AU/ACSC/243/1999-04

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

MILITARY OFFICER APPRAISAL,

AN EXAMINATION

by

Jay S. Lewis, Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Commander Al StClair

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 1999

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the United States government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

Page

DISCLAIMER ii

ABSTRACT v

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM 1

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, OFFICER EVALUATION SYSTEM. 15
- Performance Feedback Worksheet 16
- Officer Performance Reporting (OPR) 17
- Promotion Recommendation Form 22

UNITED STATES ARMY, OFFICER EVALUATION REPORTING SYSTEM 28

UNITED STATES NAVY, PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND COUNSELING SYSTEM 32

CONCLUSIONS 39

APPENDIX A: UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, FITNESS REPORT (NAVMC 10835A, REV. 1-99 (EF)) 44

APPENDIX B: UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM, SECTION F – LEADERSHIP 49

APPENDIX C: UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM, SECTION H – FULFILLMENT OF EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES. 54

APPENDIX D: UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, COMPANY AND FIELD GRADE OFFICER PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK WORKSHEETS 55

APPENDIX E: UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, COMPANY AND FIELD GRADE OFFICER PERFORMANCE REPORT (OPR) 57

APPENDIX F: UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION FORM (PRF) 61

APPENDIX G: UNITED STATES ARMY, OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT SUPPORT FORM 62

APPENDIX H: UNITED STATES ARMY, OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT (OER) 64

APPENDIX I: UNITED STATES NAVY, FITNESS REPORT AND COUNSELING RECORD (E7-06) 66

BIBLIOGRAPHY 68

AU/ACSC/243/1999-04

Abstract

There is little or no argument that the four military services (U.S. Air Force, U.S. Army, U.S. Marine Corps, and U.S. Navy) have different approaches when performing an evaluation and appraisal of their officers. One unfailing theme is that each service's goal is to document an individual's military career and provide a consistent stream of reliable information to promotion, administrative, and command selection boards. This one document, whether it's the United States Navy's or Marine Corp's Fitness Report (FITREP), Air Force's Officer Performance Report (OPR), or the Army's Officer Evaluation Report (OER), each of these records has the greatest impact on each officer's military career and promotion opportunities. Could it be possible that an examination of each services documentation process could lead to a better format? To this end, this paper contains a broad review and analysis of the services instructions and guidance, discusses the strengths, weakness, and offers recommendations of possible improvements to their respective evaluation systems.

Chapter 1

United States Marine Corps, Performance Evaluation System

> *Where I would like to learn what I did, I learn only what I was thinking. They are loaded with opinion, moral thoughts, quick evaluations, youthful hopes and cares and sorrows. Occasionally, they manage to report something in exquisite honesty and accuracy.*
>
> —E.B. White

The United States Marine Corps (USMC), Performance Evaluation System (PES) came on line 01 January 1999. This offers an unprecedented opportunity to examine a completely revitalized evaluation system.

A first impression, the Marine Corps Instruction P1610.7E (MCINST P1610.7E) is thoroughly impressive, but like an old saying you might here from time to time, "Be careful what you wish for". The USMC fitness report is five pages in length (*please refer to Appendix A*) and could become an administrative nightmare. The detail and depth is astonishing, having spent untold hours writing, rewriting, correcting, and teaching a new reporting system in the Navy. The learning curve and the time and commitment that will be required for the USMC is hard to imagine. Following is a discussion of the possible strengths and weaknesses of MCINST P1610.7E and details of a few highlights.

The scope of the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation System (PES) is to provide for the periodic reporting, recording, and analysis of the performance and the professional character of Marines in the grades of sergeant through major general. The fundamental

concepts are accuracy, accountability, simplicity, and consistency of policy and evaluation methods. Achieving these concepts requires standardization of the evaluation chain, supervision throughout the system, and the education of all participants in the system. Reporting seniors document their observations and assessments of the performance and character of a Marine on the USMC Fitness Report. The fitness report is neither a communication to, nor a counseling document for, the Marine.

The primary purpose of the PES is to support the centralized selection, promotion, and retention of the most qualified Marines of the Active and Reserve Components. Secondarily, the PES aids in the assignment of personnel and supports other personnel management decisions.[1]

The immediate objective of the PES is for a credible and accurate recording of the history of an individual's performance. To achieve these goals, the PES must accomplish and adhere to the following objectives: (1) The accuracy of the evaluation must reflect an assessment of performance of assigned duties and responsibilities against an understood set of requirements, individual capacity, and professional character. (2) Center on the individual’s performance during a designated period of observation. (3) The Reporting Senior (RS) must report on fact and the reporting official's objective judgments, based on Marine Corps standards, not conjecture. The reporting senior also must ensure that the narrative portions of the evaluation are clear in their meaning and free of ambiguities and innuendoes.[2]

A primary goal of all the military services is to prevent and curb grade inflation. The USMC’s drive to countering inflation begins with the reporting officials, specifically the Reporting Senior (RS) and Reviewing Officer (RO), who must accurately report a

Marine's performance. The design of the PES limits the ability of RS to unjustifiably or artificially inflate a Marine's performance. To abate inflation all reports must be based on a Marine's performance vice sociability. Reporting officials can inadvertently render these controls ineffective by preparing and submitting fitness reports that fail to adhere to both the letter and the spirit of the PES Manual.[3]

The Marine Corps Commandant's guidance and the significance of the PES and Fitness report is eloquently spelled out in this quote,

> "The completed fitness report is the most important information component in manpower management. It is the primary means of evaluating a Marine's performance. The fitness report is the Commandant's primary tool available for the selection of personnel for promotion, retention, augmentation, resident schooling, command, and duty assignments. Therefore, the completion of this report is one of an officer's most critical responsibilities. Inherent in this duty is the commitment of each reporting senior and reviewing officer to ensure the integrity of the system by close attention to accurate marking and timely reporting. Every officer serves a role in the scrupulous maintenance of this evaluation system, ultimately important to both the individual and the Marine Corps. Inflationary markings only serve to dilute the actual value of each report, rendering the fitness report ineffective. Reviewing officials will not concur with inflated reports." [4]

There are several additional key concepts that need to be brought out. While these ideas are not unique to the USMC, perhaps they do take the issues to a higher level of a minimum requirement.

The fairness of the fitness report requires commitment; this report is a communication between reporting officials and the Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC). Reporting officials must provide fair and thorough evaluations. Reviewing officers and commanders must take active roles in mentoring and communicating when an RS has not adhered to the spirit and intent of the PES manual. Influence or pressure by Reviewing Officers (ROs) or commanders to modify fitness report marks or

comments is unacceptable, except to ensure that reporting officials adhere to Marine Corps policy.[5]

The focus of the fitness report is a documentation of observations and assessments of individual performance, personal qualities, character, and potential to serve at a more senior level. The fitness report is not a disciplinary tool, a lever to exert influence, but is a professional counseling document for the Marine Reported On (MRO).

Reporting seniors must evaluate missions, duties, tasks, and standards as communicated by the RS to the MRO. They must measure Marines against known Marine Corps values and soldierly virtues, not against a personal set of precepts and unreasonable expectations.[6]

Professional ethics are the cornerstone and constitute one of the foundations of the PES. Reporting officials must preserve the high standards of Marine Corps integrity and moral courage. Personal biases have absolutely no place in the process.

The Marine Corps brings forth an issue that all services need to take a lesson from, avoiding the zero defects mentality. Reporting officials must consider that Marines develop by having the latitude to make mistakes.[7] Every reporting official must encourage initiative, aggressiveness, creativity, courage, and development of warfighting skills and not dampen them by fear of making mistakes. Attaining perfection certainly is a legitimate goal, but rarely is it a reality. The realistic goal is to experience, learn, and grow professionally.

Another important area that the USMC and the PES system stress is the Counseling Program.[8] Leaders throughout the USMC are to counsel Marines to transmit the guidance, performance standards, and direction important for the Member's Reported On

(MRO's) success and continued development. The complementary relationship between the counseling process and the PES begins when the RS and MRO meet to develop the MRO's billet description. It should become a regular and continuous process with additional sessions to review billet descriptions, establish new goals, and develop performance. As a result, the performance evaluation process should not produce any surprises for the MRO. Periodic performance evaluation can also help clarify the subjects on which the counseling process should focus. Any counseling program, which relies on final evaluations as a tool to force behavioral changes, is without merit and must be avoided.[9] The PES highlights past performance and counseling shapes future performance. Again the Marine Corps places high emphasis that the fitness report is not a counseling tool.

The fitness report is an extremely detailed report. It is five grueling pages in length, and is unique in the military evaluation system because it is used for Sergeant (E-4) through Sergeant Major (E-9), Warrant Officer one through five, and Second Lieutenant (O-1) through Colonel (O-6).[10] A single document used for the vast majority of the enlisted and officer personnel in the entire Marine Corps. To give such a wide range of personnel the same performance evaluation is such a paradigm shift from what the military services have done in the past, that the next few years for the Marine Corps will be very interesting, perhaps even enlightening, and could lead the way for the other services in a new performance standard and fitness reporting system.

In the document, Block A is the general administrative data and there are some unique areas of interest. In the special information area (block A.8) is the rifle and pistol qualifications. Every Marine is too have qualified at some level from “Distinguished” to

“Marksman” during that reporting period. If for some reason a Marine did not qualify, there is a possibility that this could be an adverse report. If that Marine tried his/her best and goes unqualified, an adverse report is not merited. The USMC takes its weapons training very serious. The evaluation requires the reporting of the Physical Readiness Training (PRT) status, but also includes a first, second, and third class level and a corresponding point score, the sister services only show a pass / fail criteria.[11] Pandemonium might ensue if the services reported on the vast majority of our military PRT scores and showed how each individual ranked on a point total. Many personnel would likely cry foul. Another valuable idea in the fitness report is the block that lists the top three-duty preference for the MRO.

Blocks B (billet description) and Block C (billet accomplishments) is perhaps the most descriptive of any of the sister services. Billet description (block B) is the section of the fitness report that provides the reporting senior an opportunity to describe the scope of duties that form the basis for evaluating the MRO during the reporting period. This description puts the "flesh to the bone" of Duty Assignment in section A (administrative data). The billet description should not restate the contents of Mission Occupation Specialty (MOS) Manual; it should highlight for the reader of the report the nature of the billet and the MRO’s significant responsibilities as they relate to the accomplishment of his or her unit's or organization's mission during the reporting period. At a minimum, the RS should describe those duties and responsibilities considered most important; it should frame the RS's expectation of the MRO. The billet description must focus on acceptable standards vice goals.[12]

While billet description (Block B) concentrates on the MRO's assigned duties, the focus in billet accomplishments (Block C) is on what the MRO accomplished, the results, and achievements. The design is to highlight the MRO's actions that the RS considers most significant for the reporting period. Block C data is to complement the information contained in block B by providing an accurate account of exactly what the Marine accomplished in that billet. The RS needs to be objective rather than qualitative in nature and list only the results and achievements themselves and avoid all reference to personal qualities or potential impact of the MRO's contributions. The MC uses almost half a page to report on these two very important topics and melds results into an understandable format.[13]

The meat of the Marine Corps fitness report is the actual grading criteria of the individual. This section is three of the five pages of the fitness report and is the most detailed breakdown of an evaluation portion for an individual of any of the sister services.

The fitness report describes the "whole Marine" both on and off duty. The design is to build a picture that goes beyond the MRO's assigned duties and what the Marine accomplished; it also records the manner in which the individual discharged those duties and responsibilities. Sections D, E, F, and G comprise 13 attributes that give the RS a broad cross section of areas to evaluate the MRO that the Marine Corps deems most important. This report divides 13 attributes into four sections:[14]

1. Mission Accomplishment.
2. Individual Character.
3. Leadership.
4. Intellect and Wisdom.

Collectively, these attributes provide a very clear picture of the Marine's demonstrated capacities, abilities, and character. To keep the length of this discussion to a manageable level, the following discussion will concentrate on the Leadership section in detail. First it is important to understand the marking and grading procedures and philosophy to the corresponding letter grade.

The grades start alphabetically at “A” and continue through “G”. The “A” grade is the low end of the spectrum and is considered unacceptable performance. An "A" in any of the attributes constitutes an unsatisfactory marking and renders the entire report adverse.[15] A single event or action could be significant enough to support an unsatisfactory marking. The RS must specifically address the unacceptable performance or deficiency and the conditions under which it occurred in the "Justification" space provided in the section. While on the other end of the attribute spectrum the scaled measures "F" and "G" describe exceptional, sustained performance throughout the reporting period. It should be noted that rarely could isolated incidents, of themselves, merit a marking in either of these blocks. Members marked under "G" should reflect a truly extraordinary level of performance rarely observed, the few, truly extraordinary Marines observed during the course of one's career. This mark demands significant justification to support such a determination. All "A," "F," or "G" marks require written justification in the block provided in each section. The RS is not required nor encouraged to justify "B," "C," "D," or "E" marks.[16]

All Marines grow personally and professionally, but each does so within the bounds of personal ability. The Marine, by individual performance over the course of a career, develops a record on his or her own merits. Few Marines can excel in all aspects of their

duties. A Marine, who displayed decisiveness in one billet, may display hesitancy in another. Only accurate evaluations of each case in the context of time and circumstance will provide the CMC a clear picture of an individual. A Marine for whom an RS can find no deficiencies in a given area is not, by definition or default, a Marine deserving an "F" or "G" marking; the MRO may well be a solid, commendable "B" or "C". Additionally, the purpose of Sections D (mission accomplishment), E (individual character), F (leadership), and G (intellect and wisdom) is not to find fault, nor is it to inflate competent individuals, but to objectively evaluate Marines on their own merits. Reporting seniors must not unjustifiably inflate performance. The CMC will scrutinize RS's grading histories and return noncompliance reports.[17]

Leadership can be thought of as the force that drives all military organizations. Leaders at all levels are essential to mission accomplishment. Identifying effective leaders is a primary goal of the USMC fitness report.[18] The leadership section focuses on the most important aspects of leadership. Each evaluated area provides information that gives a more comprehensive picture of the individual's effectiveness as a leader. The overall view provides an understanding of the individual's leadership style. The leadership section alone is divided into five attributes:

1. Leading Subordinates.
2. Developing Subordinates.
3. Setting the Example.
4. Ensuring Well-Being of Subordinates
5. Communication Skills

Appendix B is the leadership section from the USMC instruction. The magnitude and detail of the section demonstrates the impressiveness of the science and art to which the USMC has taken the fitness report. It is the author's contention that the only way to demonstrate to the reader the magnitude and detail of this section is to pull out the

corresponding appendix from this paper and the USMC instruction. Remember, the leadership section is but one of four sections with a total of 13 subdivided attributes.[19]

After studying this section, the author has mixed emotions on how he might fair with an honest appraisal from a senior officer. At the very least it would be an eye opener and I'm sure there would be room for improvement. An officer or enlisted man who could consistently score in the higher (D's and E's), not just the highest range (F's and G's), without grade inflation, is a military professional I would follow into any situation or battle.

The pariah of every evaluation and appraisal system used by all the military and civilian institutions throughout time is grade inflation. How do we curve it at the start, during the creeping up phase when everyone tries and learns to game the system, and when the system has been so manipulated that the final product has little or no value. The Marine Corps appear to have developed a positive and fair control system. It is human nature that everyone who writes an evaluation on an individual is inherently worried about ensuring that his personnel get the best results and promotions. Therefore a grading creep begins and everyone learns how to write and grade an evaluation higher and higher to ensure that their personnel get the best product and have an advantage over anyone else who does not work in his chain of command.

When the large percentage start to initiate the grade creep phenomenon and when the small percentage do their best to follow the rules and guidelines, the small percentage could ultimately hurt their subordinates. Usually this takes just one round of reports and results to get back to the senior before he also joins the ranks of inflating evaluations. A vicious cycle that seems impossible to break, unless you build into your fitness reporting

system a strong set of checks and balances. The Marine corps have developed such a checks and balances method in Block H (fulfillment of evaluation responsibilities) (Appendix C). The purpose of block “H” is to accomplishing the objectives of the PES by add a rating check for the drafter of the report on his own fitness report.[20] This check is designed to ensure that the provisions of the evaluation manual are adhered to and is the responsibility of every reporting official to measures the level to which the reporting officials fulfill their responsibilities and establishes a direct method of ensuring that reporting officials accomplish the objectives of the PES by evaluating their efforts to submit accurate, timely, and uninflated evaluations. In addition section “H” is a single, stand-alone, evaluated area, highlighting the importance of accurate, uninflated, and timely reporting by that individual while he was acting as a reporting officer.

The scaled measurements of appendix C allow little tolerance for submitting or forwarding inflated reports. One instance as either an RS or RO can result in a mark of "B." The scale does allow some tolerance for submitting or forwarding administratively incorrect reports. For example, a Marine could have a "few" reports returned from either the RO or HQMC for administrative errors and still receive a mark of "D" but depending on the context a "C" mark might be more appropriate. A MRO (evaluated as an RS) whose reports exhibit flagrant inflation, multiple administrative errors, severe untimeliness, or any combination thereof could warrant a mark of "A". This grade mark would make the report adverse.[21] Now, how is this for checks and balances, actually grade a MRO on how he writes and grades his subordinates, while acting as a reporting officer. The ultimate in curbing grade inflation and producing a correct document from the start.

One last subject area of the report to discuss is Block K (reviewing officer's comments). Block K formalizes the RO's involvement in the PES. It requires the RO to certify the administrative correctness of the report. In addition the reviewing officer is to characterize his or her level of observation of the MRO. No hard guidelines on what constitutes sufficient knowledge and observation are detailed in the instruction. In some circumstances an RO gets to know a great deal about an MRO in an extremely short time and in other cases, the RO may never gain sufficient observation regardless of how long both serve in the same command.

Another checks and balance approach that the USMC has built into the fitness report is a block for the reviewing officer to address whether the RO has sufficiently observed the MRO, concur or nonconcur with the RS's evaluation, compare the MRO's professional abilities and potential to other Marines of the same grade whose professional abilities are known to the RO, and comment concerning the MRO's potential. The comparative assessment (block K.3) provides the RO an opportunity to compare the MRO to <u>all</u> Marines (both past and present) of the same grade whose professional abilities are known to the RO. The RO must focus on the MRO's potential, consider all the MRO's attributes and weigh the MRO's performance as an indicator of future potential for service at more senior positions.

Now think about this phrase, "compare the MRO to *all* Marines (both past and present) of the same grade whose professional abilities are known to the RO", the reviewing officer is to compare the MRO to anyone past and present, that is a tall order and could possibly be a mighty cast of professional military officers to be stacked against. Please note the description portion of the comparative assessment, the reviewing

officer has eight possible blocks to mark what will describe where the MRO falls in how the RO feels that the individual is qualified and to what level. The least qualified level is of course the "unsatisfactory" block, followed by "a qualified Marine", "one of the many highly professionals who from the majority of this grade", here there are three levels to choose from, this option allows the reviewing officer more flexibility in his choices.[22] Next block is "one of the few exceptional qualified Marines", with two levels and the highest level "the eminently qualified Marine".[23] There appears to be no controls embedded into the fitness report that governs the RO's ability to mark the MRO's. Example, if the RO is reviewing 20 officers, he could possibly mark each officer "the eminently qualified Marine", taking into account the intent of this entire Marine Corps instruction and the emphasis placed on each person in the chain of command, to dispatch any consideration of grade inflation, the ethical integrity of each Marine, and his professional military bearing, a Marine Officer probably will not have any difficulty in doing his military duty any different on this fitness report; anymore then he would have any difficulty on a battlefield.

Notes

[1] US Marine Corps Officer Instruction MCO P1610.7E. *Performance Evaluation System*, 08 December 1998, 1-3.
[2] Ibid., 1-4.
[3] Ibid., 1-4.
[4] Ibid., 1-4.
[5] Ibid., 1-4.
[6] Ibid., 1-4.
[7] Ibid., 1-4.
[8] Ibid., 1-5.
[9] Ibid., 1-6.
[10] Ibid., 1-3.
[11] Ibid., 4-14.
[12] Ibid., 4-20.
[13] Ibid., 4-22.

Notes

[14] Ibid., 4-24.
[15] Ibid., 4-26.
[16] Ibid., 4-25.
[17] Ibid., 4-25.
[18] Ibid., 4-34.
[19] Ibid., 4-24.
[20] Ibid., 4-42.
[21] Ibid., 4-43.
[22] Ibid., 4-51.
[23] Ibid., 4-52.

Chapter 2

United States Air Force, Officer Evaluation System.

> *A record will be kept in the War Department of the services, efficiency, and special qualifications of officers of the Army, including the condition of their commands and the percentages of desertion therefrom, and from further reports made for that purpose.*
>
> —Secretary of War Redfield Proctor, April 1890

The Air Force's officer evaluation system is perhaps the most convoluted and easiest manipulated evaluation system in all of the military services. An additional important characteristic between the Air Force's way of doing business and the other military services is that the Air Force has broken out its officer's into two groups for reporting purposes, Company Grade Officers (Second Lieutenants (O-1), First Lieutenants (O-2) and Captains (O-3)) and Field Grade Officers (Major (O-4), Lieutenant Colonel (O-5) and Colonel (O-6)) (note: this paper will discuss the O-1 (Second Lieutenant / Ensign) through O-6 (Colonel / Captain) levels and disregard Flag Officers O-7 through O-10 to keep the complexity of this project at a manageable level).[24] The distinction that the Air Force has made is a valuable breakout tool and the other three services could find this concept of value.

Air Force Instruction 36-2402 is the service guidance that provides procedures for implementing the Air Force (AF) Evaluation Systems policy for the Officer Evaluation System (OES). It describes how to prepare, submit, and manage Air Force Forms 724A,

Field Grade Officer Performance Feedback Worksheet; 724B, Company Grade Officer Performance Feedback Worksheet; 707A, Field Grade Officer Performance Report; 707B,Company Grade Officer Performance Report; 475, Education/Training Report; 709, Promotion Recommendation; and 77, Supplemental Evaluation Sheet.[25]

Performance Feedback Worksheet

The Field Grade Officer Performance Feedback Worksheet (PFW) (Appendix D), AF Form 724A and Company Grade Officer Performance Feedback Worksheet; AF Form 724B are private communication worksheets between the rater (the first official in the rating chain serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee) and ratee (the officer being rated) and as such the comments may not be reviewed by anyone other than the officer or introduced in any personnel action unless first introduced by the ratee or the officer alleges he or she did not receive required feedback sessions or the sessions were inadequate.[26]

Raters use the Performance Feedback Worksheet (PFW) as a guide for the performance feedback sessions. These sessions and the form provide the means for a rater to tell a subordinate officer what is expected regarding duty performance and how well he or she is meeting those expectations. These documented feedback sessions do not replace informal day-to-day interaction and feedback and providing this information is designed to help an officer improve his or her performance and grow professionally. Additionally, he may use the completed form as he or she desires. It is recommended that the rater should keep a copy of the PFW to use in the preparation of the next Officer Performance Report (OPR) and subsequent feedback sessions.

The PFW is handwritten document prepared by the rater and is designed to be an informal counseling session to provide realistic feedback for the officer to discuss issues which both he and the rater see as important to that officer's ability to improve personally, professionally and to re-enforce those attributes which the rater considers his strengths.

The two key areas of information on the PFW are the block II, Key Duties, Tasks, and Responsibilities (Duty performance is a fill-in-the-blank area where the rater outlines specific duties (specialty and assignment)). These entries include the most important duties and correspond to the Officer Performance Report (OPR), block III, Job Description, and section IV, Impact on Mission. The Block III, Performance Feedback, which contain the six performance factors cover qualities and skills required of all officers and are the same as those listed on the Officer Performance Report (OPR).[27] The PFW has a behavior scale within each. The rater marks, on the continuous scale from "Needs Significant Improvement" to "Needs Little Improvement," for each behavior that applies to the officer. If a particular behavior is not applicable to what the officer does, the rater writes "Not applicable (N/A)." The comment sections provide space for factual, helpful performance feedback so ratees can improve their duty performance or define their professional development goals.[28]

Officer Performance Reporting (OPR)

The Air Force's Officer Performance Report (Appendix E) original intention was to have a valuable impact on an officer's evaluation throughout his career, but it has diminished in its overall impact to a level of little more than filling a check in the box.

The value added of the document seems to add little to the information on an officer's performance other than helping keep track his unit's missions and job description.

The Air Force Instruction 36-2402 (AFI36-2402) details the purpose of the OPR as a permanent record of an officer's performance over a specific period. The rater, who is also the person that is to write the OPR, will be the first official in the rating chain serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee. Date of rank is not a consideration, which simply means that a major (O-4) could be the rater for another major (O-4).[29] The rater has the responsibility to assess and document what the officer did, how well he or she did it, and the potential based on that performance. This is accomplished through an evaluation of Impact on Unit Mission, block IV; Performance Factors, block V; and Rater Overall Assessment in block VII.[30] The ratee is encouraged to provide the rater input on specific accomplishments. While it is true that the ratee is not to "draft" his own OPR, if that individual desires to have specific items stressed in his write up, then in real life a draft copy from the ratee to the rater would help the rater develop an OPR that will contain certain aspects that the ratee feels will be of value to him through his career.

The first important information other than general administrative data is the "Unit Mission Description" which provides a description of primary unit responsibilities (e.g., what it is, does, and to whom it is responsible), and is the same for all members of a unit (block II information). Block III (Job Description / Item 1: Duty Title / Item 2: Key Duties / Tasks / and Responsibilities) provides information about the position the ratee held in the unit and the nature/level of job responsibilities. The rater develops the information for this section. The description of key duties, tasks, and responsibilities (block III item 2) must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job and not be

standardized.[31] It must be specific to include, level to which responsible, number of people supervised, dollar value of resources accountable for / projects managed. The language is to be clear and understandable, avoid jargon, acronyms, and topical references--these obscure rather than clarify meaning. Significant additional duties related to mission accomplishment and previous jobs held during the period of the report, which impact on the evaluation maybe mentioned.

Perhaps the first area that takes on some consequence is "Impact on Mission Accomplishment", block IV. In this area of the OPR the rater is to use bullet format.[32] The rater addresses only primary duty responsibilities and tasks assigned to the ratee during the reporting period that contributed to, or detracted from, the unit mission. The rater may also address the ratee's ability to evaluate and develop subordinates here. This area should not include duties not directly related to mission accomplishment or civic involvement (unless dealing with the public was a primary duty). Promotion or other recommendations should not be made here. Each item entered must document a specific responsibility or task and result (what the ratee's done and how well he/she performed). Comments are allowed that discuss the impact of other jobs held or significant mission related additional duties.[33]

Now we reach the part of the OPR that has degraded to a point that it adds no value to this document, block V, Performance Factors. This section has six factors rated on a two-block scale. The six factors are Job knowledge, Leadership Skills, Professional Qualities, Organizational skills, Judgement and Decisions, and Communication Skills. Both the company and field grade reports have identical performance factors; there is a little additional rhetoric for the field grade officers to consider, which does add to the

validity of the grading scale. That is where the merit of block V, performance factors, ends. The rater is to choose between two performance scales, “Does Not Meet Standards” and “Meets Standards”. All officers require these qualities in performance of duties regardless of specific job. The rater is to enter a handwritten X in the appropriate box for each factor after carefully evaluating the officer’s performance and qualities. A "Does Not Meet Standards" rating or referral remark requires an explanation and is considered a derogatory performance report. In the military, a “No’” answer may have career ending consequences. A rater must have documented proof that this individual has extremely limited value to the armed services and be prepared for a long administrative ordeal. The normal outcome of this ordeal will be to: (1) support your recommendations and actions up the chain of command, and (2) start possible discharge procedures.[34]

Block VI, rater overall assessment, and block VII, additional rater overall assessment allow evaluators to comment on the ratee’s overall performance and performance-based potential as compared to others in the same grade known by the evaluators. Raters must also certify performance feedback in this area. Comments should be based on performance, not on other considerations, such as PME, academic education, duty history, etc. Promotion recommendations should be included; however, recommendations to select for a particular assignment, PME, augmentation, continuation, or indefinite reserve status are appropriate, as are remarks about community involvement and additional duties. Evaluators must consider Regular AF augmentation (applicable only to officers on active duty). Comments should be limited to the space provided unless the OPR is referral or adverse.[35] Block VI is the first area in the OPR that starts to be important to the promotion boards later in that individuals career, remembering that

the rater is the direct supervisor to the ratee and the rater is the individual that did the ratee's performance feedback earlier in the period of report.

This becomes important when considering block VII, Additional Rater Overall Assessment, the additional rater is the second official in the rating chain, after the rater, serving in a grade equal to or higher than the rater and in a grade higher than the ratee. A colonel may be the additional rater for a colonel. The additional rater carefully reviews the ratee's evaluation to ensure it is accurate, unbiased and uninflated. If he disagrees, then the additional rater may ask the originator to review his evaluation, but he cannot direct a change in the evaluation. If there is still disagreement with the rater, then he is to mark "Non-Concur" and explain in the comment section. This is the first step of two in the validation process. The additional rater and reviewer are the primary quality control level and guards against misstatement and exaggeration. Both the additional rater and reviewer indicates concurrence or non-concurrence with the rater by placing an "X" in the appropriate box.

The reviewer is the third or final evaluator on an Officer Performance Report. The reviewer also carefully reviews both rater's marks and comments. If he considers their evaluations accurate, unbiased and uninflated, then he "Concurs" with the report and marks the appropriate box. If the reviewer disagrees with the previous evaluators, he may request that they review their evaluations. The reviewer cannot direct them to change their appraisals. If the reviewer still cannot come to closure with the rater and / or the additional rater, then it is a "NonConcurence" report and he is to mark it as such and explain in block VIII. The reviewer on the OPR and senior rater on the Performance Recommendation Form (PRF) will occupy the same position.

Promotion Recommendation Form

Possibly one of the ultimate goals of an evaluation and appraisal system is to promote the correct personnel at the proper time in their careers. The Air Force evaluation system has chosen to have a stand-alone document that covers the subject of promotion and is the only military service that goes about this issue in such a manner.

The purpose of the PRF (Appendix F) is to provide a performance-based differentiation to assist central selection boards. To determine how the Air Force goes about this difficult task, it will be helpful to go through the promotion recommendation form and highlight the significant portions of the guiding instruction from the Air Force (AFI36-2402).

The most important person to have an impact on the PRF is the senior rater. The senior rater is the evaluator who completes the Performance Recommendation Form and also serves as the reviewer on the Officer Performance Report (OPR). Senior raters must be in a position to have personal knowledge or access to personal knowledge of the ratee's performance. They must also have the scope of responsibility and breadth of experience to assess performance and its significance as it relates to potential for promotion. The same senior rater normally evaluates all officers in an organization in a particular grade and promotion zone. For majors and below, the senior rater must be at least a colonel (or equivalent) serving as a wing commander or equivalent. For lieutenant colonels and colonels, the senior rater must be a general officer (or equivalent) and will be the first general officer in the rating chain. The senior rater develops his ratee's information and has the responsibility to review the ratee's record of performance (ROP) and Duty Qualification History Brief (DQHB), Personal Information File (PIF), and

Unfavorable Information File (UIF) before preparing the PRF. He may consider other reliable information about duty performance and conduct.

The senior rater will furnish the ratee one copy of the PRF notice to check for accuracy. Incorrect or questionable entries should be resolved with the Unit Personnel Office (UPO). An important and possibly difficult issue is that the senior rater must be knowledgeable of the ratee's most recent performance. Subordinate supervisors may provide information on an officer's most recent duty performance and performance-based potential, and may make suggestions based upon the officer's duty performance for PRF recommendations. No officer should be asked to draft or prepare his or her own PRF. Additionally, there will be no boards or panels of officers convened to collectively score, rate, rank, or tally the records and/or generate a priority list of eligible officers unless specifically authorized by AFI36-2402. The senior rater is solely responsible for evaluating each officer’s ROP and DQHB, and for either awarding PRF recommendations among officers or submitting officers to compete for aggregation or carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations. The senior rater submits the PRF with section IX (overall recommendation block) unmarked when submitting an officer for competition in aggregation or carry-over categories at a Management Level review (MLR) and/or HQ USAF review.

The senior rater completes promotion recommendations and corrects any error that results in awarding more "Definitely Promote" recommendations than allocated by the Management Level (ML). However, if he or she fails to fulfill this responsibility, the review president makes the appropriate corrections to include reaccomplishing PRF’s a senior rater prepared. The senior rater is to provide the ratee a copy of the PRF

approximately 30 days before the central selection board (CSB). PRFs are a private matter between the senior rater and the ratee. Subordinate evaluators may have access to a PRF rating to assist in the feedback process only if desired by the ratee. The senior rater must attach a memo telling the ratee who receives a PRF with a "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation that he or she has the right to submit a letter to the Central selection Board (CSB). In addition, the senior rater will provide the PRF to the ratee either by hand or by sending it in a sealed envelope marked, "To Be Opened By Addressee Only."[36]

A “Definitely Promote” recommendation says the strength of the ratee’s performance, and performance-based potential alone warrants a promotion. A “Promote” recommendation says the ratee is qualified for promotion and should compete on the basis of performance, performance-based potential and broader considerations such as duty history, PME, advanced degrees, etc. A “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendation says the ratee does not warrant promotion on the central selection board for which the PRF is being prepared. . A “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendation is considered adverse and could require considerable documentation from the senior rater to get support from the chain of command and administrative chain also.[37]

A moderately difficult concept is the allocation process to develop the number of “Definitely Promotes” (DP). DP recommendations are limited in number to ensure that only the best qualified records are endorsed and send a strong signal to the CSB that this officer is ready for immediate promotion. DP allocation rates for “In the Promotion Zone” (IPZ) and “Above the Promotion Zone” (APZ) officers are lower than the IPZ promotion opportunity; this ensures a significant number of officers receiving “Promote”

recommendations will be promoted. Management Levels (MLs) receive a share of DP allocations based on the number of IPZ or Below the Promotion Zone (BPZ) officers assigned. Allocation rates vary for each competitive category; grade and promotion zone may fluctuate according to changes in the promotion opportunity to guarantee the minimum promotion rate for eligibles receiving a “Promote” recommendation (P-Rate). Allocation rates for BPZ officers are higher than the BPZ promotion opportunity to ensure all senior raters have the same opportunity to nominate their most deserving officers for an early promotion with the limited number of BPZ promotions available. HQ AFPC/DPPPEB publicizes rates for each PRF cycle.[38]

To determine Line of the Air Force Allocations, MLs determine the number of "DP" allocations they have by applying the appropriate allocation rate (developed by HQ/AFPC/DPPPEB) to their IPZ or BPZ eligibles. Round up fractions to the next whole number, e.g. if a ML has 262 BPZ eligibles and the allocation rate is 10%,[39] the ML earns 27 DP allocations (262 BPZ eligibles x 10% allocation rate = 26.2 which rounds up to 27 allocations).

To determine Senior Rater Allocations you follow essentially the same guidelines as the ML and in addition a minimum group size for one “Definitely Promote” allocation is three eligibles. MLs determine each senior rater's share of allocations in the same manner as discussed above, except instead of rounding up, senior raters round down. For example, a 55% allocation rate applied to a senior rater's 10 IPZ captains would yield 5 DP allocations (10 IPZ eligibles x 55% allocation rate = 5.5 which rounds down to 5 allocations).

A senior raters has the option to return earned allocations to the ML if they believe the quality of officers in their unit does not warrant the full share of allocations. MLs redistribute all returned allocations.

Since allocations are rounded down when applying the allocation rate to a senior rater's eligible population, there are normally fractions of allocations remaining. These fractions accrue at the ML and result in allocations called carry-over DP allocations. Carry-over allocations (and any returned allocations) are awarded to account for variations of quality within organizations under the ML.

With the returned allocations and carry over senior raters without the minimum number of I/APZ officers assigned may compete for DP recommendations through a process known as aggregation. Grouping of all such officers and the application of the allocation rate yields, after rounding down, the number of DP allocations available to officers competing in aggregation. Senior raters without the minimum numbers of BPZ officers assigned to earn an allocation aggregate their officers to the next higher senior rater in the rating chain until the number of eligibles is large enough to earn at least one allocation. This is quite a process to develop your DPs, but it does perhaps develop the largest number possible given the restrictions imposed by the AFI.[40]

In the PRF, Block II, unit mission description, and block III, job description, to include the sections on duty title and key duties, tasks, responsibilities are to be filled out in the same manner as the corresponding blocks on the OPR and using the same verbiage. Block IV, Promotion Recommendation, is filled in by the senior rater to explain why the officer should or should not be promoted.[41] This section covers the entire Record of Performance and provides key performance factors from the officer's entire career, not

just recent performance. Comments are limited to the next higher grade. For officers eligible for promotion to the grades of colonel and below, comments on BPZ "Promote" PRFs are optional and comments on all I/APZ PRFs are mandatory. A key point of interest is the comment "This section covers the entire Record of Performance and provides key performance factors from the officer's entire career, not just recent performance."[42] To look at a ratee's entire career and make a PRF recommendation is perhaps reaching a bit, because a senior rater's ability to know that individual over entire career is very limited.

Notes

[24] Air Force Instruction 36-2402, *Officer Evaluation System*, Washington, D.C., 01 July 1996, 16.
[25] Ibid., 1.
[26] Ibid., 13.
[27] Ibid., 13.
[28] Ibid., 15.
[29] Ibid., 16.
[30] Ibid., 16.
[31] Ibid., 25.
[32] Ibid., 25.
[33] Ibid., 26.
[34] Ibid., 26.
[35] Ibid., 26.
[36] Ibid., 38.
[37] Ibid., 38.
[38] Ibid., 41.
[39] Ibid., 41.
[40] Ibid., 42.
[41] Ibid., 56.
[42] Ibid., 58.

Chapter 3

United States Army, Officer Evaluation Reporting System

> *It is impossible to think of a man of any actual force and originality, universally recognized as having those qualities, who spent his whole life appraising and describing the work of other men.*
>
> —H.L. Mencken

Having written at length about the United States Marine Corps and the United States Air Force officer evaluation systems, one theme is constant, their purpose is the same throughout the military institutions, have common goals, and each service does do business in similar ways. My intention is to discuss the two parent services, the Army and Navy, in an abbreviated fashion and basically discuss what I have found to be their strengths and possible weaknesses.

The strongest section of the Army's officer evaluation reporting system when compared to it's sister services has to be the Officer Evaluation Report (OER) support form (DA Form 67-9-1) (Appendix G). The Army does the best job out of the four services on counseling and mentoring of its officers.

The primary propose of the OER support form is to promote a top down emphasis on leadership communication, integrating rated officer (the officer to be reported on) participation in objective setting, performance counseling, and evaluation. At the beginning of the rating period, enhanced planning and relating performance to mission through joint rater (officer supervisor) and rated officer discussion of the duty description

and major performance objectives. During the rating period, the Army encourages performance counseling with the best use of individual talent by continuous conununication to update and revise the performance objectives. At the beginning of rating period or shortly after the rated officer assumes duties, the rater provides him with copies of the rater's and senior rater's most recent support forms. The rated officer then drafts his own OER support form paying particular attention to duty description and major performance objectives. Within the first 30 days the rater conducts the initial face-to-face counseling with the rated officer, and approves the duty description and major performance objectives.[43]

When the initial face-to-face discussion is completed, the rated officer dates and initials in Part III (verification of face to face discussion) of the support form. The rater also initials (Part III) and forwards the support form to the senior rater, normally the Commanding Officer or at a minimum an officer in his chain of command two ranks above the rated officer. The senior rater reviews and initials in Part III, and returns it to the rater. The rater retains a copy and returns the original to the rated officer. During the rating period or period of report, the rated officer uses the support form as a performance guide. The rater conducts mandatory quarterly performance developmental counseling with the rated officer and makes adjustments to performance objectives on the support form, if required.[44]

The support form communication process is characterized by initial and follow-up face-to-face counseling between the rater and the rated officer. The initial face-to-face counseling assists in developing the elements of the rated officer's duty description, responsibilities and performance objectives. The follow up counseling enhances mission

related planning, assessment, and performance development. Through the communication process, the rated officer is made aware of the specific nature of his duty and may influence the decision on what should be accomplished. The rated officer is better able to direct and develop his own subordinates, plan for attaining the mission, gain valuable information about the organization, and find better ways to accomplish the mission. Using performance objectives as the basis for leadership communication enables the rater and rated officer to identify the rated officer's most important tasks, priorities, and major areas of concern and responsibility.

Upon completion of each periodic counseling, the rated officer dates/initials in Part III and the rater initials in Part III. The senior rater then reviews and initials in Part III, and returns it to the rater. The rater retains a copy and returns the original to the rated officer. At the end of the rating period, the rated officer should look back over the entire evaluation period to determine the most significant objectives and contributions in the preparation of the final support form. The rated officer completes the support form, in the significant contribution portion (Part IVc), and forwards to rater. The rater uses the support form as input for the OER; writes comments to the senior rater in raters comments (Part Va) signs the form; and forwards support form and OER to the senior rater. The senior rater uses support form as OER input and returns support form to rated officer.[45]

The check that the Army uses to ensure that the counseling and support forms are being used by its officer corps is on the OER (Appendix H) document. Under part IV, performance evaluation, block d, is a yes / no block that asks a simple question, "Were developmental tasks recorded on officer evaluation support form and quarterly follow-up

counselings conducted?" As a rater of officers subordinate in your chain of command and on your own OER and your senior rater (commanding officer) were to mark the no box, that could become an adverse fitness report for you and quite possibly be an end to your career. That is a considerable enforcement tool and one that no professional military officer could possibly ignore.

While it my opinion that the Army counseling and mentoring system is the strongest of the four services, there is an area of weakness that needs to be discussed. The army's OER is an overall sound evaluation process, but under part IV (performance evaluation) there are 23 traits that are graded on a yes or no criteria.[46] While this makes the OER easier to fill out, there is little ability to breakout the truly outstanding or document the officers that just barely make the grade. Using a grading scale comparable to the US Marine Corps or the Navy would be advisable. Also, I would recommend that the Army put percentage caps on the following areas to help curb promotion and grade inflation, Part Va (performance and potential evaluation), and Part VIIa (evaluate the rated officer's promotion potential to the next higher grade).

Notes

[43] Army Regulation 623-105, *Officer Evaluation Reporting System.* Washington, D.C., 01 October 1997, 11.
[44] Ibid., 11.
[45] Ibid., 12.
[46] Ibid., 17.

Chapter 4

United States Navy, Performance Evaluation and Counseling System

Data is what distinguishes the dilettante from the artist.

—George V. Higgins

This chapter provides an overview of the Navy performance evaluation and counseling system. It is a relatively new reporting system, coming on line 01 January 1996. The system employs a Fitness Report and Counseling Record (FITREP) (Appendix I) for chief petty officers and officers (E7-O6); this is a break from the other sister services except for the Marine Corps. The Air Force breaks its officers into categories, company grade (O-1 to O-3) and field grade (O-4 to O-6) officers and uses two similar Officer Performance Reports (OPRs), where leadership traits are emphasized for the field grade officers. The Marine Corps use the same report for it Sergeants (E-4) to Colonels (O-6) and the Army uses just one form for its officers.

The Navy places great emphasis on the promotion from Petty Officer First-Class (E-6) to Chief Petty Officer (E-7) and the chiefs leadership role. Including not just a change in uniforms from the enlisted blue to the chief's and officers' khaki, but also using the same FITNESS report for chiefs and officers. This distinction is not important for this paper, nor will it be discussed further. This just another example of how the military can take the same programs and solve it in different ways.

The FITREP has seven performance traits and each are graded on a five-point scale, from 1.0 (lowest) to 5.0 (highest), using performance standards printed on the FITREP forms. These seven graded traits are:

1. Professional Expertise: Professional knowledge, proficiency, and qualifications.
2. Equal Opportunity: Fairness, respect for human worth.
3. Military Bearing / Character: Appearance, conduct, physical fitness, and adherence to Navy Core Values.
4. Teamwork: Contributions to team building and team results.
5. Mission Accomplishment and Initiative: Taking the initiative, planning, prioritizing, and achieving missions.
6. Leadership: Organizing, motivating and developing others to accomplish goals.
7. Tactical Performance: (Warfare qualified officers only) Basic and tactical employment of weapons systems.[47]

The meanings of the trait grades are printed on the FITREP form, along with representative performance standards detailed above. The 5.0 grade is reserved for performance, which is far above standards, and is notable for its exemplary or leadership quality. The 1.0 grade means generally poor performance which is not improving, or unsatisfactory performance with respect to a single standard. For the majority of officers, most of the trait grades should be in the 2.0 to 4.0 range. Arbitrarily "two-blocking" the trait grades is detrimental for two reasons. First, the reporting senior's average trait grade will be available to detailers and selection boards for comparison purposes. Second, it will be difficult for the reporting senior to allocate promotion recommendations if everyone's trait grades are the same. An example would be 5.0 grade in Military Bearing/Character requires a physical readiness test (PRT) score of excellent or outstanding unless the member is waived or exempt. This block should not be graded 5.0, however, only because of PRT score. There are other important standards to consider, and most of them must rate a 5.0. If Military Bearing/Character is graded lower than 5.0, an excellent or outstanding PRT score should be mentioned in the comment

section (block 41). Comments should be based on verifiable facts. The basis is to use input from the member and the member's immediate supervisor(s) as well as the raters' and reporting senior's personal observations.[48]

The 3.0 grade represents performance to full Navy standards, with higher grades reserved for performance, which significantly exceeds standards. All 1.0 and 5.0 grades must be specifically justified by comments. Comments on other trait grades are optional. The FITREP form provides a five step promotion recommendation scale: "Significant Problems," "Progressing," "Promotable," "Must Promote," and "Early Promote." "Early Promote" recommendations are based solely on performance, and do not require eligibility for early promotion; However there are, mandatory limits on the number of "Early Promote" recommendations. For the more senior officer, there are also limits on "Must Promote" recommendations.[49] These limits ensure a sufficient range of recommendations to make the reports useful to the promotion system. While there are no corresponding limits on trait grades, they are expected to be consistent with the promotion recommendations.

An important distinction in the Navy system to note is that the commanding officers is the reporting senior by virtue of their command authority and signs the vast majority of fitness reports. The development of the FITREP is a team effort. The objective is to develop a better evaluation than could be achieved by any single member of the team. The rater (drafter) and reporting senior must work together to ensure consistent interpretation and application of Navy standards. In some cases, reports can be developed in a single cooperative effort. Where a division of effort is required, the rater should first collect input from the member, primary and collateral duty supervisors,

command duty officer, etc. The rater will then review the member's performance, assign trait grades using the performance standards, propose career recommendations, and as a minimum, draft a justifying comment for each 1.0 and 5.0 grade.[50] The senior rater (department head or executive officer) will review the rater's trait grades and career recommendations, expand the comments if necessary, and propose a promotion recommendation. The reporting senior will ensure that the FITREP standards have been respected, and will determine the final distribution of promotion recommendations within the member's summary group.

While the reporting senior can delegate signing authority to one of his subordinate (minimum of an O-4), this is usually only done on a large staff and the officer would normally be a Captain (O-6) or above.[51]

An integral aspect of the Navy’s evaluation process is the counseling system. Counseling methods are up to the commanding officer and is the CO's program.

Planned and scheduled counseling is a major focus of the Navy's performance evaluation system. Performance counseling should be provided at the midpoint of the periodic report cycle, and when the fitness report is signed. The counselor will be a supervisor who participates in the member's FITREP preparation. For the majority of officers the counselor will be the Commanding Officer (CO) or Executive Officer (XO), depending on the overall size of the wardroom (officer’s mess). Commanding officers are to guide the counseling program and monitor counselor performance and results.[52] The purpose of performance counseling is to enhance professional growth, encourage personal development, and improve communication among all members within the command. It should be a frank, open discussion of individual performance, with

reference to the seven performance traits on the fitness report form. Feedback from the member is an important element of the counseling process. Feedback increases the member's and supervisor's understanding of the member's performance, allows the member to be involved in decision making, and assists in planning the actions required to implement the decisions.

The objectives are to provide feedback to the member, and to motivate and assist in his professional improvement. Performance counseling starts with a fair assessment of the member's performance and capabilities. It identifies the member's strengths and motivates their further improvement. It also addresses important weaknesses, but should not dwell on unimportant ones. It should avoid personality and concentrate on performance. The FITREP forms are used as counseling worksheets, and must be signed by the counselor and member. Counselors may use the tick marks next to each performance standard, assign tentative trait grades, and write comments.

It is important to understand that under no circumstances should a future promotion recommendation be promised during counseling. The reasoning behind this is the percentage caps on the “early promote” and “must promote” categories on the promotion recommendation (block 42) portion, and the dynamic nature of the total number of officers at the command throughout the reporting period. Unfulfilled promises of promotion could lead to possible motivation problems and even administrative action. Promotion recommendations should be consistent with the performance trait grades. The intention is not to make "Early Promote" and "Must Promote" recommendations merely because quotas are available, and do not recommend any member as "Promotable" who could not, if called on, currently perform the basic duties of the next higher grade.

Individuals should not automatically be place in the "Early Promote" category when they are evaluated singly. The same standards for trait grades and recommendations should be used as are used for other members of the command.

An area that the Navy uses as a promotion tool is the use of summary groups to block off officers of similar warfare specialties. Officer summary groups generally consist of all members in the same pay grade and same promotion status, who receive the same type of report from the same reporting senior on the same ending date, and are further subdivided by competitive category (e.g. unrestricted line officers, special duty-intelligence officers, Medical Corps officers, etc.). The officer summary group is a valuable tool, which enables promotion boards to review records of similar backgrounds and job descriptions.[53]

To close out this section on the Navy FITREP system, the last subject to discuss is perhaps the strongest grade inflation technique of any of the services. The Navy has developed a series of checks and balances that perhaps will get grade inflation under control.

Taking into account the seven performance traits that each officer is graded on and that each trait is assigned a numerical value from one to five, then it is an easy calculation to develop individual trait average for the reporting period. Two more calculations enter into the system. A summary group trait average is developed, which is simply the trait average of all the officers in the same summary group and reporting period averaged. The second data point developed is the reporting senior trait average, which is the total overall trait average of every officer in the same summary group that the reporting senior has developed a FITREP on, throughout his career. For example: a Captain has reporting

senior trait average of 3.24 and a summary group trait average of 3.32 as the officer reported on gets an individual trait average of 3.43, then by all standards that is a very solid report. The next command the Captain as the reporting senior has an overall trait average throughout his career of 4.45 and the summary group trait average is 4.50 and the officer reported on receives an individual trait average of 4.43.[54] Even though the individual trait average went up an astounding 1.0 overall, the promotion board will actually look at this FITREP as a possible decline in performance. With the development of a reporting senior's trait average, it is an advantage to actually work to keep that trait average lower to allow room to breakout the front runners. With the summary group trait average it is an easy comparison to see how an officer fits in the summary group for the reporting period.

Notes

[47] Bureau of Naval Personnel Instruction 1610.10, *Navy Performance Evaluation and Counseling System.* Washington, D.C., 02 August 1995, A-19.
[48] Ibid., 3.
[49] Ibid., 1.
[50] Ibid., 2.
[51] Ibid., 1.
[52] Ibid., C-1.
[53] Ibid., 4.
[54] Ibid., Q-2.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

US Marine Corps:

Strengths:

1. The most in-depth and complete reporting system of all the services.
2. Has very strong checks and balances to fight grade inflation.

Weakness:

1. Rating traits are assigned alphabetical designation, therefore it is difficult to analyze and report data in a useful format to promotion and administrative boards.
2. There is no percentage cap on the reviewing officer's comments for ranking the Marine Reported On (MRO).
3. The depth and five-page length could become an administrative nightmare.

Recommendations:

1. Change the rating traits from an alphabetical designation to a numeric designation. This will enable the development of numeric data points that are easier for promotion and administrative board to understand. Follow the Navy's lead with grade trait averages and reporting senior's averages.
2. Develop a percentage cap on the reviewing officer's comments that will ensure that a MRO receiving a description recommendation in the top performance boxes is under tight control. This will add creditability to the process.
3. Only time will tell just how much of an administrative requirement the USMC fitness report will be.

US Air Force:

Strengths:

1. The breakout of its officers into company grade and field grade officer groups. The Army, Marine Corps, and Navy should follow this lead.

Weaknesses:

1. The Officer Performance Report (OPR) has become a very weak document. The performance factors, Block V, are “does not meet standards” or “meets standards”, essentially a yes or no criteria. There is no ability for a promotion board to make a break out of its officers. There is no promotion recommendation opportunity.
2. The Performance Recommendation Form (PRF) is a redundant document, administrative burden, and has little value to add to the officer evaluation system. The document is only of temporary value and is destroyed immediately after promotion boards.
3. Develop the use of summary groups in the officer corps. The tradition of grouping all Air Force officers into a single promotion group is analogous to comparing apples to oranges.

Recommendations:

1. Combine the OPR and PRF into one document.
2. Follow the Navy’s lead and assign numerical values to the OPR’s performance factors. This one change will enable the development of individual trait averages, summary group trait averages, and a reporting senior

trait averages. This will enable the development of numeric data points that are easier for promotion and administrative boards to understand.

3. Develop a non-variable percentage cap on promotion recommendations and discontinue the practice of “below zone” and “in or above zone” recommendation procedures. Follow the other services example on this issue.
4. Develop the use of officer summary groups.

US Army:

Strengths:

1. The use of the Officer Evaluation Report (OER) support form is by far the strongest counseling, development of performance objectives, and documentation procedures for the officer corps of any of the services.
2. A built in grade inflation check in the form of a percentage cap in block VII part b (potential compared with officers senior rated in same grade).

Weaknesses:

1. On the OER, the use of “Yes” or “No” criteria in the performance evaluation, block IV, there is no ability for a promotion board to make a break out of its officers.
2. No percentage cap for blocks V part a (performance and potential evaluation) and block VII part a (evaluate the rated officer’s potential to next higher grade).

Recommendation:

1. Change the block IV, the rating traits from a yes / no designation to a numeric designation. This will enable the development of numeric data points that are

easier for promotion and administrative boards to understand. Follow the Navy's lead with grade trait averages and reporting senior's averages.

2. Develop a percentage cap for blocks V part a (performance and potential evaluation) and block VII part a (evaluate the rated officer's potential to next higher grade). This will help curb grade inflation and develop better data points for promotion boards.

US Navy:

Strengths:

1. A built in percentage cap on blocks 42 (promotion recommendations).
2. The use of a numeric scale of 1 to 5 in the performance traits (blocks 33 through 39). This enables the development of numeric data points that easier for promotion and administrative board to understand. The development of individual trait averages, summary group trait averages, and most important the reporting senior trait average.
3. A recent change in Navy policy is to allow ranking of individuals in the narrative section. This enables the Commanding Officer to breakout an individual when he is constrained by the percentage cap in the promotion recommendation block (Blk 42).

Weakness:

1. The use of equal opportunity as one of the seven-grade trait averages. Block 34 is the most abused and miss understood performance trait on the fitness report.
2. Officer counseling is weak.

Recommendation:

1. Remove block 34, equal opportunity and replace it with a more applicable subject area. An alternative recommendation would be a performance trait of "Intellect and Wisdom" with emphasis on Professional Military Education (PME), decision making ability, and judgment. The USMC's fitness report, block G, would be an outstanding template.
2. Develop a stronger officer professional counseling methods; use the US Army's system as a guide.

Appendix A

Appendix A: United States Marine Corps, FITNESS Report (NAVMC 10835A, Rev. 1-99 (EF))

USMC FITNESS REPORT (1610)
NAVMC 10835A (Rev. 1-99 (EF))
PREVIOUS EDITIONS WILL NOT BE USED
SN: 0109-LF-069-0600

DO NOT STAPLE THIS FORM

COMMANDANT'S GUIDANCE

The completed fitness report is the most important information component in manpower management. It is the primary means of evaluating a Marine's performance and is the Commandant's primary tool for the selection of personnel for promotion, augmentation, resident schooling, command, and duty assignments. Therefore, the completion of this report is one of an officer's most critical responsibilities. Inherent in this duty is the commitment of each Reporting Senior and Reviewing Officer to ensure the integrity of the system by giving close attention to accurate marking and timely reporting. Every officer serves a role in the scrupulous maintenance of this evaluation system, ultimately important to both the individual and the Marine Corps. Inflationary markings only serve to dilute the actual value of each report. Reviewing Officers will not concur with inflated reports.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

1. Marine Reported On:
a. Last Name | b. First Name | c. MI | d. SSN | e. Grade | f. DOR | g. PMOS | h. BILMOS

2. Organization:
a. MCC | b. RUC | c. Unit Description

3. Occasion and Period Covered:
a. OCC | b. From | To | c. Type

4. Duty Assignment (descriptive title):

5. Special
a. Adverse ☐ b. Not Observed ☐ c. Extended ☐

6. Marine Subject Of:
a. Commendatory Material ☐ b. Derogatory Material ☐ c. Disciplinary Action ☐

7. Recommended For Promotion:
a. Yes ☐ b. No ☐ c. N/A ☐

8. Special Information:

a. QUAL		d. HT(in.)		g. Reserve Component	
b. PFT		e. WT		h. Future Use	
c. Status		f. Body Fat		i. Future Use	

9. Duty Preference:

	a. Code	b. Descriptive Title
1st		
2nd		
3rd		

10. Reporting Senior:
a. Last Name | b. Init | c. Service | d. SSN | e. Grade | f. Duty Assignment

11. Reviewing Officer:
a. Last Name | b. Init | c. Service | d. SSN | e. Grade | f. Duty Assignment

B. BILLET DESCRIPTION

C. BILLET ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Marine Reported On: a. Last Name	b. First Name	c. MI	d. SSN	2. Occasion and Period Covered: a.OCC	b. From	To

D. MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT

1. PERFORMANCE. Results achieved during the reporting period. How well those duties inherent to a Marine's billet, plus all additional duties, formally and informally assigned, were carried out. Reflects a Marine's aptitude, competence, and commitment to the unit's success above personal reward. Indicators are time and resource management, task prioritization, and tenacity to achieve positive ends consistently.

ADV							N/O
	Meets requirements of billet and additional duties. Aptitude, commitment, and competence meet expectations. Results maintain status quo.		Consistently produces quality results while measurably improving unit performance. Habitually makes effective use of time and resources; improves billet procedures and products. Positive impact extends beyond billet expectations.		Results far surpass expectations. Recognizes and exploits new resources; creates opportunities. Emulated; sought after as an expert with influence beyond unit. Impact significant; innovative approaches to problems produce significant gains in quality and		

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. PROFICIENCY. Demonstrates technical knowledge and practical skill in the execution of the Marine's overall duties. Combines training, education and experience. Translates skills into actions which contribute to accomplishing tasks and missions. Imparts knowledge to others. Grade dependent.

ADV							N/O
	Competent. Possesses the requisite range of skills and knowledge commensurate with grade and experience. Understands and articulates basic functions related to mission		Demonstrates mastery of all required skills. Expertise, education and experience consistently enhance mission accomplishment. Innovative troubleshooter and problem solver. Effectively imparts skills to subordinates.		True expert in field. Knowledge and skills impact far beyond those of peers. Translates broad-based education and experience into forward thinking, innovative actions. Makes immeasurable impact on mission accomplishment. Peerless teacher, selflessly imparts expertise to subordinates, peers, and		

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

JUSTIFICATION:

E. INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER

1. COURAGE. Moral or physical strength to overcome danger, fear, difficulty or anxiety. Personal acceptance of responsibility and accountability, placing conscience over competing interests regardless of consequences. Conscious, overriding decision to risk bodily harm or death to accomplish the mission or save others. The will to persevere despite uncertainty.

ADV							N/O
	Demonstrates inner strength and acceptance of responsibility commensurate with scope of duties and experience. Willing to face moral or physical challenges in pursuit of mission accomplishment.		Guided by conscience in all actions. Proven ability to overcome danger, fear, difficulty or anxiety. Exhibits bravery in the face of adversity and uncertainty. Not deterred by morally difficult situations or hazardous responsibilities.		Uncommon bravery and capacity to overcome obstacles and inspire others in the face of moral dilemma or life-threatening danger. Demonstrated under the most adverse conditions. Selfless. Always places conscience over competing interests regardless of physical or personal consequences.		

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. EFFECTIVENESS UNDER STRESS Thinking, functioning and leading effectively under conditions of physical and/or mental pressure. Maintaining composure appropriate for the situation, while displaying steady purpose of action, enabling one to inspire others while continuing to lead under adverse conditions. Physical and emotional strength, resilience and endurance are elements.

ADV							N/O
	Exhibits discipline and stability under pressure. Judgment and effective problem-solving skills are evident.		Consistently demonstrates maturity, mental agility, and willpower during periods of adversity. Provides order to chaos through the application of intuition, problem-solving skills, and leadership. Composure reassures others.		Demonstrates seldom-matched presence of mind under the most demanding circumstances. Stabilizes any situation through the resolute and timely application of direction, focus and personal presence.		

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. INITIATIVE Action in the absence of specific direction. Seeing what needs to be done and acting without prompting. The instinct to begin a task and follow through energetically on one's own accord. Being creative, proactive and decisive. Transforming opportunity into action.

ADV							N/O
	Demonstrates willingness to take action in the absence of specific direction. Acts commensurate with grade, training and experience.		Self-motivated and action-oriented. Foresight and energy consistently transform opportunity into action. Develops and pursues creative, innovative solutions. Acts without prompting. Self-starter.		Highly motivated and proactive. Displays exceptional awareness of surroundings and environment. Uncanny ability to anticipate mission requirements and quickly formulate original, far-reaching solutions. Always takes decisive, effective action.		

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

JUSTIFICATION:

1. Marine Reported On:

a. Last Name	b. First Name	c. MI	d. SSN	2. Occasion and Period Covered: a.OCC	b. From	To

F. LEADERSHIP

1. LEADING SUBORDINATES. The inseparable relationship between leader and led. The application of leadership principles to provide direction and motivate subordinates. Using authority, persuasion, and personality to influence subordinates to accomplish assigned tasks. Sustaining motivation and morale while maximizing subordinates' performance.

ADV	Engaged; provides instructions and directs execution. Seeks to accomplish mission in ways that sustain motivation and morale. Actions contribute to unit effectiveness.		Achieves a highly effective balance between direction and delegation. Effectively tasks subordinates and clearly delineates standards expected. Enhances performance through constructive supervision. Fosters motivation and enhances morale. Builds and sustains teams that successfully meet mission requirements. Encourages initiative and candor among subordinates.		Promotes creativity and energy among subordinates by striking the ideal balance of direction and delegation. Achieves highest levels of performance from subordinates by encouraging individual initiative. Engenders willing subordination, loyalty, and trust that allow subordinates to overcome their perceived limitations. Personal leadership fosters highest levels of motivation and morale, ensuring mission accomplishment even in the most difficult circumstances.		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

2. DEVELOPING SUBORDINATES. Commitment to train, educate, and challenge all Marines regardless of race, religion, ethnic background, or gender. Mentorship. Cultivating professional and personal development of subordinates. Developing team players and esprit de corps. Ability to combine teaching and coaching. Creating an atmosphere tolerant of mistakes in the course of learning.

ADV	Maintains an environment that allows personal and professional development. Ensures subordinates participate in all mandated development programs.		Develops and institutes innovative programs, to include PME, that emphasize personal and professional development of subordinates. Challenges subordinates to exceed their perceived potential thereby enhancing unit morale and effectiveness. Creates an environment where all Marines are confident to learn through trial and error. As a mentor, prepares subordinates for increased responsibilities and duties.		Widely recognized and emulated as a teacher, coach and leader. Any Marine would desire to serve with this Marine because they know they will grow personally and professionally. Subordinate and unit performance far surpassed expected results due to MRO's mentorship and team building talents. Attitude toward subordinate development is infectious, extending beyond the unit.		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

3. SETTING THE EXAMPLE. The most visible facet of leadership: how well a Marine serves as a role model for all others. Personal action demonstrates the highest standards of conduct, ethical behavior, fitness, and appearance. Bearing, demeanor, and self-discipline are elements.

ADV	Maintains Marine Corps standards for appearance, weight, and uniform wear. Sustains required level of physical fitness. Adheres to the tenets of the Marine Corps core values.		Personal conduct on and off duty reflects highest Marine Corps standards of integrity, bearing and appearance. Character is exceptional. Actively seeks self- improvement in wide-ranging areas. Dedication to duty and professional example encourage others'		Model Marine, frequently emulated. Exemplary conduct, behavior, and actions are tone-setting. An inspiration to subordinates, peers, and seniors. Remarkable dedication to improving self and others.		N/

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

4. ENSURING WELL-BEING OF SUBORDINATES. Genuine interest in the well-being of Marines. Efforts enhance subordinates' ability to concentrate/focus on unit mission accomplishment. Concern for family readiness is inherent. The importance placed on welfare of subordinates is based on the belief that Marines take care of their own.

ADV	Deals confidently with issues pertinent to subordinate welfare and recognizes suitable courses of action that support subordinates' well-being. Applies available resources, allowing subordinates to effectively concentrate on the mission.		Instills and/or reinforces a sense of responsibility among junior Marines for themselves and their subordinates. Actively fosters the development of and uses support systems for subordinates which improve their ability to contribute to unit mission accomplishment. Efforts to enhance subordinate welfare improve the unit's ability to accomplish its mission.		Noticeably enhances subordinates' well-being, resulting in a measurable increase in unit effectiveness. Maximizes unit and base resources to provide subordinates with the best support available. Proactive approach serves to energize unit members to "take care of their own," thereby correcting potential problems before they can hinder subordinates' effectiveness. Widely recognized for techniques and policies that produce results and build morale. Builds strong family atmosphere. Puts motto *Mission first, Marines always*, into action.		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

5. COMMUNICATION SKILLS. The efficient transmission and receipt of thoughts and ideas that enable and enhance leadership. Equal importance given to listening, speaking, writing, and critical reading skills. Interactive, allowing one to perceive problems and situations, provide concise guidance, and express complex ideas in a form easily understood by everyone. Allows subordinates to ask questions, raise issues and concerns and venture opinions. Contributes to a leader's ability to motivate as well as counsel.

ADV	Skilled in receiving and conveying information. Communicates effectively in performance of duties.		Clearly articulates thoughts and ideas, verbally and in writing. Communication in all forms is accurate, intelligible, concise, and timely. Communicates with clarity and verve, ensuring understanding of intent or purpose. Encourages and considers the contributions of others.		Highly developed facility in verbal communication. Adept in composing written documents of the highest quality. Combines presence and verbal skills which engender confidence and achieve understanding irrespective of the setting, situation, or size of the group addressed. Displays an intuitive sense of when and how to listen.		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

JUSTIFICATION:

1. Marine Reported On:

a. Last Name	b. First Name	c. MI	d. SSN	2. Occasion and Period Covered: a.OCC	b. From	To

G. INTELLECT AND WISDOM

1. PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION (PME). Commitment to intellectual growth in ways beneficial to the Marine Corps. Increases the breadth and depth of warfighting and leadership aptitude. Resources include resident schools; professional qualifications and certification processes; nonresident and other extension courses; civilian educational institution coursework; a personal reading program that includes (but is not limited to) selections from the Commandant's Reading List; participation in discussion groups and military societies; and involvement in learning through new technologies.

ADV	Maintains currency in required military skills and related developments. Has completed or is enrolled in appropriate level of PME for grade and level of experience. Recognizes and understands new and creative approaches to service issues. Remains abreast of contemporary concepts and issues.		PME outlook extends beyond MOS and required education. Develops and follows a comprehensive personal program which includes broadened professional reading and/or academic course work; advances new concepts and ideas.		Dedicated to life-long learning. As a result of active and continuous efforts, widely recognized as an intellectual leader in professionally related topics. Makes time for study and takes advantage of all resources and programs. Introduces new and creative approaches to services issues. Engages in a broad spectrum of forums and dialogues.		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

2. DECISION MAKING ABILITY. Viable and timely problem solution. Contributing elements are judgment and decisiveness. Decisions reflect the balance between an optimal solution and a satisfactory, workable solution that generates tempo. Decisions are made within the context of the commander's established intent and the goal of mission accomplishment. Anticipation, mental agility, intuition, and success are inherent.

ADV	Makes sound decisions leading to mission accomplishment. Actively collects and evaluates information and weighs alternatives to achieve timely results. Confidently approaches problems; accepts responsibility for outcomes.		Demonstrates mental agility; effectively prioritizes and solves multiple complex problems. Analytical abilities enhanced by experience, education, and intuition. Anticipates problems and implements viable, long-term solutions. Steadfast, willing to make difficult decisions.		mplex problems. Seldom matched analytical a		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

3. JUDGMENT. The discretionary aspect of decision making. Draws on core values, knowledge, and personal experience to make wise choices. Comprehends the consequences of contemplated courses of action.

ADV	Majority of judgments are measured, circumspect, relevant, and correct.		Decisions are consistent and uniformly correct, tempered by consideration of their consequences. Able to identify, isolate and assess relevant factors in the decision making process. Opinions sought by others. Subordinates personal interests in favor of impartiality.		Decisions reflect exceptional insight and wisdom beyond this Marine's experience. Counsel sought by all; often an arbiter. Consistent, superior judgment inspires the confidence of seniors.		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

JUSTIFICATION:

H. FULFILLMENT OF EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES

1. EVALUATIONS. The extent to which this officer serving as a reporting official conducted, or required others to conduct, accurate, uninflated, and timely evaluations.

ADV	Occasionally submitted untimely or administratively incorrect evaluations. As RS, submitted one or more reports that contained inflated markings. As RO, concurred with one or more reports from subordinates that were returned by HQMC for inflated marking.		Prepared uninflated evaluations which were consistently submitted on time. Evaluations accurately described performance and character. Evaluations contained no inflated markings. No reports returned by RO or HQMC for inflated marking. No subordinates' reports returned by HQMC for inflated marking. Few, if any, reports were returned by RO or HQMC for administrative errors. Section Cs were void of superlatives. Justifications were specific, verifiable, substantive, and where possible, quantifiable and supported the markings		No reports submitted late. No reports returned by either RO or HQMC for administrative correction or inflated markings. No subordinates' reports returned by HQMC for administrative correction or inflated markings. Returned procedurally or administratively incorrect reports to subordinates for correction. As RO nonconcurred with all inflated reports.		N/O

A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G ☐ H ☐

JUSTIFICATION:

1. Marine Reported On: a. Last Name	b. First Name	c. MI	d. SSN	2. Occasion and Period Covered: a.OCC	b. From	To

I. DIRECTED AND ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

J. CERTIFICATION

1. I CERTIFY that to the best of my knowledge and belief all entries made hereon are true and without prejudice or partiality and that I have provided a signed copy of this report to the Marine Reported on.

(Signature of Reporting Senior) (Date in YYYYMMDD format)

2. I ACKNOWLEDGE the adverse nature of this report and

☐ I have no statement to

☐ I have attached a

(Signature of Marine Reported On) (Date in YYYYMMDD format)

K. REVIEWING OFFICER COMMENTS

1. OBSERVATION: ☐ Sufficient ☐ Insufficient **2. EVALUATION:** ☐ Concur ☐ Do Not Concur

3. COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT: Provide a comparative assessment of potential by placing an "X" in the appropriate box. In marking the comparison, consider all Marines of this grade whose professional abilities are known to you personally.

DESCRIPTION		COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT
THE EMINENTLY QUALIFIED MARINE	☐	
ONE OF THE FEW EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED MARINES	☐ ☐	
ONE OF THE MANY HIGHLY QUALIFIED PROFESSIONALS WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THIS GRADE	☐ ☐ ☐	
A QUALIFIED MARINE	☐	
UNSATISFACTORY	☐	

4. **REVIEWING OFFICER COMMENTS:** Amplify your comparative assessment mark; evaluate potential for continued professional development to include: promotion, command, assignment, resident PME, and retention; and put Reporting Senior marks and comments in perspective.

5. I CERTIFY that to the best of my knowledge and belief all entries made hereon are true and without prejudice or partiality.

(Signature of Reviewing Officer) (Date in YYYYMMDD format)

6. I ACKNOWLEDGE the adverse nature of this report and

☐ I have no statement to

☐ I have attached a

(Signature of Marine Reported On) (Date in YYYYMMDD format)

L. ADDENDUM PAGE

ADDENDUM PAGE ATTACHED: ☐ **YES**

NAVMC 10835E (Rev. 1-99 (EF))
SN: 0109-LF-071-1700

PAGE 5 OF 5

Appendix B

Appendix B: United States Marine Corps, Performance Evaluation System, Section F – Leadership.

SECTION F - LEADERSHIP

1. **LEADING SUBORDINATES**

a. **Definition**. "The inseparable relationship between leader and led. The application of leadership principles to provide direction and motivate subordinates. Using authority, persuasion, and personality to influence subordinates to accomplish assigned tasks. Sustaining motivation and morale while maximizing subordinates' performance."

b. **Scaled Measurements**

(1) "B" marking - "Engaged; provides instructions and directs execution. Seeks to accomplish mission in ways that sustain motivation and morale. Actions contribute to unit effectiveness."

(2) "D" marking - "Achieves a highly effective balance between direction and delegation. Effectively tasks subordinates and clearly delineates standards expected. Enhances performance through constructive supervision. Fosters motivation and enhances morale. Builds and sustains teams that successfully meet mission requirements. Encourages initiative and candor among subordinates."

(3) "F" marking - "Promotes creativity and energy among subordinates by striking the ideal balance of direction and delegation. Achieves highest levels of performance from subordinates by encouraging individual initiative. Engenders willing subordination, loyalty, and trust that allow subordinates to overcome their perceived limitations. Personal leadership fosters highest levels of motivation and morale, ensuring mission accomplishment even in the most difficult circumstances."

c. **Discussion**. Assessing leadership is difficult; particularly those styles that are not always immediately obvious.

(1) Better leaders employ varied methods to get the best from their subordinates.

(2) They lead through the quiet times and not just the busy activities.

(3) This attribute assesses MRO's achievements in terms of applied leadership. Success in this applied leadership should manifest itself in increased subordinate and unit performance.

(4) The scope of an individual's leadership expands further than the number of people under his or her immediate charge; it is also a measure of how one inspires, directs, influences, and persuades others by words and deeds. These qualities can be assessed even when the MRO is not filling a leadership billet, per se.

3. **DEVELOPING SUBORDINATES**

a. **Definition**. "Commitment to train, educate, and challenge all Marines regardless of race, religion, ethnic background, or gender. Mentorship. Cultivating professional and personal development of subordinates. Developing team players and esprit de corps. Ability to combine teaching and coaching. Creating an atmosphere tolerant of mistakes in the course of learning."

b. **Scaled Measurements**

(1) "B" marking - "Maintains an environment that allows personal and professional development. Ensures subordinates participate in all mandated development programs."

(2) "D" marking - "Develops and institutes innovative programs, to include PME, that emphasize personal and professional development of subordinates. Challenges subordinates to exceed their perceived potential thereby enhancing unit morale and effectiveness. Creates an environment where all Marines are confident to learn through trial and error. As a mentor, prepares subordinates for increased responsibilities and duties."

(3) "F" marking - "Widely recognized and emulated as a teacher, coach and leader. Any Marine would desire to serve with this Marine because they know they will grow personally and professionally. Subordinate and unit performance far surpassed expected results due to MRO's mentorship and team building talents. Attitude toward subordinate development is infectious, extending beyond the unit."

c. **Discussion**. This attribute seeks to assess the leader's capacity to "fine-tune" the team. Given that most leaders will achieve basic proficiency in the training of their unit, you can best judge exceptions in this area by the degree of honing that the leader achieves. The following questions provide help here:

(1) Does the Marine seek to prepare subordinates to assume greater responsibility at short notice?

(2) Does the Marine challenge subordinates to seek their own knowledge and develop their analytical skills?

(3) Does the Marine tolerate honest mistakes, and pace the program on the development of subordinates, rather than on the achievement of

objectives; or, in the words of General Lejeune, "Does the leader teach and coach, or simply instruct?"

4. **SETTING THE EXAMPLE**

a. **Definition.** "The most visible facet of leadership: how well a Marine serves as a role model for all others. Personal action demonstrates the highest standards of conduct, ethical behavior, fitness, and appearance. Bearing, demeanor, and self-discipline are elements."

b. **Scaled Measurements**

(1) "B" marking - "Maintains Marine Corps standards for appearance, weight, and uniform wear. Sustains required level of physical fitness. Adheres to the tenets of the Marine Corps core values."

(2) "D" marking - "Personal conduct on and off duty reflects highest Marine Corps standards of integrity, bearing and appearance. Character is exceptional. Actively seeks self-improvement in wide-ranging areas. Dedication to duty and professional example encourage others' self-improvement efforts."

(3) "F" marking - "Model Marine, frequently emulated. Exemplary conduct, behavior, and actions are tone setting. An inspiration to subordinates, peers, and seniors. Remarkable dedication to improving self and others."

c. **Discussion.** Leadership depends on personal credibility and a commitment to excellence.

(1) Leaders who do not demonstrate self-discipline, personal organization, physical fitness, and respect for the Corps fail to fully meet the responsibility of their offices.

(2) Beyond the physical aspects of leadership, being fully knowledgeable in the directives that guide appearance, fitness, conduct, and other areas is essential in creating the aura of authority.

(3) Paramount is a personal commitment to our core values; a belief that these values are central to the Corps' ethos and status in American society. The health and vitality of the Corps depend on passing along these characteristics that make Marines unique.

5. **ENSURING WELL-BEING OF SUBORDINATES**

a. **Definition.** "Genuine interest in the well-being of Marines. Efforts enhance subordinates' ability to concentrate/focus on unit mission accomplishment. Concern for family readiness is inherent. The importance placed on welfare of subordinates is based on the belief that Marines take care of their own."

b. **Scaled Measurements**

(1) "B" marking - "Deals confidently with issues pertinent to subordinate welfare and recognizes suitable courses of action that support subordinates' well-being. Applies available resources, allowing subordinates to effectively concentrate on the mission."

(2) "D" marking - "Instills and/or reinforces a sense of responsibility among junior Marines for themselves and their subordinates. Actively fosters the development of and uses support systems for subordinates which improve their ability to contribute to unit mission accomplishment. Efforts to enhance subordinate welfare improve the unit's ability to accomplish its mission."

(3) "F" marking - "Noticeably enhances subordinate well-being, resulting in a measurable increase in unit effectiveness. Maximizes unit and base resources to provide subordinates with the best support available. Proactive approach serves to energize unit members to “take care of their own,” thereby correcting potential problems before they can hinder subordinates' effectiveness. Widely recognized for techniques and policies that produce results and build morale. Builds strong family atmosphere. Puts motto *Mission first, Marines always*, into action."

c. **Discussion**. From their first days in training, Marines learn the imperative of taking care of their subordinates. The phrase "Marines take care of their own" captures the spirit of this facet of leadership. The primary reason for this emphasis is the time-tested observation that military units perform better when their leadership looks to the well being of their members.

(1) A leader's efforts in ensuring subordinates' welfare and their families’ quality of life reduces the Marines' burden, allowing them to concentrate more effectively on accomplishing the unit's mission. A concern is that a leader's efforts may be so aggressive that Marines get the impression that the leader will always fix their problems for them.

(2) The leader's policies and actions must instill a sense of personal responsibility among junior Marines for themselves and *their* subordinates.

(3) Efforts to ensure subordinate welfare should never take priority over or come at the expense of the unit's mission or effectiveness. Taking care of Marines is inherent to accomplishing the mission.

6. **COMMUNICATION SKILLS**

a. **Definition**. "The efficient transmission and receipt of thoughts and ideas that enable and enhance leadership. Equal importance given to listening, speaking, writing, and critical reading skills. Interactive, allowing one to perceive problems and situations, provide concise guidance, and express complex ideas in a form easily understood by everyone. Allows subordinates to ask questions, raise issues and concerns, and venture opinions. Contributes to a leader's ability to motivate as well as counsel."

b. **Scaled Measurements**

(1) "B" marking - "Skilled in receiving and conveying information. Communicates effectively in performance of duties."

(2) "D" marking - "Clearly articulates thoughts and ideas, verbally and in writing. Communication in all forms is accurate, intelligible, concise, and timely. Communicates with clarity and verve, ensuring understanding of intent or purpose. Encourages and considers the contributions of others."

(3) "F" marking - "Highly developed facility in verbal communication. Adept in composing written documents of the highest quality. Combines presence and verbal skills, which engender confidence and achieve understanding irrespective of the setting, situation, or size of the group addressed. Displays an intuitive sense of when and how to listen."

c. **Discussion**. The ability to communicate is vital.

(1) Without this skill: orders get misunderstood, directives get confused, and the potency of good leadership becomes diluted.

(2) This is an everyday skill that all Marines must practice and refine.

(3) Skill in listening to - and hearing - what others offer is as important as what we say or write.

Appendix C

Appendix C: United States Marine Corps, Performance Evaluation System, Section H – Fulfillment of Evaluation Responsibilities.

Section H: Definition. "The extent to which this officer serving as a reporting official conducted, or required others to conduct, accurate, uninflated, and timely evaluations."

1. **Scaled Measurements**

a. "B" marking - "Occasionally submitted untimely or administratively incorrect evaluations. As RS, submitted one or more reports that contained inflated markings. As RO, concurred with one or more reports from subordinates that were returned by HQMC for inflated marking."

b. "D" marking - "Prepared uninflated evaluations which were consistently submitted on time. Evaluations accurately described performance and character. Evaluations contained no inflated markings. No reports returned by RO or HQMC for inflated marking. No subordinates' reports returned by HQMC for inflated marking. Few, if any, reports were returned by RO or HQMC for administrative errors. Section Cs were void of superlatives. Justifications were specific, verifiable, substantive, and where possible, quantifiable and supported the markings given."

c. "F" marking - "No reports submitted late. No reports returned by either RO or HQMC for administrative correction or inflated markings. No subordinates' reports returned by HQMC for administrative correction or inflated markings. Returned procedurally or administratively incorrect reports to subordinates for correction. As RO nonconcurred with all inflated reports."

Appendix D

Appendix D: United States Air Force, Company and Field Grade Officer Performance Feedback Worksheets

COMPANY GRADE OFFICER PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK WORKSHEET

I. PERSONAL INFORMATION

NAME	GRADE	UNIT

II. KEY DUTIES, TASKS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

III. PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK

	needs significant improvement	*needs little or no improvement*
1. JOB KNOWLEDGE		
Has knowledge required to perform duties effectively	←	→
Strives to improve knowledge	←	→
2. LEADERSHIP SKILLS		
Sets and enforces standards	←	→
Works well with others	←	→
Fosters teamwork	←	→
Displays initiative	←	→
Self-confident	←	→
3. PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES		
Exhibits loyalty, discipline, dedication, integrity, honesty, and officership	←	→
Adheres to Air Force standards	←	→
Accepts personal responsibility	←	→
Is fair and objective	←	→
4. ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS		
Demonstrates ability to plan	←	→
Coordinates actions	←	→
Schedules effectively	←	→
Uses resources effectively and efficiently	←	→
Meets suspenses	←	→
5. JUDGEMENT AND DECISIONS		
Makes timely and accurate decisions	←	→
Emphasizes logic in decision making	←	→
Retains composure in stressful situations	←	→
Recognizes opportunities	←	→
Requires minimal supervision	←	→
6. COMMUNICATION SKILLS		
Listening	←	→
Speaking	←	→
Writing	←	→

IV. COMMENTS

AF FORM 724B, OCT 97 (LRA) *(EF-V1)* *(PerFORM PRO)* PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE

FIELD GRADE OFFICER PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK WORKSHEET

I. PERSONAL INFORMATION

NAME	GRADE	UNIT

II. KEY DUTIES, TASKS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

III. PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK

	needs significant improvement	*needs little or no improvement*
1. JOB KNOWLEDGE		
Has knowledge required to perform duties effectively	←	→
Strives to improve knowledge	←	→
Applies knowledge to handle nonroutine situations	←	→
2. LEADERSHIP SKILLS		
Sets and enforces standards	←	→
Motivates subordinates	←	→
Works well with others	←	→
Fosters teamwork	←	→
Displays initiative	←	→
Self-confident	←	→
Has respect and confidence of subordinates	←	→
Fair and consistent in evaluation of subordinates	←	→
3. PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES		
Exhibits loyalty, discipline, dedication, integrity, honesty, officership	←	→
Adheres to Air Force standards	←	→
Accepts personal responsibility	←	→
Is fair and objective	←	→
4. ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS		
Plans, coordinates, schedules, and uses resources effectively	←	→
Schedules work for self and others equitably and effectively	←	→
Anticipates and solves problems	←	→
Meets suspenses	←	→
5. JUDGEMENT AND DECISIONS		
Makes timely and accurate decisions	←	→
Emphasizes logic in decision making	←	→
Retains composure in stressful situations	←	→
Recognizes opportunities and acts to take advantage of them	←	→
6. COMMUNICATION SKILLS		
Listening	←	→
Speaking	←	→
Writing	←	→

IV. COMMENTS

AF FORM 724A, OCT 95 *(LRA)* *(PerFORM PRO)*

Appendix E

Appendix E: United States Air Force, Company and Field Grade Officer Performance Report (OPR)

COMPANY GRADE OFFICER PERFORMANCE REPORT

I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA *(Read AFI 36-2402 carefully before filling in any item)*

1. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*	2. SSN	3. GRADE	4. DAFSC

5. PERIOD OF REPORT From: Thru:	6. NO. DAYS SUPERVISION	7. REASON FOR REPORT

8. ORGANIZATION, COMMAND, LOCATION	9. PAS CODE

II. UNIT MISSION DESCRIPTION

III. JOB DESCRIPTION

1. DUTY TITLE:

2. KEY DUTIES, TASKS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

IV. IMPACT ON MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT

V. PERFORMANCE FACTORS	DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS	MEETS STANDARDS
1. Job Knowledge Has knowledge required to perform duties effectively. Strives to improve knowledge.	☐	☐
2. Leadership Skills Sets and enforces standards. Works well with others. Fosters teamwork. Displays initiative. Self-confident.	☐	☐
3. Professional Qualities Exhibits loyalty, discipline, dedication, integrity, honesty, and officership. Adheres to Air Force standards. Accepts personal responsibility. Is fair and objective.	☐	☐
4. Organizational Skills Demonstrates ability to plan, coordinate, schedule effectively, and uses resources effectively and efficiently. Meets suspenses.	☐	☐
5. Judgement and Decisions Makes timely and accurate decisions. Emphasizes logic in decision making. Retains composure in stressful situations. Recognizes opportunities. Requires minimal supervision.	☐	☐
6. Communication Skills Listens, speaks, and writes effectively.	☐	☐

AF FORM 707B, OCT 95 ***(EF -V2)*** *(PerFORM PRO)* PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE.

VI. RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Last performance feedback was accomplished on: _____ *(consistent with the direction in AFI 36-2402.)*
(If not accomplished, state the reason)

NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	DUTY TITLE		DATE
	SSN	SIGNATURE	

VII. ADDITIONAL RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT ☐ CONCUR ☐ NONCONCUR

NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	DUTY TITLE		DATE
	SSN	SIGNATURE	

VIII. REVIEWER ☐ CONCUR ☐ NONCONCUR

NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	DUTY TITLE		DATE
	SSN	SIGNATURE	

Instructions

All: Recommendations must be based on performance and the potential based on that performance. Promotion recommendations are prohibited. Do not comment on completion of or enrollment in PME, advanced education, previous or anticipated promotion recommendations on AF Form 709, OER indorsement levels, family activities, marital status, race, sex, ethnic origin, age, or religion.

Rater: Focus your evaluation in Section IV on what the officer did, how well he or she did it and how the officer contributed to mission accomplishment. Write in concise "bullet" format. Your comments in Section VI may include recommendations for augmentation or assignment.

Additional Rater: Carefully review the rater's evaluation to ensure it is accurate, unbiased and uninflated. If you disagree, you may ask the rater to review his or her evaluation. You may not direct a change in the evaluation. If you still disagree with the rater, mark "NON-CONCUR" and explain. You may include recommendations for augmentation or assignment.

Reviewer: Carefully review the rater's and additional rater's ratings and comments. If their evaluations are accurate, unbiased and uninflated, mark the form "CONCUR" and sign the form. If you disagree with previous evaluators, you may ask them to review their evaluations. You may not direct them to change their appraisals. If you still disagree with the additional rater, mark "NONCONCUR" and explain in Section VIII. Do not use "NONCONCUR" simply to provide comments on the report.

IX. ACQUISITION EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR *(Indicate applicable review by marking the appropriate box(es).)* ☐ ACQUISITION EXAMINER *(If applicable)* ☐ AIR FORCE ADVISOR *(If applicable)*

NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	SIGNATURE	DATE

AF FORM 707B, OCT 95 ***(REVERSE) (EF-V2)*** *(PerFORM PRO)*

FIELD GRADE OFFICER PERFORMANCE REPORT

I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA *(Read AFI 36-2402 carefully before filling in any item)*

1. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*	2. SSN	3. GRADE	4. DAFSC

5. PERIOD OF REPORT From: Thru:	6. NO. DAYS SUPERVISION	7. REASON FOR REPORT

8. ORGANIZATION, COMMAND, LOCATION	9. PAS CODE

II. UNIT MISSION DESCRIPTION

III. JOB DESCRIPTION

1. DUTY TITLE:

2. KEY DUTIES, TASKS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

IV. IMPACT ON MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT

V. PERFORMANCE FACTORS	DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS	MEETS STANDARDS
1. Job Knowledge Has knowledge required to perform duties effectively. Strives to improve knowledge. Applies knowledge to handle nonroutine situations.	☐	☐
2. Leadership Skills Sets and enforces standards. Motivates subordinates. Works well with others. Fosters teamwork. Displays initiative. Self-confident. Has respect and confidence of subordinates. Fair and consistent in evaluation of subordinates.	☐	☐
3. Professional Qualities Exhibits loyalty, discipline, dedication, integrity, honesty, and officership. Adheres to Air Force standards. Accepts personal responsibility. Is fair and objective.	☐	☐
4. Organizational Skills Plans, coordinates, schedules, and uses resources effectively. Schedules work for self and others equitably and effectively. Anticipates and solves problems. Meets suspenses.	☐	☐
5. Judgement and Decisions Makes timely and accurate decisions. Emphasizes logic in decision making. Retains composure in stressful situations. Recognizes opportunities and acts to take advantage of them.	☐	☐
6. Communication Skills Listens, speaks, and writes effectively.	☐	☐

AF FORM 707A, OCT 95 ***(EF -V2)*** *(PerFORM PRO)* PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE.

VI. RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT		
Last performance feedback was accomplished on: _____ *(consistent with the direction in AFI 36-2402.)* *(If not accomplished, state the reason)*		
NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	DUTY TITLE	DATE
	SSN	SIGNATURE

VII. ADDITIONAL RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT		CONCUR		NONCONCUR
NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	DUTY TITLE			DATE
	SSN	SIGNATURE		

VIII. REVIEWER		CONCUR		NONCONCUR
NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	DUTY TITLE			DATE
	SSN	SIGNATURE		

Instructions

All: Recommendations must be based on performance and the potential based on that performance. Promotion recommendations are prohibited. Do not comment on completion of or enrollment in PME, advanced education, previous or anticipated promotion recommendations on AF Form 709, OER indorsement levels, family activities, marital status, race, sex, ethnic origin, age, or religion.

Rater: Focus your evaluation in Section IV on what the officer did, how well he or she did it and how the officer contributed to mission accomplishment. Write in concise "bullet" format. Your comments in Section VI may include recommendations for augmentation or assignment.

Additional Rater: Carefully review the rater's evaluation to ensure it is accurate, unbiased and uninflated. If you disagree, you may ask the rater to review his or her evaluation. You may not direct a change in the evaluation. If you still disagree with the rater, mark "NON-CONCUR" and explain. You may include recommendations for augmentation or assignment.

Reviewer: Carefully review the rater's and additional rater's ratings and comments. If their evaluations are accurate, unbiased and uninflated, mark the form "CONCUR" and sign the form. If you disagree with previous evaluators, you may ask them to review their evaluations. You may not direct them to change their appraisals. If you still disagree with the additional rater, mark "NONCONCUR" and explain in Section VIII. Do not use "NONCONCUR" simply to provide comments on the report.

IX. ACQUISITION EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR *(Indicate applicable review by marking the appropriate box(es).)*		ACQUISITION EXAMINER *(If applicable)*		AIR FORCE ADVISOR *(If applicable)*
NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	SIGNATURE			DATE

AF FORM 707A,OCT 95 ***(REVERSE) (EF-V2)*** *(PerFORM PRO)*

Appendix F

Appendix F: United States Air Force, Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF)

PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION

I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA *(Read AFI 36-2402 carefully before filling in any item)*

1. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*	2. SSN	3. GRADE	4. DAFSC
5. ORGANIZATION, COMMAND, LOCATION			6. PAS CODE

II. UNIT MISSION DESCRIPTION

III. JOB DESCRIPTION

1. DUTY TITLE:

2. KEY DUTIES, TASKS, RESPONSIBILITIES:

IV. PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION

V. PROMOTION ZONE	VI. GROUP SIZE	VII. BOARD	VIII. SENIOR RATER ID
BPZ ☐ I/APZ ☐			

IX. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION	X. SENIOR RATER	
	NAME, GRADE, BR OF SVC, ORGN, COMD & LOCATION	
DEFINITELY PROMOTE ☐	DUTY TITLE	
PROMOTE ☐		
DO NOT PROMOTE THIS BOARD ☐	SSN	SIGNATURE

Instructions

Review previous OERs, OPRs, Education/Training Reports, and Supplemental Evaluation Sheets. Evaluate the officer's performance and assess his or her potential. Write Promotion Recommendation (Section IV) in concise "bullet" format.

Provide an accurate, unbiased assessment free from consideration of race, sex, ethnic origin, age, religion, or marital status.

Provide the officer a copy of this report approximately 30 days prior to the board for which this report is prepared.

AF FORM 709, JUN 95 ***(EF-V2)*** *(PerFORM PRO)* PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE.

Appendix G

Appendix G: United States Army, Officer Evaluation Report Support Form

OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT SUPPORT FORM

For use of this form, see AR 623-105; the proponent agency is ODCSPER

Read Privacy Act Statement on Reverse before Completing this form

PART I - RATED OFFICER IDENTIFICATION

NAME OF RATED OFFICER (Last, First, MI)	RANK	ORGANIZATION

PART II - RATING CHAIN - YOUR RATING CHAIN FOR THE EVALUATION PERIOD IS:

RATER	NAME	RANK	POSITION
INTERMEDIATE RATER	NAME	RANK	POSITION
SENIOR RATER	NAME	RANK	POSITION

PART III - VERIFICATION OF FACE-TO-FACE DISCUSSION

MANDATORY RATER / RATED OFFICER INITIAL FACE-TO-FACE COUNSELING ON DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR THE CURRENT RATING PERIOD TOOK PLACE ON _____ (Date) Rated Officer Initials _____ Rater Initials _____ Senior Rater Initials _____ (Review)

PERIODIC RATER / RATED OFFICER FOLLOW-UP FACE-TO-FACE COUNSELINGS:

Dates _____ Rated Officer Initials _____ Rater Initials _____ Senior Rater Initials _____ (Review)

PART IV - RATED OFFICER *(Complete a, b, and c below for this rating period)*

PRINCIPAL DUTY TITLE	POSITION AOC / BR

a. STATE YOUR SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

b. INDICATE YOUR MAJOR PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

DA FORM 67-9-1, OCT 97 REPLACES DA FORM 67-9-1, FEB 85, WHICH IS OBSOLETE, 1 OCT 97 USAPA V1.00

c. LIST YOUR SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS

SIGNATURE AND DATE

PART V - RATER AND/OR INTERMEDIATE RATER *(Review and comment on Part IVa, b, and c above).*

Insure remarks are consistent with your performance and potential evaluation on DA Form 67-9

a. RATER COMMENTS (Optional)

SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)

b. INTERMEDIATE RATER COMMENTS (Optional)

SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT *(U.S.C. 552a)*

1. AUTHORITY: Sec 301 Title 5 USC; Sec 3012 Title 10

2. PURPOSE: DA Form 67-9, Officer Evaluation Report, serves as the primary source of information for officer personnel management decisions. DA Form 67-9-1, Officer Evaluation Support Form, serves as a guide for the rated officer's performance and development, enhances the accomplishment of the organization mission, and provides additional performance information to the rating chain. DA Form 67-9-1a, Junior Officer Developmental Support Form, serves as a common framework for Junior Officer Development and standardizes Junior Officer counseling.

3. ROUTINE USE: DA Form 67-9 will be maintained in the rated officer's Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) and Career Management Individual File (CMIF). A copy will be provided to the rated officer either directly or forwarded to the rated officer. DA Form 67-9-1 and DA Form 67-9-1a are for organizational use only and will be returned to the rated officer after review by the rating chain.

4. DISCLOSURE: Disclosure of the rated officer's SSN (Part I, DA Form 67-9) is voluntary. However, failure to verify the SSN may result in a delayed or erroneous processing of the officer's OER. Disclosure of the information in Part IV, DA Form 67-9-1 is voluntary. However, failure to provide the information requested will result in an evaluation of the rated officer without the benefits of that officer's comments. Should the rated officer use the Privacy Act as a basis not to provide the information requested in Part IV, the Support Form will contain the rated officer's statement to that effect and be forwarded through the rating chain in accordance with AR 623-105.

Appendix H

Appendix H: United States Army, Officer Evaluation Report (OER)

OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT
For use of this form, see AR 623-105; the proponent agency is ODCSPER

SEE PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT ON DA FORM 67-9-1

PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

a. NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) | b. SSN | c. RANK | d. DATE OF RANK (Year Month Day) | e. BRANCH | f. DESIGNATED SPECIALTIES / PMOS (WO)

g. UNIT, ORG., STATION, ZIP CODE OR APO, MAJOR COMMAND | h. REASON FOR SUBMISSION

i. PERIOD COVERED — FROM (Year Month Day) THRU (Year Month Day) | j. RATED MONTHS | k. NONRATED CODES | l. NO. OF ENCL | m. RATED OFFICER COPY (Check one and date): 1. Given to Officer; 2. Forwarded to Officer — Date | n. PSB INITIAL | o. CMD CODE | p. PSB CODE

PART II - AUTHENTICATION (Rated officer's signature verifies officer has seen completed OER Parts I-VII and the admin data is correct)

	SSN	RANK	POSITION	SIGNATURE	DATE
a. NAME OF RATER (Last, First, MI)	SSN	RANK	POSITION	SIGNATURE	DATE
b. NAME OF INTERMEDIATE RATER (Last, First, MI)	SSN	RANK	POSITION	SIGNATURE	DATE
c. NAME OF SENIOR RATER (Last, First, MI)	SSN	RANK	POSITION	SIGNATURE	DATE
SENIOR RATER'S ORGANIZATION		BRANCH	SENIOR RATER TELEPHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS	
		d. This is a referred report, do you wish to make comments? ☐ Yes, comments are attached ☐ No		e. SIGNATURE OF RATED OFFICER	DATE

PART III - DUTY DESCRIPTION

a. PRINCIPAL DUTY TITLE | b. POSITION AOC/BR

c. SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. REFER TO PART IVa, DA FORM 67-9-1

PART IV - PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - PROFESSIONALISM (Rater)

CHARACTER Disposition of the leader: combination of values, attributes, and skills affecting leader actions

a. **ARMY VALUES** (Comments mandatory for all "NO" entries. Use PART Vb.)

	Yes	No		Yes	No
1. **HONOR:** Adherence to the Army's publicly declared code of values			5. **RESPECT:** Promotes dignity, consideration, fairness, & EO		
2. **INTEGRITY:** Possesses high personal moral standards; honest in word and			6. **SELFLESS-SERVICE:** Places Army priorities before self		
3. **COURAGE:** Manifests physical and moral bravery			7. **DUTY:** Fulfills professional, legal, and moral obligations		
4. **LOYALTY:** Bears true faith and allegiance to the U.S. Constitution, the Army, the unit, and the soldier					

b. **LEADER ATTRIBUTES / SKILLS / ACTIONS:** First, mark "YES" or "NO" for each block. Second, choose a total of six that best describe the rated officer. Select one from ATTRIBUTES, two from SKILLS (Competence), and three from ACTIONS (LEADERSHIP). Place an "X" in the appropriate numbered box with optional comments in PART Vb. **Comments are mandatory in**

b.1. *ATTRIBUTES (Select 1)* Fundamental qualities and characteristics	1.	**MENTAL** Possesses desire, will, initiative, and discipline	YES NO	2.	**PHYSICAL** Maintains appropriate level of physical fitness and military bearing	YES NO	3.	**EMOTIONAL** Displays self-control; calm under pressure	YES NO
b.2 *SKILLS (Competence) (Select 2)* Skill development is part of self-development; prerequisite to action	1.	**CONCEPTUAL** Demonstrates sound judgment, critical/creative thinking, moral reasoning	YES NO	2.	**INTERPERSONAL** Shows skill with people: coaching, teaching, counseling, motivating and empowering	YES NO	3.	**TECHNICAL** Possesses the necessary expertise to accomplish all tasks and functions	YES NO
	4.	**TACTICAL** Demonstrates proficiency in required professional knowledge, judgment, and warfighting	YES NO						
b.3. *ACTIONS (LEADERSHIP) (Select 3) Major activities leaders perform: influencing, operating, and improving*									
INFLUENCING Method of reaching goals while operating / improving	1.	**COMMUNICATING** Displays good oral, written, and listening skills for individuals / groups	YES NO	2.	**DECISION-MAKING** Employs sound judgment, logical reasoning and uses resources wisely	YES NO	3.	**MOTIVATING** Inspires, motivates, and guides others toward mission accomplishment	YES NO
OPERATING Short-term mission accomplishment	4.	**PLANNING** Develops detailed, executable plans that are feasible, acceptable, and suitable	YES NO	5.	**EXECUTING** Shows tactical proficiency, meets mission standards, and takes care of people/resources	YES NO	6.	**ASSESSING** Uses after-action and evaluation tools to facilitate consistent improvement	YES NO
IMPROVING Long-term improvement in the Army its people and organizations	7.	**DEVELOPING** Invests adequate time and effort to develop individual subordinates as leaders	YES NO	8.	**BUILDING** Spends time and resources improving teams, groups and units; fosters ethical climate	YES NO	9.	**LEARNING** Seeks self-improvement and organizational growth; envisioning, adapting and leading	YES NO

c. APFT: DATE: HEIGHT: WEIGHT:

d. JUNIOR OFFICER DEVELOPMENT - *MANDATORY YES OR NO ENTRY FOR RATERS OF LTs AND WO1s.*
WERE DEVELOPMENTAL TASKS RECORDED ON DA FORM 67-9-1a AND QUARTERLY FOLLOW-UP COUNSELINGS CONDUCTED? YES NO NA

DA FORM 67-9, OCT 97 REPLACES DA FORM 67-8, 1 SEP 79, WHICH IS OBSOLETE, 1 OCT 97 USAPA V2.00

NAME	SSN	PERIOD COVERED –

PART V - PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL EVALUATION (Rater)

a. EVALUATE THE RATED OFFICER'S PERFORMANCE DURING THE RATING PERIOD AND HIS/HER POTENTIAL FOR PROMOTION

☐ OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE, MUST PROMOTE ☐ SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE, PROMOTE ☐ UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE, DO NOT PROMOTE ☐ OTHER *(Explain)*

b. COMMENT ON SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR PROMOTION. REFER TO PART III, DA FORM 67-9 AND PART IVa, b, AND c DA FORM 67-9-1.

c. IDENTIFY ANY UNIQUE PROFESSIONAL SKILLS OR AREAS OF EXPERTISE OF VALUE TO THE ARMY THAT THIS OFFICER POSSESSES. FOR ARMY COMPETITIVE CATEGORY CPT THROUGH LTC, ALSO INDICATE A POTENTIAL CAREER FIELD FOR FUTURE SERVICE.

PART VI - INTERMEDIATE RATER

PART VII -SENIOR RATER

a. EVALUATE THE RATED OFFICER'S PROMOTION POTENTIAL TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE

☐ BEST QUALIFIED ☐ FULLY QUALIFIED ☐ DO NOT PROMOTE ☐ OTHER *(Explain below)*

I currently senior _____ officer(s) in this grade

A completed DA Form 67-9-1 was received with this report and considered in my evaluation and review ☐ YES ☐ NO *(Explain in c)*

b. POTENTIAL COMPARED WITH OFFICERS SENIOR RATED IN SAME GRADE (OVERPRINTED BY DA)

☐ ABOVE CENTER OF MASS (Less than 50% in top box; Center of Mass if 50% or more in top box)

☐ CENTER OF MASS

☐ BELOW CENTER OF MASS RETAIN

☐ BELOW CENTER OF MASS DO NOT RETAIN

c. COMMENT ON PERFORMANCE/POTENTIAL

d. LIST 3 FUTURE ASSIGNMENTS FOR WHICH THIS OFFICER IS BEST SUITED. FOR ARMY COMPETITIVE CATEGORY CPT THROUGH LTC, ALSO INDICATE A POTENTIAL CAREER FIELD FOR FUTURE SERVICE.

DA FORM 67-9, OCT 97 (Reverse) USAPA V2.00

Appendix I

Appendix I: United States Navy, Fitness Report and Counseling Record (E7-06)

FITNESS REPORT & COUNSELING RECORD (E7-06)

RCS BUPERS 1610-1

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)	2 Grade/Rate	3. Desig	4. SSN

5. ACT ☐ TAR ☐ INACT ☐ AT/ADSW/ 265 ☐	6. UIC	7. Ship/Station	8. Promotion Status	9. Date Reported

Occasion for Report				Period of Report	
10. Periodic ☐	11. Detachment of Individual ☐	12. Detachment of Reporting Senior ☐	13. Special ☐	14. From:	15. To:

16. Not Observed Report ☐	Type of Report 17. Regular ☐	18. Concurrent ☐	19. Ops Cdr ☐	20. Physical Readiness	21. Billet Subcategory (if any)

22. Reporting Senior (Last, FI MI)	23. Grade	24. Desig	25. Title	26. UIC	27. SSN

28. Command employment and command achievements.

29. Primary/Collateral/Watchstanding duties. (Enter primary duty abbreviation in box.)

For Mid-term Counseling Use. (When completing FITREP, enter 30 and 31 from counseling record, sign 32.	30. Date Counseled	31. Counselor	32. Signature of Individual Counseled

PERFORMANCE TRAITS: 1.0 - Below standards/not progressing or UNSAT in any one standard; 2.0 - Does not yet meet all 3.0 standards; 3.0 - Meets all 3.0 standards; 4.0 - Exceeds most 3.0 standards; 5.0 - Meets overall criteria and most of the specific standards for 5.0. Standards are not all inclusive.

PERFORMANCE TRAITS	1.0* Below Standards	2.0 Pro-gressing	3.0 Meets Standards	4.0 Above Standards	5.0* Greatly Exceeds Standards
33. PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Professional knowledge, proficiency, and qualifications. NOB ☐	- Lacks basic professional knowledge to perform effectively. - Cannot apply basic skills. - Fails to develop professionally or achieve timely qualifications.	-	- Has thorough professional knowledge. - Competently performs both routine and new tasks. - Steadily improves skills, achieves timely qualifications.	-	- Recognized expert, sought after to solve difficult problems. - Exceptionally skilled, develops and executes innovative ideas. - Achieves early/highly advanced qualifications.
34. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY: Fairness, respect for human worth. NOB ☐	- Displays personal bias or engages in harassment. - Tolerates bias, unfairness or harassment in subordinates. - Lacks respect for EO objectives. - Interferes with order and discipline by disregarding rights of others.	-	- Always treats others with fairness and respect. - Does not condone bias or harassment in or outside of workplace. - Supports Navy EO objectives. - Contributes to unit cohesiveness and morale.	-	- Admired for fairness and human respect. - Ensures a climate of fairness and respect for human worth. - Pro-active EO leader, achieves concrete EO objectives. - Leader and model contributor to unit cohesiveness and morale.
35. MILITARY BEARING/ CHARACTER: Appearance, conduct, physical fitness, adherence to Navy Core Values NOB ☐	- Consistently unsat appearance. - Unsatisfactory demeanor/conduct. - Unable to meet one or more physical readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT	-	- Excellent personal appearance. - Excellent demeanor or conduct. - Complies with physical readiness program, within all standards. - Always lives up to Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE COMMITMENT.	-	- Exemplary personal appearance. - Exemplary representative of Navy. - Excellent or outstanding PRT. A leader in physical readiness. - Exemplifies Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.
36. TEAMWORK: Contributions to team building and team results. NOB ☐	- Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take directions well.	-	- Reinforces others' efforts, meets personal commitments to team. - Understands team goals, employs good teamwork techniques. - Accepts and offers team direction.	-	- Team builder, inspires cooperation and progress. - Talented mentor, focuses goals and techniques for team. - The best at accepting and offering team direction.
37. MISSION AC-COMPLISHMENT AND INITIATIVE: Taking initiative, planning, prior-itizing, achieving mission. NOB ☐	- Lacks initiative. - Unable to plan or prioritize. - Does not maintain readiness. - Fails to get the job done.	-	- Takes initiative to meet goals. - Plans/prioritizes effectively. - Maintains high state of readiness. - Always gets the job done.	-	- Develops innovative ways to accomplish mission. - Plans/prioritizes with exceptional skill and foresight. - Maintains superior readiness, even with limited resources. - Gets jobs done earlier and far better than expected.

NAVPERS 1610/2 (7-95)

FITNESS REPORT AND COUNSELING RECORD (E7-06) (cont'd)

RCS BUPERS 1610-1

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)	2. Grade/Rate	3. Desig	4. SSN
SAMPLE, DOCUMENT	CDR	1310	123-45-6789

PERFORMANCE TRAITS	1.0* Below Standards	2.0 Pro-gressing	3.0 Meets Standards	4.0 Above Standards	5.0 Greatly Exceeds Standards
38. LEADERSHIP: Organizing, motivating and developing others to accomplish goals. NOB ☐	- Fails to motivate, train or develop subordinates. - Fails to organize, creates problems for subordinates. - Does not set or achieve goals relevant to command mission. - Lacks ability to cope with or tolerate stress. - Indequate communicator. - Tolerates hazards or unsafe practices. - Does not attend to welfare of subordinates. ☐	- ☐	- Effectively motivates, trains and develops subordinates. - Organizes successfully, solves problems as they occur. - Sets/achieves useful, realistic goals which support command mission. - Performs well in stressful situations. - Clear, timely communicator. - Ensures safety of personnel and equipment. - Routinely considers subodinates' personal and professional welfare. ☐	- ☐	- Inspiring motivator and trainer, consistently builds winners. - Superb organizer, great foresight, gets ahead of problems. - Leadership achievements dramatically further command mission. - Perseveres through the toughest challenges and inspires others. - Exceptional communicator. - Makes subordinates safety-conscious, maintains top saftey record. - Constantly improves the personal and professional lives of others. ☐
39. TACTICAL PERFORMANCE: (Warfare qualified officers only) Basic and tactical employment of weapons systems. NOB ☐	- Has difficulty attaining qualification expected for the rank or experience. - Has difficulty in ship(s), aircraft or weapons systems employment. Below others in knowledge and employment. - Warfare skills in specialty are below standards compared to others of same rank and experience. ☐	- ☐	- Attains qualifications as required and expected. - Capably employs ship(s), aircraft, or weapons systems. Equal to others in warfare knowledge and employment. - Warfare skills in specialty equal to other of same rank and experience. ☐	- ☐	- Fully qualified at appropriate level for rank and experience. - Innovatively employs ship(s), aircraft, or weapons systems. Well above others in warfare knowledge and employment. - Warfare skills in specialty exceed others of same rank and experience. ☐

40. I recommend screening this individual for next career milestone(s) as follows: (maximum of two)
Recommendations may be for competitive schools or duty assignments such as: LCPO, DEPT CPO, SEA, CMC, CWO, LDO, Dept Head, XO, OIC, CO, Major Command, War College, PG School.

41. COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE: * All 5.0 and 1.0 marks must be specifically substantiated in comments. No numerical ranking permitted. Comments must be verifiable. Bold, underlined, italic, or other highlighted type is prohibited. Font must be 10 or 12 pitch (10 to 12 point) only. Use upper and lower case.

Promotion Recommendation	NOB	Significant Problems	Progressing	Promotable	Must Promote	Early Promote	44. Reporting Senior Address
42. INDIVIDUAL							
43. SUMMARY	X	0	0	1	0	0	

45. Signature of Reporting Senior

Date:

46. Signature of Individual Evaluated. "I have seen this report, been apprised of my performance, and understand my right to submit a statement."
I intend to submit a statement. ☐ I do not intend to submit a statement. ☐

Date:

47. Typed name, grade, command, UIC, and signature of Regular Reporting Senior on Concurrent Report

Date:

NAVPERS 1610/2 (7-95)

Bibliography

Bernardin, H. John and Richard W. Beatty. *Performance Appraisal: Assessing Human Behavior at Work.* Kent Human Resource Management Series, 1984.

Anstey, E. *Staff Reporting and Staff Development*. London, England: Royal Institute of Public Administration, 1961.

Barnett, Donna G., Philip G. Benjamin, Emily E. Chamberlin, Michael L. Chase, Craig L. Hobbs, Terrance J. McCarthy, Gary T. McCoy, Lee A. Newman, Glenn N. Pontiff, Dennis R. Rider, James A. Steele, and Bruce A. Thieman. *Officer Evaluation System Proposal*. Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Library, May 1987.

Air Force Instruction 36-2402, *Officer Evaluation System*, Washington, D.C., 01 July 1996.

Army Regulation 600-8-29, *Officer Promotions.* Washington, D.C., 30 November 1994.

Army Regulation 623-105, *Officer Evaluation Reporting System.* Washington, D.C., 1 October 1997.

Army Pamphlet 623-105, *The Officer Evaluation Reporting System "In Brief"*. Washington, D.C., 1 October 1997.

US Marine Corps Officer Instruction, *MCO P1610.7E, Performance Evaluation System.* 08 December 1998.

Bureau of Naval Personnel Instruction 1610.10, *Navy Performance Evaluation and Counseling System.* Washington, D.C., 02 August 1995.

Erwine, Larry C. *Officer Effectiveness Ratings—Facts or Fiction?* Central Michigan University, January 1988.

Gatewood, Robert D. and Hubert S. Field. *Human Resource Selection.* Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1998.

Jones, Darrell D. *The Air Force Officer Evaluation System: Is This the Best We Can Do?* Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Library, April 1995.

Milkovich, George T. and John W. Boudreau. *Human Resource Management*. Boston, MA: Times Mirror Higher Education Group, 1997.

Schmid, Harold W. *A Comparative Analysis of the Officer Evaluation Systems of the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force*. Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air University Library, March 1988.

United States Total Army Personnel Command. *The New OER Briefing.* 1 October 1997, n.p., On-line. Internet, 2 January 1998. Available from http://www-perscom.army.mil/tagd/oers/brief/brief.htm.