

BAND

TOGETHER

LOCAL 1921

Performance Management System Agreements Update

GAO Employees Organization,
IFPTE, Local 1921

Overview of Today's Update

- Background – GAO's recent efforts to review the Performance Management system
- Current Performance Assessment Study revision activities
- Union's role in the current activities
- Highlights from two Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs)



Recent GAO Efforts Reviewing Performance Management System

- Ivy Study
- Performance Assessment System (PAS) Study



Current GAO Effort

PAS Advisory Committee

- Union pre-decisional involvement
- Representatives from Diversity Advisory Council



PAS Advisory Committee

- Developed Statement of Work
- Designated Evaluation Committee



PAS Evaluation Committee

- Union participated
- Scored 7 proposals
- Participated in selection of oral presentations - OPM
- Participated in final selection



Evaluation Team Selected PDRI as Contractor

- Experience - Design of Pay for Performance and Performance Management (PM) in federal sector
- Experience - Consulted on GAO's existing system
- Presented innovative approach that is critical of current focus of PM systems
- Provided paper "[Why is Performance Management Broken?](#)" (Pre-publication)



Master Contract Negotiations

Identified 3 Phases for Union-Agency Negotiation and Discussion

1. Current 2010 rating cycle (10/09 – 10/10)
2. Interim rating cycle(s) until revised system implemented
3. Revision, implementation, and ongoing evaluation of system



Current 2010 Rating Cycle

- Current system remains in place
- Clarification – employees rated only on Work Activities performed; they do not need to demonstrate all Work Activities for a good rating



Clarification from PAS Study Findings:

PAS Finding: The performance appraisal system does not clearly address how DPMs should appraise performance when employees did not have the opportunity to demonstrate performance across the competencies and work activities.

- 45 percent of DPMs that encountered this situation in the 2008 appraisal cycle gave the employees a “Meets Expectations” rating given the lack of opportunity to perform all of the work activities.
- 21 percent of DPMs that encountered this situation in the 2008 appraisal cycle gave the employee a lower appraisal than he/she might have earned if the individual had engaged in all of the work activities. (PAS study, page 29)



Interim Rating Cycle(s)

- Goal – revise and implement new system for 2012 rating cycle
- Interim cycle(s): pilot features based on employee feedback (Ivy & PAS studies)
- Developed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)



Interim Rating Cycle(s) MOA

- Appropriate consideration of Work Activities
- Emphasis on feedback



Interim Rating Cycle(s) MOA - Pilot Features

- Emphasis on feedback
 - Mid-point feedback written summary
 - Self-assessment narrative options
 - Final written summary narrative



PAS Emphasis on feedback

PAS Finding: We found that employees and managers prefer their ratings to include a summary narrative to describe their performance. (PAS study, pg 2)

61 percent of respondents GAO-wide strongly or generally agreed that written appraisal narrative has the potential to help employees better understand performance.

- Hispanic employees were 124 percent more likely to agree with this than white employees.
- Black or African American employees were 64 percent more likely to agree with this than white employees. (PAS study, pg 54)



PAS Emphasis on feedback

PAS Finding: Feedback is generally effective but improvements can be made. (PAS study, pg 30)

- Staff are concerned that feedback they receive is not clear and actionable (Just 52 percent of survey respondents strongly or generally agreed that feedback from their DPM helped them understand what they needed to do to perform at a higher performance level.)
- CBPS data for the 2008 performance cycle show that 33 percent of employees did not have a mid-point feedback date recorded by their DPMs. (PAS study, pg 44)
- 87 percent of survey respondents would like the performance appraisal system to include an objective to provide employees with clear and actionable feedback



IVY Study

- African American Analysts found informal feedback less useful than Caucasian Analysts. (IVY Study, pg 45)
- No narratives to support ratings. Some Analysts interview indicated they found value in the narratives. (IVY Study, pg 30)



Interim Rating Cycle(s) Pilot Feature

Midpoint Feedback Summary

A midpoint feedback summary will be provided in writing for all non-developmental program employees in addition to the oral feedback discussion. It will normally be given after the oral feedback session. This summary will only cover the first half of the appraisal year... It will cover the following topics:

- Whether expectations are being met
- General statement of performance
- If known, observable performance differences
- Actionable and constructive next steps, as appropriate
- maximum of 2500 characters



Interim Rating Cycle(s) Pilot Feature

Written Self-Assessment Options

- Written narrative competency by competency
- Overall written summary narrative
- Any combination, including no narrative
- Rating check marks optional (any, all, or none of the competencies)



Interim Rating Cycle(s) Pilot Feature

Final Written Summary Rating Narrative

- All employees will receive a written summary narrative
- Might not contain all of the support for the rating.
- In addition to oral feedback session
 - key examples of the employee's performance and achievements for the year
 - key information supporting the rating
 - maximum of 2500 characters



Interim Rating Cycle(s) Pilot Features

- Union will seek feedback from employees on pilot features throughout 2011 rating cycle
- Experience and feedback on pilot features will inform revisions to system



Revisions to Current System - MOA

- Union will work closely with GAO management
- Union will have access to data/information
 - Ratings information by age, race, ethnicity
 - Relevant survey data
- Goal: Increase employee satisfaction and fairness of PM system



Union Collaborative Involvement in Revisions

- Not required in federal sector
- Agency has right to evaluate employees and design system
- Union and agency will use collaborative approach, working directly with contractor
- Focus is on bargaining unit



Union Ongoing Involvement

- Union involved in subsequent review and evaluation
- Union will be provided data

BAND TOGETHER LOCAL 1921

Questions?

Comments?

GAO Employees Organization, IFPTE, Local 1921 www.gaoanalysts.org