
INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DIRECTIVE NUMBER 656



PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SENIOR CIVILIAN OFFICERS (EFFECTIVE: 28 APRIL 2008)

A. AUTHORITY. The National Security Act of 1947, as amended; the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (IRTPA), and other applicable provisions of law.

B. IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION. The Director of National Intelligence (DNI) and the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies with Intelligence Community (IC) employees have agreed upon and approve this IC Directive (ICD or "Directive"). The Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) and the executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees will exercise their respective authorities to implement and administer this ICD consistent with its provisions. This ICD does not waive the respective statutory authorities of the DNI or the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees.¹ Those executive departments that have senior civilian officers covered by title 5 US Code (USC) will implement, apply, administer, and interpret the policy requirements of this ICD with respect to those covered senior civilian officers in a manner that adheres to and complies with title 5 USC, and related implementing regulations, as well as Office of Personnel Management (OPM) policy.

C. PURPOSE. The IRTPA authorizes the DNI to prescribe, in consultation with the heads of IC agencies and elements, and the heads of their respective departments, personnel policies that, among other things, enable the IC to recruit, motivate, and retain highly qualified senior civilian officers for the effective conduct of intelligence activities, and to facilitate the rotation of highly qualified individuals between and among the IC components, the DNI, and the national intelligence centers. This Directive establishes common, core requirements and processes for managing the performance of IC senior civilian officers that will be incorporated into the

¹ A legal determination as to whether the language in this paragraph is necessary under the IRTPA, in order for the DNI to execute this ICD, has not been made. However, in order to advance the policies established and agreed upon herein, and in accordance with the spirit and intent of the IRTPA, this language has been included in this ICD.

performance management systems established and administered by those executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees.

D. APPLICABILITY. This Directive applies to the executive departments and independent agencies as defined by the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, that have senior civilian officers (hereafter referred to as “senior officers”) assigned to agencies and elements of the IC, to include members of the Senior National Intelligence Service; the Senior Intelligence Service; the Department of Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service and Department of Defense Intelligence Senior Level employees; members of the Federal Senior Executive Service appointed under title 5 USC §3393; Senior Level employees appointed under 5 USC §3324; Scientific and Professional employees appointed under 5 USC §3325; and members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Administration Senior Executive Service. This ICD may also apply to senior officers of other departments or agencies that may be designated by the President, or designated jointly by the DNI and the head of the executive department or agency concerned, as an IC component, regardless of funding source. It may also apply to certain elements of an executive department, as designated by the head of that department, to the extent permitted by law. This Directive does not apply to civilian employees of an IC agency or element who are classified at or below the General Schedule grade of 15 (or equivalent personal rank), members of the Foreign Service, military personnel, or contract personnel.

E. DEFINITIONS.

1. Competencies. The measurable or observable knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and other characteristics needed to perform a type of work or function. For purposes of this Directive, these competencies serve as the basis for common and IC component-specific performance elements.

2. Evaluation of Record. The final, official performance evaluation of a senior officer prepared at the end of the performance evaluation period.

3. Executive Departments and Independent Agencies with IC Employees. For the purposes of this Directive, the Departments of State, the Treasury, Defense, Justice, Energy, Homeland Security, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, and any other agency or element designated by executive order or law as part of the Intelligence Community.

4. IC Components. For the purposes of this Directive, the intelligence agencies and elements that belong to the executive departments or that constitute independent agencies.

5. Interim Evaluation. A brief written description of the senior officer’s performance against performance objectives expectations. The Rater completes an Interim Evaluation when either the Rater or the rated senior official changes position, in which case the Rater no longer performs rating functions for the senior official. This is distinct from the midterm review described below.

6. Midterm Review. A review of a senior officer's performance, conducted approximately midway through the performance evaluation period.

7. Performance Elements. The IC-common and component-specific behaviors that describe the manner in which work is to be performed. Performance elements are based on job competencies that have been validated in accordance with accepted professional and technical standards. This ICD establishes "core" performance elements that are applicable to all IC senior officers covered by this Directive.

8. Performance Evaluation. The formal review of a senior officer's performance against performance objectives and performance elements resulting in an Evaluation of Record.

9. Performance Evaluation Period. The period of time established under a performance management system for reviewing senior officer performance.

10. Performance Expectations. The aggregate view of what each senior officer is expected to accomplish in any given performance evaluation period. Expectations are comprised of performance objectives and performance elements as specifically defined in this section.

11. Performance Management. The process of planning, establishing, aligning, and communicating individual and organizational performance expectations to senior officers; monitoring and measuring their performance; providing feedback; taking appropriate steps to improve senior officer performance; addressing poor performance; and rating and rewarding senior officer performance to reflect the accomplishment of individual and organizational goals and objectives.

12. Performance Objectives. The major results required by or associated with each senior officer's position and assignment, as communicated to that senior officer by a management official. The contributions and demonstrated achievements of each senior officer are evaluated against those objectives as the basis for an individual's Evaluation of Record.

13. Performance Review Board (PRB). The entity established or designated by each IC component to make recommendations to the head of the IC component with respect to senior officer evaluations of record. The PRB provides appropriate oversight of the component's senior officer performance management process; monitors senior officer ratings for rigor and consistency; and ensures compliance with applicable departmental or agency regulations and this Directive.

14. Performance Standards. The behavioral descriptions of expected performance at a particular rating level. Such standards may vary by occupation, position, pay, and where appropriate, tier.

15. Rater. The management official who evaluates the performance of a senior officer and prepares the Evaluation of Record.

16. Reviewer. The management official who reviews and approves Evaluations of Record to ensure consistency between and among Raters.

17. Senior Civilian Officers (Senior Officers). All personnel in positions above the General Schedule grade of 15 or equivalent, or individuals of equivalent personal rank. This includes members of the Senior National Intelligence Service (SNIS); the Senior Intelligence Service (SIS); the Department of Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service (DISES) and Department of Defense Intelligence Senior Level (DISL) employees; members of the Federal Senior Executive Service (SES) appointed under title 5 USC §3393; Senior Level (SL) employees appointed under 5 USC §3324; Scientific and Professional (ST) employees appointed under 5 USC §3325; and members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Administration SES.

18. Senior Officer Performance Management System. The system or systems each executive department or independent agency with IC employees establishes and implements to accomplish those activities described in (E.11) above with respect to senior officers, as well as to meet those requirements established by this Directive and other applicable issuances. Those executive departments that have senior officers covered by title 5 USC will implement, apply, administer, and interpret the policy requirements of this ICD with respect to those covered senior officers in a manner that adheres to and complies with title 5 USC and related implementing regulations, as well as OPM policy.

F. RESPONSIBILITIES.

1. Director of National Intelligence. The DNI, in collaboration and coordination with the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees, establishes common, core policies and processes for the performance management systems established and administered by those executive departments and independent agencies or their IC components. They will ensure, through oversight, program evaluation, and other support, that performance management systems effectively meet the requirements of this Directive.

2. Heads of the Executive Departments and Independent Agencies with IC Employees. These individuals are responsible for establishing performance management systems for their senior officers, and in coordination with the DNI, to ensure that those systems conform to the common, core policies and processes established by this Directive. In addition, the heads of those executive departments that have senior officers covered by title 5 USC are responsible for implementing, applying, administering, and interpreting the policy requirements of this ICD with respect to covered senior officers in a manner that adheres to and complies with title 5 USC and related implementing regulations, as well as OPM policy. They are also responsible for ensuring that their management officials and senior officers receive initial and ongoing training in the implementation and operation of those systems.

3. Senior Officers. Those senior civilian officers with supervisory or managerial responsibilities who are responsible for managing the performance of subordinate employees, including subordinate senior officers. Such senior officers set performance expectations; monitor the performance of their employees; foster and reinforce high performance; gather and

provide ongoing feedback to employees and peers regarding their career development and performance; realistically and rigorously evaluate that performance; make meaningful distinctions among employees based on performance; address poor performance; and maintain and promote the highest standards of professionalism for themselves and their employees.

G. POLICY.

1. Performance management systems have one primary purpose: to achieve organizational results and mission objectives through the effective management of individual and team performance. In order to achieve that purpose, performance management should be a priority for all IC senior officers. The performance expectations of IC components and their senior leaders will be linked to the National Intelligence Strategy and departmental, component, and other applicable strategies, goals, and objectives, and serve as a basis for the performance expectations of subordinate employees. In turn, pay determinations, career opportunities, and other rewards should be based on individual, team, and organizational results.

2. IC common, core requirements and processes do not (and are not intended to) establish a single, uniform performance management system for all IC senior officers, nor are they designed to address every aspect of performance management. Rather, they serve to establish those core requirements and processes for performance management deemed essential to fostering and sustaining a strong, cohesive IC senior officer corps.

a. Departments and independent agencies with IC senior officers will exercise their relevant statutory authority to integrate and incorporate these common, core requirements and processes into their senior officer performance management systems and policies, and implement and apply these provisions to their IC senior officers in a manner that meets the respective requirements of their performance management policies and processes and this Directive.

b. Those executive departments that have senior officers covered by title 5 USC will implement, apply, administer, and interpret the policy requirements of this ICD with respect to those covered senior officers in a manner that adheres to and complies with applicable provisions of title 5 USC, as well as implementing regulations and policies issued by the OPM.

3. Each department and independent agency with senior officers will, for purposes of this and other applicable ICDs, recognize all senior officer personnel management systems and the senior officers appointed and paid under those systems, regardless of department or independent agency, or whether such systems are established by law or administrative action.

4. All performance management systems covering IC senior officers will, at a minimum, provide for:

a. The evaluation of senior officers on their results (“what” they achieve) by establishing individual annual performance objectives at the beginning of the performance evaluation period that meet the criteria set forth below, adjusting those objectives as appropriate during the evaluation period, and then by comparing their progress toward meeting those performance objectives at the conclusion of that period.

b. The evaluation of senior officers on the manner by which they achieved those results (“how” results were accomplished), using the core IC performance elements set forth in section G.5.d., as well as any additional departmental or component-specific performance elements and standards; all such elements will be based on validated job competencies.

c. An official Evaluation of Record for covered senior officers using the common IC performance rating levels, labels, and definitions established and described in section G.5.f.(3) as the basis for such rating. Executive departments that have senior officers covered by title 5 USC are exceptions, and may employ four performance rating levels with respect to those covered senior officers, in accordance with applicable law and OPM regulation.

d. Except as provided in paragraph G.4.q, an official annual Evaluation of Record, which includes a summary rating of a senior officer’s performance against performance objectives; a summary rating of a senior officer’s performance against performance elements; and an overall summary rating that is based on the two summary ratings, and other relevant factors.

e. A process that gathers 360° feedback from the senior officer’s collaborative network that includes, as appropriate, co-workers, professional colleagues, customers and clients, management officials, and subordinates. That feedback will be utilized to identify and prescribe appropriate developmental activities such as training, or other career development assignments. The DNI, in coordination with the heads of executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees, and subject to their concurrence, will establish the scope, coverage, and standard baseline requirements for application of such a process, as well as an implementation timetable, in the form of a policy issuance supplementing this ICD.

f. An annual performance evaluation period that will begin between 1 July and 1 November and end between 30 June and 31 October, but in no case shall the evaluation period exceed 12 months in length. The head of an executive department or independent agency with IC employees (or if delegated, the head of an IC component) may, in consultation with the DNI, grant exceptions for mission critical requirements. All senior officers will receive a written Evaluation of Record at least annually. Final Evaluations of Record will be completed as soon as practicable and no later than 90 calendar days after the end of the performance evaluation period.

g. A period of no less than 90 calendar days under a performance plan before a senior officer can receive an Evaluation of Record.

h. A clear linkage between a senior officer’s performance evaluation and his or her promotion opportunities, compensation, rewards, and retention considerations.

i. The evaluation of senior officers with managerial responsibilities on how effectively they manage the performance and compensation of their subordinates in accordance with applicable IC, departmental, and agency directives, in addition to other supervisory and managerial performance expectations.

j. The evaluation of all senior officers on a Joint IC Duty Assignment will be in accordance with ICD 601, its implementing instructions, as set forth in IC Policy Guidance 601.01, and the following:

(1) Annual performance evaluations (and where applicable, interim evaluations) for senior officers on a joint IC duty assignment will be conducted by a management official in the gaining component who has been designated as the individual's immediate supervisor or performance rating official, in accordance with the appropriate performance management system of the individual's employing IC component and using any standard form(s) applicable thereto.

(2) A senior officer's proposed annual Evaluation of Record will be reviewed and approved by a management official in the gaining component that is at least one organizational level above the designated rating official. The reviewing official will consult with a designated point of contact from the individual's employing IC component and provide that official with an opportunity to review and provide written comments on the senior officer's performance, which will be included in the evaluation form before a final performance evaluation is approved by the gaining component's PRB and provided to the senior officer.

(3) The gaining component's PRB will also determine whether a senior officer on a joint IC duty assignment will receive a performance bonus or other appropriate award in accordance with the policies and regulations of the gaining component. Funding for performance bonuses awarded to a senior officer on a joint IC duty assignment will be the responsibility of the gaining component.

(4) As soon as possible after the conclusion of its annual performance evaluation process, the gaining component is responsible for providing the employing IC component with the final performance ratings and bonuses accorded senior officers of those employing IC components who are on a joint IC duty assignment.

(5) The employing IC component is responsible for providing ongoing career development guidance and feedback to its senior officers who are on a joint IC duty assignment, to include during the period of such assignments. The gaining component will facilitate such dialogue.

(6) Subject to section G.4.g above and IC component regulations, a senior officer who begins or ends a rotational assignment during the annual performance evaluation period may be eligible for performance recognition (performance bonus or other appropriate award) in both the employing and gaining IC components. Individuals may not, however, be recognized twice for the same accomplishment or period of service. To preclude duplicate recognition, reviewing officials or designated points of contact from the employing and gaining IC components will consult with each other prior to completion of the performance review process.

k. Component level senior leadership review of the results of each annual performance evaluation period to ensure rigor and consistency in component-wide ratings, as well as compliance with this Directive. In addition, the DNI, in consultation with the heads of IC

components, will review component results annually to ensure IC-wide ratings rigor and consistency, as well as compliance with this Directive.

l. To the extent applicable, adherence to and compliance with 5 USC 5307(d) and 5382, and 5 Code of Federal Regulations 534.404 with respect to certification and pay, as a matter of policy.

m. Adherence to and compliance with merit system principles, to the extent required by law.

n. Adequate time and effort throughout the performance evaluation period for training on and administration of the performance management system.

o. Three primary phases:

(1) Plan and set performance expectations.

(2) Provide ongoing performance feedback.

(3) Assign the Evaluation of Record.

p. Administrative policies, regulations, or instructions, as applicable, that incorporate the procedural requirements set forth in sections G.4., G.5., and G.6.

q. The flexibility for those departments with a senior officer performance management systems to establish different or additional rating levels, labels or rating requirements, to assign separate ratings in accordance with departmental requirements and this ICD, using a process set forth in an implementing memorandum of understanding as established pursuant to Section K.

5. Planning and setting performance expectations. This phase establishes the basis for evaluating performance.

a. All senior officers will be provided performance expectations appropriate for their occupation, position, tier, and pay. Designated management officials will develop performance expectations in consultation with the senior officers they supervise. However, final decisions regarding performance expectations are within the sole and exclusive discretion of the senior officer's supervisor of record.

b. Before, or at the beginning of the performance evaluation period, performance expectations, as defined herein, will be communicated formally in writing, in either hardcopy or electronic format, and reviewed with the senior officer.

c. Management officials will ensure that, to the extent possible, all performance objectives support and are aligned with the strategic goals and objectives of the National Intelligence Strategy, as applicable to each IC component, as well as the strategic goals and objectives of each IC component. In addition, such objectives will be:

(1) Specific, describing an observable action, behavior, or achievement; a rate of performance; or a frequency, percentage, or other quantitative measure. Performance objectives should be specific about the result, not how it is achieved.

(2) Measurable, including a method or procedure to observe, verify, assess, and record the result.

(3) Achievable but challenging, consistent with the senior officer's occupation, position, pay, and organizational responsibilities, and with the financial resources, time, and personnel available.

(4) Relevant, aligned with and important to the organization's mission and goals.

(5) Time-specific, with a defined start and completion date, as applicable.

d. The DNI, in coordination with the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees, will identify, validate, promulgate, and from time to time revise, core IC performance elements that are common to all IC senior officers. These core performance elements, as set forth below, describe attributes and behaviors expected of all IC senior officers covered by this Directive. At a minimum, all IC senior officers will be evaluated on these core performance elements. To meet the requirements of this Directive, performance elements (1) through (3) below must be integrated and incorporated as written into the appraisal instrument(s) employed by a particular IC component. Performance elements (4) through (6) may be integrated and incorporated with other departmental or agency performance elements as applicable, such that a senior officer's performance on those elements can be readily evaluated in this regard.

(1) Collaboration and Integration: IC senior officers have a responsibility to provide information and knowledge to achieve results, and are expected to build effective networks and alliances with key peers and stakeholders across the IC, and with other U.S. Government (USG), state, local, tribal and foreign officials, as appropriate. They should actively engage these peers and stakeholders, involve them in key decisions, and effectively leverage networks and alliances to achieve significant results. In addition, senior officers are expected to create an environment that promotes employee engagement, collaboration, integration, information and knowledge sharing, and the candid, open exchange of diverse points of view.

(2) Enterprise Focus: IC senior officers are expected to demonstrate a deep understanding of how the missions, structures, leaders, and cultures of the various IC components interact and connect. They should synthesize resources, information, and other inputs to effectively integrate and align component, IC, and USG interests and activities to achieve IC-wide, national, or international priorities. In addition, senior officers are expected to encourage and support joint duty assignments and developmental experiences that develop and reinforce an enterprise focus among their subordinates.

(3) Values-Centered Leadership: IC senior officers are expected to personally embody, advance and reinforce IC core values which include: a *Commitment* to selfless service and excellence in support of the IC's mission, as well as to preserving, protecting, and defending the Nation's laws and liberties; the integrity and *Courage* (moral, intellectual, and physical) to seek and speak the truth, to innovate, and to change things for the better, regardless of personal or professional risk; and to encourage *Collaboration* as members of a single IC-wide team, respecting and leveraging the diversity of all members of the IC, their background, their sources and methods, and their points of view. In addition, senior civilian officers are also expected to demonstrate and promote departmental and component core values, which may be incorporated in writing, as applicable.

(4) Domain Knowledge: IC senior officers are expected to acquire and maintain a deep knowledge and understanding of their leadership and management "domain," that is, the institutional, organizational, functional, and technical context in which they operate, or demonstrate the capacity to quickly acquire such knowledge. They are also expected to strategically and systematically leverage that knowledge and understanding to plan, develop, direct, and integrate employees and programs in order to achieve organizational results.

(5) Executive Leadership: IC senior officers are expected to articulate and achieve organizational vision, demonstrate adaptability and flexibility in leading organizational change, and to engage and motivate employees, peers and stakeholders. They must exhibit political savvy and create a workplace that promotes and reflects diversity (of both persons and points of view) and equal opportunity; encourage innovation and critical thinking; and maintain organizational and personal focus, intensity, and persistence, even under adversity. Those IC senior officers with duties that are primarily technical in nature (for example, ST or DISL employees) are expected to adapt and apply these same competencies in dealing with professional colleagues and peers in their particular technical field or professional discipline, as well as organizational customers or clients.

(6) Management Tradecraft: IC senior officers are expected to acquire, plan, organize, develop, integrate and prioritize the human, financial, material, and information resources to effectively accomplish their organization's mission, strategic goals, and performance objectives. Senior officers are also expected to make sound and timely decisions, set clear employee performance expectations, give employees constructive coaching and feedback, and provide appropriate developmental opportunities. They must make meaningful distinctions between the performance of subordinates, and rigorously and realistically evaluate the contributions of individual employees to organizational results. Those IC senior officers with duties that are primarily technical in nature (for example, ST or DISL employees) are expected to adapt and apply these same competencies to the oversight, coordination, and technical management of research, programs, or projects in their particular technical field or professional discipline.

e. The heads of the executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees may establish additional performance elements for senior officers as deemed necessary. In addition, the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees

may establish performance standards (for example, by occupation) for common IC and component-specific performance elements. All such additional elements and standards must be:

(1) Derived from job competencies that have been validated in accordance with Federal Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (41 Code of Federal Regulations § 60-3) and other applicable professional and technical standards.

(2) Linked to the common IC performance rating system set forth in section G.5.f.

(3) Provided to the ODNI prior to their effective date, so that they may be incorporated into an appropriate IC Competency Directory.

f. The common performance rating criteria and provisions in this ICD will be used in evaluating the performance of all IC senior officers. The rating levels and generic standards, as set forth below, will be incorporated as written into the appraisal instruments employed by the IC components to meet the requirements of this Directive. Common IC rating standards are applicable to performance objectives, performance elements, and the overall summary rating in the annual Evaluation of Record. Heads of IC components may supplement these general standards, as appropriate. All such standards will be applied within the context of the scope and level of the senior officer's responsibility.

(1) The rating level Minimally Successful is optional, except for those senior officers covered by title 5 USC.

(2) Those executive departments that have senior officers covered by title 5 USC, and also have a senior employee performance management system that has been certified by OPM and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), may employ only one rating level above Successful with respect to those covered senior officers.

(3) Rating levels and general standards for applying those levels in evaluating the performance of senior officers against performance elements, performance objectives, and overall, are as follows:

General Standards Applicable To:			
Rating Of:	Performance Objectives	Performance Elements	Overall Summary Rating
Outstanding (5)	The senior officer far exceeded expected results on all performance objectives, and in so doing, the senior officer's performance contributed to overall IC and organizational results that otherwise would not have been achieved, and served as a role model for others.	The senior officer far exceeded the behavioral standards described in all performance elements, and in so doing, served as an exemplary role model for others.	The senior officer's overall contribution to the IC's and organization's mission, in terms of both results and the manner in which those results were achieved, was extraordinary. Only a few senior officers are expected to achieve this level of exemplary, benchmark performance.
Excellent (4)	The senior officer exceeded expected results on a majority of the performance objectives, and achieved expected results on the remainder.	The senior officer exceeded the behavioral standards described in most performance elements.	The senior officer's overall contribution to the IC's and organization's mission, in terms of both results and the manner in which those results were achieved, was clearly over and above what was to be expected from most senior officers.
Successful (3)	The senior officer achieved expected results on all performance objectives.	The senior officer achieved all of the behavioral standards described in performance elements.	The senior officer's overall contribution to the IC's and organization's mission, in terms of both results and the manner in which those results were achieved, was positive and valued. Most senior officers are expected to achieve this level of performance.

Minimally Successful (2) (Optional)	The senior officer only partially achieved expected results on one or more assigned objectives, but made satisfactory progress on some of those performance objectives.	The senior officer did not meet the behavioral standards described in one or more performance elements and requires immediate improvement, but made an effort and demonstrated some satisfactory progress.	The senior officer's overall contribution to mission was less than expected.
Unacceptable (1)	The senior officer failed to achieve expected results in one or more assigned performance objectives.	The senior officer failed to meet one or more of the behavioral standards described in the performance elements.	The senior officer received an unacceptable rating on one or more performance objectives.

6. Providing Ongoing Performance Feedback. Management officials are responsible for providing ongoing (i.e., regular and timely) feedback to senior officers on their actual performance. Senior officers are responsible for providing, receiving, and acting on feedback as applicable, and participating in the performance management process.

a. Interim Evaluations. When a Rater no longer supervises performance management responsibilities to a particular senior officer, the Rater will complete a brief written description of the senior officer's accomplishments against performance expectations for the portion of the rating period that has passed. At a minimum, interim evaluations are required for periods of at least 90 calendar days during which the senior officer has been performing under an approved performance plan, and are optional for shorter periods. Interim evaluations will be shared with the senior officer being evaluated. Interim evaluations will be used to prepare the senior officer's final Evaluation of Record.

b. Midterm Review. A senior officer's Rater will conduct at least one formal review of a senior officer's performance, approximately midway through the performance evaluation period. This review will acknowledge achievements, suggest areas for improvement, address near-term professional development, and adjust or discuss progress towards meeting performance expectations as appropriate. The senior officer will be provided with written or electronic confirmation that the midterm was conducted. The Rater will record the senior officer's receipt of the midterm review. While the midterm review will be used to prepare the final Evaluation of Record, no rating is assigned.

c. Addressing Poor Performance. If at any time during the performance evaluation period the Rater determines that a senior officer's performance may be rated as "Minimally Successful" or "Unacceptable," as defined in section G.5.f., the Rater will take timely, appropriate action to address the deficiency, taking into account the circumstances, including the nature and gravity of the unsatisfactory performance and its consequences to the organization, pursuant to the procedures and policies of each IC component.

7. Assigning the Evaluation of Record. At the end of the performance evaluation period, the Rater will prepare an evaluation for the senior officer, subject to the following conditions and requirements:

a. Senior officers will be given the opportunity to provide the Rater with a written description of their accomplishments and progress towards meeting their performance expectations.

b. Accomplishment of performance objectives is the single most important factor in evaluating a senior officer's performance. Those executive departments that have senior officers covered by title 5 USC will implement, apply, administer, and interpret the policy requirements of this ICD with respect to those covered senior officers in a manner that adheres to and complies with existing OPM and OMB rules and standards for the certification of their senior employee performance management systems.

c. The Rater is required to provide a narrative as justification for the overall summary rating. Separate and distinct Rater narratives are required for:

(1) A summary rating of Outstanding.

(2) A summary rating below Successful.

(3) A summary rating of Excellent for performance objectives.

d. A summary rating of Unacceptable, as defined in section G.5.f., on a senior officer's performance objectives requires an overall summary rating of Unacceptable. However, a summary rating of Unacceptable on a senior officer's performance elements does not require, but permits, an overall summary rating of Unacceptable.

e. Any rating below Successful requires corrective or remedial action within 90 calendar days of the date of rating, pursuant to the policies of each IC component.

f. IC component heads may provide rating and reviewing officials with guidance to ensure that rating levels and general standards are applied strictly and consistently across the organization. However, IC components will not impose fixed numeric or percentage limitations on the assignment of any rating level or levels.

g. The evaluation is subject to review and oversight as follows:

(1) The reviewer, a management official at a higher level than the Rater, will review the evaluation to ensure consistency between and among Raters.

(2) Each IC component will establish a Performance Review Board or equivalent, to make recommendations to the head of the IC component with respect to senior officer Evaluations of Record; provide appropriate oversight of the component's senior officer

performance management process; monitor senior officer ratings for rigor and consistency; and ensure compliance with this Directive.

h. At a minimum, the reviewer will review the Rater's proposed Evaluation of Record before that evaluation is communicated to the rated senior officer. The Rater will communicate the proposed Evaluation of Record to the senior officer in accordance with the policies established by each IC component.

i. When communicating the annual Evaluation of Record, the Rater will provide and discuss the senior officer's career development objectives, training opportunities, future assignments, and promotion potential, as appropriate.

j. A senior officer's Evaluation of Record is not final until approved by the head of the IC component, or a designated senior official, and issued to the senior officer with all appropriate reviews and signatures.

k. An Evaluation of Record will be used as a basis for: making performance distinctions among senior officers; informing pay determinations; determining reduction in force retention standing; and such other actions as determined appropriate.

H. RECONSIDERATION OF EVALUATIONS. IC senior officers may request reconsideration of their current Evaluation of Record through informal or formal processes.

1. In accordance with IC component procedures, senior officers may first request informal resolution with management officials in their rating chain.

2. If informal processes do not resolve the issue, senior officers may pursue the matter to the extent permitted by component policies and procedures. Requests for formal resolution will be made in writing, and senior officers will receive responses in writing.

3. IC components will track reconsideration requests and final resolutions to ensure proper application and enforcement of performance evaluation policies and processes in conformance with this ICD and component requirements.

I. DNI OVERSIGHT. The DNI will conduct oversight of performance management policies established in accordance with this Directive.

1. Program Evaluation. Performance management systems modified to implement the requirements of this Directive will be coordinated in advance with the DNI (or the Associate DNI for Human Capital as the ODNI senior designee).

2. Reporting.

a. Each IC component will, on an annual basis, report its senior officer performance ratings, bonuses, and permanent pay adjustments to the DNI.

b. The DNI will, in coordination with the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies, establish additional reporting requirements for the purposes of conducting oversight of IC component senior officer performance management systems.

J. REVIEW AND REVISIONS.

1. **Biennial Review.** The DNI, in conjunction with the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees, will review this ICD biennially (from the date of issuance) to determine whether its requirements should be retained or modified.

2. **Revisions.** The DNI, or the head of an executive department or independent agency with IC employees, may request revisions to this ICD at any time.

K. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ICD is effective upon signature. All executive departments and independent agencies with IC employees will begin implementing provisions of this Directive no later than 1 October 2008 for application to the FY2009 performance cycle, but may implement the provisions of this ICD earlier if they so choose. For those executive departments that have senior officers covered by title 5, USC, the DNI, or the Associate DNI for Human Capital, as the ODNI senior designee, and the heads of those departments, or their senior designees, may enter into separate a Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with respect to those covered senior officers that will set forth a mutually acceptable implementation plan that integrates the legal, policy, and program requirements of both parties.



Director of National Intelligence

28 APR 08
Date