



ADMINISTRATIVE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENTAL DIRECTIVE

OS: 1-106

Page 1 of 14 (04/10/2008)

Distribution:
All Department of Education Employees

Approved by: _____/s/_____
Margaret Spellings
Secretary

Organizational Assessment

Table of Contents

I.	Purpose.....	2
II.	Policy	2
III.	Authorization	2
IV.	Applicability	2
V.	Definitions.....	2
VI.	Responsibilities.....	4
VII.	Procedures and Requirements.....	5

I. Purpose

This directive describes the Organizational Assessment (OA), the U.S. Department of Education's department-wide performance management system.

II. Policy

Executive Order 13450, Improving Government Program Performance, requires that the Department (ED) have a system for establishing: i) clear annual and long-term goals defined by objectively measurable outcomes, ii) specific plans for achieving the goals, including means to assign specific duties, authorities, and resources to agency personnel and to measure progress toward achievement of the goals, and iii) mechanisms for ensuring continuous accountability of ED personnel to the Secretary for achievement of the goals. In addition, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) requires ED to evaluate its Principal Offices (POs) on an annual basis. It is ED's policy to use the OA system as the principal basis for meeting the requirements of Executive Order 13450 and for conducting the evaluations required by OPM. The OA system also serves as a foundation for the risk-adjusted performance measures required by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

III. Authorization

Section 201 of the Department of Education Organization Act directs that ED be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. 20 U.S.C. § 3411. In carrying out the responsibility to effectively manage ED to achieve its mission and goals, the Secretary has developed the OA as the tool to measure and manage the Department's organizational effectiveness and productivity.

IV. Applicability

This directive applies to all ED POs, with the exception of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

V. Definitions

- A. *Chief Management Officer (CMO)*: An employee appointed by the Senior Officer of each PO to serve as the primary point-of-contact for all OA communications and efforts. The CMO has responsibility for leading the PO's OA and performance management activities.
- B. *Chief Operating Officer (COO)*: Based in the Office of the Secretary, the ED Senior Officer with overall responsibility for the OA.
- C. *Data Owner*: The individual responsible for defining a measure, determining how the measure will be calculated, and ensuring the measure's results are published online

- through Visual Performance Suite (VPS) and provided to the CMOs in advance of each Targeted Results Assessment Check-in (TRAC) Meeting.
- D. *Final OA Rating*: The qualitative OA rating designation finally awarded to a PO (Outstanding [O], Highly Successful [HS], Fully Successful [FS], Minimally Successful [MS], and Unsatisfactory [U]). The Final OA Rating is determined by the Secretary.
 - E. *Measure*: The basic element of the PO's OA Framework and an indicator of PO performance that can be clearly defined and evaluated. As set forth more fully in VII.C., each measure shall be assigned a set of performance targets, and each measure (other than Qualifying Measures [QMs]) shall be assigned a weight, expressed as a percentage, with the total weight of all measures summing to 100%.
 - F. *Measure Owner*: The individual within each PO responsible for driving, tracking, and communicating progress for a measure.
 - G. *Measurement Categories*: The OA measurement categories are Management Effectiveness, Human Capital, Strategic Priorities, Peer Review, and Qualifying Measures.
 - H. *Organizational Assessment (OA)*: The department-wide performance management system used to evaluate PO performance.
 - I. *OA Coordinator*: The individual in the Office of the Secretary responsible for directing and managing the OA process on a day-to-day basis.
 - J. *OA Framework*: The system of measures, weights, and targets developed by a PO and approved by its OA Rating Official.
 - K. *OA Rating Official*: The individual responsible for approving a PO's OA Framework and for determining its Preliminary OA Rating. The OA Rating Official is the ED Senior Officer with coordinating responsibility for the PO. As of the publication date of this directive, the OA Rating Officials are the Deputy Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Chief Operating Officer, and the Secretary's Chief of Staff.
 - L. *OA Score*: The quantitative OA result for a PO. The OA Score is a number between 1.00 and 5.00 (inclusive), expressed to two decimal places. The OA Score is the weighted average of a PO's scores on all OA measures, adjusted by the PO's average score on the QMs if applicable.
 - M. *Preliminary OA Rating*: The qualitative OA rating recommended to the Secretary by the OA Rating Official. The Preliminary OA Rating is determined by the OA Rating Official based on a consideration of the PO's OA Score, its Scoring Justification, and any other factors deemed significant and relevant by the OA Rating Official.

- N. *Principal Office (PO)*: An organization within ED headed by a Senior Officer. The OIG is not subject to the requirements of this directive, and all references to POs are intended to exclude the OIG.
- O. *Qualifying Measure (QM)*: A measure of a basic administrative function of a PO. Unlike other measures, QMs have only three target levels of performance (O, HS, and FS) and no weight in the OA Score. As set forth in VII. F. Calculating OA Scores, OA Scores are limited by the PO's average QM score.
- P. *Quality Improvement Initiative (QII)*: A type of peer review measure involving two or more POs that focuses on a specific quality improvement requirement. Like all measures, QIIs are approved by the OA Rating Official as part of a PO's OA Framework.
- Q. *Scoring Justification*: A document prepared at the end of the year by a PO to summarize and substantiate its performance on its OA measures.
- R. *Targeted Results Assessment Check-in (TRAC) Meeting*: Periodic meetings convened by the OA Coordinator and attended by CMOs, Data Owners, and other participants in the OA system. The purpose of these meetings is to review OA results and to address other matters important to the successful operation of the OA system.
- S. *Targets*: The levels of achievement specified for each measure. For measures other than QMs, POs will identify 4 targets at the Outstanding (O), Highly Successful (HS), Fully Successful (FS), and Minimally Successful (MS) levels of achievement. Unsatisfactory (U) is defined as performance below the MS target level.
- T. *Visual Performance Suite (VPS)*: The online system used to input measure results and report PO performance.
- U. *Weights*: The significance in a PO's OA Framework of each measure (other than QMs). Weights are expressed as a percentage between 0% and 100% and are used to determine the PO's OA Score in accordance with VII. F. Calculating OA Scores.

VI. Responsibilities

- A. The CMO (with the Senior Officer and other members of the PO) shall develop the OA Framework for his or her PO, coordinate the work of Measure Owners in the PO, and track and report progress on all OA measures. The CMO should report results and progress to the Senior Officer, other members of the PO, the OA Rating Official, the OA Coordinator, and others as appropriate throughout the performance period. The CMO shall report the PO's progress and/or results to the Senior Officer at least twice each quarter. The CMO shall participate in all OA activities, including the TRAC Meetings and meetings with the PO's OA Rating Official.

- B. The *Data Owners* shall define the measure(s) for which they are responsible, including specifying the data sources and any calculations needed to determine the score for a measure, and shall ensure that results for the measure(s) are published online in VPS and to the CMOs on a timely basis. Data Owners are responsible for finalizing and disseminating measure definitions, data sources, and calculations by the end of the first quarter of the rating period.
- C. The *Measure Owners* shall be responsible for driving, tracking, and communicating progress for their measure(s) within their PO. Measure Owners shall be expected to have a step-by-step plan for meeting the objectives identified for their measure(s).
- D. The *OA Coordinator* shall oversee all aspects of the OA. He or she shall facilitate development and approval of OA Frameworks, resolve discrepancies or disagreements on measures, plan and convene TRAC Meetings, verify OA Scores, facilitate interim reviews with the OA Rating Officials, and facilitate preparation and communication of Preliminary and Final OA Ratings, among other responsibilities.
- E. The *OA Rating Official* shall approve OA Frameworks at the beginning of the year, approve any mid-year adjustments to OA Frameworks, approve any exemption requests, conduct interim reviews, and determine Preliminary OA Ratings at the end of the year.
- F. The *Office of the Secretary (OS)* is the office responsible for planning and executing the OA in accordance with this directive.
- G. The *Secretary of Education (the Secretary)* shall determine the Final OA Rating for each PO, and may make awards to POs and employees based on their OA results.

VII. Procedures and Requirements

A. Overview

The OA is ED's department-wide performance management system. The OA operates at the PO level and is designed to integrate and align all of ED's performance management elements, including the Strategic Plan, the Secretary's annual priorities, the priorities of the POs, and other requirements of law and of the President. The OA provides a framework for communicating goals and priorities to employees and for aligning employee performance plans with ED and PO objectives. The OA is flexible and accommodates wide differences in PO mission, structure, and size.

The Secretary intends that the OA be used to set ambitious goals for each PO, to establish high standards of performance, and to instill meaningful accountability for results. The Secretary intends that OA measures be incorporated into employee performance plans where appropriate.

Prior to the start of the fiscal year, each PO shall develop an OA Framework. Consisting of approximately 20 to 30 measures, the OA Framework is not expected to reflect all activities of the PO. Rather, it is intended to focus on those activities that support the primary objectives of the PO and of ED as a whole.

During the year, each PO shall regularly assess its progress on each measure and communicate progress and results to the OA Coordinator. These reports, delivered at each TRAC Meeting, shall include year-to-date and/or projected results for each measure. The reports shall also include an action plan for closing the gap between the current results and the desired results on key measures.

Twice each year, at the mid-point and at the end of the rating period, POs shall report results to their OA Rating Official. At the end of the rating period, the OA Rating Official shall recommend a Preliminary OA Rating to the Secretary. The Secretary will determine each PO's Final OA Rating.

It is important that OA Frameworks, OA results and ratings, and other information about the OA are well-communicated across ED and within each PO. The Senior Officer and the CMO are responsible for communications within each PO. At the beginning of each performance period, the Senior Officer and the CMO should ensure that employees within their PO are well-informed about the PO's OA Framework, including the most important measures and targets and the owners for each measure (Measure Owners). During the performance period, the Senior Officer and the CMO should ensure that employees are well-informed about the PO's progress and results, including at a minimum the results of the interim review with the OA Rating Official. Last, at the end of the performance period, the Senior Officer and the CMO should ensure that employees are well-informed about the PO's OA results, including the results of the most important measures and the PO's Final OA Rating.

B. Milestones

The OA system shall operate on an approximately 18-month cycle. Milestones may vary on a year-to-year basis, but should approximate the following:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Milestone</u>
8/1	POs begin developing OA Frameworks
10/1	Fiscal year begins
10/15	Final OA Frameworks approved by OA Rating Officials
4/30	Interim reviews with OA Rating Officials complete
8/31	Peer review cutoff; exemption requests due
9/30	Fiscal year ends
11/1	All results data entered
11/1	Scoring Justifications due
11/20	Preliminary OA Ratings determined and communicated by OA Rating Officials
1/15	Final OA Ratings determined and communicated by the Secretary

C. Measurement Categories and Measures

OA Frameworks shall have five measurement categories:

1. *Management Effectiveness*: Measures of a PO's key processes that support achievement of its goals and priorities.
2. *Human Capital*: Measures of a PO's Human Capital management priorities, including staffing, succession planning, and work environment.
3. *Strategic Priorities*: Measures of a PO's core, outcome-oriented activities. Strategic Priorities should be aligned with ED's Strategic Plan and the Secretary's annual priorities, and should be designed to have a significant impact on the PO's mission and/or program results.
4. *Peer Review*: Generally, measures of a PO's work product quality as evaluated by other POs, and the effectiveness of a PO's communications with other POs. This measurement category may also include QIIs. Peer review, including any QIIs, should have a 10% weighting in the PO's OA Framework unless otherwise approved by the OA Rating Official.
5. *Qualifying Measures*: Measures of the basic administrative functions of a PO. POs are expected to perform at the FS level or higher on these measures, and therefore, QMs have only three target levels of performance (O, HS, and FS). QMs have no weight in the OA Score. As set forth in VII. F. Calculating OA Scores, QMs may limit a PO's OA Score.

Within each category, a PO shall develop a set of measures that reflect the PO's priorities and expected achievements in that category. Each measure (other than QMs) shall be assigned a weight, expressed as a percentage, with the total weight of all measures in all categories in the OA Framework summing to 100%.

Each measure shall be assigned a set of performance targets. Measures other than QMs shall be assigned four targets, corresponding to the Outstanding (O), Highly Successful (HS), Fully Successful (FS), and Minimally Successful (MS) performance levels. QMs shall be assigned three targets, corresponding to the O, HS, and FS performance levels.

Targets must be specific and measurable. Where possible, targets should be quantified. If a quantifiable target is not possible or desirable in a specific case, then the target levels of performance should be precisely described to ensure proper interpretation of performance outcomes.

D. Peer Review

Because most of ED's POs are highly interdependent, ratings provided by other POs ("peer reviews") are a critical component of the assessment process and shall account

for 10% of a PO's total OA Score, unless a lower weighting is approved by the OA Rating Official. In no case, shall the peer review weighting be less than 5%. The goal of peer review is to ensure POs are communicating effectively with each other, producing quality work products, and continuously improving their performance against internal requirements.

Peer review feedback shall be provided once each year. The peer review performance period shall end on August 31 to allow time to prepare and review peer feedback before the end of the fiscal year. The OA Coordinator shall manage the peer review feedback process, including the development of peer review pairings and the collection, aggregation, and communication of peer review feedback. The OA Rating Official shall approve peer review pairings when approving the PO's OA Framework. A PO's peer review score shall be the simple average of the numeric ratings submitted by all of the rating POs.

Peer review ratings shall reflect the rating PO's aggregate assessment of the rated PO's timeliness, communication and responsiveness, and work product quality. The peer rating for each PO shall include a 1-5 rating and written comments. The 1-5 ratings shall correspond to the O, HS, FS, MS, and U performance levels with 5 corresponding to O and 1 corresponding to U. The rating PO's Senior Officer shall approve the rating and all written comments and shall provide them to the OA Coordinator. The OA Coordinator shall provide the rating and written comments to the rated PO and shall identify the rating PO, but shall not edit or filter the written comments. Peer review ratings and written comments shall be shared only with the rated PO and with the OA Rating Official.

The most valuable elements of peer review are the written comments and the follow-up "crucial conversations" between POs. Feedback must be of high quality and must accurately assess a PO's performance. To ensure the overall quality of peer review feedback, each rating PO shall be required to provide quality written feedback (i.e., comments that are specific, actionable, and constructive) and to use a reasonable rating range (i.e., a range that differentiates among rated POs and does not inflate PO ratings). POs shall have the opportunity to revise their peer review feedback if it does not meet these standards on the first submission. The OA Rating Official will reject ratings that rate most or all POs above average without clear and substantiated justification. POs that fail to provide quality written feedback or fail to use a reasonable rating range shall have their peer review score and OA Score reduced.

As a complement to, or substitute for, the peer review ratings described above, POs may propose Quality Improvement Initiatives (QIIs) as part of their OA Framework. QIIs are focused projects designed to improve work product quality and/or communications effectiveness between two or more offices. QIIs enable POs to more precisely tailor and define the evaluation criteria to be used when offices rate each other. QIIs with significant scope shall be identified as measures separate from the peer review measure, shall have their own weightings, and shall specify target levels of performance at the O, HS, FS, and MS levels. Any weight given to QIIs shall be

included in the POs' total peer review weighting. When QIIs are used, they will be the sole basis for peer feedback between the participating POs.

E. Guidelines for Measures and Targets

Developing effective measures and setting appropriate targets requires considerable judgment and effort by the Senior Officer, the CMO, and the OA Rating Official.

The best measures are:

- Ambitious, reflecting goals that have a significant impact on the PO's mission and/or programs and that are outside the control of the PO,
- Aligned with ED's Strategic Plan, the Secretary's priorities, and the PO's goals, and
- Prioritized, emphasizing the PO's most important objectives.

The best targets are:

- Results-oriented, focused on outcomes rather than activities or effort,
- Precise, providing a clear description of the targeted levels of achievement, and
- Ambitious, reflecting meaningful (FS) to significant (O) annual progress against the PO's historical performance on the measure.

For most measures, targets shall be defined for four levels of achievement: O, HS, FS, and MS. Unsatisfactory (U) is defined as failure to achieve the target for MS for a particular measure. For QMs, target levels shall be defined for three levels of achievement: O, HS, and FS.

Fully Successful (FS) targets should be set at a level of performance that demonstrates measurable annual progress over a PO's historical performance on each measure. Outstanding (O) targets should be set at a level that, in the judgment of the PO and the OA Rating Official, requires significant achievement during the performance period and results in a fundamental improvement of the PO's performance on that measure. Generally, Highly Successful (HS) targets should be set halfway between the FS and O targets. Minimally Successful (MS) targets should generally be set at the same distance from FS as the HS targets, but in the opposite direction.

F. Calculating OA Scores

OA Scores are determined mathematically using a three-step procedure.

First, each measure in the OA Framework is assigned a number of points based on the actual or estimated results for that measure and the target levels of achievement specified in the OA Framework. The number of points assigned to each level of performance is set forth in the table below:

<u>Target Level of Achievement</u>	<u>Points Awarded for Each Measure</u>
Outstanding (O)	5
Highly Successful (HS)	4
Fully Successful (FS)	3
Minimally Successful (MS)	2
Unsuccessful (U)	1

Second, for those measures with weights assigned in the OA Framework (i.e., measures in the Management Effectiveness, Human Capital, Strategic Priorities, and Peer Review measurement categories), the scores assigned in the first step are i) multiplied by each measure's weight, and then ii) summed to produce a weighted-average score for these measures. This score is calculated to two decimal places.

Third, for the Qualifying Measures, the scores assigned in the first step are averaged to produce an average QM score. This score is calculated to two decimal places.

The OA Score is the lesser of the weighted-average score determined in step two and the average QM score determined in step three. For example, if the weighted-average score for a PO is 4.05 and the average QM score is 3.50, then the OA Score for the PO is 3.50. If the weighted-average score for a PO is 4.05 and the average QM score is 4.50, then the OA Score for the PO is 4.05.

G. Data Gathering, Tracking Progress, and Managing Performance

Each PO shall track its current results and expected year-end results for each measure. CMOs will report this information at each TRAC Meeting.

At least one week prior to each TRAC Meeting, CMOs, working with the Data Owners and Measure Owners, shall ensure that the information for their PO is updated in VPS. The CMO shall verify that all data entered by others is accurate and shall resolve any discrepancies at least one day before the TRAC meeting.

CMOs are responsible for leading the performance management system within their PO, working in close cooperation with the Senior Officer and other members of the PO. This includes developing the OA framework, coordinating the work of Measure Owners in the PO, and tracking and reporting progress on OA measures. The CMO has a significant role in ensuring the PO executes its commitments and achieves its annual goals.

H. Mid-year Adjustments

Programs and priorities change over the course of a fiscal year, and POs are expected to update their OA Frameworks when material changes occur. Updates to measures,

targets, or weights may be driven by new budgets, legislation, or other circumstances. A PO that wishes to change its OA Framework for any reason should submit its request in writing to its OA Rating Official, who must approve any changes to the OA Framework.

I. Interim Reviews

At least once each quarter during the OA cycle, Senior Officers and CMOs should take the opportunity to share progress with, and solicit feedback from, their OA Rating Official.

At mid-year, Senior Officers and CMOs shall have a more formal discussion of PO performance with their OA Rating Official, including a review of progress to date on all measures and the PO's plan for closing gaps between actual interim and desired final outcomes.

J. Exemptions

A PO may request an exemption or mid-year adjustment for a measure if unique or unanticipated circumstances have rendered, or threaten to render, a measure unfair, irrelevant, and/or impossible to influence; or have created an unintended misalignment of incentives for a PO. If the unique or unanticipated circumstances are identified early in the performance period, then a mid-year adjustment of the PO's OA Framework should be proposed to the OA Rating Official. If the circumstances occur too late in the performance period for a mid-year adjustment to be appropriate, then the PO should request an exemption for that measure.

Exemption requests should describe the circumstances impacting the measure, document why such circumstances make achieving the measure beyond the influence of the PO, and propose a remedy. Depending on the circumstances, remedies may include modifying the measure, replacing the measure, or deleting the measure, and may include reallocating the weight originally assigned to the impacted measure.

Exemption requests must be approved by the OA Rating Official. Exemptions are intended to be infrequent and limited to situations that are beyond the reasonable influence of the PO. As an example, acts of Congress or the courts that could not reasonably be anticipated when the OA Framework was approved will generally be considered beyond the influence of the PO. On the other hand, issues that arise within the PO, or within another PO, will generally be considered within the influence of the PO. Requests for exemptions must be made by August 31 of each year.

K. Scoring Justifications

At the end of the year, POs shall submit Scoring Justifications to their OA Rating Official. Scoring Justifications shall summarize and substantiate the PO's

performance on its measures, with particular focus on substantiating scores on measures that are subjective and/or self-reported. POs may include information on achievements not included in the OA Framework. Scoring Justifications are limited to three pages (POs with measures that are candidates for the Secretary's Award for Innovation and Impact may use additional pages to document their performance on the candidate measure).

L. OA Ratings

Generally, OA Scores will map to Preliminary and Final OA Ratings as set forth in the table below:

OA Score	OA Rating
4.50 and above	Outstanding (O)
3.50 – 4.49	Highly Successful (HS)
2.50 – 3.49	Fully Successful (FS)
1.50 – 2.49	Minimally Successful (MS)
Below 1.50	Unsatisfactory (U)

In some cases, however, an OA Rating Official and/or the Secretary will determine that a PO's Preliminary and/or Final OA Rating should be higher or lower than the rating suggested by the OA Score. In making such determinations, the OA Rating Official and/or the Secretary will consider the OA Score and the PO's Scoring Justification, and may consider any other information deemed significant and relevant. The OA is designed to be as objective as circumstances allow; however, subjectivity remains inherent to the system. OA Frameworks, measures, targets, and results, no matter how well-defined in advance, cannot describe the full complexity and breadth of each PO's operations. Accordingly, the judgments of the OA Rating Officials and the Secretary will always be important in ensuring that Final OA Ratings reflect the fairest and most accurate assessment of a PO's performance during the rating period. In cases where the Preliminary and/or Final OA Rating is higher or lower than the rating suggested by the OA score, the OA Rating Official will provide the PO a written explanation for the adjustment.

The OA Rating Official shall determine each PO's Preliminary OA Rating which rating shall also be his or her recommendation to the Secretary for the PO's Final OA Rating. The Secretary shall determine each PO's Final OA Rating, which rating shall not be subject to appeal.

OA rating levels are defined as follows:

- Outstanding (O):** The PO's results-oriented performance has made a notable difference in advancing ED's mission and Strategic Plan, the Secretary's priorities, and/or the PO's priorities. Indicators of performance at this level include measurable achievements in performance that well exceed defined goals. The PO's contributions have significant impact on ED's operations and priorities.

- **Highly Successful (HS):** The PO continually exceeds performance expectations and achievement of its goals and priorities, which leads to positive organizational change.
- **Fully Successful (FS):** The PO met all expectations with solid, dependable performance, demonstrating measurable annual progress on key measures. The PO's actions contribute positively toward the achievement of ED's strategic goals.
- **Minimally Successful (MS):** The PO's performance is marginally acceptable, occasionally resulting in negative consequences or incomplete or deficient products or services. Limited action is taken to support strategic goals, and minimal progress is made in one or more program priorities.
- **Unsatisfactory (U):** The PO's performance is unacceptable. Work or actions often cause a negative impact on workforce productivity and morale. Activities fail to support strategic goals, and actions are often inappropriate, ineffective, or undermine ED's strategic goals. Progress was not made toward desired results in one or more program priorities.

M. Awards

As part of the OA cycle, the following awards may be given at the discretion of the Secretary:

1. *Secretary's Award for Achievement.* The Secretary's Award for Achievement may be given to the PO that makes the greatest contribution toward the achievement of ED's mission during the fiscal year. The Secretary will determine the recipient of the award, or may determine that no award will be made. If the Secretary makes an award, he or she may also elect to increase the PO's budget for making performance awards in accordance with ED's Incentive Awards Program (PMI 451-1) in recognition of the PO's outstanding performance for the year.
2. *Secretary's Award for Innovation and Impact.* The Secretary's Award for Innovation and Impact (SAI&I) may be given to members of a workgroup or team that achieve a single extraordinary goal with tremendous impact for ED's customers or stakeholders. The Secretary will determine the recipients of a SAI&I, or may determine that no awards will be made. If the Secretary makes an award, he or she may also elect to recognize the employees designated as part of the workgroup or team with a Special Act Cash Award of up to \$10,000 per person in accordance with ED's Incentive Awards Program (PMI 451-1).

Awards may be made only for Strategic Priority measures designated as SAI&I candidates in the PO's approved OA Framework. SAI&I candidates will be

approved only when achievement of the Strategic Priority will be significantly impactful to ED's customers or stakeholders. In recognition of the risk that a PO must take in committing to a particularly bold goal, the FS and MS targets for all SAI&I candidate measures will be waived so that the PO will receive no less than FS on the measure.

A PO shall report the final results of any SAI&I candidate measure in its Scoring Justification (and may use additional pages to do so). When determining the PO's Preliminary OA Rating, the OA Rating Official shall also make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding the rating for the SAI&I candidate measure.

3. *CMO of the Year Award.* The CMO of the Year Award may be given to the CMO who has demonstrated the greatest leadership, management, and innovation in setting objectives, creating systems, and driving results. Candidates for the award must be nominated by their Senior Officer. The Secretary will determine the recipient of the award, or may determine that no award will be made. If the Secretary makes an award, he or she may also elect to recognize the recipient with a Special Act Cash Award of up to \$5,000 in accordance with ED's Incentive Awards Program (PMI 451-1).