UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
5000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-5000

JUL 2 2010

INTELLIGENCE

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

SUBJECT: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management Year-End Guidance for the 2009-2010 Performance Cycle

The second DCIPS performance management cycle is coming to a close. As an enterprise, we have made great strides in improving the performance management process, but potential for improvement remains. This memo provides supplemental guidance responsive to questions from employees and managers, and implements National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) recommendations for clarification of roles and responsibilities. This memo will be posted on the DCIPS webpage; request you provide widest dissemination to your employees, managers, and Performance Management Performance Review Authorities (PM PRAs).

DCIPS provides common and consistent policies and procedures which apply to all Defense intelligence components. Our success as an enterprise depends on this consistency and adherence to practices that ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all employees.

Performance Ratings Descriptors. Validated DCIPS performance rating descriptors apply universally to the five performance rating levels for both performance objectives and performance elements. Additionally, detailed performance standards have been developed for assigning the appropriate performance rating level for each performance element. The descriptors and standards are written to support employees of all band levels and occupations earning each rating level, based on their individual performance against their specific objectives and the six standard performance elements. NAPA identified a perception that only higher banded employees can be rated at the higher ratings levels. Although data from the first performance cycle does not support this, the perception must be addressed. Employees, raters and reviewing officials must understand and apply the descriptors in the context and scope of individual employees' positions and performance objectives, vice the high level mission and focus of the

organization. Objectives for all employees must be appropriate for their band level, and descriptors must be applied equitably to all. This will help address the perception of inequities resulting from a particular band level.

Prohibition on Quotas and Forced Distributions. As we continue to rigorously evaluate employee performance against validated performance standards and rating descriptors provided for both performance objectives and performance elements, we must ensure that we properly recognize employee accomplishments. Quotas and forced distributions of ratings are absolutely prohibited. This fact must be clearly communicated to all, and appropriate monitoring provided to ensure all understand and enforce this prohibition. As leaders, I ask that you be alert to any real or perceived violations of these prohibitions and take swift and appropriate action to ensure adherence to DCIPS policy and merit system principles. DCIPS policy and merit system principles require fair and equitable treatment of employee performance.

Performance Management Performance Review Authorities (PM PRAs). PM PRAs have a very important "final review" role in the review and validation of proposed performance evaluations of record. PM PRAs provide a final review of all performance evaluations of record to ensure consistency across supervisors and reviewing officials and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Evaluations of record are not final until the PM PRA has completed this review. PM PRAs can, and should, decline to complete their final review on proposed evaluations of record that did not follow DCIPS policy or merit system principles. PM PRAs cannot change proposed evaluations; however, they can withhold their final review and return proposed evaluations of record to the rating and reviewing officials and direct that changes be made where policy was not followed. The PM PRAs can also request additional information be provided in support of the proposed evaluations of record.

Movement to Another DCIPS Component. Under DCIPS policy, an employee's current DCIPS performance evaluation rating is portable, and moves with them to a new position in the same or other DCIPS organization. All DCIPS components use the same performance management process and standards and this transferrable evaluation of record helps support commonality and consistency across the enterprise, as well as movement throughout the performance cycle. DCIPS components must ensure that any employee who has moved during the performance cycle is evaluated properly and receives appropriate consideration of their performance during the pay pool process according to DCIPS policy.

Joint Duty Assignments. Intelligence Community and DCIPS policy provide specific guidance for handling Joint Duty assignments. Employees on Joint Duty assignments are rated by a management official in the employee's chain of command in the Host organization, both for the final evaluation of record and any interim evaluations. Review of the ratings is conducted by Host organization management officials, in

consultation with an official of the Parent organization. Once a performance evaluation is completed by the Host, the evaluation is final and cannot be changed, or "normalized," by anyone outside of an official reconsideration process of the host organization. Reconsiderations, as applicable, are processed through the organization that assigned the evaluation of record under review. The same policy applies to an evaluation of record completed by the Parent organization; it cannot be changed by the Host. Joint Duty employees are included in pay pools at their Host organization for bonus consideration and at their Parent organization for salary increases. During the last evaluation cycle, some components did not follow this guidance, which resulted in confusion by managers and employees and inconsistencies across the enterprise. Specific issues resulting from this policy should be identified for resolution to ensure consistent treatment across the enterprise.

My point of contact in the Human Capital Management Office is Ms. Donna Green, 703-604-2762.

James R. Clapper, Jr.

cc:
Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2, Department of the Army
Director of Naval Intelligence, Chief of Naval Operations (N2)
Director of Intelligence for Support, Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps
Director of Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Plans and Resources, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force
General Counsel of the Department of Defense
Defense Intelligence Human Resources Board Members