

# Rating Guide

## Performance Management Program for Executives



# The EX Performance Management Directive requires that:

Performance awards cannot be authorized in the absence of a valid performance agreement and an assessment of performance against it

- The manager and executive discuss expectations i.e. commitments, performance measures and demonstration of the [Key Leadership Competencies](#) at the beginning of the cycle.
- At year-end, managers are required to document executive performance within the performance agreement module of the ETMS. A description of the results achieved, the “*what*”, and the extent to which the key leadership competencies were demonstrated, the “*how*”, **are required to be documented in two distinct and separate narrative assessments.**
- The Deputy Minister establishes a review committee, or a similar mechanism, to ensure equity and consistency in the assessment of executive performance across the organization. The DM is ultimately responsible for reviewing and finalizing performance ratings for all executives in the organization.



# Rating Guide – “WHAT”

Assessment		What
		Performance against commitments, as well as the relative scope and complexity of the challenges faced. Rating is based on results achieved.
Level 5	Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivered on all commitments and exceeded expectations <u>in the delivery of major commitments</u>.</li> <li>Consistently delivers results that provide exceptional value to stakeholders and the Department.</li> <li>Truly exceptional performance.</li> </ul>
Level 4	Succeeded Plus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivered on all commitments and exceeded the performance expectations.</li> <li>Fully succeeded in a position of greater scope and complexity in relation to those of other executives at the same group and level. This rating also applies to executives who have undertaken significant special assignments or projects in addition to successfully performing their regular duties.</li> <li>Is recognized as a strong contributor to stakeholders and organizational successes.</li> </ul>
Level 3	Succeeded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has fully achieved the performance expectations.</li> <li>Delivered on all commitments.</li> <li>A strong contributor to stakeholders and organizational successes.</li> </ul>
Level 2	Succeeded Minus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This rating should be seen as a meaningful contributor to the organization. It acknowledges a satisfactory performance while leaving room for employee development in delivery of commitments.</li> <li>Did not fully succeed in meeting performance expectations.</li> <li>While succeeded, it was in a position with performance expectations of less scope and complexity in relation to those of other executive jobs at the level.</li> <li>Performance results indicate a need for development in some areas; still evolving and stabilizing in role as an executive.</li> <li>Role may not allow the individual to demonstrate their strengths. Individual may require a move that will provide a better job fit and a match of skills and abilities.</li> </ul>
Level 1	Did not meet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not achieve performance expectations.</li> <li>Delivered on some but did not deliver on one or more of the most important commitments.</li> <li>Performance results fall below expected standards.</li> <li>A performance improvement action plan must be developed to address performance issues.</li> </ul>
Level 0	Unable to assess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The performance of some executives cannot be assessed for a variety of reasons such as insufficient time in the position.</li> <li>This does not mean that the individual has not established a performance agreement, just that there has been insufficient opportunity for achievement against the commitments.</li> </ul>

In assessing executives against their individual commitments, the following elements should be taken into consideration: the extent to which they have achieved results against their individual commitments; the extent to which they have contributed to the organizational achievements with respect to the corporate commitment; and the extent to which they have demonstrated the Key Leadership Competencies (KLC).



# Rating Guide – “HOW”

Assessment		<u>How :</u> Rating is based on observable behaviours or actions related to Key Leadership Competencies
Level 5	Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In delivering commitments, exemplifies (role model) the competencies that are most critical to the executive’s role (outstanding demonstration of the competency, virtually no, or only very minor weakness; demonstration of the competency greatly facilitated delivery on commitments).</li> <li>Role model in demonstrating all key leadership competencies.</li> <li>Specific effective behaviours are demonstrated all of the time.</li> <li>Demonstrated effectiveness in all the Key Leadership Competencies and mastery of several.</li> </ul>
Level 4	Succeeded Plus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In delivering commitments, clearly and fully demonstrated competencies that are most critical to the executive’s role (solidly demonstrated the competency, demonstrations of the competency facilitated delivery on commitments).</li> <li>Specific effective behaviours are demonstrated consistently.</li> <li>Demonstrated effectiveness in all the Key Leadership Competencies and mastery of some.</li> </ul>
Level 3	Succeeded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In delivering commitments, clearly demonstrated competencies that are most critical to the executive’s role (demonstrated the competency, demonstrations of the competency facilitated delivery on commitments).</li> <li>Specific effective behaviours are demonstrated frequently.</li> <li>Demonstrated all the Key Leadership Competencies in an appropriate manner.</li> </ul>
Level 2	Succeeded Minus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In delivering commitments, demonstrated a need for improvement in the competencies that are most critical to the executive’s role (demonstrated the competency, but delivery on commitments could have been notably enhanced by stronger skills).</li> <li>Failed to demonstrate Key Leadership Competencies in how results were achieved.</li> <li>Executives newly appointed to their level who did not demonstrate all Key Competencies at expected maturity.</li> <li>Definite weaknesses evident in how the results were achieved.</li> <li>Specific effective behaviours are demonstrated some of the time, but not consistently.</li> <li>Did not demonstrate some Key Leadership Competencies in a manner which would be appropriate for his/her position.</li> <li>Difficult to ascertain leadership competencies in this role. Individual may require a move that will provide a better job fit and a match of skills and abilities.</li> </ul>
Level 1	Did not meet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In delivering commitments, had ongoing difficulty in demonstrating the competencies that are most critical to the executive’s role (weakness in demonstrating the competency, interfered with delivery on objectives).</li> <li>Evidence of ineffective behaviours.</li> </ul>
Level 0	Unable to assess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The performance of some executives cannot be assessed for a variety of reasons such as insufficient time in the position.</li> <li>Did not demonstrate the Key Leadership Competencies.</li> <li>This does not mean that the individual has not established a performance agreement, just that there has been insufficient opportunity for achievement against the commitments.</li> </ul>

The Key Leadership Competencies (KLCs) constitute the leadership skills, abilities and characteristics that are needed in the Public Service to meet the challenges of today going forward. The KLCs are assessed in terms of observable behaviours or actions.

# Rating

The matrix below provides a uniform approach to help managers determine **one** integrated rating for results achieved against the “What” and the “How”.

**Note:** Proposed ratings are discussed at Review Committee and final decision rests with the Deputy Minister.

		<b>“What”</b> : Results achieved against commitments, as well as the relative scope and complexity of the challenges.				
		1 Did Not Meet	2 Succeeded Minus	3 Succeeded	4 Succeeded Plus	5 Surpassed
<b>“How”:</b> Evaluation is based on observable behaviours or actions related to Key Leadership Competencies	5 Surpassed	2	3	4	4	5
	4 Succeeded Plus	2	3	3	4	4
	3 Succeeded	2	2	3	3	4
	2 Succeeded Minus	1	2	2	3	3
	1 Did Not Meet	1	1	2	2	2
		<b>Final Rating</b> To be reported to TBS and upon which the performance award will be based				



# Key Leadership Competencies

## **Create Vision and Strategy**

Leaders define the future and chart a path forward. They are adept at understanding and communicating context, factoring in the economic, social and political environment. Intellectually agile, they leverage their deep and broad knowledge, build on diverse ideas and perspectives and create consensus around compelling visions. Leaders balance organizational and government-wide priorities and improve outcomes for Canada and Canadians.

## **Mobilize People**

Leaders inspire and motivate the people they lead. They manage performance, provide constructive and respectful feedback to encourage and enable performance excellence. They lead by example, setting goals for themselves that are more demanding than those that they set for others.

## **Uphold Integrity and Respect**

Leaders exemplify ethical practices, professionalism and personal integrity. They create respectful and trusting work environments where sound advice is valued. They encourage the expression of diverse opinions and perspectives, while fostering collegiality. Leaders are self-aware and seek out opportunities for personal growth.

## **Collaborate with Partners and Stakeholders**

Leaders are deliberate and resourceful about seeking the widest possible spectrum of perspectives. They demonstrate openness and flexibility to forge consensus and improve outcomes. They bring a whole-of government perspective to their interactions. In negotiating solutions, they are open to alternatives and skillful at managing expectations. Leaders share recognition with their teams and partners.

## **Promote Innovation and Guide Change**

Leaders have the courage and resilience to challenge convention. They create an environment that supports bold thinking, experimentation and intelligent risk taking. They use setbacks as a valuable source of insight and learning. Leaders take change in their stride, aligning and adjusting milestones and targets to maintain forward momentum.

## **Achieve Results**

Leaders mobilize and manage resources to deliver on the priorities of the Government, improve outcomes and add value. They consider context, risks and business intelligence to support high-quality and timely decisions. They anticipate, plan, monitor progress and adjust as needed. Leaders take personal responsibility for their actions and outcomes of their decisions.



# Review Committees

## Mandate and Role of Review Committees

- Review committees provide advice to deputy heads on the fair and consistent determination of performance ratings and the allocation and sound management of executive performance pay.
- Review committee members develop a clear and common understanding of how performance ratings are applied, distributed and calibrated within their organization.

## Expectations of Review Committee Members

- Review committee members play a critical challenge function. They advise on proposed ratings and performance pay, ensure differentiation between performance levels, and review strategies to address unsatisfactory performance.

## Applying the Rating Scale

- Executive performance is assessed against a five-level rating scale ([Annex C](#)). The following questions can assist in validating its consistent application:
  - In your business context, what is the difference between meeting performance expectations and exceeding them?
  - Is it possible for an executive to “miss the mark” on a commitment, but still receive a *Succeeded* or *Succeeded Plus* rating? If so, under what circumstances?
  - What evidence should the review committee look for to ensure executives demonstrate each of the new key leadership competencies?
  - If an executive has not fully demonstrated some or all of the new key leadership competencies (for example, Mobilizing People) how should his / her performance rating be affected?



# Review Committees (continued)

## Rating Distribution and Calibration

- TBS does not prescribe a specific rating distribution. While it is expected that performance results would reflect a normal distribution, effective rating calibration serves to clarify the difference between levels of performance.
- The following questions may be used to confirm clear differentiation of performance levels and fair and consistent rating decisions:
  - What was the executive's level of accountability and challenge relative to his / her peers?
  - Have similar standards of evidence and performance been applied to executives with similar roles?
  - What was the relative complexity of the organization's goals and the executive's commitments towards those goals?
  - How did this executive's performance contribute to the achievement of organizational success?
  - What factors contributed to this executive's achievements / failures? What actions did he / she take to address feedback received during the performance cycle?





# ESDC Approach “2” Succeeded -

## When should the rule be applied?

- Individuals who have not completed a 12-month performance cycle at their new EX level
- Individuals acting at higher levels

## Why apply the rule?

- Individuals who receive level 2 ratings are considered to be meaningful contributors to the organization with satisfactory performance while leaving room for employee development for any of the following reasons:
  - In delivering commitments, demonstrated a need for improvement in the competencies for executives (demonstrated the competency, but delivery on commitments could have been notably enhanced by stronger skills)
  - Performance results indicate a need for development in some areas (still evolving and stabilizing in their role as executive)
  - Have not had sufficient time to demonstrate competencies at higher levels
  - Did not fully succeed in meeting performance expectations, or delivered on the **most** important commitments but not necessarily on all of them
  - Did succeed in meeting performance expectations, but in a position where performance expectations is of less scope and complexity in relation to those of other EXs at the same level.

## Are exceptions to the rule allowed?

- Yes, exceptions are allowed however, a rationale for the exception must be presented to the Review Committee for approval
  - from Level 2 “Succeeded Minus” to Level 3 “Succeeded” with well substantiated performance results and exceptional Key Leadership Competencies demonstrated
  - from Level 2 “Succeeded Minus” to Level 1 “Did not meet” where performance expectations were not met

