



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

ADS 425

Senior Level and Scientific
Technical Professional Positions
Performance Management System

Partial Revision Date: 05/02/2019
Responsible Office: HCTM/CPE
File Name: 425_050219

Functional Series 400 – Human Resources
ADS 425 – Senior Level and Scientific Technical Professional Positions
Performance Management System
POC for ADS 425: Karen Baquedano, (202) 712-0695, kbaquedano@usaid.gov

Table of Contents

<u>425.1</u>	<u>OVERVIEW</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>425.2</u>	<u>PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>425.3</u>	<u>POLICY DIRECTIVES AND REQUIRED PROCEDURES</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>425.3.1</u>	<u>Performance Appraisal Period</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>425.3.2</u>	<u>SL/ST Performance Work Plans</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>425.3.3</u>	<u>Performance Appraisal (AID Form 425-1)</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>425.3.4</u>	<u>Progress Reviews</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>425.3.5</u>	<u>Appraisal of Performance</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>425.3.6</u>	<u>Performance Review Board Review and Approval of Ratings</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>425.3.</u>	<u>Final Approval of Annual Summary Rating</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>425.3.8</u>	<u>Performance-Based Pay and Awards</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>425.3.9</u>	<u>Records Management.....</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>425.3.10</u>	<u>System Evaluation</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>425.4</u>	<u>MANDATORY REFERENCES</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>425.4.1</u>	<u>External Mandatory References</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>425.4.2</u>	<u>Internal Mandatory References</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>425.4.3</u>	<u>Mandatory Forms.....</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>425.4.4</u>	<u>Optional Forms</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>425.5</u>	<u>ADDITIONAL HELP</u>	<u>18</u>

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

425.6 **DEFINITIONS**..... **18**

ADS 425 – Senior Level and Scientific Technical Professional Positions Performance Management System

425.1 OVERVIEW

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

This new ADS chapter establishes the mandatory policy directives and required procedures for USAID's performance management system for Senior Level and Scientific Technical Professional (SL/ST) positions. The policy directives and required procedures for USAID's Senior Executive Service (SES) members are described in [ADS 421, Senior Executive Service Performance Management System](#).

This performance management system is designed to ensure the accountability of both individual professionals and organizations, and to ensure the improvement of overall Agency strategic goals and objectives by:

- a. Promoting excellence in SL/ST professional performance;
- b. Holding executives accountable for business results, by linking individual professional performance to results-oriented goals, as established through the Agency's strategic planning initiatives and the [Government Performance and Results Act \(GPRA\) of 1993](#);
- c. Establishing and communicating the expected performance goals, regarding both the individual and the organization;
- d. A mandatory critical element, which holds executives accountable for (1) aligning subordinate performance plans with organizational goals and (2) rigorously completing performance plans and appraisals of subordinates by the due dates set by the Office of Human Capital and Talent Management (HCTM);
- e. Appraising professional performance, using measures that balance organizational results with customer, employee, or other perspectives; and
- f. Using performance results as the primary basis for determining SL/ST:
 - Pay,
 - Awards,
 - Development,
 - Retention, removal, and
 - Other employment decisions.

425.2 PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

a. The **Administrator** (or designee) serves as the appointing authority for the SL/ST performance system. In this role, the Administrator approves:

1. Annual summary ratings, bonuses, and pay adjustments, based on each individual professional's performance; and
2. The recommendations of the Performance Review Board (PRB) (see **425.2d**).

b. The **Office of Human Capital and Talent Management, Civil Service Personnel Division, Executive Resources Staff (HCTM/CSP)** is responsible for:

1. Administering the SL/ST performance management system;
2. Developing and updating the SL/ST performance management policy directives;
3. Providing guidance to professionals and supervisors on the appraisal processes, laws, regulations, policy directives, and required procedures;
4. Providing formal training and guidance on the proper preparation and completion of SL/ST performance work plans;
5. Coordinating and disseminating information on organizational performance and results that are derived from the Performance and Accountability Report (PAR), Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), and other indicators that Rating Officials use to prepare their end-of-year initial summary ratings; and
6. Assessing the effectiveness of the SL/ST program through:
 - An ongoing evaluation of technical compliance with laws;
 - OPM performance management regulations; and
 - USAID policy directives.

This evaluation focuses on the adequacy of performance work plans and rating, as related to the Agency accomplishments, which are reflected in the USAID Human Capital Strategic Plan.

c. **Rating Officials** are immediate supervisors who are responsible for:

1. Establishing performance work plans and standards, in consultation with the individual professional, that aligns the individual's performance with the

organization's goals. These performance work plans and standards include measures for making meaningful distinctions, based on relative performance;

2. Monitoring and communicating progress to the individual professional, throughout the appraisal period, and modifying performance elements, requirements and standards, when necessary;
 3. Proposing appropriate actions for professionals whose performance is less than fully successful; and
 4. Reviewing the individual professional's self-assessment, work products, and gathering any additional performance information from relevant sources such as **AID 400-27, Diversity Checklist** – supervisors only. [Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.]
- d. The **Performance Review Board (PRB)** is responsible for:
1. Ensuring that the individual professional ratings' are consistent with the Agency's performance and results;
 2. Approving all SL/ST performance work plans, at the beginning of the appraisal period, to ensure that they are clear, results-oriented, and equitable. Additionally, the PRB must establish the coordination of both organizational goals and the anticipated individual professional results and achievements;
 3. Ensuring that only those professionals whose performance merits a "fully successful" or higher rating receive ratings that reflect meaningful distinctions based on their relative performance;
 4. Providing support and oversight to supervisors, when dealing with professionals who are problematic; and
 5. Providing a unified set of written recommendations to the Administrator on all rated professionals; concerning their initial and annual summary ratings, bonuses, pay adjustments and nominations for Presidential Rank Awards.

425.3 POLICY DIRECTIVES AND REQUIRED PROCEDURES

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

This section details the mandatory policies and required procedures for USAID's Senior Level and Scientific Technical Professional Positions Performance Management System.

425.3.1 Performance Appraisal Period

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

- a.** The annual performance appraisal period for professionals begins on October 1 and ends on September 30 of the following year.
- b.** The minimum performance period for which an individual professional may receive a valid appraisal is 90 days (see [5 CFR 430.304](#)).
- c.** If, as of September 30, an individual professional has not been under an established SL/ST performance work plan for the minimum 90 calendar-day appraisal-period, then USAID will extend the period for a necessary amount of time in order to meet the minimum appraisal period. At that time, the individual professional's supervisor will prepare an initial summary rating.
- d.** The supervisor must establish a SL/ST performance work plan any time an individual professional is assigned to a supervisor for at least a 90-calendar day appraisal period, (for example, details or task forces).
- e.** The appraisal period may end any time after the minimum appraisal period is completed; if there is an adequate basis on which to appraise and rate the senior individual professional's performance (for example, the professional's supervisor retires on September 10) (see [5 CFR 430, Subpart B](#)).

425.3.2 SL/ST Performance Work Plans

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

- a.** Supervisors establish SL/ST performance work plans at the beginning of the appraisal period, in consultation with the individual professional. This is completed within 30 calendar days, at the start of the appraisal period, or after the individual professional enters into a particular SL/ST position.
- b.** Each SL/ST performance work plan will:
 - (1)** Establish responsibility for the achievement of individual and organizational goals and objectives assigned to the executive, consistent with the Agency's strategic goals and objectives;
 - (2)** Consist of duties and responsibilities described in the executive's position description and for which USAID holds the executive accountable for the rigorous performance appraisal of subordinates;

- (3) Consist of duties and responsibilities that are critical to the implementation of recruitment and selection decisions, in accordance with the Agency's Merit Staffing Policy/hiring plans.
- (4) Contain performance elements and standards that are critical to achieving successful performance; and
- (5) Be established in concert and alignment with subordinate performance work plans, so that the organizational goals for which the executive is responsible can be translated into specific, measurable results that their subordinates can accomplish (supervisory positions only).

c. The individual professional's performance work plan incorporates the following items:

- (1) Each performance element must be specific and not describe general tasks, activities, duties, or responsibilities of an ongoing job. Performance elements must describe observable, measurable, and achievable results. The individual professional's performance work plan must specify the expected accomplishments, and the results must have specific target dates. Performance elements must incorporate strategic objectives, goals, program plans, or other similar means. By using these performance elements, the individual professional's performance work plan shows the process in which business results can be accomplished over the upcoming year. If the individual professional's performance work plan timeframe is longer than one year, then the supervisor should identify interim milestones.
- (2) Each performance element is weighted equally, with at least 60 percent of the performance standards identifying the correlation with the Agency's strategic goal and the Agency's desired results.
- (3) Each individual professional is responsible for the achievement of a minimum of three critical performance elements, and no more than five critical performance elements. These critical performance elements are in addition to the two mandatory performance elements already included on the appraisal form, **AID Form 425-1, Performance Appraisal Plan for the Senior-Level and Scientific Technical Professional.** [Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.]
- (4) At a minimum, supervisors must write performance standards at the "Fully Successful" level (Level 3). The standards must be objective, measurably achievable, specific, and must describe expected results. Measures may relate to quantity, quality, cost effectiveness and timeliness.

d. Supervisors prepare the performance appraisal plan, with goals and standards on **AID Form 425-1, SL/ST Performance Appraisal [Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.]**. Both the Rating Official and the individual professional sign and date the SL/ST performance work plan. Once the SL/ST performance work plan is completed, supervisors must maintain a copy of it. This copy certifies that the performance elements and standards are applicable to the individual's position, and that the identified criteria are the basis of any rating for the upcoming appraisal period.

Once certification is complete, the Rating Official sends the SL/ST performance work plan to HCTM/CSP, for submission to the PRB for their approval.

NOTE: If the supervisor and individual professional cannot reach an agreement on the performance goals and/or standards for the SL/ST performance work plan, the Rating Official will decide what is expected of the individual professional, and inform the individual professional of their expectations. If the individual professional declines to sign the SL/ST performance work plan, then the Rating Official should note his or her refusal on the SL/ST performance work plan. This then becomes the final SL/ST performance work plan for the appraisal year; with the elements and standards by which any initial rating will be derived for the cycle.

425.3.3 Performance Appraisal (AID Form 425-1)

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

Rating Officials must use **AID Form 425-1 [Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.]** at the end of the appraisal period to evaluate the performance of all SL/ST employees. The Rating Official prepares the initial rating and the PRB reviews and recommends a rating to the Administrator for final approval.

When completing the performance appraisal, the Rating Official may use a separate page to provide a narrative for each performance standard. Complete the forms in 10 point Arial font only.

425.3.4 Progress Reviews

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

a. The Rating Official must conduct at least one formal progress review with the individual professional during the annual appraisal period. At the review, the official will apprise the individual professional of his or her performance against the established performance elements and standards. The Rating Official must sign the progress form acknowledging that the review was conducted. The individual professional should also sign. If the individual professional declines to sign, then the Rating Official will initial and check the box on page 1. USAID strongly encourages frequent informal communication between Rating Officials and professionals, concerning the professional's progress in meeting established goals and objectives. Rating Officials

should also provide advice and assistance on performance improvement, when necessary.

b. During the progress review(s), the Rating Official should communicate to the individual professional any changes to the performance work plan, if warranted. The supervisor must document, in writing on the appraisal form, any such revisions.

c. If an individual professional's performance in one or more critical elements falls below "Fully Successful" (whether or not a formal appraisal has been given), the Rating Official must provide written documentation outlining the measures that the employee must take to correct performance deficiencies and must counsel him or her on performance improvement methods in order to bring their performance up to an acceptable level. In addition, the Rating Official should also prepare an Individual Development Plan (IDP) identifying on-the-job and formal training, to address any performance deficiencies. The Rating Official provides a copy of this documentation to the individual professional and to the PRB.

d. Rating Officials may use **AID Form 421-2, The Individual Development Plan (SL/ST)** [Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.] to identify short and long-term developmental goals.

425.3.5 **Appraisal of Performance**
Effective Date: 05/02/2019

a. Appraisal Process and Written Summary Rating

If an individual professional has served in his or her current position under a written performance work plan for the established minimum 90-day appraisal period at the point in which the performance appraisal cycle ends and there is an adequate basis on which to rate the individual professional, the individual professional must be rated.

The Rating Official must obtain a written self-assessment of accomplishments from the individual professional regarding actual performance within 30 days after the appraisal period has ended. The Rating Official must also provide written comments to support and document the summary rating and consider any related appraisals, in regards to a detail or transfer, when preparing the summary rating after the rating period has ended.

The Rating Official must rate the individual professional's performance on success in meeting each performance element; unless there has been an insufficient opportunity to demonstrate a specific performance in a certain element. In doing so, the Rating Official must use a balanced approach that correlates organizational results with distinctive groups' perspectives, including customers and employees. The Rating Official must also state how the Executive accomplished organizational goals over the rating period timeframe. The individual professional's performance is appraised by the Rating Official by assigning his or her performance against each performance element,

according to one of the five summary rating levels, in order to determine the overall performance.

The Rating Official must

- (1) Prepare an initial summary rating, which incorporates accomplishments that were observed and verified throughout the performance year, and appropriately consider “self-assessment” accomplishments.
- (2) Document job assignments, details, or transfer assignment performances in the initial summary rating.
- (3) Rate the individual professional’s success in meeting overall strategic goals and objectives in each performance element and each performance standard.
- (4) Request and collect “balance measures” feedback from customers, peers, and colleagues in regards to the individual professional. **Rating Officials are prohibited from directly or indirectly soliciting feedback from implementing partners on the performance of Contracting/Agreement Officers (COs/AOs) and Contracting Officer’s Representatives/Agreement Officer’s Representatives (CORs/AORs).**

Annual Assessment of Agency Performance

Periodically, the SL/ST Program Coordinator will train Rating Officials and professionals on performance management, including pay-for-performance criteria. When changes in the operations of the program occur, such as OPM regulatory requirements or Agency assessments; HCTM/CSP will communicate these changes and provide the necessary workshops, briefings, and notice issuance training. At the end-of-year appraisal cycle, HCTM/CSP will provide guidance on appraisal preparation in regards to the individual professional. The Coordinator will instruct Rating Officials and the PRB to take various indicators of organizational performance into account; in appraising and reviewing the professional’s performance. In addition, Rating Officials and the PRB will provide information on the following indicators:

- (1) Results of each B/IO in accomplishing organizational goals;
- (2) Annual assessments of each organization’s performance;
- (3) The Performance and Accountability Report (PAR);
- (4) Reports of the Agency’s Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA);

- (5) Results from the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) conducted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB);
- (6) Joint Summary of Performance and Financial Information;
- (7) Annual performance plans and target dates; and
- (8) Program performance measures, and any other relevant indicators.

b. Appraisals for Position Changes and Details

If an individual professional changes positions or transfers to another Agency after completing the minimum appraisal period; the losing supervisor must prepare an initial summary rating using form AID 425-1 [**Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.**] to document his or her performance. The individual professional's gaining supervisor must consider the appraisal, when developing the initial summary rating, after the appraisal period has ended.

If an individual professional is detailed or temporarily reassigned for an expected 90-day or longer period, then the gaining supervisor must provide the individual professional with written performance elements and standards within 30 days, after the start of the detail or temporary reassignment. During this timeframe, the gaining supervisor must document the individual professional's performance and must also write an appraisal at the end of the assignment. The Rating Official factors this appraisal into the initial summary rating that he or she prepares after the rating period has ended. If the detail is to an Agency or organization outside USAID, then the Rating Official must make a reasonable effort to obtain the performance information that the official will need to complete the initial summary rating.

c. Benchmark Descriptions in Rating Individual Performance Elements

Rating Officials must consider the following Benchmark Descriptions when assigning ratings to each individual performance elements and standards:

- (1) **Outstanding (Level V)** – At this level, the professional has demonstrated the highest degree of achievement in his or her field of work. The executive's achievements have advanced the Agency's Mission, strategic, and/or performance goals; and have significantly contributed to the improvements of both programs and cost savings. The executive demonstrated an exceptional degree of leadership, in collaboration and business relationships, which supported the resolution of the most complex organizational issues, and the executive has also developed and executed innovative solutions in order to accomplish organizational goals, consistently ahead of established targets.

The result of his or her leadership and accomplishments has far exceeded:

- The goals, programs, and functions of the individual professional's own B/IO;
- Has made a significant impact or has supported results in the goals or operations of other B/IOs;
- And might have a long-range, constructive impact on advancing both program goals and objectives.

The Senior Executive's work was conducted in the context of a constantly changing or an unstable work environment that created new demands and requirements.

(2) Exceeds Fully Successful (Level IV) – This level demonstrates a number of exceptional achievements that exceeded stated goals and objectives, and were performed within established timeframes. The professional's leadership reflects initiative and effective management of additional organizational responsibilities, beyond those expected at the start of the appraisal cycle. Work has been conducted in the context of a predictable and somewhat stable work environment.

(3) Fully Successful (Level III) – This level demonstrates that the individual performance is such that:

- Expectations were generally met;
- Goals were generally achieved;
- The desired results were fully successful;
- The results and accomplishments represented a performance that can reasonably be expected of the executive, in order to fully and adequately achieve assigned responsibilities; and
- The work environment is consistent and generally stable or similar to the previous year.

d. Summary Rating Levels

The SL/ST Performance Management System consists of five summary rating levels, which the Rating Official uses to assign the level of the individual professionals' performance. The levels are as follows:

- (1) **Outstanding** is identified as performance that consistently and significantly exceeds results-oriented expectations. The individual professional's achievements have advanced the Agency's Mission, strategic objectives, and goals, which contributed to cost savings and program improvements. To receive an overall rating of "Outstanding," the individual professional must not receive a rating below the "Exceeds Fully Successful" level in any results-oriented element.
- (2) **Exceeds Fully Successful** is identified as performance that consistently meets or exceeds expectations on all results-oriented performance elements, with the majority rated "Exceeds Fully Successful." The individual professional's performance demonstrated an exceptional level that achieved the Agency's strategic objectives and goals. To receive an overall rating of "Exceeds Fully Successful," the individual professional must not receive a rating below the "Fully Successful" level in any results-oriented element.
- (3) **Fully Successful** is identified as performance that meets expectations on all results-oriented performance elements. The individual professional's performance demonstrated a reasonable understanding of expectations and generally met strategic objectives and goals, within a reasonable timeframe.
- (4) **Minimally Successful** is identified as performance that is marginally acceptable in meeting expectations in one or more results-oriented performance elements.
- (5) **Unsatisfactory** is identified as performance that does not meet expectations in one or more results-oriented performance elements.

e. **Appraisal Review Process**

The individual professional reviews the appraisal and has 10 workdays to provide a narrative statement regarding the performance evaluation. If the professional is satisfied with the appraisal and does not request a higher-level review, then the supervisor sends the performance plan to HCTM/CSP, which then forwards it to the PRB for its review.

An individual professional who disagrees with the initial summary rating may request a higher-level review, as follows, in writing within 10 workdays of receiving the initial summary rating. The individual professional submits the request to the Chief, Civil Service Personnel Division (HCTM/CSP). The reviewing official will review the request, prepare a separate written statement on the findings, and make recommendations to the PRB within 10 business days. HCTM/CSP will provide copies to both the individual professional and the Rating Official.

425.3.6 Performance Review Board Review and Approval of Ratings

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

a. Composition of Performance Review Board (PRB)

The PRB consists of a minimum of three members, recommended by HCTM/CSP. The Administrator or his designee also gives their final approval of the selection of PRB members. The majority of PRB members must be career members of the SES. USAID must appoint at least one career member of the SES from another Federal agency. These members are appointed to ensure consistency, stability, and objectivity in recommending SL/ST ratings, bonuses, and base pay adjustments. The annual Agency PRB will function for both the SES and SL/ST.

The names of PRB members must be published in the Federal Register, as required by regulation.

b. PRB Review of Ratings of Records

The PRB reviews and evaluates the initial summary rating, the individual professional's written response, and the written recommendations that are prepared by the reviewing official.

In reviewing each individual professional's performance, the PRB takes into account organizational performance. The basis for Agency organizational performance is through annual assessments of the Agency's performance, with respect to each B/IO, and the Agency's strategic objectives and goals.

The PRB must make a written recommendation to the Administrator concerning each individual professional's initial summary rating, ensuring that only those professionals whose job performance exceeds normal expectations are rated at levels above "Fully Successful." If the PRB recommendations differ from the recommendation of the Rating Official, then the PRB must document, in writing, its rationale for the recommended change.

The PRB must base its recommendations on the extent to which the professional met organizational goals, with consideration to fellow employees' comments and customer perspectives.

The PRB submits its recommendations through HCTM to the Administrator for a final decision.

NOTE: PRB members must not take part in any PRB deliberations involving their own appraisals, bonuses, or pay adjustments, or those of their immediate supervisor.

425.3.7 Final Approval of Annual Summary Rating

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

The Administrator reviews the summary rating to ensure that the process results in multiple, meaningful distinctions between base pay adjustments, performance awards, and performance ratings. Once final approval is complete, the Administrator provides the final ratings to HCTM/CSP. HCTM/CSP then provides the individual professional with a copy of the final results.

The PRB's annual summary ratings are not appealable or grievable. However, the individual professional may appeal to the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) about allegations of prohibited personnel practices, related to the appraisal process under [5 USC 2302](#).

The Agency may not prescribe a forced or pre-established distribution of ratings.

425.3.8 Performance-Based Pay and Awards

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

[The Senior Professional Performance Act of 2008](#) established a new pay system for SL/ST professional employees, which is comparable to the SES pay system. [Public Law 110-372](#) significantly changed how to financially compensate professionals and establish levels of pay which must be reflective of the responsibilities of the position, qualifications, performance and contributions of the professionals.

The SL/ST Program Coordinator will issue guidelines at the beginning of the performance year, based on base salary adjustments and bonus percentages, as part of the training of the PRB chair and members. In addition, the SL/ST Program Coordinator will present compensation directions to all Rating Officials, so that they understand how to evaluate and issue recommendations on base salary adjustments and bonuses.

425.3.9 Records Management

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

The Performance Appraisal includes a summary Rating of Record that is approved by the Administrator and must be filed in a separate Employee Performance Folder (EPF) that HCTM/CSP maintains for each individual professional for a minimum of five years. HCTM/CSP must also retain justifications and documentation of awards other than those based on the Performance and Accountability Report (PAR).

After the individual professional transfers to another Federal agency, HCTM/CSP will then forward all appropriate, performance-related documents less than five-years old to the gaining agency.

425.3.10 System Evaluation

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

In accordance with [5 CFR 430.311\(b\)](#), “Agencies must periodically evaluate the effectiveness of their performance management system, and implement improvements, as needed.” At USAID, the Executive Resources Board (ERB) or Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO) may serve in this capacity, evaluating the SL/ST performance management system on an annual basis and reporting findings and recommendations to the Administrator. This evaluation is performed after the PRB’s annual review of final ratings and recommendations for bonuses, base pay adjustments, and Presidential rank award nominations conducted at the end of year appraisal cycle.

425.4 MANDATORY REFERENCES**425.4.1 External Mandatory References**

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

- a. [5 CFR Part 319, Employment in Senior Level and Scientific Professional Positions](#)
- b. [5 CFR Part 430, Performance Management](#)
- c. [5 CFR Part 451, Awards](#)
- d. [5 CFR Part 534.501, Pay under Other Systems](#)
- e. [5 USC 2302, Prohibited Personnel Practices](#)
- f. [5 USC 3104, Employment of Specially Qualified Scientific and Professional Personnel](#)
- g. [5 USC 4312, Senior Executive Service Performance Appraisal Systems](#)
- h. [Government Performance and Results Act \(GPRA\) of 1993](#)
- i. [The Senior Professional Performance Act of 2008](#)

425.4.2 Internal Mandatory References

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

- a. [ADS 421, Senior Executive Service Performance Management System](#)

425.4.3 Mandatory Forms

Effective Date: 08/10/2012

- a. [AID 425-1, Senior Level and Scientific Technical Professional Performance Appraisal Report \[Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.\]](#)

- b. **AID 400-27, Diversity Checklist** [Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.]

425.4.4 Optional Forms
Effective Date: 08/10/2012

- a. **AID 421-2, Individual Development Plan (SL/ST)** [Note: This form is available on the USAID intranet.]

425.5 ADDITIONAL HELP
Effective Date: 08/10/2012

There are no Additional Help documents for this chapter.

425.6 DEFINITIONS
Effective Date: 05/02/2019

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

annual summary rating

The overall rating level that an appointing authority (the Administrator) assigns at the end of the appraisal period after considering the Performance Review Board's (PRB's) recommendations. This is the official rating of record. (Chapter 425)

Appointing Authority

The Agency Head or other official delegated authority to make appointments of Professionals in SL/ST. This official assigns the official rating and approves bonuses and pay adjustments. (Chapters 425, [421](#))

appraisal period

The period of time for which a Senior Executive's performance will be appraised and rated. This period must be a minimum of 90 days. (**Chapter 421, 425**)

balanced measures

An approach to performance measurement that balances organizational results with the perspectives of distinct groups, including customers and employees. (Chapter 425)

Diversity Checklist

A form of 360-degree feedback used only for supervisors to evaluate their efforts to promote diversity and comply with relevant agency Office of Civil Rights and Diversity (OCR&D) policy and merit principles. (Chapter 425)

element

A key component of a Senior Professional's work that contributes to the achievement of organizational goals and results and is so important that unsatisfactory performance of

the element would make the professional's overall job performance unsatisfactory. (Chapter 425)

employee statement

An optional statement that accompanies the Performance Appraisal Plan allowing an employee to comment on his or her performance for the current rating cycle. (Chapter 425)

Higher-Level Reviewer

A supervising official at a higher level who was not involved in the initial rating process – normally the second-level supervisor (Chapter 425)

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, the United Nations and other multilateral organizations, professional and business associations, and private businesses and individuals. (Chapters [421](#), [425](#), [461](#), [462](#))

Individual Development Plan

A formal document that specifically identifies short and long-term learning and developmental goals. (Chapter 425)

initial summary rating

An overall summary rating level the Rating Official derives from appraising the Senior Level Professional's performance during the appraisal period and forwards to the Performance Review Board. (Chapter 425)

minimum appraisal period

The minimum performance period that must be completed before a performance rating can be given. (Chapter [425](#), [461](#))

performance

The accomplishment of assigned work described in the Senior Executive's performance plan. (Chapter [421](#), [425](#))

performance appraisal

The review and evaluation of a Senior Level Professional's performance against performance elements and standards established at the beginning of the appraisal period. (Chapter 425)

performance management system

A framework of policies/procedures established for the planning, monitoring, developing, evaluating, and rewarding of individual and organizational performance. Under the system, personnel information is used as a basis for making other employment decisions. (Chapter 425)

performance plan

The written summary of work the Senior Executive is expected to accomplish during the appraisal period and the standards against which performance will be evaluated. The plan addresses all elements established for the Senior Executive. (**Chapter 421, 425**)

Performance Review Board (PRB)

A group of executives appointed by the Administrator that provides recommendations regarding Senior Executive Service performance appraisals, bonuses, pay adjustments, and rank award nominations. (**Chapter 421, 423, 425**)

performance standard

A statement containing the level of performance expected for an element. (**Chapter 421, 425**)

progress review

A review of the Senior Professional's progress in meeting established performance elements and standards. A progress review normally occurs midway through the appraisal period. (Chapter 425)

strategic planning initiatives

Agency strategic plans, annual performance plans, organizational work plans, and other related initiatives. (Chapter 425)

summary performance levels

USAID's Senior Executive Service performance management system has five summary performance levels: Outstanding, Exceeds Fully Successful, Fully Successful, Minimally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. (**Chapter 421, 425**)

summary rating

The overall rating assigned to a Senior Executive's job performance through the systematic assessment of individual element ratings. (**Chapter 421, 425**)

425_102320