluation of record cannot be completed. When such occurs, employees must be informed and must be advised of the process to resolve disputed ratings in accordance with paragraph 7c of Enclosure 7 and Enclosure 10 of this volume, as applicable. Timelines begin the date the employee has been informed that the closeout performance evaluation has become the performance evaluation of record.

b. Interim or Temporary Assignment Report of Performance. Many employees within the DoD Components with DCIPS positions are called on 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 less than 90 calendar days, but during which time the employee is making significant contributions to the mission of the DoD or the IC.

(1) For such assignments, and for reassignments, realignments, and supervisor changes for periods of less than 90 calendar days, it is important that the contributions of the employee be officially documented for consideration during the end-of-year performance evaluation process. The format for this narrative is at the discretion of the DoD Component (e.g., email, memorandum, documented in the performance management automated evaluation system).

(2) For periods of deployment or temporary assignment for 90 calendar 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 will complete a brief narrative of the employee's contributions during the deployment for submission to the employee's rating official.

(3) In their submission of accomplishments for either the full annual or closeout evaluation period, employees should include a brief summary of their accomplishments during any deployments or temporary assignments completed during the current performance evaluation period.

(4) 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.

ENCLOSURE 9

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

1. EMPLOYEES ABSENT TO PERFORM MILITARY SERVICE. Employees who are absent from their positions to perform military service will be entitled to all protections of Title 38, United States Code (Reference (t)), commonly referred to as the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act).

a. Employees who leave their positions during an evaluation period to serve a period of active military service, and who have completed at least 90 calendar days under their performance plan, will be entitled to a closeout performance evaluation in accordance with paragraph a(2) of Enclosure 8.

b. Employees who return to their positions following a period of military service who do not have the required 90 calendar days of civilian service under a performance plan during the current evaluation period at the close of the evaluation period will be assigned a presumptive performance evaluation of record. The presumptive evaluation will be their last performance evaluation of record before departure for military service. If the employee's last performance evaluation of record before his or her departure is not available, or if it is below "Successful," the employee must be assigned a presumptive performance evaluation of record of "Successful" with a numerical value of 3.0 (with each Performance Element and Performance Objective receiving individual ratings of "3"), for the evaluation period that has closed. Presumptive ratings may not be submitted for informal or formal administrative reconsideration.

2. EMPLOYEES ABSENT ON WORKERS' COMPENSATION. Employees absent from their positions on workers' compensation will be handled in accordance with the procedures in section 1 of this enclosure.

3. EMPLOYEES ABSENT DUE TO OTHER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES. Employees absent from their positions on long-term training or other special circumstances will be handled in accordance with the policies established by their DoD Components.

ENCLOSURE 10

CHALLENGING THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF RECORD

This enclosure describes the DoD reconsideration process for DCIPS performance evaluations of record. The administrative reconsideration process described is the exclusive formal process by which DCIPS employees may challenge their performance evaluation of record or content of the performance evaluation of record pursuant to this volume. Employees may not challenge a midpoint review or an interim assignment report of performance. Raters, reviewing officials, PM PRAs and DoD Component heads must consult with legal counsel if an employee raises an allegation that a performance evaluation of record was based on prohibited considerations such as race, color, religion, sex, including sexual orientation, national origin, age, physical or mental disability; on reprisal; on prohibited personnel practices; or on protections against whistleblower reprisal.

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

c. Procedures for Informal Administrative Reconsideration

(1) If an employee disagrees with the ratings on the performance evaluation, the employee should first contact the rating and reviewing officials within 5 calendar days of the employee's receipt of the rating to resolve the disagreement informally. DoD Components may, at their discretion, require that informal reconsideration be a required first step in the reconsideration process.

(2) The rater and reviewing officials are expected to respond to the employee within 5 calendar days from the day the employee raises the disagreement.

(3) All changes made to the performance evaluation of record based on informal reconsideration must be reviewed and approved by the PM PRA.

(4) If the employee, rater, and reviewer are unable to resolve the employee's issue through informal reconsideration, the employee may pursue the formal administrative reconsideration process delineated in paragraph d of this enclosure within 10 calendar days of receipt of the response to his or her informal reconsideration request.

d. Procedures for Formal Administrative Reconsideration. If after using the informal reconsideration process as provided by paragraph c of this enclosure, or in lieu of such discussion (if the DoD Component does not require that informal reconsideration be pursued), the employee continues to disagree with the ratings, the employee may seek formal reconsideration of the rating by the PM PRA. DoD Components may, at their discretion, develop formal reconsideration procedures that provide for reconsideration by a PM PRA outside of the employee's immediate chain of supervision who was not involved in the initial assignment of the rating.

(1) An employee seeking reconsideration of the performance evaluation of record, including the rating of any individual performance objective or performance element, the overall rating, or the narrative, 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. The request for reconsideration must state the basis for the disagreement about the ratings and explain how any informal procedure has not resolved the matter. Typographical errors or other administrative edits may be corrected outside of the administrative reconsideration process.

(a) An employee who has attempted to resolve the disagreement informally as described in paragraph c of this enclosure will have 10 calendar days from the date he or she receives a decision from the rater and reviewing officials about the disagreement to initiate the formal administrative reconsideration process.

(b) For DoD Components who do not require the procedures in paragraph c of this enclosure, an employee who has not pursued an informal resolution of the performance evaluation of record disagreement will have 10 calendar days from the receipt of the performance 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 will 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 performance 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 paragraph d of this enclosure may result in the PM PRA issuing a written cancellation of the reconsideration request. In this case, a copy of the cancellation will be furnished to the servicing human resources office, the employee's rating official, and the employee.

(5) The PM PRA will 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 will 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 approved the request, the PM PRA will set the date, time, location, and method of communication. To the extent practicable, such events will 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 DoD Component head. A copy of the decision will be provided to the servicing human resources office, 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 performance evaluation of record, a request for reconsideration must be submitted to the DoD Component head, in accordance with internal Component guidelines within 7 calendar days of receipt of the notice of the PM PRA decision. A DoD Component head may, at his or her discretion, designate another official he or she deems appropriate to conduct the further and final reconsideration.

(9) Within 15 calendar days of receipt of a request for further and final reconsideration, the DoD Component head, or designee, will issue a final decision unless he or she determines that further inquiry is required. In such cases, the DoD Component head will advise the employee that a final decision will be rendered on completion of the inquiry, but not later than 30 calendar days from the date of such notification. A decision by the DoD Component head on the request for reconsideration is final.

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

(11) 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, federal holiday, or a day on which the employee is not regularly scheduled to work. In those cases, the last day of the time limit will be moved to the employee's next regularly scheduled workday. All time limits are counted in calendar days.

(12) If the PM PRA or DoD Component head grants the employee's request for reconsideration after the annual pay-decision process, the employee's pay decision will be

reconsidered and, if the change in rating so indicates, will be changed to be consistent with the pay decisions for other similarly situated employees within the employee's pay pool. The new pay decision will be made retroactive to the effective date of pay pool decisions that have been made within the employee's pay pool in accordance with Reference (g).

(13) The formal reconsideration process, once it is initiated, must continue until a final decision has been made and has been communicated to the employee, unless it has been withdrawn by the employee or rejected in accordance with DoD Component procedures. This includes instances where the employee transfers, resigns, or his or her employment terminates during the reconsideration process.

ENCLOSURE 11

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 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. DCIPS does this through objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound.

b. DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials will 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, and the appropriateness of the objective to the employee's position, including work category, work level, and pay band or grade.

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.

(1) 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.”

(2) 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.

(3) 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 will be undertaken (e.g., 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 at least one and generally 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 3a 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 will complete an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on Country X’s industrial sector by August 31 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.

(1) In the example in paragraph 3b of this enclosure, the work product has been described in terms sufficiently specific for an experienced analyst to understand.

(2) 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.”

(3) 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.

(4) 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. In this example, critical thinking, communication, engagement and collaboration would all be significant in the achievement of the objective.

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

d. Performance Objectives are Achievable

(1) All performance objectives should be appropriate to the experience, skill, and pay level of the employee. In the example in paragraph 3b 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.

(2) 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.

(3) 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 National Intelligence Strategy, Defense Intelligence guidance, and the mission objectives of the employee's organization.

f. Performance Objectives are Timely or Time-Bound. Performance objectives must specify the period during which the objective is expected to be achieved. In the example in paragraph 3b of this enclosure, the period has been specified as requiring completion and delivery of the work product by August 31, within 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 (e.g., 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, following from the managers' objectives through the unit supervisor to the individual employee analyst, would be: "The employee will complete an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on Country X's industrial sector by August 31 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 the current version of the National Intelligence Strategy in Reference (k).

(3) If the analyst in the example in paragraph 4b(1) of this enclosure were located in a joint intelligence 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 3a of this enclosure, an objective might include such supervisory objectives as: "Develops the annual operating plan for the unit; develops and communicates

specific performance objectives to all subordinate employees; establishes success measures for each objective; and provides 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

PART I. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| DCIPS | Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System |
| GG | pay series for DCIPS employees in the graded structure |
| IC | Intelligence Community |
| IDP | individual development plan |
| JIOC | Joint Intelligence Operations Center |
| NR | not rated |
| PM PRA | Performance Management Performance Review Authority |
| SMART | specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound |
| WGI | within-grade increase |

PART II. DEFINITIONS

Unless otherwise noted, these terms and their definitions apply to this volume 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 who has supervised the employee for a minimum of 90 calendar days, 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 a performance evaluation of record, but will be used to inform the rating official of employee accomplishments or needed improvement for the period covered by the evaluation. A closeout performance evaluation may become the performance evaluation of record where the performance evaluation of record cannot be completed.

days. All time limits are counted in calendar days.

evaluation period. The annual period from creation of the employee performance plan through completion of the annual performance evaluation and performance 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 of record will be the date on which the reviewer approves the rating, following PM PRA approval, 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 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 less than 90 calendar days.

midpoint performance review. A formal performance review at or near the midpoint of the evaluation period. During this review, the rating official and employee should discuss achievements to date against performance objectives; any areas for improvement; and examples in support of the performance elements and any areas for improvement.

overall performance element rating. The rating, expressed as a number rounded to the nearest tenth, derived from averaging the employee's performance element ratings, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance.

overall performance objective rating. The rating, expressed as a number rounded to the nearest tenth, derived from averaging the employee's performance objective ratings, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance.

overall rating. The rating, expressed as a number rounded to the nearest tenth, derived from the arithmetic average of the overall performance objective rating, which will account for 60 percent of the overall rating, and the overall performance element rating, which will account for 40 percent of the overall rating, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance.

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 element rating. The rating, expressed as a whole number, assigned to a performance element, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance.

performance evaluation of record. The performance rating derived from the employee's overall rating rounded to the nearest whole number, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance. The performance evaluation of record is used for official purposes including decisions on pay increases as part of the DCIPS annual pay-decision process, along with 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 objective. Information that relates individual job assignments or position responsibilities or accomplishments to performance elements and standards and to the mission, goals, and objectives of the DoD Component.

performance objective rating. The rating, expressed as a whole number, assigned to a performance objective, assigned during the annual evaluation of employee performance.

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 work level.

personally identifiable information. Defined in Reference (1).

PM PRA. A senior employee or panel within an employee's chain of supervision, 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 DoD Component head, 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 will be established as a senior employee or panel not in the chain of supervision for the performance evaluations under consideration. A DoD Component may have more than one PM PRA.

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 performance evaluation of record on an employee.

reviewing official. An individual in the rating official's direct chain of supervision designated by the DoD Component head 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.

self-report of accomplishments. A written report by an employee of that employee's achievements during the evaluation period that should address each performance objective and provide examples regarding performance elements. The self-report is a part of the performance record and is used by the rating official as input to the employee's end-of-year performance evaluation. Also called a "self-assessment."