

Colorado Department
of Public Safety

Performance Management Program
(Incorporated as Part of CDPS Policy and Procedures, 2.1.8)

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Joe Morales by P. Sillars", is written over a horizontal line.

Approved
November 12, 2004

Hon. Bill Owens, Governor
Mr. Joe Morales, Executive Director
Ms. Pamela A. Sillars, Deputy Executive Director and PMP Point Person
Col. Mark V. Trostel, Chief, Colorado State Patrol
Karl W. Wilmes, Director, Office of Preparedness, Security, and Fire Safety
Mr. Paul L. Cooke, Director - Division of Fire Safety
Mr. Raymond T. Slaughter, Director - Division of Criminal Justice
Mr. Robert C. Cantwell, Director - Colorado Bureau of Investigation
Mr. Marshall R. Norman, Human Resource Services Director, and Diversity Coordinator
Ms. Jane M. Crisman, Policy Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Overview of Program	3
	A. Performance Management Program - Paradigm Shift	3
	B. No Surprises	4
	C. The Feedback Cycle and Process	4
	D. Gathering Information	4
	E. Performance Ratings	5
	F. Subjectivity	7
	G. Performance Salary Adjustments and Allocation of Funds	8
	H. Time Line	9
	I. CDPS's Approach	10
	J. Implementation and Transition	10
Chapter 2	Performance Management	11
	A. Performance Planning	11
	B. Core Competencies and Performance Measures	13
	C. Performance Review and Evaluation	14
	D. Record-Keeping and Reporting	18
	E. Program Review and Modification	18
	F. On-Going Program Evaluation	18
	G. Training	19
Chapter 3	Performance-Based Pay Performance Salary Adjustments	20
Chapter 4	Dispute Resolution Process	24
	A. Overview and Guidelines	24
	B. Parameters of this Resolution Process	25
	C. Internal Process for Disputes Concerning Performance Plans	26
	D. Internal Process for Disputes Concerning Performance Evaluations	27
	E. External Stage of Dispute Resolution Process	28
Chapter 5	Index (In progress, not complete)	30
Appendices		
	Appendix 1 - Colorado Revised Statutes 24-50-104	33
	Appendix 2 – CDPS PMP Forms (In progress, not complete)	35

CHAPTER 1 Overview of Program

The Performance Management Program (PMP) is the Colorado Department of Public Safety's (CDPS) implementation tool for Colorado's Performance-Based Pay (PBP) System, a program designed to reward member performance. The program was mandated after legislation passed in 2000, modifying the State's movement toward performance-based pay that was formerly addressed by Colorado Peak Performance. The State's Performance Pay System became effective on July 1, 2001, with payouts beginning July 1, 2002.

CDPS is a unique agency, and it is imperative that any performance-based pay system be applied with consideration of not only our members, but also our customers. Criminal justice agencies are held to a higher standard of professionalism, integrity, competence, and conduct. PMP must reflect and preserve these standards.

The Department will strive to maintain an equitable partnership with its managers and members when setting the Department's mission, establishing its strategic plan, setting priorities and goals, developing performance plans, and measuring and rewarding performance. The Department's mission contains the values necessary for implementing performance management within CDPS:

The mission of the Colorado Department of Public Safety is to provide a safe environment in Colorado by maintaining, promoting, and enhancing public safety through law enforcement, criminal investigations, fire and crime prevention, recidivism reduction, and victim advocacy. The CDPS also provides professional support of the criminal justice system, fire safety community, other governmental agencies, and private entities. Throughout, our goal is to serve the public through an organization that emphasizes quality and integrity.

The Performance Management Program Team ("PMP Team") developed the Department's plan, and continues to be involved in its revision, evaluation, and maintenance. At least one member from each division, as well as the CDPS point person, the CDPS Human Resource Services (HRS) director, and the CDPS Policy Director, serve on this team. If members are not sure who represents their division on the PMP team, they may contact either the CDPS HRS or CDPS policy directors.

The Department's Performance Management Program follows these guiding principles:

A. Performance Management Program - Paradigm Shift

Performance-based pay and performance-based management require members of the Colorado Department of Public Safety to undergo a paradigm shift from the traditional reward for longevity system. As a result of this shift, the performance planning and evaluation tool is subject to change as the needs of the Department change, and as the state may adjust its

system. The state's performance pay system does not apply to the Senior Executive Service (SES).

B. No Surprises

1. No surprises means that members and supervisors will have an on-going dialogue, both formal and informal, regarding the development and implementation of the member's performance plan, objectives, and revisions throughout the performance year. This dialogue is in addition to the mandatory, documented mid-year progress and final reviews.
2. Supervisors will provide practical and on-going coaching and feedback regarding performance. This includes establishing performance planning and evaluation activities that require active participation by both supervisor and staff to ensure that the final evaluation is not a surprise.

C. The Feedback Cycle and Process

1. CDPS recognizes that the feedback process for the Performance Management Program is a vital part of the program and is critical to its success.
2. Feedback is defined as information about past behavior, delivered in the present, which may influence future behavior. Continuous feedback, in both directions, between member and supervisor is especially important.
3. Feedback gives the member information about how the member affects others, helps to keep member behavior on target, and thus helps the member to better achieve his/her goals. In turn, this will help the unit, the branch, the division, and the Department meet their goals.

D. Gathering Information

1. Multiple pieces of information are to be considered during the evaluation and planning processes: the evaluation tool, customer satisfaction/feedback approaches, competency, capability and other performance-related behaviors.
2. Information collected is to be treated as a tool. Supervisors may collect information regarding member performance from a variety of sources, both internally and externally. This information may be used in the evaluation or planning process. Supervisors must be aware that this information should be used appropriately.

E. Performance Ratings

1. Performance Rating Levels:

For the 12-month annual evaluation cycle beginning April 1st and ending March 31st, CDPS will use the following labels for the four performance levels required under the State Performance Pay System:

- Level 1—Does Not Meet Standards
- Level 2—Meets Standards
- Level 3—Frequently Exceeds Standards
- Level 4—Consistently Exceeds Standards

- a. **Level 1 (Does Not Meet Standards):** This rating level encompasses those members whose performance does not consistently and independently meet expectations set forth in the performance plan, as well as those members whose performance is clearly unsatisfactory and consistently fails to meet requirements and expectations. Marginal performance requires substantial monitoring to achieve consistent completion of work, and requires more constant, close supervision. Though these members do not meet expectations, they may be progressing satisfactorily toward a level 2 rating and need to demonstrate improvement in order to satisfy the core expectations of the position.

A final overall rating at Level 1 shall trigger a course of progressive measures designed to enable the member to improve his or her performance. It will result in a corrective action and a performance improvement plan (CDPS 223), or a disciplinary action, pursuant to Chapter 6 of the State Department of Personnel, Personnel Board Rules and Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures (hereinafter referred to as *State Personnel Rules and Administrative Procedures*) R-6-4. Level 1 performers are not eligible for a performance salary adjustment.

- b. **Level 2 (Meets Standards):** This rating level encompasses a range of expected performance. It includes those members who exhibit competency in the work behaviors, skills, and assignments for the job, as well as those employees who are successfully developing in the job. These members are meeting all the expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives on their performance plan and, on occasion, may exceed them. This is the member who reliably performs the job assigned. Level 2 performers are successful and valued members of the Department.
- c. **Level 3 (Frequently Exceeds Standards):** This rating level encompasses the accomplished performers who consistently exhibit the desired competencies effectively and independently, while frequently exceeding expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives of the job assigned. For example, the member may have participated in one or more projects or groups, over and above

what would normally be assigned to the position during the evaluation year, or may have been called upon to serve in an “acting” or similar capacity at some point. Their work has a documented impact beyond the regular assignments, and performance objectives that directly support the mission of the organization.

- d. **Level 4 (Consistently Exceeds Standards):** This rating represents consistently exceptional and documented performance or consistently superior achievement beyond the regular assignment. Members make exceptional contribution(s) that have a significant and positive impact on the performance of the unit or the organization, and may materially advance the mission of the organization. The member provides a model for excellence and helps others to do their jobs better. Peers, immediate supervisors, higher-level management and others can readily recognize such a level of performance. Level 4 is unique and difficult to achieve. This person is a role model. **NOTE: A single unique or unusual contribution during a rating period does not provide sufficient justification for an overall Level 4 rating for the year.**
 - e. The Department recognizes that a large majority of its members operate at Level 2, and a smaller percentage will operate at both Level 3 and Level 4.
 - f. Level 2, 3 and 4 performers may be eligible for a performance salary adjustment, based upon whether the member is below or at the range maximum.
2. Quotas or forced distribution processes for determining the number of ratings in any of the four performance levels will not be established nor tolerated. Each member must receive a rating based solely on their performance for the rating period.
 3. One form will be used across the CDPS for planning and evaluation. This form (CDPS 221) will be available to all members, either on a shared LAN directory or via electronic bulletin board/Internet site. Other forms that may be used in the performance management program will also be available.
 4. Completed CDPS 221 forms for final performance ratings will be forwarded to CDPS Human Resources, and kept in the member’s personnel file.
 5. Distinguishing Levels of Performance

When a rater distinguishes levels of performance among members, these distinctions will be based on:

- Fact-supported judgments
 - Use of a preponderance of job-relevant performance information
 - Information from a variety of sources.
- a. Rating Criteria

Performance rating differences among members are based on differences in job-relevant performance among those members. Elements of job performance that may be taken into consideration include:

- 1) Performance in each of the relevant competency areas contained on the member's individual performance plan;
 - 2) Performance on the relevant factors within each relevant competency area;
 - 3) Performance on the relevant job activities within each relevant factor;
 - 4) Performance on the Individual Performance Objectives (IPOs) contained on the member's individual performance plan;
 - 5) Performance on the job functions contained on the member's Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ);
 - 6) Performance on standards of professional conduct; and
 - 7) Other job-relevant information.
- b. All members are expected to meet basic standards of professional conduct.
- c. Final performance evaluation ratings (numerical scores) will be grouped within the established Levels of Performance.

F. Subjectivity

While there will always be an element of subjectivity in the appraisal or evaluation process, CDPS will address this issue through the following actions:

1. A commitment to specific and measurable individual performance objectives
2. Training/Training Manual - providing periodic guidance and updates
3. A required, documented, midyear progress review in addition to the required annual, year-end review
4. Incorporation of the role of the reviewer (next-level supervisor)
5. Departmental Dispute Resolution Process

G. Performance Salary Adjustments and Allocation of Funds

1. Prior to the payment of annual performance salary adjustments, the state personnel director shall specify and publish the percentage ranges for performance levels based on the available statewide performance pay funding. Adjustments for each level of performance will be specified as a percentage of salary, and will become effective on the state-wide common date of July 1st. All adjustments are subject to available funding and no adjustment will be guaranteed. The state's Performance Pay System allows the payment of base- and non-base-building performance adjustments.
 - a. A base-building performance salary adjustment is an amount of money that permanently adds to the member's base monthly salary; e.g. it does not have to be re-earned the following year. A base building salary adjustment becomes part of the regular base monthly salary starting July 1st and continuing until the member leaves state service.
 - b. A non-base building performance salary adjustment is an amount of money that is paid to the member one time only, in addition to the member's annual salary. It must be re-earned the following year.
 - 1) Non-base building adjustments are paid in one lump sum in July. The full amount is owed to the member, no matter what change in circumstances occurs after July 1st. This includes discipline, transfer to another position or agency, termination, or death.
 - 2). The statutory salary lid does not apply to non-base building performance adjustments.
2. Level 2 through Level 4 performers are eligible for base building performance salary adjustments if their current base salary is below the range maximum. No base building adjustment will be granted that results in a base salary that exceeds the range maximum.
 - a. Level 4 performers below the range maximum monthly salary may receive a base-building salary adjustment up to the range maximum.
 - b. If a Level 4 performance salary adjustment results in an amount that exceeds grade maximum, any portion of the adjustment amount that exceeds the maximum shall be paid as a one-time, lump sum, non-base building amount in the July payroll.
3. For any level of performance, the combination of pay and base-building adjustment cannot exceed the monthly, statutory salary lid.
4. Performance pay salary adjustment funding will be appropriated by the General Assembly at the Department level (within the EDO). PMP salary adjustment dollars

will be calculated at the Department level by the Department’s budget officer. Division budget officers will provide assistance regarding members’ organizational units and other funding source information.

5. General State Personnel System Pay-Out Rules

- a. First, the salary survey adjustment (if approved by the Legislature) is added to all current members’ base pay (except those rated at level 1) on July 1st.
- b. After the salary survey adjustment, those members who may still be below the new range minimums must be brought up to the new range minimum with salary survey funds.
- c. Any status change effective on July 1st that increases base salary, such as promotion, is made.
- d. The resulting salary base is used as the basis for the annual performance salary adjustment.
- e. Performance-based salary adjustments must be base-building to the point of the member’s pay range maximum. Only for members rated as Level 4, any performance salary adjustment amount that exceeds the pay range maximum must be non-base building (paid as a lump sum). Members rated at Levels 2 and 3 are not eligible for non-base building performance adjustments.

H. Time Line

- 1. The annual performance planning and evaluation cycle will run from April 1st to March 31st. This cycle applies to all members within the Department.
- 2. Contingent upon available funding, pay out of base-building salary adjustments will begin on July 1st of each year. Non-base building performance salary adjustments will be paid in one lump sum on the July 31st payroll.

ACTIVITY	DATE
Performance planning	April 1st – April 30th
Performance Plans must be completed	April 30 th (or within 30 days of a status-changing action or completion of FTO/CTO)
Mid-Year Performance Progress Review (required)	September 1st – 30th
Preliminary review of the evaluation between supervisor (rater) and member. (No rating communicated to member at this time.)	March 31 st – April 15th

ACTIVITY	DATE
Supervisor (rater) completes CDPS 221 and assigns preliminary final overall rating. (No rating communicated to member.)	April 1st – April 20th
Supervisor (rater) gives completed CDPS 221 preliminary rating to reviewer. (No rating communicated to employees.)	April 20th
Reviewer/division conducts Quality Review Process of Levels 1 through 4 ratings and review process is completed before ratings are finalized and given to members.	April 20th – 28th
Final Overall Rating communicated to members. Review and sign the CDPS 221.	May 1st – 10th
Final Overall Rating and completed CDPS 221 forms due to CDPS HRS	May 15th
Dispute Resolution Process	May - June
State Personnel Director publishes the percentage ranges for performance levels based on available statewide funding	May
CDPS executive management determines payout percentages	June
Notice of Performance Salary Adjustment Letter sent to members from CDPS HRS	June 15 th – July 15th
Payment of performance salary adjustments	July 31st

I. CDPS’s Approach

The Colorado Department of Public Safety’s approach to performance management begins with the mission, strategic plan, and priorities of the Department. Division and work unit goals will be written in alignment with the Department goals. Individual performance objectives (IPOs) will align with the division and/or work unit goals.

J. Implementation and Transition

Member input was a key factor in the design of the Department’s implementation of the Performance Management Program. PMP was established by a core group composed of supervisory and non-supervisory members from all divisions of the CDPS.

Chapter 2. Performance Management

There are three critical elements of CDPS's Performance Management Program: planning, coaching and feedback, and evaluation. The basis of the performance management cycle includes these three critical elements coupled with the performance-based pay component.

A. Performance Planning

Each member needs to know what is expected in order to be an effective performer and to actively participate in the process. An effective performance plan includes descriptions of desired results and how they are to be measured.

1. Performance plans are to be aligned with the mission, strategic plan and priorities of the Department, division and work unit. Each member must have access to a copy of the CDPS and the division strategic plan and work unit goals to ensure his/her plan is in alignment with the Department's goals.
2. Although supervisors are responsible for developing performance plans for each of their members, they are expected to involve members in the planning process to the greatest extent possible. Also, supervisors and members should discuss professional growth and training opportunities on an annual basis.
3. A member's performance plan should begin on April 1st of each year and will be effective for one year (12 calendar months). A performance plan shall not exceed 12 months. A planning session between the supervisor and member for the upcoming 12-month performance cycle must be completed no later than April 30th of each year. From this planning session, a performance plan (CDPS Performance Management Plan & Evaluation Form, CDPS 221) must be completed.
 - a. For new members, this planning meeting should take place within 30 calendar days of hire or completion of the Field Training Officer (FTO) or Communication Training Officer (CTO) program. These meetings should be face to face, except in extenuating circumstances, such as illness, family medical leave or similar situations,
 - b. Occasionally, the Colorado State Patrol hires Patrol Interns (Cadets) several months prior to the start of an academy class; or, after hire, an intern will be deferred to a future academy class. To comply with state personnel rules, these interns must be evaluated, in writing, at least annually, regardless of their job assignments. A planning meeting between the supervisor and new intern shall be held, and a performance plan developed, within 30 days of the intern's date of hire or status change (such as deferment from a current academy class). At a minimum, the session should include information that the intern's performance during the period prior to attending or completing the Patrol Academy will be forwarded to the administrator of the Patrol Academy.

4. New performance plans must also be completed within 30 days of a status-changing personnel action; e.g. transfer, upward movement, downward movement. The new plan should cover that portion of the annual cycle after the status change.
5. If the member disagrees with the plan, a review meeting involving the member, the immediate supervisor and the reviewer (next-level supervisor) should be completed by May 15th or within 45 days of hire for a new member or status change for a current member. This meeting should be face to face when practical, but can be conducted by tele-conference due to remote office location, illness or similar extenuating circumstances.
6. If a plan is not established within the time frames above, a review meeting involving the member, the immediate supervisor and the reviewer (next-level supervisor) should be completed by May 15th or within 45 days of hire for a new member, or status change for a current member. This meeting should be face to face when practical, but can be conducted by tele-conference due to remote office location, illness or similar extenuating circumstances. The reviewer shall ensure a plan is completed no later than five (5) calendar days after the meeting.
7. A member who still disagrees with the plan after meeting with the supervisor and the reviewer (next-level supervisor) can initiate the Dispute Resolution Process. This written process must be initiated within seven (7) calendar days of the meeting or the plan will become final without the member's signature. Please refer to **CHAPTER IV. Dispute Resolution Process** for further information. If the member does not take this step, the disagreement/dispute is considered resolved and the performance plan becomes final, with or without the member's signature.
8. A member who does not yet have a plan within seven (7) calendar days after the review meeting with supervisor and the reviewer (next-level supervisor) can initiate the Dispute Resolution Process. This written process must be initiated within seven (7) calendar days of the meeting. Please refer to **CHAPTER IV. Dispute Resolution Process** for further information.
9. If a supervisor fails to plan for each subordinate member within the PMP guidelines, the reviewer (the supervisor's supervisor, or the member's next-level supervisor) is responsible for completing the plan. If the reviewer fails to complete the plan within the PMP guidelines, the reviewer's supervisor is responsible for completing the plan. This continues up the chain of command to the appointing authority, until the plan is completed as required. CRS 24-50-104 (c.5) and *State Personnel Rules And Administrative Procedures* require corrective and disciplinary action, as cited in number 10, below, for the person at each level of the chain of command who fails to develop a performance plan(s).
10. Supervisors will be evaluated on their performance management and evaluation of employees. Absent extraordinary circumstances, classified supervisors who fail to develop a performance plan for each subordinate in accordance with CDPS's

established timelines shall receive a corrective action and will be ineligible for a performance salary adjustment. If the individual performance plan is not completed within 30 days of the corrective action, the designated rater shall be disciplinarily suspended in increments of one workweek following the pre-disciplinary meeting.

11. Performance plans should be retained at the supervisor (rater) and/or division level and not forwarded to CDPS HRS.

B. Core Competencies and Performance Measures

Statewide uniform core competencies, which have been defined by the State Personnel Director, will be incorporated into every member's performance plan and be considered during every member's evaluation. Each member must be evaluated, at a minimum, on every required competency.

These competencies are so important to the basic performance of every state employee and CDPS member that, per the state's Performance Pay System, **performance at Level 1 (Does Not Meet Standards) in any one of these required competencies will prevent a final, overall rating that is higher than Level 2 (Meets Standards).**

Members may also be rated on additional competencies and/or Individual Performance Objectives (IPOs), as agreed upon by the member and supervisor during the planning process.

1. A competency is a measurable pattern of skills, knowledge, abilities, behaviors and other characteristics that an individual needs to perform work roles or occupational functions successfully.
2. There are four (five for supervisors/managers) core competencies required for all state employees:
 - a. Communication
 - b. Interpersonal Skills
 - c. Customer Service
 - d. Organizational Accountability
 - e. Supervision/Management (Supervisors/managers only)
 - f. There is one additional core competency required by CDPS for all of its members: Professional Competence.

These core competencies cannot be disregarded in the final overall rating for any member.

3. Individual Performance Objectives (IPOs):
 - a. Every member may have up to 12 personal individual performance objectives in the annual performance plan.

- b. Up to two additional (optional) competency areas may be developed for instances where the member and supervisor feel there are aspects of the individual's job responsibilities and performance that are not covered by the required, common areas.
4. The supervisor and the member are responsible for determining the appropriate weight (percentage of overall rating) assigned to each competency factor. Division directors may set weights for job classifications within their span of control. The score a member actually earns in each section will be based on the cumulative total of all competency areas. The weights of all competency areas must total 100%.
5. When completing the performance evaluation, the overall score or rating will be determined by multiplying the weight of the anchor/IPO times the level of performance (1, 2, 3, or 4) for that anchor/IPO. Half points may be used (e.g., 1.5, 2.5, 3.5) but the rating for each anchor/IPO cannot exceed four (4.0). The total for a competency area or the overall evaluation may result in fractions of points.

The points for each weighted competency area will be totaled, for a final score or rating between 100 and 400 points. The score will fall within one of the four levels of performance.

6. All supervisors shall have an anchor within the Supervision/Management competency area in their own performance plans that measures and evaluates their effectiveness in implementing the Performance Management Program for all members within their span of control.

C. Performance Review and Evaluation

1. All members will be evaluated in writing, using the CDPS 221 form, at least annually based on their job performance during the previous year. A supervisor's (rater's) annual recommended overall evaluation of a member's performance must be reviewed by the rater's supervisor (reviewer or next-level supervisor) prior to the recommended overall rating being given to the member.
2. At least one mandatory and documented progress review is required during the planning cycle. This interim progress review meeting should normally be held no earlier than September 1st and no later than September 30th. Interim reviews provide informal but specific feedback, identify areas that need further development early on in the cycle, encourage regular communication, and decrease the potential for unanticipated outcomes at the time of the evaluation.
3. Supervisors are encouraged to hold coaching and feedback meetings more often than that which is required. Members who are new to the Department or the position, or who are working under performance improvement plans, need more frequent

- meetings. For new members, the supervisor and member may agree upon a mutual time frame for these meetings to occur.
4. For members working under performance improvement plans, a mandatory review must be held as defined in the performance improvement plan until the improvement goal is reached or corrective or disciplinary action is initiated.
 5. State Personnel Rules and the State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures stipulate that the supervisor is responsible for rating each subordinate. CDPS's plan requires that members have the opportunity to provide input into their performance evaluation prior to the rating being given.
 6. If a member has more than one supervisor, it is the responsibility of the supervisors to jointly evaluate the plan for that member, balancing the evaluation to the greatest extent possible.
 7. A member's final evaluation for the annual performance cycle should be completed after March 31st and no later than May 15th. If a member's evaluation is in dispute on April 30th, the supervisor must notify CDPS HRS. Completed final evaluations are due to CDPS Human Resource Services no later than April 30th each year.
 - a. Final evaluations are also required within 30 days of a status-changing personnel action; e.g. transfer, upward movement, downward movement. The evaluation should cover that portion of the annual cycle prior to the status change, and must be received by CDPS HRS no later than 45 days after the date of the personnel action. A copy of this evaluation must be forwarded to the new appointing authority or agency.
 - b. For a member hired between January 1st and March 31st, a performance evaluation must be completed but a supervisor is not required to assign an annual performance rating for that period. A default rating of Level 2 will be assumed unless the supervisor assigns a different rating.
 - c. For a member who is still participating in or who has successfully completed the Patrol's FTO/CTO program between January 1st and March 31st, the member's rating will be received from the Academy or FTO/CTO Program. A default rating of Level 2 will be assumed unless the Academy training supervisor, or FTO/CTO supervisor, assigns an interim rating.
 9. The first step in the evaluation process is for the member and the supervisor to meet and discuss the evaluation. Except in extenuating circumstances, such as illness or similar situations, these meetings should be face to face.
 10. Immediate supervisors should meet with their subordinate members for a preliminary review of the evaluation, to ensure that the member has an opportunity for input. Both the member and the supervisor should prepare for this meeting.

11. After meeting to review the initial evaluation with the member, the supervisor will prepare the final evaluation and recommended overall rating. The reviewer (next-level supervisor) should review the final evaluation before it is given to the member by the supervisor.
12. A description of the internal dispute resolution process, including time lines and name of the appointing authority (or PMP decision-maker) is contained in the CDPS 221 Performance Plan and Evaluation form. The member will be provided a completed copy of this form at the time the final evaluation is given.
13. A member who disagrees with the final evaluation may request a meeting with the supervisor. This request must be made in writing within five (5) work days of being given the final evaluation. The requested meeting must be held within five (5) calendar days of the supervisor's (rater's) receipt of the written request. This meeting should be approached as a problem-solving action, not as a legal or adversarial meeting. The rater (supervisor), and the member may agree to make changes to the final evaluation, if a consensus can be reached. This is the first step in the resolution of a disagreement (or dispute) related to the member's performance evaluation.
14. A member who still disagrees with the final evaluation after meeting with the supervisor can initiate the Dispute Resolution Process. This written process must be initiated within seven (7) calendar days of the meeting or the plan will become final without the member's signature. Please refer to ***Section IV. Dispute Resolution Process*** for further information.
15. Supervisors will be evaluated on their performance management and evaluation of employees. Absent extraordinary circumstances, classified supervisors who fail to complete a final evaluation for each subordinate in accordance with the CDPS's established timelines shall receive a corrective action and will be ineligible for a performance salary adjustment. If the performance evaluation is not completed within 30 days of the corrective action, the designated rater shall be disciplinarily suspended in increments of one workweek following the pre-disciplinary meeting.
16. If a supervisor fails to evaluate each subordinate member within the PMP guidelines, the reviewer (the supervisor's supervisor, or the member's next-level supervisor) is responsible for completing the evaluation. If the reviewer fails to complete the evaluation within the PMP guidelines, the reviewer's supervisor is responsible for completing the evaluation. This continues up the chain of command to the appointing authority, until the evaluation is completed as required. If a rating is not given, the overall evaluation shall be Level 2 until a final rating is completed. CRS 24-50-104 (c.5) and *State Personnel Rules And Administrative Procedures* require corrective and disciplinary action, as cited in Number 15, above, for the person at each level of the chain of command who fails to complete a performance evaluation(s).

17. If a supervisor is not available to provide a performance rating to the member, the next-level supervisor (the reviewer) is responsible for completing the rating. If the reviewer is not available to provide a rating, the responsibility continues up the member's chain of command. If a rating is not given, the overall evaluation shall be Level 2 until a final rating is completed.
18. It is the responsibility of the reviewer (next-level supervisor) to ensure that individual performance evaluations are reviewed, as required by State guidelines.
19. Reviewers will gather and review evaluations for all members within their span of control to monitor the quality and consistency of those performance ratings, and to determine if individual member and work unit performance resulted in achievement of the division's goals. Reviewers are also encouraged to meet with other designated reviewers to ensure that performance is evaluated consistently within the Department.
20. Reviewers (next-level supervisors) will ensure that members receive a performance evaluation from their supervisor by April 30th of each year.
21. Per statute, the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director, and the division directors shall determine annually on May 1st whether each supervisor in the Department has completed the mandatory performance evaluation required for each CDPS member during the preceding 12 months. Absent extraordinary circumstances, for each evaluation outstanding on May 1st, the reviewer shall immediately issue a corrective action to the supervisor, giving him/her 30 calendar days to complete the evaluation, have it reviewed, and provide it to the member.
22. If, at the end of the 30-day period, the evaluation process is not completed as directed, the reviewer shall suspend the immediate supervisor, pursuant to *State Personnel Rules and Administrative Procedures*, Chapter 6. The reviewer will then complete the evaluation(s), which must be received at CDPS HRS no later than June 10th. Due to the time lines of the Performance Management Program and the Salary adjustment allocation process, coordination between the reviewer and CDPS HRS in this situation is crucial.
23. If the next-level supervisor does not provide a member with an evaluation by June 8th, the next level(s) up the member's chain of command will evaluate the member. The evaluation must be received at CDPS HRS by close of business on June 10th.
24. If any evaluations have still not been completed by July 1st, the supervisor may be subject to demotion. If a supervisor has not timely completed annual performance evaluations for two (2) years, the supervisor shall be demoted to a non supervisory position. The CDPS Human Resource Services Section will be responsible for tracking all member evaluations and notifying appointing authorities when a supervisor has failed to conduct an evaluation of a member's performance for the previous year.

D. Record-Keeping and Reporting

1. It is the Department's plan to maintain all performance management records in a confidential, secured file.
2. All relevant PMP records will be included in the Department's personnel file for each member and relevant information will be uploaded into EMPL (the state's employee information database).

PMP-related documents to be included in the personnel file are performance plans, evaluations, disputes, grievances, and resolutions. Records will be maintained in both written and electronic form, according to *State Personnel Rules and Administrative Procedures*. CDPS Human Resource Services will report information required by the State Personnel Director by specified deadlines.

3. Performance plans should be retained at the supervisor (rater) and/or division level and not forwarded to CDPS HRS.
4. Payroll records are not part of the personnel file and will be maintained separately by an authorized Department custodian.
5. Requests for release of performance rating and/or performance salary adjustment information will be directed to the CDPS Human Resource Services Section. CDPS HRS will follow established guidelines in response to the request.
6. The Department will develop tools required to track and report performance and salary adjustment information, including appropriations and adjustments to CDPS members. This report will include the total dollars appropriated for performance salary adjustments in prior fiscal years, the amount of those dollars paid to members for performance, and the total amount of dollars paid for each performance category.

E. Program Review and Modification

The PMP Team anticipates that changes will need to be made to CDPS's program as the Department discovers what works and what does not work. Changes in the State's guidelines and legislative decisions may require changes to the program. The program will again be reviewed annually. If any major adjustments are needed, a revised program will be submitted to State Personnel for review.

F. On-Going Program Evaluation

1. The CDPS Executive Team will review and revise these policies and procedures, as necessary, for the purpose of continually improving the implementation of the State's

Performance Pay System and CDPS's Performance Management Program. The result should be more accurate and consistent ratings across supervisors and raters.

2. The PMP Team will continue to play an active role in PMP. In order to assure a fair Performance Management Program, periodic meetings will be called by the CDPS PMP point person, HRS director, or policy director:
 - a. To continue to offer guidance concerning PMP issues, and to identify and make recommendations to address problems and concerns as they arise;
 - b. To provide ongoing evaluation of PMP within the Department to see if the established goals are being met; i.e., to compare theory to practice and to refine its plan as necessary;
 - c. To evaluate the adequacy of training provided, and to assess the need for further training; and
 - d. To provide a continuum of communication and a feedback loop for members regarding PMP within the Department.
3. The Team will also consider the use of surveys. Areas to evaluate include, but are not limited to, improved performance, improved member satisfaction, improved manager satisfaction, improved customer services, cost analysis, member retention, equity issues, budget accountability, and the PMP annual report.

G. Training

Updates and training materials/classes will be provided periodically to all members regarding the performance management plan and performance-based pay system.

1. Supervisor training will include guidance in establishing work unit plans, writing plans driven by the Department and division strategic plans, and additional training regarding writing and measuring IPOs.
2. The Department's diversity coordinator will continue to be involved in all aspects of the implementation and continuation of PMP.
3. The Team will provide ongoing information concerning PMP to members through the HRS web site, the CDPS electronic bulletin board, and e-mail.

CHAPTER 3. Performance-Based Pay—Performance Salary Adjustments

Funding for performance-based pay is appropriated each year by the Legislature. The funding of (and the amount of) performance pay is subject to annual budget appropriations. Funding may not be available or appropriated each year. If funding is not available or appropriated, performance pay salary adjustments would not be available. Performance salary adjustments are subject to available funding and will not be guaranteed.

In order to fulfill its mission, CDPS has set a goal to recruit, hire, and sustain employment of the highest quality employees. One way to meet that goal is to develop and competitively compensate its members.

1. Permanent members are eligible for a performance salary adjustment each year except as provided below. Temporary members are not eligible for performance salary adjustments.
 - a. Any member below the pay range maximum who is eligible for a performance salary adjustment (a final overall rating of Level 2, 3 or 4) may receive a base-building adjustment, up to the pay range maximum. A member who is not at pay range maximum and receives a Level 4 rating, may receive a combination of a base-building and a non-base building adjustment. Any portion of the adjustment amount that exceeds grade maximum shall be paid as a one-time lump sum in the July payroll. The statutory salary lid does not apply to any non-base building salary adjustments.
 - b. A member at the pay range maximum who receives a rating of Level 2 or 3 is not eligible for an annual performance salary adjustment.
 - c. A member in saved pay status above the maximum who receives a final overall rating of Level 4 may receive a non-base building salary adjustment.
 - d. Members with a final, overall rating of Level 1 are not eligible for a performance salary adjustment.
2. A member who is eligible for an annual performance salary adjustment shall not be denied the adjustment because of a corrective or disciplinary action issued for an incident that occurred after the close of the previous performance rating cycle. If the incident occurred prior to the close of the previous performance cycle (March 31st), the supervisor/reviewer may consider adjusting the performance rating based upon the disciplinary action issued, so long as the adjustment is made prior to June 10th.
3. The Department and its divisions may not use excess personal services money to pay additional PMP salary adjustments.
4. Per the state's System, performance salary adjustment dollars may not be used for any purpose except performance pay.

5. The CDPS Executive Team has final approval authority of all performance salary adjustment decisions within their respective divisions/organizations, based on the evaluations completed by raters and reviewers, and upon the CDPS PMP boundaries.
6. The director of the Department Of Personnel & Administration shall specify and publish the percentage ranges for performance levels based on the available state-wide performance pay funding. Within those ranges, CDPS will specify the salary adjustment percentages for Levels 2, 3 and 4 based on the Department's budget, member demographics, and distribution of ratings. Decision-making on the amount of performance salary adjustments to be paid within CDPS will be negotiated by the CDPS Executive Team, with input from the Department's human resources and budget staff.
7. The Department will use a budget allocation tool to track performance management and pay, and to allow the Executive Team and budget officers to model and then allocate available funding.
8. Determining Performance Salary Adjustment Amounts:
 - a. Level 1 performers are not eligible for a performance salary adjustment.
 - b. Level 2 and Level 3 performers may receive base-building performance salary adjustments representing a percentage of base salary, not to exceed range maximum.
 - c. Level 4 performers may receive base-building or non-base building performance salary adjustments, or a combination.
9. The performance salary adjustment amount for a new CDPS member hired between April 1 and December 31 will be one-twelfth (1/12) of the full adjustment for each month of employment during the performance cycle. There will be no payment if the member is hired on or after January 1. Appointing authorities are encouraged to make this information part of the hiring process so that new members are fully informed of this provision when hired.
10. The performance salary adjustment for a member on leave without pay (LWOP) will not be affected, unless the member's date of service is adjusted as a result of the leave. For each month that CDPS HRS adjusts the member's service date, one month (one-twelfth OR 1/12) of the adjustment will be deducted.
11. A member who is reemployed, reappointed, or reinstated within the rating cycle shall be treated as a new member for purposes of determining any performance salary adjustment.
12. The performance salary adjustment for a member who transfers laterally to a new position within the Department, or is promoted within the Department, is determined

by the new appointing authority, based upon the combined interim ratings from both positions/supervisors. The entire performance adjustment, if any, comes from the new organizational unit's funding sources.

13. The performance salary adjustment for members who transfer into CDPS from another state Department will be determined based upon the status of that member's rating in their former Department at the time of transfer. Appointing authorities should contact CDPS HRS prior to negotiating a transfer, in order to assess the impact on the transferring employee's performance salary adjustment.
 - a. For new members transferring with a final performance evaluation (final rating) at their former Department, but before July 1st, the rating will be considered as any CDPS final rating, and any performance salary adjustment will be determined under the provisions of the CDPS Performance Management Program Plan.
 - b. For new members transferring with an interim rating from their former Department, CDPS will conduct an interim rating for the remainder of the rating cycle. The interim ratings will be combined into a final rating on the CDPS 221 form.

If the transfer occurs on or after January 1st, the CDPS interim rating can default to Level 2, as outlined in Section II.B.7.b of this Plan. The supervisor may also perform the rating. Any performance salary adjustment will be determined in accordance with the CDPS PMP Plan.
 - c. If no interim rating from their former Department was given prior to the transfer, CDPS will rate the new member for the time they work at CDPS. If the transfer occurs on or after January 1st, the rating can default to Level 2, as outlined in Section II.B.7.b of this Plan. The supervisor may also perform a rating. Any performance salary adjustment will be based upon the full rating cycle.
14. Members transferring out of CDPS to another state Department after receiving their performance evaluations at CDPS but before July 1 will receive any performance salary adjustment under the provisions of their new Department's performance pay plan.
15. Members must still be employed on July 1st to receive performance salary adjustments from the previous performance cycle. After approval, base-building adjustments will be reflected beginning with the member's July 1ST salary. Level 4 performers receiving non-base building performance salary adjustments will receive lump sum payments on the July 31st paycheck.

Performance Management Salary Adjustment Eligibility at a Glance

	PERFORMANCE LEVELS			
	<u>Level 1</u> Does not Meet Standards	<u>Level 2</u> Meets Standards	<u>Level 3</u> Frequently Exceeds Standards	<u>Level 4</u> Consistently Exceeds Standards
Member <u>below</u> their range maximum - eligible for performance SALARY ADJUSTMENT	Not eligible	Yes, eligible for base building up to range maximum. An adjustment that results in a dollar amount greater than the range maximum is not allowed.	Yes, eligible for base building up to range maximum. An adjustment that results in a dollar amount greater than the range maximum is not allowed.	Yes - eligible for base building, and for a <u>non-base-building</u> adjustment for the portion that <u>exceeds</u> the range maximum.
Member <u>at</u> their range maximum (or in saved pay) - eligible for performance adjustment	Not eligible	Not eligible for adjustments.	Not eligible for adjustments.	Non-base-building, lump sum.
Adjustment amount if below range maximum	Not eligible	Within the range set annually by the state personnel director.	Within the range set annually by the state personnel director.	Within the range set annually by the state personnel director.
Adjustment amount if at range maximum (or in saved pay)	Not eligible	\$0	\$0	\$0 to percentage set by DPA/CDPS, non-base building.

The State Personnel Director will annually set the ranges for performance salary adjustment levels. Regardless of performance level, an employee cannot be granted an adjustment GREATER than the set performance adjustment maximum.

CHAPTER IV. Dispute Resolution Process

CDPS will use a procedure designed to encourage resolution of disputes at the lowest level. This will be an open and impartial process that is not a grievance or appeal. If the dispute is not resolved at the first level, the member may request review up through the chain of command to the appointing authority or PMP decision maker.

A. Overview and Guidelines

The State Personnel Board Rules and State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures (hereinafter referred to as *State Personnel Rules and Administrative Procedures*), Chapters 6 - Performance, and 8 - Dispute Resolution are hereby incorporated by reference as part of this Dispute Resolution Process. The rules and procedures are available from a link on the CDPS HRS web page: www.cdpsweb.state.co.us/hr/

You may also contact HRS for a copy.

The Dispute Resolution Process consists of two stages, an Internal Stage and an External Stage. As required by the State system parameters, the State Personnel Director retains jurisdiction for disputes related to performance evaluations that do not result in corrective or disciplinary actions.

State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures, Chapter 8, specify that disputes are not subject to the Personnel Board's grievance process unless a corrective action is involved or discrimination is alleged.

The purpose of the dispute resolution process is to resolve disputes concerning performance management that may arise between a member and supervisor. A problem-solving approach is strongly recommended. This process is not intended to be legalistic or adversarial.

The dispute resolution process must be open and impartial, and must allow the parties an opportunity to have issues heard. The parties to the dispute may have an advisor present, but the parties are expected to represent and speak for themselves. This does not translate to an absolute right to legal representation. Please refer to the State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures for the definition of an advisor.

Staff of the CDPS Human Resource Services Section may assist members only with information about rules, process and procedures. They should not advise parties how to approach a specific concern or give any advice relating to the substance of the dispute.

In this process, a dispute will be heard and timely decisions will be made after all relevant information has been reviewed. All decisions will be provided in writing and must fully address the member's concern(s).

Members should treat each other with respect and courtesy throughout the process. Retaliatory behavior toward any person involved in this process is prohibited under State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures.

Final resolution of issues concerning the individual's performance plan (or lack of plan) and the individual's performance evaluation shall occur within the Internal Stage. Members will have no further recourse for resolution of these disputes.

Disputes concerning application of the Department's Performance Management Program, policies or processes, or full payment of a performance salary adjustment (if relevant) may proceed beyond the Internal Stage (Department level) to the State Personnel Director (External Stage) after completion of the Internal Stage process.

The CDPS 221 Performance Management Planning and Evaluation Form contains the steps involved in the CDPS Internal, and the State's External, Dispute Resolution Process. This information provides all members with written notice that they may, after completion of the internal dispute resolution process, submit a written request to the state personnel director (external dispute resolution process) for disputes concerning the application of the CDPS performance management program or full payment of a performance salary adjustment [refer to Section IV.E). The notice includes deadlines for filing; lists of what must be included in the request; and the address for filing.

The External Stage of the Dispute Resolution Process is administered by the State Personnel Director. Only those original issues involving the application of the Department's performance plan to the individual performance plan and/or evaluation, or full payment of a performance salary adjustment, may advance to this stage. Disputes are not grievances or appeals.

B. Parameters of this Resolution Process

1. Members may dispute only the following issues under this Dispute Resolution Process:
 - a. Their own performance plan, or lack of a plan during the planning cycle
 - b. Their own final overall rating, or lack of a final rating for a planning cycle
 - c. The application of the CDPS Performance Management Program, policies, or process to the individual member's plan and/or evaluation
 - d. Full payment of any performance salary adjustment
2. The following issues are not disputable under this Dispute Resolution Process:
 - a. The evaluations or salary adjustments of any other members
 - b. The content of the CDPS Performance Management Program
 - c. Matters related to the funds appropriated for performance salary adjustments

- d. The amount of a performance salary adjustment, including whether it is base or non-base building, any combination, or none (if relevant to new pay plan), unless the issue involves the application of the Department's Performance Management Program.
 - e. Any interim rating
3. Appointing authorities will be the decision-makers in the internal dispute resolution process. The dispute will be heard by the appointing authority (PMP decision maker) and a timely decision rendered after all relevant information has been reviewed. Within CDPS, the PMP decision makers are:
 - For EDO, OPSFS, AND CICJIS, the CDPS Deputy Executive Director
 - For CSP, the Region Commander (Lieutenant Colonel) or Chief
 - For DCJ, the DCJ Director
 - For CBI, the CBI Director

The appointing authority or PMP decision maker must be at least one level higher than the reviewer. In all cases, if the appointing authority or PMP decision maker was the rater or reviewer, the CDPS Executive Director will be the PMP decision maker.

4. Decision makers are limited to addressing facts surrounding the current action and shall not substitute their judgment for that of the rater and reviewer, but may instruct raters to:
 - a. Follow the Department's program
 - b. Correct errors
 - c. Reconsider a performance rating or plan
 - d. Suggest other appropriate processes (for example, provide further documentation supporting a rating)

The decision-maker cannot make a decision that would alter the Department's Performance Management Program (PMP).

5. Only issues originally presented in writing shall be considered throughout the resolution process.
6. A copy of each final decision made within a division or the EDO shall be promptly forwarded to the CDPS Human Resource Services Director.

C. Internal Process for Disputes Concerning Performance Plans

1. Any disagreement regarding PMP should be resolved at the lowest possible level. The first step in resolving a PMP disagreement is for the member to have an informal discussion with the first-level supervisor.

2. If the disagreement is not resolved after an informal meeting with the first-level supervisor, the member can initiate the dispute resolution process by submitting it in writing to the next-level supervisor (reviewer). If not resolved, the process advances through the chain of command to the appointing authority or the delegated decision-maker.
 - a. A member who still disagrees with the performance plan, or WHO does not have a plan, after the initial review meeting with the supervisor [see Section II.A) can initiate the Dispute Resolution Process. This process must be initiated in writing within seven (7) calendar days of the meeting with the supervisor or the plan will become final without the member's signature. The written request for a review must include the issues that remain in dispute and it must be made to the member's next-level supervisor (reviewer). If the member does not take this step, the disagreement/dispute is considered resolved and the performance plan becomes final, with or without the member's signature.
 - b. When conducting a review, the next-level supervisor will review the plan, after receiving written responses to the member's request for review from the member's supervisor. A meeting among all of the parties may also be held. The reviewer will have 5 work days from the date of receiving a request for review to reach a decision, which must be in writing and given to the member and the supervisor. If the dispute is not resolved at this level, the member may request a review from the next level in the chain of command, and if not resolved, the process continues up the chain of command to the decision maker (the appointing authority or delegate. The decision maker will have five (5) work days from the date of receiving a request for review to render a written decision. These time lines may be waived upon the mutual agreement of the member and the appointing authority/decision maker.
3. If the request reaches the decision maker and if the decision maker is the appointing authority's delegate, the appointing authority will also be notified of the decision.
4. The appointing authority's or decision maker's decision on issues involving an individual performance plan concludes the Internal Stage of the Dispute Resolution Process and is final and binding. (State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures P-8-17.A.)
5. Members who do not receive a performance plan from their supervisor by April 30th of each year shall inform their immediate supervisor's supervisor (next-level supervisor or reviewer). The next-level supervisor must provide the member with a written plan by May 15th.

D. Internal Process for Disputes Concerning Performance Evaluations

1. A member who disagrees with the final evaluation after a review meeting with the supervisor can initiate the Dispute Resolution Process. This process (see Section II.B.12) must be initiated, in writing, within seven (7) calendar days of the meeting with the supervisor, or the evaluation will become final without the member's signature. The written request for a review must include the issues that remain in dispute and it must be made to the member's next-level supervisor (reviewer). If the member does not take this step, the disagreement/ dispute is considered resolved and the performance evaluation becomes final, with or without the member's signature.
2. When conducting a review, the next-level supervisor will review the evaluation after receiving written responses to the member's request for review from the member's supervisor. A meeting among all of the involved parties may also be held. The reviewer will have five (5) work days from the date of receiving a request for review to reach a decision, which must be in writing and given to the member and supervisor. If the dispute is not resolved at this level, the member may request a review from the next level in the chain of command, and if not resolved, the process continues up the chain of command to the decision maker (appointing authority or delegate). Since the timetable for tracking evaluations and allocating performance salary adjustments is very short, a written decision must be made within five (5) work days of the receipt of the request at each level of the chain of command. These time lines may be waived upon the mutual agreement of the member and the appointing authority/decision maker.
3. If the request reaches the decision maker and if the decision maker is the appointing authority's delegate, the appointing authority will also be notified of the decision.
4. The appointing authority's or decision maker's decision on issues involving an individual performance evaluation concludes the Internal Stage of the Dispute Resolution Process and is final and binding. (Chapter 8 of *State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures*)

E. The External Stage of the Dispute Resolution Process

1. As required by State Personnel Rules and Administrative Procedures, the External Stage of the CDPS Dispute Resolution Process provides for the review of a member's written request by the State Personnel Director. The State Personnel Director shall establish time lines regarding the deadlines for filing and completion of the process, which shall be contained in Chapter 8 of the State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures.
 - a. A member must exhaust the remedies provided for by the Internal Stage of the process before proceeding to the External Stage.
 - b. The review at the External Stage is limited to:

- 1) Application of the Department's performance management plan to the individual member's plan or final rating, or lack of a final rating.
 - 2) Full payment of a salary adjustment.
2. A member's written request for review by the State Personnel Director must be made within five (5) working days of the Department's final decision. A copy of the original written dispute and the final Department decision must be included with the member's written appeal to the State Personnel Director. Only original issues concerning those matters that are disputable are allowed at this stage. No new issues are allowed.
3. A written decision is issued within 30 days of receipt. The decision is final and binding.

B

Budget officer	
CDPS.....	9
Budget officers	
division.....	10

C

CDPS 221.....	7, 11, 12, 15, 17, 24, 27, 37
Coaching	4, 12, 16
Collection of information.....	5
Competency	5, 6, 7, 14, 15
Corrective action.....	5, 14, 17, 18, 26
Customer	4, 21

D

Department of personnel.....	35
Disciplinary action	5, 13, 16, 18, 22, 35
Dispute Resolution Process.....	8, 11, 13, 17, 26, 27, 29, 30
Distinguishing Levels of Performance.....	7

E

Evaluation cycle	
annual.....	5

F

Feedback	4, 12, 16, 20
continuous	4
final performance ratings	<i>See Performance Ratings, final</i>
Forced distribution	
not established or tolerated.....	7
prohibited in statute.....	35

G

Guiding principles	
PMP.....	3

H

HRS Director.....	20, 23, 25, 27
Human Resource Services	3
director	3

I

Individual Performance Objectives (IPOs).....	8, 14, 15
Information	
collection of.....	5

L

Labels
 performance rating levels 5
 Level 1
 performance pay eligibility 6
 Level 1 (Does Not Meet Standards)
 definition 5
 Level 2
 performance pay eligibility 6, 9
 Level 2 (Meets Standards)
 definition 6
 Level 3
 performance pay eligibility 6, 9
 Level 3 (Frequently Exceeds Standards)
 definition 6
 Level 4
 eligible for non-base building adjustment..... 9
 Performance pay eligibility 6, 9
 Level 4 (Consistently Exceeds Standards)
 definition 6
 Levels
 rating 5
 Levels of Performance
 Distinguishing 7

M

Mission
 Department..... 3

P

Pay-Out Rules
 General State System 10
 Performance improvement plan 5, 16
 Performance management
 report due annually to State Pers. Dir. (statute) 36
 Performance Management Program Team..... 3
 Performance plan 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 27, 29
 no surprises..... 4
 Performance rating
 differences among members 7
 Performance Rating
 levels 5
 Performance Ratings 5
 Performance Ratings, final..... 7
 Performance Salary Adjustments
 allocation of funds..... 8

base-building	9
date effective	8
non-base building	9
non-base building, due to member on July 1st.....	9
not guaranteed, per statute.....	36
overview	8
Performance system	
statutory requirements.....	35
Performance-based management	4
Performance-based pay	4
Performance-Based Pay	3
planning and evaluation	
form	7
PMP Team.....	3, 20
Policy Director	1
Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ).....	8
Q	
Quotas	
not established or tolerated.....	7
R	
Rating Criteria.....	7
Reviewer	8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 28, 29, 30
S	
Senior Executive Service	4
Standards of professional conduct	8
State Department of Personnel, Personnel Board Rules and Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures.....	<i>See State Personnel Rules and Administrative Procedures</i>
State personnel director.....	8, 35, 36
State Personnel Rules and Administrative Procedures	6, 19, 26, 30
Statutory salary lid	9, 22
Subjectivity	8
Supervisor	
subject to demotion (statute)	36
who fails to evaluate (statute)	36

Appendix 1

COLORADO REVISED STATUTES 24-50-104,
REGARDING PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION
(as of 2004 Legislative Session)

(c) (I) Based on a system of performance management and evaluation, the state personnel director shall adopt procedures for periodic salary increases for employees in the state personnel system based on performance.

(II) The Department of personnel shall develop guidelines and coordinate a performance system pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (I) of this paragraph (c) that:

(A) Is simple and understandable to employees in the state personnel system;

(B) (Deleted by amendment, L. 2003, p. 1931, § 5, effective May 22, 2003.)

(C) Is developed with input from employees in the state personnel system, managers, and other affected parties;

(D) Emphasizes planning, management, and evaluation of employee performance;

(E) Includes uniform and consistent guidelines for all state Departments and institutions of higher education;

(F) Prohibits a forced distribution of performance ratings; and

(G) Authorizes individual and group performance awards.

(III) (Deleted by amendment, L. 2003, p. 1931, § 5, effective May 22, 2003.)

(IV) The state personnel director may authorize state Departments and institutions of higher education to establish a program for the particular state Department or institution to implement the performance system prepared by the Department of personnel in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph (c). The state personnel director shall encourage state Departments and institutions of higher education to implement performance evaluations of employees that are as objective as possible and that, as soon as possible and wherever feasible, include an assessment from multiple sources of each employee's performance. Such sources shall include, where applicable, the employee's self-assessment, the employee's superiors, subordinates, peers, and any other applicable sources of an employee's performance. The state personnel director shall adopt procedures to establish a process to resolve employee disputes related to performance evaluations that do not result in corrective or disciplinary action against the employee. Each program established by a state Department or institution of higher education pursuant to this subparagraph (IV) shall be subject to the director's approval. Except as provided in paragraph (d) of subsection (5) of this section,

salaries may be increased or left unchanged subject to available appropriations for the performance system; except that no annual increase shall be guaranteed.

(c.5) (I) The state personnel director shall provide for the evaluation of employee performance. Each employee shall be evaluated at least once a year. The evaluation of performance shall be used as a factor in compensation, promotions, demotions, removals, reduction of force, and all other transactions as determined by the state personnel director in which considerations of quality of service are properly a factor.

(II) A supervisor, including a supervisory state employee not within the state personnel system, who does not evaluate subordinate employees in the state personnel system as required by this paragraph (c.5) on at least an annual basis shall be suspended from work without pay for a period of not less than one workweek. The provisions of this subparagraph (II) shall only apply to supervisors who are state employees.

(III) The head of each principal Department and each state-supported institution of higher education, respectively, shall determine annually on May 1 whether each supervisor in the Department or institution has completed the mandatory performance evaluation required for each employee in the state personnel system during the preceding twelve months. If any evaluations have still not been completed by July 1, the supervisor may be subject to demotion. If a supervisor has not timely completed annual performance evaluations for two consecutive years, the supervisor shall be demoted to a non supervisory position.

(IV) The state personnel director shall adopt procedures for the implementation of the provisions of this paragraph (c.5). Nothing in this paragraph (c.5) shall be construed to limit the ability of the state personnel director to provide for additional sanctions for noncompliance with the provisions of this paragraph (c.5).

(V) The state personnel director shall monitor compliance with the requirements of this paragraph (c.5) and paragraph (c) of this subsection (1) and shall annually report the director's findings pertaining to the prior fiscal year no later than January 1 of the following fiscal year to the joint budget committee of the general assembly. The report shall include, by Department or institution, the number of supervisors who were suspended or demoted, the percentage of all supervisors who complied with the requirements of this paragraph (c.5), the total amount of dollars appropriated for performance awards, the total amount of such dollars that were awarded to employees for performance awards, and the total amount of those dollars awarded for each performance category.

THIS SECTION IS STILL PENDING!!!

CDPS PMP Forms

CDPS 221 Performance Management Plan & Evaluation Form –
Use is mandatory throughout the Department

CDPS 222 Progress Review Form – Use is optional

CDPS 223 Performance Improvement Plan – Use is mandatory, along with official
corrective action form for Level 1 ratings

CDPS 224 CDPS Performance Management Plan (PMP) Assessment Worksheet –
Use is mandatory through the Department

**Colorado Department of Public Safety
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN & EVALUATION FORM**

IDENTIFICATION

Name (Print): _____ Personnel Number: _____

Planning/Evaluation Period From _____ To _____ Evaluation (circle one): Annual Other _____

Classification Title: _____ Division: _____ Org. Unit No. _____
Member's
Supervisor's Printed Name: _____ Supervisor's Pers. Number: _____ Supervisor's Position No: _____

PLANNING SECTION

The member has been provided a Performance Management Plan.

INTERIM PROGRESS REVIEW HELD

Supervisor Initial _____

Date _____

Member Initial _____

Supervisor Signature

I agree disagree* with this performance plan. _____

Member Signature _____ Date _____

Member should explain disagreement* in the "Comments From the Member Regarding the Plan" area on page 6.

EVALUATION SECTION

FINAL OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING (information from Page 5)

TOTAL POINTS

THE FINAL OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING FOR THE ENTIRE PERIOD WAS (check one):

- Level 1 — Does Not Meet Standards Level 3 — Frequently Exceeds Standards
 Level 2 — Meets Standards Level 4 — Consistently Exceeds Standards

Supervisor Signature _____ Date _____

Reviewer Signature _____ Date _____ Reviewer's Printed Name _____

I agree disagree* with this performance evaluation.

Member Signature _____ Date _____

Member should explain disagreement* in the "Comments From the Member Regarding the Plan" area on page 6.

* The member may initiate the Internal Dispute Resolution Process concerning this performance plan or evaluation within five (5) working days following the date when the member received the plan or rating. The member must follow the CDPS Dispute Resolution Process of the CDPS Performance Management Plan (see page 7). (If the member refuses to sign, the rater should note the refusal on the Member Signature line, and indicate the date on which the member refused on the line for the Date of the member's signature.) If the member does not initiate the dispute resolution process, the disagreement/dispute is considered resolved and the plan or evaluation becomes final, with or without the member's signature.

The member may attach comments to this evaluation, either by using the space provided on page 6 or by attaching a separate sheet.

NOTE: Statements in each evaluation area are written as *LEVEL 2 — Meets Standards* statements

COMMUNICATION (required for all State Employees)					
		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Keeps others informed in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ensures communications are clear, concise, easily understood, and grammatically correct.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Actively listens and asks effective questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS (required for all State Employees)					
		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Treats others professionally, with dignity, respect, and courtesy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contributes to a productive work environment and positive relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maintains self-control and composure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Balances individual and group efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Promotes intra- and interagency cooperation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides and accepts constructive feedback in a positive manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CUSTOMER SERVICE (required for all State Employees)					
		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Works effectively with internal/external customers (clients, co-workers, peers, and all contacts) to satisfy service and/or product expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ORGANIZATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY (required for all State Employees)					
		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Member's work behaviors demonstrate responsible personal & professional conduct, which contribute to the overall goals and objectives of the Department of Public Safety.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adheres to laws, regulations, policies, rules, and procedures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performance demonstrates commitment to the department's values, goals, missions, vision, and philosophies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Observes duty hours.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adapts to changing conditions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Positively represents the department.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING					
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

KEY TO RATING LEVELS
(Definitions on Page 4)

- Level 4: Member consistently exceeds standards.
- Level 3: Member frequently exceeds standards
- Level 2: Member consistently meets standards.
- Level 1: Member consistently or significantly does not meet standards.

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE (required for all CDPS Members)		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates job knowledge and proficiency.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maintains confidentiality of information acquired during course of employment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Performs duties/tasks in a timely and accurate manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ensures a safe and secure work environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Is proficient in the operation and care of equipment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exercises sound fiscal responsibility.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUPERVISION/MANAGEMENT (required for all State Employees who supervise one or more members)		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Effectively implements and administers the CDPS Performance Management program within his/her span of control.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Develops, positively influences, motivates and challenges subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adapts leadership style to a variety of situations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Plans, supports, and provides assistance, resources, and direction in accomplishing objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriately delegates while maintaining responsibility.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Effectively utilizes available resources to accomplish objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exercises sound financial management.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates ability to make appropriate, timely, logical decisions using all available information and assesses the potential impact.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adheres to the Department's affirmative action principles and policy, while ensuring a work environment free from harassment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OPTIONAL:		May be used for an additional competency area at the supervisor's and member's discretion. May also be used for additional IPOs. <u>A member should have no more than 12 IPOs (total) in the annual plan.</u>			
		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OPTIONAL:		May be used for an additional competency area at the supervisor's and member's discretion. May also be used for additional IPOs. <u>A member should have no more than 12 IPOs (total) in the annual plan.</u>			
		1	2	3	4
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	IPO:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OVERALL COMPETENCY RATING		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

KEY TO RATING LEVELS
(Definitions on Page 4)

- Level 4: Member consistently exceeds standards.
- Level 3: Member frequently exceeds standards
- Level 2: Member consistently meets standards.
- Level 1: Member consistently or significantly does not meet standards.

Rating Levels – Definitions:

Level 1 (Does Not Meet Standards): This rating level encompasses those members whose performance does not consistently and independently meet expectations set forth in the performance plan, as well as those members whose performance is clearly unsatisfactory and consistently fails to meet requirements and expectations. Marginal performance requires substantial monitoring to achieve consistent completion of work, and requires more constant, close supervision. Though these members do not meet expectations, they may be progressing satisfactorily toward a level 2 rating and need to demonstrate improvement in order to satisfy the core expectations of the position.

Level 2 (Meets Standards): This rating level encompasses a range of expected performance. It includes those members who exhibit competency in the work behaviors, skills, and assignments for the job, as well as those employees who are successfully developing in the job. These members are meeting all the expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives on their performance plan and, on occasion, may exceed them. This is the member who reliably performs the job assigned. Level 2 performers are successful and valued members of the department.

Level 3 (Frequently Exceeds Standards): This rating level encompasses the accomplished performers who consistently exhibit the desired competencies effectively and independently, while frequently exceeding expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives of the job assigned. For example, the member may have participated in one or more projects or groups, over and above what would normally be assigned to the position during the evaluation year, or may have been called upon to serve in an “acting” or similar capacity at some point. Their work has a documented impact beyond the regular assignments, and performance objectives that directly support the mission of the organization.

Level 4 (Consistently Exceeds Standards): This rating represents consistently exceptional and documented performance or consistently superior achievement beyond the regular assignment. Members make exceptional contribution(s) that have a significant and positive impact on the performance of the unit or the organization, and may materially advance the mission of the organization. The member provides a model for excellence and helps others to do their jobs better. Peers, immediate supervisors, higher-level management and others can readily recognize such a level of performance. Level 4 is unique and difficult to achieve. This person is a role model.
NOTE: A single unique or unusual contribution during a rating period does not provide sufficient justification for an overall Level 4 rating for the year.

The State Personnel Director defines a **competency** as a measurable pattern of skills, knowledge, abilities, behaviors, and other characteristics that an individual needs to perform work roles or occupational functions successfully.

PERFORMANCE PLANNING NARRATIVE (If more space needed, please ADD A PAGE AFTER page 8):

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION NARRATIVE (If more space needed, please ADD A PAGE AFTER page 8):

AN OVERALL RATING OF LEVEL 1—DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS REQUIRES A COMPLETED CDPS 223 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN, WHICH MUST BE ATTACHED TO THIS FORM. A CORRECTIVE ACTION IS ALSO REQUIRED TO BE PROCESSED (DO NOT ATTACH HERE).

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - RATING

COMPETENCY AREA TITLES	WEIGHT	X (TIMES) RATING				=	POINTS
		1	2	3	4		
	%					DECIMAL FACTOR if used	
_____	_____	<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"/>	<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"/>		_____
_____	_____	<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"/>	<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"/>		_____
_____	_____	<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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		_____

THE "WEIGHT" COLUMN MUST TOTAL **100%**

CURRENT RATING – POINTS

ANY COMPETENCY AREA(S) RATED AT **LEVEL 1— DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS** REQUIRES(S) A WRITTEN EXPLANATION OF THAT RATING. (USE THE SPACE ON PAGE 6 FOR THE EXPLANATION.)

IF ONE OR MORE INTERIM RATINGS WERE REQUIRED DURING RATING PERIOD, COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING TO DETERMINE THE FINAL ANNUAL RATING:

1. Enter the Interim Points Earned for each interim rating in column A.
2. Determine the months covered by each interim rating and convert months to decimal (see figure at right, below).
3. Enter the decimal for months covered for each interim rating in column B.
4. Multiply the interim total points earned by the decimal figure; enter result in column C for each interim rating.
5. Add the adjusted interim point ratings to arrive at the overall annual rating.

Column A		Column B		Column C	
INTERIM POINTS EARNED	X	DECIMAL	=	ADJUSTED INTERIM POINT RATING	
Date	X	_____		_____	1 month = 0.08
Date	X	_____		_____	2 months = 0.17
Date	X	_____		_____	3 months = 0.25
Date	X	_____		_____	4 months = 0.33
					5 months = 0.42
					6 months = 0.50
					7 months = 0.58
					8 months = 0.67
					9 months = 0.75
					10 months = 0.83
					11 months = 0.92
FINAL ANNUAL RATING				<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	

CONVERSION TABLE (FROM TOTAL POINTS EARNED TO OVERALL RATING LEVEL) CHECK BOX BELOW:

100-175 Points = Level 1 — Does Not Meet Standards

281-360 Points = Level 3 — Frequently Exceeds Standards

176-280 Points = Level 2 — Meets Standards

361-400 Points = Level 4 — Consistently Exceeds Standards

FINAL OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING = 1 2 3 4

AN OVERALL RATING OF **LEVEL 1—DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS** REQUIRES A COMPLETED CDPS 223 PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN, WHICH MUST BE ATTACHED TO THIS FORM. A CORRECTIVE ACTION IS ALSO REQUIRED TO BE PROCESSED (DO NOT ATTACH HERE).

ANY COMPETENCY AREA(S) RATED AT **LEVEL 1— DOES NOT MEET STANDARDS** REQUIRES(S) A WRITTEN EXPLANATION OF THAT RATING. (If more space needed, please ADD A PAGE AFTER page 8)

COMMENTS FROM THE MEMBER REGARDING THE PLAN (If more space needed, please ADD A PAGE AFTER page 8):

COMMENTS FROM THE MEMBER REGARDING THE EVALUATION (If more space needed, please ADD A PAGE AFTER page 8):

OTHER INFORMATION PERTINENT TO PLAN AND/OR EVALUATION (If more space needed, please ADD A PAGE AFTER page 8):

If applicable, member has met all CDPS training requirements (CDPS 225 is attached)..

INSTRUCTIONS: The original of this form (the plan) should be kept by the supervisor in the local personnel file until the plan is closed by a final evaluation (annual, separation, transfer, etc.). Once the plan and evaluation are complete, the original form should be sent to the CDPS Human Resource Services Office at Headquarters. For the annual cycle, which begins April 1st and runs through March 31st, the plan must be completed by April 30th. Please refer to the CDPS Performance Management Program document for other important time lines and information.

Performance Management Evaluation Dispute Resolution Process

This area of the form should be completed, initialed and dated, by the supervisor. Then a copy of the entire CDPS 221 form, including these pages 7 and 8, should be given to the member at the time of the final performance evaluation. **The "Date Given to Member", below, must be the date that the final evaluation is given to the member.**

Member's Appointing Authority (or PMP decision maker) is: _____

(Appointing Authority or Designee - contact HRS if unsure)

Supervisor's Initials: _____ Date Given to Member: _____

The Dispute Resolution Process consists of two stages, an Internal Stage and an External Stage. As required by State system parameters, the State Personnel Director retains jurisdiction for disputes related to performance evaluations that do not result in corrective or disciplinary actions. State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures, Chapter 8, specify that disputes are not subject to the Personnel Board's grievance process unless a corrective action is involved or discrimination is alleged.

CDPS encourages resolution of disputes at the lowest level. The purpose of this process is to resolve disputes concerning performance management that may arise between a member and supervisor. This process will be open and impartial, and is not intended to be legalistic or adversarial. It is not a grievance or appeal.

CDPS Internal Stage:

1. A dispute should be resolved at the lowest possible level. The first step in the resolution of a disagreement (or dispute) about your performance evaluation is for you to informally discuss it with your supervisor. You must request this meeting, in writing, within five (5) work days of being given your final evaluation (see "**Date Given to Member**", above). This meeting must be held within five (5) days of your supervisor's (rater's) receipt of the written request. It should be approached as a problem-solving action, not as a legal or adversarial meeting. The rater (supervisor) and the member may agree to make changes to the final evaluation, if a consensus can be reached.
2. If you still disagree with the final evaluation after meeting with your supervisor, you can initiate the Dispute Resolution Process, in writing, within seven (7) calendar days of the meeting with your supervisor. The written request for a review must be made to your next-level supervisor (your supervisor's supervisor, who is also the reviewer). If you do not take this step, the dispute is considered resolved and the performance evaluation becomes final, with or without your signature.
3. You may dispute only the following issues under this Dispute Resolution Process:
 - a. Your own final overall rating, or lack of a final rating for a planning cycle
 - b. The application of the CDPS Performance Management Program, policies, or process to your evaluation
 - c. Full payment of any performance salary adjustment
4. You may not dispute:
 - a. The evaluations or performance salary adjustments of any other members
 - b. The content of the CDPS Performance Management Program
 - c. Matters related to the funds appropriated for performance salary adjustments
 - d. The amount of a performance salary adjustment, unless the issue involves the application of the Department's Performance Management Program.
 - e. Any interim rating
5. You and your supervisor may have an advisor present, but you are expected to represent and speak for yourselves. This does not translate to an absolute right to legal representation. Please refer to the *State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures* for the definition of an advisor. Staff of the CDPS Human Resource Services Section may assist you only with information about rules, process, and procedures. They should not advise you or your supervisor how to approach a specific concern or give any advice relating to the substance of the dispute.

6. When conducting a review, the next-level supervisor (reviewer) will review your evaluation after receiving written responses to your request for review from your supervisor. A meeting with you, your supervisor, and the reviewer may be held. The reviewer will have five (5) working days from the date of receiving your request for review to reach a decision. The decision must be in writing, and be given to you and to your supervisor.
7. If you feel the dispute is not yet resolved at this level, you may request a review from the next level in the chain of command. You must make this request, in writing, within seven (7) calendar days of the date of the written decision. If the dispute is not resolved at that level, the process continues up the chain of command to the decision maker (appointing authority or delegate). A written decision must be made within five (5) work days of the receipt of the request at each level of the chain of command. You have seven (7) calendar days from the date of each written decision to request a review at each level of the chain of command. These time lines may be waived if you and the appointing authority/decision maker both agree to do so.
8. Only issues originally presented in writing shall be considered throughout the resolution process.
9. If your request reaches the level of the PMP decision maker, and if the decision maker is the appointing authority's delegate, the appointing authority will also be notified of the decision.
10. The appointing authority's or decision maker's decision on issues involving your performance evaluation concludes the Internal Stage of the Dispute Resolution Process, and is final and binding. (*State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures, Chapter 8.*)
11. All members should treat each other with respect and courtesy throughout the process. Retaliatory behavior toward any person involved in this process is prohibited (*State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures P-8-19.*).
12. If the dispute concerns your final performance evaluation, resolution of the dispute shall occur within the Internal Stage. You will have no further recourse for resolution.
13. If your dispute concerns the application of the Department's Performance Management Program, policies or processes, or full payment of a performance salary adjustment (if relevant), the dispute may proceed beyond the Internal Stage (department level) to the State Personnel Director (External Stage) after completion of the Internal Stage process.

External Stage (State Personnel Director):

1. The External Stage of the Dispute Resolution Process is administered by the State Personnel Director. Only those original issues involving the application of the Department's performance plan to your performance evaluation, or full payment of a performance salary adjustment, may advance to this stage.
2. Your written request for review by the State Personnel Director must be made within five (5) working days of the Department's final decision. A copy of the original written dispute and final Department decision must be included with your written appeal to the State Personnel Director. Only original issues concerning those matters that are disputable are allowed at this stage. No new issues are allowed. Mail your request and documentation to:
State Personnel Director, 1313 Sherman Street, Denver CO, 80203.
3. The Personnel Director will select a neutral third party to make the decision regarding the dispute. A written decision will be issued within 30 days of receipt. The decision is final and binding.

Refer to the *State Personnel Board Rules and State Personnel Director's Administrative Procedures, Chapters 6 - Performance, and 8 - Dispute Resolution* for complete information regarding dispute resolution for performance management evaluations. These rules are available: On the Internet at http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/gss/hr/rules/ruleshome.htm
On the CDPS HRS web page at: www.cdpsweb.state.co.us/hr/ and click on [Rules](#)
From CDPS Human Resource Services Section (303.239.4427)