

PEER OR SECOND LEVEL SCI REVIEW GUIDELINES

Examine the CADA for each employee in the group under review. Use the SCI Criteria and your knowledge of employees in the group to answer the following questions below.

1. Are the comments legible?
 - a. Yes, very clear and understandable.
 - b. Not always readable; need to be more clearly written.
2. Has the manager provided specific examples of demonstrated contribution?
 - a. Yes, examples of results, outcomes, and deliverables are provided.
 - b. More examples would be useful.
3. Are the contributions mentioned within the review period?
 - a. Yes, the contributions fall within the performance cycle.
 - b. Some contributions occurred before or after the performance cycle.
4. Are the comments and examples consistent with the criteria level descriptions?
 - a. Yes, examples match the CADA descriptors and are in the correct category.
 - b. The comments and examples don't appear to align well with the criteria.
5. Are the manager's recommendations consistent with the documented comments?
 - a. Yes, there is internal consistency between the recommendations and documented examples and comments.
 - b. The documentation doesn't support the recommendation.
6. Are the recommendations consistent with your first-hand knowledge of the individuals in this group?
 - a. Yes, based on my knowledge of these employees, I agree with the recommendations.
 - b. I disagree with the recommendations.
 - c. I do not have enough familiarity with the employees in this group to comment.
7. Do the numbers of individuals recommended in each contribution category match that specified by the Agency?
(OSI: 35%; SCI-2: 45%; SCI-1: 20%)
 - a. Yes, with some minor rounding error.
 - b. No, the percentages don't match the guidelines.
 - c. This group is too small for the percentages to easily apply, but they are close.
8. Is the distribution of SCI recipients appropriate to the organization's workforce profile?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No, the allocation seems to be disproportionate in comparison to the workforce profile.
 - c. Don't have sufficient baseline data to evaluate.

If you have checked a "b" response for any of the eight questions above, please provide the manager with appropriate feedback for improvements or enhancements.

If you have checked "a" or "c" for all of the eight questions above, this indicates that you find the materials and recommendations to be satisfactory for submission to higher level management.

Narrative Summary

Chris performed her duties as the organization's Administrative Officer (AO) in an extremely competent manner. Due to her hard work and dedication, the organization was successful in meeting its operational goals. Specifically, her contributions for the year include:

- Assisted managers and staff in projecting staffing needs.
- Conducted work flow studies within the organization.
- Ensured the effective use of administrative/clerical staff.
- Served as primary liaison to the human resources office.
- Maintained human resources files such as position descriptions and performance plans.
- Provided guidance and assistance to managers on preparing personnel actions.
- Determined the administrative needs of the organization's awards program.
- Prepared budget activities that distribute in-house funds among branches and/or programs.

Feedback

This write-up looks more like a job description or a list of job responsibilities. You need to support your comments with specific examples of what Chris did (For example: you stated Chris, "Ensured the effective use of administrative/clerical staff." Provide specific examples of what Chris did, how Chris did it, and what the results were.) There's also a lot of "white space" here. If you are going to recommend Chris for an SCI-1, you should be able to fill up the narrative summary block. This narrative does not support SCI-1; needs to be stronger.

RECOMMENDATION (*Mandatory if manager preparing the narrative is not the Decision Level*).

- Annual Increase: Pay increase equal to OSI
 Pay increase equal to OSI plus .6% SCI-2
 Pay increase equal to OSI plus 1.8% SCI-1

Recommending Official's Signature: _____ Date _____

DECISION LEVEL REVIEW: Concur Non-Concur

Comments (*Mandatory if non-concur; optional otherwise.*)

Decision Level Signature: _____ Date _____