

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

Theses

Theses & Dissertations

1998

Army Officer Evaluation Report: Past, Present, and Future

Jason Brownrigg
Lindenwood College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/theses>



Part of the [Business Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brownrigg, Jason, "Army Officer Evaluation Report: Past, Present, and Future" (1998). *Theses*. 198.
<https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/theses/198>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses & Dissertations at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

**ARMY OFFICER EVALUATION
REPORT: PAST
PRESENT AND FUTURE**

JASON BROWNRIGG, B.S.

An Abstract Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Lindenwood University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science, Corporate Communication

20 September 1998

ABSTRACT

This thesis will focus on the study of performance evaluations of Army officers and the type of evaluation most useful for the future.

The Army has been using performance appraisals to evaluate the performance of officers since its inception over 200 years ago. Since World War II has the Army provided a required format for these evaluations.

The format of these evaluations has changed over the years due to operational requirements along with the expansion and contraction of the total Army structure. Also influencing the content of the evaluation reports are the current moral beliefs of the nations that are being emulated by the armed forces.

The performance appraisals are tolerated as a necessary evil at their very best. They are used primarily to assist in the proper placement of soldiers, promotion of those most deserving and determining who receives higher schooling. They are an important instrument used to ensure that an adequate supply of personnel are sufficiently trained in the performance of higher level tasks.

Judgments about how individuals are performing will be made whether or not a formal performance evaluation system is in place.

People constantly make judgments about others. More impressionistic judgments tend to be more erroneous, and more vulnerable to charges of bias; therefore a formal procedure is needed.

Removing the performance evaluation requirement from the military would be detrimental to order and discipline allowing for unqualified and subjective judgments. What must be done is to correctly identify those areas most beneficial to the military and its soldiers while encompassing those ideas into a evaluation report that will guide the Army as it enters the 21st century. This discussion analyzes strengths and weakness of past performance appraisal approaches in the military and develops guidelines toward meeting that goal.

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Professor Michael Castro, Chairperson and Advisor

Associate Professor Gareth Gardiner

Adjunct Assistant Professor Joseph Lonigro

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Preface.....	v
I. Introduction	1
II. Literature Review.....	56
III. Selective Review and Evaluation of Literature.....	66
IV. Results.....	73
V. Discussion.....	83
Works Cited.....	91
Vita Auctores.....	92

List of Tables

Table 1 Evaluation Methods.....	4
Table 2 Performance Rating Distribution.....	44

List of Figures

Figure 1	DA Form 67-8 (Front).....	7
Figure 2	DA Form 67-8 (Back).....	8
Figure 3	DA Form 67-8-1 (Front).....	10
Figure 4	DA Form 67-8-1 (Back).....	11
Figure 5	DA Form 67-8-2.....	15
Figure 6	DA Form 67-7 (Front).....	17
Figure 7	DA Form 67-7 (Back).....	18
Figure 8	DA Form 67-6 (Front).....	20
Figure 9	DA Form 67-6 (Back).....	21
Figure 10	DA Form 67-5 (Front).....	23
Figure 11	DA Form 67-5 (Back).....	24
Figure 12	DA Form 67-5 (Continuation).....	25
Figure 13	DA Form 67-5 (Continuation).....	26

Figure 14	DA Form 67-4 (Front).....	28
Figure 15	DA Form 67-4 (Back).....	29
Figure 16	DA Form 67-3 (Front).....	31
Figure 17	DA Form 67-3 (Back).....	32
Figure 18	DA Form 67-2 (Front).....	34
Figure 19	DA Form 67-2 (Back).....	35
Figure 20	WD Form 67-1 (Page 1).....	36
Figure 21	WD Form 67-1 (Page 2).....	37
Figure 22	WD Form 67-1 (Page 3).....	38
Figure 23	WD Form 67 (Front).....	40
Figure 24	WD Form 67 (Back).....	41
Figure 25	1813 Efficiency Report.....	42
Figure 26	DA Form 67-9-1 (Front).....	46
Figure 27	DA Form 67-9-1 (Back).....	47

Figure 14	DA Form 67-4 (Front).....	28
Figure 15	DA Form 67-4 (Back).....	29
Figure 16	DA Form 67-3 (Front).....	31
Figure 17	DA Form 67-3 (Back).....	32
Figure 18	DA Form 67-2 (Front).....	34
Figure 19	DA Form 67-2 (Back).....	35
Figure 20	WD Form 67-1 (Page 1).....	36
Figure 21	WD Form 67-1 (Page 2).....	37
Figure 22	WD Form 67-1 (Page 3).....	38
Figure 23	WD Form 67 (Front).....	40
Figure 24	WD Form 67 (Back).....	41
Figure 25	1813 Efficiency Report.....	42
Figure 26	DA Form 67-9-1 (Front).....	46
Figure 27	DA Form 67-9-1 (Back).....	47

Figure 28	DA Form 67-9-1a (Front).....	48
Figure 29	DA Form 67-9-1a (Back).....	49
Figure 30	DA Form 67-9 (Front).....	50
Figure 31	DA Form 67-9 (Back).....	51
Figure 32	DA Form 67-9-2.....	52

Preface

From the very beginning, managers have sought to provide accurate and efficient evaluations of employee performance. Yet, the performance evaluations becomes a far too “relative” term when the evaluation process must proceed through a cumbersome, difficult and time-consuming system before the evaluation finally reaches the employee. The deliberate verification procedures and coordination requirements are still too slow, allowing the employee too much time between the action and the evaluation of that action. Now is the time to make the change.

The application of appropriate and accurate employee evaluations must have fewer constraints in the future. Performance awareness has placed us on the brink of a revolution in the nature of the evaluation report. The knowledge-based organization of tomorrow will have formidable information dominance, unprecedented agility and the most advanced technology available. To capitalize on the potential of the organization managers must exploit these capabilities to provide effective performance evaluations with minimal time separation between action and evaluation.

The quest for immediate evaluation of performance has always been a managerial problem. On the one hand managers strive to provide employees responsive evaluations. On the other hand, managers strive to provide honest

and accurate evaluations. The current requirement for multiple personnel providing inputs toward an evaluation slows the evaluation process. Control measures also restrict the timely completion of evaluations; legal restrictions, organizational codes, and tracking requirements all slow down the process.

Performance awareness, effective interpersonal communication processes and honest evaluations should equate to a valid performance evaluation. Instead of relying on multiple layered and long term evaluations, information management and advancements in technology will enable managers to achieve the desired effects through the appropriate use of performance evaluations.

Twenty-first century technology has the potential to revolutionize personnel management. It is up to the supervisors and managers to exploit this potential to ensure that performance evaluations correctly and accurately portray an employee's potential. Allowing the organization to place the appropriate employee in the correct position, thereby improving the overall productivity of the department and elevating the stature of the organization, is the ultimate goal of performance management.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

History

“The Importance of the Officer’s Evaluation Record. The Army Officer who aspires to ultimate selection for the higher schools and colleges and the more important assignments must deserve and receive a commendable series of evaluation reports. These assignments are selected on the ‘best qualified’ basis, which is the best system for the individual as well as the Army. Do a good job and you will fare well” (Crocker 222).

The requirement for submitting annual efficiency reports began early in the 20th century, with less formal letter reports being created on an ad hoc basis in earlier periods, as illustrated by the example at Figure 24. A standardized rating scale and evaluation system was instituted during World War I.

The system of evaluation ratings and periodic reports on the performance of duty of each officer in the Army has been determined to be of importance to:

- a) The Army: It is believed that the Officer Evaluation Report (OER) will largely determine the quality of the officer corps, the selection of future leaders and the course of each officer’s career.
- b) Personnel Management: The information provided in the OER, combined with the needs of the Army and the individual officer’s qualifications is

used as the basis for personnel actions, to include promotions, eliminations, retention, command selection, school selection, and assignments.

c) **The Rated Officer:** The OER encourages communication between the rater and the rated soldier. On one hand, this communication makes the rated officer aware of what his or her duties are and allows the officer to take part in organizational planning. On the other hand, such communication allows the rater to guide and develop his or her subordinates. It stresses the importance of setting standards and giving direction to the performance of subordinate officers. The OER is a program designed to increase human effectiveness. The ultimate goal of the OER system is to provide better opportunities for career progression as well as produce higher standards throughout the Army officer corps.

Every officer wants to receive a favorable evaluation or series of evaluation reports, and to achieve their maximum capability as their knowledge and experience increases. The evaluation reports provide the strongest and most influential determination upon the career path of each officer, starting with the first assignment. The most important periodic contribution to the officer's official military record is the performance rating and description provided by the evaluation report.

Unless the rated officer's capabilities and/or deficiencies are reflected accurately in the evaluation report, intelligent job assignments and personnel actions cannot be accomplished in a manner that provides equality to all officers. Every individual evaluation report must contain a broad and all-inclusive

appraisal of an officer's abilities and capabilities. Positive recommendations for the correction of weaknesses and deficiencies, together with the results of counseling by the rating officials, serves to provide a foundation for comparison of future reports concerning these deficiencies. In reality they provide a method to track positive or negative trends in a soldier's performance of duty and can assist in selecting appropriate remedial actions to correct those noted deficiencies. The evaluation reports also assist in determining an individual's core competency for future assignments.

The evaluation report requires careful consideration and thorough preparation by the rater and senior rater who must prepare the OER. Evaluation reports that are lacking in completeness, accuracy, and objectivity deprive commanders and career managers of necessary information required as a basis for evaluating progressive career development opportunities and may injure the officer receiving the non-comprehensive report.

The current evaluation procedure uses a rater and a senior rater for the evaluation of a rated officer. In some situations there may be an intermediate rater in the evaluation process. The rater normally is the immediate supervisor of the rated officer. The senior rater must be senior to the rater and to the intermediate rater. Provisions exist for civilian raters and senior raters of military personnel. The evaluation procedure now used by the Army first became effective on 15 September 1979. It built upon the best features of its predecessors, but it also represents a significant change from the earlier forms and procedures. The aim of

the current procedure is to: A) reduce the inflated ratings that occurred with the

Table 1

Rating Officials RATER	Requirements Will normally be immediate supervisor of the rated officer	
INTERMEDIATE Rater	Will be senior to the rated officer Will normally be included when there is a level of supervision between the rater and the senior rater If included will be senior to the rated officer	
SENIOR Rater		
Grade of rated officer is:	The minimum grade for the senior rater is:	
	Military Senior Rater	Civilian Senior Rater
Warrant Officer	MAJ/CPT(P)	GM/GS/UA-13
Second Lieutenant		
First Lieutenant		
Captain	LTC/MAJ(P)	GM/GS/UA-15
Major	COL/LTC(P)	GM/GS/UA-15
Lieutenant Colonel	COL/LTC(P)	GM/GS/UA-15
Colonel	BG/COL(P)	GM/GS/UA-16
General Officers	Senior to the rater and Intermediate rater	
Source:	Army Regulation 623-105, <u>Officer Evaluation Reporting System</u>	

earlier reports, B) provide mandatory performance counseling to the rated officer, C) increase communications within the chain of command; and D) provide a more comprehensive evaluation of performance and potential. A major objective of the present procedure is to increase the role of senior officers in the evaluation

process.

In the past it was often difficult to identify the best officer within a group of highly-rated officers. Selections for the most important assignments, senior service colleges, and university training are all on the basis of choosing the best qualified officer. Promotions to grades above lieutenant are all highly competitive and also on the basis of best qualified. Evaluation reports that assist in wise selections are clearly essential to the interests of the officers being considered and the Army.

What follows is a historical perspective of the forms and procedures used by the Army in rating officers, from most recent to oldest.

DA Form 67-8, 67-8-1 and 67-8-2:

The current evaluation procedure utilizes 3 forms. DA Form 67-8 is the Officer Evaluation Report (OER) form (Figure 1 and 2). An OER is prepared on each officer in the Army at least annually or more often as prescribed by regulations. Evaluation reports must be submitted for any of the following reasons:

- Change of rater: The evaluation will be submitted when the rated officer ceases to serve under the rating officer.
- Change of duty: An evaluation is mandatory when the rated officer has a change of principal duty, even though the rater may remain the same.
- Annual evaluation: An evaluation report will be submitted upon completion of one calendar year of duty following the "Through" date of the last

report submitted.

- Relief for cause: A report will be generated when an officer is relieved for cause regardless of the rating period involved.
- Complete the record: At the option of the rater, a report may be submitted on a rated officer who is about to be considered by a promotion board.
- Senior rater option: When a change of senior rater occurs, the senior rater may direct that a report be created.
- Rater option: The report may be generated if the rated officer has served continuously under the same rater for 90 days. The DA Form 67-8 has space for the rater, intermediate rater, and the senior rater to provide narrative comments on matters not specifically covered elsewhere or to amplify other parts of the report. It is required that the narrative be completed within the space provided. Careful wording is required to permit concise, yet full evaluation of the rated officer, while avoiding less meaningful and lengthier narratives. It must be understood that brevity is an objective but of greater importance is accuracy, objectivity, fairness, and amplification or explanation of other parts of the reports deserving further comment. The completed OER is then forwarded to the Department of the Army where it becomes a permanent part of the rated officer's personnel records. The current procedure also uses a Support Form, DA Form 67-8-1, which is designed to involve the rated officer in the evaluation process and to improve job performance counseling. The third form, DA 67-8-2, is designed for use by Department of the Army. The form is titled Senior Rater

SEE PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT ON DA FORM 67-8

For use of this form, see AR 622-123 (31030901) Agency is US Army Military Personnel Center

199704151194

PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE DATA															
1. LAST NAME - FIRST NAME - MIDDLE INITIAL [REDACTED]			2. SSN [REDACTED]		3. GRADE CPT		4. DATE OF RANK 92 05 20		5. BR AG	6. BR 42B00	7. BR SPECIALTIES	8. BR 42B00	9. BR W4M0		
10. UNIT, ORGANIZATION, STATION, ZIP CODE OR APO MAJOR COMMAND USAR Con Gp (AGR) w/dty EHC ARPERCEN (W4M0AA) 9700 Page Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63132-5200								11. REASON FOR SUBMISSION 22 SR Option		12. CODE SE					
13. PERIOD COVERED			14. NO OF MONTHS	15. MILPO CODE	16. RATED OFFICER COPY (Check one and date)			17. FORWARDING ADDRESS							
FROM		THRU		10	RP01	<input type="checkbox"/> 1. GIVEN TO OFFICER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. FORWARDED TO OFFICER [Signature]									
18. EXPLANATION OF NONRATED PERIODS															
PART II - AUTHENTICATION (Rated officer signature verifies PART I data and RATING OFFICIALS ONLY)															
19. NAME OF RATER (Last, First, MI)			20. SSN		21. SIGNATURE		22. DATE								
[REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		[Signature]		28 May 97								
23. GRADE, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, DUTY ASSIGNMENT MAJ, EN, ARPERCEN, St. Louis, MO Team Leader, Regional Support Team 2															
24. NAME OF INTERMEDIATE RATER (Last, First, MI)			25. SSN		26. SIGNATURE		27. DATE								
[REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		[Signature]										
28. GRADE, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, DUTY ASSIGNMENT															
29. NAME OF SENIOR RATER (Last, First, MI)			30. SSN		31. SIGNATURE		32. DATE								
[REDACTED]			[REDACTED]		[Signature]		970404								
33. GRADE, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, DUTY ASSIGNMENT COL, GS, ARPERCEN, St. Louis, MO Director, Officer Personnel Management															
34. SIGNATURE OF RATED OFFICER			35. DATE		36. DATE ENTERED ON DA FORM 2-1		37. RATED OFFICER MPO INITIALS		38. NO OF INCL						
[Signature]			2 June 97				[Initials]								
PART III - DUTY DESCRIPTION (Rules)															
39. PRINCIPAL DUTY TITLE Personnel Management Officer										40. SS/MOS 41A					
41. REFER TO PART III (DA FORM 67-8-1) Serve as personnel manager for Team 2 supporting 8235 officers in the states of New York and New Jersey. Provide direct personnel support for the 77th Regional Support Command, 78th Division Exercise and 98th Division Training. Fill unit vacancies with qualified officers. Obtain school quotas giving Force Support Package unit officers priority. Process and monitor personnel actions to include unit assignment orders, Individual Mobilization Augmentee position assignments, physical exams, security clearances, IMA Annual Training orders, professional development course orders, promotion screening, and Mandatory Removal Date extensions. Fill exercise support requests with qualified officers for short and long active duty tours in support of contingency operations and the Presidential Selective Reserve Call-up.															
PART IV - PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - PROFESSIONALISM (Rules)															
42. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE (In items 1 through 14 below, indicate the degree of agreement with the following statements as being descriptive of the rated officer. Any comments will be reflected in d below)										43. HIGH DEGREE			44. LOW DEGREE		
										1			2 3 4 5		
1. Possesses capacity to acquire knowledge/grasp concepts	1	8. Displays sound judgment	1												
2. Demonstrates appropriate knowledge and expertise in assigned tasks	1	9. Seeks self-improvement	1												
3. Maintains appropriate level of physical fitness	PASS	9610	1	10. Is adaptable to changing situations	1										
4. Motivates, challenges and develops subordinates	1	11. Sets and enforces high standards	1												
5. Performs under physical and mental stress	1	12. Possesses military bearing and appearance	70/161	YES	1										
6. Encourages candor and frankness in subordinates	1	13. Supports EO/EEO	1												
7. Clear and concise in written communication	1	14. Clear and concise in oral communication	1												
45. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS (Comment on any area where the rated officer is particularly outstanding or needs improvement)															
(a.1,2) One of his strongest abilities. Easily mastered personnel management information and tools.															
(b.1-8) All of his professional ethics are unquestionable. [REDACTED] possesses a high degree of dedication, loyalty, and integrity.															
1. DEDICATION	2. RESPECTS BUILTY	3. LOYALTY	4. DISCIPLINE	5. INTEGRITY	6. MORAL COURAGE	7. SELFLESSNESS	8. MORAL STANDARDS								

DA FORM 67-8

REPLACES DA FORM 67-8-1, 1 JAN 73, WHICH OBSOLETE 1 NOV 79

US ARMY OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT

Figure 1 (DA Form 67-8) Front

PERIOD COVERED 860310-870308

PART V - PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL EVALUATION Form 67-8

1. RATED OFFICER'S NAME [REDACTED] SSN [REDACTED]

2. RATED OFFICER IS ASSIGNED IN ONE OF HIS/her DESIGNATED SPECIALTIES AND: YES NO

3. PERFORMANCE DURING THE RATING PERIOD: REFER TO PART III DA FORM 67-8 AND PART III A AND C DA FORM 67-8

ALWAYS EXCEEDED REQUIREMENTS USUALLY EXCEEDED REQUIREMENTS MET REQUIREMENTS OFTEN FAILED REQUIREMENTS USUALLY FAILED REQUIREMENTS

4. COMMENT ON SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PERFORMANCE: REFER TO PART III DA FORM 67-8 AND PART III A, B AND C DA FORM 67-8. DO NOT USE FOR COMMENTS ON POTENTIAL.

[REDACTED] performance on this team has been stellar. His motivational attitude has helped this team weather turbulent transitional times. He consistently demonstrated that the best way to lead is by example. He is a well respected and totally competent officer. [REDACTED] commitment and pride in job performance drives him to exceed both his personal standards and the Army's. He was instrumental in the development and execution of the first mass mail system used by officers within the Directorate. This system has been adopted as the future standard for all personnel managers to contact, review, and help manage Individual Ready Reserve (IRR), Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA), and Troop Program Unit (TPU) soldiers, potentially saving an estimated \$100,000 in long distance telephone charges. During the rating period, he has proven himself on all automated requirements for the team. He aggressively improved the region's deployment capabilities by correcting 73 bad addresses and 19 flagged records, and issuing 274 physical exams. [REDACTED] has processed 127 training orders, 31 amendments, and 7 revocations. He has put 13 officers in TPUs, issued 12 attachment for points only orders, and placed 19 soldiers in IMA positions. He consistently provides his population with sound professional guidance and assisted them in furthering their careers. His unselfish service to this team and his managers is a reflection of his loyalty and his dedication to duty.

5. THIS OFFICER'S POTENTIAL FOR PROMOTION TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE IS:

PROMOTE AHEAD OF CONTEMPORARIES PROMOTE WITH CONTEMPORARIES DO NOT PROMOTE OTHER (Specify Below)

6. COMMENT ON POTENTIAL: [REDACTED] has unlimited potential. Select for resident CGSOC. Strongly

PART VI - INTERMEDIATE RATER

7. COMMENTS:

PART VII - SENIOR RATER

8. COMMENTS: [REDACTED] is an exceptionally professional and competent officer. He handles complex tasks with ease, using an extremely effective system for breaking down situations and solving every component. [REDACTED] is dedicated to improving this Directorate, his team, and himself. His tremendous efforts in the development of the mass mail system is matched by his efforts to achieve his Master's Degree. He is exceptionally well organized and approaches each new challenge with assertiveness. [REDACTED] seeks responsibility, takes initiative, and accomplishes the mission. [REDACTED] potential is unlimited. He is one of the best officers in the unit. A definite must for resident CGSOC selection.

9. COMPLETED DA FORM 67-8 WAS RECEIVED WITH THIS REPORT AND CONSIDERED IN EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION: YES NO

10. [REDACTED] CMC 0522
 SR BRG 855 CPT
 [REDACTED] 7 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] 4 SSN [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] 3 SR: [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] 0 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] 0 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] 0 PROC 19970416
 [REDACTED] 1 SIGN 19970404
 [REDACTED] 0 RATINGS 10
 [REDACTED] 0 OFFICERS 10

Figure 2 (DA Form 67-8) Back

Profile Report and is provided to maintain a rating history of each senior rater. This form tracks the rating history of the senior rater and makes it available to both the senior rater and the Department of the Army.

Under the present procedure, the rated officer has two formal requirements associated with the rating process: 1) the rated officer is required to have a face-to-face discussion with the rating officer within the first 30 days of the rating period. This discussion is designed to encourage communication with and counseling by the rating officer. It is intended to result in development of duties, responsibilities and performance objectives with the approval of the rating officer. These duties, responsibilities and performance objectives are entered in Part IV of the initial working copy of the Support Form. The rated officer and the rating officer then indicate in Part III of the form the date of their discussion, then both initial the form. The results of the discussion and counseling will serve as a guide for performance, but they are not normally all inclusive. 2) Following the face-to-face discussion and partially filling out of the initial working copy of the Support Form, the rated officer is then required to maintain the form during the remainder of the rating period. He/she should review the agreed upon duties, responsibilities and performance objectives periodically. If necessary, he/she should request additional meetings with the rating officer to adjust the entries on the form to assure that they reflect any changes in emphasis or job description. At the end of the rating period the rated officer will be expected to completely fill out a final copy of the support form, including his/her significant accomplishments and

OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT SUPPORT FORM			
For use of this form, see AR 623-105; the proponent agency is DCSPER.			
Read Privacy Act Statement on Reverse before Completing this form.			
PART I - RATED OFFICER IDENTIFICATION			
NAME OF RATED OFFICER (Last, First, MI)		GRADE	ORGANIZATION
PART II - RATING CHAIN - YOUR RATING CHAIN FOR THE EVALUATION PERIOD IS:			
RATER	NAME	GRADE	POSITION
INTERMEDIATE RATER	NAME	GRADE	POSITION
SENIOR RATER	NAME	GRADE	POSITION
PART III - VERIFICATION OF INITIAL FACE-TO-FACE DISCUSSION			
AN INITIAL FACE-TO-FACE DISCUSSION OF DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR THE CURRENT RATING PERIOD TOOK PLACE ON _____			
RATED OFFICER'S INITIALS _____ RATER'S INITIALS _____			
PART IV - RATED OFFICER (Complete a, b, and c below for this rating period)			
a. STATE YOUR SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES			
DUTY TITLE IS _____ THE POSITION CODE IS _____			
b. INDICATE YOUR MAJOR PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES			

Figure 3 (DA Form 87-8-1) Front

<p>2. LIST YOUR SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">SIGNATURE AND DATE</p>	
<p>PART V - RATER AND/OR INTERMEDIATE RATER (Review and comment on Part IV, b, and c above. Insure remarks are consistent with your performance and potential evaluation on DA Form 67-8.)</p>	
<p>a. RATER COMMENTS (Optional)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)</p>
<p>b. INTERMEDIATE RATER COMMENTS (Optional)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a)</p>	
<p>1. AUTHORITY: Sec 301 Title 5 USC; Sec 3012 Title 10 USC.</p>	
<p>2. PURPOSE: DA Form 67-8, Officer Evaluation Report, serves as the primary source of information for officer personnel management decisions. DA Form 67-8-1, Officer Evaluation Support Form, serves as a guide for the rated officer's performance, development of the rated officer, enhances the accomplishment of the organization mission, and provides additional performance information to the rating chain.</p>	
<p>3. ROUTINE USE: DA Form 67-8 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 sent to the forwarding address shown in Part I, DA Form 67-8. DA Form 67-8-1 is for organizational use only and will be returned to the rated officer after review by the rating chain.</p>	
<p>4. DISCLOSURE: Disclosure of the rated officer's SSN (Part I, DA Form 67-8) 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 67-8-1 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.</p>	

Figure 4 (DA Form 67-8-1) Back

contributions in Part IVc of the form. Also Part IVc must include the results of the Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) and the soldier's height and weight. The rated officer will then sign the form in Part IVc. At the same time he/she will receive a copy of the Evaluation Report with administrative data entered in Parts I and II. The officer being rated is responsible for verifying the correctness of this information entered on the form, and will then forward both the Evaluation Report and the completed Support Form to the rating officer.

As stated earlier the rater is required to counsel the rated officer within 30 days of the start of the rating period as to the rated officer's major duties and responsibilities and the performance objectives for the period. At the end of the rating period, the rater then evaluates the rated officer based upon his or her performance of the stated duties and the rated officer's potential for promotion.

The rater will have considerable latitude in developing the rated officer's duties and objectives. The rater may develop them alone or may develop them in discussion with the rated officer or may task the rated officer to develop them based upon guidance that will be provided. It must be remembered that the Support Form is only a guide. The rated officer is still responsible for all that is normally expected of an officer of that grade serving in that specific duty position. During the rating period, the rater should assure that the duty description and major performance objectives of the rated officer are kept current. This periodic review affords the rater an excellent opportunity to coach or counsel the rated officer and to provide him or her with the benefit of the rater's knowledge and

experience.

At the end of the rating period, the rater will receive the completed Support Form and the partially completed OER from the rated officer. The information on the Support Form should enable the rater to write a more accurate and complete OER. If the information on the form is inadequate or inaccurate, it is appropriate to discuss this with the rated officer and to suggest changes. However, the rater may not require the rated officer to change the information on the Support Form (Figure 3 and 4).

Raters must understand that the success of the officer evaluation system depends upon the complete and accurate use of the report and the regulations governing its preparation. The success or failure of the evaluation system depends in part upon the rater's ability to report accurately and objectively. The rater should remember that the OER is ultimately used to assist in determining the future leaders of the Army. The rated officer must be evaluated fairly, as an individual, based upon current grade, experience, and military schooling, in comparison with officers of similar grade.

In most cases there will be no intermediate rater. For those instances where an intermediate rater is designated, the intermediate rater will use Part IV of the OER to comment on the rated officer's performance and potential. If there is no intermediate rater, part IV is left blank.

The senior rater is responsible for both the final rating chain review of the OER and for a critical evaluation of the rated officer's potential. Part VII of the

OER is reserved for the use of the senior rater.

The senior rater is expected to provide an objective evaluation of the performance and potential of the rated officer, based upon additional experience, broad organizational perspective, and a focus on organizational requirements versus actual performance results. The senior rater is required to compare the potential of the rated officer against a hypothetical average population of 100 officers of the same grade, essentially placing all officers into a forced distribution rating. The evaluation should recognize that across the entire officer corps, there should be a normal distribution in terms of quality and potential. It is highly unlikely that all or most of the officers who are senior rated are in the top few percent of the officer corps. The senior rater evaluation must be accurate and fair, both to the rated officer and to the Army. The forced distribution is accomplished by placing an "X" in the appropriate box in the column marked SR, and any comments in Block B. The senior rater comments generally address the potential of the rated officer, but they may also address performance, administrative review, or the comments of the rater and/or intermediate rater. The completed OER is then forwarded to the appropriate Military Personnel Service Center (MPSC) for administrative processing. At the appropriate headquarters, the evaluations of the rated officer will be combined with previous ratings of similar officers to produce an updated profile of the senior rater's tendency. This profile for officers of that specific grade will be entered in part VII of the OER by Department of the Army, providing a graphic indication of the rating tendency and how a particular officer

CJRORG/J

U.S. ARMY RESERVE PERSONNEL CENTER SENIOR RATER PROFILE REPORT OFFICER EVALUATION REPORTING SYSTEM							9700 PAGE BOULEVARD ATTN: ARPC-PRE ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63132-5200					
FOR USE OF THIS FORM, SEE AR 672-106; REPORTING AGENCY IS U.S. TOTAL ARMY PERSONNEL COMMAND												
PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE DATA												
A. NAME (LAST, FIRST MI)				B. SSN		C. GRADE		D. DATE OF REPORT				
██████████				██████████		COL		940714				
PART II - SENIOR RATER PROFILE												
MG	BG	COL	LTC	MAJ	CPT	1LT 2LT	CW5	CW4	CW3	CW2	WO1	HIGHEST
						3			1			I
						3						II
						6						IIII
						3						
												II
												I
												LOWEST
											TOTAL NUMBER OF RATED OFFICERS	
						10			1			██████████
						8002	8709					
T T T LAST DATE START SENIOR RATER PROFILE (YEAR/MONTH) T T T												

A - 000841233 - 001

This is a certified true copy

Figure 5 (DA Form 67-8-2)

compared to all other officers of his or her grade that have been previously rated by that senior rater within the past year.

The box checked most frequently by the senior rater creates a "center of mass" in the profile that may be compared to the box checked for the rated officer in order to determine if the rated officer is above, in or below the center of mass of that particular senior rater's profile. The "center of mass" concept has been selected as the preferred method of interpreting the senior rater profile and is how selection boards interpret the evaluation.

The Senior Rater Profile, DA Form 67-8-2 (Figure 5), is produced annually by DA, based upon the cumulative total by grade of all the senior raters evaluations. One copy of the Senior Rater Profile is retained by DA in the senior rater's personnel records and one copy will be forwarded to the senior rater. The form is designed to track the general rating tendencies of the senior rater and to make this information available to the senior rater and to DA, where it may be used by various selection boards in their consideration of how the senior rater has performed his/her duties.

DA Form 67-7:

Prior to the DA Form 67-8 was the DA Form 67-7 which became effective on 1 April 1973 (Figure 6 and 7). It was similar to the DA Form 67-5. The plan was for the new form to utilize the features of its predecessors while at the same time narrowing the focus, allowing the form to become a streamlined management tool. Instead of a numerical score pertaining to the professional

S. SMITH 34787
82124

For use of this form, see AR 633-106. Proportion agency is US Army Military Personnel Center.

7/11

PART I - PERSONAL DATA (Read paragraph 1 to AR 633-106)

1. NAME - LAST, FIRST NAME - MIDDLE INITIAL	2. GRADE	3. SERVICE NUMBER	4. BRANCH	5. UIC	6. UIC	7. UIC
S. SMITH	2LT	71 08 27	FA			NA
8. UNIT (Include Army Center)						9. UIC (Include Army Center)
Btry C 2d Bn 104th FA NYARNG 93-05 168th St., Jamaica, NY 11433 42d Inf Div NYARNG						36/23 36

PART II - REPORTING PERIOD AND DUTY DATA (Read paragraph 1-2b, AR 633-106)

1. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	2. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	3. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	4. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	5. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	6. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	7. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	8. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	9. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	10. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)
73 05 31	73 07 31	73 09 30	73 11 30	74 01 31	74 03 31	74 05 31	74 07 31	74 09 30	74 11 30
11. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		12. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		13. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		14. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		15. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	
73 05 31		73 07 31		73 09 30		73 11 30		74 01 31	
16. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		17. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		18. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		19. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)		20. Reporting Period (Month, Day, Year)	
73 05 31		73 07 31		73 09 30		73 11 30		74 01 31	

PART III - DESCRIPTION OF DUTY (Read paragraph 4-1c, AR 633-106)

1. Position Title: **Executive Officer**

2. Special Duty Program (Investigation): **NA**

3. Duty Station: **1193**

4. Assignment: **LI**

Average Score: 149, DA Msg, 30 Aug 73, SUBJ: Off Eval Rept Sys

PART IV - PROFESSIONAL ATTRIBUTES (Read paragraph 4-1c, AR 633-106)

1. Question	2. Yes	3. No	4. Remarks
1. Has this officer demonstrated moral and character strength?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Has this officer demonstrated technical competence appropriate in his grade and branch?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Has this officer demonstrated, as appropriate, his honest opinions and convictions? (Not a "yes man")	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Has this officer used responsibility?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5. Has this officer willingly accepted full accountability for his actions and the actions of his subordinates?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Is this officer emotionally stable under stress?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7. Is this officer's judgment reliable?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Has this officer maintained effective two-way communications with juniors, seniors, and peers?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Has this officer demonstrated concern for the best interests of his subordinates?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10. Has this officer contributed to the personal and professional development of his subordinates?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. Has this officer subordinated his personal interests and welfare to those of his organization and subordinates?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
12. Has this officer's personal conduct set the proper example for his subordinates?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
13. Was this officer innovative in his approach to his duties and responsibilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
14. Has this officer demonstrated a breadth of perspective and depth of understanding beyond the limits of his specific responsibilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
15. Has this officer kept himself physically fit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
16. Has this officer fulfilled his responsibilities concerning the Army's Equal Opportunity Program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

PART V - SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE OF PRESENT DUTY (Read paragraph 4-1c, AR 633-106)

In my judgment, this officer's performance of duty was (mark score in appropriate box):

SCORE	Outstanding 70-88	Superior 87-97	Excellent 98-108	Effective 11-11	Marginal 12-12	Inadequate 1-11
SCORE			56			
PROOFER			56			

DA FORM 67-7 1 JAN 73 REPLACES DA FORM 67-6, 1 MAR 68, WHICH IS OBSOLETE. US ARMY OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT

FIRST YEAR - ARNG

Figure 6 (DA Form 67-7) Front

S. SMITH 34787
82124

PART IV - PERFORMANCE (Read paragraph 4-12, AR 623-101)

1. What did this officer do best? **Superior leadership and functions as Battery Executive Officer**

2. In what capacity or capacities do you believe this officer would meet the general requirements in the rating? **Command/Combat/Battalion**

3. If I had full responsibility and authority, I would (place score in applicable box):

	Promote this officer immediately	Promote this officer to the next higher grade ahead of his subordinates	Promote this officer with his subordinates	Promote this officer to the next higher grade behind his subordinates	Do not promote this officer
SCORE	30	29-24	23-8	7-2	1-0
DATE		21			
REMARKS			23		

PART V - COMMENTS (Read paragraph 4-16, AR 623-101)

4. Describe the performance in narrative form:

is extremely competent in all phases of military operations, has contributed immeasurably to the superior rating attained by this unit at AT-73. His judgement is highly respected by both seniors and subordinates. He constantly strives to improve his knowledge through self study and service schools. His contribution to this unit is singularly outstanding.

5. Evaluate the performance in narrative form:

This officer is very knowledgeable and competent. His enthusiastic attitude, combined with his competence would make an asset in any position to which he may be assigned.

PART VI - AUTHENTICATION (Read paragraph 3-2, AR 623-101)

DATE	SCORE	INITIALS	SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER	TYPED NAME (Last, First, MI)	DATE
V	56	56	<i>Donald + Dean</i>		10 Mar 74
VI	24	23	<i>Donald + Dean</i>		10 Mar 74
VI	80	79	<i>Donald + Dean</i>		10 Mar 74
REPORT SCORE		159	<i>Donald + Dean</i>		10 Mar 74

PART VII - PERFORMANCE OFFICER (Read paragraph 3-23, AR 623-101)

DATE	REPORT SCORE	INITIALS	SIGNATURE OF REPORTING OFFICER	TYPED NAME (Last, First, MI)	DATE
10 Mar 74			<i>Donald + Dean</i>		10 Mar 74

1. DATE ENTERED ON DA: 10 Mar 74

2. DATE RECEIVED: 10 Mar 74

3. FORWARDING ADDRESS (Name, Office):

4. DATE RECEIVED: 10 Mar 74

Figure 7 (DA Form 67-7) Back

attributes, the rater was required to state yes, no or needs improvement. This form did however provide for a system of scores, to include overall and subtotals to be calculated and recorded. The rater and endorser were provided with identical scoring requirements in the various sections of the report. It should be noted that unlike older versions, higher numbers reflected better scores or a greater degree of goodness. Those scored areas marked with an asterisk required mandatory remarks in the comments or narrative section. Parts IV and VII provided space for the rater and endorser to provide brief comments on items not covered elsewhere or items that require further address. It is required that the comments be completed within the space provided, additional enclosures were not permitted. The rating officer was usually the immediate superior to the rated officer. The endorser was the next higher commander who prepared the efficiency report. The reviewing officer was required to ensure that the comments were correct and understandable. Unlike previous reports, it was the rated officer's duty to ensure that the efficiency report provided complete and accurate information on all the aspects indicated in the report. Upon completion by the reviewing officer, the rated officer was allowed to view the report prior to its being placed into the rated officer's Official Military Personnel File (OMPF). No records were kept pertaining to the statistical rating history of any of the rating officers.

DA Form 67-6:

The DA Form 76-6 (Figures 8 and 9) became effective on 1 April 1968. It was planned to utilize the best features of its predecessors, and introduce new

S. Smith 307287 82124

A4

RATER		MOOREE		PART VI - PERFORMANCE OF DUTY FACTORS (Read paragraph 4-36, AR 623-102)							PART VII - PROMOTION POTENTIAL (Read paragraph 4-36, AR 623-102)																																																																					
RATER		MOOREE		TOP	SECOND	MIDDLE	FOURTH	BOTTOM	NOT OBSERVED	1	2																																																																					
<p>1. EMPLOYE A PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE OF ASSIGNED DUTIES</p> <p>2. MANAGES RESOURCES EFFICIENTLY AND ECONOMICALLY</p> <p>3. ESTABLISHES AND ACHIEVES HIGH STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE</p> <p>4. FULFILLS HIS RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUBORDINATES</p> <p>5. PLANS BEYOND THE IMMEDIATE REQUIREMENTS OF ASSIGNED DUTIES</p> <p>6. DELEGATES AUTHORITY AS APPROPRIATE</p> <p>7. EXHIBITS PROPER DEGREE OF SUPERVISION</p> <p>8. COMMANDS CONFIDENCE AND RESPECT</p> <p>9. ACCEPTS FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIS ACTIONS</p> <p>10. WILLINGLY ACCEPTS AND ACTS UPON SUGGESTIONS AND CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM</p> <p>11. EXPRESSES HIMSELF CLEARLY AND CONCISELY ORALLY</p> <p>12. EXPRESSES HIMSELF CLEARLY AND CONCISELY IN WRITING</p> <p>13. MAINTAINS AN APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF PHYSICAL FITNESS</p> <p>14. HAS CONCERN FOR THE WELFARE OF SUBORDINATES</p>				<p>PART VIII - DEMONSTRATED PERFORMANCE OF PRESENT DUTY (Read paragraph 4-36, AR 623-102)</p> <p>RATER: X MOOREE: X</p> <p>PERFORMS THIS DUTY BETTER THAN ANY OTHER OFFICER I KNOW *</p> <p>PERFORMANCE OF THIS DUTY EQUALS BY VERY FEW OFFICERS</p> <p>PERFORMS THIS DUTY BETTER THAN MOST OFFICERS</p> <p>PERFORMS THIS DUTY AS WELL AS MOST OFFICERS</p> <p>PERFORMANCE OF THIS DUTY MEETS MINIMUM STANDARDS</p> <p>PERFORMS THIS DUTY IN AN UNSATISFACTORY MANNER *</p>		<p>PART IX - SCHOOLING POTENTIAL (Read paragraph 4-36, AR 623-102)</p> <p>HIGHEST MILITARY SCHOOL COMPLETED: OCS</p> <p>LEARNED S... COLLEGE AHEAD OF CONTEMPORARIES</p> <p>LEARNED SERVICE COLLEGE WITH CONTEMPORARIES</p> <p>LEARNED IN EQUIVALENT AHEAD OF CONTEMPORARIES</p> <p>LEARNED ON EQUIVALENT WITH CONTEMPORARIES</p> <p>NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FURTHER SCHOOLING</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE</p>																																																																										
<p>PART X - COMMENTS (Read paragraph 4-36, AR 623-102)</p> <p>RATER: [] MOOREE: []</p> <p>As a newly commissioned officer, he is showing considerable ability and potential to be an outstanding officer. He is enthusiastic and welcomes responsibility. His lack of technical knowledge is compensated for by his zeal. This individual supports the U. S. Army's Equal Opportunity Program.</p> <p>is one of our newer officers and has already shown the potential to be an outstanding officer. He is presently attending the resident basic officers course at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. Upon completion he will be able to contribute greatly to the success of this organization and the "Guard". supports the Army's Equal Opportunity Program.</p>																																																																																
<p>PART XII - OVER-ALL VALUE TO THE SERVICE (Read paragraph 4-36, AR 623-102)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">OFFICERS OF THIS GRADE PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS - CURRENTLY RATE BY MOOREE</th> <th rowspan="2">TOTAL</th> <th colspan="5">PLACEMENT OF OFFICERS (Enter "x" in appropriate group)</th> <th rowspan="2">RATING BY ALL GROUP</th> </tr> <tr> <th>BOTTOM 25%</th> <th>FOURTH</th> <th>MIDDLE</th> <th>SECOND</th> <th>TOP</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>RATER</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MOOREE</td> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>5*</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>RATING OF THIS OFFICER IN COMPARISON WITH ALL ARMY OFFICERS OF THIS GRADE AND BRANCH I KNOW WELL ENOUGH TO RATE</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>RATER</th> <th>5</th> <th>0</th> <th>10</th> <th>20</th> <th>30</th> <th>40</th> <th>50</th> <th>60</th> <th>70</th> <th>80</th> <th>90</th> <th>100</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>RATER</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>97</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MOOREE</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>87</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>													OFFICERS OF THIS GRADE PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS - CURRENTLY RATE BY MOOREE	TOTAL	PLACEMENT OF OFFICERS (Enter "x" in appropriate group)					RATING BY ALL GROUP	BOTTOM 25%	FOURTH	MIDDLE	SECOND	TOP	RATER	1							MOOREE	8			1	5*	2		RATER	5	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	RATER										97			MOOREE										87		
OFFICERS OF THIS GRADE PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS - CURRENTLY RATE BY MOOREE	TOTAL	PLACEMENT OF OFFICERS (Enter "x" in appropriate group)					RATING BY ALL GROUP																																																																									
		BOTTOM 25%	FOURTH	MIDDLE	SECOND	TOP																																																																										
RATER	1																																																																															
MOOREE	8			1	5*	2																																																																										
RATER	5	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100																																																																				
RATER										97																																																																						
MOOREE										87																																																																						

Figure 9 (DA Form 67-6) Back

sections and new rating requirements to make the total report a broader, more comprehensive and more useful management tool. Past efficiency reports had an overall or total points scoring to offer an immediate grade on an officer's efficiency, performance and potential. This system contains scores, but no overall totals or subtotals are to be calculated or recorded. The rater and the endorser had identical scoring requirements in the various sections of the report. It should be noted that higher numbers sometimes indicated better scores and sometimes the opposite, requiring care and concentration when filling out the report. All scores marked with an asterisk required an explanation in the narrative section. Part IX had space for the rater and endorser to provide brief comments on items not covered elsewhere or to amplify other sections of the report. It was expected that the narrative be completed within the space provided, however enclosures were acceptable if additional space was required. The rating officer was normally the rated officer's immediate superior in the chain of command. The endorsing officer was the next higher commander who prepares the efficiency report. The reviewing officer was usually the endorser's rating officer. The reviewing officer had the responsibility of ensuring that the efficiency report provided complete and accurate information on all of the individual aspects listed in the report form. Upon completion by the reviewing officer, the rated officer was allowed to view the report prior to its placement into the officer's OMPF. No statistical records were kept pertaining to the rater, endorser or reviewing official's rating history.

DA Form 67-5:

SJ 530610 #1

READ CAREFULLY. REFERENCED SECTION IN AR 623-106 BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO COMPLETE ANY ITEM.

110101

11

23 SEP 63 Z-175

PART I - PERSONAL DATA (From Sections IV, AR 623-102)											
1. NAME (Last, First Name, Middle Initial)				2. SERVICE NUMBER		3. GRADE		4. DATE OF BIRTH		5. BRANCH	
[REDACTED]				[REDACTED]		CPT		22 May 63		DC	
6. UNIT, ORGANIZATION, STATION AND MAJOR COMMAND											
121ST MED DET (DEN SVC), Fort Richardson, Alaska, USARAL											
PART II - REPORTING PERIOD AND DUTY DATA (From Sections IV and V, AR 623-102)											
7. PERIOD COVERED					8. REASON FOR RENDERING REPORT (Check)			9. REPORT BASED ON (Check)		10. RATER	
FROM TO					ANNUAL			DAILY CONTACT		X X	
22 Jul 66 - 13 Jun 67					X CHANGE OF RATER			FREQUENT OBSERVATION			
DUTY DAYS					PCS RATED OFFICER			INFREQUENT OBSERVATION			
304					OTHER DUTY FOR RATED OFFICER			RECORDS AND REPORTS			
OTHER DAYS					OTHER (Specify)						
29											
11. DUTY ASSIGNMENT FOR RATED PERIOD											
12. PRINCIPAL DUTY			13. DUTY NOS			14. AUTH GRADE					
Dentist			3170			Captain					
15. MAJOR ADDITIONAL DUTIES											
PART III - MANNER OF PERFORMANCE (From Paragraph 2c, AR 623-102)											
16. RATER											
[REDACTED] is an industrious young officer with a sincere desire to perform his best for this command. He has an indomitable spirit and a will to pursue an objective relentlessly if he is convinced the cause is right. He is an excellent speaker and has been assigned to the position of Preventive Dentistry Officer of this clinic as an additional duty. He has performed well in this capacity and has lectured to the majority of the troops in this command. His message of prevention has been well received by the troops, as many of them have reported in to the clinic for check-ups and oral hygiene instruction. [REDACTED] clinical abilities are excellent, and he sincerely attempts to pattern his treatment to the individual patient. He commands his unit well. This officer has excellent potential as a Preventive Dentistry Officer and, should he decide upon a service career, would be best guided into this particular field of dentistry.											
17. INDORSE											
<input type="checkbox"/> I AM UNABLE TO EVALUATE THIS OFFICER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:											
[REDACTED] has performed his duties in a superior manner during the period covered by this report. This young, energetic officer, as Chief of the Operative Section, has instituted several innovations which have resulted in increased supply economy. As an additional duty, [REDACTED] has been appointed as the Post Preventive Dentistry Officer. His lectures to the troop units of this command have resulted in a very definite improvement in the oral health of the troops. Although on occasion, [REDACTED] has expressed a desire to remain in the service, he has resigned as a member of the Officers' Club. Repeated counseling sessions have been held, at which time his social obligations have been pointed out; but he has continued to refrain from rejoining. This officer has failed to join the Army community, and his attitude has had a detrimental effect on the Dental Corps at this post. (CONT)											

DA FORM 67-5 AUG 62 REPLACES DA FORM 67-5, 1 FEB 62, WHICH IS OBSOLETE EFFECTIVE 30 SEP 62. US ARMY OFFICER EFFICIENCY REPORT (AR 623-102)

Figure 10 (DA Form 67-5) Front

ST 530610 #1

RATED OFFICER'S NAME AND SERVICE NUMBER										
PART IV - PERSONAL QUALITIES (Read paragraph 214, AR 432-101)							PART V - APPRAISAL OF QUALIFICATIONS (Read paragraph 214, AR 432-101)			
LEGEND	GRADE NUMBER	INADEQUATE	MARGINAL	BELOW AVERAGE	AVERAGE	ABOVE AVERAGE	EXEMPLARY	DUTIES		
		0	1	2	3	4	5	RATER	INDOORER	
RATER	INDOORER	A. ADAPTABILITY (Adapt to new or changing situations & succeed there on your own)						A. COMMAND & TACTICAL UNIT		
4	4	B. AMBITION (Seeks and achieves additional and more important responsibilities)						A. COMB NON-TACTICAL UNIT		
4	4	C. APPEARANCE (Possesses military bearing and is neat, smart, and well-groomed)						B. STAFF		
4	4	D. COOPERATION (Works in harmony with others on a team basis)						PLANS/STAFF		
3	3	E. EFFICIENCY (Performs necessary and important duties in a timely manner)						INTEL		
4	4	F. INITIATIVE (Takes necessary and appropriate action on his own)						GENERAL (G)		
4	4	G. INTELLIGENCE (Acquires knowledge and grows conscious reality)						OR		
4	4	H. JUDGMENT (Thinks logically and makes practical decisions)						JOINT (J)		
5	4	I. LOYALTY (Lends loyal and willing support to superior and subordinates)						CONV		
5	4	J. MORAL COURAGE (Demonstrates honesty and conducts both orally and in writing)						SPECIAL STAFF		
4	4	K. PERSONALITY (Exercises initiative and energy in the conduct of his duties)						RATER (Specify)		
4	4	L. SELF-IMPROVEMENT (Takes action to improve himself)						INDOORER (Specify)		
4	4	M. SOCIALABILITY (Participates freely and easily in social and community activities)						SPECIALIST		
4	4	N. STAFFING (Performs necessary and important duties in a timely manner)						RATER (Specify)		
3	3	O. TACT (Acts or does what is appropriate without getting unnecessary orders)						INDOORER (Specify)		
4	4	P. UNDERSTANDING (Appreciation of another person's viewpoint)						Dentist (3170)		
8.3	7.5	SCORE						Dentist (3170)		
PART VI - OVERALL DEMONSTRATED PERFORMANCE AND ESTIMATED POTENTIAL (Read paragraphs 211 and 212, AR 432-101)										
RATING		EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION OF 100 OFFICERS RATED				OVERALL DEMONSTRATED PERFORMANCE (1)		ESTIMATED POTENTIAL (2)		
A. DUTY	EXCELLENT					RATER	VALUE	INDOORER	RATER	VALUE
B. EXCEPTIONAL						86-100			9	10
C. SUPERIOR						80-85			3	8
D. EXCELLENT						70-79	79			
E. EFFECTIVE						60-69			5	
F. MARGINAL						50-59			5	
G. INADEQUATE						40-49			4	
SCORE						80	70	9	8	
PART VII - NUMERICAL VALUE (Read paragraph 213, AR 432-101)					PART VIII - AUTHENTICATION (Read paragraph 211, AR 432-101)					
I. SIGNATURE OF RATER					DATE					
[Signature]					15 June 1967					
II. TYPED NAME, GRADE, BRANCH, SERVICE NUMBER, ORGANIZATION, AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT					DATE					
[Typed Name]					14 July 1967					
III. SIGNATURE OF INDOORER					DATE					
[Signature]					17 July 67					
IV. TYPED NAME, GRADE, BRANCH, SERVICE NUMBER, ORGANIZATION, AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT					DATE					
[Typed Name]					18 Jul 67					
V. SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER					DATE					
[Signature]					18 Jul 67					
VI. TYPED NAME, GRADE, BRANCH, SERVICE NUMBER, ORGANIZATION, AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT					DATE					
[Typed Name]					18 Jul 67					
VII. SIGNATURE OF COMMANDING OFFICER					DATE					
[Signature]					18 Jul 67					
VIII. TYPED NAME, GRADE, BRANCH, SERVICE NUMBER, ORGANIZATION, AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT					DATE					
[Typed Name]					18 Jul 67					

Figure 11 (DA Form 67-5) Back

SJ

830610

#1

B7

[REDACTED], Captain

PERIOD COVERED: 22 Jul 66 - 19 Jun 67

ITEM 19, Continued

Further action was considered; however, a rating at the bottom of the "exceptional" category, with a score of 90, and a rating at the middle of the "superior" category, with a score of 79, were not considered as a wide difference of opinion between these two evaluations in Part VI; nor was the evaluation in Part IV considered inconsistent. Therefore, this report was not referred to the rater and indorser for comment. I felt that each rating was an honest evaluation based on each officer's observation of the rated officer. During this period, I counseled [REDACTED] regarding his responsibilities as a member of the Army community and the benefits of membership in the Fort Richardson Officers' Open Mess. No further action is considered appropriate at this time.

Santo P. Giunta

[REDACTED], LTC, DC,
[REDACTED], 121st Med Det (Det Svc),
Commanding Officer

INCL 2

SJ 830610 #1

██████████, ██████████, Captain

PERIOD COVERED: 22 Jul 66 - 19 Jun 67

ITEM 16, Continued

He has also brought embarrassment to those in higher authority. I do not recommend that this officer be considered for the Regular Army at this time.

W. C. Beaman
██████████, LTC, DC,
██████████, 121st Med Det (Den Svc),
Clinic Chief

INCL 1

DA Form 67-5 (Figure 10 and 13) actually had two effective dates. The first was 1 February 1962 and was replaced on 30 September 1963. The form number was not changed at that time. The DA Form 67-5 at TAB D is the second edition. In the Army's attempt to make the form more relevant for managers and superiors, the DA Form 67-5 was overly technical. It was the first documented use of forced distribution. The rater and endorser were required to place the rated officer into a statistical mean based on performance and potential as can be seen in Part VI. In Part III, the rater and endorser were given much more space to provide comments on performance and to make other recommendations as deemed appropriate or necessary. I am unable to determine the exact function of Part V. My best estimate is that it was used as a method of recommending additional future assignments that the rated officer would be best suited for. The most interesting aspect of the example report is that the endorser did not recommend the rated officer for a Regular Army appointment due to the rated officer having refused to rejoin the Officer's Club, although throughout the entire report, the rated officer has been described as "superior", "exceptional", and "excellent", his career was technically over because he had not lived up to the social obligation of the time.

DA Form 67-4:

Initiated 1 October 1956, the DA Form 67-4 (figure 14 and 15) used a rater, endorser, and reviewing officer. The rater and endorser were given a block

IMPORTANT: THE PREPARATION OF AN EFFICIENCY REPORT IS A SERIOUS RESPONSIBILITY. EACH INDIVIDUAL WILL TAKE THE SAME PAINSTAKING CARE IN THE PREPARATION OF THE EFFICIENCY REPORT FOR HIS SUBORDINATES THAT HE WOULD EXPECT HIS RATING OFFICER TO TAKE IN THE PREPARATION OF HIS OWN EFFICIENCY REPORT. ALL ENTRIES WILL BE TRUE AND IMPARTIAL AND MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AR 600-105

SECTION I - PERSONAL DATA OF OFFICER BEING RATED

1. LAST NAME - FIRST NAME - MIDDLE INITIAL [REDACTED]	2. SERVICE NUMBER [REDACTED]	3. DATE OF BIRTH 23 Feb 52	4. GRADE Major	5. BRANCH AR
6. UNIT, ORGANIZATION, AND STATION U. S. Army Signal School Fort Monmouth, New Jersey		7. PERIOD OF REPORT FROM: 6 Feb 59 TO: 18 Aug 59		8. DUTY DAYS 153 OTHER DAYS 41
9. DUTY ASSIGNMENT FOR RATED PERIOD				
10. DUTY NOS 82728	11. AUTHORIZED GRADE FOR DUTY ASSIGNMENT Not Applicable	12. MAJOR ADDITIONAL DUTIES (If any) NONE		
13. DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES PERFORMED Senior Armor Branch Representative to the U.S. Army Signal School. Serves as Liaison Officer between the USASCS and the U.S. Army Armor School, advising the Commandant and his staff of matters pertaining to the U.S. Army (Cont'd)				
14. REASON (Check One)	15. BASIS (Check One)	16. RATER	17. ENDORSER	
ANNUAL	DAILY CONTACT	XX		
CHANGE DUTY RATED OFFICER (Retain in Section III)	PCS RATED OFFICER X PCS Rating Officer	FREQUENT OBSERVATION		
CHANGE DUTY RATING OFFICER		INFREQUENT OBSERVATION		
		RECORDS AND REPORTS		

Figure 14 (DA Form 67-4) Front

PERFORMANCE LEGEND		1 - SATISFACTORY	2 - EXCELLENT	3 - OUTSTANDING	
UNK - UNKNOWN		1 - UNSATISFACTORY	2 - VERY SATISFACTORY	3 - SUPERIOR	
SECTION IV - ESTIMATED PERFORMANCE OF OTHER DUTIES					
Estimate the level at which the rated officer would perform in each type of duty described below by indicating for each item the appropriate number shown in the Performance Legend. The Performance Legend contains six steps with each step indicating a level of performance. Consider each item in terms applicable to rated officer's grade and branch. Use the UNKNOWN (UNK) only if the nature of your contacts makes it impracticable for you to make an estimate of his probable performance in a particular assignment. Marking UNKNOWN does not penalize the rated officer.					
DUTIES				RATER	INDORSER
1. COMMAND A TACTICAL UNIT				5	
2. COMMAND A NON-TACTICAL UNIT				5	
C. SERVE AS A STAFF OFFICER		RATER (Specify type of Staff Duty) Div G3, MCS 2162		INDORSER (Specify type of Staff Duty)	
3. SERVE AS AN INSTRUCTOR				5	
4. SERVE IN A CAPACITY INVOLVING CONTACTS WITH OTHER SERVICES AND OR AGENCIES OF THE U. S. GOVERNMENT				5	
5. SERVE ABROAD IN AN ASSIGNMENT REQUIRING CONTACT WITH FOREIGN FORCES AND OR FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS				5	
6. SERVE WITH RESERVE COMPONENTS				5	
7. SERVE IN AN ASSIGNMENT REQUIRING APPRECIATION OF GOOD PUBLIC RELATIONS				5	
8. CARRY OUT AN ASSIGNMENT INVOLVING MOSTLY ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES				5	
9. SERVE IN AN ASSIGNMENT REQUIRING EXPRESSION EITHER WRITTEN OR ORAL				5	
SECTION V - TRAITS, QUALITIES AND CHARACTERISTICS			SECTION VII - PROMOTION POTENTIAL		
Study carefully the listed attributes which apply in some degree to all officers. Designate in order of priority, as M1, M2 and M3 the three attributes which are the MOST PRONOUNCED in the rated officer. If considered appropriate a maximum of four additional MUST PRONOUNCED attributes may be indicated as M4. Attributes which are considered to be LEAST PRONOUNCED in the rated officer may, if considered appropriate, be indicated as L1.			Considering only officers of his grade, branch, and about the same time in grade, what is your opinion of this officer's promotion potential? Place a heavy X in the box opposite best description. A recent promotion or a transfer requires a comparison with other officers about similar circumstances.		
RATER			INDORSER		
1. ABLE TO INFLUENCE AND DIRECT OTHERS			1. ONE OF THE FEW EXCEPTIONAL OFFICERS WHO SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR MORE RAPID PROMOTION THAN HIS CONTEMPORARIES.		
2. WELL GROUNDED AND INFORMED	M1		2. SHOULD GIVE AN OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE WHEN PROMOTED TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE	X	
3. MAKES PRACTICAL DECISIONS			3. SHOULD GIVE A SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE WHEN PROMOTED TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE		
4. SOUND JUDGEMENT AND COMMON SENSE	M2		4. SHOULD GIVE AN EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE WHEN PROMOTED TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE		
5. COURAGE OF HIS CONVICTIONS			5. SHOULD GIVE A VERY SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE WHEN PROMOTED TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE		
6. STRONG INITIATIVE	M3		6. SHOULD GIVE A SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE WHEN PROMOTED TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE		
7. ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY			7. HAS REACHED THE HIGHEST GRADE COMMENSURATE WITH ABILITY		
8. GETS ALONG WELL WITH PEOPLE					
9. CAN WORK WITH MINIMUM SUPERVISION					
10. LOYAL TO SUPERIORS					
11. TEAMWORKER					
12. ALWAYS SETS THE EXAMPLE					
13. DELEGATES AUTHORITY					
14. LOYAL TO SUBORDINATES					
SECTION VI - PERFORMANCE OF PRESENT DUTY			SECTION VIII - OVERALL VALUE TO SERVICE		
Considering only officers of his grade, branch, and about the same time in grade, rate the officer on performance of his duty assignment. Read all descriptions and place a heavy X in the box opposite best description.			Considering officers of the same grade, branch, and about the same time in grade, what is your estimate of the rated officer's overall value to the service? Place a heavy X in the box opposite best description.		
1. OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE OF THIS DUTY FOUND IN VERY FEW OFFICERS.		X	1. AN OUTSTANDING OFFICER OF GREAT VALUE TO THE SERVICE.	X	
2. PERFORMS THIS DUTY IN A SUPERIOR MANNER.			2. A SUPERIOR OFFICER OF GREAT VALUE TO THE SERVICE.		
3. PERFORMS THIS DUTY IN AN EXCELLENT MANNER.			3. AN EXCELLENT OFFICER OF DISTINCT VALUE TO THE SERVICE.		
4. PERFORMS THIS DUTY IN A VERY SATISFACTORY MANNER.			4. A VERY SATISFACTORY OFFICER WHOSE VALUE TO THE SERVICE IS LIMITED IN SOME RESPECTS.		
5. PERFORMS THIS DUTY IN A SATISFACTORY MANNER.			5. A SATISFACTORY OFFICER WHOSE VALUE TO THE SERVICE IS LIMITED IN MANY RESPECTS.		
6. PERFORMS THIS DUTY IN AN UNSATISFACTORY MANNER.			6. AN UNSATISFACTORY OFFICER OF NO VALUE TO THE SERVICE.		

CONTINUED FRONT SIDE OF DA FORM 67-4

Figure 15 (DA Form 67-4) Back

to check indicating the frequency of contact that was used for the evaluation. A block was provided for a narrative description of the rated officer, "Comments will reflect your appraisal of this officer and will emphasize strengths, weaknesses, behavior, personality, character or other qualities which distinguish this officer". These comments were allowed to be carried over onto a continuation sheet if the rater or endorser felt that additional space was required to provide an accurate reflection of the rated officer. In Section IV, numeric scores were to be given based upon how the rater and endorser felt the rated officer would perform in different potential assignments. Section V, allowed for the selection of three attributes which were observed to be most prominent in the rated officer. Section VI provided for the overall rating of current duty performance. Section VII allowed for reflection of the promotion potential, while Section VIII provided for a rating of the individual's overall value to the service. While this might be a novel approach to the evaluation of an individual's capability and worth, it provides no control over placement based upon a statistical mean; and I would imagine that in practice all officers who were in favor with the rater and endorser were given stellar ratings.

DA Form 67-3:

The DA Form 67-3 (figures 16 and 17) was instituted on 1 October 1953. The rater and endorser were allowed to rate the officer based upon a scale of satisfactory, unsatisfactory or unknown, an interesting method that would eliminate guesswork of the rated individuals relative goodness, now either good

OFFICER EFFICIENCY REPORT (AR 600-135 and SR 600-135-1)					
SECTION I					
1. LAST NAME - FIRST NAME - MIDDLE INITIAL ██████████, J.R.		2. SERVICE NO. ██████████	3. GRADE Major	4. BRANCH ARMY	
5. COMPONENT █		6. UNIT, ORGANIZATION, AND STATION OF RATED OFFICER 2332-2 IG Advisor Group, RD 2, Ansville, Pa. w/dy station Lewisport, Pa.			
7. PERIOD OF REPORT FROM (Da.mo.yr) TO (Da.mo.yr) 1 May 55 16 Aug 55		DUTY DAYS 108	OTHER DAYS 0		
8. REASON FOR REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> Annual <input type="checkbox"/> Change duty rated officer <input type="checkbox"/> Change duty rating officer <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)		9. BASIS FOR RATING OFFICER'S ENTRIES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PCS rated officer <input type="checkbox"/> PCS rating officer <input type="checkbox"/> Close daily contact <input type="checkbox"/> Infrequent observation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Frequent observation <input type="checkbox"/> Reports and records			
10. DUTIES ACTUALLY PERFORMED ON PRESENT JOB ASSIGNMENT (Give his duty MOS, job assignment, and briefly describe major additional duties). Advises personnel of a Battalion of National Guard Companies in matters pertaining to training and administration. Performs periodic inspections of records and equipment. Supervises Regular Army personnel assisting him. Acts as Investigating Officer for Reports of Survey involving Federal property. Acts as a member of various personnel Boards.					
11. OFFICER CHARACTERISTICS					
		RATER		INDORSER	
		UNKNOWN	UNSATIS-FACTORY	SATIS-FACTORY	
a. How effective is this officer in the maintenance of supply discipline?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b. How effective is this officer in utilization of personnel?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
c. FOR RATER ONLY - Does this officer possess the physical, mental, and moral qualities expected for his grade, branch, and length of commissioned service?		UNKNOWN	NO	YES	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If UNKNOWN or NO explain in detail in item 12a.
d. FOR RATER ONLY - Could this officer be expected to serve adequately in any normal branch assignment commensurate with his grade?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If UNKNOWN or NO explain in detail in item 12a.
12. DESCRIPTION OF RATED OFFICER AND COMMENTS. Remarks should cover any special strengths or weaknesses affecting performance of duty or ability to perform other types of assignments. If officer served in combat during period, state number of days (days) and discuss strengths and weaknesses exhibited in combat.					
a. Comments of rating officer					
<p>This officer is a personable individual who has a high standard of duty. He is aggressive, fair and objective in his work. He has shown great energy and initiative in his work on this assignment. His high standards of work, conduct and bearing have earned him the respect and liking of his associates and the units he serves. I earnestly recommend that this officer be considered for attendance at the Command and General Staff School.</p>					
b. Comments of indorsing officer					
<input type="checkbox"/> I do not know the rated officer well enough to complete the reverse side of this report. <p>This officer is energetic, efficient and capable of performing any duties assigned him. He presents himself with decorum and in a military manner at all times. His moral conduct and personal habits are above reproach.</p>					
13. RATING OFFICER'S NAME, GRADE, SERVICE NUMBER, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT ██████████, Lt Col, █, Advisor ██████████ IG Advisor Group, Regimental Advisor			14. INDORSING OFFICER'S NAME, GRADE, SERVICE NUMBER, BRANCH, ORGANIZATION, AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT ██████████, Lt Col, █, Infantry ██████████ IG Advisor Group, Executive Officer		
I CERTIFY THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF ALL ENTRIES MADE HEREON BY ME ARE TRUE AND IMPARTIAL AND ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AR 600-135 AND SR 600-135-1.			I CERTIFY THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF ALL ENTRIES MADE HEREON BY ME ARE TRUE AND IMPARTIAL AND ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AR 600-135 AND SR 600-135-1.		
DATE 17 Aug 55	SIGNATURE ██████████	DATE 17 Aug 55	SIGNATURE ██████████		
15. THIS REPORT HAS 0 INCLOSURES. (Insert "0" if appropriate).			16. DATE ENTERED ON DA FORM 66 PERSONNEL OFFICER'S INITIALS 17 Aug 55 ██████████		

DA FORM 67-3 OCT 53

REPLACES DA AGO FORM 67-3, 1 SEP 50 WHICH WILL BE OBSOLETE 31 OCT 53.

Figure 16 (DA Form 67-3) Front

RATED OFFICER'S NAME AND SERVICE NUMBER

SECTION II ESTIMATED DESIRABILITY IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES

Indicate the extent to which you would desire the rated officer to serve under you in each type of duty described below. Place an X in the proper box. Consider each item in terms appropriate to rated officer's grade and branch. Use the UNKNOWN column only if the nature of your contacts makes it impracticable for you to make an estimate of his probable usefulness in a particular assignment. Marking UNKNOWN does not penalize the rated officer.

		RATER							INDORSER						
		1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
		UNKNOWN	HOT WANT HIM	WOULD PREFER OTHERS	PLEASED TO HAVE HIM	PREFER HIM TO MOST	PARTICULARLY DESIRE TO HAVE HIM			UNKNOWN	HOT WANT HIM	WOULD PREFER OTHERS	PLEASED TO HAVE HIM	PREFER HIM TO MOST	PARTICULARLY DESIRE TO HAVE HIM
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Command a unit. Serve as a staff officer.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	B	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Specify: S-1 or S-3		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	C	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Work as a specialist, professional person, or technician. Specify:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	D	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conduct military instruction.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Serve in a capacity involving contacts with other services, allied forces, or civilians - e.g., joint boards, contract negotiations, reserve components, etc.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	F	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Carry out an assignment involving mostly administrative duties.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	G	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Represent your viewpoint in liaison activities.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	H	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Make decisions and take action in your name during your absence - e.g., act as your deputy.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Be responsible in an emergency requiring forceful leadership.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	J	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other. Specify:		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Comment on and/or clarify above ratings if necessary

* For technical and administrative services, or staff, interpret this to mean managerial responsibilities commensurate with command.

SECTION III PERFORMANCE OF DUTY

Considering only officers of his grade, branch, and about the same time in grade, rate the officer on performance of his duty assignment. Read all descriptions and place a heavy X in the box opposite best description.

	RATER	INDORSER
7. Exceeds any other officer I know in performance of this duty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Outstanding performance of this duty found in very few officers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Very fine performance of such a nature that this officer is a distinct asset to the service.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Performs this duty in a competent, dependable manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Performs this duty acceptably.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Barely adequate in performance of this duty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Inadequate in performance of this duty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION IV PROMOTION POTENTIAL

Considering officers of his grade, branch, and about the same time in grade, what is your opinion of this officer's promotion potential? Place a heavy X in the box opposite best description.

	RATER	INDORSER
6. One of the few exceptional officers who should be considered for more rapid promotion than his contemporaries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Should give an outstanding performance when promoted to next higher grade.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Should give a competent and dependable performance when promoted to next higher grade.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Should give a fairly adequate performance of duty when promoted to next higher grade.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Has not yet demonstrated potential for promotion to next higher grade. Needs more time in present grade.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Has reached the highest grade level at which satisfactory performance should be expected. Should not be promoted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION V OVER-ALL VALUE

What is your estimate of the rated officer's over-all value to the service? Compare him with officers of the same grade, branch, and about the same time in grade. Place a heavy X in the box opposite best description.

	RATER	INDORSER
5. The most outstanding officer I know.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. One of the few highly outstanding officers I know.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. A very fine officer who is a great asset to the service.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. A competent, dependable officer of distinct value to the service.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. A typically effective officer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. An acceptable officer whose value is limited in some respects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. An officer who performs acceptably in a limited range of assignments, but who could easily be replaced.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. An officer who is not of the caliber that one should reasonably expect in an officer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Figure 17 (DA Form 67-3) Back

or bad. In Section II, the evaluation allowed for the ever-present inflation of ratings. Rater and endorser were to rate the individual on "the extent to which you would desire the rated officer to serve under you" in various duty assignments. Obviously if the rated individual was not in favor with the rater or endorser they had a clear opportunity to create a rating that would cause the rated officer to either be transferred out of the unit or most likely to be passed over for promotion, retention or school, effectively ending his/her career. Sections III - V provided for a rating of performance, promotion potential, and overall value to the service in that order. No controls were in place to prevent inflation of the ratings. It appears that if the rated officer was unwilling to be favorably known to his senior officers his career was in jeopardy of becoming very short.

DA Form 67-2:

The DA Form 67-2 (Figures 18 and 19) was implemented on 1 September 1950. The content appears to be identical to the DA Form 67-3 that replaced it. In reality the forms are the same, the arrangement of the data fields was changed apparently to present the image of progress and improvement. Again the primary problems are that the rater and endorser were capable of inflating the ratings of officers in favor and deflating the rating of the officer that they chose to dislike whether that dislike was professional or personal in nature.

DA Form 67-1:

The DA Form 67-1(Figures 20 and 21) initiated on 1 July 1947 was the

SECTION II													
ESTIMATED DESIRABILITY IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES - INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU WOULD DESIRE THE RATED OFFICER TO SERVE UNDER YOU IN EACH TYPE OF DUTY DESCRIBED BELOW. PLACE AN X IN THE PROPER BOX. CONSIDER EACH ITEM IN TERMS APPROPRIATE TO RATED GRADE AND BRANCH. USE THE "UNKNOWN" COLUMN ONLY IF THE NATURE OF YOUR CONTACTS WITH THE RATED OFFICER MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR YOU TO MAKE AN ESTIMATE OF HIS PROBABLE USEFULNESS IN A PARTICULAR ASSIGNMENT.													
		RATER				INDORSER							
A. COMMAND A UNIT		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
B. SERVE AS A STAFF OFFICER SPECIFY: <i>Staff Officer</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
C. WORK AS A SPECIALIST, PROFESSIONAL PERSON, OR TECHNICIAN SPECIFY: <i>Specialist</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
D. TEACH IN A CLASSROOM SITUATION		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
E. SERVE IN A CAPACITY INVOLVING MANY CONTACTS WITH CIVILIANS - e.g. CONTRACT NEGOTIATION, ROTC, NG, ORC, ETC.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
F. CARRY OUT AN ASSIGNMENT INVOLVING MOSTLY ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
G. REPRESENT YOUR VIEWPOINT IN LIAISON ACTIVITIES		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
H. MAKE DECISIONS AND TAKE ACTION IN YOUR NAME DURING YOUR ABSENCE		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
I. BE RESPONSIBLE IN AN EMERGENCY REQUIRING FORCEFUL LEADERSHIP		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
J. OTHER SPECIFY: <i>1200 Detachment Commander</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
K. COMMENT, AND/OR CLARIFY ABOVE RATINGS AS DEEMED NECESSARY; INCLUDE ANY SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS OF VALUE TO SERVICE <i>This command mobilization is supplied, equipment and personnel by this officer's command.</i>													
*For technical services, administrative services, or staff, interpret this to mean managerial responsibilities commensurate with command.													
SECTION III					SECTION IV								
A. PERFORMANCE OF DUTY - CONSIDERING ONLY OFFICERS OF HIS GRADE AND BRANCH WITH ABOUT THE SAME COMMISSIONED SERVICE, RATE THE OFFICER ON PERFORMANCE OF HIS DUTY ASSIGNMENT. READ ALL DESCRIPTIONS AND PLACE A HEAVY X IN THE BOX OPPOSITE BEST DESCRIPTION.					WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATE OF THE RATED OFFICER'S OVER-ALL VALUE TO THE SERVICE? COMPARE HIM WITH OFFICERS OF THE SAME GRADE, BRANCH AND OF ABOUT THE SAME LENGTH OF COMMISSIONED SERVICE. PLACE A HEAVY X OPPOSITE THE MOST APPROPRIATE DESCRIPTION.								
B. EXCELS ANY OTHER OFFICER I KNOW IN PERFORMANCE OF THIS DUTY					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>							
C. OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE OF THIS DUTY FOUND IN VERY FEW OFFICERS					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>							
D. VERY FINE PERFORMANCE OF DUTY OF SUCH A NATURE THAT THIS OFFICER WOULD BE HARD TO REPLACE					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
E. PERFORMS THIS DUTY IN SUCH A COMPETENT, DEPENDABLE MANNER THAT THIS OFFICER IS AN ASSET TO THE SERVICE					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. THE MOST OUTSTANDING OFFICER I KNOW						
F. USUALLY PERFORMS THIS DUTY COMPETENTLY					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. ONE OF THE FEW HIGHLY OUTSTANDING OFFICERS I KNOW						
G. BARELY ADEQUATE IN PERFORMANCE OF THIS DUTY					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>							
H. INADEQUATE IN THE PERFORMANCE OF THIS DUTY					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. A VERY FINE OFFICER WHO IS A DISTINCT ASSET TO THE SERVICE						
I. IN THE EVENT OF immediate mobilization, WHAT IS THE highest level of performance YOU WOULD EXPECT FROM THE RATED OFFICER? READ ALL DESCRIPTIONS AND PLACE A HEAVY X IN THE BOX OPPOSITE BEST DESCRIPTION.							5. A COMPETENT, DEPENDABLE OFFICER OF GREAT VALUE TO THE SERVICE						
J. WOULD GIVE AN OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE AT two grade levels HIGHER					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. A TYPICALLY EFFECTIVE OFFICER WHO IS A CREDIT TO THE ARMY						
K. WOULD GIVE A COMPETENT AND DEPENDABLE PERFORMANCE AT two grade levels HIGHER					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. AN ACCEPTABLE OFFICER WHOSE VALUE IS LIMITED IN SOME RESPECTS						
L. WOULD GIVE A FAIRLY ADEQUATE PERFORMANCE AT two grade levels HIGHER					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. AN OFFICER WHO PERFORMS ACCEPTABLY IN A LIMITED RANGE OF ASSIGNMENTS, BUT WHO COULD EASILY BE REPLACED						
M. WOULD GIVE AN OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE AT THE next higher GRADE					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. AN OFFICER WHO DOES NOT HAVE THE CALIBRE THAT ONE SHOULD REASONABLY EXPECT IN AN OFFICER						
N. WOULD GIVE A COMPETENT AND DEPENDABLE PERFORMANCE AT THE next higher GRADE					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>							
O. WOULD GIVE A FAIRLY ADEQUATE PERFORMANCE AT THE next higher GRADE					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>							
P. WOULD GIVE AN INADEQUATE PERFORMANCE AT THE next higher GRADE					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>							

Figure 19 (DA Form 67-2) Back

EFFICIENCY REPORT
 See AR 600-125 for details.

Unit Incident or Rating Officer will complete Sections I and III.
 Rating Officer will complete Sections II, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX.
 Inspiring Officer will complete Sections II, V, VII, and IX.

Section I. OFFICER REPORTED UPON
 Use typewriter or print in ink. Use carbon paper to fill out Section III at same time. See AR 600-125.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	INITIAL	SERIAL NUMBER	GRADE	ARM OR SERVICE	COMPONENT	PERIOD OF REPORT	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Capt	(name and)		FROM [REDACTED] TO [REDACTED]	
NUMBER OF CONTINENTAL TOURS	UNIT, ORGANIZATION, AND STATION		PRIMARY AOC	DUTY ASSIGNMENT (MOS CODE)		DAYS OF		
1	1203 Company, The Armor School, Ft. Belvoir, Ill.		1203	1203		DUTY LEAVE OTHER NON-DUTY		
DATE OF REPORT		FOR REPORTS RENDERED BECAUSE OF PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION, SUPPLY ADDRESS OF UNIT AND INSTALLATION WHERE OFFICER WILL REPORT					72	
10 August 1955		1203 Company, The Armor School, Ft. Belvoir, Ill.						
NAME, GRADE, AND ORGANIZATION OF UNIT OF RATING OFFICER				NAME, GRADE, AND ORGANIZATION OF UNIT OF INSPIRING OFFICER				70
Major James M. [REDACTED], 1203 Company, The Armor School, Ft. Belvoir, Ill.				Lieut Colonel [REDACTED], 1203 Company, The Armor School, Ft. Belvoir, Ill.				CA

Section II. DATA AND SUGGESTIONS FOR USE IN ASSIGNMENT
 NOTE: Information on this page will be forwarded to the Career Branch of the Personnel and Administration Division by TAG after ratings have been determined. Proper future assignment and utilization of the officer will depend upon the care with which information in this section is formulated and reported. Use typewriter or print in ink.

A. DUTIES ACTUALLY PERFORMED ON PRESENT JOB. To be supplied by Rater. Be specific. Give his duty assignment and all additional duties with enough specific detail to show scope of job in each area.

Company Commander, direct and supervised administration of a library personnel attending The Armor School.

B. DESCRIPTION OF OFFICER RATED AND COMMENTS. These paragraphs should cover physical, mental, moral qualities of rated officer, specialties of value to the Army, and any special defects or weaknesses affecting his ability to do certain assignments.

COMMENTS OF RATING OFFICER	COMMENTS OF INSPIRING OFFICER
All above, well-appearing, level-headed and very dependable officer. Although recently promoted to rank of captain, he performs the duties of company commander with outstanding ability.	Commander. This officer has improved greatly during this reporting period as a result of added responsibility. He presents a clean-cut appearance, a lively personality, good morals and an alert mind. He can be sharp and concise when confronted with opinions conflicting with his own.

C. ESTIMATED DESIRABILITY IN VARIOUS CAPACITIES. Assume you are a commander of a major unit in war. Indicate to what extent you would want the rated officer to serve under you in the next higher grade in each type of duty described below. Place an X in the proper box, using the shaded NA area if the duty is not applicable. If line h is used, specify the nature of the specialty.

	RATER					INSPIRER						
	NA	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1	2	3	4	5
a. Represent your viewpoint and make decisions in your name at a higher headquarters.												
b. Command a unit immediately subordinate to you on a combat mission.												
c. Be responsible in an emergency calling for initiative, coolness, forceful leadership.												
d. Work on an assignment requiring great attention to detail and routine.												
e. Plan all aspects of a military situation, using judgment, initiative, and coolness.												
f. Carry out an assignment in a civilian component such as ROTC, NG or ORC.												
g. Represent you where tact and ability to get along with people are needed.												
h. Work on an assignment as specialist or technician. (Specify)												
i. Carry out the duties of the type of work to which he is now assigned.												

D. IMMEDIATE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT. Be specific.

RATER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR ASSIGNMENT (MOS CODE)	INSPIRER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR ASSIGNMENT (MOS CODE)
That: Unit Commander 1203 Company	That: Unit Commander 1203 Company
RATER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER TRAINING	INSPIRER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER TRAINING
Advance Course, The Armor School, US 1203	Advance Course, The Armor School, US 1203

E. ENTRIES ARE BASED ON

INTIMATE DAILY CONTACT (RATER WILL CHECK)	FREQUENT OBSERVATION OF THE RESULTS OF HIS WORK	INFREQUENT OBSERVATION OF THE RESULTS OF HIS WORK	ACADEMIC RECORDS	OFFICIAL REPORTS

Figure 20 (WD Form 67-1) page 1

EFFICIENCY REPORT		Unit Adjutant - Personnel Officer will complete Sections I and II Rating Officer will complete Sections III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX. Indorsing Officer will complete Sections II, V, VII, and IX.	
WD AGO Form 67-1 Part 2 See AR 600-135 for details.			
Section III. OFFICER REPORTED UPON Enter same information as for Section I.			
LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	INITIAL	SERIAL NUMBER
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
GRADE	ARM OF SERVICE	COMPONENT	PERIOD OF REPORT
Capt	Infantry (Inf)	EA	FROM: 1 May 50 TO: 1 Feb 50
THEATER OR CONTINENTAL COMMAND	UNIT, ORGANIZATION, AND BRANCH	PRIMARY MOS	DUTY ASSIGNMENT MOS CODES
Second Army	2nd Co 37th Regt Armd Inf	14B	2176
DATE OF REPORT	FOR REPORTS RENDERED BECAUSE OF PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION, SUPPLY ADDRESS OF UNIT AND INSTALLATION WHERE OFFICER WILL REPORT		
20 August 1950	Assigned new principal duty, permanent duty		
READ INSTRUCTION SHEET CAREFULLY BEFORE MARKING THIS SECTION		Section IV. JOB PROFICIENCY	
A. Becomes domineering about his authority.	A. Always criticizes, never praises.	A. Fails to work for the best interest of all.	A. Fails to support fellow officers.
B. Careless & slothful in attention to duty.	B. Carries out orders by "passing the buck."	B. Has a high degree of initiative.	B. Criticizes his authority.
C. No one ever doubts his ability.	C. Knows "his job" and performs it well.	C. Moves ideas around for his mistakes.	C. Gives clear, precise directions.
D. Well-grounded in all phases of Army life.	D. Plays no favorites.	D. Slow in accomplishing his work.	D. Very capable in his duties.
A. Follows closely directions of higher echelons.	A. Convinced striving for new knowledge and ideas.	A. Criticizes orders of superiors.	A. Blames others for his mistakes.
B. Inclined to "gold brick."	B. Businesslike.	B. Others can't work with him.	B. Always demands strict discipline.
C. Criticizes unnecessarily.	C. Apparently not physically fit.	C. If he is wrong, will admit it.	C. Excels in constructive criticism.
D. Willing to accept responsibility.	D. Fails to use good judgment.	D. The men know they can rely on his judgment.	D. Hesitant about rendering decisions.
A. A go-getter who always does a good job.	A. Cannot assume responsibility.	A. Doesn't like to "pull rank."	A. Can take over in an emergency.
B. Cool under all circumstances.	B. Shows how and when to delegate authority.	B. Shows men their capabilities & limitations.	B. Fair and just in his dealings.
C. Doesn't listen to suggestions.	C. Offers suggestions.	C. Low efficiency.	C. Gets things done.
D. Drives instead of leads.	D. Too easily changes his ideas.	D. Uses a steady, monotone in his speech.	D. Questions orders from superiors.
READ INSTRUCTION SHEET CAREFULLY BEFORE MARKING THIS SECTION		Section V. JOB PROFICIENCY	
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE	1. Management and operation of military matters not included in tactics and strategy.	5. Assisting commanders of battalions or larger units in devising methods of meeting the requirements of military situations.	
	2. The direction of the overall operation of a military unit.	6. Duties involving technical skills performed by field officers.	
	3. Presenting learning materials in a classroom situation in a military or civilian component.	7. Training at service schools, Air University, Army Industrial College, etc.	
	4. Exercise of specialized knowledge, requiring lengthy technological training.		
FOR RATING OFFICER		FOR INDORSING OFFICER	
PRIMARY	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	PRIMARY	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
SECONDARY	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	SECONDARY	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE			

Figure 21 (WD Form 67-1) page 2

Section VI PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Use ELECTROGRAPHIC PENCIL, following same directions as for Section IV. Make ONE mark in each column for each set of items.

<p>A. People work for & with him because of his personality.</p> <p>B. Never rank-conscious.</p> <p>C. Thinks only of himself.</p> <p>D. Worries a great deal.</p>	<p>A. Less ability to inspire confidence of men & officers.</p> <p>B. Easygoing.</p> <p>C. Type of man everyone likes for a friend.</p> <p>D. Has a quiet, dignified bearing.</p>	<p>A. Plenty of military spirit, bearing, & earnestness.</p> <p>B. Normally cheerful.</p> <p>C. Can't take criticism.</p> <p>D. Doesn't get along with people.</p>	<p>A. Obtains respect & obedience without causing resentment.</p> <p>B. Lacks aggressiveness.</p> <p>C. Has an excellent command of language.</p> <p>D. Lacking in good conduct & moral habits.</p>
<p>A. Active in athletics.</p> <p>B. Firm but not overbearing.</p> <p>C. Egotistical.</p> <p>D. Runs people the wrong way.</p>	<p>A. Non-temper.</p> <p>B. Fails to demonstrate originality.</p> <p>C. Reserved.</p> <p>D. Impresses people favorably.</p>	<p>A. Modest & reserved.</p> <p>B. Doesn't have drive or force he should.</p> <p>C. Antisocial.</p> <p>D. Respected by all fellow officers.</p>	<p>A. Coordinated.</p> <p>B. Commands respect by his actions.</p> <p>C. Overbearing.</p> <p>D. Indifferent.</p>
<p>A. Commends a man on his good work.</p> <p>B. Loses his head, gets excited.</p> <p>C. Has admiration of officers & men alike.</p> <p>D. Poor in dress & appearance.</p>	<p>A. Boastful.</p> <p>B. Inspires pride in the organization.</p> <p>C. Lacks tact.</p> <p>D. Thoughtful of others.</p>	<p>A. A quiet, unassuming officer.</p> <p>B. Follows rather than leads.</p> <p>C. Has an attitude of superiority.</p> <p>D. Tactical.</p>	<p>A. Impatient.</p> <p>B. Modest but not retiring.</p> <p>C. Nervous.</p> <p>D. Thoroughly cooperative in his work.</p>

Section VII. PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Use ELECTROGRAPHIC PENCIL, following same directions as for Section V. MARK ALL SIX QUALIFICATIONS.

	FOR RATING OFFICER										FOR INDORSING OFFICER									
The degree to which he is able to meet situations without bias and without emotional upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The degree to which he is able and willing to work with other officers and enlisted men.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The degree to which he is able to act on his own responsibility in absence of orders.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The degree to which he is able to discriminate & evaluate facts to arrive at logical conclusions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The degree to which his appearance and behavior cause people to react favorably.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The degree to which he is able to carry out orders with consistency & firmness to achieve objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Section VIII. OVER-ALL RELATIVE RANK
FOR RATER ONLY

The number of officers in this grade rated by me at this time is _____

If these officers were arranged in order, considering overall future usefulness to the Army, from highest (No. 1) to lowest, this officer would be No. _____ of the total group rated.

Section IX. AUTHENTICATION

Use typewriter, except for signatures, of ink.

I certify that I have read the current AR 600-185 and that all ratings are made in accordance with instructions contained therein, and that to the best of my knowledge and belief all entries contained hereon are true and impartial.

<p>SIGNATURE OF RATING OFFICER</p> <p>NAME, GRADE, AND ORGANIZATION OR UNIT</p> <p>OFFICIAL STATUS OF RATED OFFICER WITH RESPECT TO RATING OFFICER</p>	<p>SIGNATURE OF INDORSING OFFICER</p> <p>NAME, GRADE, AND ORGANIZATION OR UNIT</p> <p>OFFICIAL STATUS OF RATED OFFICER WITH RESPECT TO INDORSING OFFICER</p>
--	--

Figure 22 (WD Form 67-1) page 3

only form located that provided more than 2 pages of rating space (3 pages in this case). As is normal, it provided the rater and endorser the opportunity to evaluate the rated officer. I find the potential ratings in Section II, part C very interesting and entertaining. The ratings were based upon the following criteria in a wartime situation: 1) Not want him, 2) Take a chance on him, 3) Happy to have him, 4) Prefer him to most and 5) Fight to get him. In Section V, Job Proficiency, the rater was to select the most and least likely job traits from a grid of 12 traits each providing 4 choices. I am unable to determine the function or use of Section V: it provided 7 levels of goodness, yet the available blocks for this rating go to 10. In Section VI the rater again was provided 12 blocks of 4 choices this time relating to the rated individual's personal qualifications. In Section VII, the rater and endorser were to rate the individual's personal qualifications on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 presumably the best or highest score possible. All ratings on this form were to be annotated on a grid scale with the use of an electrostatic pencil. Why or what an electrostatic pencil is I do not know. Without the ability to compile the ratings and evaluate them with the use of a computer I don't understand why a special device was required to mark the blocks. Again this rating system provided for simple inflation of an officer's rating or for the placement of derogatory comments if so desired by the rater or endorser.

WD Form 67:

The WD Form 67(Figure 22 and 23) was the first coordinated

EFFICIENCY REPORT

USE TYPEWRITER IF POSSIBLE IF NOT, PLEASE PRINT		PREPARE THIS REPORT WITH PAINSTAKING ACCURACY. ITS VALUE LIES IN THE DEGREE OF OBJECTIVITY, IMPARTIALITY, AND SOUND, CONSIDERED JUDGMENT DISPLAYED BY THE RATING OFFICER. READ INSTRUCTIONS.				SEE AR 600-185
A. PLACE OF ORIGIN OF REPORT						
THEATER OR COMMAND <u>UNITED STATES FORCES IN EUROPEAN THEATER</u>		ORGANIZATION AND UNIT <u>IXTH CORPS COMMAND AUSTRIA</u>			DATE OF REPORT <u>31 Dec 1946</u>	
B. OFFICER REPORTED UPON						
LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE INITIAL <u>[REDACTED] JR.</u>		SERIAL NUMBER <u>[REDACTED]</u>	GRADE <u>1st Lt</u>	ARM OR SERVICE <u>INF</u>	COM- PONENT [REDACTED]	
DATE OF BIRTH <u>18 Oct 1921</u>	SERVICE Limited <input type="checkbox"/> General <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OFFICIAL STATUS OF OFFICER WITH RESPECT TO YOU <u>Asst Staff Officer in G-3 Section, of which I am chief, for IXth Corps Command</u>		PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT <u>[REDACTED]</u>	FROM <u>1 Jul 1946</u>	TO <u>31 Dec 1946</u>
C. STATIONS AT WHICH OFFICER SERVED AND DUTY ASSIGNMENTS						
STATIONS		DUTY ASSIGNMENTS		PLACE "X" IN BOX OR BOXES TO CLASSIFY DUTY		
				STAFF		COMMAND
				COMBAT	NOT COMBAT	COMBAT
						NOT COMBAT
						TRAIN- ING
						ADMIN. & EXEC.
<u>1st Lt 4th Constab</u>		<u>1st Lt Condr (37 66-1 6.1)</u>				
<u>2nd Regt 210</u>						
<u>3rd 16 Inf Regt ETO</u>		<u>US 4/20a, G-3 Section 6.6</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
D. WRITE A BRIEF GENERAL ESTIMATE OF THIS OFFICER. REFER TO POINTS OF WEAKNESS AS WELL AS STRENGTH. UNFAVORABLE ENTRIES OF OPINION IN THIS ESTIMATE NEED NOT BE REFERRED TO THE OFFICER BEING RATED.						
An eager, stable officer whose attitude of cooperation overcomes his lack of experience. This officer, it is believed, will develop force and initiative when experience has increased his self-confidence.						
E. ALL ENTRIES ARE FORMULATED ON THE FOLLOWING		F. INDICATE YOUR ATTITUDE WOULD YOU		G. WHAT DEGREE OF SUCCESS HAS HE ATTAINED UNDER THE FOLLOWING? PLACE AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACE TO DENOTE RATING. ENTER THE PROPER NUMERICAL VALUE IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN UNDER "TOTAL VALUE". NO VALUE SHOULD BE ENTERED FOR A RATING OF UNKNOWN. SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE SIDE.		
BASED ON		ATTITUDE		RAT. VAL.		
				Unsat.	Exc.	V. S.
				EXC.	SUP.	Un-
						known
				—Total		+Total
INTIMATE DAILY CONTACT		PARTICULARLY DESIRE HIM?		1. Physical Activity and Endurance		
FREQUENT OBSERVATION OF THE RESULTS OF HIS WORK		BE PLEASED TO HAVE HIM?		2. Stability Under Pressure		
INFREQUENT OBSERVATION OF THE RESULTS OF HIS WORK		BE SATISFIED TO HAVE HIM?		3. Attention to Duty		
ACADEMIC RECORDS		PREFER NOT TO HAVE HIM?		4. Cooperation		
OFFICIAL REPORTS		DEFINITELY NOT WANT HIM?		5. Initiative		
				6. Intelligence		
				7. Force		
				8. Judgment and Common Sense		
				9. Leadership		
				10. Ability to Obtain Results		
H. Since last report has he been mentioned in official communications?		I. During the period covered by this report was he the subject of any disciplinary measure that should be included on his record? If so, enclose separate statement of nature and attendant circumstances.		J. In case unfavorable entries have been made, other than in D and F, were the deficiencies brought to the officer's attention while under your command and prior to preparation of this report?		Totals
Favorably Yes or No		Yes or No		Yes or No		Net Value
Unfavorably Yes or No		1.0		-1.0		5.1
L. OUTSTANDING SPECIALTIES OF VALUE IN MILITARY SERVICE. MAKE NO ENTRIES EXCEPT WHERE STATEMENT IS BASED ON PERSONAL OBSERVATION OR OFFICIAL REPORTS. SHOW PILOT AND/OR OBSERVER RATINGS OF AIR CORPS OFFICERS.				M. Enter numerical rating using the following basis: Numerical rating equals the net value (K) divided by total number of entries for which a numerical rating was given.		Numerical Rating
None						5.5
				N. Enter adjectival rating based on numerical rating (M). Use following code: Below 0 (-4) —Unsatisfactory		Adjectival Rating
				0.0 to 1.99 —Satisfactory		Satisfactory
				2.0 to 2.49 —Very satisfactory		
				3.5 to 4.49 —Excellent		
				5.5 to 7.0 —Superior		
C. I CERTIFY THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ENTRIES MADE HEREON ARE TRUE AND IMPARTIAL AND ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AR 600-185.						
INCLOSURES		SIGNATURE		TYPE NAME, GRADE AND ORGANIZATION		COMMANDING WHAT
		<u>[REDACTED]</u>		<u>[REDACTED] JR.</u>		<u>1st Section 401</u>
WD AGO FORM 67 (This form supersedes WD AGO Form 67, 27 September 1944, which will be used until existing stocks are exhausted.)		1 FEB 1945		10-16794-4		10-16794-4

Figure 23 (WD Form 67) Front

...REASONED EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE NEEDS...

1ST. IND.

HEADQUARTERS, 10TH CORP AND DIVISION, AF 501, T. S. 4113, 26 January 1947

To: The Adjutant General, Washington 25, D. C.

I do not know the officer reported upon but I have confidence in the judgement, spirit of fairness and impartiality of the reporting officer.

[Redacted Signature]
Major General, U. S. Army
Commanding

INSTRUCTIONS
(SEE AR 600-102)

1. Efficiency ratings consist of an evaluation of an officer in comparison with others of the same grade. In a large group of officers, such as are normally assigned to an infantry division, the law of averages will establish that about twenty percent of the officers of each grade may be superior, about twenty percent may be in the two lower distributions of very satisfactory and satisfactory (Unsatisfactory officers should be identified promptly and reclassified), the remaining sixty percent who constitute the mass of thoroughly capable officers would fall into the excellent category. Commanders of regiments and large units must analyze the reports prepared within their organization and whenever the distribution varies markedly from the above the reasons must be sought. It is highly important that officers who are genuinely superior be distinguished by their ratings so that their talents may be fully utilized. It is also important to identify those officers whose qualifications and standards of performance of duty are above the minimum required, but who are clearly below the standards established by the mass of officers of their grade. A series of reports of an individual officer should present a highly accurate evaluation of his worth.

2. Prior to filling in Section G of this report consider carefully the following definitions and the numerical values assigned to each. Keep them in mind when rating, taking into consideration the length of service of officer you are rating and the opportunities afforded him, which might have a bearing upon his performance of duty, personal characteristics, or professional qualifications.

- Unsatisfactory:** Performance of the particular duty reported upon or personal characteristics or professional qualifications below minimum standard—inefficient.
- Satisfactory:** Performance of the particular duty reported upon or personal characteristics or professional qualifications up to minimum standard—decently efficient.
- Very Satisfactory:** Performance of the particular duty reported upon in an efficient manner. Personal characteristics, professional qualifications, or efficiency above that acceptable as satisfactory.
- Excellent:** Performance of the particular duty reported upon in a very efficient manner. Personal characteristics, professional qualifications, or efficiency above very satisfactory but below superior.
- Superior:** Outstanding and exceptional performance of the particular duty reported upon. Personal characteristics, professional qualifications, or efficiency above that considered excellent.
- Unknown:** To be used in all cases in which the reporting officer has had insufficient opportunity during the period covered by this report to observe the officer reported upon to permit a rating as to the performance of the particular duty. (See Standard of Professional Qualifications)

100

Figure 24 (WD Form 67) Back

documentation of an individual's performance appraisal. It was a simple form, one page in length. All that was required was for the rater to provide his evaluation of the rated officer and then for a reviewing officer to provide additional comments if so desired. The system allowed for easy inflation of the rating system. I doubt the ratings were impartial; if there was a personality conflict between the rater and rated officer the individual being rated was soon processed out of the service. Obviously it was determined that this form was too simple; within two years the form was revised to the three page DA Form 67-1.

1813 Army Efficiency Report: Figure 24

Throughout the history of the Army, efficiency reports have been a required method of evaluating assigned personnel. In this example from 1813 the rating officer provided frank and candid comments about the officers assigned to his unit. It is not possible to determine if the ratings themselves had any effect on the career paths of the rated officers. It is most likely that the "reviewer" to whom the letter was written did not pay attention to the comments on the officers of lower rank with whom he may never have had any contact. I suspect that the evaluation reports were filed like all documents, most never to be seen a second time, if they were even read in the first place. It is also certain that the officers who were rated were not afforded the privilege of viewing the report prior to its submission. In the event the report had been made available for review I doubt the rating officer would have survived long enough to have sent the review, much

less the next rating period.

The Future Figures 25 through 31

Within the next year the Army plans to institute a new evaluation report, the DA Form 67-9. What has been created by the current form is a conflict among the military members themselves. The primary factor creating this conflict is the use of the forced distribution ranking on a modified bell curve (Daniels, 86). The established performance rating distribution of the Army is as follows:

1% 2% 4% 13% 60% 13% 4% 2% 1%

The competition created as a result of this system is guaranteed to be unhealthy. As one Officer strives to be rated in the top 7%, another officer must be moved down in rating. As stated in the Army Officer Guide, page 222, "The officer who aspires to ultimate selection for the higher schools and colleges and the more important assignments must deserve and receive a commendable series of evaluation reports". What we have effectively created is a formal atmosphere of corporate mistrust, dislike and backstabbing.

It is time for a new form. Senior raters have managed to inflate the rating system, effectively causing all officers to appear as top-rated individuals. In this environment any officer receiving a rating in the 4th or 13th percentile, although performing well above the statistical median is considered an undesirable officer and will most likely be passed over for promotion or selection to service schools.

The new evaluation report system will be comprised of the DA Form 67-9-1 (Officer Evaluation Report Support Form), DA Form 67-9-1c (Junior Officer Developmental Support Form), DA Form 67-9 (Officer Evaluation Report), and DA Form 67-9-2 (Senior Rater Profile Report).

The primary changes to the form will be:

- Support Form Reinvigoration: Requirements are built into the system that are designed to enhance leadership communication from the top down. Senior raters will be required to ensure that all rated officers receive a copy of the rater's and senior rater's support form shortly after assuming duties and prior to creation of the rated officer support form.

- Company Grade Officer Leader Development: Mechanisms have been put in place to assist in the Army's commitment to ensure a rapid, equal, and fair transition of junior officers into the Army culture, and to provide a common framework to base their development upon.

* Junior Officer Developmental Support Form: A mandatory support form worksheet for Lieutenants and Warrant Officers on which developmental training tasks in leadership along with mandatory quarterly counseling summaries are recorded.

* Regular Follow-Up Performance Counseling: Institutes a policy for regular face-to-face counseling, and provides a method to track that counseling.

* Masking of Second Lieutenant Reports: When an officer is

OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT SUPPORT FORM			
For Use of the form, see AR 623-105. The processing agency is ODCSPER.			
Read Officer's Act Statement on Reverse before Completing this Form.			
PART I - RATED OFFICER IDENTIFICATION			
NAME OF RATED OFFICER (Last, First, MI) DOE, JOHN A.		RANK ILT	ORGANIZATION B COMPANY, 1-41 INFANTRY BATTALION
PART II - RATING CHAIN - YOUR RATING CHAIN FOR THE EVALUATION PERIOD IS:			
RATER	NAME Smith, Robert A.	RANK CPT	POSITION Company Commander
INTERMEDIATE RATER	NAME	RANK	POSITION
SENIOR RATER	NAME Jones, William D.	RANK LTC	POSITION Battalion Commander
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:			
	Date: _____	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 ACC / BR _____	
a. STATE YOUR SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES			
SEE PARAGRAPH 3-6			
b. INDICATE YOUR MAJOR PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES			
SEE PARAGRAPH 3-6			

DA FORM 67-9-1, OCT 97

REPLACES DA FORM 67-9-1, FEB 85, WHICH IS OBSOLETE, 1 OCT 97

Figure 3-1. Sample DA Form 67-9-1 (Front Side)

Figure 26 (DA Form 67-9-1) Front

<p>F. LIST YOUR SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SEE PARAGRAPH 3-6</p> <p style="text-align: right;">SIGNATURE AND DATE</p>	
<p>PART V - RATER AND/OR INTERMEDIATE RATER <i>(Person and comments in Part IV, 2, and 3 above.)</i> <i>(Rater remarks are consistent with rated performance and objective evaluation in DA Form 67-9)</i></p>	
<p>4. RATER COMMENTS (Colonel)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SEE PARAGRAPH 3-7</p> <p style="text-align: right;">SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)</p>	
<p>5. INTERMEDIATE RATER COMMENTS (Colonel)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SEE PARAGRAPH 3-8</p> <p style="text-align: right;">SIGNATURE AND DATE (Mandatory)</p>	
<p>DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT (U.S.C. 552a)</p>	
<p>1. AUTHORITY: Sec 301 Title 5 USC; Sec 3012 Title 10</p> <p>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 67-3-1a, Junior Officer Developmental Support Form, serves as a common framework for Junior Officer Development and standardizes Junior Officer counseling.</p> <p>3. ROUTINE USE: DA Form 67-9 will be maintained in the rated officer's Official Military Personnel File (CMPF) 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 67-3-1a are for organizational use only and will be returned to the rated officer after review by the rating chain.</p> <p>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 67-3-1 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.</p>	

DA FORM 67-9-1, OCT 97 (Reverse)

Figure 3-2. Sample DA Form 67-9-1 (Reverse Side)

Figure 27 (DA Form 67-9-1) Back

JUNIOR OFFICER DEVELOPMENTAL SUPPORT FORM			
For use of this Form, see AR 623-105; the proponent agency is QDCSPER			
NAME OF RATED OFFICER (Last, First, MI) DOE, JOHN A.		SSN 111-11-1111	ORACI ORGANIZATION 1LT B, 1-41 Inf Bn
PART I - INSTRUCTIONS. Use of this form is mandatory for Lieutenants and WO1s; optional for all other ranks.			
Initial face-to-face (Part II and III) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss duty description/major performance objectives from DA Form 67-9-1. Discuss Army leader values, attributes and skills as related to future duty performance and professional development (Part II; Leader Character) Complete Developmental Action Plan (Part III; Record at least one developmental task for each leadership action that targets major performance objectives listed on DA Form 67-9-1. Upon completion of the initial face-to-face counseling, date and initial Part IV (verification). Obtain senior rater's initials. Rated officer and rater retain file copy for use during later follow-up counselings. 		Quarterly Follow-up Counselings (Part V; Reverse) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss major performance objectives and progress made. Adjust as needed. Discuss progress made on developmental tasks; update/modify task as needed to continue developmental process. Rater summarizes key points in appropriate block of Part V. Rater and rated officer initial, date, and keep a file copy for use during later counselings. NOTE: Reference for Army Leadership Doctrine is FM 22-100.	
PART II CHARACTER. Description of the rated officer's combination of values, attributes and skills affecting leader actions. (See FM 22-100)			
ARMY VALUES			
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 deed		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			
ATTRIBUTES Fundamental qualities and characteristics	MENTAL Possesses discern, will, initiative, and discipline	PHYSICAL Maintains appropriate level of physical fitness and military bearing	EMOTIONAL Displays self-control, calm under pressure
SKILLS (Competence) Skill development is a part of self-development; prerequisite to action	CONCEPTUAL Demonstrates sound judgment, critical / creative thinking, moral reasoning	INTERPERSONAL Shows skill with people; teaching, coaching, counseling, mentoring and employing	TECHNICAL Possesses the necessary expertise to accomplish all tasks and functions
TACTICAL. Demonstrates proficiency in required professional knowledge, judgment, and prioritizing			
PART III - DEVELOPMENTAL ACTION PLAN. Developmental tasks that target major performance objectives on the DA Form 67-9-1. (See FM 22-100)			
INFLUENCING: Communicating, Decision Making, Motivating			
COMMUNICATING. Articulates written and oral ideas/concepts clearly and concisely. Message received equals message sent. Displays effective listening skills.			
SEE PARAGRAPHS 3-11 and 3-12			
DECISION MAKING. Reaches sound, logical decisions based on analysis/synthesis of information, and uses sound judgment to allocate resources and select appropriate courses of action.			
MOTIVATING. Inspires, motivates, and guides others towards mission accomplishment. Sets the example by being in excellent physical / mental condition and consistently displaying proper military bearing.			
OPERATING: Planning, Executing, Assessing			
PLANNING. Uses critical and creative thinking to develop executable plans that are suitable, acceptable, and feasible.			
EXECUTING. Shows tactical and technical proficiency; meets mission standards; takes care of people/resources. Maximizes the use of available systems and technology. Performs well under physical and mental stress.			

DA FORM 67-9-1a, OCT 97

Figure 3-3. Sample DA Form 67-9-1a (Front Side)

Figure 28 (DA Form 67-9-1a) Front
AR 623-105 • 1 October 1997

ASSESSING: Uses after-action and evaluation tools to facilitate consistent improvement.			
IMPROVING: Developing, Building, Learning			
DEVELOPING: Teaches, trains, coaches and counsels subordinates increasing their knowledge, skills and confidence.			
SEE PARAGRAPHS 3-11 and 3-12			
BUILDING: Develops effective, disciplined, cohesive team built on bonds of mutual trust, respect, and confidence. Fosters ethical climate.			
LEARNING: Actively seeks self-improvement (individual study, professional reading, etc.), and fosters a learning environment in the unit (IPRs, AARs, NCOPL, etc.).			
PART IV - VERIFICATION		Rater initials _____	Rated officer initials _____
PART V - DEVELOPMENTAL ASSESSMENT RECORD: Summary of key points made during follow-up counseling. Highlight progress and strengths observed as well as developmental needs across values, attributes, skills and actions.		Date _____	Senior rater initials _____
SEE PARAGRAPH 3-12			
Rated officer initials _____		Rater initials _____	Date _____
1st Assessment Key Points			
Rated officer initials _____		Rater initials _____	Date _____
2nd Assessment Key Points			
Rated officer initials _____		Rater initials _____	Date _____
3rd Assessment Key Points			
Rated officer initials _____		Rater initials _____	Date _____

DA FORM 67-9-1a, OCT 97 (Reverse)

Figure 3-4. Sample DA Form 67-9-1a (Reverse Side)

Figure 29 (DA Form 67-9-1a) Back

AR 623-105 • 1 October 1997

OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT										SEE PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT CYDA FORM 67-9-1	
PART I - ADMINISTRATIVE DATA											
1. NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) BUCK, GEORGE G.			2. SSN 999-99-9999		3. GRADE CPT		4. DATE OF BIRTH 1992 05 01		5. BRANCH IN		6. REPORTING UNIT 11A
7. UNIT ORG. STATION ZIP CODE OR APO MAJOR COMMAND A Company, 1st Bn, 41st Infantry, 3d Armor Division, APO AE 09002										8. REASON FOR SUBMISSION 05 Annual	
9. PERIOD COVERED			10. RATED MONTHS		11. RATED CODES		12. NO. OF ENCL.		13. RATED OFFICER CERT. (Check one and enter date)		14. PER. BATTAL
1997 10 01, 1998 09 30			11		Q		X 1. Given to Officer		4 Oct 1998		E9 EU29
PART II - AUTHENTICATION (Rated officer's signature verified officer has been completed DER Parts I-VII and the admin data is correct)											
15. NAME OF RATER (Last, First, MI) SCOTT, THOMAS D.			16. SSN 123-45-6789		17. GRADE LTC		18. POSITION BN COMMANDER		19. SIGNATURE		20. DATE 05 OCT 1998
21. NAME OF INTERMEDIATE RATER (Last, First, MI) JONES, WILLIAM A.			22. SSN 345-67-8901		23. GRADE COL		24. POSITION BDE COMMANDER		25. SIGNATURE		26. DATE 06 OCT 1998
27. SENIOR RATER'S ORGANIZATION 1st Brigade, 4th Division APO AE 09002 APO AE 09002					28. BRANCH IN		29. SENIOR RATER TELEPHONE NUMBER DSN 330-6705		30. E-MAIL ADDRESS 1bdecdrg@4id.army.mil		
31. THIS IS A SERVICE REPORT (YES OR NO) (Check one)					32. THIS IS A PROMOTION REPORT (YES OR NO) (Check one)		33. SIGNATURE OF RATED OFFICER		34. DATE 07 OCT 1998		
PART III - DUTY DESCRIPTION											
35. PRINCIPAL DUTY TITLE Company Commander						36. POSITION ACROSS 11A00					
37. SIGNIFICANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES REFER TO PART IV (DA FORM 67-9-1)											
SEE PARAGRAPH 3-18											
PART IV - PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - PROFESSIONALISM (Rated)											
CHARACTER Description of the rated officer's combination of values, attitudes, and skills affecting leader actions											
38. ARMY VALUES (Comments mandatory for all "NO" entries. Use PART Vb.)											
1. HONOR: Adherence to the Army's publicly declared code of values			2. INTEGRITY: Possesses high personal moral standards; honest in word and deed			3. COURAGE: Maintains physical and moral bravery			4. LOYALTY: Bears true faith and allegiance to the U.S., Constitution, the Army, the unit, and the soldier		
5. RESPECT: Promotes dignity, consideration, fairness, & TD			6. SELFLESS-SERVICE: Places Army priorities above self			7. DUTY: Fulfills professional, legal, and moral obligations					
X			X			X			X		
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 Part Vb for all "No" entries.											
b.1. ATTRIBUTES (Select 1)											
1. MENTAL: Possesses desire, will, initiative, and discipline			2. PHYSICAL: Maintains appropriate level of physical fitness and military bearing			3. EMOTIONAL: Displays self-control; calm under pressure					
X NO			X NO			X NO					
b.2. SKILLS (Competence) (Select 2)											
1. CONCEPTUAL: Demonstrates sound judgment, creative/innovative thinking, moral reasoning			2. INTERPERSONAL: Shows skill with people; coaching, teaching, encouraging, motivating and empowering			3. TECHNICAL: Possesses the necessary expertise to accomplish all tasks and functions					
X NO			X NO			X NO					
b.3. ACTIONS (LEADERSHIP) (Select 3) Major activities leaders perform: influencing, operating, and improving											
1. INFLUENCING: Method of reaching goals while operating/improving			2. COMMUNICATING: Displays good oral, written, and listening skills for individuals & groups			3. DECISION-MAKING: Employs sound judgment, logical reasoning and uses resources wisely			4. MOTIVATING: Inspires, motivates, and guides others toward mission accomplishment		
X			X NO			X NO			X NO		
5. OPERATING: Short term mission accomplishment			6. PLANNING: Develops detailed, executable plans that are feasible, acceptable, and timely			7. EXECUTING: Shows tactical proficiency, meets mission standards, and takes care of people/resources			8. ASSESSING: Uses after-action and evaluation tools to facilitate continuous improvement		
X			X NO			X NO			X NO		
9. IMPROVING: Long term improvement in the Army; its morale and organizations			10. DEVELOPING: Invests adequate time and effort to develop individual subordinates as leaders			11. BUILDING: Spends time and resources improving teams, groups and units; fosters ethical climate			12. LEARNING: Seeks self-improvement and organizational growth; encourages, accepts and leading change		
X			X NO			X NO			X NO		
c. APPT. PASS DATE: APR 1997 HEIGHT: 69 WEIGHT: 175 YES											
4. JUNIOR OFFICER DEVELOPMENT - MANDATORY YES OR NO ENTRY FOR RATERS OF LT4 AND WO14											
WHERE DEVELOPMENTAL TASKS RECORDED ON DA FORM 67-9-1a AND QUARTERLY FOLLOW-UP COUNSELINGS CONDUCTED? X NO NA											
DA FORM 67-9, OCT 97 REPLACES DA FORM 67-9, 1 SEP 79, WHICH IS OBSOLETE, 1 OCT 97											

Figure 3-5. Sample DA Form 67-9) (Front Side)

Figure 30 (DA Form 67-9) Front
AR 623-105 • 1 October 1997

NAME: BLICK, GEORGE G		SSN: 500.00.0000	PERIOD COVERED: 10071011 - 10081010
PART V. PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL EVALUATION (Rating)			
1. EVALUATE THE RATED OFFICER'S PERFORMANCE DURING THE RATING PERIOD AND HIS/HER POTENTIAL FOR PROMOTION.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE. MUST PROMOTE	<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE. PROMOTE	<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE. DO NOT PROMOTE	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Explain)
2. COMMENT ON SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR PROMOTION. REFER TO PART II, DA FORM 67-9 AND PART IV, 9, AND DA FORM 67-9.			
SEE PARAGRAPH 3-20			
3. IDENTIFY ANY UNIQUE PROFESSIONAL SKILLS OR AREAS OF EXPERTISE OF VALUE TO THE ARMY THAT THIS OFFICER POSSESSES FOR ARMY COMPETITIVE CATEGORY CRT THROUGH LTC. ALSO INDICATE A POTENTIAL CAREER FIELD FOR FUTURE SERVICE.			
SEE PARAGRAPH 3-20			
PART VI. INTERMEDIATE RATER			
SEE PARAGRAPH 3-21			
PART VII. SENIOR RATER			
4. EVALUATE THE RATED OFFICER'S PROMOTION POTENTIAL TO THE NEXT HIGHER GRADE.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BEST QUALIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/> FULLY QUALIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/> DO NOT PROMOTE	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Explain)
5. POTENTIAL COMPARED WITH OFFICERS SENIOR (DATED IN SAME GRADE) (OVERPRINTED BY DA):		6. COMMENT ON PERFORMANCE POTENTIAL.	
<input type="checkbox"/> ABOVE CENTER OF MASS (Less than 50% of 100 over. Capable of More than 50% of more in 100 over)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CENTER OF MASS	<input type="checkbox"/> BELOW CENTER OF MASS RETAIN	<input type="checkbox"/> BELOW CENTER OF MASS DO NOT RETAIN
		7. LIST 3 FUTURE ASSIGNMENTS FOR WHICH THIS OFFICER IS BEST SUITED FOR ARMY COMPETITIVE CATEGORY CRT THROUGH LTC. ALSO INDICATE A POTENTIAL CAREER FIELD FOR FUTURE SERVICE.	
		SEE PARAGRAPH 3-22	

DA FORM 67-9, OCT 97 (Reverse)

Figure 3-6. Sample DA Form 67-9 (Reverse Side)

Figure 31 (DA Form 67-9) Back

SENIOR RATER PROFILE REPORT OFFICER EVALUATION REPORTING SYSTEM FOR USE OF THIS FORM, SEE AR 623-105. PROMOTING AGENCY IS ODCSPER								
A. NAME			B. SSN		C. RANK		D. DATE OF REPORT	
CURRENT OER PROFILE						PROFILE HISTORY		
	ACOM COM	COM	BCOM RETAIN	BCOM DO NOT RETAIN	Total Ratings	Total Ratings	1st Block COM	% Total 1st Block
COL								
LTC								
MAJ								
CPT	1	2	0	0	3	6	1	50
1LT								
2LT								
CW5								
CW4								
CW3								
CW2								
WO1								

DA FORM 67-9-2 1 OCT 97

Figure 3-3. Sample DA Form 67-9-2 (Front Side)

Figure 32 (DA Form 67-9-2)

AR 623-105 • 1 October 1997

being considered for promotion to Captain and above, his efficiency reports as a Second Lieutenant will not be available to the selection board. This is due to the fact that Second Lieutenants are considered to be in a training phase and their evaluation reports should have no further bearing upon their careers past First Lieutenant.

- Rater Evaluation Upgrade: Initiating the use of rating criteria that will enhance the officer corps' familiarity with doctrinal Army values along with being considered for promotion to Captain and above, his efficiency reports as a Second Lieutenant will not be available to the selection board. This is due to the fact that Second Lieutenants are considered to be in a training phase and their evaluation reports should have no further bearing upon their careers past First Lieutenant.

- Rater Evaluation Upgrade: Initiating the use of a rating criteria that will enhance the officer corps' familiarity with doctrinal Army values along with select leadership skills, emphasizing and reinforcing the most desirable behaviors of the officer corps.

- Senior Rater Evaluation: Two box checks and a narrative focused on the rated officer's potential. The first box is an evaluation of the rated officer's promotion potential compared to all officers of the same grade. The second box is an evaluation of the rated officer's potential in comparison to a much narrower group consisting of officers of the same grade which the senior rater has senior rated or are currently in the senior rater's population. Also created has been a

senior rater profile in which less than 50% of rated officers will be able to receive an "Above Center of Mass" rating.

- Rated Officer's Signature: The rated officer is now required to sign the OER after it has been completed by the rater, intermediate rater (if any) and senior rater. This is a significant change from past procedures, where the rated officer had to sign the form prior to the OER being completed, his signature only verifies correctness of name and social security number.

Without having been subjected to an evaluation under this system I am unable to provide any coherent personal evaluation of this form. The only drawback that I can see to the new system is that we are reverting back to the DA Form 67-1 that provided the rater the opportunity to select the attributes most often displayed by the rated individual. This is accomplished with a "Yes" or "No" format. Of 15 attributes in 5 categories the rater is required to select yes or no to indicate which 1 attribute of 3 is most prominently displayed. It is considerably unjust to identify the rated officer with only one prominent attribute when all 3 may be strongly exhibited. I have doubts that the individual who designed the current form has ever reviewed historical documents of performance evaluations.

Statement of Purpose

The military performance appraisal is tolerated as a necessary evil at best. The information is required for important management decisions. Creating a new performance evaluation report is a difficult job for any organization. Through detailed research of various evaluation techniques I will present a composite

evaluation reporting method that will be suitable for use by the Army. This new evaluation report will provide the necessary information required for personnel managers while removing the potential for inflated rating as much as possible.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following discussion is a review of the literature used during the research:

Buzzotta, V.R. and Lefton, Robert E., "Improve Your Performance Appraisal": A highly useful book that provided much insight into the numerous aspects surrounding the Performance Appraisal. It diagnosed the problems to include correcting poorly constructed processes, wrong attitudes, and inadequate skills. From there it assisted in determining what could be done to correct the deficiencies, such as; training managers to appraise. It emphasized the need for managers and employees to engage in a give and take relationship supported by mutual trust and respect.

Crocker, Lawrence P., "The Army Officers Guide": This book tells all the ins and outs of having a successful career in the Army. There is valuable information here for everyone. A useful reference for research information about military customs and courtesies, as well as historical perspectives.

Creech, Bill, "The Five Pillars of TQM": Written by an educator of the Total Quality Management (TQM) philosophy. This book analyzes TQM's fundamental principles and their implementation, explaining how anyone can introduce the Five Pillars of TQM into an organization. The Five

Pillars of TQM is an excellent book on how to structure and manage an organization for success.

Hersey, Paul., Blanchard, Kenneth H., Johnson, Dewey, "Management of Organizational Behavior": This book provides an examination of the applied behavioral sciences, and focuses on fundamental ideas which have been successfully implemented in academic, business, not-for-profit and administrative environments.

Koontz, Harold., O'Donnell, Cyril., Weinrich, Heinz., "Essential of Management": This was an introduction to management text based on current business situations. This book included social responsibilities, and ethics, planning premises, electronic media and an updated section on international management. It was not found to be a significantly useful text, however it did provide useful insight.

Rothwell, William., Sullivan, Roland., and Mclean, Gary., "Practicing Organizational Development": A simple book written by instructors of Organizational Development for students as well as for those already employed in the field. Organized around personal competencies essential in the organizational development field, this book is a useful and valuable resource for all who wish to facilitate change.

Rummler, Geary., Brache, Alan., "How to Manage the White Space on the Organizational Chart": This is an excellent book that approaches process management from the top of the organization to the individual performer in a

manner that is meaningful to every employee of that organization. It greatly expanded my view of process in effectively managing core business practices. It was by far the best and most practical guide to the real work of identifying, analyzing, validating and improving process in the business organization. Beginning with the necessary holistic view of the organization, the book sets forth a rational, clear, and yet simple view of the organizational skeleton, process levels, and interdependencies. The authors provide a practical tool to actually doing the work and achieving the benefits of process improvement.

Swan, William S., "How to do a Superior Performance Appraisal": This sourcebook provides coverage of all aspects of performance management; communication, coaching, measuring, rating, reviewing, and developing. This is a useful resource for those who are designing, managing and evaluating performance management systems within an organization. It links performance management to strategy and discusses it as an organizational culture change method.

DA Pamphlet 623-105, "The Officer Evaluation Reporting System in Brief": A short and confusing narrative of the the correct flow and management of the Officer Evaluation Reporting System. Highly technical and often unreadable due to numerous references and sub-reference. A useful tool for the decryption of the theory behind the Officer Evaluation Report. Recommended only for those who have time on their hands.

Army Regulation 623-105, "Officer Evaluation Reporting System": Very

similar to the DA Pamphlet 623-105, just much longer and equally convoluted. It proved a valuable tool in deciphering the legal and administrative requirements behind the Officer Evaluation Report. Although it is narrow in focus, the sheer number of references proved confusing. Recommended for those researchers who enjoy puzzles.

Some of the most important information uncovered during my research is:

1. Performance evaluations have two major functions in an organization.

First, it is a process that is used for employee development. The comments employees receive from the appraisal assists the employee in recognizing how their performance level compares to the expectations of management, and provides recommendations for training or remedial action. Second a, performance appraisal provides consistent criteria and evaluation for management to use for administrative decisions such as promotion or salary evaluation.

2. Performance Evaluations can provide work planning, objective feedback, identification of problems and setting of compensation.

Work Planning: It is commonly believed that evaluations are simply a supervisor's review of the employee's performance and mistakes. Actually, the supervisor and the employee not only review the past year's performance and achievements while identifying areas requiring improvement, but also look toward the future and set performance objectives and targets for the coming evaluation period. This creates for the employee an individual list of accomplishments and gives the supervisor and the employee something

constructive to talk about during the face-to-face part of the evaluation. Setting those goals and objectives together allows for everyone to understand the goals of the organization and how the employee's actions and outcomes fit.

Objective Feedback: The performance evaluation is a constructive way to provide both negative and positive feedback in an objective manner. The inherent structure intended by performance evaluations serves to guide the rater in separating personal biases from valid and objective observations. If the evaluation is successful in providing objective feedback it then serves to lessen the sting of receiving negative feedback. Also, it is often the case that at least some of the performance criteria were created jointly by the supervisor and employee. The employee's involvement in setting criteria further enhances the employee's perception of fairness and objectivity by the rater.

Identify Problems: Performance evaluations are intended to evaluate the performance of individuals, work groups, teams and organizations as a whole. A well structured performance evaluation will not only spot substandard or off-target performance and pinpoint where it is occurring, it also helps to track the reasons, which can be difficult to uncover. The performance evaluation allows the supervisor and the employee to correct the problem(s) in an objective and cooperative manner.

Setting Compensation: Linking the compensation of employees to performance evaluations helps to solve the problem of how to structure the compensation packages, annual raises, and other incentives fairly and reasonably.

When work plans and performance targets are being set for the upcoming rating period, salary increase percentages and nonsalary incentives can be attached to those targets up front. When it comes time to complete the evaluation report, and compute each individual's reward for contributing to the organization's success that year, it is clear who deserves what size reward. When the compensation formula is objective, no one gets labeled as a pushover or a scrooge.

There are four predominant schools of thought when it comes to the distinct methods of Performance Evaluations. There is a) Forced Distribution (the military way), b) 360 degree evaluations, c) Performance Based evaluations and d) Personal Trait and/or Work Characteristic evaluations (Landy 144)

The forced distribution model used by the Army was discussed in detail in Chapter 1. It is a valid method of selecting the theoretically best officers for promotion and continued service. Due to the vertical rank structure it has been determined that roughly 30 percent of any given rank will be selected for promotion to the next higher grade. For example:

1	Brigadier General
3	Colonels
9	Lieutenant Colonels
27	Majors
81	Captains
243	First Lieutenants
729	Second Lieutenants

This example is highly simplified and does not take into account the officers who elect to resign their commissions, retire or decide to no longer continue in

military service for some reason.

This system tends to limit performance in at least two ways. First, it places a cap on the number of overachievers, and second, the difference between the distribution categories may be very small, yet will provide great disparity in the consequences received, i.e. longevity and promotions (Mohrmans 182).

The 360 Degree Performance Evaluation: By definition a 360 Degree evaluation is based upon the compilation of evaluations pertaining to an employee's performance from multiple sources, such as supervisors, subordinates, peers, customers or any other source that may provide valid observations. These evaluations are designed to provide the rated employee with a snapshot of their knowledge, skills and abilities from numerous point sources that can evaluate different aspects of the employee's performance. The 360 degree evaluation is designed to provide the rated employee with an all-around evaluation of the areas they do well in and also the areas that they must show improvement. Evaluations of this type certainly do not have the ability to improve the quality of the information that individuals receive pertaining to the quality of their performance (O'Reilly).

With pencil and paper or better yet on their computer, each individual fills out an anonymous questionnaire about another employee. Everything can be evaluated: the way the individual deals with others, leadership skills, personality, talents, values and ethics. After a period of time to collate the information, the person being evaluated is given the results and the chance to

compare self perception with those individuals who theoretically should know them best.

Results Based Evaluations: In this case the system used for the appraisal must be based upon documented and measurable goals that have been preselected based upon their importance to the organization. This must be tempered with the need to provide for an evaluation that will cover both the performance in accomplishing goals and plans along with the actual performance of the rated individual as a manager, or ability to assume responsibility for a predetermined outcome. The most common results based evaluation method is, management-by-objectives method. Most sources have credited Peter Drucker with the creation of this approach. This method involves goal setting, action planning, and plan implementation along with period reviews. Most evaluation forms utilizing this method are very simple. The form contains space for the objective to be entered at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and then a space for the evaluation of the performance toward that objective at the end. Common to most organizations utilizing the results based evaluation technique is the provision that the objective and standards are negotiated and agreed upon by the performer and the evaluator. This approach provides a measurement for the objectives to be achieved by the rated individual, along with the measures of the standards of performance that are expected by the organization (Bernadin 69).

Trait Based Evaluations: This type of evaluation has been in use for many years, and is commonly used to evaluate an individual's personal traits and

work characteristics. The typical trait rating system may list up to fifteen personal traits such as ability to work with others, leadership ability, analytical ability, and initiative. The list may also contain work-oriented characteristics such as job knowledge, production ability, and cost savings. Given these rating points the rater is then required to evaluate the rated individual from "unacceptable" to "outstanding". Organizations initiate this approach by listing a group of traits, characteristics, or personal attributes which are believed to be required in the satisfactory job performance. What is not included is employee accomplishments (Grote 44). Whether the person possesses the basic traits needed for adequate performance is the entire focus of the trait based system. The trait based system (also called the performer focused appraisal) is considered the pioneer in performance appraisals. Early attempts at performance appraisals typically consisted of a laundry list of traits that were determined or at least thought to be essential in getting the job completed. This is a dichotomous system which requires the evaluator to simply indicate whether or not the individual possesses each trait. More recently, this rating system was replaced by the scaled score system, wherein the appraiser was required to select a number from one to five to indicate the extent which the trait was present. This is currently a system in use by the Army today.

All four of the evaluation methods described above have valid applications; however, as a military officer, I do not feel that the trait based evaluation method would have any validity in military performance evaluations.

If all members are to be evaluated on a fair and level field then the application of evaluations based upon personal traits is a poor fit. Since the members of the military come from diverse backgrounds and cultures, applying an evaluation technique that demands uniformity of traits is unfair. Each member must be evaluated based upon his ability to perform those tasks necessary to complete the objectives and must therefore be evaluated based upon the degree of completion. The remaining three techniques are all useful yet when combined, will form a solid and reliable basis for evaluation.

Chapter 3

SELECTIVE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF LITERATURE

If the Army ever decided to recreate the Officer Evaluation Report one more time, creating the DA Form 67-10, I would like to see it redesigned to incorporate and selectively blend the features of the following three models of performance evaluation: a) Forced Distribution, b) Performance Based Evaluations and c) 360 Degree Performance Evaluations.

It is my belief that with the judicious use of the three models listed above the Army would be able to create a viable evaluation report that would be useful in selection for promotion, retention, school selection and future job assignments.

What follows is an in depth review and evaluation of those three models that would be combined to create a proposed new Army Officer Evaluation Report.

Forced Distribution: The one finding that has remained consistent among performance appraisal researchers is that leniency and rating inflation are the most common errors (Swan 91). Most evaluators will, in order to avoid conflict, rate individuals higher than their work merits.

The forced distribution system is organized so that a percentage of individuals at each level of performance will roughly approximate the normal distribution of a bell curve. In a normal system roughly two thirds of all

employees will be rated in the middle, or satisfactory. The remaining one third would then be divided between 15 % who are Superior and 15 % who are less than satisfactory. In most systems 2 to 3 % are reserved at both ends of the rating spectrum to account for individuals who are either Exceptional or Unacceptable to the organization.

Although this system will achieve a statistical distribution of performance ratings, this system is appropriate only for a very large random population of employees. No matter how large the organization, the population that is being rated by one individual will not be large enough to ensure the statistical certainty of a bell curve (Hersey 182). It is a virtual guarantee that the distribution is not random. No organization will hire and promote at random, but an organization will hire and promote the most highly qualified candidates that it can find. There is no manner in which the performance of employees in an organization will parallel the performance of the general population.

Another difficulty with the use of the forced distribution system is that improvement within a rating category cannot be recognized. It is possible for the improvement in performance to be significant, yet the final rating will remain unchanged (Hersey 183).

The most important factor in using forced distribution evaluations is what type of distribution will employees be forced into. The requirement of managers to place individuals into a bell curve assumes a normal distribution among the employees, and normal distribution is therefore expecting randomness among

those employees. Most managers are not scientific when it comes to evaluating their employees. They can easily pick out their outstanding performers and also their poorest employees. The majority of all employees become lost somewhere in the middle. The easiest approach to initiate within any organization is to identify the extremes listed above. Within the middle, the evaluator is able to make rewards as he/she sees fit. This method will ensure that those who are overachievers do receive recognition while those who are underachievers are removed from the organization.

Providing guidelines pertaining to the percentages will be the only efficient manner to instill quality performance appraisals while preventing ratings inflation, and protecting employees who may be evaluated by excessively strict or lenient supervisors. A published and enforced distribution format will provide a necessary guide to the inexperienced evaluator as well. No set of guidelines will be appropriate for very small groups, but if created and enforced correctly quality performance appraisals will provide adequate and accurate evaluations for most organizations.

Results Based Evaluation: The results based evaluation system has many solid benefits to offer an organization. It produces improved short-and long-term planning. The process begins at the highest levels of the organization with the determination of mission, values, etcetera. This leads to the development of broad objectives based upon organizational needs. This objective setting process flowsdown through the organization until every individual has completed the

process of identifying, developing, and committing in writing to the accomplishment of individual goals that will support the organization's efforts. The focus on results will communicate the importance of achieving significant results to all employees of the organization. The results based evaluation technique encourages focused efforts on performance. It specifies what the organization is attempting to achieve and will reduce the probability that time and resources will be expended on the successful completion of unimportant tasks. In most cases the evaluator and the individual being evaluated accept the method as fair. While some members prefer a system that is less demanding, there can be little objection made to the message the organization creates when a results based system is placed into effect. In today's litigious society a major advantage of the results based system is that it is strongly defensible in a court of law. The process is entirely job specific and in most cases directly involves the rated individual's participation in the development of the goals and objectives.

The results based evaluation system does have limitations. It can easily become too results oriented. If end results are the only things that count or are to be rated there is likely to be far too much emphasis placed on the achievement of short-term results, most likely at the expense of long-term results. The system must also remain flexible. There may have been so much emphasis and time put into the original development and refinement of the objectives that there will be reluctance to alter the original goals, even when the operating conditions have changed making the initial objectives inappropriate. The system is also difficult

to create and cumbersome to use. An enormous amount of organizational time and energy is required to make the system work properly. A large amount of time spent in training is required for every individual that will be touched by the system, and the organization must develop controls to ensure that the steps required by the system are working as they have been designed to do.

The results based evaluation system is unable to provide all the required data necessary to ensure that valid decisions are made pertaining to an individual's future with the organization. It is not possible to use the system in an instance where results measured are either nonexistent or become secondary to the manner in which the job is performed. Results oriented systems are unable to provide sufficient information on how a job was performed. They focus on what the individual has achieved without an all encompassing picture of how (Buzzotta 152).

360 Degree Performance Evaluation: There is a large amount of literature written on performance appraisals. Very little has been written pertaining to the 360 Degree Performance Evaluation. It is believed that 360 degree evaluations are typically utilized in organizations with a participatory culture. In the 360 degree evaluation, the value of input from multiple sources is enhanced, unlike the traditional ratings provided by supervisors. The multiple sources used in this evaluation method provide for proving the consistency of the rated individuals behavior and the reliability of the information used in the evaluation (Buzzotta 292). The behavior of the rated individual will vary

depending upon who he/she is interacting with and in what situation, i.e. supervisor, subordinate, peer or customer. In the relations with supervisors, the rated individual may put greater effort into creating a favorable impression, while expending less effort toward subordinates. In this situation, the implementation of 360 Degree Evaluations will prove useful in improving the cohesion and work efficiency of individual teams.

The fact that the customers, both internal and external, are allowed to provide input proves useful. By simultaneously measuring the expectations of the customer versus performance, the focus of the evaluation shifts from the rater to the ability of the rated individual to effectively respond to varied and changing customer requirements. Such an approach proves useful in identifying those individuals with foresight, those who possess the ability to anticipate future needs while responding to the needs of the rater, peers, and subordinates.

The 360 Degree Performance Evaluation has two beneficial aspects for any organization. First, it draws attention to critical performance objectives that have been neglected by the organization. Second, it proves useful in the enhancement of communications. It improves the formal and informal methods of communication. Once communications have opened up, the organization benefits from, improved work relations, opens up additional positions for employee involvement, identifies and solves some items of conflict, and displays to employees that management has respect for their ideas and

opinions.

The primary disadvantage of the 360 Degree Performance Evaluation is the cost in training time and money necessary to prepare and implement the process. What was once a straightforward evaluation process now requires notifying and equipping the proper individuals and collecting and analyzing the data provided. The rated individuals will most likely and inadvertently generate tension between him/herself and the individuals that provides the rating input.

The process generates a massive amount of information to analyze and collate. At this point it may become susceptible to the wrong perception or the information contained will be selectively distorted. Negative input potentially becomes very powerful and difficult to prove incorrect when the individuals providing the ratings agree, and conversely, easy to manipulate or ignore when the rating individuals do not agree.

When properly combined and applied, these three evaluation techniques have the potential to provide the Army with a valid and reliable tool to assist in the promotion, retention, training, and rewarding of military members. As the force becomes smaller it is essential that those who are valuable performers be retained and those who are not contributing be removed to make way for the advancement of others.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The military is the largest organization in our country with the ethnic/racial diversity most reflective of our American culture. For many, military service offers the first opportunity to meet and interact with persons perceived as being "different". Sometimes these differences are seen through skin color, language, attitude, and even mannerisms. Sometimes these differences are tolerated and sometimes they are not. If not properly managed, or at least recognized, cultural conflicts can and do play out to the detriment of the intercultural relationship. In creating the new evaluation form I have attempted to remove cultural biasing as much as possible. However, there is no way to completely prevent any rater from providing disparaging remarks based solely on the rated individual's differences.

Culture: Culture is not a precise condition or an exact science. As it passed from generation to generation, some elements remain unchanged. As new people of the group relate to their environment, there are adaptations which change the culture (Military Equal Opportunity Management Institute).

Race: Race is a division of mankind that possesses traits that are transmissible by descent and that are sufficiently different as to be characterized as a distinctive human type (Military Equal Opportunity Management Institute).

It must be noted that by joining the military an individual will begin the process of enculturation into the military. This process of enculturation is the passing of the culture, those behaviors and attitudes deemed socially acceptable, from the older to the younger members of the military. It is both conscious and unconscious conditioning which occurs when individuals are learning how to act in order to function successfully in the culture. As with all cultures, the military has certain learned behaviors for certain situations. These behaviors are developed when we enter the organization and are a result of what senior members teach us. When individuals enter the military, they must learn the new culture of the military. This is a two-way process because those who have already been socialized to the requirements of the organization, must now become familiar and sensitive to the diverse cultural groups entering the system. In the supervisor/subordinate relationship the giving of directions, management styles and lack of military training affect the relationship. Work relationships are also affected by cultural factors, how authority figures are viewed, and an individual's work ethic.

Supervisors must ensure the system is not used to victimize cultural minorities. Traditionally, within the military evaluation system, protected classes and minorities have suffered in terms of receiving disproportionate shares of adverse reports. The evaluation process developed is egalitarian as it stands. In concert with the affirmative actions plan, the revised evaluation report will reduce some of the unfairness, but equality must remain a concern.

Employees who are not part of the dominant culture of the organization may have even more apprehension about the performance evaluation process.

Some of the following factors may contribute to evaluation resistance:

-Fear of Repercussions: All of us feel less safe in an organization or culture where we are not the dominant group. Diverse employees, realizing that they are not a majority may experience fear when being evaluated. It is possible that they feel they do not have recourse to a fair evaluation. They may perceive the evaluation as a formalized reprimand for past mistakes and hence may be reluctant to participate.

- "Not One of Us Syndrome": The American judicial system has mandated that every person on trial be judged by a jury of his/her peers. It is felt that only those in similar circumstances can make a fair judgment. In a diverse organization, the rater is not necessarily of the same group as the employee. The employee may feel that it is not possible to be fairly evaluated by someone who has little understanding or empathy for the problems of the employee.

-Lack of Understanding of the Process: Employees often see the performance evaluation as a means of reprimand. They do not fully understand the reasons behind the evaluation, nor the actual form and process. In addition, the forms used may be confusing and intimidating for someone not used to such administrative paperwork.

-It is a Foreign Experience: For employees who are from other cultures, the whole evaluation process may be strange and confusing. In many countries,

rewards such as promotions and raises are a result of seniority or family connections rather than performance. They may never have experienced this kind of formalized evaluation process. Also, the employee may have little experience with the notion of individual responsibility, goal setting, and monitoring of performance that underlie the evaluation process.

-All Task and No Relationship: In the more structured setting of an evaluation session, the employee may be taken aback when the task takes precedence over the relationship. Suddenly the evaluation form with its boxes and categories seems more important than the person. If the employee has had a comfortable relationship with the boss, the employee may feel betrayed, as though the boss who was so friendly this morning is now cold and all business.

No evaluation method is ever completely unbiased as long as human beings do the evaluating. Using performance based criteria leaves the least room for bias against diverse employees. Performance based objectives are results oriented. Care must be taken to make sure criteria relate to the specific job responsibilities.

Ratings based on traits and characteristics evaluate the individual and tend to produce a defensive response from the employee. This type of evaluation also allows for more subjectivity on the part of the rater, making room for charges of discrimination and accusations of prejudice. Ratings based on performance and behavior on the job are less personally focused and so tend to produce less defensiveness. Behavior is the topic, so both the rater and the subordinate can

discuss performance in a more detached manner. In addition, behavior can be observed, quantified and measured in more objective and equitable ways.

There are of course numerous ways to design and implement an organization wide evaluation system. The content matter may be elusive, and the objectives not quite within reach, but improving employee performance is and will continue to be one of the primary concerns for any organization. In creating the improved Officer Evaluation Report (OER) I have combined the evaluation models detailed in Chapter 3. The following is a description of what components of each method I would recommend utilizing in the new OER:

360 Degree Performance Evaluation: Like all performance appraisals, 360 Degree Evaluations need to be made pertaining to performance criteria that are relevant to the success of the organization, thereby making the contents relevant to job performance. In initiating this aspect into the military culture I would recommend only using the evaluations of superiors, peers and subordinates. Employing the evaluations of external customers would provide great latitude in the relationships with those customers, perhaps leading to unwanted immoral or illegal activities.

Encourage interchangeable jobs through cross training. Employees of the team must cross train themselves to be able to handle any of the potential jobs that a team member may be called upon to perform. All employees must become knowledgeable with the same tasks, so the individuals supplying the rating have an accurate understanding of the rated individuals work.

Ensure that all employees are afforded the maximum opportunity to train in interpersonal skills and problem solving techniques prior to workers beginning their new duties as evaluators. The ultimate goal is for the evaluations to become a continual process not just a twice a year exercise. However in the interest of uniformity the formal evaluation should remain at yearly intervals with variations allowed per the regulations.

Some of the areas that may be evaluated using this method are:

Teamwork: Is capable of working effectively with other employees.

Shares credit and opportunities when appropriate. Helps others when appropriate.

Problem Solving: Recognizes and analyzes work related problems. Uses available resources to evaluate potential solutions.

Accountability: Displays professionalism in approach to work. Accepts responsibilities for all areas of the job. Will not make excuses for errors. Will not blame others for mistakes.

Motivation: Handles several tasks concurrently and comfortably. Displays enthusiasm for the job. Displays a positive attitude in completing work assignments and interacting with others.

Knowledge of Job: Possesses sufficient skills and abilities to perform all aspects of the job effectively and efficiently. Capable of providing technical assistance to others.

Planning and Organizing: Plans and organizes work effectively.

Identifies available resources required to complete the project. Sets and meets deadlines and appointments.

Communicating: Presents ideas effectively in all situations. Conveys thoughts clearly and concisely. Listens well and asks appropriate questions. Keeps supervisor and co-workers informed.

Quality of Work: Uses time efficiently with a minimum or wasted effort. Completes work thoroughly in an appropriate amount of time.

Attendance: Is fully ready to work at beginning of work day and continues until work day is completed. Conforms to work hours and schedules. Is present for work every day.

Those areas listed above that are chosen for inclusion in the evaluation format should be rated on a scale as follows.

- Needs Improvement
- Satisfactory
- Beyond Expectations

By providing only three distinct categories those individuals chosen to complete the evaluation will not be burdened with lengthier or more complicated scenarios.

Forced Distribution Performance Evaluations: I do not recommend altering the current breakdown used for the distribution evaluation. The current categories of: Above Center of Mass, Center of Mass, Below Center of Mass Retain and Below Center of Mass Do Not Retain are sufficient to provide for

accurate and useful evaluation. The change I am recommending is the incorporation of the Forced Distribution Evaluation at the Rater level in addition to the current Senior Rater Evaluation. It will provide a more accurate appraisal of how an individual's performance is being appraised by an individual more closely related to the tasks being performed. It is possible that the Senior Rater may rarely or never actually witness the performer at work and therefore is providing his evaluation based solely on written comments provided by the Rater and Intermediate Rater.

Results Based Evaluations: A major part of the Officer Evaluation Report is the Evaluation Support Form where the rated Officer and the Rater will list his/her significant objectives for the coming rating period and also a space to list or detail how closely those objectives were achieved. For the Results Based Evaluation to be effective it is necessary for the rater and employee to meet at the beginning of the rating period to review A) what the employee will be held accountable for, B) set objectives and C) agree on how performance will be measured.

First it is necessary to create a list of areas of accountability. These areas will obviously differ from one unit to another and one position to another. Some of the more generic areas of accountability to be considered are:

- Personal Development
- Professional Development
- Customer Satisfaction
- Public Relations
- Communications

- Interdepartmental Relations
- Project Management

After it appears that all of the areas of accountability have been identified correctly, it is now necessary to create objectives for each area of accountability. The employee with the assistance of the rater will now determine the goals or objectives that will be assigned to each individual area of accountability when the appraisal is completed. Once the areas of accountability have been set as well as goals and objectives are expected of the employee, the most important factor is how will accomplishment of these tasks be measured to determine how well the job has been done. Traditionally, this has been the most flawed area within the Officer Evaluation Report. It is imperative that quantifiable standards be set for how task accomplishment will be measured and reported. Realizing that every area of accountability may not be capable of direct measurement, the fewer ambiguous measures made available, the easier it will be for both the rater and the employee to appraise the individual's performance.

In attempting to measure degrees of successful achievement of goals and objectives it is necessary to realize that there are only four measurements of output: quality, quantity, cost and time.

Quality: The measurement of quality can be both objective and subjective. The more objective measurements that can be made, the more accurate and solid the necessary ratings can be.

Quantity: Quantity is by far the easiest to measure objectively. The greatest risk is that the quantity measures do not provide for the accurate

assessment of quality.

Cost: Cost is another easily measured objective. Budget, waste, overtime and profit all provide detailed information that may be used in the evaluation of the employee.

Time: Measurements of time should focus on the timeliness of the results, although this will not take into account quality or quantity. Due dates, staying on schedule and deadlines can all be measures of time.

No matter how good the system may be in theory, no matter how legally solid, if it is not used correctly the entire evaluation process is a waste of time. The next chapter will deal with implementing the new performance appraisal system.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Supervisors and employees bring their diverse backgrounds and cultures to work, and these variations touch every part of the organization's system. Performance appraisals are no different. Both cultural and experiential variables of diverse employees have a significant effect on the process of evaluating employee performance.

A performance evaluation generally has three major functions. First, it serves as a tool to help improve performance by giving employees clear feedback about what they are doing well and where they need to improve. Second, it gives the organization a method of measuring to assist in the allocation of equitable rewards. Finally, it helps the employees in their own career growth, giving them feedback and assistance in professional goal planning.

Performance evaluations fail in accomplishing these objectives when employees and supervisors do not understand the purpose of the evaluation. Both supervisors and employees find themselves required to go through the motions of a process that seems to be missing the mark, a waste of time at best, and a morale and productivity reducer at worst. For a performance evaluation to serve its purpose with diverse employees it needs to be clearly explained and perceived as constructive.

The most important factor in determining the success of an evaluation

system is whether or not the evaluators themselves will take their responsibilities seriously and if the evaluators are held accountable for the correct use of the system. One wonders why more time is not being spent on performance appraisals. My belief is that the supervisors are not being held accountable for how well they conduct performance appraisals on their employees. Common sense dictates that little effort will be devoted to an unpleasant task that one will not be held accountable for anyway.

Sufficient training must be provided to all appraisers. This training will serve two purposes. The most obvious is to provide the knowledge and skills necessary to use the system well. The second reason is that raters who are well trained, experience fewer claims of discrimination, along with improving the rater's legal chances in the event that a discriminations claim is filed.

Once the new appraisal system has been implemented, the need for training will continue. Individuals newly promoted to supervisor or individuals transferred into supervisory positions will require training. Refresher training should be made available for individuals who write infrequent appraisals and may be in need of renewing their skills.

A combination of skills is required for supervisors to complete performance appraisals in a successful manner. Technical skills and people skills are not the only requirements. The ability to convey the philosophy of this new system along with why the organization is doing this will lead to success of the new evaluation format.

Ideally the military will conduct a formal and comprehensive training program that all managers will be required to attend as a precondition for their conducting performance appraisals. In absence of this ideal, every unit or organization within the military must afford the time required to conduct a one hour training session to assist raters in carrying out their responsibilities with a minimal degree of understanding. Providing this minimum level of training, in addition to its ability to assist in ensuring accurate performance appraisals, will also be useful to supervisors and the organization in avoiding discrimination complaints.

With this new appraisal system in place, the primary responsibility for management of performance will be borne by the individuals being rated and not by the manager. Over the term of the rating period, the employee will achieve the objectives and demonstrate the various skills and abilities that are required for success. The activities of the rated individuals and the supervisor together will constitute the performance management process.

The rated individual will now be held accountable for:

Goal Achievement: The rated individuals will have to make the conscious decision to invest the time and effort into organizational requirements. Once the individual has willingly chosen to accept these requirements they become goals for the rated individual.

Soliciting Feedback and Coaching: Granted, the manager is responsible for providing performance feedback and coaching, the rated individual must

actively seek feedback and use that feedback to improve performance. The rated individual must initiate a coaching session with the manager in advance of a critical meeting or prior to starting a new project.

Open Communication: Just as the supervisor is responsible for continual feedback and for the revision of goals and objectives during the course of the rating period, the rated individuals bear the obligation to communicate openly and regularly with the supervisor.

Distribution of Performance Data: As the rated individuals completes projects the individual needs to advise the supervisor of the status of the objectives that were originally set at the beginning of the rating period.

Prepare for Performance Review: When the performance review is drawing near the best advise for any individual being rated is to be prepared. The rated individual will be required to list his/her successes and where the goals were not met. This will provide a clear picture of where the rated individual stands when compared to the goals that were agreed upon at the beginning of the rating period.

In this Performance Appraisal, the manager must be held accountable for:

Conditions that Motivate: While the rated individual bears the primary responsibility for managing their performance to achieve the goals and objectives that have been agreed upon in a proper manner, the manager must be held accountable for creating working conditions that allow motivation and personal growth to occur.

Observe and Document Performance: Managers will be encouraged to utilize the performance appraisal form to record any observations made during the rating period. Since the performance appraisal form has been correctly constructed to emphasize both results and behaviors, the manager will find it easy to complete the formal report since a great deal of information already exists from what has been noted throughout the rating period.

Update Objectives and Standards: It is almost guaranteed that over the course of the rating period the objectives will change, making revisions necessary. What will be difficult for the rated individual to accept is the fact that performance standards may change. If the organization changes over the course of the rating period, it should be expected that the standards of performance will change as well.

Provide Feedback and Coaching: It must be understood that feedback is information that will provide the employee an assist in correcting their actions so that the probability of goal attainment is increased. Coaching must be provided to improve or increase performance. It may also be provided when the supervisor witnesses a particularly meritorious act or in advance of an important event.

Provide the Opportunity to Develop: Although the individual employee is responsible for his or her own development, the supervisor must make further opportunities available. At the very least supervisors must encourage the employee's participation in training sessions and developmental programs. It is

possible for supervisors to delegate further responsibility to assist in the growth and development of the employee.

Reinforcement: The final requirement of the performance management process is to reinforce the accomplishments of the employee when progress is made toward the achievement of the objectives set forth in the initial performance meeting.

A sound performance evaluation system draws on both supervisor and employee. Together they negotiate performance expectations for the future. With expectations set, the next step is to monitor progress. There is a wide range in supervisory level of performance in this step. Some employees may need to be monitored closely and frequently. Others, based on managerial experience, may need only occasional contact. However this task is not to be neglected. Supervisors have a right and need to know what progress is being made toward expected results.

Finally, using the information obtained through ongoing monitoring of progress, it is time to evaluate the results. The evaluation of performance prepares the supervisor to provide feedback, make recommendations on administrative decisions, and provide appropriate counsel on performance improvement. It is never an end in itself. The performance evaluation system also provides documentation to substantiate administrative decisions.

Evaluations should reflect a true picture of an employee's contribution. There are several pitfalls to avoid in order to accomplish this. Evaluators should

consider all relevant issues that can be observed. They should be willing to distinguish among levels of performance, and avoid personal bias and extraneous issues in the process. They must focus on making a simple comparison of what was actually accomplished to what was expected for the rating period.

Being a member of a cohesive team can be an exciting work experience. Through the proper allocation of supervisory skills and interpersonal ability, the leader can set the stage for the development of an effective team on which everyone's job will be more enjoyable, including the supervisor's.

GLOSSARY

NOTE: These are working definitions, not regulatory ones.

Appraisal: Comparison under an appraisal system of an employee's performance of duties and responsibilities with performance standards.

Criteria: Quality, quantity, timeliness, cost-effectiveness, productivity, reduction in paperwork, courtesy, meeting goals, or other tools which may be used to measure results of performance.

Individual Performance Elements: Those aspects of work that an individual has control over and relate directly to assigned tasks.

Measurement Item: Those specific items (within the selected criteria) which will be measured.

Measurement Method: The means used to determine the degree to which standards have been met.

Performance: An employee's level of accomplishment of duties and responsibilities.

Performance Standards: The expressed measure of level of achievement, including quantity, quality, and timeliness, established by management for the duties and responsibilities of a position or group of positions.

Unacceptable Performance: Performance of an employee which fails to meet established performance standards in one or more critical elements of such employee's position.

Works Cited

- Buzzotta, V.R. and Lefton, Robert E., "Improve Your Performance Appraisal", Psychology Associates, 1996, 1997
- Crocker, Lawrence P., "The Army Officers Guide", Stackpole Books, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1990
- Creech, Bill, The Five Pillars of TQM, Truman Tally Books, New York, New York, 1994
- Daniels, Aubrey C., Performance Management, Performance Management Publications Tucker, Georgia, 1989
- Hersey, Paul., Blanchard, Kenneth H., Johnson, Dewey, Management of Organizational Behavior, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 1996
- Koontz, Harold., O'Donnell, Cyril., Weinrich, Heinz., Essentials of Management McGraw-Hill, New York, 1982
- Rothwell, William., Sullivan, Roland., and McLean, Gary., Practicing Organizational Development, Pfeiffer and Company, San Diego, 1995
- Rummler, Geary., Brache, Alan., How to manage the White Space on the Organization Chart, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1990
- Swan, William S., How to do a Superior Performance Appraisal, John Wiley, New York, 1991
- DA Pamphlet 623-105, "The Officer Evaluation Reporting System In Brief", Headquarters Department of the Army, 1 October 1997
- Army Regulation 623-105, "Officer Evaluation Reporting System", Headquarters Department of the Army, 1 October 1997