



**Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency
for the District of Columbia**

*Office of the Director
Office of Human Resources*

HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTIVE 430.2

SUBJECT: Performance Management System

EFFECTIVE DATE:

APPROVED: _____
Jasper Ormond, Interim Director

I. INTRODUCTION:

One of the primary goals of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) is to establish a measurement-based performance management system which ties compensation, incentives, promotions and retention to performance measures linked to Agency mission objectives, the Strategic Plan and the Agency's Critical Success Factors. The Agency has adopted this process to appraise performance and to use performance as a key criterion for promotions, salary increases, awards and retention. This Directive establishes a three-level performance appraisal system for CSOSA and sets forth procedures to address performance deficiencies.

II. COVERAGE:

This Directive covers all permanent CSOSA employees, excluding the Director (PAS), Deputy Director and Associate Directors (Senior Level executives). The Pretrial Services Agency is not covered under this Directive.

III. LEGAL AUTHORITY:

The Performance Management System will be managed in compliance with 5 U.S.C. Chapter 43 and 53, and 5 CFR §§ 430, 432, 451 and 531.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES:

A. The Director is responsible for setting general policies for the administration of the performance management system.

B. The Associate Director for Human Resources, Office of Human Resources (OHR) is responsible for overall implementation of this Directive, to include developing and maintaining necessary procedures and instructions for the administration of the Performance Management

System, for providing initial orientation and on-going training, and for processing salary

633 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 820, Washington, DC 20001

Voice: (202) 220-5600 (202) 220-5615

increases, performance awards, and other personnel actions approved pursuant to this Directive.

C. The Associate Directors for Community Supervision Services (CSS) and Community Justice Programs (CJP) are responsible for updating Critical Success Factor (CSF) Performance Targets/Standards for Community Supervision Officers and Supervisory Community Supervision Officers to reflect current Agency priorities.

D. First-line supervisors are responsible for developing individual performance appraisal plans and for rating the performance of all covered employees reporting directly to them. The next line of supervision (Approving Officials) reviews and approves performance appraisal plans and ratings of those employees reporting through subordinate levels of management and are responsible for overall compliance with the requirements of this Directive, including the identification of critical elements/competencies and standards, the timely submission of performance ratings, and the recommendation of performance awards when warranted.

V. DEFINITIONS:

A. Approving Official – the second-line supervisor (*i.e.*, the next level above the Rating Official).

B. Career-Ladder Promotion - a non-competitive promotion within an established career-progression path based on (1) fully acceptable performance, (2) the employee's demonstration of the ability to perform successfully at the higher grade, (3) budgetary resources, (4) the availability of work at the higher level, and (5) supervisory approval.

C. Critical Element - a component of an employee's job that is of such significance that performance below the minimum level established by management requires remedial action and may be the basis for removing or reducing the employee in grade. Such action may be taken without regard to performance on other components of the job.

D. Competency - A job-related knowledge, skill, ability or behavior considered essential for successful performance.

E. "Exceeded Expectations" Performance - overall performance which is significantly higher than that normally expected; (*i.e.*, a numerical Level 3; see Section IX).

F. First-Line Supervisor - the first level of management to whom the employee reports; serves as the Rating Official responsible for appraising performance of employees under his/her direct supervision.

G. "Fully Met Expectations" Performance - overall performance of the duties and responsibilities which satisfies the normal expectations of the supervisor on all critical elements/competencies (*i.e.*, a numerical Level 2; see Section IX).

H. Performance Appraisal - the act or process of reviewing and evaluating the performance of an employee against established performance criteria.

I. Performance Improvement Period (PIP) – a formal, written notice to an employee of

the supervisor's determination that the employee's performance is considered to be at the "Unacceptable" level on one or more critical elements/competencies and/or CSF's. The PIP notice must state the critical element(s) involved, with examples, offer remedial guidance, inform the employee of the performance level that must be reached in order to be retained, and provide for a 60-day period in which to demonstrate the specified performance improvement.

J. Performance-Based Incentive Award - a lump-sum cash award based on overall performance achievement as documented in the annual performance rating.

K. Performance Plan – a description of the critical elements, performance goals, competencies and standards for an employee's position.

L. Performance Standards – objective statements describing the levels of performance on critical elements/competencies that explains what is expected and serves as the yardstick/measurement tool against which performance is measured. Must be consistent with the assigned duties of the position.

M. Progress Review - a meeting at approximately mid-year of the rating cycle between the first-line supervisor and employee to review and discuss the employee's performance, duties and responsibilities, performance standards, performance goals and objectives, critical competencies/elements, appropriate training and remedial action if appropriate. Progress reviews are to be conducted at least once a year during the rating cycle and more frequently if required. Progress reviews are not considered formal ratings.

N. Quality Step Increase (QSI) – a pay increase from one step of a grade to the next higher step based on an "Exceeded Expectations" performance rating.

O. "Unacceptable" Performance – performance on one or more critical elements which fails to meet the minimum level required for retention (*i.e.*, fails to meet performance described as Level 2). This rating describes performance that cannot be accepted as satisfactory, *i.e.*, the employee failed to meet the prescribed standard on one or more critical elements/competencies and/or CSF's. A rating of "Unacceptable" on any one critical element/competency and/or CSF will result in an overall rating of "Unacceptable" and will serve as the basis for the initiation of remedial action. (See Section XI.)

P. Within Grade Increase (WGI) - a periodic pay increase from one step of the grade to the next higher step based on performance at or above the "Fully Met Expectations" level.

VI. PERFORMANCE PLANS:

A. A performance plan must set forth what the employee is expected to accomplish in terms of performance goals/targets and define the expected level of performance on the job elements/competencies applicable to the job. The performance plan shall be in effect for at least 120 days prior to applying it in officially rating the employee.

B. Critical elements/competencies must be stated in writing. The number of critical elements depends on the position; normally, three to five should be identified. There must be at least three critical elements in the performance plan.

C. Descriptive performance levels/standards of expected performance must be in writing and defined at the “Fully Met Expectations” level. The “Fully Met” level of performance *must* be defined for each CSF Performance Target, Critical Competency and Performance Goal. This written description states what is required from the employee in terms of quantity, quality, timeliness, desired behavior, and adherence to established work procedures and processes. Standards must be objective statements that serve as the benchmark against which performance is measured.

D. Critical competencies and performance standards for supervisory and managerial positions should focus more on managerial goals (*e.g.*, project completion) than on specific skills (*e.g.*, writing ability). They must address the performance elements typical of a manager or supervisor (*e.g.*, leadership, budget management, etc.).

VII. PERFORMANCE RATING FORMS:

A. Separate performance rating forms based on the job elements and competencies relevant to broad occupational groups have been developed and will be used to rate the performance of employees in the following groups:

1. Community Supervision Officers (CSOs) GS-5/7/9/11/12 (CSS only)
2. Supervisory Community Supervision Officers GS-13/14/15 (CSS only)
3. Supervisors and Program Managers (Agency-wide)
4. Administrative and Professional Personnel (Agency-wide)
5. Support Personnel (Agency-wide)

B. Each covered agency position has been categorized into one of these groups and an appropriate performance appraisal form, incorporating competencies relevant to the group, will be provided to the first-line supervisor.

VIII. RATING CYCLE/DUE DATES:

A. A formal written appraisal is due annually, based on the schedule announced by OHR.

B. The minimum rating period is 120 days. If 120 days have not elapsed from the date the employee’s performance plan is communicated, the rating period shall be extended as needed.

C. This Directive will be phased in as follows:

1. CSOs – The initial rating cycle for CSOs will begin on April 30, 2001 and end September 30, 2001. The next rating cycle will run from October 1, 2001 to July 31, 2002. Thereafter, the rating cycle will run from August 1 to July 31 annually.
2. All other CSS supervisors and staff - The initial rating cycle will begin on August 30, 2001 and end July 31, 2002. Thereafter, the rating cycle will run from August 1 to July 31 annually.

3. All other CSOSA supervisors and staff - The initial rating cycle for will begin on or before September 30, 2001 and end July 31, 2002. Thereafter, the rating cycle will run from August 1 to July 31 annually.

D. Approximately mid-way through the rating cycle, a progress review meeting must be held. The date of the progress review must be documented on the performance appraisal form.

IX. SUMMARY RATING:

A. Community Supervision Officers (CSOs) and Supervisory CSOs - These occupational groupings have three (3) rating levels as follows:

- “Exceeded Expectations” – Performance rated at an overall numeric rating of 2.75 or higher. (Level 3)
- “Fully Met Expectations” – Performance rated at an overall numeric rating of 2.00 to 2.74. (Level 2)
- “Unacceptable” – One or more Critical Element/Competency or CSF rated at the “Unacceptable” level. (Level 1)

B. All other Supervisors, Program Managers, Administrative, Professional and Support Staff – These occupational groupings also have three (3) rating levels as follows:

- “Exceeded Expectations” – Level 3
- “Fully Met Expectations” – Level 2
- “Unacceptable” – Level 1

The specific criteria for determining the rating level scores will be issued at the beginning of the rating cycles.

C. A descriptive narrative *must* be provided as the basis for explaining and justifying a performance rating at the “Exceeded Expectations” or “Unacceptable” performance levels.

D. Performance ratings *must* be fully discussed with employees. This is accomplished after the performance rating has been reviewed and approved by the Approving Official (e.g., Associate Director/Office Head).

E. No forced or pre-set determination of rating scores is permitted.

F. The final performance rating and any monetary award recommendation must be reviewed and approved by the respective Approving Official *prior* to issuance or discussion with the employee.

X. SOURCES OF PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK:

The first-line supervisor's observations and review of work products remain the primary basis for the rating. However, with advanced notice to employees, raters are encouraged to consider other relevant feedback; *e.g.*, customer service comments regarding employees responsible for providing service to internal/external clients; feedback on employee's ability to work effectively with other offices in furtherance of the Agency's mission, etc.

XI. UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE:

A. When an employee's performance is considered to be at the "Unacceptable" level on one or more critical elements/competencies, the supervisor must give the employee a formal, written notice of this determination, including the critical element(s) involved, with examples. The supervisor must offer remedial guidance and must inform the employee of the performance level that must be reached in order to be retained, and must provide a reasonable amount of time in which to demonstrate improvement. The employee is given a 60-day period in which to improve. This is referred to as the Performance Improvement Period (PIP).

B. At the conclusion of the PIP, a rating is issued to the employee. However, if the performance has not improved to the "Fully Met Expectations" level, action is initiated to effect the employee's reassignment, demotion, or removal. If the employee's performance has improved to the "Fully Met Expectations" level or better, any pending within-grade increase is processed. (NOTE: *During the initial five-month 2001 rating cycle for CSOs or Supervisory CSOs, demotion or removal actions based solely on performance will be deferred until the employee has performed for at least twelve months under the assigned critical elements/competencies, standards, and CSFs.*)

C. A proposed action may be based on instances of unacceptable performance which occur within the previous one-year period ending on the date of the notice of the proposed action. If at anytime during the one-year period beginning with the issuance of the PIP the employee's performance again becomes unacceptable, an additional opportunity to demonstrate acceptable performance need not be provided.

D. If an employee has performed acceptably for one year from the beginning of the opportunity period to demonstrate acceptable performance (in the critical elements/competencies for which the employee was afforded an opportunity to demonstrate acceptable performance), and the performance again becomes unacceptable, the agency shall afford the employee an additional opportunity to demonstrate acceptable performance before determining whether to propose a reduction in grade or removal.

XII. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE FOR PERFORMANCE RATINGS:

Performance ratings, but not the substance of performance elements/competencies, standards and CSFs, may be grieved. The grievance procedure for performance ratings is outlined in Human Resources Directive (HRD) 771.1, Conflict Resolution Procedure.

XIII. WITHIN-GRADE AND QUALITY STEP INCREASES:

A. Within-Grade Increase (WGI) - An employee paid at less than step 10 of the grade of his/her position shall earn advancement in pay to the next higher step of that grade upon meeting the following requirements:

1. The employee's performance must be at an acceptable level of competence (*i.e.*, a rating of “Fully Met Expectations” or higher/better on each critical element).
2. The employee must have completed the required waiting period for advancement to the next higher step of the grade of his/her position (see subsection 4 below).
3. The employee must not have received an “equivalent increase” (*e.g.*, a promotion) during the waiting period. An increase in an employee’s rate of basic pay shall not be considered an equivalent increase when it results from:
 - a statutory pay adjustment,
 - periodic adjustment of a wage schedule,
 - establishment of higher minimum rates,
 - quality step increase or
 - temporary or term promotion when returned to the permanent grade and step.
4. The waiting periods for within-grade increases are as follows:
 - 52 weeks to move to Steps 2, 3 and 4;
 - 104 weeks to move to Steps 5, 6 and 7;
 - 156 weeks to move to Steps 8, 9 and 10.

B. Quality Step Increase (QSI) - A QSI may be awarded based on receipt of an “Exceeded Expectations” performance rating. A QSI may not be granted if an employee received one within the preceding 52 consecutive calendar weeks. QSI recommendations shall accompany the rating and must include a brief justification that addresses the employee’s high quality performance. In addition, to justify a QSI, the high quality performance must be expected to continue. The expectation is that these increases will be limited in number and granted to recognize the performance of the Agency’s very best performers.

XIV. CHANGES IN POSITIONS DURING THE RATING PERIOD:

A. If an employee changes his/her position before the end of the rating period, but after working in the position for at least 120 days, a summary interim rating will be prepared within 30 days after the change of position to document the assessment of the performance in the former

position. The summary interim performance rating will be considered by the new supervisor in determining the final rating at the end of the rating period.

B. If an employee is detailed for more than 120 days within the Agency, the detail supervisor must provide a narrative interim rating at the end of the detail. This information will be considered in deriving the employee's next annual rating.

C. If an employee is detailed outside of the Agency, CSOSA will make reasonable efforts to obtain narrative appraisal information from the outside agency. This information will be considered in deriving the employee's next annual rating.

D. If an employee's immediate supervisor departs, a summary interim rating will be prepared immediately before separation or transfer of the supervisor. If the supervisor leaves within the last 120 days of the rating period, this rating may serve as the final rating.

XV. CASH AWARDS: Awards will be processed in accordance with HRD 451.1, until superseded, and by any additional instructions which may be issued by OHR.

XVI. RECORDS:

A. Maintenance: Copies of each employee's current and previous performance ratings of record (four years old or less), including the performance plans on which the performance ratings were based, will be retained in the Employee Performance Folder (EPF) in OHR. Copies of performance ratings issued for temporary assignments and other performance related documents will also be kept in the EPF.

B. Disposition: When an employee's Official Personnel Folder (OPF) is sent to another Federal agency, or to the National Personnel Records Center, the OHR shall include in the OPF all performance ratings of record that are four (4) years old or less, including the performance plan on which the most recent performance rating was based. Summary performance ratings that may have been issued when employees change positions are also retained for four (4) years and filed in the EPF.

XVII. RELATED DIRECTIVES:

HRD 430.1 – Interim Performance Management System
HRD 451.1 – Incentive Awards and Recognition Program
HRD 771.1 – Conflict Resolution Procedure
HRD 752.1 – Disciplinary and Adverse Actions

XVIII. CANCELLATIONS:

This Directive cancels any previous regulations or memoranda regarding performance management systems for CSOSA, except for HRD 430.1.

- A. CSOSA Performance Appraisal Forms –
(1) Community Supervision Officers (CSS)
(2) Supervisory Community Supervision Officers (CSS)

- (3) Supervisors and Program Managers (Agency-wide)
- (4) Administrative and Professional Positions (Agency-wide)
- (5) Support Positions (Agency-wide)

B. Award Recommendation Form