



NASA Employee Performance Communication System Employee Performance Plan and Appraisal



Employee JAMES ROSS Title SYSTEMS ENGINEER

Organization FLIGHT SYSTEMS IMPLEMENTATION BRAN Center AMES RESEARCH CENTER

Appraisal Period: May 1, 2007 to April 30, 2008 If other, from _____ to _____

Performance Plan Development

Performance requirements for the above period have been established, discussed with, and provided to the employee.

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Rating Official's Name and Signature _____ Date _____

Progress Review

A minimum of one progress review must be conducted during the appraisal period, generally midpoint in the period. If performance requirements have changed, the plan should be modified accordingly.

A Progress Review has been conducted by the Rating Official with the employee.

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Rating Official's Signature _____ Date _____

Development Discussion(s)

Both the progress review and the end of the appraisal period discussion provide opportunities to discuss an employee's training and development needs; such a discussion may be initiated by either the Rating Official or the employee.

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Rating Official's Signature _____ Date _____

Individual Development Plan (IDP) offered. Yes No *(Note: The offer of an IDP is optional unless required by Center policy.)*

Employee's Initials/Date _____ Rating Official's Initials/Date _____

Performance Appraisal - Performance Summary Rating Level

RATING OF RECORD *(A Rating of Record must be supported by the narrative summary.)*

DISTINGUISHED ACCOMPLISHED FULLY SUCCESSFUL NEEDS IMPROVEMENT UNACCEPTABLE

Rating Official's Signature _____ Date _____

(A performance summary rating of Distinguished, Needs Improvement, or Unacceptable must be reviewed and approved by a higher-level official.)

Reviewing Official's Signature _____ Date _____

Acknowledgment

I acknowledge receipt of this rating; however, my signature on this form does not imply agreement or disagreement with the rating received. I may request reconsideration of the rating within 15 calendar days.

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

I request reconsideration. Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

Disposition of Form: *This form is subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act. The original signed form must be retained in the Employee Performance File for 4 years.*

EPCS Performance Planning and Appraisal Instructions, Requirements, and Guidelines



OVERVIEW - The NASA Employee Performance Communication System (EPCS) establishes a systematic process for planning, monitoring, developing, assessing, and rewarding employee performance that contributes to achieving the Agency's Vision, mission, and goals. The EPCS ensures alignment with the Agency's goals, promotes a performance culture that focuses on two-way communication and accountability for results, and clearly differentiates between high and low performers.

PERFORMANCE PLANNING - The Rating Official (usually the immediate supervisor) must meet with the employee to discuss the performance requirements for the appraisal period and give the employee an opportunity to provide input to his/her performance plan. Each plan must identify at least one critical element - a Program/Project/Functional Objective element specific to the position. A critical element is a work assignment or responsibility of such importance that unacceptable performance in that element would result in a determination that an employee's overall performance summary rating is Unacceptable [5 CFR 430.203]. The required performance elements and any additional element(s) identified at the discretion of the Rating Official may be either critical or non-critical elements as determined by the Rating Official based on the employee's work assignments and responsibilities. A non-critical element is a dimension or aspect of individual, team, or organizational performance, exclusive of a critical element, that is used in assigning a performance summary rating level. Failure on a non-critical element cannot be used as a basis for a performance-based adverse action nor can the employee's performance be summarized as "Unacceptable" overall based on that failure [5 CFR 430.203]; however, non-critical does not mean not important. Performance standards must be written at the Meets Expectations performance level. Both the Rating Official and the employee must sign the plan.

Program/Project/Functional Objective -The primary work assignment or responsibility of the employee that supports the achievement of an Agency strategic goal(s) should be identified as the Program/Project/Functional Objective and will be the critical element that holds an employee accountable for achieving measurable results. This objective must address the following:

Alignment - In accordance with Figure 4.3.2-1 of NPD 1000, Strategic Management and Governance Handbook, the employee's performance plan must show the linkage to projects up through the Agency's strategic goals/objectives (i.e., individual performance plan → projects → programs → annual performance goals → performance outcomes → strategic goals/objectives). Therefore, the plan must identify at least one annual performance goal (APG) and/or organizational performance goal related to the APG to which the employee will contribute. The goal(s) should follow the performance plans of the chain of authority within the organization (i.e., from senior executive to manager to supervisor to employee). Alignment should be obvious; however, it is the responsibility of the Rating Official to ensure that the employee understands how his/her performance supports the achievement of the Agency's goals/objectives.

Measurable Results - Performance standards are statements of performance thresholds, requirements, or expectations written at the Meets Expectations performance level, commensurate with the knowledge and skills required for the position. Standards communicate what an employee has to do or achieve to meet the performance element. Performance standards should be described in terms of clear, credible measures of performance and identify the expected results/accomplishments (not activities or tasks). General measures of performance are:

Quality - How well work is performed and/or how accurate or how effective the service or final product is.

Quantity - How much work is produced (can be expressed as an error rate, such as a number or percentage of errors allowable per unit of work).

Timeliness - How quickly, when, or by what date the work is produced; however, a timeliness measure must not be absolute leaving no margin for error.

Cost-effectiveness - Dollar savings to the Government or working within a budget (may include such aspects as maintaining or reducing costs, reducing time it takes to produce a product or service, or reducing waste).

These general measures of performance must be further defined and must be **SMART**:

Specific - What is being measured (i.e., the expected result) is easily understood.

Measurable - A target can be established; data to support the metric is available and quantifiable.

Aggressive yet Achievable - The target, established at the Meets Expectations rating level, is challenging and significant but not so challenging that it is not really achievable.

Results oriented - Identifies the expected accomplishments (a product or service) described as a noun (not an activity or task described as a verb).

Time based - Identifies a specific time frame for the achievement of the target.

Required Elements - The performance standards identified may need to be modified to more accurately reflect the performance requirements of the employee. Additional performance standards may, also, be identified. If possible, standards should be described in terms of clear, credible measures of performance and identify the expected results/accomplishments and/or behaviors. Both the supervisor and employee may suggest additional or alternative performance standards. As stated in Performance Planning above, these elements may be critical or non-critical depending on the employee's work assignments and responsibilities.

EPCS Performance Planning and Appraisal Instructions, Requirements, and Guidelines



PROGRESS REVIEW - At a minimum, one progress review must be conducted during the appraisal period, generally midpoint in the period; however, a progress review may be initiated at any time during the appraisal period by either the Rating Official or the employee. The primary purpose of the review is to discuss the employee's performance to date; provide feedback on his/her progress in accomplishing the performance requirements described in the performance plan; and provide, when necessary, advice and assistance on how to improve his/her performance. If necessary, the performance plan should be annotated to document any new performance requirements or changes to existing performance requirements at this time. The Rating Official must offer the employee an opportunity to provide input on his/her accomplishments for the progress review. Both the Rating Official and the employee must sign the plan to indicate that the review was held.

DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSION - Both the progress review and the end of the appraisal period discussion provide opportunities to discuss an employee's training and development needs; such a discussion may be initiated by either the Rating Official or the employee.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT - At the end of the appraisal period, the Rating Official must meet with the employee to discuss both the employee's accomplishments and the organization's achievements. The Rating Official must offer the employee an opportunity and strongly encourage the employee to identify specific accomplishments and results; if provided, the employee's input must be retained as part of the appraisal documentation. In assessing the employee's performance, the Rating Official must consider the overall organization's performance taking into account the results achieved in the organization's senior executive's mission-related or functional area of responsibility as evidenced by the Agency's annual Performance and Accountability Report, Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) ratings, and/or other assessments/reports. An additional performance element should be left unrated (i.e., Not Rated) only if the employee has had an insufficient opportunity to demonstrate performance on the element; in such cases, this must be documented on the appraisal form. The plan must be signed by both the Rating Official and the employee to indicate the appraisal was held.

RATING LEVEL DEFINITIONS

Performance Element Rating Levels

SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS - Performance that consistently exceeds the performance standards to an exceptional degree.

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS - Performance that consistently exceeds the performance standards to a high degree.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS - Performance that fully and consistently meets the performance standards.

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT - Performance that does not fully meet the performance standards.

FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS - Performance that fails to meet the established performance standards.

Performance Summary Rating Levels

DISTINGUISHED (Level 5) - Performance when all elements are rated "Significantly Exceeds Expectations."

ACCOMPLISHED (Level 4) - Performance when all elements are rated no lower than "Exceeds Expectations."

FULLY SUCCESSFUL (Level 3) - Performance when no element is rated below "Meets Expectations."

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (Level 2) - Performance when any element is rated below "Meets Expectations."

UNACCEPTABLE (Level 1) - Performance when any critical element is rated "Fails to Meet Expectations."

The performance summary rating level assigned at the end of the appraisal period (i.e., Rating of Record) must be supported by the narrative summary. A performance summary rating of Distinguished, Needs Improvement, or Unacceptable must be reviewed and approved by a higher-level official.

PERFORMANCE AWARD ELIGIBILITY - An employee who receives a performance summary rating of "Distinguished" is eligible for monetary performance awards, nonmonetary recognition, and/or a quality step increase [5 CFR 531.504]. An employee who receives a performance summary rating of "Accomplished" or "Fully Successful" is eligible for monetary awards and nonmonetary recognition based on performance. An employee who receives a "Needs Improvement" or "Unacceptable" performance summary rating is not eligible for monetary or nonmonetary awards based on performance. An award and/or recognition bestowed on an employee must be commensurate with the level of his/her performance, responsibility, and progress toward the achievement of the Agency's/organization's goals and objectives and relative to the performance of other employees in the organization. The process for determining the level of award and recognition must be fair, consistent, and transparent to others.



National
Aeronautics and
Space
Administration

NASA Employee Performance Communication System Employee Performance Plan and Appraisal Critical Element



In the accomplishment of the performance elements and standards below, the employee shall abide by NASA's values of Safety, Teamwork, Integrity, and Mission Success.

In accordance with NPD 1000, Strategic Management and Governance Handbook, the employee's performance plan must show the linkage to projects up through the Agency's strategic goals/objectives (i.e., individual performance plan → projects → programs → annual performance goals → performance outcomes → strategic goals/objectives). Identify at least one annual performance goal (APG) and/or organizational performance goal related to the APG to which the employee will contribute. The goal(s) should follow the performance plans of the chain of authority within the organization (i.e., from senior executive to manager to supervisor to employee). (See *Alignment under Performance Planning in Instructions, Requirements, and Guidelines.*):

Annual Performance Goal 8AC03: Conduct 30 ground-based investigations in the physical and biological sciences that promote the development of related microgravity research capabilities.

Space Bioscience Division at ARC supports the Human Research Program within ESMD in the tests of assessment and mitigation strategies in operational analog spaceflight environments.

1. PROGRAM/PROJECT/FUNCTIONAL OBJECTIVE (Insert the primary work assignment or responsibility of the employee that supports the achievement of the goal(s)/objective(s) above per instructions.)

Supports the Flight Systems Implementation Branch within the Space Bioscience Division by conducting and coordinating tests; overseeing contractor support, and pursuing new business.

Performance Standards (Identify in sufficient detail (i.e., number of standards), the expected results defined by credible measures):

1. The "BIOMICRO EXPERIMENT 3" aboard the 8 foot centrifuge is completed successfully, with 0 safety violations, within 1-5 days of approved schedule, and at or below approved budget. Changes to approved schedule and budget are generally communicated and negotiated in advance.
2. The "CEV Acceleration Launch Test" plan is written by September 30 with all appropriate concurrences and minimal changes.
3. Sub-task S-9.3 "Automation Upgrade of Human Performance Centrifuge" is completed successfully, with 0 safety violations, within 1-3 days of schedule, and at or below cost. Changes to schedule and budget are generally communicated and negotiated in advance.
4. Contractor performance review completed within 60 days of the end of the project.
5. S-Task Manager notified of task modifications within 24 hours of recognized changes to requirements.
6. Initial contact with Aerospace Dynamics, Inc. is made by January 1, 2008; requirements are collected with minimal inaccuracies; report submitted to supervisor by March 1, 2008, outlining the feasibility of pursuing future new business with Aerospace Dynamics Inc.

COMMENTS

PROGRAM/PROJECT/FUNCTIONAL OBJECTIVE RATING:

- SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS
 EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS
 MEETS EXPECTATIONS
 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
 FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS



National
Aeronautics and
Space
Administration

NASA Employee Performance Communication System Employee Performance Plan and Appraisal Required Elements



2. COLLABORATION AND TEAMWORK

CRITICAL NON CRITICAL

Performance Standards:

When possible, identifies opportunities to collaborate and work with others in other Center organizations, at other NASA Centers, and/or with external organizations.

Knowledge of best practices and lessons learned are, to the extent possible, shared with others.

Working relationships with his/her supervisor, co-workers, and others are cooperative and respectful.

COMMENTS:

COLLABORATION AND TEAMWORK RATING:

SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS MEETS EXPECTATIONS
 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS

3. COMMUNICATIONS:

CRITICAL NON CRITICAL

Performance Standards:

Oral and written communications are open and honest, yet aware of and sensitive to individual and cultural differences of the audience.

Information is usually accurate and effectively presented (e.g., presented in a clear, concise, and well-organized manner).

Written materials generally follow NASA's prescribed standards and style and are infrequently returned for substantial revision.

Oral communications are generally courteous (e.g., shows respect, listens well, and responds appropriately).

COMMENTS:

COMMUNICATIONS RATING:

SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS MEETS EXPECTATIONS
 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS



National
Aeronautics and
Space
Administration

NASA Employee Performance Communication System Employee Performance Plan and Appraisal Additional Elements



4. (Optional)

CRITICAL NON CRITICAL

Performance Standards:

COMMENTS:

ELEMENT RATING:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> MEETS EXPECTATIONS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS IMPROVEMENT | <input type="checkbox"/> FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> NOT RATED |

5. (Optional)

CRITICAL NON CRITICAL

Performance Standards:

COMMENTS:

ELEMENT RATING:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> MEETS EXPECTATIONS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS IMPROVEMENT | <input type="checkbox"/> FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> NOT RATED |



National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NASA Employee Performance Communication System Employee Performance Plan and Appraisal Additional Elements



6. (Optional)

CRITICAL NON CRITICAL

Performance Standards:

COMMENTS:

ELEMENT RATING:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> MEETS EXPECTATIONS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS IMPROVEMENT | <input type="checkbox"/> FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> NOT RATED |

7. (Optional)

CRITICAL NON CRITICAL

Performance Standards:

COMMENTS:

ELEMENT RATING:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> MEETS EXPECTATIONS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NEEDS IMPROVEMENT | <input type="checkbox"/> FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> NOT RATED |



National
Aeronautics and
Space
Administration

NASA Employee Performance Communication System Employee Performance Plan and Appraisal Narrative Summary



(Summarize the employee's significant achievements and results for the appraisal period.)

During the performance period, Jim exceeded expectations as a systems engineer in the Flight Systems Implementation Branch. As Test Coordinator for the "BIOMICRO EXPERIMENT 3," no safety violations were reported; the team came in on schedule; and the experiment was 100% successful. Based on feedback from peers and customers, Jim communicated very effectively between NASA, PI, and the contractor.

Jim, also, wrote the test plan for the "CEV Acceleration Launch Test" by September 15, 2007, which was 15 days before the due date. This required exceptional communication skills among the PIs across the Center and at JSC. As manager of the contractor subtask S-9.3, Jim evaluated the work and got the facility upgrade completed on time and 12% under budget allocation, exceeding expectations. Jim's input to the S-Task Manager for the contractor performance review was excellent; it was thorough, complete, and on time. Jim, also, initiated dialogue with Aerospace Dynamics, Inc. by January 1, 2008, and exceeded expectations by submitting a draft Space Act Agreement for their use of the Human Performance Centrifuge for a future test.

Jim communicated very well with management, co-workers, customers, and contractors throughout the performance period, keeping tasks on track and successfully completing all required NASA training on time. Overall, there were no safety violations or incidents on the two projects he managed; both projects were completed without any schedule slips and one was completed under budget. The PI has submitted the highest rating for Jim at her experiment debrief which exceeded expectations.

Jim has exceeded expectations on all elements of his performance plan. His performance is highlighted by his commitment to safety, excellent communications, and his development of additional new business. His performance summary rating is Accomplished.