



UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
5000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-5000

MAY 27 2011

INTELLIGENCE

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY
ACTING CHIEF OF STAFF, OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY
OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE

SUBJECT: Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management
Supplemental Guidance and Policy Clarification

As the third annual DCIPS performance evaluation period closes, I am pleased that feedback reflects a better understanding and an improved comfort level regarding DCIPS performance management. Strong performance management processes are essential in supporting a performance culture and ensuring the right people with the right experience are positioned to meet mission requirements.

Our focus remains on commonality and consistency across the Defense Intelligence Enterprise and the fair and equitable application of DCIPS policy. Feedback received from employees, managers and leaders through various means, to include site visits and the DCIPS survey, indicates some confusion continues to exist regarding authority of rating officials, reviewing officials and Performance Management Performance Review Authorities (PM PRAs). The attached supplemental guidance includes policy clarification on these roles and responsibilities in the performance management process; please provide widest dissemination within your component.

I encourage you to be clear on your expectations for consistent adherence to policy and a shared understanding of the process for evaluating employee performance against the DCIPS standards. This guidance, and a wide variety of training courses and communication tools, are available through the DCIPS webpage at <http://dcips.dtic.mil> to help management officials understand and perform their roles in the performance management process. Mr. Timothy Clayton, Director, Human Capital Management Office, at (703) 607-0334, is authorized to provide additional supplemental guidance and policy clarification, as necessary.

Michael G. Vickers

Attachment:
As stated



cc:

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy
Associate Director of National Intelligence, IC Chief Human Capital Officer
Defense Intelligence Human Resources Board Members

Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) Performance Management Supplemental Guidance

This supplemental guidance provides policy clarification to emphasize specific roles and responsibilities in the DCIPS performance management process.

1. Prohibition on Quotas and Forced Distributions. DCIPS prohibits quotas and forced distributions. These prohibitions include “modeling” and “goals” that could be perceived as foretelling the distribution of final evaluations of record. Leadership is encouraged to consistently and firmly share this message across their components. Strong management oversight will serve to avoid violations of these prohibitions.

2. Responsibilities and Authority of the Performance Management Performance Review Authority (PM PRA). The responsibilities and authority of the PM PRA are derived from DoDI 1400.24 Volume 2011, DCIPS Performance Management, and apply universally across the Enterprise. This Volume assigns responsibility to the PM PRA for ensuring oversight and compliance with merit system principles. The PM PRA performs these responsibilities by performing the final review of proposed performance evaluations of record and closeouts. Under DCIPS policy, evaluations of record cannot be finalized until the PM PRA 1) completes their review of the evaluations of record and, 2) informs the reviewing officials that the review is complete and they may proceed in finalizing the evaluations of record. Any evaluations of record finalized before completion of the PM PRA review are invalid and must be submitted to the PM PRA for review in accordance with DCIPS policy.

The PM PRA's review is a valuable tool in supporting DCIPS performance management as a merit-based system. For this reason, the PM PRA must withhold completion of this review if ratings or narratives do not support the proposed evaluation of record or closeout, or if there is concern regarding the merit of the proposed evaluation of record. The PM PRA can, and must, send back proposed evaluations of record where there is a mismatch between the narrative justifications and examples provided and the proposed evaluation of each performance objective or performance element, or any indication that policy was not followed. The PM PRA should initially encourage the rating and reviewing officials to refocus and resolve issues identified but may direct that specific action be taken, if necessary. In the event rating or reviewing officials are unavailable or unwilling to make changes to comply with merit system principles and DCIPS policy, the PM PRA may make the necessary changes to ensure compliance.

3. Responsibilities and Authority of Rating and Reviewing Officials. Rating officials are responsible and shall be held accountable for effectively managing the performance of assigned employees, developing performance plans and providing proposed ratings for the evaluations of record or any closeout, interim or temporary assignment report of performance. Reviewing officials are the approving officials for performance plans and evaluations of record, but they cannot provide the final approval of evaluations of record until the PM PRA review has been

completed and they are advised they may proceed. Each of these roles is essential in support of DCIPS as a merit-based performance management system.

4. Movement to Another DCIPS Component. Under DCIPS policy, an employee's current DCIPS performance evaluation of record (closeout, interim or temporary assignment report of performance) moves with them to a new position in the same or other DCIPS organization. This portability, coupled with the basic tenets of the common DCIPS performance management system, helps support movement and consistency across the Enterprise by ensuring that any employee who has moved during the performance cycle is evaluated properly and receives appropriate consideration through the appropriate pay pool for all performance during the performance evaluation period.

5. Joint Duty Assignments. Employees on Joint Duty assignments are evaluated by a management official in the employee's chain of command in the host organization, both for the final evaluation of record and any interim evaluations. Proposed evaluations of record are reviewed by host organization management officials, in consultation with an official of the parent organization. Once a performance evaluation of record is completed by the host, it is final and cannot be changed outside of a reconsideration decision made by the organization that assigned the evaluation of record under review. The same policy applies to an evaluation of record or closeout completed by the parent organization; it cannot be changed by the host organization. Current policy dictates that Joint Duty employees are included in pay pools at their host organizations for bonus consideration and other lump sum awards for accomplishments and contributions, and at their parent organizations for salary increase awards such as pay-for-performance at the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency or base-pay increase monetary awards at all other components. Adherence to Joint Duty policy guidance continues to be an area of confusion. Intelligence Community (IC) and Departmental Joint Duty policy guidance will be followed until such guidance is superseded.

6. Performance Management and the Transition to DCIPS Grades. As components prepare for transition to the DCIPS graded structure, any impact on the performance management process must be addressed proactively. In general, transition does not impact DCIPS performance management; however, the transition readiness review does include the requirement for components to perform a complete review and determine in advance any changes they will make, including any timelines that may be affected. Performance objectives are written to the appropriate band level/work level with a general standard that applies to all and standards for performance elements are written to each band level/work level; therefore, no changes are required for employees transitioning to a grade encompassed in their current band level/work level. For components using the manual position-based transition process, any changes to the work level will require associated changes to the performance plans of affected employees. Components are reminded that the minimum DCIPS evaluation period is 90 days and there is a requirement that new performance plans be effective no later than 30 days after the beginning of the performance cycle or an action requiring a change. Performance plans must align to the employee's assigned work, at the assigned work level, at all times.

7. Weighting of Performance Objectives and Performance Elements. Effective October 1, 2010, to align with IC policy, all DCIPS components must apply the performance objectives weighted at 60 percent with the performance elements weighted at 40 percent.

8. Component Specific Guidance. Component specific guidance is key to communicating DCIPS performance management. Through such guidance components can provide clarification or additional information to help employees and managers work through the process. In focus groups, many expressed accolades for component specific guidance but also some concerns that not all guidance promulgated by components aligned with DCIPS policy or that such guidance may have unintentionally increased administrative requirements of employees or managers. While components are encouraged to market DCIPS specific to their component, they must ensure continued alignment to policy at all times.