

CONTENTS

10.B. ENLISTED EMPLOYEE REVIEW SYSTEM (EERS)	1
10.B.1. GENERAL	1
10.B.1.a. Purpose	1
10.B.1.b. Policy	1
10.B.2. REQUIRED SUPPORTING REMARKS	1
10.B.2.a. Discussion	1
10.B.2.b. Definitions	3
10.B.3. DESIGNATING OFFICIALS	5
10.B.3.a. Evaluators	5
10.B.3.b. Delegating Approving Official Authority	7
10.B.3.c. Approving Official Supervises Member	7
10.B.3.d. Flag Officer Supervises Member	8
10.B.3.e. Member Assigned to Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS)	8
10.B.4. RESPONSIBILITIES	8
10.B.4.a. The Unit	8
10.B.4.b. The Evaluatee	8
10.B.4.c. The Rating Chain	9
10.B.5. SUBMISSION SCHEDULE	12
10.B.5.a. Regular Employee Reviews	12
10.B.5.b. Special Employee Reviews	14
10.B.6. THE EVALUATION PROCESS	17
10.B.6.a. General	17
10.B.6.b. Documentation	19
10.B.7. THE ADVANCEMENT RECOMMENDATION	19
10.B.8. GOOD CONDUCT AWARD ELIGIBILITY	20
10.B.8.a. Eligibility	20
10.B.8.b. An Unsatisfactory Conduct Mark	20
10.B.9. APPEALS	21
10.B.9.a. General	21
10.B.9.b. Responsibilities	22
10.B.10. WAIVING AND CHANGING EVALUATION MARKS	23
10.B.10.a. Waiving Evaluations	23
10.B.10.b. Changing Evaluation Marks	23

10.B. Enlisted Employee Review System (EERS)

10.B.1. General

10.B.1.a. Purpose

The **Enlisted Employee Review System (EERS)** has been designed to serve several specific purposes:

1. To set standards by which to evaluate the performance and behavior of all enlisted members;
2. To inform enlisted members of the performance standards they will be measured against;
3. To provide a means by which enlisted members can receive feedback on how well they are measuring up to the standards;
4. To capture a valid, reliable assessment of enlisted members' performance, so the Coast Guard may advance and assign members with a high degree of confidence;
5. To provide critical information that may affect discharges, re-enlistments, good conduct, advancement eligibility, and reductions in rate.

The employee review is not only used to document an individual's past performance, but more importantly, to provide a road map for future improvement.

10.B.1.b. Policy

Each commanding officer/officer in charge must ensure all enlisted members under their command receive accurate, fair, objective, and timely employee reviews. To this end, the Service has made enlisted performance criteria as objective as possible, within the scope of jobs and tasks enlisted personnel perform. In using the Enlisted Employee Review System, strict and conscientious adherence to the specific wording of the standards is essential to realizing the purpose of **the employee review process**.

10.B.2. Required Supporting Remarks

10.B.2.a. Discussion

1. **Supporting remarks are required to be submitted along with the employee review, up through the marking chain to address the future leadership potential of all enlisted personnel, E-6 and above, and for any recommended marks of 1, 2, or 7, unsatisfactory conduct mark, or loss of recommendation for advancement. ☞ Articles 10.B.6.a., 10.B.7. and 10.B.9.a.**
 - (a) **Employee reviews that result in assignment of an unsatisfactory conduct mark or low competency marks as defined in ☞ Article 10.B.8.a. must be supported by an adverse remarks entry for:**

- (1) Non-judicial punishment;
 - (2) Court-martial;
 - (3) Civil conviction;
 - (4) Financial irresponsibility;
 - (5) Not supporting dependents;
 - (6) Alcohol incidents; and
 - (7) Not complying with civilian and military rules, regulations, and standards.
- (b) Do not confuse this entry with the many other reasons to **provide supporting remarks when completing an employee review. This entry must either state an NJP, CM, civil conviction or low competency mark (☞ Article 10.B.8.a.)** occurred, or give specific examples of financial irresponsibility, non-support of dependents, alcohol incidents, nonconformance to civilian and military rules, regulations, and standards which discredited the Coast Guard.
- (c) In noncompliance with civilian and military rules, regulations, and standards; a one-time, minor infraction (e.g., late to work) is insufficient to be classified as an adverse **remarks** entry, which, in turn, necessitates conducting a special employee review and terminating Good Conduct Award eligibility. Adverse entries dealing with minor infractions should focus on patterns of unacceptable behavior instead of a one-time minor infraction.
- (d) To clearly distinguish this type of remarks entry from all others, start the entry in the conduct competency field with:
- This is an adverse supporting remarks entry for
- (e) **All employee reviews submitted on enlisted personnel, E-6 and above, are required to include supporting remarks, documenting the individual's leadership potential, along with the commanding officer's advancement recommendation. They must clearly identify the member's current and future potential for positions of greater responsibility. The accuracy of these entries is essential to distinguish individuals requesting to compete for command cadre or special assignment positions.**

10.B.2.b. Definitions

1. **Enlisted Employee Review Management System (EERMS)**. The automated system which assists Commandant (G-W) in monitoring EERS performance, providing system feedback, enforcing enlisted employee review discipline, and serving as the data base of official marks of each member.
2. **Enlisted Employee Review (EER)**. The series of web pages contained in CGHRMS used to report the performance of Coast Guard enlisted

personnel. The EER contains updated performance standards and is a web-based application used to initiate, review and transmit a member's completed employee review.

3. **Enlisted Employee Review System (EERS)**. The Coast Guard system, which addresses the performance appraisal of its enlisted personnel.
4. **Evaluee**. The enlisted member being evaluated.
5. **Competency Types**. The four major categories of performance.
 - a. **Military**. Measures a member's ability to bring credit to the Coast Guard through personal demeanor and professional actions.
 - b. **Performance**. Measures a member's willingness to acquire knowledge and the ability to use knowledge, skill, and direction to accomplish work.
 - c. **Professional Qualities**. Measures those qualities the Coast Guard values in its people.
 - d. **Leadership**. Measures a member's ability to direct, guide, develop, influence, and support others performing work.
6. **Competencies**. The individual elements on which the Coast Guard evaluates its enlisted personnel.
7. **Employee Review Worksheet**. **This form is optional and shall be used only by units without access to CGHRMS. Those units not having CGHRMS access can access the procedures for completing an off-line Employee Review Worksheet at www.uscg.mil/hq/hrsic/Manuals-Pubs-Newsletters/PPPM/PPPM-PDR-BYCHAP/CHAP10.pdf. The Approving Official shall ensure any employee review initiated using a worksheet is properly entered into CGHRMS. In these cases, the unit that entered the review into CGHRMS (typically a unit providing administrative support, e.g. PERSRU, Group Office, etc.) provides the approving official with a copy of the Member Counseling Receipt which reflects the effective status of 'Active'. This printed receipt serves as confirmation to the unit and servicemember that the Employee Review Worksheet was properly recorded into CGHRMS.**
8. **Performance Feedback**. No specific form or forum is prescribed for performance feedback. Performance feedback - formal or informal - actually occurs whenever an evaluee receives any advice or observation from a rating official on their performance or any other matter on which they may be evaluated. Performance feedback can occur during a counseling session, particularly during a mid-period session, through on-the-spot comments about performance, or at the end of the employee review period. Each evaluee must be continuously alert for the "signals" received in one of these ways from the rating chain. If the signals are not clear, the evaluee must ask the rating chain for clarification.

9. **Competency Descriptions.** The written criteria on the **EER** that define objective performance levels within each competency.
10. **Rating Officials.** The individuals responsible for evaluating and helping to motivate the performance and behavior of the evaluatee.
11. **Supervisor.** The Supervisor shall be an officer, civilian, or enlisted person.
 - a. If enlisted, the Supervisor must be at least one pay grade senior to the evaluatee except as noted below:
 - (1) The command may designate a first class petty officer (E-6) as the Supervisor.
 - (2) A supervisor who is a first class petty officer, designated as executive petty officer, does not have to be one pay grade senior to the evaluatee.
 - b. If civilian, must be an official designated as the member's supervisor.
 - c. If necessary, the Marking Official can fill the role of Supervisor.
12. **Marking Official.** The Marking Official shall be an officer, civilian, chief petty officer, or first class petty officer. However, a first class petty officer must be designated as an executive petty officer. A Marking Official who is a designated executive petty officer does not have to be one pay grade senior to the evaluatee.
13. **Approving Official.** The Approving Official must be a Coast Guard officer, officer in charge (E-7 or above), or Coast Guard civilian who is the official supervisor of the Marking Official.
 - a. Approving Officials will appoint rating chain officials within the prescribed guidelines for any enlisted personnel who are not otherwise covered by the general guidelines.
 - b. If necessary, the Approving Official can fill the role of the Marking Official.
14. **Regular Employee Review.** Any annual or semiannual employee review.
15. **Special Employee Review.** An employee review performed for any reason other than a regular Employee Review as prescribed in  Article 10.B.5.b.

10.B.3. Designating Officials

10.B.3.a. Evaluators

Figure 10.B.3.1. designates those personnel who execute the employee review process for enlisted personnel. Waiver requests for exceptions to these designations shall be addressed to Commander, (CGPC-epm-1) for determination.

FIGURE 10.B.3.1.

ENLISTED EMPLOYEE REVIEW RATING CHAIN

UNIT TYPE	SUPERVISOR¹	MARKING OFFICIAL¹	APPROVING OFFICIAL¹	APPEAL AUTHORITY¹
Headquarters	As Division Chief designates	Division Chief	Office and Staff Chiefs	Assistant COMDT (G-A, G-W, etc.) ⁶
Area/MLC Offices	Supervisor as Branch Chief designates	Section Chief	Operations Branch or Chief, Staff Components	Area/MLC Commander
District Offices	Section Chief or as Branch Chief designates	Branch Chief	Division Chief or Chief, Staff Components	District Commander
Academy	Section Chief or as Branch Chief designates	Branch Chief	Division Chief	Superintendent (including EAGLE)
Headquarters Units	As Division Chief designates	Division Chief	Commanding Officer	Commandant
TRACEN	As Approving Official designates	As Approving Official designates	Division Chief or Training Division Branch Chief	Commandant (G-WT)⁸
Area/District Vessels/Units ²	As Marking Official designates	Department Head, Division Chief ⁵	Commanding Officer	Area/District Commander
Units/Vessels, Groups, Sections ²	As Marking Official designates	Department Head, Division Chief ⁵	Commanding Officer, Group/Section/Activity Commander ⁷	District/MLC Commander
Group/Units/Vessels	As Commanding Officer or Officer-in-Charge designates ⁹	Executive Officer/ Executive Petty Officer	Group Commander/ ³ Commanding Officer/Officer In Charge	District Commander
ADASGN Personnel and Reservists at PSUs and CNCWUs	As Commanding Officer designates	As Commanding Officer designates	Commanding Officer ⁴	District/Area/MLC Commander
Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard	As designated by Approving Official	As designated by Approving Official	As designated by Approving Official	Commandant (G-CCS)

ENLISTED EMPLOYEE REVIEW RATING CHAIN
FOOTNOTES FOR FIGURE 10.B.3.1.

1. ☞ Article 10.B.2.b. for specific guidelines on the definitions of the rating officials.
2. Includes ship indoctrination units, aircraft program offices, detachments, liaison offices, and other similar units. For those units where Figure 10.B.3.1. does not clearly indicate roles, contact Commander, (CGPC-epm-1) for direction.
3. Group and activity commanders will be the Approving Official for employee reviews of officers in charge and may designate Marking Officials as defined in ☞ Article 10.B.2.1 (2).
4. The Approving Official must be a Coast Guard officer or officer in charge (E-7 or above). Public Health Service officials assigned to Coast Guard commands may sign as Approving Official.
5. In rare circumstances, the executive officer or executive petty officer may serve as Marking Official where they provide primary task direction.
6. The Chief of Staff is the Appeal Authority for enlisted members assigned to the Commandant's staff and the Vice Commandant's staff. When the Commandant personally signs as Marking Official and Approving Official the Appeal Authority will be the Board for Corrections of Military Records.
7. **Commander, Coast Guard Activities New York and Baltimore have authority to assign division chiefs as Approving Official and branch chiefs as Marking Official for those members assigned to duty within their rating chain.**
8. **Commanding Officer, TRACEN Yorktown, Petaluma and Cape May have authority to assign Division Chief or Training Division Branch Chief as Approving Official for those members assigned to duty within their rating chain. CO has authority to grant an appeal. Appeals not granted will be endorsed by the CO and forwarded to Commandant (G-WT) for consideration and final decision.**
9. **The supervisor must be an E-6 or above.**

10.B.3.b. Delegating Approving Official Authority

Approving Official authority may not be delegated.

10.B.3.c. Approving Official Supervises Member

If an evaluatee works directly for the Approving Official and no one else supervises the member, such as at district, MLC, CGPC, or Area independent staff components, liaison offices, detachments, etc., the Approving Official completes the entire employee review and any appropriate **supporting** remarks ☞ **Article 10.B.2.**

10.B.3.d. Flag Officer Supervises Member

If an evaluatee, such as a flag level Command Master Chief, Special Command Aide, etc., works directly for a flag officer, the flag officer completes the entire employee review and any **required supporting remarks** ☞ **Article 10.B.2.**

10.B.3.e. Member Assigned to units without Access to CGHRMS

If an evaluatee is assigned to a unit without access to CGHRMS, the appropriate individuals shall utilize an Employee Review Worksheet ☞ Article 10.B.2.b.7., completing the Supervisor and Marking Official sections, if necessary. The completed worksheet is then forwarded to the member's designated Approving Official ☞ Figure 10.B.3.l. for final review and entry into CGHRMS.

10.B.4. Responsibilities

10.B.4.a. The Unit

- 1. Responsible for reviewing the personnel roster through CGHRMS to determine when employee reviews are required ☞ Article 10.B.5.**
- 2. Determine the reason for employee review if the member is being evaluated for any reason other than a regularly scheduled annual or semiannual employee review.**
- 3. Initiates the EER and ensures all required competencies receive an assigned mark and the EER is forwarded through the rating chain.**
- 4. Ensures employee reviews are completed, including the signed counseling sheet, not later than 21 days after the end of the employee review period ending date. If an evaluatee refuses to sign the counseling sheet, a unit representative should so state in the evaluatee's signature block and sign the statement prior to transmitting the completed EER to HRSIC. The unit provides the evaluatee the original counseling sheet.**

10.B.4.c. The Evaluatee

The evaluatee and the rating chain are responsible for meeting all **EERS** standards. The evaluatee is ultimately responsible for:

- 1. Learning the EERS intent and procedures as set forth in these prescribed guidelines.**
- 2. Finding out what is expected on the job.**
- 3. Obtaining sufficient feedback or counseling and using that information in adjusting, as necessary, to meet or exceed the standards.**

4. If desired, providing a list of significant accomplishments.
5. **Signing in the member's signature block of the counseling sheet and retaining this form as a receipt to indicate acknowledgment of:**
 - a. The counseling and review of their employee review;
 - b. The impact of their employee review on their Good Conduct eligibility;
 - c. The appeal time frame;
 - d. His or her advancement potential and recommendation.
6. **Verifying through CGHRMS self service that their individual employee review has been properly recorded.**

Note: Members that have an approved employee review will be notified on their Leave and Earnings Statement (LES). It is their responsibility to verify their employee review and report any discrepancy thru their chain of command.

10.B.4.d. The Rating Chain

1. The rating chain assesses an enlisted member's performance and value to the Coast Guard through a system of multiple evaluators who present independent views and thus ensure accurate, prompt, and correct reporting. It reinforces decentralization by placing responsibilities for development and performance review at lower levels within the command structure. It ensures the evaluatee is evaluated on the required period ending date and the employee review is based on how the evaluatee performed in each competency consistently throughout the period, except for Conduct, which must be adhered to every day of the period.
2. Responsibility for evaluating the performance of enlisted personnel has been placed at several different levels. The employee review begins with the evaluatee's Supervisor and is progressively reviewed and modified, as necessary, by higher supervisory levels until finally approved by the Approving Official. Through this process, the **EERS** has a built-in check and accountability system to ensure supervisory personnel are aware of the importance of employee reviews and give them incentive to be totally objective and accurate. Each rating official shall:
 - a. Review and correct any inconsistencies found in employee reviews when considering an individual's performance compared to the written standards;
 - b. Hold the next lower supervisory level accountable for their employee reviews by observing the accuracy and quality of the employee reviews they submit, and by reporting the same on **their EER or OER.**

3. The Supervisor.

- a. Must become thoroughly familiar with the instructions, **competencies**, and standards before initiating an employee review(s).
- b. Must clearly communicate goals and acceptable standards of performance to the evaluatee before and throughout the marking period.
- c. Gathers all written and oral reports on the evaluatee's performance. Ascertains the status of the evaluatee's performance qualifications for next higher pay grade.
- d. Establishes a method for the evaluatee to provide input on his or her performance. **A suggested method is to have the evaluatee submit a list of significant achievements or aspects of performance midway during the marking period and not later than 14 days before the end of the marking period.**
- e. **Routes the completed employee review to the Marking Official no later than nine days prior to the period ending date, including supporting comments for any recommended supporting remarks ☞ Article 10.B.2.**
- f. **Counsels the evaluatee on the employee review after the Approving Official's action. The importance of how effective this piece of the evaluation process can be in setting the evaluatee up for future success cannot be over emphasized. How well the supervisor clearly communicates the member's past performance and methods in which to improve are primary to ensuring future success. The Supervisor is required to ensure the evaluatee is provided with a printed counseling sheet and acknowledges receipt by obtaining their signature ☞ Article 10.B.4.a.4.**

4. The Marking Official.

- a. Must become thoroughly familiar with the instructions, competencies, and standards before performing the employee review(s).
- b. Gathers all written and oral reports on the evaluatee's performance.
- c. Reviews recommended marks. Discusses with the Supervisor any recommendations considered inaccurate or inconsistent with the member's actual performance, paying special attention to recommended 1s, 2s, 7s, unsatisfactory conduct marks, or low competency marks. ☞ Article 10.B.8.a. The Marking Official has the authority to return the employee review to the Supervisor for further justification or support for any marks.

d. Routes the completed employee review to the Approving Official not later than five days after the employee review period ending date.

e. Holds Supervisor accountable for his or her **EERS** responsibilities.

5. The Approving Official.

a. Must become thoroughly familiar with the instructions, competencies, and standards before performing the employee review(s).

b. Gathers all written and oral reports on the evaluatee's performance.

c. Is responsible for ensuring:

(1) Overall consistency between assigned marks and actual performance/behavior and output without using any type of forced distribution process;

(2) Evaluatees are counseled and advised of appeal procedures;

(3) Employee reviews are submitted on time;

(4) The required supporting remarks are completed ☞ Article 10.B.2

(5) All reviews initiated using an Employee Review Worksheet are entered into CGHRMS ☞ Article 10.B.2.b.7.

d. Reviews the Marking Official's recommended marks and discusses with him or her any recommendations considered inaccurate or inconsistent with the evaluatee's actual performance, paying special attention to recommended marks of 1, 2, or 7; unsatisfactory conduct marks; low competency marks, or a "Not Recommended" mark in the Recommendation for Advancement competency ☞ Article 5.C.4.b.1.1., 5.C.4.e.5.a. and 10.B.7.3. The Approving Official has the authority to return the employee review form to the Marking Official to further justify or support any marks ☞ Article 10.B.2.

e. Holds Marking Official responsible for his or her **EERS** responsibilities.

f. Forwards the completed employee review to the Supervisor to counsel and inform the evaluatee.

g. Ensures the completed employee review, with supporting remarks (if applicable), are processed in sufficient time to permit them to be reviewed by the evaluatee through CGHRMS self service not later than 30 days following the employee review period ending date.

6. Commandant (G-W). Commandant (G-W) has overall responsibilities for the **EERS** for all enlisted personnel.
 7. Commandant (G-WPM) (for active duty members).
 - a. Provides individual appeal and policy guidance.
 - b. Maintains all applicable instructions and establishes policy governing the **EERS**.
 8. Commandant (G-WTR) (for reservists).
 - a. Provides individual appeal and policy guidance.
 - b. Maintains all applicable instructions and establishes policy governing the **EERS**.
 9. Commander, (CGPC-epm) or (CGPC-rpm).
 - a. Monitors all applicable instructions, and policy governing the **EERS**.
 - b. Responds to individual and command requests related to **EERS** policy. Direct phone inquiries to Commander, (CGPC-epm-1) or (CGPC-rpm).
 - c. Conducts statistical analysis of servicewide marking patterns to assist in system discipline.
 10. Commanding Officer, (HRSIC (adv)). Provides administrative quality control of all employee reviews.
-

10.B.5. Submission Schedule

10.B.5.a. Regular Employee Reviews

1. Regular Employee Reviews for active and reserve members are required to be submitted as shown in Figure 10.B.5.1. The deadline months shown in Figure 10.B.5.1 ensure all employee reviews are submitted in sufficient time for processing and completing the final multiple for Servicewide Examinations.

Figure 10.B.1 – Regular Employee Review Submission Schedule

PAY GRADE	DEADLINE DUE THE LAST DAY OF:
E-1	February (all) & August (AD only)
E-2	February (all) & August (AD only)
E-3	January (all) & July (AD only)
E-4	March (all) & September (AD only)
E-5	April (all) & October (AD only)
E-6	May (all) & November (AD only)
E-7	September (all)
E-8	November (all)
E-9	June (all)

2. If the rating chain must perform a special employee review on the same period ending date as the member's regular period ending date, enter as regular instead of the special reason, excepting a special disciplinary employee review; for that, enter the reason as disciplinary instead of regular.
3. Regular employee reviews may not be delayed. The unit rating chain is responsible for ensuring complete reviews are acknowledged by the evaluatee and completed within CGHRMS not later than 30 days after the employee review period ending date.
4. Do not complete a regular employee review on a member until the next regular period ending date when:
 - a. A special employee review has been completed within 92 days for E-6 and below employee reviews, 184 days for E-7 and above employee reviews, or 19 drill periods for reservists before the end of a regular period ending date,
 - b. An evaluatee has been assigned to a new duty station for fewer than 92 days for E-6 and below employee reviews, 184 days for E-7 and above employee reviews, or 19 drill periods for reservists on a regular period ending date.
5. Do not complete any employee review for the following circumstances:
 - a. Upon discharge, reenlistment, release from active duty, or retirement;
 - b. Evaluatee is undergoing Class "A," "C," advanced, or recruit training, except in disciplinary situations described in  Article 10.B.5.b.3;

- c. Evaluatee is in an unauthorized absence or desertion status on the regular period ending date;
- d. Evaluatee is granted leave awaiting appellate review of a court-martial;
- e. Evaluatee is in Home Awaiting Order Status (HAOS) awaiting Final Action of a Formal Physical Evaluation Review Board.
- f. On awarding NJP or civil conviction if the NJP award or conviction was due to an alcohol incident for which the member was previously assigned a special employee review. This exemption applies to alcohol incidents only.
- g. Upon advancement to any pay grade up to, and including, advancement to pay grade E-6.

10.B.5.b. Special Employee Reviews

Special employee reviews are conducted for any reason other than a regular employee review. While the **EERS** focuses on regular employee reviews, occasionally a special employee review is in order. Use the following to determine whether to perform a special employee review.

1. Complete a special employee review if the rating chain completed a regular or special employee review for a period ending more than 92 days for E-6 and below employee reviews, 184 days for E-7 and above employee reviews, or 19 drill periods for reservists before one of the events listed below.
 - a. Advancement or change in rating to pay grade E-7 or above. Complete a special advancement employee review as of the day prior to the effective date of advancement or change in rating using the employee review competencies for the previously held pay grade.
 - b. Detachment for permanent change of station. Commands shall ensure members sign the counseling sheet for transfer employee review **NO LATER THAN 15 days** before departing the unit to allow adequate time for counseling and appeal processing if required.
 - c. Detachment for intra-command reassignments if the Approving Official will change.
 - d. Detachment of an Approving Official who directly supervises an evaluatee.
☞ Articles 10.B.3.c and 10.B.3.d.
2. **The TAD, Active Duty for Special Work-Reserve Component (ADSW-RC), or Active Duty for Special Work-Active Component (ADSW-AC) commanding officer should provide, in writing, supporting documentation for input in the**

member's next regular employee review when an evaluatee completes TAD, ADSW-RC, or ADSW-AC for any length of time.

3. The following events require a special employee review, regardless of the time since the last employee review.
 - a. On the date a member is awarded non-judicial punishment (NJP) or convicted by a court-martial (CM).
 - (1) When a member awarded NJP or convicted by CM is stationed at a major Headquarters unit whose designated commanding officer of enlisted personnel for the command is not the regular Approving Official for the individual (i.e., Chief, Administration Division at a District Office or Commanding Officer, Headquarters Support Command), that officer sends a memorandum explaining the circumstances and a copy of the Court Memorandum, CG-3304, completed as a result of the NJP or CM to the member's designated Approving Official. The designated Approving Official uses the information provided to complete a special disciplinary employee review when:
 - (a) A member, including all students except Class "A" school and PCS DUINS, is awarded NJP or convicted by CM while serving on TAD and is to return to the parent command on completing the TAD; e.g., commanding officer of a training center for a person attending a two-week course who is awarded NJP while at the training center. The command effecting the NJP or CM conviction sends a letter explaining the circumstances to the member's parent command, including with the letter a copy of the Court Memorandum, CG-3304, completed as a result of the NJP or CM. The member's parent command completes a special disciplinary employee review using the information provided and its knowledge of the member's performance.
 - (b) When a member is awarded NJP or convicted by CM while serving PCS DUINS or as a Class "A" school student, the commanding officer completes a special disciplinary employee review, assigning an unsatisfactory conduct mark only, and leaves all other competencies blank.
 - (c) When a member is undergoing recruit training and is awarded NJP or convicted by CM, the commanding officer completes a special disciplinary employee review, assigning an unsatisfactory conduct mark only, and leaves all other competencies blank.
 - (2) On the date a civil court convicts a member if the civil offense compares to similar offenses covered by the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). The following guidelines apply:

COAST GUARD PERSONNEL MANUAL CHAPTER 10.B.

- (a) The Approving Official determines whether a civil offense resulting in conviction, action amounting to a finding of guilt or forfeiture of bail, is a minor or major offense compared to similar offenses covered by the UCMJ.
 - (b) Civil convictions must be evaluated carefully to avoid lowering conduct marks inappropriately or unjustly. Treat certain civil offenses; e.g., parking tickets, as not warranting a special employee review unless they are excessive.
 - (c) If the Approving Official determines a civil offense is a minor offense, they should normally consider it equivalent to NJP. Examples of minor offenses might include provoking a fight, a minor case of disturbing the peace, or an excessive number of parking tickets.
 - (d) If the Approving Official determines a civil offense is a major offense, they should normally consider it equivalent to a CM conviction. Examples of major offenses include robbery or driving while intoxicated.
 - (e) If a civil offense warrants an employee review of a member undergoing any Class "A," "C," advanced, or recruit training, the commanding officer completes a special disciplinary employee review, assigning an unsatisfactory conduct mark only, and leaves all other competencies blank.
 - (f) When a member is TAD, ADSW-RC, or ADSW-AC and convicted in civil court, the TAD, ADSW-RC, or ADSW-AC command writes a letter to the member's parent command to explain the circumstances. The parent command completes a special disciplinary employee review using the information provided and its knowledge of the member's performance.
4. For reduction in rate.
- a. Reduction as punishment.
 - (1) Complete a special disciplinary employee review effective the date punishment is imposed.
 - (2) Use the competencies for the rate from which reduced.**
 - (3) If a reduction in rate was awarded but the punishment was suspended and the suspension was later vacated, complete a special disciplinary employee review if more than 92 days have elapsed (for E-6 and below

Employee Reviews), 184 days (for E-7 and above Employee Reviews), or 19 drill periods (for reservists) between the conviction and the reduction dates.

b. Reduction for incompetence or at the member's request.

(1) Complete a special reduction employee review effective the day before the effective reduction date.

(2) Use the competencies for the rate from which reduced.

5. At the end of a three-month probationary period for incompetency.

☞ Article 5.C.38.c.

6. For Servicewide Examination (SWE) purposes. Complete a special SWE employee review only if the rating chain has not completed an employee review for the current pay grade during the prescribed time frame for advancement. ☞ Chapter 5.C.

7. Complete a special employee review to allow Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) members to compete in a SWE.

8. A special employee review is required for a member who has an alcohol incident.

10.B.6. The Employee Review Process

10.B.6.a. General

1. The rating chain will evaluate each enlisted member on the required period ending date to assess his or her actual performance since the last recorded employee review. The rating chain shall base employee reviews on how the member performed in each competency consistently throughout the period, except for conduct, to which the member must adhere every day of the period. Normally, a single, isolated event (either positive or negative) should not drastically affect the marks assigned during the employee review period. However, the rating chain must consider the overall positive or negative impact of the event.

2. The rating chain uses employee reviews to evaluate enlisted members' performance of duties in any position or pay grade, whether in specialty or not.

3. For members with a limited opportunity to perform for reasons such as illness, injuries, pregnancy, use the following guidelines.

a. Occasionally, circumstances resulting from a temporary condition may limit a member's opportunity to perform. These circumstances may cause specific performance restrictions; e.g., those imposed by a medical authority, and may

COAST GUARD PERSONNEL MANUAL CHAPTER 10.B.

even require restructuring or reassigning duties. While rating chains shall not give preferential treatment, commanding officers shall ensure these individuals do not receive adverse employee reviews solely for these circumstances.

- b. In consultation with the health care provider, the commanding officer must establish a "reasonable expectation of performance" in the member's current circumstances. In particular, the commanding officer must determine whether a member requires reassignment to a different work environment, restrictions on performing specific types of tasks, or reduced work hours. When considering reassigning or restructuring duties, commanding officers should strive to identify service needs, which compliment the member's temporary limited abilities.
- 4. Members are divided into three pay grade groups: master, senior, and chief petty officers (E-9, E-8, and E-7); petty officers (E-6, E-5, and E-4); and non-rated personnel (E-3, E-2, and E-1). Use the non-rated employee review for non-rated personnel with designators.
- 5. Each competency is defined in terms of three performance standards: low, middle, and high. These standards are not the same for each pay grade group. The higher the pay grade group, the higher the standards become, as should be expected considering their increased training and experience. All raters shall mark each evaluatee against the written standards, not against others in the same rate or rating.
- 6. For a mark of 2, 4, or 6, the member must meet these standards and no others in the next higher performance standard. A mark of 4 represents the expected performance level of all enlisted personnel. Normally, a single, isolated event, either positive or negative, should not drastically affect the marks assigned during the employee review period. However, the rating chain must consider the overall positive or negative impact of the event.
- 7. Use the following guidelines to assign marks.

MARK	MEANS THE MEMBER CONSISTENTLY
1	(Unacceptable) - Did not meet all the written performance standards in the "2" level and the rater considered the impact severely detrimental to the organization or to others.
2	(Poor) - Met all the written performance standards in this level.
3	(Below Standard) - Did not meet all the written performance standards in the "4" block.
4	(Average) - Met all the written performance standards for this level and none in the "6" level.
5	(Above Average) - Met all the written performance standards in the "4" level and at least one of those in the "6" level.

6	(Excellent) - Met all the written performance standards for this level and did not exceed any of them.
7	(Superior) - Met all the written performance standards in the “6” level and exceeded at least one of them.

10.B.6.b. Documentation

1. The employee review is designed to inform members how they are performing compared to the written standards. The form requires few or no supporting remarks and should cover explicitly all performance factors for each evaluatee. The rater may use the employee review as a tool in counseling the evaluatee.
 - a. **Raters must provide supporting remarks for certain marks** ☞ **Article 10.B.2. These remarks serve as supplemental information on the evaluatee in determining decisions such as OIC certification, removal for cause, regular duty assignments, or special duty assignments as a recruiter, instructor, investigator, or CMC.**
 - b. Specific comments that paint a succinct picture of the evaluatee's performance and qualities allow the reader to determine WHAT or HOW they exceeded or failed to meet the standards and may reduce or even eliminate subjectivity and interpretation.
 - c. The rater’s challenge is to convey to the reader the performance picture observed daily. This is difficult because the reader does not “see” the evaluatee in action and cannot read into a general comment what the evaluator sees every day and takes for granted. If the reader cannot form a clear performance picture, the human tendency is to disregard or assign a lesser value to the comments. This “collective group of words” could be the deciding factor in today’s competitive environment for choice assignments.
2. The Approving Official may solicit other comments on observed performance to support any marks at any time. Likewise, the Supervisor or Marking Official may comment any time either believes more should be said about the evaluatee in any competency or factor.
3. Use any comments that affected the employee review results during the counseling and feedback session.

10.B.7. The Advancement Recommendation

1. While the rating chain must consider past performance, it must also consider and base the recommendation on the member's potential to perform satisfactorily the duties and responsibilities of the next higher pay grade, qualities of leadership, and adherence to the Service’s core values. Each rating chain member must address this independent section every time they complete an employee review.

2. When completing this part of the employee review, the rating chain should focus on the guidelines in ☞ Chapter 5.C. on advancement recommendations and then select one of the following choices.
 - a. **RECOMMENDED.** The member is fully capable of satisfactorily performing the duties and responsibilities of the next higher pay grade. The rating chain should choose this entry regardless of the member’s qualification or eligibility for advancement. If the member has met all eligibility requirements, choosing this value constitutes an official recommendation for advancement.
Personnel, E-6 and above, must receive a supporting remarks entry clearly documenting their present and future leadership potential for greater responsibility ☞ Article 10.B.2.a.(1).(d).
 - b. **NOT RECOMMENDED.** The member is not capable of satisfactorily performing the duties and responsibilities of the next higher pay grade.
3. If the Approving Official marks "Not Recommended," they must ensure the member is properly counseled on the steps necessary to earn a recommendation and prepare supporting remarks ☞ Articles 5.C.4.b.1.l., 5.C.4.e.5.a., 10.B.2. , and 10.B.4.d.5.c.(4)(d).
4. The Approving Official's decision on the advancement recommendation is final and may not be appealed. However, if the Approving Official learns new information and decides to change the recommendation, they should follow the procedures in ☞ Article 10.B.11.b.

10.B.8. Good Conduct Award Eligibility

10.B.8.a. Eligibility

A new period of eligibility for the Good Conduct award begins any time a member receives an unsatisfactory mark in conduct or a competency type total mark less than shown in the following chart.

GROUP	MIL	PERF	PROF	LDRSHP
Nonrate	9	18	18	12 (E-3 only)
PO	6	21	18	21
CPO	6	27	18	21

10.B.8.b. An Unsatisfactory Conduct Mark

The rating chain must assign an unsatisfactory mark in conduct whenever an individual meets any of the criteria listed in ☞ Article 10.B.2.a.

1. Use the following guidelines to determine when terminating Good Conduct Award eligibility is warranted:
 - a. **On the effective date the member is awarded NJP or convicted by CM, or in civil court. Do not complete a special disciplinary employee review if the civil conviction was due to an alcohol incident for which the rating chain previously completed a special employee review. This exemption applies to alcohol incidents only. The rating chain must still document the civil conviction under  Chapter 8.B.**
 - b. On the employee review period ending date if the member receives an unsatisfactory conduct mark or lower than minimal competency marks or competency type totals.
 2. Assigning an unsatisfactory conduct mark may impact advancement to the next higher pay grade, change in rate, or participation in the Servicewide Examination.  Article 5.C. for specific guidance on advancements.
-

10.B.9. Appeals

10.B.9.a. General

1. The employee review is designed to be as objective as possible. However, when one human being evaluates another, there will be some subjectivity. Even when the member perceives no difference in performance from one period to the next, small variations in marks can occur.
2. The appeals process is designed to review marks the evaluatee believes were based on:
 - a. incorrect information;
 - b. prejudice;
 - c. discrimination; or
 - d. disproportionately low marks for the particular circumstances.
3. The recommendation for advancement portion on the employee review may not be appealed.

10.B.9.b. Responsibilities

1. The member.

COAST GUARD PERSONNEL MANUAL CHAPTER 10.B.

- a. Before writing an appeal, the member should request an audience with the rating chain to verbally express any concerns that could lead to a written appeal.
 - b. If this meeting does not lead to an agreement between the Approving Official and the member, the member can appeal in writing and submit the appeal to the Appeal Authority indicated in Figure 10.B.3.1., via the commanding officer. If the member has been reassigned, they must submit the appeal to the Appeal Authority for the former command, via the commanding officer of that command.
 - c. The appeal letter must contain the specific competencies in dispute and supporting information indicating why the marks should be reviewed. Supporting information must include specific examples of demonstrated performance that indicate how the member met or exceeded the written standards. The member attaches a copy of the signed employee review counseling sheet as enclosure (1) and other enclosures pertinent to the assigned marks.
 - d. The member must submit the appeal within 15 calendar days (30 calendar days for reservists) after the date they signed the acknowledgment section of the counseling sheet for the disputed employee review.
 - e. If appealing more than 15 calendar days (30 calendar days for reservists) after the date the member signed the employee review acknowledgment section, the member must explain the circumstances that did not allow or prevented him or her from submitting the appeal within the prescribed time limit.
2. The commanding officer. In most cases the commanding officer is the Approving Official. However, for commands such as district offices, area offices, and MLCs, the commanding officer might not be the Approving Official. In these instances, the Approving Official is synonymous with the title commanding officer for the below responsibilities.
- a. Each commanding officer must ensure all enlisted persons are aware of their right to appeal under this Article.
 - b. Each commanding officer must ensure counseling and clerical assistance are provided to any member desiring to exercise these appeal rights.
 - c. As a result of the appeal, a commanding officer may raise or leave marks unchanged, but may not lower any marks. If the member accepts the relief the Approving Official grants, the appeal need not be sent to the Appeal Authority. If the relief does not satisfy or only partially satisfies the member, the commanding officer must send the appeal and then comply with the change procedures in  Article 10.B.10.b.

- d. Commanding officers shall endorse and send the appeal letter to the Appeal Authority within 15 calendar days of receiving it from the member. The Appeal Authority may extend the 15 days if the commanding officer needs additional information before responding to the appeal; e.g., if a rating chain member has been transferred and the commanding officer needs more information from this member before they can respond to the appeal adequately. The commanding officer's endorsement should address this delay.
 - e. The commanding officer's endorsement shall contain specific examples of demonstrated performance that warranted the assigned marks and address any extenuating circumstances. The commanding officer shall ensure the member receives a copy of the command's endorsement.
3. Appeal Authority.
- a. The Appeal Authority must review and act on the appeal within 15 calendar days after receiving it. Commander, (CGPC-epm-1) may extend the 15 days if the Appeal Authority needs additional information from either the member or commanding officer before responding to the appeal.
 - b. In acting on an appeal, the Appeal Authority may raise or leave unchanged the member's marks, but may not lower any marks an Approving Official assigned.
 - c. Once the Appeal Authority has decided, they should ensure copies of the appeal package (member's letter, command endorsement along with all enclosures, and Appeal Authority's action) are sent to Commander, (CGPC-adm-3) for filing and to Commanding Officer, HRSIC (adv) for review and possible update to the member's employee review data.

10.B.10. Waiving and Changing Employee Review Marks

10.B.10.a. Waiving Employee Reviews

Occasionally it is either impossible to evaluate an evaluatee; e.g., the member was in-patient or on sick leave during entire period, or an employee review period is overlooked administratively. In these and similar situations the Approving Official can submit a request to HRSIC (adv), seeking a waiver of the entire period by letter, specifying the reasons.

10.B.11.b. Changing Employee Review Marks

1. Approving Officials are authorized to change any mark they assigned to members still attached to the unit if the Approving Official receives additional information that applies to the particular employee review period.

COAST GUARD PERSONNEL MANUAL CHAPTER 10.B.

- a. If the employee review has not been marked final, the Approving Official discusses the marks with the Marking Official as noted in ~~10~~ Article 10.B.4.d.4. If they change any marks, those changes must be entered in CGHRMS. A new counseling sheet will be printed and acknowledged by the member.
 - b. If the Approving Official already has submitted the employee review to HRSIC, the Approving Official writes, signs, and sends a letter to Commanding Officer, HRSIC (adv) to request changing the marks. The letter should contain the following information.**
 - (1) The member's name, rate, and employee ID,
 - (2) The period ending date,
 - (3) The specific competencies being changed,
 - (4) The original numerical mark, **conduct mark or CO's recommendation for advancement,**
 - (5) The revised numerical mark, **conduct mark or CO's recommendation for advancement,**
 - (6) A statement the member has been advised of these changes.
 - c. Commanding Officer, HRSIC (adv) changes the member's employee review in CGHRMS.
 - d. The member shall verify through CGHRMS self service that their individual employee review has been properly updated.
2. If judicial proceedings are later set aside, the current Approving Official re-evaluates and adjusts marks on the special disciplinary employee review assigned by any Approving Official based on alleged offenses committed.
 3. **Any Approving Official who has reason to believe marks assigned by another commanding officer are erroneous shall write to Commander, (CGPC-epm-1) describing the circumstances. This letter shall include any supporting documentation and a recommended course of action.**