



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

ADS 462

Employee Evaluation Program, Civil Service

Partial Revision Date: 05/01/2019
Responsible Office: HCTM/CPE
File Name: 462_050119

Functional Series 400 – Human Resources
ADS 462 – Employee Evaluation Program, Civil Service
POC for ADS 462: Karen Baquedano, (202) 712-0695, kbaquedano@usaid.gov

Table of Contents

462.1 **OVERVIEW** **4**

462.2 **PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES** **4**

462.3 **POLICY DIRECTIVES AND REQUIRED PROCEDURES** **5**

462.3.1 **Employee Evaluation Program Basics.....** **5**

462.3.1.1 **Appraisal Period** **6**

462.3.1.2 **Appraisal Input Form (AIF) (AID Form 462-4 or 462-5).....** **6**

462.3.1.3 **Rating Officials.....** **7**

462.3.1.4 **Appraisal Committees (ACs).....** **8**

462.3.1.5 **Annual Evaluation Form (AID Form 462-1).....** **9**

462.3.2 **Performance Plans** **11**

462.3.2.1 **Performance Elements and Standards** **11**

462.3.2.2 **Review and Approval of Performance Plans.....** **12**

462.3.3 **Deficient Performance.....** **12**

462.3.4 **Progress Reviews.....** **13**

462.3.5 **Gathering Appraisal Information** **14**

462.3.5.1 **Employee Self-Assessments** **14**

462.3.5.2 **360-Degree Input Sources.....** **15**

462.3.6 **Final AEF** **16**

462.3.6.1 **Professional Development.....** **16**

462.3.6.2 **Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW)** **16**

462.3.6.3 **Rating of Record.....** **16**

462.3.6.4 **Adjectival Ratings for Performance Elements.....** **16**

462.3.6.5 **Summary Ratings** **17**

462.3.7 **Employee Feedback Sessions.....** **18**

462.3.8 **Appraisal Committee (AC) Review of the Evaluation** **18**

462.3.9 **Principal Officer’s Role** **19**

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

462.3.10 Submission of Annual Evaluation Forms 19

462.3.11 Training..... 20

462.4 MANDATORY REFERENCES 20

462.4.1 External Mandatory References 20

462.4.2 Internal Mandatory References 20

462.4.3 Mandatory Forms..... 20

462.5 ADDITIONAL HELP 20

462.6 DEFINITIONS..... 21

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

ADS 462 – Employee Evaluation Program, Civil Service

462.1 OVERVIEW

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

The Employee Evaluation Program (EEP) provides a systematic process by which the Agency involves its employees in improving Agency organizational effectiveness by

- Establishing clear linkages among Agency’s goals, operating unit strategic objectives, and employees’ work;
- Improving communications concerning organizational objectives and individual career goals;
- Developing employees’ capacity to perform better;
- Providing feedback to employees to motivate them to work more effectively, improve their skills, and prepare them for increased responsibilities;
- Correcting deficiencies and providing both positive and negative feedback (negative feedback must be in writing); and
- Providing a basis for cash awards, bonuses, and pay adjustments based on performance, and other, non-monetary awards for performance.

This chapter applies to all Civil Service (CS) employees (including Schedule C employees and employees whose appointments are Administratively Determined (AD)) under the authority of [5 U.S.C. Chapter 43](#) and [5 CFR 430, Performance Management, Subpart B, Performance Appraisal for General Schedule, Prevailing Rate and Certain Other Employees](#).

This chapter does not apply to Foreign Service (FS), Senior Foreign Service (SFS), or Senior Executive Service (SES) employees, Presidential Appointees, or experts and consultants. See [ADS 461](#) for the EEP for FS and SFS employees.

462.2 PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

a. The **Principal Officer of an Operating Unit** is responsible for managing his or her operating unit’s performance evaluation program. This responsibility includes communicating objectives, goals, policies, procedures, and deadlines; ensuring compliance with the program; designating employees to play particular roles in the program; and keeping the Office of Human Capital and Talent Management, Center for Performance Excellence, (HCTM/CPE) abreast of important information concerning the EEP.

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

- b.** The **Approving Official** is responsible for ensuring that the Rating Official observes, evaluates performance at each stage of the process, and provides ongoing feedback to each employee.
- c.** The **Rating Official** is responsible for working closely with individual employees throughout the review cycle to create performance plans, evaluate performance, provide feedback, and revise plans, as appropriate. These actions culminate in the Rating Official's and Approving Official's completion of an Annual Evaluation Form (AEF) for submission to the employee, Appraisal Committee (AC), if requested or required, and to HR.
- d.** **Employees** are responsible for participating from beginning to end in their own evaluation. This includes performing as specified in the performance plan; evaluating themselves; and participating orally and in writing in review and feedback sessions.
- e.** The **Appraisal Committee**, if requested by the Approving Official or employee, reviews and discusses AEFs, Appraisal Input Forms (AIFs), and Skills Feedback Worksheets (SFWs) with Rating Officials, providing input to the evaluation and formally approving the AEF. However, if an employee's performance is at the "Needs Improvement" or "Unacceptable" level at any time during the rating cycle, AC participation is mandatory.

Throughout the evaluation process, the Appraisal Committee and individual members of the Committee ensure that Rating and Approving Officials comply with the policy directives and required procedures set forth in this chapter. The Appraisal Committee provides assistance to, and helps to resolve conflicts among Rating Officials, Approving Officials, and employees. In fulfilling its responsibilities, the AC is expected to be mindful of privacy concerns.

- f.** The **Office of Human Capital and Talent Management, Center for Performance Excellence, (HCTM/CPE)** is responsible for the EEP formulation, monitoring, revision, and training. HCTM/CPE develops employee evaluation policies, procedures, and guidelines after monitoring the operation and evaluating implementation of the EEP, and the related pay and awards systems affected by this program. Additionally, as appropriate, HCTM/CPE is responsible for action against those who fail to comply with this program.

462.3 POLICY DIRECTIVES AND REQUIRED PROCEDURES

462.3.1 Employee Evaluation Program Basics

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

The Employee Evaluation Program (EEP) begins with the Principal Officer of each operating unit. The Principal Officer

- Establishes overall operating unit strategic objectives and communicates to

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

employees the relationships among Agency goals and the operating unit's development objectives;

- Communicates information on the evaluation process to all employees in the unit, including establishing and publicizing internal deadlines and procedures for completing each phase of the process;
- Ensures the operating unit's adherence to Agency policies, procedures, and schedules governing the EEP; and
- Seeks Employee and Labor Relations and Benefits Division (HCTM/ELR) guidance regarding appropriate administrative action for employees and Agency management officials who have failed to adhere to the policies, procedures, and schedules of the EEP.

To understand the policies and procedures for each part of the evaluation cycle, Principal Officers, Rating Officials, Approving Officials, AC Representatives, and employees must first familiarize themselves with all aspects of the EEP.

462.3.1.1 Appraisal Period

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

USAID has established a one-year appraisal period for employees. The appraisal period is from January 1 through December 31. The Rater of Record must complete written performance appraisals at the end of the rating cycle (see **462.3.6**).

The minimum appraisal period is 90 days. All employees who are on an active performance plan of 90 days or more will receive an Annual Evaluation Form (AEF) ([AID Form 462-1](#)) at the end of the evaluation period.

462.3.1.2 Appraisal Input Form (AIF) (AID Form 462-4 or 462-5)

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

Raters of the employee must complete an Appraisal Input Form (AIF) ([AID Form 462-4 or 462-5](#)) when either the supervisor or employee changes assignment or responsibility and when the employee has been supervised for at least 30 calendar days. The AIF records Performance Elements and Standards. The Rating Official must

- Complete the AIF at least two weeks before either the employee or the Rating Official changes jobs, unless the HCTM/CPE grants a waiver;
- Provide the employee with the AIF at least five days prior to the performance feedback meeting;

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

- Hold a mandatory meeting with the employee to review and discuss the AIF ([AID Form 462-4 or 462-5](#)); and
- Forward the AIF, with optional employee response, to the employee's next Rating Official (or Administrative Officer, Executive Officer (EXO), or other employee designated by the Principal Officer) within two days after completion.

If an employee is on temporary duty (TDY) at another duty station for 30 days or more, an appropriate official at the TDY duty station must prepare an AIF on the employee's performance for the employee's Rating Official.

The employee and/or Approving Official may request Appraisal Committee participation during this stage of the EEP. Any decisions made by the AC are final as they have approval authority.

462.3.1.3 Rating Officials

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

The Principal Officer of the operating unit designates the Rating Official. Rating Officials play an essential role in the EEP since they

- Observe, evaluate performance, and provide ongoing feedback to each employee;
- Provide negative feedback in a timely manner and in writing;
- Conduct at least one mandatory mid-cycle review with each employee;
- Review the employee's self-assessment and work products, gather additional performance information from relevant sources (AIFs ([AID Form 462-4 or 462-5](#)) and other 360-degree input), draft the AEF ([AID Form 462-1](#)) and Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW) ([AID Form 462-2](#)), and discuss both forms with the Appraisal Committee (AC), if requested;
- Submit the AEF to the Approving Official and AC for review and signature, if requested or required; and
- Discuss the final AEF and SFW with Approving Official and with each rated employee.

Approving Officials also play an essential role in the EEP process since they

- Ensure that Rating Official's observe, evaluate performance, and provide ongoing feedback to each employee;
- Ensure that Rating Officials provide negative feedback, when necessary, in a

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

timely manner and in writing;

- Ensure that Rating Officials conduct at least one mandatory mid-cycle review with each employee;
- Ensure that Rating Officials review the employee's self-assessment and work products, gather additional performance information from relevant sources (AIF and other 360-degree input), draft the AEF ([AID Form 462-1](#)) and Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW) ([AID Form 462-3](#)), and discuss both forms with the Appraisal Committee (AC), if requested; and
- Review the AEF, discuss with Rating Officials, and sign.

462.3.1.4 Appraisal Committees (ACs)

Effective Date: 12/03/2009

Appraisal Committees (ACs) provide an organizational perspective on an employee's performance. The committees also ensure that all AEFs are fair and objective. An AC or AC Representative is involved in every aspect of the EEP, if requested.

ACs (and management officials) have the authority to seek guidance from HR/ELR regarding appropriate administrative action for any employee who fails to adhere to the policies, procedures, and schedules of the EEP.

a. AC Functions

ACs are responsible for the following actions:

- Review and sign performance plans, when requested by either the Approving Official or employee, and ensure that Performance Elements and Performance Standards are reasonable and attainable.
- Review substantive changes and sign mid-cycle performance reviews when requested by the Approving Official or employee.
- Assist Approving Officials with employee performance problems, when requested by the Rating Official or employee.
- Review and discuss draft AEFs and SFWs with Approving Officials and recommend changes. This review ensures that Rating Officials obtained 360-degree input and used it appropriately; ensures that Approving Officials reviewed and considered employee self-assessments; and ensures that evaluations are properly prepared and are equitable and objective.
- Make changes in the AEF, including adjectival ratings or the summary rating and assumes final approval authority when participation is requested.

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

b. Who Is On the AC?

ACs are established at the beginning of the rating cycle and must include at least three members, not including Rating Officials or Approving Officials. Rating Officials and Approving Officials who are members of an AC must recuse themselves as members and may not participate in AC deliberations when the AC reviews the AEFs they prepared as Rating Officials and/or Approving Officials and when the AC reviews their own AEF.

The AC should consist of knowledgeable, career, U.S. direct-hire (USDH) staff from the operating unit who are familiar with the unit's strategic objectives and have knowledge of the performance of the employees being evaluated. Every consideration should be given to the inclusion of peers on the AC. However, at least one member of the AC other than the Rating Official must be a Subject Matter Expert (SME) in the work of the rated employee whose performance the AC will review. Large operating units must establish more than one AC to effectively review all employees.

*The Principal Officer for each Operating Unit must establish the AC. The Officer must appoint only U.S. direct-hire career employees to ACs. Foreign Service Limited employees and probationary Civil Service employees are not eligible to serve on ACs. Career candidates and FS employees appointed under the Recall authority (Section 308 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980) are eligible to serve on ACs, but there can only be one of each per AC and neither can serve as the committee chairperson.

462.3.1.5 Annual Evaluation Form (AID Form 462-1)

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

a. The AEF

The AEF ([AID Form 462-1](#)) is used to evaluate the performance of all U.S. direct-hire employees other than FS, SFS, Foreign Service Nationals, Senior Executive Service employees, and Presidential appointees. The Rating Official prepares and the Approving Official approves, and both sign all AEFs. If AC participation is required or requested, completed AEFs are not official records of performance until approved by the Appraisal Committee. The employee does not need approval from the Rating Official or Approving Official to request AC participation.

See the [EEP Guidebook Part 2, Civil Service](#), for detailed information on the annual evaluation process.

When completing the AEF, do not exceed the space allowed. Complete the forms in 10 point Arial font only.

The AEF consists of seven sections. They are as follows:

1. Section 1 – Authentication of Performance Plan

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

Rating Officials and Approving Officials complete this section, having appropriate parties sign to show that the AEF has been put in place.

2. Section 1-A – Authentication of Progress Review

Rating Officials and Approving Officials complete this section, having appropriate parties sign to show that the mandatory progress review was held.

3. Section 1-B – Authentication of Final Annual Evaluation

Rating Officials and Approving Officials complete this section, having appropriate parties sign to show that the final AEF has been completed.

4. Section 1-C – Final Annual Evaluation Performance Results

Rating Officials complete this section, indicating all 360-degree sources that were contacted and responded.

5. Section 2 – Role in the Organization

Rating Officials describe the employee's role in the organization in terms of organizational setting and principal duties, including specific responsibility that links the employee's position to the Joint Strategic Plan goals, Bureau/office/operating unit's organizational goals and objectives, and overall Agency goals.

6. Section 3 – Performance Elements and Standards

Rating Officials complete this section by establishing whether or not Performance Elements and Performance Standards are critical and by providing a narrative for each. Performance Element #1 is a mandatory critical element for all employees.

7. Section 4 – Critical Performance Elements and Performance Standards for Supervisors and Managers

Rating officials of supervisors complete this mandatory critical element section.

8. Section 5 – Final Summary Rating Explanation

Rating Officials document final summary rating if employees have two or more equal number of adjectival ratings.

9. Section 5-A – Professional Development

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

Rating Officials complete this section if summary rating is less than “Exceeds Fully Successful.”

10. Section 5 B – Revisions

Rating Officials complete this section if an employee has changed jobs during the rating period or if they want to state any new or other changed occurrence.

11. Section 6 – Formal Mid-Cycle Progress Review

Rating Officials complete this section for all employees who are currently at the “Minimally Successful” or “Unacceptable” level. This section should be completed when an employee is performing at the “Needs Improvement” or “Unacceptable” level at any time during the rating cycle.

b. Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW)

This worksheet is used to provide feedback and career guidance to employees. It is mandatory that the Rating Official use this tool throughout the evaluation period for professional development purposes and in evaluating the employee both at mid-cycle review and for the end-of-year rating. However, the SFW is not submitted to HR for filing in the employee’s Performance Evaluation File. When completing this worksheet, the Rating Official must take into account the grade of the employee.

c. Employee Statement

This form ([AID form 462-2](#)) allows employees to comment on the evaluation of their performance.

462.3.2 Performance Plans

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

Performance plans are documents prepared by the Rating Official in consultation with the employee and may contain statements of performance expectations and results to be achieved. Performance expectations are conveyed to all employees. The plan informs the employee of the measures by which his or her performance will be judged. Performance plans consist of Performance Elements and Standards.

The Rating Official and Approving Official approve the Performance Plan, and the Rating Official gives it to the employee within 30 days of the beginning of the annual rating cycle or the employee’s assignment to a new position. The AC reviews and signs performance plans only if requested by the employee or Approving Official.

462.3.2.1 Performance Elements and Standards

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

Performance Elements are either critical or non-critical. Employees and their Rating Officials must specifically define Performance Standards for each Performance Element. Performance Standards address quantity, quality, timeliness, or the most cost-effective way of accomplishing the work objective. Rating Officials will establish Performance Standards at the “Fully Successful” level. Performance Elements must be commensurate with the employee’s official position grade.

462.3.2.2 Review and Approval of Performance Plans

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

An AC is assigned to each operating unit to serve as a liaison between employees and Approving Officials. The AC, when requested, will

- Review, provide input, and approve performance plans for all employees in the operating unit; and
- Review and approve any substantive revision of Performance Elements and Performance Standards during the rating period.

An employee’s performance plan becomes effective the day after the Rating Official, Approving Official, and employee sign the AEF. If an employee declines to sign the AEF, the Rating Official will annotate the box in the field “employee declines to sign” on the AEF with an “x.” If this is the case, the Rating Official will notify the Approving Official that the employee declined to sign. The Rating and Approving Officials will sign the AEF and an AC Representative will also annotate the AEF indicating the representative’s acknowledgement. The performance plan becomes official the day after the Rating and Approving Officials are signatory to the form. The Rating Official must provide the employee with a copy of the performance plan.

462.3.3 Deficient Performance

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

If at any time during the rating cycle an employee is performing at less than the “Fully Successful” level against established Performance Elements and Standards, the Rating Official must provide timely and constructive feedback in writing, outlining the measures the employee must take to improve (see AEF, Section 6).

Managing performance problems. Misconduct is generally a failure to follow a workplace rule (whether written or unwritten). Although it is common for performance and misconduct to be interrelated, it is important to recognize the difference between the two. On issues of misconduct, the Rating Official must seek guidance from the Employee and Labor Relations and Benefits Division (HR/ELB). When the issue is primarily a performance problem, the Rating Official must communicate expectations

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

and performance problems to the employee and must also seek guidance from HR/ELR.

Consistent performance feedback is the best way to prevent performance problems from developing. In most cases, an open line of communication between the Rating Official and employee can resolve or improve performance problems. When the Rating Official determines that there is a performance problem, the Rating Official must conduct a counseling session with the employee. The counseling session will

- Specify in which Performance Elements and/or on which Performance Standards the employee is performing poorly;
- Reiterate the “Fully Successful” level of performance for the Performance Elements(s) and Standard(s); and
- Specify, in writing, how the employee can improve to achieve the “Fully Successful” level of performance.

462.3.4 Progress Reviews Effective Date: 05/01/2019

Rating Officials must conduct at least one progress review with each employee, normally at mid-cycle during an appraisal period, and are encouraged to provide progress reviews to employees on a continuous basis throughout the rating cycle.

For the mid-cycle progress review, employees must provide the Rating Official with 360-degree sources (names of customers, peers, subordinates (if any), and any other person with whom they may have worked during the rating cycle) who can provide the Rating Official with information about their performance. **Contracting/Agreement Officers (COs/AOs) and Contracting Officer's Representatives/Agreement Officer's Representatives (CORs/AORs) must not include implementing partners as 360-degree sources.**

During progress reviews, Rating Officials and employees are to discuss the employee's progress toward achieving Performance Elements and Performance Standards. If an employee is failing to meet a Performance Element, the Rating Official must counsel the employee and document in writing his or her deficient performance.

Rating Officials must document on the AEF in Section 6, “Managing Performance”, an interim summary rating of what the employee’s performance is to date. Narratives for “Minimally Successful” and “Unacceptable” must be indicated in Section 6.

If the employee’s performance is at the “Minimally Successful” level at any time during the rating cycle, the Rating Official outlines the deficiencies in writing in Section 6 of the AEF and counsels the employee. The maximum allowance for improvement to the “Fully Successful” level or higher is 90 calendar days. Depending upon the time left in

the rating period and the severity of the deficient performance, this time may be less than the 90-calendar day period. If performance has not improved to the “Fully Successful” level by the end of the rating cycle, the employee’s next Within Grade Increase may be withheld.

If the employee’s performance is at the “Unacceptable” level at any time during the rating cycle, the Rating Official outlines the deficiencies in writing in Section 6 of the AEF and counsels the employee. However, at this point, the employee must also be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). The maximum allowance for improvement to the “Minimally Successful” level or higher is 90 calendar days.

The Rating Official, Approving Official, and employee must sign the AEF, indicating that a mid-cycle progress review took place. If requested, the AC will be brought into the process and sign the AEF, invoking its final approval authority. However, if the employee’s performance on a critical element is at the “Minimally Successful” or “Unacceptable” level, then it is mandatory that the Rating Official notify the AC. If an employee declines to sign a mid-cycle review, the Rating Official will check the box in Section 1-A. If this is the case, the AC representative will initial. The review then becomes part of the official record.

462.3.5 Gathering Appraisal Information

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

Rating Officials must base employee performance appraisals on multiple sources of information, including the following:

- a. Direct observation of performance and evaluation of representative work products;
- c. Employee’s self-assessment of performance;
- d. Information solicited from individuals who can provide informed views of the employee's performance during the rating cycle (360-degree input sources); and
- d. All AIFs received from Rating Officials;
- e. Comments solicited from at least two subordinates regarding supervisory Performance Elements and Standards and a Diversity Checklist ([AID Form 400-27](#)) from all direct-report subordinates **if rating a supervisor.**

462.3.5.1 Employee Self-Assessments

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

At the end of the appraisal period, employees must provide Rating Officials with a written assessment of their performance during the appraisal period. Employees must

include on the self-assessment a summary of comments received from AIFs completed by all other offices.

462.3.5.2 360-Degree Input Sources
Effective Date: 05/01/2019

a. Employee Submission of Names

At the end of the appraisal period, employees must also provide the Rating Official with the names of customers, peers, subordinates (if any), and any other person with whom they may have worked during the appraisal period who can provide the Rating Official with information about their performance. **Implementing partners are prohibited from providing direct or indirect 360-degree feedback on the performance of COs/AOs and CORs/AORs.** Rating Officials must contact at least three of these sources for performance information. However, Rating Officials can contact more if they desire to do so. **Rating Officials are prohibited from directly or indirectly soliciting feedback from implementing partners on the performance of COs/AOs and CORs/AORs.**

b. Agreeing on 360-Degree Input Sources

Rating Officials and employees are required to agree on at least three individuals whom the Rating Official will contact to gather performance information. Rating Officials are free to contact more than three individuals on the employee's list or other sources deemed appropriate to the Rating Official. AC members may be consulted if requested by the Approving Official or employee.

Rating Officials of supervisors are required to contact no fewer than two of the supervisor's subordinates for information about the supervisor's Leadership, Staff Development, Equal Employment Opportunity skills, and Accountability skills. Rating Officials of supervisors must request all direct-report subordinates to complete the Diversity Checklist ([AID Form 400-27](#)).

c. Soliciting Input from 360-Degree Input Sources

Rating Officials must focus their questions on job-relevant discussions concerning Performance Elements and Performance Standards. It is the Rating Official's responsibility to reconcile any differences of opinion and determine which viewpoint is most reliable.

Rating Officials' notes on feedback from 360-degree input sources are personal working notes. **Rating officials are prohibited from soliciting direct or indirect 360-degree feedback from implementing partners on the performance of COs/AOs and CORs/AORs.** If significant performance problems are identified during the process that will result in an employee receiving a "Minimally Successful" or "Unacceptable", then the Rating Official will need supporting documentation (for example, emails, memoranda to the file).

462.3.6 Final AEF

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

Using the multiple sources of information described in **462.3.5**, the Rating Official must prepare the final AEF, in accordance with instructions on the AEF Form ([AID 462-1](#)) and guidance provided in **462.3**.

462.3.6.1 Professional Development

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

Professional development includes, but is not limited to, activities, training, details, assignments, and projects that, alone or with others, provide learning opportunities for career growth.

462.3.6.2 Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW)

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

The SFW ([AID Form 462-2](#)) is a tool that guides the Rating Official during the employee feedback session. The Rating Official must be mindful of the SFW throughout the rating cycle to provide performance feedback to the employee. The AC reviews the SFW only when requested by the Approving Official or employee. However, it is not part of the official rating of record.

462.3.6.3 Rating of Record

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

Every employee will receive a Rating of Record. A Rating of Record is the performance rating prepared at the end of the appraisal period for performance over the entire period. Ratings of Record include adjectival performance ratings for each Performance Element and Performance Standard and a summary rating.

If a Rating of Record cannot be prepared at the end of the rating cycle, the appraisal period will be extended. A Rating of Record must be prepared when the minimum appraisal period has been met.

No Rating of Record may be assigned for employees solely for affecting an employee's Reduction in Force (RIF) retention standing.

Rating Officials must not assign Ratings of Record according to a predetermined or forced distribution. All Ratings of Record must reflect an employee's actual performance against specific Performance Elements and Performance Standards.

462.3.6.4 Adjectival Ratings for Performance Elements

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

The Rating Official must determine the performance level the employee attained for each established Performance Element and Performance Standard and assign an adjectival rating. An employee's Rating of Record must be consistent with the procedures for deriving summary ratings in **462.3.6.5** below.

The five adjectival ratings follow:

- (1) Outstanding:** Work performance consistently exceeds established Performance Elements and Standards.
- (2) Exceed Fully Successful:** Work performance usually exceeds established Performance Elements and Standards.
- (3) Fully Successful:** Work performance consistently meets established Performance Elements and Standards.
- (4) Minimally Successful:** Work performance meets some, but not all, established Performance Elements and Standards.
- (5) Unacceptable:** Work performance does not meet any established Performance Elements and Standards.

462.3.6.5 Summary Ratings

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

All employees will be assigned a summary rating based on the adjectival ratings of each of the employee's Performance Elements and optional Performance Elements, as follows:

OUTSTANDING (Level 5)

In order to receive an "Outstanding" rating, the mandatory Performance Element #1, (Execution of Duties and Delivery of Assignments) must be "Outstanding", a majority of critical Performance Elements must be rated "Outstanding", and none of the other elements can be lower than "Exceeds Fully Successful." In rating supervisors, in addition to Performance Element #1 being "Outstanding", three (3) of the four (4) supervisor-specific Performance Elements #7-10 must be "Outstanding", with the majority of Performance Elements #2-6 being "Outstanding."

EXCEEDS FULLY SUCCESSFUL (Level 4)

In order to receive an "Exceeds Fully Successful" rating, a majority or preponderance of critical performance elements must be rated, "Exceeds Fully Successful", and none may be below "Fully Successful."

FULLY SUCCESSFUL (Level 3)

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

In order to receive a “Fully Successful” rating, a majority or preponderance of critical performance elements are rated, “Fully Successful”, and none may be below “Minimally Successful.”

MINIMALLY SUCCESSFUL (Level 2)

In order to receive a “Minimally Successful” rating, a majority or preponderance of critical performance elements are rated, “Minimally Successful”, and none may be below that level.

UNACCEPTABLE (Level 1)

Any one critical Performance Element is rated “Unacceptable.”

462.3.7 Employee Feedback Sessions

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

The Rating Official must discuss the draft AEF with the employee. This discussion allows the employee to point out any discrepancies, inconsistencies, or gross omissions on the draft AEF.

The employee has five working days from the date of the discussion of his or her AEF to submit documentation regarding this matter. The Rating Official, absent documented good cause, then has two working days to revise the AEF.

The Rating Official must conduct an end-of-cycle performance review with the employee, at which time the Rating Official discusses the employee's evaluation, areas of improvement, and professional development needs and goals. Professional development discussions may result in proposed formal training, on-the-job training, stretch assignments, or detail(s) to another office(s).

The Rating Official must use the Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW) ([AID Form 462-2](#)) as a feedback tool and provide the employee with a copy. This document is not submitted to HR, but remains with the employee and the Rating Official.

Employees must be given the opportunity to express any concerns with the evaluation and are strongly encouraged to prepare an Employee Statement ([AID Form 462-3](#)).

Employees have a period of five working days to review the approved AEF and prepare an Employee Statement, if desired.

462.3.8 Appraisal Committee (AC) Review of the Evaluation

Effective Date: 05/01/2019

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

Appraisal Committees (ACs) are responsible for reviewing and discussing each employee's AEF and SFW with the responsible Approving Official or employee, if requested, at any point in the rating cycle.

When reviewing an employee's evaluation, ACs will review self-assessments, contact anyone (including the Rating Official or employee and selected 360-degree input sources), and review documents relied on by the Approving Official, in order to make appropriate recommendations and decisions. **The AC must review 360-degree input sources and recommend removing any direct or indirect input from an implementing partner on the performance of COs/AOs and CORs/AORs.** The Rating Official is mandated to make the requested changes, including adjectival and/or summary ratings, as the AC has final approval authority.

ACs are responsible for ensuring that AEFs are balanced, fair, and accurate.

AC members who reviewed final AEFs will have their names typed at the bottom of Section 1-B of the AEF. The AC Representative must sign the final AEF.

462.3.9 Principal Officer's Role

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

The Principal Officer is responsible for managing the operating unit's performance evaluation program by adhering to Agency policies, procedures, and schedules. The Principal Officer also disseminates information on the EEP to Rating Officials and employees in the operating unit.

Principal Officers establish operating unit AC membership, standard procedures, and internal deadlines and designate Rating Officials (supervisor).

462.3.10 Submission of Annual Evaluation Forms

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

The Administrative Management Staff (AMS) or another employee designated by the Principal Officer must forward **all** approved AEFs to HCTM/CPE, for retention in the employee's Performance Evaluation File (PEF) and distribution, as appropriate. The Principal Officer of an operating unit is responsible for ensuring that **all** AEFs are submitted to HCTM/CPE.

All AEFs submitted after the prescribed due dates must include a statement explaining the reason(s) for the lateness. HCTM/CPE will review these statements to determine whether the delays have been adequately explained. If it is determined that the delay was not justified, HCTM/CPE will refer the matter to the Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO), who will decide whether action should be taken. The CHCO may decide to issue a critical letter. If warranted, this letter will serve to deny or reduce any award or performance bonus for the year in which the AEFs were due.

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

462.3.11 Training

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

All Agency employees will be offered training and information about the EEP. Information will include a guidebook (see [Employee Evaluation Program Guidebook Part 2, Civil Service](#)) describing the operation of the program and the roles and responsibilities of employees, Rating Officials, Approving Officials, and ACs. In addition to this and Agency-sponsored supervisory and managerial courses and other learning activities, operating units may request special briefings or training sessions on the program.

462.4 MANDATORY REFERENCES**462.4.1 External Mandatory References**

Effective Date: 01/01/2005

- a. [5 CFR 430, Subpart B](#)
- b. [5 U.S.C. 43](#)

462.4.2 Internal Mandatory References

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

- a. [ADS 462maa, Employee Evaluation Program Guidebook Part 2, Civil Service](#)

462.4.3 Mandatory Forms

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

- a. [AID Form 462-1, Annual Evaluation Form](#)
- b. [AID Form 462-2, Skills Feedback Worksheet](#)
- c. [AID Form 462-3, Employee Statement](#)
- d. [AID Form 462-4, Appraisal Input Form \(Non-supervisory staff\)](#)
- e. [AID Form 462-5, Appraisal Input Form \(Supervisory staff\)](#)
- f. [AID Form 400-27, Diversity Checklist](#)

462.5 ADDITIONAL HELP

Effective Date: 03/21/2008

There are no Additional Help documents for this chapter.

**Text highlighted in yellow indicates that the adjacent material is new or substantively revised.*

462.6**DEFINITIONS**

Effective Date: 05/01/2019

See the [ADS Glossary](#) for all ADS terms and definitions.

360 degree sources

Customers, peers, other managers, subordinates, and other individuals with whom or for whom an employee may have worked who can provide feedback, from their various perspectives, about the employee's performance during any period of performance currently being evaluated. Implementing partners are prohibited from providing direct or indirect 360-degree feedback on the performance of Contracting/Agreement Officers (COs/AOs) and Contracting Officer's Representatives/Agreement Officer's Representatives (CORs/AORs.) (**Chapters [421](#), [461](#), 462**)

Annual Evaluation Form (AEF)

The form used to evaluate employees under the Employee Evaluation Program (EEP). (Chapters [415](#), 462, [463](#))

annual rating cycle

A one-year evaluation period, which is January 1 – December 31. (Chapter 462)

appraisal committee

A committee that reviews and provides management input into employee Performance Elements and Performance Standards (if requested), reviews mid-point performance (if required or requested), and reviews end-of-year AEFs (mandatory if requested, or required if "Needs Improvement" or "Unacceptable"). (Chapter 462)

appraisal committee representative

A member of the Appraisal Committee, who acts as liaison to the Appraisal Committee for a specific employee and his or her Rating Official. (Chapter 462)

Appraisal Input Form (AIF)

An evaluation form covering a period of performance of at least 30 days that is long enough to require written documentation of performance against an established performance plan. (Chapter 462)

approving official

The Deputy Director or equivalent or whomever the Principal Officer delegates (as long they are a higher level than the Rating Official serving in a supervisory-designated capacity). (Chapter 462)

diversity checklist

A form of 360-degree feedback used only for supervisors to evaluate their efforts to promote diversity and comply with relevant agency EEO policy and merit principles. (Chapter 462)

employee statement

An optional statement that accompanies the AEF allowing an employee to comment on his or her performance for the current rating cycle. (Chapter 462)

feedback

Communication to employees regarding the extent to which their performance meets, does not meet, or exceeds expectations; the adequacy of their relevant skills, and their progress toward career development goals. (Chapter 462)

Implementing Partner

An organization or individual with which/whom the Agency collaborates to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives and to secure participation of ultimate customers. Partners include host-country governments, private voluntary organizations, indigenous and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities, other U.S. Government Agencies, Departments, the United Nations and other multilateral organizations, professional and business associations, and private businesses and individuals. (Chapters [421](#), [425](#), [461](#), [462](#))

mid-cycle review

A mandatory progress review to be held by the Rating Official and employee at or near the mid-point in the appraisal period. (Chapters [461](#), 462)

minimum appraisal period

The minimum performance period of 90 days that must be completed before a performance rating can be given. (Chapter 462)

minimally successful performance

Work performance meets some, but not all, established Performance Elements and Performance Standards. (Chapter 462)

non-critical element

A performance element that, while sufficiently important to be documented on the Annual Evaluation Form (AEF), would not result in an “Unacceptable” summary rating for the annual rating cycle if performance on this element were unacceptable. (Chapter 462)

opportunity period (performance improvement period)

The period during which an employee is given a reasonable time to demonstrate acceptable performance, where the performance had been determined to be unacceptable. (Chapter 462)

performance elements

Work responsibility for an employee established by management for a particular rating period. (Chapter 462)

performance standard

Criteria (qualitative and quantitative) that measure an employee's achievement of a given performance element. (Chapter 462)

performance plan

The completed Annual Evaluation Form at the beginning of the performance cycle, which consists of Performance Elements and Performance Standards. (Chapter 462)

principal officer

The most senior officer in a USAID operating unit, who establishes the Appraisal Committees for that operating unit, for example, Assistant Administrator, Independent USAID/W Office Director, Mission Director, or USAID Representative. (Chapter 462)

progress review

Progress reviews may be held periodically throughout the rating cycle, during which the Rating Official provides feedback to the employee about performance or progress toward career development goals. Also see mid-cycle review. (Chapters [461](#), 462)

rating official

The employee's immediate supervisor or team leader, as designated by the Principal Officer. (Chapters [461](#), 462)

rating of record

The performance rating prepared at the end of an appraisal period for performance of Agency-assigned duties over the entire period and the assignment of a summary level within a pattern (as specified in 5 CFR § 430.208 (d)). (Chapter 462)

self-assessment

A narrative written by the employee commenting on the performance of each Performance Element and Performance Standard, or any other performance. (Chapter 462)

Skills Feedback Worksheet

A feedback tool that the Rating and Approving Officials use during the employee feedback session during mid-year and final rating reviews to assess skill and proficiency level for employees under their purview. (Chapter 462)

supervisor

Employees who have “supervisory” in their title as specified in his or her position description and occupy at least 25% of supervisory time. (Chapter 462)

team leader

Designated by supervisor to assure the work of his or her team is carried out by performing a range of coordinating and supportive duties and responsibilities. (Chapter 462)

unacceptable performance

Performance that fails to significantly meet the Performance Standard established for a Performance Element or optional Performance Element. (Chapter 462)

462_050119