Enlisted Evaluation System (EES)
Frequently Asked Questions

Date: 4/25/2018

What is the EES?

The Enlisted Evaluation System (EES) is the new name of the program governing all enlisted evaluations per Commandant policy. Previously known as the Enlisted Employee Review System (EERS), the name change was made to align nomenclature within CG-1 and remove redundancies with use of the acronym "EERS" elsewhere in policy. In addition, the Enlisted Employee Review will now be referred to as the Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER) for similar reasons. Policy, procedures and all references to the evaluation system will be updated as part of the system revision.

Why is the Coast Guard revising the EES?

Current Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER) performance standards no longer optimally support Coast Guard enlisted members or the numerous human resources decisions for the active duty and reserve enlisted workforce. The Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard and CG-1 chartered a joint work group to revise the EES in order for it to remain an effective expectations management tool for our members, continue to be a performance management tool for our supervisors, and a talent management tool for the organization.

What are the objectives of the EES revision?

The objectives were threefold. First, to incorporate the Leadership Development Framework from COMDTINST M5351.3 (series) into the EER. Second, to provide better data for all assignments, retentions, separations, boards, panels, and advancement decisions. Third, to reduce the evaluation process workload for supervisors by streamlining unnecessary competencies, while maintaining the effectiveness and value of the system.

When do the changes go into effect?

The changes are scheduled to go into effect on 1 March 2018. This means anyone evaluated with an effective date of 1 March 2018 or later (for any reason) will receive marks using the new EER. To help prepare for these changes, the revised draft competencies and associated draft performance standards were announced in October 2017. Updated policy changes surrounding the new EES and finalized competencies and performance standards are scheduled to be released in early 2018.

When will Direct Access (DA) be updated to reflect the new changes to the EES?

Users will not see any of the new programming in DA before the implementation date. The programming team has entered the revised performance standards into DA, and has been testing the SWE and CWO appointment board score computation processes to ensure seamless integration of the old and new competencies and ensure it is ready for release. Even after 1 March 2018, DA will continue to run both the old and new EER and will populate the correct EER competencies based on the effective date of the EER being submitted.

What policies and procedures will be updated?

Changes to the EES will require a revision to the Enlisted Accessions, Evaluations, and Advancements Manual, COMDTINST M1000.2 (series). In addition, a new procedural guide, Enlisted Evaluation System Procedures Manual, PSCINST 1611.2 (series), will be published by CG Personnel Service Center (PSC), to provide more detailed guidance surrounding the new EERs.

Will there be training on the EES revision?

Initial informational materials were made available in the fall of 2017 on the Enlisted Personnel Management (EPM) CG PORTAL site found at the end of this FAQ guide. More detailed process guides, instructional videos, and DA user guides will be available in February 2018. In addition, training plans and materials, to include unit outreach via phone/video conference, will be available beginning in early 2018; members are encouraged to check the CG Portal page for the most recent updates.

This is being communicated as a substantial change from the current EER. As these changes will affect all Coast Guard members (evaluee, rating chain), what can members do to prepare for it?

This revision is substantial. It involves expectation changes at almost every paygrade, changes to comment blocks, an addition of a new potential block, and changes to the recommendation for advancement. All members of an enlisted rating chain – officer, enlisted, civilian – should review the draft performance standards that were released in October 2017, as well as the finalized versions that will be released early 2018. It is important evaluees review the new EER with their supervisors to set performance expectations and goals to align with the new competencies. Additionally, all members will need to thoroughly review the revised policy and new PSC procedural guide before they enter their first set of new marks into DA.

Is a new branch being created in EPM?

EPM has proposed the creation of a new branch to be identified as CG PSC-EPM-3. This branch, currently under construction, will have some temporary staffing starting in the summer of 2018. This staff will provide the governance and administration of the new EES, to include policy and process management as well as serving as the new authority for EER content validation.

EPM manages active duty enlisted personnel only. Will RPM also create a new branch to validate reserve EERs?

Not at this time. The initial focus of the proposed EPM-3 branch will be to oversee the EES for both active duty and reserve enlisted members. Adjustments may be made in the future.

How will the EES revision affect the SWE multiple or the CWO appointment board score computation?

The update should be seamless to the SWE. EPM does not anticipated changes to SWE multiple policies. The changes to the number of competencies will be normalized in DA by programmers at CG PPC (Topeka) and CG OSC (Martinsburg) to ensure the final multiples continue to align with existing advancement policy, which are currently set at 50 points.

Are advancement EER's required for the 1 March 2018 advancement cycle?

Answer: Yes. Advancement EER's are required for the 1 March 2018 advancement cycle if the appropriate observance period is met.   Set the effective date of the EER under as 2/28/2018 and under the former rank and populate the legacy form.

What type of changes should we expect to see with the new EER?

Below is a list highlighting the major changes with the EER:

1. **Reduced Competencies**: The most notable change you will see on your initial review of the new EER forms are the reduced amount of competencies. For the vast majority of EERs the competencies were reduced almost 50%. A comparison of the current number of competencies with the revised number is as follows:

Paygrade	E1-E3	E4	E5	E6	E7-E9
Current # of Competencies	19	25	25	25	25
Revised # of Competencies	9	13	13	13	15

2. **Revised Competencies:** New competencies and descriptions that better align performance standards with the Leadership Development Framework found in COMDTINST M5351.3 (series).

3. **Paygrade specific EERs**: With the exception of E-1 to E-3, each paygrade will have their individual EER with performance standards specific to each paygrade. This will help reset higher performance expectations after each advancement.

4. **Required Comments (competencies)**: Comments will be required for all marks of a 1, 2, 3 & 7. This provides future EER reviewers with a better understanding of why a member received one of these marks, allowing personnel managers to make more informed human resources decisions. It will also allow supervisors to clearly document performance deficiencies or highlights to support and encourage evaluee development.

5. **Required Comments (format)**: Space for comments for marks of 1,2,3, & 7 will be limited to two lines of text per competency.   There is no negative connotation with "white space". If it can be captured in less than two lines, than do so.

6. **Future Potential**: Comments documenting a member's future potential will be required for each EER for paygrades E-4 and above. A block has been created on the new EER to meet this requirement. This block will require specific, succinct comments addressing the member's potential for future leadership responsibilities. This includes potential to serve in special, independent, or command cadre assignments in the current or subsequent paygrades. Again, white space is not a negative; a lengthy narrative to say what can be said in one line is **not** the objective.

7. **Advancement EERs**: An EER will now be required for any member advancing to paygrade E5 or above (the 92/184 day rule still applies). This change is necessary due to the fact that the competencies and performance standards change at each paygrade – as such, it would be unfair to evaluate a member against the higher performance standards if they have not had ample time to perform in that paygrade. By requiring an EER on the day prior to someone advancing, the policy greatly reduces a member being evaluated shortly after the expectations being changed.

8. **Recommendation for Advancement:** The new "three-button" system will better separate individuals who are satisfactorily performing at their current paygrade from those who are unsatisfactorily performing at their current paygrade. **It also incorporates eligibility and qualification requirements for E4 and above.** Comments will only be required for "Not Ready" and "Not Recommended" marks. Only personnel who receive a "Ready" will receive a SWE. The new buttons and definitions will be:

   a) <u>Ready:</u> Assign this mark if, in the view of the rating official, at the time of this evaluation the individual has the capability and capacity to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the next higher grade, and has satisfied all eligibility and qualification requirements for the next higher grade. Required time in grade shall not be considered when determining overall eligibility for advancement.

   b) <u>Not Ready:</u> Assign this mark if, in the view of the rating official, at the time of this evaluation the individual is satisfactorily performing their required duties but is not yet ready to carry out the duties and responsibilities of the next higher grade, or has not satisfied all eligibility and qualification requirements for the next higher grade. Required time in grade shall not be considered when determining overall eligibility for advancement.

   c) <u>Not Recommended:</u> Assign this mark if, in the view of the rating official, the individual should not be advanced to the next higher grade, regardless of qualification or eligibility, due to negative conduct or poor performance, including an unsatisfactory conduct mark, or good order and discipline issues.

Is the Coast Guard going to require an evaluee to submit enlisted evaluation support or "bullets" for their marks?

The requirement to provide supporting documentation to the rating chain will remain the same. The rating chain will have the authority in policy to set their own requirements for how and when, and to what extent a member they evaluate must submit "bullets" for their marks. Also, there will not be an official CG Form for proving enlisted evaluation support information – members and rating chains may use any means they deem appropriate.

Eligibility requirements will be an integral part of the "Ready" or "Not Ready" determination. Will there be an automated way to determine an individual's completion of the variety of requirements per rating?

The future process guide will provide information related to advancement requirements and best practices for efficiently performing the task of evaluating a member's status.

All of the performance standards are changing. Should we also expect to see changes with the submission schedule as well?

Not with the initial release. The current submission schedules for enlisted EERs found in COMDTINST M1000.2 (series) will remain in effect. New timelines for E-7 and above submission schedules are under review for the next revision to COMDTINST M1000.2B.

I think the E-6 EERs should be on an annual submission schedule, vice semi-annual. Is that going to change?

Not at this time. We have received similar comments asking for an annual submission schedule for E-6s. Semi-annual EERs for E-6s allow for more data necessary to make the best HR management decisions at the E-6 timeframe regarding advancement potential to E-7, assignments, boards, and panels actions. We will continue to take the feedback under advisement.

As an Approving Official, if I am limited to 220 characters in comments for marks of 1,2,3, and 7, should I also try to limit my characters in the "Not Ready" or "Not Recommended" blocks?

No. These two comment blocks are designed for expansive entries and are purposely not character limited. For example: For the "Not Ready" comments section you should document exactly what the member needs to do to earn a mark of "Ready". Take as much space as necessary to ensure proper documentation. Does the member needs to complete an eligibility requirement for the next higher paygrade? If no, state the member meets all eligibility requirements. If yes, which ones? Does the member meet the Approving Official's performance and/or leadership expectations of the next higher paygrade? If yes, state so and briefly describe them. If no, what exactly needs further developed to meet those expectations?

It is perceived some supervisors inflate or deflate marks for their personnel. Will the EES revision correct this issue?

Not in and of itself; however, if supervisors follow policy and mark in accordance with the new performance standards for each competency many marks should reset to a 4. The revision to the EES attempts to provide a more objective system to reduce real and/or perceived EER inflation or deflation.

Marks inflation and deflation will continue to be a leadership issue. It is critical that ALL personnel, including officer, enlisted, and civilian, review the training materials and new performance standards in order for the new marking system to be implemented properly. The best way we can ensure accurate, fair and repeatable evaluations for our enlisted members is to ensure the marks assigned in each EER meet the written criteria for each numerical mark, every time, for every competency, on every EER. It should be a simple concept, and EERs should be a true reflection of the member's performance and behavior for the relevant period – and nothing more.

Since "Not Ready" is required for members who have not completed all eligibility requirements for advancement, will a member who receives a "Not Ready" be prohibited from applying for CWO?

No. A member who receives a "Not Ready" will not be prohibited by policy from applying for CWO. The enlisted advancement qualifications are different than the CWO appointment requirements. The recommendation for CWO from the Commanding Officer is communicated by a different process, separate of the EER recommendation; the member would still need to receive a favorable recommendation through CWO appointment process.

As an Approving Official, I have a member on weight probation. Am I required to give them a "Not Ready"?

No. Compliance with weight standards is an advancement specific eligibility requirement and not a eligibility requirement for the next higher paygrade. A member can earn a "Ready" for advancement

and take the respective SWE if they are on weight probation, however any advancements will be held in abeyance until the member is no longer on weight probation. This falls in the same category as attendance at the CPO Academy is an advancement requirement for E-7. Commands should not give an E-6 member a "Not Ready" for advancement just because they haven't attended the CPO Academy.

Will this change include a change to the requirements for the rating chain, or clarification to the requirements for the rating chain listed in the Commandant Instruction?

Yes. The rating chain is comprised of designated members who execute the enlisted evalutation report process. The Enlisted Evaluation Report Rating Chain table previously listed in COMDTINST M1000.2A will be removed from the new version, and will be incorporated in the Enlisted Evaluation System Procedures Manual, PSCINST M1611.2 (series) that will be promulagated as part of this EES revision.

If I receive a mid period counseling with the new performance standards and then receive an unscheduled EER in late February 2018 prior to my normal end of period EER, what performance standards will I be marked on?

You will be marked on the current performance standards. DA will be updated such that if a supervisor selects any end date prior to 1 March 2018, they will see and have to fill in the old performance standards.

Under current policy, members may appeal competency marks; however, members are unable to appeal a mark of "Not Recommended" for advancement. Will this policy change with the revision of the EES? In addition, will a mark of "Not Ready" be appealable?

No. The current policy regarding appealing a mark of "Not Recommended" for advancement will remain the same. The mark of "Not Ready" will also carry the same policy. Commands currently have authority, under chapter 4.E of M1000.2 (series), to make corrections to approved evaluations, including the recommendation for advancement. This policy will carry over into the revised EES.

What happens if a member who was marked "Not Ready" due to missing eligibility requirements satisfies those requirements before the SWE; can they participate in the SWE?

For a member who is given a "Not Ready" because they have not completed all requirements for advancement, who subsequently completes those requirements prior to the servicewide eligibility date, the command has the option to complete an EER to change the CO's recommendation from "Not Ready" to "Ready" in order for a SWE to be sent to the member. See the policy updates for instructions for completion of a CORC EER.

Does a CORC EER need to be initiated by the approving official who initially approved the previous EER?

No. Under the revised CORC policy, at any time, the member's current commanding officer may change a recommendation for advancement for any good and sufficient reason. A CORC may be submitted by the member's commanding officer (or approving official if delegated) by compling a CORC EER in Direct Access.

Is it possible to receive a "Not Ready" mark solely due to a member not completing newly required "EPQs/RPQs" that will also have the secondary effect of removing the member from previous SWE Eligibility lists where the "new" EPQs/RPQs were not required?

Yes.

In these specific cases, if the "Not Ready" is given only due to the mbr not completing the RPQs to sit for the new SWE, commands should request a waiver of COMDTINST M1000.2B from PPC to allow the member to stay on previous SWE eligibility lists. This waiver will not allow members to take a future SWE.

This waiver can be requested by sending an email to: PPC-DG-CustomerCare@uscg.mil, and copying ARL-SMB-CGPSC-EPM-Evaluations@uscg.mil

Subject line: Waiver request for (Rate/Rank, Full Name, EMPLID, USCG(R) A. Enlistments, Evaluations, and Advancements, COMDTINST M1000.2B, Article 3.A.4.f.

1. SNM was previously recommended, eligible, and participated in the SWE and is currently on the Service wide Eligibility list(s) from (list SWE cycles, ie May17, Nov17, May18, etc). The members latest EER dated ******* changed the member's advancement recommendation status to "Not Ready" solely due to the member not having yet completed the latest EPQ/RPQ versions which will be required for the upcoming ***** SWE.

2. Request SNM be given a waiver of the requirements to maintain a current CO's recommendation in order to remain on all current SWE advancement eligibility list(s) in spite of the "Not Ready" mark assigned. If SNM completes the new EPQ/RPQ requirements prior to the next SWE eligibility date (SED), this command (does/does not) plan to submit a "Change of CO's Recommendation (CORC) EER.

3. POC: (Rate/Rank/Name, Phone#)

Any questions on the waiver process should be directed to PPC-DG-CustomerCare@uscg.mil at PPC (adv).

Any questions on the Enlisted Evaluation System should be directed to: ARL-SMB-CGPSC-EPM-Evaluations@uscg.mil

When can we expect to see further information and instructions released on the EES?

Below is the projected schedule of milestones:

Milestone	Date
Coast Guard-wide communications	October 2017
Revised Performance Standards released	October 2017
Policy changes released	January 2018
Unit outreach	January-March 2018
Training materials released	February 2018
Implementation date	1 March 2018

Where can I find more information regarding the revised EES?

Further information regarding CG PSC-EPM-3 and the EES, including the new performance standards and procedural guides, will be made available at the below websites:

CG PORTAL: https://cg.portal.uscg.mil/units/psc/psc-epm/SitePages/EPM-3.aspx

Public internet site: https://dcms.uscg.afpims.mil/Our-Organization/Assistant-Commandant-for-Human-Resources-CG-1/Personnel-Service-Center-PSC/EPM/EPM3/

Do you have an additional question that should be added here or that you would like addressed separately? Check the CG PSC-EPM-3 CG Portal site for information on how to submit a question.