



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, DC 20240

DEC 12 2006

In Reply Refer To:
FWS/ABHR/PFL/028406

Memorandum

To: Service Directorate

From: **Acting**
Deputy DirectorSubject: 2007 Guidance on Establishing Employee Performance Appraisal Plans for
General Workforce Employees

On September 30, 2006, the Fish and Wildlife Service marked the end of the second performance appraisal cycle under the 5-level Performance Management System for the general workforce. As you are aware, supervisors are responsible for ensuring their subordinates are annually placed under appropriate performance plans. This memorandum provides guidance for establishing performance plans for the FY 2007 appraisal year, and specifically addresses the criteria established by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) for determining adequacy of Employee Performance Appraisal Plans (EPAPs).

In order to meet OPM's criteria for adequacy, performance plans must display the following characteristics:

- **Strategic Alignment:** Employee performance plans should align and support organizational goals and targets that are established in an organization's annual performance plan and/or that have been included in the Senior Executive Service (SES) members' performance plans. Alignment should be clear so that employees can see how their performance plans support achievement of organizational goals. Where possible, the same specific organizational goals and objectives should cascade throughout the chain of authority (i.e., SES members, to managers, to supervisors) to the front-line employee. In cases where cascading the same goal does not make sense, linkage to a different goal will suffice. Merely including a generic statement in performance plans that employees' performance requirements support organizational goals is not adequate for communicating alignment. Similarly, simply restating organizational goals without also including the metrics for determining performance against those goals is not adequate
- **Results-focused:** Critical elements and standards should be written in terms of expected results. While it may be desirable to include critical elements that focus on competencies such as teamwork or customer service, at least one critical element must hold an

employee accountable for **achieving a result that directly supports an organizational goal included in a SES member's performance plan.**

- ***Credible Measures:*** Employee performance plans should include credible measures of performance. General types of measures of performance include quality, quantity, timeliness, and/or cost effectiveness, and are described in the generic benchmark standards that have been developed for supervisory and non-supervisory employees. However, **specific measures** of quality, quantity, timeliness, and or cost effectiveness **must be identified at least at the Fully-Successful level** so that employees understand how their performance is going to be evaluated. Further, these measures must be appropriate to the employee's level of responsibility within the organization, and must provide for clearly and consistently distinguishing between rating levels.

Examples of performance elements and standards that meet the criteria outlined above are provided as Attachment 1.

OPM has also prescribed additional requirements that apply to supervisors. The supervisory EPAP and benchmark standards have been revised to include the requirement for supervisors to take into consideration employee and customer perspectives. The supervisory benchmark standards have also been revised to include more specific criteria relative to effective performance management. The newly revised supervisory EPAP, which includes the mandatory supervisory critical element, and the revised supervisory benchmark standards are located at <http://www.doi.gov/hrm/guidance/di.3100s.pdf> and provided as Attachment 2. They **must be used for all supervisory employees, and should be used without modification to ensure consistency.** (Note: OPM does NOT require development of measurable standards for the supervisory element, so no augmentation of the supervisory benchmarks is required.)

A request was made to the Department for the Service to continue its use of our existing supervisory critical element which essentially augments the Department's by providing further clarification and adding a bullet on IDPs and training. We also requested to add language on developing employees. The Department initially disapproved our request, however, they have since indicated they will reconsider a formal request which is currently under development. If our request for variance is approved, you will be so notified. In the meantime, we need to ensure that the supervisory critical element reads as required by the Department.

By December 30, you must certify to the respective human resources office that all eligible employees have been placed under a performance plan. On at least a quarterly basis, servicing human resources offices must conduct an adequate random sampling of employee performance plans to ensure that they contain at least one critical element that links to a GPRA or strategic goal which cascades down from the respective SES manager, as this is a measure contained in our Human Capital Scorecard.

If you have questions or need assistance regarding the FY 2007 guidance on establishing performance plans for general workforce employees, please contact your regional Office of Human Resources.

Examples of elements/standards that meet the three required criteria:

Example #1: Position of Program Manager responsible for an adult literacy program with the intended outcome of improved literacy in adults.

Critical Element:

Strategic Goal: Organization Goal #3, Improving Adult Literacy Rate
Effectively manages the Adult Literacy Program for the Pacific Region, improving attendance in the program and literacy rate among participating adults.

Exceptional Standard: In addition to benchmark standards, during FY07, at least 95 percent of participating adults passed a standard literacy test. The program had less than a 2 percent drop-out rate.

Fully Successful Standard: In addition to benchmark standards, during FY07, at least 80 percent of participating adults passed a standard literacy test. The program had less than a 5 percent drop-out rate.

- This element is aligned to the organizational goal that specifies a certain percentage related to adult literacy improvement. The result that is measured is the literacy rate among participating adults in that region. The credible measures are the percent of participating adults who passed the test (quality), the percent drop-out rate (quantity) and the fiscal year (timeliness).

Example #2: Supervisor of work unit that reviews and processes cases.

Critical Element:

GPRG Goal: Management Excellence
Effectively manages the work of the unit to ensure that backlog is reduced while ensuring accuracy of cases completed.

Exceptional Standard: Work unit reduces the case backlog by 50% by the end of the fiscal year, with at least 98% accuracy in cases completed.

Fully Successful Standard: Work unit reduces the case backlog by 30% by the end of the fiscal year, with at least 88% accuracy in cases completed.

- This critical element is aligned to the GPRG goal of Management Excellence that specifies caseload reduction and customer satisfaction. The result is a reduced case backlog. The measures of performance are the percent of reduction of backlog (quantity), the accuracy rate (quality), and the fiscal year (timeliness).

Example #3: Administrative Officer responsible for budget of an organization:

Critical Element:

GPRA Goal: Management Excellence

Prepares well justified, accurate and timely budget submissions.

Exceptional Standard: FY07 budget for the organization is completed and approved ahead of schedule, at least by June 15. Budget request descriptions are well written such that they are used as examples for others to follow. Submission has no errors, and exceeds all specifications outlined by the CFO.

Fully Successful Standard: FY07 budget for the organization is completed and approved by deadline of June 30. Budget requests descriptions are adequate, require no rewrite, contain no significant errors, and fully meet all specifications outlined by the CFO.

- This element shows the alignment to Management Excellence, which prescribed timely and accurate budget requests. The result is a complete budget document. The measures of performance are the deadline (timeliness) and meeting all the specifications of the CFO (quality).

Attachment 1

DI-3100S

September 2006 (previous edition obsolete)

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Supervisory Employee Performance Appraisal Plan**

Employee Name and Social Security Number:		Title/Serial/Grade:	
Duty Station:	Appraisal Period:	From:	To:

Part A: Notification of Standards: Signatures certify that critical elements and performance standards were discussed. Critical elements and performance standards are contained in Part E.

Employee:	Rating Official:	Reviewing Official (if applicable):
Date:	Date:	Date:

*If determined by Bureau/Office.

Part B: Progress Review: Signatures certify that performance was discussed.

Employee:	Date:	Rating Official:	Date:
-----------	-------	------------------	-------

Part C: Summary Rating Determination: To determine a summary rating, assign one of the numerical rating levels that accurately reflects the employee's performance for each of the critical elements (Use only whole numbers: **Exceptional = 5 points; Superior = 4 points; Fully Successful = 3 points; Minimally Successful = 2 points; and Unsatisfactory = 0 points.**) See reverse for complete instructions for assigning a Summary Rating.

Element Number	Numerical Rating
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
Total:	

Total Numerical Rating _____ ÷ Number of Elements _____ = Numeric Summary Rating _____

Part D: Overall Summary Rating: Use conversion chart below to determine Summary Rating. Check the appropriate box.

Exceptional	4.0 - 5.00 AND No critical element rated lower than "Superior".
Superior	3.0 - 3.99 AND No critical element rated lower than "Fully Successful".
Fully Successful	2.0 - 2.99 AND No critical element rated lower than "Fully Successful".
Minimally Successful	1.0 - 1.99 AND No critical element rated lower than "Minimally Successful".
Unsatisfactory	One or more critical elements rated "Unsatisfactory".

Employee:	Rating Official:	Reviewing Official (if applicable):
Date:	Date:	Date:

Check here if Interim Rating: _____ Performance Award: _____ Cash _____ QSI _____ Time Off _____

Employee's Signature above certifies that the overall summary rating was discussed. Reviewing Official's signature is required for Exceptional, Minimally Successful and Unsatisfactory ratings, and otherwise if determined by Bureau/Office.