



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G-2  
1000 ARMY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20310-1000

DAMI-CP

17 Jan 18

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Issuance of the Department of the Army Policy, Volume 2011, Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Performance Management

1. References:

a. Memorandum, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), 23 Oct 17, subject: Delegation of Civilian Human Resources Authorities, Matrix 02-2017.

b. Memorandum, Secretary of the Army, 23 Oct 17, subject: Delegation of Authority for Responsibility of Civilian Human Resources Management, Administration, and Authorities in the Department of the Army, Matrix 02-2017.

c. Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 1400.25-V2011 (DoD Civilian Personnel Management System, Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management, 7 May 16.

d. Department of the Army DCIPS Policy, Volume 2011 (Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Performance Management, 19 Jan 18 (enclosure).

e. Department of the Army DCIPS Policy, Volume 2011 (Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System, Performance Management), 29 Jun 11 [incorporating change 1 dated 27 Jun 14] (hereby superseded).

f. Headquarters, Department of the Army General Orders No. 2017-01, 5 Jan 17, subject: Assignment of Functions and Responsibilities within Headquarters, Department of the Army.

2. In accordance with above reference 1a, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) delegated to the Army G-2 the authority to issue Army supplemental DCIPS guidance. Pursuant to reference 1f, the Army G-2 approves the release of the enclosed Army DCIPS Performance Management Procedures (reference 1d). This issuance supersedes reference 1e and is effective 19 Jan 18.

DAMI-CP

SUBJECT: Issuance of the Department of the Army Policy, Volume 2011, Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Performance Management

3. The Army G-2 further authorizes the supplementation of this policy where necessary, consistent with reference 1d. Organizations must forward copies of any supplements to the Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2, Intelligence Personnel Management Office, 1000 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-1000.

4. The Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2 point of contact is Mr. Richard Leviner, Human Resources Specialist, (703) 695-1046; e-mail: richard.j.leviner.civ@mail.mil.

RAPP,JEFFREY N.105039982  
Y.N.105039982  
2

Digitally signed by  
RAPP,JEFFREY N.105039982  
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government,  
ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=USA,  
cn=RAPP,JEFFREY N.105039982  
Date: 2018.01.17 11:22:11 -0500

Encl

JEFFREY N. RAPP  
Acting Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2

DISTRIBUTION:

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY  
COMMANDER

- U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY PACIFIC
- U.S. ARMY EUROPE
- U.S. ARMY CENTRAL
- U.S. ARMY NORTH
- U.S. ARMY SOUTH
- U.S. ARMY AFRICA/SOUTHERN EUROPEAN TASK FORCE
- U.S. ARMY SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND
- MILITARY SURFACE DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY SPACE AND MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND/ARMY STRATEGIC  
COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY CYBER COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY MEDICAL COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
- U.S. ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
- U.S. ARMY TEST AND EVALUATION COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
- U.S. ARMY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMAND

SUPERINTENDENT, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY  
DIRECTOR, U.S. ARMY ACQUISITION SUPPORT CENTER  
(CONT)

DAMI-CP

SUBJECT: Issuance of the Department of the Army Policy, Volume 2011, Defense  
Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Performance Management

DISTRIBUTION: (CONT)

COMMANDANT, U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE

DIRECTOR, CIVILIAN HUMAN RESOURCES AGENCY

CF:

DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)

GENERAL COUNSEL

DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G-1



**Department of the Army**

**Volume 2011**

**Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel  
System Performance Management**

**January 19, 2018**

Revised IAW Army Directive (AD)  
2005-01, effective 24 January 2025

Enclosure

# ***SUMMARY of CHANGE***

Army Policy-Volume (AP-V 2011)

Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management

This AP-V provides Performance Management policy, responsibilities, and procedures governing civilian employees of the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System

## **Change 2 (1/19/2018)**

This reissuance aligns the Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 1400.25, Volume 2011 “DCIPS Performance Management” dated 5/7/2016 with the revised performance elements in Intelligence Community Directive (ICD) 651 (signed on 12/23/2014).

Changes also include but may not be exclusive to the following:

- Provides clarification on Within Grade Increase eligibility and denial.
- Clarifies that acceptable level of competence decisions for Within Grade Increase must be based on an evaluation of record and establishes a process.
- Amends process and further clarifies necessary steps required when addressing requirements for performance improvement.
- Provides clarification on Performance Closeout Evaluations.
- Provides clarification on the Performance Evaluation Reconsideration Appeals process to include broadening what can be challenged through the DCIPS Administrative Reconsideration process and the method used to correct the evaluation based upon the reconsideration decision.
- Clarifies that all DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials of Army DCIPS employees will utilize the automated DCIPS Performance Appraisal Application (PAA) when completing each phases of the DCIPS performance management process.
- Clarifies when a Rating Official may also serve as the Reviewing Official. Provides delegation on its use herein.
- Clarifies that 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.
- Defines what a presumptive evaluation of record is and dictates how it is calculated.

- Updates responsibilities.
- This revision incorporates numerous minor administrative changes throughout.
- Updates and adds references at Enclosure 1
- Expands glossary terms and definitions
- Add Abbreviations and acronyms



## Department of the Army DCIPS Policy

### VOLUME 2011 – Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Performance Management

#### 1. Purpose

a. Overall Policy. Refer to Department of the Army Policy-Volume 2001 (AP-V 2001) Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Introduction (Reference a).

c. This Volume. In accordance with references listed in Enclosure 1, this Volume reissues AP-V 2011 to establish Army performance management policies, assign responsibilities, and prescribe procedures concerning DCIPS Performance Management System and further supplements and must be used in concert with DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2011 (Reference f) and Army policy guidance on civilian personnel management. Additional supplementation is authorized except where prohibited. Policies regarding performance pay pool structure, funding, pay pool processes, and calculations related to performance payouts are established in Army Policy-Volume 2012 (Reference d). Issuance of this Army Policy-Volume hereby cancels AP-V 2011 “Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Performance Management,” June 29, 2011 [Incorporating Change 1, June 29, 2014].

**NOTE: DCIPS Army policy, indicated by the prefix AP-V 2011, is numbered to align with DoD Instruction (DoDI) 1400.25, Volume 2011 (Reference f).**

#### 2. References

See Enclosure 1.

#### 3. Applicability

a. This policy applies to Army civilian positions, employees or organizations as described in Army Policy-Volume 2001 (Reference a) engaged in or in support of an intelligence or intelligence-related mission.

b. This policy does not apply to Federal Wage System or equivalent employees, non-appropriated fund employees or foreign national employees. It also does not apply to members of the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service (DISES) and Defense Intelligence Senior Leaders (DISL) unless specifically addressed in Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) Memorandums (Reference g or h) or in performance of any respective performance management process role listed under Enclosure 2, Responsibilities.



#### **4. Definitions**

See Glossary.

#### **5. Policy**

It is Army policy that:

a. All Army DCIPS employees (refer to paragraph 3) will use the DCIPS Performance Management System per DoDI 1400.25, Volume 2011 (Reference f), as provided by DoD Directive 5143.01 (Reference l), DoD Directive 1400.25 (Reference i), and DoD Directive 1400.35 (References j) and required by sections 1601-1614 of Title 10, United States Code (Reference o) and as further directed by this policy.

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

c. The DCIPS Performance Management System will:

- (1) Ensure the alignment of individual performance objectives to the intelligence goals and objectives of the Department of the Army and the individual's organization.
- (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 rating and evaluating DCIPS employee performance within and across the Defense Intelligence Components.
- (5) Identify the developmental needs of DCIPS employees.
- (6) Be consistent with the merit systems principles set out in Chapter 23 of Title 5, United States Code (Reference m).

#### **6. Responsibilities**

See Army Policy-Volume 2001 (Reference a) and Enclosure 2 of this policy.

## **7. Procedures**

See Enclosure 3.

## **8. Releasability**

Unlimited. This policy is approved for public release.

## **9. Effective Date**

This policy is effective January 19, 2018.

## **Enclosures**

1. References
2. Responsibilities
3. Procedures
4. Guidelines for Writing Performance Objectives
5. Quick Reference Performance Management Timeline

Glossary

## ENCLOSURE 1

### REFERENCES

- (a) AP-V, Volume 2001, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Introduction," March 25, 2012 (Incorporating Change 1, March 22, 2013)
- (b) AP-V, Volume 2009, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Disciplinary, Performance-Based, and Adverse Action Procedures," March 25, 2012 [Incorporating Change 1, March 22, 2013]
- (c) AP-V, Volume 2006. "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Compensation Administration," March 25, 2012 [Incorporating Change 1, April 29, 2013]
- (d) AP-V, Volume 2012, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Performance-Based Compensation," August 31, 2015
- (e) AP-V, Volume 2010, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Professional Development," November 17, 2017
- (f) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 2011, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management," May 7, 2016
- (g) Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) Memorandum; subject "Interim Policy Directive for Intelligence Components to Operate Under Certain Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Subchapters," May 25, 2005 [Authorizes use of Interim Subchapter 1002, "Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Services (DISES)," which will be rescinded upon publication of Volume 2002]
- (h) Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) Memorandum; subject "Interim Policy Directive for Intelligence Components to Operate Under Certain Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Subchapters," May 25, 2005 [Authorizes use of Interim Subchapter 1003, "Defense Intelligence Senior Level (DISL) Program," which will be rescinded upon publication of Volume 2003]
- (i) DoD Directive 1400.25, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System," November 25, 1996
- (j) DoD Directive 1400.35, "Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS)," September 24, 2007, as amended
- (k) DoD Directive 5124.02, "Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness USD(P&R)," June 23, 2008

(l) DoD Directive 5143.01, "Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)),  
October 24, 2014, as amended

(m) United States Code, Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, Merit System  
Principles

(n) United States Code, Chapter 43 of Title 38, Uniformed Services Employment and  
Reemployment Rights

(o) United States Code, Chapter 83, Section 1601 - 1604 of Title 10, Defense-wide  
Intelligence Personnel Policy

(p) Army Regulation 11-2, "Managers' Internal Control Program," Paragraph 2-11,  
January 4, 2010

(q) Army Regulation 25-22,"The Army Privacy Program," December 22, 2016

(r) Executive Order (EO) 13526, "Classified National Security Information," December  
29, 2009

(s) Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter 1, Subchapter B, Subpart D, Section 531.405  
of Title 5, Waiting Period for Within-Grade Increase.

## ENCLOSURE 2

### RESPONSIBILITIES

The primary purpose of performance management is to achieve organizational results and mission objectives through the effective management of individual and organizational performance. To achieve that purpose, performance management will be a priority for all Army Intelligence executives, managers, supervisors, and employees. The performance expectations of organizations and their senior leaders will be linked to the strategies promulgated by the Director of National Intelligence Strategy, Total Army Intelligence Strategy, and other applicable strategies of the Army and Department of Defense (DoD) with Army DCIPS employees. Performance expectations will cascade from the senior levels of the organization through subordinate managers and supervisors to individual employees. Successful performance management requires commitment to effective performance planning, measurement, and management practices. All participants in the performance management process must invest adequate time and effort throughout the performance evaluation period to ensure performance management is effective. 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 Army Regulation (AR) 25-22 (Reference q).

Note: All management officials (civilian and military) involved in the performance evaluation process are expected to complete available DCIPS performance management training prior to executing performance evaluation responsibilities.

#### **1. The Secretary of the Army**

a. The Secretary of the Army will implement and comply with the DCIPS policies, procedures, and programs and issue supplements or guidance to the extent authorized by Department of Defense Directive (DoDD) 1400.35 (Reference j) and the DCIPS volumes of the Department of Defense (DoD) implementing policy in AP-V 2001 (Reference a) and DoD Instruction (DoDI) 1400.25 (Reference i).

b. Delegate the authority as appropriate, to implement this policy within Army.

#### **2. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (ASA (M&RA))**

The ASA (M&RA) will:

a. Establish broad performance management policy and objectives for DCIPS within Army and in coordination with Headquarters Department of the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff (DCS), G-2, develop policy guidance.

b. Exercise oversight over DCIPS, including but not limited to serving as the approval authority for performance management program policy and strategic direction; and periodically review and evaluate DCIPS to ensure that implementation goals are accomplished.

c. Provide performance management program evaluation data and other reports to the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)), as required.

### **3. The Headquarters Department of the Army (HQDA), Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1, Assistant G-1 (Civilian Personnel)**

The AG-1 (CP) will:

a. Provide advice and assistance to the HQDA, DCS, G-2 on all civilian human resources programs.

b. Ensure alignment of DCIPS policies and procedures with the Army's strategic human capital plan and transformation goals.

c. Support the implementation and sustainment of the DCIPS performance management policies and programs.

### **4. The Headquarters Department of the Army, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2 (HQDA, DCS, G-2)**

The HQDA, DCS, G-2 will:

a. Provide resources to design, develop, implement, administer and evaluate Army DCIPS performance management policy and programs in coordination with Headquarters Department of the Army, Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1, Assistant G-1 (Civilian Personnel) and USD(I).

b. Establish the performance management program's strategic direction, provide the overall policy framework, and approve policy guidance for administration of DCIPS performance management.

c. Represent the Army's interest in the development or resolution of intelligence community human resources programs and issues with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) and USD(I).

d. Exercise oversight of DCIPS Performance Management System.

### **5. The Headquarters Department of the Army, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2 (HQDA, ADCS, G-2)**

The HQDA, ADCS, G-2 will:

- a. Provide executive advice and consultation to the HQDA, DCS, G-2 and direct the full spectrum of DCIPS performance management programs, policies, and systems through supervision of the Director, IPMO.
- b. Ensure the implementation of DCIPS performance management and compliance with policy guidance.
- c. Serve as the Army Performance Management Performance Review Authority (Army PM PRA) for final independent review and decision of the employee's performance evaluation rating of record when an employee challenges the decision by the Command Performance Management Performance Review Authority (Command PM PRA).
- d. Establish the Performance Review Authority for the HQDA, ODCS, G-2 as provided for in paragraph 7 of this enclosure.

**6. The Headquarters Department of the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2, Director, Intelligence Personnel Management Office (HQDA, ODCS, G-2, IPMO)**

The Director of IPMO will:

- a. Design, develop, implement, administer, and evaluate Army DCIPS policy and programs, as directed by the HQDA DCS, G-2 in coordination with USD(I), ASA(M&RA), AG-1 (CP), the Civilian Human Resources Agency (CHRA) and other agencies as necessary.
- b. Ensure DCIPS civilian personnel programs, policies, regulations, and procedures align with functional goals and objectives.
- c. Respond to official inquiries from Congress, ODNI, DoD, and Army regarding DCIPS.
- d. Act on requests for Army DCIPS personnel actions or entitlements requiring HQDA or higher level decision or approval.
- e. Provide advice, assistance, and training on DCIPS programs.
- f. Develop broad-based DCIPS civilian human resources products in coordination with senior intelligence officials.

## **7. Commanders of the Army Commands (ACOMs), Army Service Component Commands (ASCCs), Direct Reporting Units (DRUs), the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (AASA), and HQDA ADCS, G-2**

a. Serve as the Command PM PRA with the following responsibilities, in addition to the responsibilities contained in paragraph 10.

b. Establish their respective PM PRA structure through the appointment of Organizational PM PRA(s). Organizational PM PRAs may be specific individuals or panels (headed by a chairperson) that report back to and provide recommendations to the PM PRA.

(1) If panels are utilized, the members serving on a panel should be employees of Army Intelligence organizations.

(2) When the entire panel cannot consist of Army Intelligence employees, the Commander may request appropriate personnel from within the Defense Intelligence Community (IC) to participate on their panel to provide appropriate levels of expertise. In these circumstances, an Army Intelligence employee must serve as the chairperson of the panel.

(3) Appointments as Organizational PM PRA(s) must be in writing, no lower than to Commanders (Colonel – O6 and above or civilian equivalent). A copy of the appointment must be maintained where the authority is held and provide a copy to HQDA, ODCS, G-2 Director, IPMO.

(4) The Authority to render decisions for formal reconsideration requests will remain at the Command PM PRA level and is not further delegable.

c. Provide independent review and decision of formal reconsideration requests of evaluations of record when challenged by employees (in accordance with Enclosure 3, para 8.c).

d. Commanders of ACOMs, ASCCs, and DRUs may further delegate the authority to serve as the Command PM PRA to their Deputy Commander or Command Chief of Staff. For Headquarters, Department of the Army, the AASA may further delegate the authority to the Deputy Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army or to the Principal Officials. Delegations must be in writing with the official designated by organizational title. A copy of the delegation must be maintained in the office where the authority is held and provided to the HQDA, ODCS, G-2 Director, IPMO. Commanders are to remain cognizant of and accountable for all actions taken pursuant to the delegated authorities.

## **8. Civilian Human Resources Directors of the ACOMs, ASCCs, DRUs, and the AASA**



- a. Advise on DCIPS civilian human resources system and programs.
- b. Recommend changes to DCIPS regulations and standards through command channels to HQDA, ODCS, G-2 IPMO.
- c. Disseminate DCIPS information to subordinate human resources offices/personnel and ensure non-DCIPS supervisors (civilian and military) of DCIPS employees are informed and knowledgeable regarding DCIPS.
- d. Serve as a point of contact for the HQDA DCS, G-2 on managing DCIPS programs within their Command.

**9. U.S. Army Civilian Human Resources Agency (CHRA), DCIPS Servicing Civilian Personnel Advisory Centers (CPACs)**

CHRA, DCIPS Servicing CPACs will:

- a. Provide DCIPS performance management advice, training, assistance, guidance and administration of this policy to activity commanders, supervisors, managers and employees.
- b. Ensure that personnel actions and data comply with applicable laws, regulations and policies.
- c. Ensure CHRA CPAC human resources specialists, who provide service to DCIPS employees and supervisors/managers of DCIPS employees, are trained in DCIPS performance management and associated automated tools and receive periodic sustainment training.

**10. Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA) [includes Army PM PRA, Command PM PRA's and Organizational PM PRA's] is responsible and will be held accountable for:**

- a. Oversight of the performance management process to ensure the consistency of DCIPS performance management policies within Army Intelligence and non-intelligence organizations with DCIPS-covered employees.
- b. Establishment of annual guidance and procedures for the performance management review process.
- c. Notifying employees no later than 90 calendar days before the end of a performance evaluation period of the employee's PM PRA structure [Command PM PRA or Organizational PM PRA].

d. Providing final approval of all performance evaluations of record to include closeout and early annual evaluations under his or her purview, directing changes when necessary to ensure compliance with merit systems principles (Reference m) and policy requirements.

e. 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 3 of this policy for procedures on challenging the evaluation of record.

f. Ensuring prevention of conflicts of interest in the establishment and operation of performance management reviews and reconsideration process.

**11. 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 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 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:

(1) Ensuring performance plans and IDPs are in place and in accordance with Army DCIPS policy, guidance and established timelines for all employees within their purview.

(2) Ensuring subordinate rating officials and supervisors (when the supervisor is not the rating official) are trained in their roles and responsibilities.

(3) Ensuring subordinate rating officials provide performance feedback throughout the evaluation period and document at least one midpoint performance review feedback session with each employee.

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

(5) Ensuring all performance evaluations of record within the subordinate organizations and units are completed within Army DCIPS policy, guidance, guidance and established timelines.

(6) Ensuring performance standards are consistently applied among those rating officials for whom they are the reviewing official. Reviewing officials will meet with rating officials on an as needed basis to discuss consistency in establishing performance expectations and in the rating process.

(7) Ensuring subordinate's performance objectives and employee development plans are aligned with the organizational goals and objectives.

(8) Ensuring rating officials adhere to DCIPS performance management policies and procedures.

(9) Ensuring subordinate rating officials execute their responsibilities consistent with merit system principles and DCIPS policy.

(10) Serving as the approving official for each individual's performance plan and evaluation within their purview.

(11) Ensuring accuracy of performance management within the subordinate organizations and units for which they are responsible.

## **12. Rating Officials.**

a. Rating Officials are responsible and will be held accountable for, but not limited to:

(1) Effectively managing the performance of assigned employees.

(2) Executing the requirements of this policy in a manner consistent with the Merit System Principles set forth in Chapter 23 of Reference (m).

(3) Ensuring employees are trained in the DCIPS Performance Management Program.

(4) Collaborating with, developing, and communicating performance objectives and expectations to employees for the performance evaluation period within prescribed timelines, and ensure accountability for accomplishing them.

(5) Preparing jointly with employees developmental objectives for the performance evaluation period and record them in an IDP.

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

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

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

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

(10) Fostering and rewarding exceptional performance.

(11) Addressing poor performance as soon as it occurs or as soon as it becomes apparent.

(12) Making meaningful and fair distinctions among employees based on performance and contribution; forced distribution of scores or ratings is prohibited.

(13) Completing closeout performance evaluations and interim performance reviews within established timelines.

(14) Collaborating with reviewing officials to complete performance evaluations.

(15) Ensuring that eligible employees are assigned an evaluation of record as prescribed by this policy.

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

(17) Ensuring consistency of ratings with DCIPS performance standards.

b. Generally, the same person will not serve as both the rating official and reviewing official for an employee or set of employees. However, if the rating official leaves without completing a closeout evaluation, the reviewing official may serve in both roles, as needed, to close out the evaluation. Likewise, the Commanders (or their designated PM PRA) of the ACOMs, ASCCs, the Commanders/Superintendent of the DRUs, the AASA, and the ADCS, G-2 may determine and document other appropriate circumstances where the Rating Official may also serve as the Reviewing Official. This

authority may be further delegated in writing, as appropriate, to subordinate commanders (or their designated Organizational PM PRA(s)). When approving exceptions to serve as both a rating and reviewing official, exceptions should be made only when there are very compelling and/or exceptional circumstances (e.g. chain of command includes a Commander who simply does not have personal knowledge of employees day-to-day work performance and therefore would have an inadequate basis on which to approve performance plan, review a midpoint review, or render a final higher level review recommendation).

**13. 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 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 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 that he or she maintains ongoing dialogue with the rating official regarding the employee's performance during the performance evaluation period.
- b. Participate with the rating official in the completion of closeout, interim, and/or evaluation of record.
- c. Participate with the rating official in the completion of closeout or interim evaluations on employees under their supervision for whom they are not the rating official.

**14. Employees.** Employees are responsible and 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 record their accomplishments and results throughout the evaluation period.
- c. Participating in midpoint performance reviews and end-of-year performance evaluation discussions (including any closeout or interim performance reviews) with the rating officials.
- d. Preparing their end-of-year accomplishments as input to their annual performance evaluation.

e. Understanding the linkage between their performance objectives and the organizational mission and goals.

f. Accepting personal accountability for their actions.

## ENCLOSURE 3

### PROCEDURES

#### 1. THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

a. The DCIPS performance management process consists of three distinct phases: performance planning, managing performance throughout the evaluation period, and evaluation of performance at the end of the performance evaluation period. All DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials of Army DCIPS employees will utilize the automated DCIPS Performance Appraisal Application (PAA) when completing each of the three distinct phases of the DCIPS performance management process. The single assessment option within the PAA will be used for the completion of any performance evaluation assessment and midpoint performance review. The standard performance evaluation period for DCIPS runs from 1 October through 30 September of each year. The performance evaluation period officially begins on 1 October of each year with the performance planning process. During the performance planning phase in October of each year, 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 coming year. The rating official and employee planning process will also include discussion of the six behaviorally-based DCIPS performance elements (the “how” of performance) further described in subparagraph 2.b.(2)(b) of this enclosure. These six elements are evaluated independently of the performance objectives.

b. Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees will engage in continuing dialogue throughout the performance evaluation period to manage performance. 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. 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. 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. At least once during the performance evaluation period, generally at the midpoint of the period, the supervisor will document formally the performance discussion with the employee.

c. 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. 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 an overall summary evaluation of record. 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 his/her rating official is not required to agree with it or adopt the language or the recommended ratings from the employee, if provided. If no self-report of accomplishments is submitted; the rating official will still assign scores and complete the rating official narrative of the employee's performance annotating within the rater's assessment that the employee did not provide a self-report of accomplishment after being asked to do so. Enclosure 4 provides a quick reference of the performance evaluation period and the performance management timeline.

d. 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 performance evaluation period, resulting in an extended initial evaluation period.

## 2. PERFORMANCE PLANNING

a. 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:

(1) Establish a minimum of three performance objectives and no more than six, which are aligned to the National Intelligence Strategy, Total Army Intelligence Strategy, the DoD, Department of the Army, and the employee's organization goals and objectives that set specific performance targets for the individual. These performance objectives will be commensurate with duties and responsibilities assigned to the employee and the salary paid to that employee.

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

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

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

### b. Annual Performance Plan



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

(a) All DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials of Army DCIPS employees will utilize the automated DCIPS PAA in accordance with paragraph 1.a. of this enclosure.

(b) Employees 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.

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

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

(e) Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) will establish the performance plan in collaboration with their employees. A rating official's determination of performance objectives is not grievable under the formal administrative grievance procedures and administrative reconsideration process. However, in the event that an employee is not in agreement with the objectives established, the employee is encouraged to collaborate with their rating official and/or reviewing official regarding concerns.

(f) Reviewing officials will review and approve each performance plan to ensure its consistency with Department of the Army and organizational goals and objectives; appropriateness to employee's assigned position and experience, developmental needs, and work level; and consistency with other plans within the purview of the reviewing official.

(2) Performance Objectives and Elements.

(a) Performance Objectives. Each performance plan must include a minimum of three and no more than six performance objectives aligned with the National Intelligence Strategy, Total Army Intelligence Strategy, DoD, Army and organizational goals and objectives. 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.

1. Non-Supervisory Performance Objectives. Each non-supervisory DCIPS employee will be assigned performance objectives appropriate to the employee's work level, work category, 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 they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timely/Time-bounded (SMART) in accordance with guidance provided in Enclosure 4. Each objective will include specific information on how achievement of the objective will be measured. Each objective will be focused on the quality of the work and include specific information on how achievement of the objective will be measured. Objectives must be written at the "successful" level of performance, thereby establishing the standard of expected performance for that particular objective.

2. Supervisory and/or Managerial Performance Objectives. 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 progressively their more demanding leadership role. Individual objectives will be appropriate to the level of the employee's work level, work category, grade, occupational category, work assigned, and the level of supervisory or managerial responsibility. Objectives for the first-level supervisor should reflect responsibility for leading and managing the work and professional development of his or her direct reports. 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 progress and results, and implementing necessary course corrections in pursuit of results. Enclosure 4 provides specific guidance for preparing supervisory and managerial objectives. Rating officials will provide subordinate supervisors and managers specific information on how achievement of objectives will be measured. Internal Controls: Performance objectives for managers and internal control administrators will include internal control responsibilities in accordance with Army Regulation 11-2 (Reference p). The internal control-related content of performance objectives must be tailored to their relative importance and other circumstances associated with each supervisor.

(b) 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. For supervisors and managers, the focus on 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 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 the approach to accomplishing specific performance objectives. These aspects of an employee's performance are captured in the performance elements

against which all employees will be rated. Employees are rated against the following six performance elements:

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

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

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

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

5. Personal Leadership and Integrity. Army DCIPS employees are expected to demonstrate personal initiative and innovation as well as integrity, honesty, openness, and respect in their dealings with coworkers, peers, customers, stakeholders, teams, and collaborative networks across the IC. Army DCIPS employees also are expected to demonstrate core organizational, DA, DoD, 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 (EO) 13526 (Reference r).

6. Technical Expertise. Army DCIPS employees are expected to acquire and apply knowledge, subject matter expertise, tradecraft, and/or technical competency necessary to achieve results. This includes the proper handling and protection of classified information in accordance with EO 13526 (Reference r)

(c) Performance Elements for Supervisors and Managers. Supervisors and managers will be evaluated on the following two performance elements in place of Personal Leadership and Integrity and Technical Expertise:

1. Leadership and Integrity. Army Intelligence supervisors and managers are expected to exhibit the same individual personal leadership behaviors as all Army DCIPS employees. In their supervisory or managerial role, they also are expected to achieve organizational goals and objectives by creating shared vision and mission within their organizations; critical thinking, collaboration, protection of classified information in accordance with EO 13526 (Reference r), and information sharing; mobilizing employees, stakeholders, and networks in support of their objectives; and recognizing and rewarding individual excellence, community focus, innovation, and collaboration.

2. Managerial Proficiency. Army Intelligence 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 missions and objectives. In so doing, all supervisors and managers are also expected to focus on the development and productivity of their subordinates by setting clear performance expectations, providing ongoing coaching and feedback, constructively addressing or seeking assistance to properly address concerns related to the protection of classified information in accordance with EO 13526 (Reference r), evaluating the contributions of individual employees to organizational results, and linking performance ratings and rewards to the accomplishment of those results.

(3) Communicating the Performance Plan. Communications between rating officials (or in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees is critical to the success of the performance management process; therefore, communication between the employee and the supervisor regarding the content and expectations contained in the performance plan is critical to setting the tone for the annual performance management process. Though ongoing communication is encouraged throughout the entire performance evaluation period, there are three mandatory performance conversations throughout the performance evaluation period; (1) the initial dialogue; (2) a midpoint performance review; and (3) a final evaluation review. The initial dialogue between the employee and the supervisor sets the stage for follow-up midpoint performance, and performance evaluation reviews throughout the performance evaluation period. If performance deficiencies are

identified, management will consult with their DCIPS servicing CPAC Advisor for guidance in accordance with paragraph 4 of this enclosure.

(a) Performance objectives will be communicated to the employees in writing within 30 calendar days after the beginning of the evaluation period, or upon appointment or assignment to a 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.

(b) 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.

(c) Supervisors and employees will dialogue on the performance plan that includes but is not limited to the relationship between the employee's performance objectives, the goals and objectives of the organization and the broader strategic objectives contained in Army Intelligence goals, National Intelligence Strategy, Total Army Intelligence Strategy, Defense/Army Intelligence guidance, and objectives for the current and future years; examples of how the supervisor will assess employee accomplishments against performance objectives (quantitative and qualitative); and the relationship between the performance elements and standards against which the employee will be assessed and the accomplishment of performance objectives.

### c. Annual IDP

(1) Employees will develop a written IDP with the rating official (developed in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) at the beginning of the annual evaluation period.

(2) Employees assigned to a position at the beginning of the evaluation period will have approved 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 IDPs not later than 30 calendar days from the date of appointment to the position.

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

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

(6) Army Policy-Volume 2010 (Reference e) contains guidance for the development of IDPs.

d. Approval of Performance Plans. The performance objectives and IDP are considered approved when the rating official has communicated the plan to the employee in writing following approval by the reviewing official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official). The rating official will record the employee's receipt of the performance plan and IDP and the manner in which it was provided (face-to-face, e-mail, fax, etc.) to the employee. Refer to paragraph 3.c(1) of this enclosure concerning dialogue and feedback.

### 3. MANAGING PERFORMANCE

a. Monitor. 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):

(1) 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.

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

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

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

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

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

b. Active Engagement. Actively managing employee performance during the evaluation period serves to increase the productivity and morale of the work unit by

reinforcing the effective behaviors of the most productive employees and ensuring early intervention to address performance deficiencies where they may occur.

c. Dialogue and Feedback

(1) 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. 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. 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.

(2) 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 and at a minimum provide their self-assessments to their rating official to document midpoint review, and closeout, interim, and/or evaluation of record. Employees may and should request periodic feedback from their rating officials to ensure there is a common understanding of expectations and progress against performance objectives.

d. Minimum Period of Performance. Unless otherwise excluded, this guidance applies to Army DCIPS employees who at a minimum have been or are expected to be appointed or assigned to a DCIPS position and performing under an approved DCIPS performance plan for at least 90 calendar days during the current performance evaluation period, but not to extend beyond the 30 September end-of-year date. For the purpose of this policy, an “approved” performance plan is the date in which the Reviewing Official signs off on the performance plan within the automated DCIPS PAA tool (the date of the Reviewing Officials electronic signature that appears on the performance plan is the approval date). Periods of less than 90 calendar days not included in the current performance evaluation period will be covered in the subsequent performance evaluation period. Only continuous performance in a DCIPS position or in an approved detail or assignment to a non-DCIPS position may be used to satisfy the 90-day minimum period. Employees who have performed the minimum period will be issued an evaluation of record in accordance with the procedures prescribed in this policy. Employees who have not completed the minimum period of performance under an approved performance plan during the applicable performance 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 Army Policy-Volume 2012 (Reference d). Employees who are not ratable because they will not have performed

the minimum required 90 calendar days of service will be advised by the rating official during the initial performance planning session.

e. Adjustment of Performance Objectives during the Evaluation Period.

Performance objectives should be reviewed regularly by the employee and the rating official and adjusted when necessary to reflect changing priorities of the organization or when unanticipated events beyond the control of the employee and rating official make the performance objective unachievable. When adjusting performance expectations, supervisors and employees must follow the requirements for planning, communicating, monitoring, and assessing expectations established in this policy. An employee must be assigned a modified objective, approved by the electronic signature of the Reviewing Official within the automated DCIPS PAA tool, for at least 90 calendar days to be rated on that objective.

f. Adding Performance Objectives. When new performance objectives are assigned to an employee during the performance 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 performance evaluation period. New objectives must be added to the performance plan at least 90 calendar days prior to the end of the evaluation period to be included in the annual evaluation of performance.

g. Mandatory Midpoint Performance Review. Feedback between the rating official and employee should be continuous throughout the performance evaluation period. However, in addition to ongoing feedback, rating officials will conduct and document at least one formal performance review for each employee 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 and any areas for improvement needed; and examples in support of the performance elements and any areas for improvement. Both the supervisor and employee should examine current performance objectives to determine whether adjustments are necessary, and should formally document any required changes to the objectives for the remainder of the performance evaluation period. All DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials of Army DCIPS employees will utilize the automated DCIPS PAA in accordance with paragraph 1.a. of this enclosure in fulfilling the midpoint performance review.

(1) For employees who are on track to meet or exceed expectations for their performance objectives, the rating official will document and retain the outcome of the midpoint review including the date on which the session took place and noting any changes in objectives or other summary information regarding the conversation. Documentation for the record will be maintained by the rating official.

(2) For employees who are experiencing difficulties in achieving their objectives or are otherwise at risk of receiving a rating lower than "Successful," the rating official should contact their DCIPS servicing CPAC Advisor for guidance. The rating official



should be prepared to document, present and retain documentation of all performance deficiencies. The rating official should also be prepared to discuss a course of action to help improve the employee's performance to the "Successful" level. Documentation for the record will be maintained as part of the official performance record.

(3) The employee will be given a copy of the midpoint review document. The rating official will record the automated DCIPS PAA tool the employee's receipt of the midpoint review and the manner in which the review was communicated.

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

#### 4. ENHANCING PERFORMANCE

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

##### b. Monitoring Progress Against the IDP

(1) Rating officials (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) and employees will jointly review progress against the objectives of the IDP as part of the ongoing dialogue process during the evaluation period.

(2) 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 accomplishment of employee performance objectives. Rating officials should make specific reference to the relationship between IDP objectives and improving competence in areas addressed by the performance elements, and to other career-group-specific and occupational-category-specific competencies from which the performance elements were derived. The performance elements and related competencies form the basis for supervisors to assist their employees with the individual development required for continued improvements in their ability to contribute to the intelligence mission.

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

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

(1) Early and Frequent Dialogue. At the first indication that an employee is not on track to meet performance expectations for the evaluation period, the rating official will notify the reviewing official and contact their DCIPS servicing CPAC Advisor for guidance. The rating official will schedule a feedback session with the employee to explore the performance issues and set a documented course of action for improving performance during the remainder of the evaluation period. The rating official must address performance issues through feedback sessions and documentation as soon as employee performance falls below, or threatens to fall below, the “Successful (3) level.”

(a) Rating officials should engage employees in feedback sessions, begin to document performance, and provide specific actions for an employee to take in order to improve at any point in the evaluation period. There is no prohibition against these activities at any point during the evaluation period.

(b) Feedback will include discussion of the specific areas in which performance improvement is required including restatement of the expectations for specific results and behaviors; exploration of barriers to success, and specific actions that the employee and supervisor will take to improve performance.

(c) Feedback will also include identification of resources available to improve performance, including offering the employee the support that is most likely to contribute to performance improvement, such as additional on-the-job training, formal job specific training, performance coaching, mentoring, frequent follow-up performance review sessions, or other options as appropriate.

(2) Documentation. If, in the rating official’s judgment, an employee’s performance is such that failure to improve could result in an evaluation of record of “Unacceptable (1)” or “Minimally Successful (2)” at the end of the evaluation period, the rating official must document feedback sessions with the employee throughout the remainder of the evaluation period. Documentation should be provided to the employee and must include, at a minimum, a statement describing 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.

(a) Prior to issuing an “Unacceptable” level rating (Level 1), the rating official must contact the DCIPS servicing CPAC Advisor for assistance and provide documentation to support placing an employee on an Improvement Plan (IP), or initiating an adverse action based upon conduct in accordance with AP-V 2009 (Reference b) when it is determined that an IP would serve no purpose to improve employee performance. In coordination with the DCIPS servicing CPAC Advisor, the rating official must provide the employee with an IP, to formally notify the employee of deficiencies in their performance objectives and elements which have been determined to be at the “Unacceptable” level.

(b) The IP will inform the employee, in writing, which objective(s) and/or element(s) are being performed in an unacceptable manner, explain specifically what is needed to meet the objective(s) and/or element(s), what assistance will be provided, and the consequences of failing to improve during the IP period (normally 60-90 calendar days, but not to extend beyond the 30 September end-of-year date). Any determination that an IP is required needs to be made well before the end of the evaluation period in order to provide the employee a reasonable opportunity to improve prior to issuing any interim periods of performance or end-of-year performance evaluation.

(c) At the end of the IP period, the rating official will complete a performance evaluation on the employee. If the employee’s performance improves sufficiently to warrant a “Successful” level or higher summary evaluation of record, no further action or documentation is required beyond continued performance monitoring. The employee will be under close supervision for a period of one year. If the employee’s performance declines to an “Unacceptable” level during the one year period after successful completion of the IP, the employee may be reassigned, demoted, or removed from Federal service without another performance improvement period. However, should the employee fail to improve sufficiently to warrant a “Successful” level or higher rating, the rating official will consult with the reviewing official and coordinate with the servicing CPAC Advisor to identify and take the appropriate action, which may include reassignment, demotion, or removal from Federal service.

(3) 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.”

(4) 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 seek advice from their DCIPS servicing CPAC Advisor and follow the procedures prescribed in Army Policy-Volume 2009 (Reference b) and this policy.

5. End-of-Year Performance Evaluation. The end-of-year performance evaluation prepared by the rating official (if the 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 policy, the formal performance evaluation provides no surprises and simply 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 documents the employee's accomplishments against agreed-upon performance objectives and performance against the standards for the six performance elements, and provides an official evaluation of record that will be used for the annual performance-based pay pool process. All DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials of Army DCIPS employees will utilize the automated DCIPS PAA in accordance with paragraph 1.a. of this enclosure when completing the end-of-year performance evaluation. The DCIPS PAA will be used to generate a completed DCIPS Performance Evaluation of Record on DD Form 2906D and serve as the official Employee Performance File (EPF) for Army DCIPS employees.

a. Rating Performance Objectives

(1) Employee Self-Report of Accomplishments

(a) Employees are the most knowledgeable source of their individual accomplishments against their objectives. To continue the performance 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 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.

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

(c) Employees will complete their self-report of accomplishments and forward it to the rating official not later than 15 calendar days following the end of the evaluation period. Commands may establish an earlier timeline for submission of the employee self-report of accomplishments. If required to submit before the end of the evaluation period, Commands will ensure that all performance during the period is documented and considered in the evaluation process

(2) Rating Official Evaluation of Performance. The rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not the rating official) will prepare a proposed narrative and numerical evaluation for each employee in accordance with this policy. 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.

(a) 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. If the rating official believes the employee’s self-report is an accurate evaluation of the accomplishment, he or she may agree with the self-report and add a clarifying narrative that describes the effects of his/her work on the organizational goals and objectives. When employees and rating officials’ evaluation differ in accomplishments, the rating official will address the differences in the end-of-year performance dialogue.

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

(c) 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 a summary objective rating of “Unacceptable (1)” and an overall summary rating of “Unacceptable (1).” However, the rating official must rate each objective and element in the event that later action changes the rating of “1.”

(d) An overall rating for accomplishment of performance objectives will be assigned by computing the arithmetic average of all assigned performance objective ratings. Performance objectives will account for 60 percent of the score of an evaluation. The overall rating for performance objectives will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point using standard rounding procedures.

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

Table 1. Performance Objectives, Elements, and Overall Summary Rating Descriptors

<b><u>General Standards Applicable to:</u></b>			
Descriptor	Objective Descriptors	Element Descriptors	Overall Summary Rating

<p>Outstanding (5)</p>	<p>The employee far exceeded expected results on the objective such that organizational goals were achieved that otherwise would not have been.</p> <p>At 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>At 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>	<p>The employee's overall contribution, both in terms of results achieved and the manner in which those results were achieved, has had extraordinary effect or impact on mission objectives that would not otherwise have been achieved.</p> <p>Overall Summary Rating 4.6 – 5.0</p>
<p>Excellent (4)</p>	<p>The employee surpassed expected results in a substantial manner on the objective.</p> <p>At an overall performance objective rating, the employee surpassed expected results overall and in a substantial manner</p>	<p>The employee demonstrated mastery-level performance of the key behaviors of the element.</p> <p>At an overall performance element rating, the employee demonstrated mastery-level performance on most key elements.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Overall Summary Rating 3.6 – 4.5</p>

	on most of the objectives.		
Successful (3)	<p>The employee achieved expected results on the assigned objective.</p> <p>At an overall performance objective rating, the employee achieved expected or higher results overall and on most assigned objectives.</p>	<p>The employee fully demonstrated effective, capable performance of key behaviors for the performance element.</p> <p>At an overall performance element rating, the employee demonstrated effective, capable performance or higher on key behaviors on most performance elements.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Overall Summary Rating 2.6 - 3.5</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.</p>	<p>The employee's performance requires improvement on one or more of the key behaviors for the element.</p> <p>As an overall performance element rating, the employee's behavior requires improvement.</p>	<p>The employee's overall contribution to mission, although positive, has been less than that expected.</p> <p>Overall Summary Rating 2.0 – 2.5</p>
Unacceptable (1)	<p>The employee failed to achieve expected results in one or more assigned</p>	<p>The employee failed to adequately demonstrate key behaviors for the</p>	<p>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</p>

	performance objectives.	performance element.  As the overall performance element rating, the employee received a performance element rating of “Unacceptable” on average for the performance elements.	the overall performance objective rating and overall performance element rating.  Less than 2 on any objective
Not Rated (NR)	The employee did not have the opportunity to complete the objective because is 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.	Not used for overall summary rating.

**b. Rating Performance Elements**

(1) Each performance element for an employee will be rated using the 5-point rating scale contained in Table 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. 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.

(2) The rating official (in collaboration with the supervisor when the supervisor is not 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.

(3) An employee's overall rating against the six performance elements will account for 40 percent of the score of an evaluation. The overall weighted rating for performance elements will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point using standard rounding procedures.

#### c. Performance Evaluation of Record

(1) All employees will receive an overall numerical performance evaluation of record that reflects the combined accomplishments against objectives and performance against the six performance elements. The evaluation of record will be computed by calculating the arithmetic average of the overall weighted performance objectives rating and the overall weighted performance elements rating, except where the employee has received an overall rating of "1" for accomplishment of performance objectives. The summary average rating will be the arithmetic average of the average performance objectives rating and the average performance elements rating, except that an overall summary evaluation of record of "1" will be assigned if an evaluation of "Unacceptable" level is assigned to any performance objective. The average rating will be converted to an evaluation of record descriptor using the standards contained in Table 1 as a guide. Performance evaluations of record will be converted to and recorded as a whole number.

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

#### d. Reviewing Official's Review and Approval of Evaluation of Performance

(1) The rating official must forward their proposed performance evaluation of record (to include closeout and early annual evaluation) of record to the reviewing official and PM PRA for the evaluation to be approved prior to discussing the evaluation with the employee. The inclusion of the reviewing official in the performance evaluation process prior to providing feedback to the employee is not intended to limit ongoing 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's 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.

(2) The reviewing official normally will be the rating official's rater; however, it also may 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. Refer to Enclosure 2, paragraph 12.b. for delegation and circumstances that may warrant the reviewing and rating official serving in both roles.

(3) Reviewing officials will review numerical and narrative ratings provided by the rating official for:

- a. Consistency with guidance provided by the reviewing official at the beginning of the performance evaluation period.
- b. Congruence between numerical ratings assigned and supporting narrative, consistency across rating officials within the reviewing official's organizational elements.
- c. Compliance with Merit System Principles.
- d. Adherence to DCIPS and other relevant policy.

(4) Upon completion of the review, if the reviewing official agrees with the performance evaluation provided by the rating official, after PM PRA final review, he or she provides concurrence and may provide additional narrative based on first-hand knowledge of the employee's work and impact that would further clarify the employee's contributions for consideration during the pay pool decision process.

(5) If the reviewing official does not agree with the narrative or numerical ratings provided by the rating official, the reviewing official will return the performance 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 necessary changes to ensure consistency in the application of standards and guidance within the reviewing official's authority. The basis for the directed change in rating will be documented and maintained by the reviewing official until all actions relative to the annual performance evaluation and pay pool decision processes are completed and closed.

(6) The reviewing official will complete the review of all performance evaluations within 45 calendar days following the end of the performance 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 by the PM PRA.

(7) 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.

e. PM PRA Review and Approval of Performance Evaluations of Record.

Concurrent with the reviewing official's action, all evaluations of record (to include closeout and early annual evaluations) are forwarded to the PM PRA for final review. The PM PRA will review all evaluations of record to ensure consistency across rating officials/supervisors and reviewing officials and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

(1) When the PM PRA determines that there are inconsistencies requiring action, the PM PRA will seek to resolve the discrepancies with the responsible reviewing officials.

(2) 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.

(3) 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.

(4) The PM PRA will complete the performance evaluation review process no later than 45 calendar days following the end of the evaluation period.

(5) 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 evaluation of record.

f. Communicating the Evaluation of Record to the Employee

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

(2) Feedback provided to the employee should include a discussion of the performance accomplishments during the year, areas for potential improvement and how work-related behaviors captured in the performance elements may have contributed to or inhibited overall success. The overall numerical rating of record, as well as the performance objectives ratings and the performance elements ratings, will be communicated to the employee. The discussion also should focus on achievements against developmental goals for the year and what additional developmental objectives may contribute to continued improvements in employee performance.

(3) If an employee disagrees with the ratings on the performance evaluation of record they should pursue the administrative reconsideration process delineated in Section 8.c. of this enclosure.

(4) 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 has advised that the evaluations of record are final and can be shared.

g. Effective Date of Evaluation of Record. The effective date of the evaluation of record will be the date on which the reviewer approves the rating based upon completion of the PM PRA review, but not later than November 15 each calendar year. Exceptions to the standard effective date are permitted provided unique, unusual circumstances warrant the variation. Such exceptions must be for an entire organization under the PM PRA purview as a whole and must be requested through the chain of command to the USD(I).

h. Performance Management and Within-Grade Increase (WGI)s. 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 evaluation 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 s). WGIs are not awarded to permit employee salaries to be set in the DCIPS extended pay range provided for in DCIPS Army Policy-

Volume 2006 (Reference c) and Army Policy-Volume 2012 (Reference d). Rating officials should seek advice from their DCIPS servicing CPAC.

(1) 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."

(2) Supervisors of Army DCIPS employees are responsible for identifying and informing the DCIPS servicing CPAC when it is determined that an Army DCIPS employee's next scheduled WGI must be withheld 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 DCIPS servicing CPAC advisor or employee relations staff within their DCIPS servicing CPAC for guidance.

(3) A performance evaluation of record will be used in 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 less than "Successful," rating officials should consult their employee relations staff or other appropriate advisors for guidance (for example, a GG-11 employee has a current rating of Successful Level 3 but has been experiencing performance deficiencies for the past 4 months so that the current level of performance is below Success Level 3). In instances where the regular DCIPS performance evaluation period has not ended, the employee will be issued a closeout or closeout early annual, as appropriate, to document the employees' current level of competence when it is not reflective of the most recent annual evaluation of record recorded in the employees' official personnel record/Performance Appraisal Application.

The table below summarizes the types of Closeout Performance Evaluations that can be used for WGI and acceptable level of competence determinations, when they are used, and their requirements (when there is a change in the rating official requiring a Closeout Performance Evaluation not involving any performance deficiencies of the employee refer to paragraph 6 and Table 2-1 of this enclosure).

Table 1-1

Action Required	Time on Performance Plan	Time of Year	Required
<p><b><i>Closeout Performance Evaluation (for WGI and acceptable level of competence determinations)</i></b></p>	<p>90 Days or More</p>	<p>01 Jan – 30 June ( 90 or more days before end of performance period)</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <p>(1) Any adopting of a closeout performance-evaluation as the employees’ evaluation of record (for WGI and acceptable level of competence determinations) will be entered into DCPDS and serve as the employees most recent DCIPS Evaluation of Record. If more than one DCIPS Evaluation appears in DCPDS for the same performance period, the earlier DCIPS Performance Evaluation of Record numerical score for that performance period will be expunged from DCPDS and the most recent DCIPS Evaluation of Record numerical score will be recorded.</p> <p>(2) Rating and Reviewing Officials are responsible for placing the employee on a new performance plan within the PAA immediately following issuance of a Closeout performance evaluation for the remainder of the DCIPS performance period so that the employee does not have any unrated periods of performance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full narrative</li> <li>• Numeric rating</li> <li>• Rating Official narrative assessment must state that performance evaluation is generated to document employees’ current level of competence for WGI eligibility purposes.</li> <li>• Reviewing Official &amp; PRA reviews and approvals.</li> <li>• Provide written notification from the Rating Official and Reviewing Official to the servicing CPAC to adopt the closeout performance evaluation as the employees’ evaluation of record IAW this policy (needed to trigger the employees’ WGI waiting period).</li> </ul>

<p><b><i>Closeout – Early Final Evaluation of Record (for WGI and acceptable level of competence determinations)</i></b></p>	<p>90 Days or More</p>	<p>01 July – 30 Sept (less than 90 days left in performance period)</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <p>(1) Rating and Reviewing Officials are responsible for placing the employee on a new performance plan immediately following issuance of a Closeout Early performance evaluation.</p> <p>(2) Periods of less than 90 calendar days not included in the Closeout Early evaluation will be covered in the subsequent performance evaluation period</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full narrative</li> <li>• Numeric rating (used for Employee’s Final Evaluation of Record)</li> <li>• Rating Official narrative assessment must state that performance evaluation is generated to document employees’ current level of competence for WGI eligibility purposes.</li> <li>• Reviewing Official &amp; PRA reviews and approvals.</li> <li>• Provide written notification from the Rating Official and Reviewing Official to the servicing CPAC to adopt the closeout performance evaluation as the employees’ evaluation of record IAW this policy (needed to trigger the employees’ WGI waiting period).</li> </ul>
--	------------------------	--	--

(4) 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. Supervisors of Army DCIPS employees who request that an Army DCIPS employees WGI be delayed or withdrawn must contact their DCIPS servicing employee relations specialist within the Army DCIPS servicing CPAC for assistance in taking such action against the employee. 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 timelines for 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.

(5) Rating Officials and Reviewing Officials will be responsible and held accountable for reviewing employee performance and determining if the performance has reached the “Successful” level and is being sustained at that level. An evaluation should occur within 90 calendar days of the date the WGI was withheld and subsequent

reevaluation at 90 day intervals, if needed. If an employee's performance remains below "Successful" for 52 weeks from the original eligibility date of the WGI, a new withholding determination will be made, including new notification to the employee.

(6) When it is determined that the employee's performance has improved and is sustained at the "Successful" level, the Army DCIPS organization must grant the WGI for the employee. Sustained performance in this context is performance documented and observed 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 level of competence determination is made. The acceptable level of competence will be identified through issuance of a performance evaluation of record, if applicable, or a closeout following the criteria in Table 1-1, above.

6. 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 an action that removes 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. All DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials of Army DCIPS employees will utilize the automated DCIPS PAA in accordance with paragraph 1.a of this enclosure to complete evaluations for interim periods of performance unless otherwise authorized by this policy. The following special procedures are intended to address these special situations.

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. Generally, this situation exists on reassignment or separation of either the employee or rating official. Closeout performance evaluations will be approved by a reviewing official and reviewed and approved by the PM PRA as with the performance evaluation of record.

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

(2) Closeout performance evaluations will be completed for all employees detailed to another organization of 90 calendar days or more whose assignments or deployments for periods 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 performance evaluation will be forwarded to the employee’s rating official for consideration in the preparation of the performance evaluation of record.

(3) Rating officials will consider information contained in all DCIPS closeout performance evaluations when determining the performance evaluation of record. Commands will establish within their Command performance management business rules a method for which their entire Command will utilize when considering a DCIPS closeout in determining the annual 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. In these circumstances, the rating and reviewing official submit the PRA reviewed/approved closeout evaluation in accordance with the Army DCIPS “Adopting of DCIPS Closeout as an Annual Evaluation of Record” guide no later than November 15 after the end of the performance evaluation period in which the closeout being adopted was completed. When such occurs, employees must be informed and must be advised of the process to resolve disputed ratings in accordance with paragraph 8 of this enclosure, as applicable. Timelines begin the date the employee has been informed that the closeout performance evaluation has become the performance evaluation of record. In order for a closeout performance evaluation

The table below summarizes the types of Closeout Performance Evaluations, when they are used, and their requirements (for acceptable level of competence determinations for WGs see Table 1-1, above).

Table 2-1

Action Required	Time on Performance Plan	Time of Year	Required
<b>Closeout Performance Evaluation</b>	90 Days or More	01 Jan – 30 June ( 90 or more days before end of performance period)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full narrative</li> <li>• Numeric rating</li> </ul>
<b>Closeout – Early Final Evaluation of Record</b>	90 Days or More	01 July – 30 Sept (less than 90 days left in performance period)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full narrative</li> <li>• Numeric rating (used for Employee’s Final Evaluation of Record)</li> </ul>
<b>Narrative only</b>	Less than 90 Days	All year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative</li> </ul>

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

(1) For 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 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 at the parent command or organization.

(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 the 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.

## 7. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

a. Employees Absent to Perform Uniformed Military Service. Employees who are absent from their positions in order to perform uniformed 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 Act of 1994.

(1) Employees who leave their positions during an evaluation period to serve a period of active uniformed military service, and who have completed at least 90 calendar days under their performance plan during the current evaluation period, will be entitled to a close-out performance evaluation.

(2) Employees who return to their positions following a period of uniformed military service who do not have the required 90-days of civilian service under any DCIPS performance plan during the current evaluation period by the close of the performance evaluation period will be awarded a presumptive performance evaluation of record. The presumptive evaluation of record will be their last DCIPS performance evaluation of record prior to departure for uniformed 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.

b. Employees Absent on Workers' Compensation. Employees absent from their positions on Workers' Compensation will be handled in accordance with the same procedures for employees absent to perform uniformed military service.

c. Employees Absent Due to Other Special Circumstances.

(1) Employees who are absent from their permanent position for long-term training, or paid leave who have completed the minimum period of performance for a rating in their permanent position will participate in the performance evaluation and pay pool process at the end of the performance evaluation cycle. The evaluation of record will be based on the performance and contributions made by the employee while in his or her permanent position performing under an approved DCIPS performance plan. DCIPS performance management procedures will be observed to the extent practicable.

(2) Employees who are absent from their permanent position for long-term training, or paid leave (with the exception of those absent to perform military service or those on workers' compensation) who have NOT completed the minimum period of performance for an evaluation of record will NOT participate in the performance evaluation and pay pool process at the end of the performance evaluation cycle.

d. All other employees who have NOT completed the minimum period of performance, not addressed in the above paragraphs, are not eligible for a presumptive rating and will NOT participate in the performance evaluation and pay pool process at the end of the performance evaluation cycle.

8. CHALLENGING THE EVALUATION OF RECORD. This section describes the reconsideration process for DCIPS performance evaluations of record. The administrative reconsideration process described is the exclusive process by which Army DCIPS employees may challenge their evaluation of record or content of the performance evaluation of record pursuant to this policy volume. Exclusions: Employees may not challenge a midpoint review or an interim assignment report of

performance. Raters, reviewing officials, and PM PRA's must consult with legal counsel if an employee raises allegations that a performance rating was based on prohibited considerations such as race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, physical or mental disability, or reprisal; on prohibited personnel practices; or on protections against whistleblower reprisal may not be processed through the reconsideration process.

a. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). ADR, if such services are utilized at the Command, may be pursued at any time during the reconsideration process consistent with Army and Command procedures.

b. Relationship to Compensation. In the event of a decision to adjust an evaluation of record, all official personnel action compensation decisions that have been made with regard to the individual based on the adjusted evaluation of record must be reviewed for adjustment as appropriate. Any adjustments to compensation will be retroactive to the effective date of the original notification of personnel action that effected the 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 Administrative Reconsideration

(1) Informal Process. If an employee disagrees with the ratings on the evaluation of record, the employee may, at their discretion, contact the rating and reviewing officials within 5 calendar days of the employee's receipt of the evaluation of record to resolve the disagreement informally. The rater and/or reviewing official are expected to respond to the employee within 5 calendar days from the day the employee raises the disagreement informally, if employee raised the disagreement informally. If informal method used and the employee, rater and reviewer are unable to resolve the employee's issue within this 10 calendar day period, the employee may pursue the formal administrative reconsideration process. All changes made to the performance evaluation of record based on informal reconsideration must be reviewed and approved the PM PRA. 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 the below paragraph of this enclosure within 10 calendar days of receipt of the response to his or her informal reconsideration request.

(2) Formal Process. If after using the optional informal reconsideration process as provided in the above paragraph of this enclosure, or in lieu of such discussion, the employee continues to disagree with the ratings, the employee may seek formal reconsideration of the rating by the Command PM PRA.

(a) Command PM PRA:

I. An employee seeking reconsideration of an evaluation of record must submit a written request for reconsideration to the Command PM PRA with a copy to the rating official, the reviewing official, Organizational PM PRA (if applicable), and the DCIPS servicing CPAC. 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.

II. An employee who has attempted to resolve the disagreement informally will have 10 calendar days from the date he/she receives a decision from the rater/reviewing official about the disagreement to initiate the formal administrative reconsideration process. An employee who has not pursued an informal resolution of the rating disagreement will have 10 calendar days from the receipt of the evaluation of record to initiate the formal administrative reconsideration process.

III. 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 real or perceived conflict of interest with regard to the employee's request for reconsideration. The Command PM PRA will determine whether there is any potential conflict of interest that may affect the reconsideration process.

IV. The request for reconsideration must be in writing and may include a request to personally address the Command 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.

V. Failure to comply with the procedures in this section may result in the Command PM PRA issuing a written cancellation of the reconsideration request. In this case, a copy of the cancellation will be furnished to the DCIPS servicing CPAC; the employee's rating official, Organizational PM PRA (if applicable), and the employee.

VI. The Command PM PRA will review the request and confer with the rating official and reviewing official. 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.

VII. If the employee has requested an opportunity to personally address the Command PM PRA and the Command PM PRA has approved the request, the Command 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.

VIII. The Command PM PRA must render a written decision within 15 calendar days of receipt of the employee's written request for reconsideration. The Command 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 Army PM PRA. A copy of the decision will be provided to the DCIPS servicing CPAC, the Organizational PM PRA (if applicable), the rating official, the reviewing official and the employee.

IX. If the Command PM PRA decision is to change the evaluation of record, the corrected evaluation will take the place of the original one. A revised performance evaluation will be prepared and entered into all appropriate records and a copy will be provided to the employee, the Organizational PRA (if applicable), the DCIPS servicing CPAC, and the rating and reviewing officials. The revised evaluation of record will be retroactive to the effective date of the original performance evaluation of record.

(b) Army PM PRA

i. If an employee chooses to request further and final reconsideration of the performance evaluation of record, a request for reconsideration must be submitted through the employee's Command PM PRA to the Army PM PRA within 7 calendar days of receipt of the notice from the Command PM PRA decision. Within 15 calendar days of receipt of a request for further and final reconsideration, the Army PM PRA will issue a final decision unless he or she determines that further inquiry is required. In such case, the Army PM PRA 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 Army PM PRA on the request for reconsideration is final.

ii. If the Army PM PRA decision is to change the evaluation of record, the corrected evaluation will take the place of the original one. A revised performance evaluation will be prepared and entered into all appropriate records and a copy will be provided to the employee, the Command PRA, the Organizational PRA (if applicable), the DCIPS servicing CPAC, and the rating and reviewing officials. The revised

evaluation of record will be retroactive to the effective date of the original performance evaluation of record.

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

(4) If the Command PM PRA or the Army PM PRA grants the employee's request for reconsideration after the conclusion of the annual pay-decision process to include the Command Pay Pool PRA approval and Compensation Work Bench (CWB) upload, the employee's pay decision will be reconsidered and, if the change in evaluation of record 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 the personnel actions generated by the pay pool decisions made within the employee's pay pool.

(5) If the pay pool PRA approval and CWB upload have not been fully executed to include the pay pool PRA approval and CWB upload; the employee's pay decision will be reconsidered and, if the change in evaluation of record so indicates the organization will adjust the CWB accordingly with the corrected rating(s) prior to uploading the CWB.

(6) 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 dismissed (e.g. untimely, excluded matter, etc.) This includes instances where the employee transfers, resigns, or his or her employment terminates during the reconsideration process.

(7) Corrections to the performance evaluation as a result of the reconsideration process will be performed using the DCIPS Reconsideration and Clerical Corrections tool within DCPDS. Final appraisal functionality allows pay pool administrators, pay pool managers (including their alternates) and human resources professionals to make changes directly in DCPDS that results in an accurate and completed final appraisal form. Only Annual Appraisal – DCIPS and Closeout – Early Annual – DCIPS appraisals with a PAA status of 'Completed', 'Approved by HLR', or 'Approved by RO', may be corrected using this process. All other corrective actions may be accomplished by submission of a Change Request Transmittal (CRT) through the DCIPS servicing CPAC.

## ENCLOSURE 4

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

### 2. The Smart Objective

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

b. The acronym "SMART" is used to describe objectives that are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timely/Time-Bound. SMART is the test by which Army DCIPS employees, managers, and oversight bodies will judge both the



quality and fairness of objectives against which employee performance will be measured.

### 3. Writing Smart Objectives for Employees

a. Specific Objectives. 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 objectives must lay out clearly for the employee what he or she is expected to accomplish during the performance evaluation period.

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

(2) Performance Objectives are Specific. Performance objectives need to be more specific than general duty statements. Supervisors must provide employees with a minimum of three and no more than six performance objectives for the performance evaluation period with fewer generally being more effective. For example, an objective derived from the duty statement in the example in above 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 by 31 August an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on the Iraqi industrial sector and present the results of that analysis in a finished and appropriately coordinated intelligence report for release to the policy-making community.”

(3) Performance Objectives are Measurable. Employees must be provided the criteria against which their accomplishments will be evaluated. In the example above,

the work product has been described in terms sufficiently specific for an experienced analyst to understand. However, the supervisor has not yet described the criteria against which the completed work product will be reviewed to determine the extent to which it is responsive to the requirement (i.e., has the employee achieved or exceeded expectations). The supervisor might expand on the objective above by stating: “In order to achieve expectations on this objective, the completed product will make use of available intelligence from all relevant sources; will reflect engagement with other analysts, customers and stakeholders in the subject of the analysis; will have incorporated the coordinated views of those other analysts and collectors throughout the IC; will be presented in the product style appropriate to the question; and will be timely.” For an experienced employee, the standards outlined should be sufficient to establish the standard review methods that will be applied and any extraordinary expectations that may be added.

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

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

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

(5) Performance Objectives are Relevant. For the purpose of DCIPS, a “relevant” performance objective for an employee is derived from the National

Intelligence Strategy. Total Army Intelligence Strategy, Defense Intelligence guidance, Army, and the mission objectives of the employee's organization.

(6) 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 above, the period has been specified as requiring completion of and delivery of the work product by 31 August, 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 Component 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 levels, 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 above, the complete SMART objective for the analyst would be as follows: This objective would have cascaded down from the managers' objectives through the unit supervisor to the employee. The employee will complete by 31 August an analysis of the effects of U.N.-imposed sanctions on the Iraqi industrial sector and present the results of that analysis in a finished and appropriately coordinated intelligence report for release to the policy-making community. In order to achieve expectations on this objective, the completed product will make use of available intelligence from all relevant sources, will reflect engagement with other analysts and stakeholders in the subject of the analysis, will have incorporated the coordinated views of those other analysts and collectors

throughout the IC, will be presented in the product style appropriate to the question, and will be timely.”

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

(3) If the analyst cited in the example above were located in the Joint Information Operations Center (JIOC) responsible for Middle Eastern intelligence operations, his or her objectives should follow from Defense Intelligence guidance and from the JIOC manager’s objectives that might include such leadership objectives as: “Develop and implement a strategy for accessing all-source intelligence relating to the JIOC area of operations, for integrating the military and civilian workforce within the Center, and establishing Center objectives that will drive individual performance against the joint national and military intelligence mission, establish success measures against all Center objectives, and complete an initial assessment of progress against those measures by the end of the performance evaluation period.”

(4) At the supervisory level, the employee’s objectives would again follow from Defense Intelligence guidance but also from the managerial objectives. For the supervisor of the analyst cited in the example above, an objective might include such supervisory objectives as: “Develops the annual operating plan for the unit, developing and communicating specific performance objectives to all subordinate employees, establishing success measures for each objective, and conducting ongoing feedback throughout the performance 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 accomplish are provided to JIOC management by the completion of the performance evaluation period.”

ENCLOSURE 5

QUICK REFERENCE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TIMELINE

Performance Evaluation Period

1 October – 30 September

<b>DCIPS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ACTION</b>	<b>DUE DATE</b>
Objectives & IDPs	Within 30 days from the beginning of the performance evaluation period
Midpoint Performance Review	Mid-way between beginning and end of the performance evaluation period
Employee Accomplishments	Within 15 days from the end of the performance evaluation period
Rating Official/Supervisor's Evaluation	Within 30 days from the end of the performance evaluation period
Reviewing Official's Review	Within 45 days from the end of the performance evaluation period
Rating Official's Communication of Performance Evaluation to Employees	Within 10 days from receipt of the appraisal from the reviewing official
Effective Date of Performance Evaluation of Record	November 15

**KEY POINTS:**

- 1) Establishment of performance objectives, the midpoint performance review and the performance appraisal forms are all completed in the Performance Appraisal Application (PAA) tool.
- 2) The rating official is generally the immediate supervisor. However, in unusual circumstances in which rating official responsibilities are assigned to an official in the chain of supervision above the immediate supervisor, the supervisor will be responsible and accountable for collaborating with the rating official in his or her performance management responsibilities.
- 3) A close-out performance evaluation is not required if the rater or employee departs less than 90 days into the performance evaluation period. However, annotation of the employee's performance should be documented and submitted to the gaining supervisor for inclusion in the final rating.
- 4) A close-out performance evaluation is required for assignments 90 days or longer and will be completed within the automated DCIPS PAA tool. Reasons for close-outs include: the employee leaves the position and remains with the agency or Federal

government; there is a change in rater; or the employee is promoted into a different work level or into a new series.

## GLOSSARY

### PART I. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<b>AASA</b>	Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army
<b>ACOM</b>	Army Command
<b>ADCS</b>	Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff
<b>AG-1 (CP)</b>	Assistant G-1 (Civilian Personnel)
<b>AP-V</b>	Army Policy-Volume
<b>AR</b>	Army Regulation
<b>ASA (M&amp;RA)</b>	Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
<b>ASCC</b>	Army Service Component Command
<b>CHRA</b>	Civilian Human Resources Agency
<b>CPAC</b>	Civilian Personnel Advisory Center
<b>CWB</b>	Compensation Work Bench
<b>DCIPS</b>	Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System
<b>DPCDS</b>	Defense Civilian Personnel Data System
<b>DCS</b>	Deputy Chief of Staff
<b>DoD</b>	Department of Defense
<b>DoDD</b>	Department of Defense Directive
<b>DoDI</b>	Department of Defense Instruction
<b>DRU</b>	Direct Reporting Unit
<b>EPF</b>	Employee Performance File
<b>GG</b>	Pay series for DCIPS employees in graded structure
<b>HQDA</b>	Headquarters Department of the Army
<b>IC</b>	Intelligence Community
<b>IDP</b>	Individual Development Plan
<b>IPMO</b>	Intelligence Personnel Management Office
<b>JIOC</b>	Joint Intelligence Operations Center
<b>NR</b>	Not rated
<b>ODCS</b>	Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff
<b>ODNI</b>	Office of the Director of National Intelligence
<b>PAA</b>	Performance Appraisal Application
<b>PM PRA</b>	Performance Management Performance Review Authority
<b>SMART</b>	Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, timely or time-bound

**USD(I)** Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence

**WGI** Within-grade increase

## PART II. DEFINITIONS

Unless otherwise noted, these terms and their definitions apply to this policy volume and serve as the basic performance management taxonomy for Army DCIPS positions.

**Acceptable Level of Competence.** An evaluation of record equating to “Successful” level and above (i.e. Level 3 (Successful), Level 4 (Excellent), or Level 5 (Outstanding)).

**Administrative Reconsideration.** An exclusive process by which DCIPS employees may challenge their evaluation of record or content of the performance evaluation of record pursuant to this policy volume.

**Army Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA).** Provides merit system oversight of the performance management process to assure consistency in the application of principles and criteria and resolves employee requests for reconsideration. The PM PRA structure consists of an Army PM PRA (the HQDA ADCS, G-2); a Command PM PRA (the Commander of the ACOM, DRU, ASCC, the AASA, and the HQDA ADCS, G-2, or their delegates as authorized in para 5.g.(2)), and any subsequent additional lower levels of structure referred to as “Organizational PM PRAs” (at the level of the Commanders (Colonels -06 and above or civilian equivalent) as provided for under para 7.c of Enclosure 2, and/or to a panel with a chairperson who reports back to and provides recommendations to the PM PRA) that are established by the Command PM PRA.

**Closeout Performance Evaluation.** A narrative description and numeric evaluation of an eligible employee’s performance under an approved performance plan 1) when there is a change in the rating official, 2) to document performance for withholding the next scheduled WGI based on performance being observed or documented as being at a level below “Successful” when the employee has a current rating of “Successful” or above but is currently experiencing performance deficiencies so that the current level of performance is currently below “Successful,” and 3) to document an acceptable level of competence when current evaluation of record is below the “Successful” level. 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 an 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.

**Closeout - DCIPS** occurs between 01 January and 30 June each year whenever there are more than 90 days remaining in the annual performance period. A closeout performance evaluation may become the final evaluation of record where the final evaluation of record cannot be completed due to employee absence or other special situations.



**Closeout Early Annual** occurs between 01 July and 30 September when there is less than 90 days remaining in the annual performance period.

**Compensation Work Bench.** A tool used by DCIPS organizations to facilitate their pay pool panel meetings. It is a spreadsheet that contains all the functionality needed to conduct an effective pay pool to facilitate the administration of pay pool decisions.

**Days.** All time limits are counted in calendar days.

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

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

**Interim or Temporary Assignment Report of Performance.** A narrative description of an employee's accomplishments prepared by a supervisor other than the rating official during an employee's interim or temporary assignment or deployment, generally for periods of less than 90 calendar days.

**Midpoint Performance Review.** A mandatory formal performance review of an employee's performance conducted at or near the midpoint of the evaluation period. During the review, the rating official and employee should discuss achievements to date against performance objectives; any area for improvement; and examples in support of the performance elements and any area 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 Appraisal Application.** The Performance Appraisal Application (PAA) is a Department of Defense (DoD)-wide automated tool used to manage performance under DCIPS.

All DCIPS employees and rating and reviewing officials of Army DCIPS employees will utilize the automated DCIPS Performance Appraisal Application (PAA) when completing each of the three distinct phases of the DCIPS performance management process (i.e. performance planning, managing performance throughout the evaluation period, and evaluation of performance at the end of the performance evaluation period. [The DCIPS PAA can be accessed through "MyBiz+" at <https://compo.dcpds.cpms.osd.mil/>. To navigate to the 'MyPerformance Main Page', employees select 'MyPerformance' and Rating Officials/Reviewing Officials select 'Performance Management and Appraisal' under 'Manager Functions' in 'Key Services' in "MyBiz+". If you do not have a DCPDS account to access "MyBiz+", contact your DCIPS servicing CPAC advisor for assistance.]

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

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

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

**Performance Management.** The process of planning, setting, aligning, and communicating individual and organizational performance expectations to employees; monitoring and measuring their performance; providing feedback; taking appropriate steps to improve employee performance; addressing poor performance; and rating and rewarding employee performance to reflect the accomplishment of individual and organizational goals and objectives.

**Performance Management (Performance Review Authority) (PM PRA).** See Army PM PRA.

**Performance Objectives.** Information that relates individual job assignments or position responsibilities and/or accomplishments to performance elements and standards and to the mission, goals, and objectives of the Army.

**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.

**Presumptive Evaluation of Record.** The employee's last performance evaluation of record before his or her departure from their DCIPS position for uniformed military service during the current performance evaluation period who otherwise did not have the required 90-days of civilian service under any DCIPS performance plan needed to receive a closeout rating. See Enclosure 3, paragraph 7 (Special Situations) of this policy on how to calculate the presumptive rating. If the employee's last DCIPS evaluation is not available, or if it is below "Successful."

**Rating Official.** An individual within the rating official's chain of supervision or who is otherwise designated by the HQDA, DCS G-2 who has been designated responsibility for ensuring consistency, accuracy of employee ratings and compliance with DCIPS performance management policy within a designated career field or group of positions. The reviewing official is the approving official for each performance evaluation within his or her purview.

**Reviewing Official.** An individual in the rating official's chain of supervision who has been designated responsibility to ensure consistency, accuracy of employee ratings, and compliance with DCIPS performance management 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."

**Single Assessment Option.** A streamlined/single block narrative performance evaluation method performed within the DCIPS Performance Appraisal Application (PAA) which allows employees to simplify their self-assessment narrative into one single block of 6,000 characters, rather than responding to each Objective and Performance Element individually. The same methodology is used by the rating official in preparing the rater narrative assessment. The single assessment option is also applied to any early closeout performance evaluation and beginning in Fiscal Year 2018, it is applied to any midpoint performance review. The single assessment option is designed to streamline the administrative burden and reduce the redundancy of the performance management process for both employee and rating official. The single assessment option is identified at the employees pay pool level. Additional information on the single assessment option can be found on the Army DCIPS website at:  
<http://www.dami.army.pentagon.mil/site/dcips/LC-ER%202011.aspx>