

Coast Guard Supervisor's Guide to the Public Health Service (PHS) Commissioned Corps Personnel Evaluation and Promotion Systems (2011)

- Refs: 1) COMDTINST M1000.6A, Coast Guard Personnel Manual, Chapter 19
2) COMDTINST M6000.1DC, Coast Guard Medical Manual
3) COMDTINST M5100.47, Coast Guard Safety and Environmental Health Manual
4) "Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report (COER)," PHS Manual Circular 383 (2006)
5) "PHS Promotion Program," Commissioned Corps Personnel Manual (CCPM) Subchapter 23.4
6) "PHS Performance Evaluation Program," CCPM Subchapter 25.1
7) "PHS Grievances" and "Equal Opportunity: Discrimination Complaints Processing." CCPM Subchapter 26.1
8) "PHS General Administration Manual Policies and Procedures for Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records," CCPM 29.9
9) OPERATING FACILITY CHANGE ORDER (OFCO) NO. 040-10

A. Performance Evaluations of PHS Commissioned Officers

Introduction

Both USCG and USPHS policy (ref 1 and 2) establish the Director, Health, Safety, and Work-life (CG-11) as the final reviewing official on all COERs for PHS officers detailed to the USCG.

Effective 29 Aug 2009 the Health Safety and Work-Life Service Center was established and re-aligned to report to CG-11. This command at IOC in 2009 was comprised of the MLC K divisions, and the clinic and Work-Life staffs previously assigned at legacy Integrated Support Commands, Headquarters Support Command, Aviation Training Center, Coast Guard Yard, Coast Guard Academy and TRACEN Cape May and TRACEN Petaluma commands. Operating Facility Change Order (OFCO) no. 040-10 OFCO (reference 9) chopped all other locations with privileged providers (medical officers and dental officers) to the operational control and technical authority of HSWL SC and CG-11. These operations fall under HSWL SC in order to provide Health, Safety and Work-Life support. Airsta and Sector clinics are now required to function as part of the assigned product line organization (regional practice), responsive to the HSWL SC regional manager (product line manager) and the HSWL SC technical/professional chain of oversight. The local commands retain the control of administrative, local and non-technical issues that do not impact the delivery of HSWL services. PAL configuration control of HSWL related positions is a Service Center function.

PHS officers assigned to the Coast Guard are subject to the Uniformed Code of Military Justice. These officers are required to meet all Coast Guard uniform, weight, medical and dental standards. PHS officer evaluations and promotions are managed differently than Coast Guard officers

A.1. The Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report (COER)

The Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report (COER), and accompanying PHS Manual Circular instructions, shall be used in reporting on all PHS officers.

A.2. COER Importance

PHS COERs are equally important to Officer Evaluation Reports used for Coast Guard officers with respect to personnel actions such as promotion, and retention. In addition, COERs are used as guides to assignments and as a basis for recommendations for paying or withholding physician, dentist and other contractual special pays.

The COER is the major source of information concerning each officer's performance and work record. The report also provides a vehicle to discuss an officer's performance. Such discussions provide the officer with an opportunity to assess his/her strong and weak points, and overcome perceived performance and/or attitudinal deficiencies. The COER is utilized by the PHS Office of Commissioned Corps Operations (OCCO) in processing both positive and adverse actions that are initiated by command. It is imperative both to the officer and to the Service that the report be candid and objective. Under-rating the officer may affect his/her career. Over-rating is of dubious benefit as it may lead to assignments and promotions for which the officer is not qualified and could compromise requests for disciplinary action.

A.3. Definitions

Annual COER. The annual COER should reflect the officer's performance over the rating period, which normally is between October 1 of one year and September 30 of the following year. Annual COERs are required even when a COER was submitted during the rating period for some other purpose, such as special request.

Transfer COER. A transfer COER should be considered when an officer transfers from one duty location to another with at least 90 days of rated time. The transfer COER can be considered the officer's annual COER if the closing date is 1 July or later.

Change of Rater COER. The change of rater COER should be used when an officer's rater leaves within the rated period and has supervised the officer longer than 90 days. The change of rater COER can be optional as long as the officer's new rater will have an opportunity to supervise the officer for at least 6 months and receives feedback from the departing supervisor addressing the officer's previous performance.

Special Request COER. Action to obtain a special request COER can be initiated by the officer's rater in connection with any appropriate personnel matter documentation for special pay, promotion, retirement or documenting changes in officer performance).

Detailed COER. In a detailed COER, marks are assigned for each of 8 questions that cover characteristics considered most pertinent to the officer's performance in the service.

Narrative COER. A narrative COER consists of a statement by the rater and a single mark for the officer's "Overall Performance."

RATER: For PHS field billets, the Rater is the HSWL SC designated PHS officer supervisor usually in the officer's clinical category. PHS officers performing administrative and consultative duties for USCG commands (PSC, CGRC, HSWL SC, FORCECOM, CG-11) may have a USCG officer or Civilian as their RATER.

For PHS officers serving in administrative positions with CGRC, FORCECOM, PSC, and CG-11, the rater may be a USCG officer or USCG Civilian.

REVIEWER: The Reviewing Officer for all PHS officers detailed to USCG is the Director, Health, Safety, Work-Life, CG-11

USCG UNIT COMMANDER : USCG Officer with administrative oversight of HSWL field facilities. PHS Officers at these sites (Air stations/Sectors/Bases) will route their COERS through local commanders using forms attached at the end of this guide (Enclosure 1).

Commissioned Corps Liaison. The Commissioned Corps Liaison is a staff PHS officer in CG-11. The Commissioned Corps Liaison is designated to monitor the progress of completion of the COERs.

A.4. Special Circumstances

If a rater has supervised an officer for a short period of time (less than 6 months), it is appropriate for the rater to seek input in completing the COER from the officer's previous rater or chain of command.

If rating periods include extended periods of sick leave or intermittent episodes of sick leave, the officer should be evaluated on his/her performance when present.

If an officer's duty station is geographically separated from the duty station of the rater or if an officer is temporarily working in another program, diligence is to be exercised by the rater to objectively assess performance. For example, site visits or discussions and/or written input with on-site supervisors may be helpful to assess performance.

A. 5. COER Preparation and Submission

A.5.a. Duties

An officer should fully understand the performance expectations of his or her duties at the beginning of the annual evaluation period. It is recommended that the rater have a beginning of the rating year conference with the officer regarding the rater's performance expectations. It is also recommended that performance accomplishments and any performance issues be reviewed with the officer at a mid-year performance review conference. The purpose of these conferences is to enhance officer-rater communication about performance expectations and to allow the rated officer opportunity to improve or correct any identified deficiencies. Raters should ensure that USCG Unit Commanders are aware of the officer's performance expectations.

It is the duty and responsibility of all officers being rated, raters, and the Reviewing Official to promptly complete and transmit a COER when due. Officers without annual COERs will be adversely affected when being considered for promotion, awards, details, special pays, and other personnel actions that depend, in part, upon demonstrated good performance.

When it is determined that an officer, a rater, or the Reviewing Official has not transmitted a COER by the due dates established, follow-up action will be initiated by the Commissioned Corps Liaison. The Commissioned Corps Liaison will monitor the progress of COER submissions and make inquiries on those that are not submitted in a timely manner.

A.5.b. Overview of the eCOER Process

The annual eCOER is a web-based electronic workflow process that can be accessed from the PHS Commissioned Corps Management Information System website.

A.5.b.1. Rated officer initiates eCOER.

The rated officer must complete their portion of section one (administrative data) and all of section two (officer's comments) which describes the rated officer's Duties, Accomplishments and Goals. The officer must identify his/her rater and provide an e-mail address. The rated officer then releases the electronic COER to his rater.

For those PHS officers working in facilities with USCG Unit Commander administrative oversight, the Rated officer shall also provide the USCG Unit Commander with an Adobe pdf copy of his/her submitted officer comments, a copy of this guide with fillable Adobe pdf for USCG Unit Commander input, and routing information for input to PHS Rater. Unit Commanders are strongly encouraged to utilize enclosure (1) to provide their input.

A.5.b.2. Rater opens officer eCOER and evaluates.

Rater logs in to eCOER application. If necessary, rater updates contact (email address and work phone) information. The rater may be required to obtain a user name and password from PHS. Directions will be provided electronically for this process. Rater enters time supervised. If time supervised is less than two months, the rater has the option of completing either a narrative or detailed eCOER. In most cases, if the time supervised is greater than two months, the rater must complete a detailed eCOER. Narrative eCOERs are necessary for officers enrolled in long-term training.

For a detailed eCOER, the rater indicates the level that most nearly describes the officer by selecting the appropriate rating for all questions, with "1" being the lowest rating and "7" being the highest rating. A score of "4" should be considered average while a score of "5" and "6" should be considered above average and indicative of exceptional performance. A score of "7" should be given in cases where the officer has performed above and beyond his/her peers for that element of the COER. **Unless justified, a COER with all "7" marks does not reflect well upon the Coast Guard nor does it help an officer compete for promotion.**

The rater should rate each item independently without reference to any other. It is imperative both to the officer and to the PHS Commissioned Corps that the eCOER rating be candid and objective. Each "1" or "2" rating must have a comment specifying the reason for the low rating.

Comments should be specific and substantive, and consistent with the rating given. Comments should reflect accomplishments as well as level of responsibility. It is possible for an officer to have duties and responsibilities in two or more position descriptions. For example, a medical officer may also be Senior Health Services Officer, Senior Medical/Dental Executive, Regional Pharmacy Executive, Flight Surgeon, Designated Medical Officer Advisor (DMOA), and Designated Supervisory Medical Officer (DSMO).

Raters should be responsive to any information provided by an officer regarding his/her accomplishments. The rater should be aware of the medical/dental readiness data in the Readiness Management System (RMS) MRRS for units in the officer's area of responsibility, and the level of the officer's utilization and completeness of the electronic medical record. .

It is recommended that preliminary ratings be developed by raters in preparation for the performance discussion with the officer, and finalized during the performance discussion after the officer has had the opportunity to provide any additional information for the rater to consider. **The Rater should ensure he/she has received and integrated USCG Unit Commander input before finalizing the COER.** After the rater submits the eCOER comments and marks electronically, he/she releases the

eCOER to the Reviewing Official for initial review. The COER (electronic or paper) will be returned to the rater (with comments from the RO if necessary) to release to the officer.

A.5.b.3. Officer reviews rater's scores.

After the RO returns the COER to the rater he/she releases the eCOER to the rated officer for (read-only) review. The PHS officer will receive e-mail notification that the eCOER is ready for his/her concur or non-concur mark. After the PHS officer concurs or non-concurs, an email is sent to the Reviewing Official (Director Health, Safety, and Work Life (CG-11) stating the eCOER is ready for the final review. The rater will also receive e-mail notification that the PHS officer concurred or non-concurred. At this point in the process, the rater should print a hard copy of the COER. Technical problems with this step should be addressed to the local help desk.

PHS RATERS shall route a scanned copy of all COERS they are responsible for to the HSWL SC MO/DO/PhO/EHO (except officers assigned to Commandant (CG-11), CGPC, Deployable Operations Group (DOG) and CGRC). Chief, Clinical Staff, HSWL SC is responsible for the timely handling and submission of HSWL SC endorsements to CG-11 prior to action by the Reviewing Official.

A.5.b.4. Reviewing Official reviews marks and comments, and then approves with or without comment.

A.6. Rights of Officers

Officers should have an opportunity to correct conduct and performance weaknesses with the cooperation of the rater and/or Reviewing Official, as appropriate. When discussing an officer's performance weaknesses, the officer, rater and/or Reviewing Official should agree on what corrective action steps the officer needs to take. Such a plan should establish specific performance objectives and evaluation criteria, as well as a reasonable time frame over which performance can be assessed. The officer, rater, and/or Reviewing Official should, whenever possible, agree to any additional training that may be necessary or helpful.

An officer may disagree with a performance rating. At the time during the electronic process where the officer indicates concurrence or non-concurrence with the rater's evaluation, the officer will have the opportunity to indicate that he/she will submit a hard copy rebuttal to the PHS Office of Commissioned Corps Operations (OCCO) within 60 days of electronic submission of the eCOER. When completed, the officer must send the rebuttal directly to his/her Commissioned Corps Liaison. The Liaison will provide a copy to the rater and Reviewing Official, and then forward the original to OCCO for inclusion in the officer's electronic Official Personnel File (eOPF).

In addition to submitting a rebuttal, the officer may file an equal opportunity (EO) complaint in accordance with PHS INSTRUCTION 6, Subchapter CC26.1, "Equal Opportunity: Discrimination Complaints Processing." This policy instructs officers who are detailed to a military service to follow the EO complaint process of the military service to which they are assigned. Therefore, PHS officers detailed to the Coast Guard will utilize the Coast Guard's EO complaint process. If the officer is not satisfied with the EO process, he/she may apply for relief to the Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records as provided in PHS INSTRUCTION 5, Subchapter CC29.9, "General Administration Manual Policies and Procedures for Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records," of the CCPM.

The Board for Correction of PHS Commissioned Corps Records may not consider an application until the officer has exhausted other available administrative remedies, including the grievance and EO processes.

A.7. Privacy Act Provisions

Personnel records are subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974. The applicable system of record is 09-40-0001, "PHS Commissioned Corps General Personnel Records," HHS/PSC/HRS. The Privacy Act of 1974 gives individuals the right, subject to certain conditions, to gain access to records (including COERs) maintained on them.

B. PHS Promotion Boards and the Precepts/Factors used to Evaluate Officers for Promotion

B.1. Key Concepts

B.1.a. Promotion eligibility is based upon an officer's training, experience, and length of active-duty service. The assessment of officers' capabilities and performance includes review of COERs and Reviewing Official Statements (ROS); education, training, and professional development; career progression and potential; professional contributions and service to the PHS Commissioned Corps; and response readiness.

B.1.b. An officer's grade is vested in him/her, not in the position he/she occupies. The position may carry a higher or lower grade.

B.1.c. Promotion boards are convened annually to consider all eligible officers for promotion. Each professional category (e.g., medical, dental, pharmacy, environmental health) has a separate promotion board normally comprising PHS O-6 grade officers in that professional category. Each board consists of five commissioned officers who are as representative as possible of the category in terms of Agency and Program distribution, specialty, and other pertinent factors.

Promotion boards review only electronic Official Personnel Folders (eOPF) for all eligible officers, assign a numerical score to each candidate, recommend for or against the promotion of each individual considered, and present a rank-order list to the Director, OCCO, for action. More recent COERs for the officer being considered for promotion are given more consideration by the board than earlier ratings. In an effort to right-size COER marks, 2010 COERs for were lower relative to other CG PHS officers and other-agency PHS officers. Verbiage was provided by CG-11 to be included in these COERs in an effort to not disadvantage officers detailed to the CG (as opposed to those assigned to other agencies).

B.1.d. PHS officers hold two grades simultaneously: a permanent grade and a temporary grade. A permanent promotion is promotion to a grade below which an officer shall not ever be reduced except for cause. The temporary grade is usually higher than the permanent grade because the temporary promotion program permits promotion consideration before an individual meets the length-of-service requirements for permanent promotion. An officer is paid at the rate authorized for his or her temporary grade. Officers' retired pay grade is based on the highest held temporary grade.

B.1.e. There is an accelerated promotion policy that may be used for individuals who possess exceptional proficiency; see "PHS Promotion Program," Commissioned Corps Personnel Manual (CCPM) Subchapter 23.4, section L. For each temporary grade, an officer may be nominated one time for an exceptional proficiency promotion (EPP) based on the possession of unusual levels of training and/or professional experience or unique qualifications required by the PHS. Nominations for EPPs

may be made only if the officer meets all of the following: has held the current temporary grade for at least 1 year; currently is in a billet rated at or above the proposed grade; meets time in grade requirements; and is in compliance with standards of conduct, licensure, COER, and readiness. The Coast Guard can nominate only one officer for EPP each year. The process to select the officer as the Coast Guard's EPP nominee is competitive. Eligible officers (based upon criteria above) are notified in September and encouraged to compete for that promotion year's EPP.

B.1.f. Some officers on the rank-order promotion list who are recommended for promotion may not receive promotions. The cut-off score is established on the rank-order list based on the number of available vacancies. Those officers above the cut-off will be promoted provided they meet licensure and other established requirements. Those below the cut-off line are considered by the promotion board the following year.

B.1.g. An officer who is recommended for promotion, but is not ranked high enough to be selected for promotion, will be examined for temporary promotion during the next cycle for which the officer is eligible.

B.1.h. If a promotion board recommends against the permanent promotion of an officer for two consecutive cycles, and the Assistant Secretary for Health (ASH), DHHS concurs with the recommendation, the officer may be referred to an involuntary separation board.

Officers who fail to be recommended for permanent promotion twice in succession, who are not separated or retired from active duty, when the Assistant Secretary for Health (ASH) concurs with the recommendation, shall not be considered for any future permanent or temporary promotion, unless a subsequent determination is made by the Director, OCCO, that the officer's performance and conduct fully justify reinstatement of the officer on the promotion list.

B.1.i. OCCO notifies an officer of his or her selection for promotion through official personnel orders. If an officer is not successful in a given promotion cycle, information is made available concerning steps which may be taken to improve performance or enhance future consideration for promotion in the secure section of his/her eOPF.

B.2. Documentation for Promotion Boards

B.2.a. Regular promotions. A rater provides much of the information used by the promotion boards that recommend for or against promotion for each PHS commissioned officer. This information includes: annual and interim COER; and nominations for, and presentation of honor awards, which are indicative of the officer's performance, abilities, and assignments. raters can also remind the officer to submit an updated curriculum vitae to OCCO, and to review his/her eOPF prior to the promotion board's meeting to ensure that the eOPF fully represents his/her performance and professional status.

B.2.b. Exceptional proficiency promotions (EPP). If an officer demonstrates exceptional proficiency, raters may nominate the officer to the Reviewing Official for an accelerated promotion before the officer is otherwise eligible for promotion.

These officers' records are reviewed along with officers eligible in their own right. OCCO does not provide any identifying information to the promotion boards that indicate that an officer is being reviewed as an EPP candidate. Also, there is not a separate cut-off score for EPP nominees. EPP candidates are included on the board's rank order list along with officers reviewed in their own right and the category's success rate is applied to that list.

B.3. Promotion Precepts/Factors considered by Promotion Boards

B.3.a. Officers preparing for promotion need to be familiar with the 5 promotion precepts described in the electronic Commissioned Corps Issuance System (eCCIS) Instructions 331.01 and 331.02 (old CCPM CC23.4.1 Permanent Grade Promotions and CC23.4.2 Temporary Grade Promotions), and noted below. To assist officers in better understanding the promotion precepts, the precepts are described in terms of factors that may be considered in scoring that precept. Each factor has a benchmark, which is a level of achievement for the officer given the category and grade. The purpose of this guidance is to inform officers and promotion boards of the levels of achievement per promotion precept generally considered .

B.3.b The Chief Professional Officers (CPO) and Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairs, in consultation with their constituent category members, revise the Benchmarks annually to reflect the ever changing missions and policies of the Corps.

Benchmarks are levels of achievement and/or standards of excellence that describe the “best-qualified” officer. They serve as a basis by which officers can be measured within each category. The members of the Promotion Boards review the service records of each officer under consideration for promotion and each assigns a score for the specific promotion precept. Promotion Board members exercise their professional judgment and discretion in the review and rating of each record. No Officer is expected to meet all of the benchmarks. The Benchmarks are not to be considered a checklist of activities that must be completed in order to be promoted. Quality of service is more important than quantity.

The individual factors within each precept are not listed in priority order. The importance of each factor is left to the discretion of the Promotion Boards. There is no time period that limits which of the officer’s activities and accomplishments are eligible for consideration. However, activities and accomplishments subsequent to an officer’s last promotion should receive priority consideration.

B.3.c The promotion precepts are weighted as follows:

1. Performance Rating and Reviewing Official Statement (Performance) 40%
2. Education, training, and professional development 15%
3. Career progression and potential 25%
4. Professional contributions and services to the PHS Commissioned Corps (Officership) 15%
5. Response Readiness 5%

Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report – Supplemental

Officer Name: _____ PHS# _____ Unit Commander: _____

Type of Report: Annual Officer Transfer Supervisor Transfer Interim Narrative]

1. Leadership: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

2. Initiative and Growth: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

3. Communication Skills: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

4. Interpersonal Skills: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

5. Planning and Organization: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

6. Professional Competencies: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

7. Analysis, Judgment and Decision-Making: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

8. Overall Effectiveness: Circle: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7]

Strengths: List the areas in which the officer displays strong qualities and superior skills

Areas for Improvement: List the areas needed for continued growth and development

| Element | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1. Leadership | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrates behavior that maintains the status quo, often seeking direction in accomplishing the team's goals. - Has minimal influence on others. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrates behavior that facilitates collaboration, fairness, and inclusiveness. - Influences others through actions, accomplishments, and team work. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistently demonstrates behavior that contributes to the organization's success by fostering effective relationships, inspiring the trust of others, and nurturing group effectiveness and cohesion. - Influences others by exhibiting vision, innovation, resilience, inclusiveness, and by teaching and coaching others. | |
| 2. Initiative and Growth | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs assistance in identifying opportunities to improve work performance. - Work performance improves with regular supervisory input and detailed instructions about assignments. - Needs guidance to understand how personal decisions and actions contribute to mistakes or impedes success of individual and group projects. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognizes opportunities for growth and seeks experiences to improve work performance. - Willingly incorporates new approaches and responsibilities to advance program goals. Requires minimal supervision and seeks guidance with solutions only for unexpected barriers. - Accepts responsibility for personal decisions or mistakes and learns from errors. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Independently seeks out and completes challenging opportunities that broaden expertise, maximize job performance, and enhance value to the program. - Anticipates program needs including potential barriers. Proactively and decisively implements innovative solutions to improve work processes with impact beyond scope of assigned responsibilities. - Actively identifies personal role in a problem and contributes to the solution, enhancing the successful outcome of individual and group projects. | |
| 3. Communication Skills | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs assistance in expressing main thoughts clearly, both orally and in writing, and clarifying the meaning and intent of others' communication. - Uses correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation to create simple documents. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tailors communication (verbal and written) to the level and experience of the audience, ensuring that messages are organized, useful and accurate. - Utilizes strong listening skills to formulate direct, responsive answers to questions. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizes and expresses complex ideas, both orally and in writing, to successfully inform and influence individual and managerial decisions that advance the organization's mission. - Is a confident and effective speaker, asks open-ended questions, and recognizes and accommodates a vast diversity of ideas and traditions. | |
| 4. Interpersonal Skills | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prefers work activities that can be completed independently and does not require sustained interaction with individuals of differing viewpoints or opinions. - Minimally contributes to the resolution of conflicts or disagreements. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participates in group activities, demonstrates respect for others, and receives and offers constructive feedback, which contributes to the achievement of organizational goals. - Contributes to the resolution of conflicts. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promotes collaboration by demonstrating respect, friendliness, appreciation, humor, empathy, and a positive attitude. Serves as a mentor to others. - Is cognizant of the needs of others and works to ensure equal treatment of all within the work environment. Serves as mediator in resolving conflicts. | |
| 5. Planning and Organizing | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In collaboration with supervisor, sets and acts on priorities for work activities which usually results in meeting predetermined deadlines. - Seeks assistance in managing multiple work assignments and in identifying priority assignments. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Determines individual work priorities based on organizational needs and acts on those priorities with minimal supervisory guidance; completes assignments on time. - Sets realistic deadlines, based on sound criteria; keeps supervisor and others informed of progress of activities. - Met written performance goals for last year as agreed upon with supervisor. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Optimizes time and resources efficiently, and anticipates unexpected situations in order to attain the highest quality work. - Clearly and independently recognizes how the work of the individual relates to work of others within and outside the organization; understands the purpose of the work; and establishes realistic priorities and deadlines. - Develops project or work plans that set clear, well-defined desired outcomes and establishes methods of measuring progress, resulting in the advancement of the organization's mission. | |
| 6. Professional Competencies | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic knowledge of subject matter required for assigned duties; demonstrates average ability to learn and apply specialized knowledge. - Seeks assistance in understanding issues, concepts, and situations which affect job performance. - Needs supervisory assistance to ensure quality work products. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrates in depth knowledge of subjects required by assigned duties; is viewed as a competent and credible authority on specialty or operational issues. - Clear understanding of issues, concepts and situations and applies lessons learned to improve individual productivity. - Quality of work is commensurate with Officer's rank. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exhibits great depth and breadth of knowledge of multiple subjects; is viewed by others within and outside immediate office as a subject matter expert. - Excellent grasp of complex issues, concepts and situations, and applies lessons learned to improve individual and organizational productivity. - Consistently produces work of exceptional quality. | |
| 7. Analysis, Judgment, and Decision-making | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs guidance in analyzing facts, alternatives, and impact before making decisions. - Majority of judgments are relevant and correct. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employs sound judgment, logical reasoning, and uses resources wisely; makes timely and accurate decisions. - Opinions sought by others. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keen analytical insight and understanding of key issues and relevant information to make appropriate decisions; is sought after to resolve complex problems. - Consistent, superior judgment inspires the confidence of others. | |
| 8. Overall Effectiveness | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An adequately performing Officer with some potential to accept increased responsibilities and for professional growth | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A very competent Officer making significant contributions that enhance the assigned position, respected by peers; good potential for continued growth and development. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A distinguished Officer, recognized for expertise with impact extending beyond assigned position; serves as a role model for others in the program. | |

