



*****FLAG VOICE 181*****

IMPLEMENTATION OF ENLISTED EMPLOYEE REVIEWS

As per ALCOAST 354/02, all enlisted evaluations must now be initiated using the Coast Guard Human Resources Management System (CGHRMS). This is another significant step in our journey to consolidate the Coast Guard's human resource management system. The new Enlisted Employee Review (EER) module of CGHRMS adopts a commercial application for Coast Guard use. Although, like any new application, the EER module will require some initial adjustment, in the long run, it will provide a number of advantages for members of the Coast Guard.

I understand that not all units have the workstation access and connectivity needed to perform this process in CGHRMS. If commands find that they do not have adequate resources to use the EER, the command can send a completed EER marks worksheet to its Administrative Support unit for input to the CGHRMS system. In unusual cases where the administrative support unit is unable to enter the evaluation, they can be sent to HRSIC (adv) for entry. We have had some early feedback from one cutter XO indicating the product is working well even while underway.

I'm also sensitive to the privacy issues some have raised. Members who have been designated by their commands to have command level access are placed in a position of trust, and, because of the setup of the system, can see marks summaries on any enlisted member in the Coast Guard. I have made it a priority to resolve this quickly. I'm setting up a group with representatives from the MLCs, field units, PERSRUs and legal staff to look at why access to evaluation summaries are needed and then look at who needs to have access to evaluation summaries. We're reviewing options that will balance the need to know and access the enlisted employee reviews with the concerns for the sensitive nature of the evaluation process. The outcome will be more restricted access to the evaluation summaries. In the interim, I ask you to carefully review your command access designations to ensure that those individuals have an indisputable need to this level of access.

Let me recap the history of this initiative. We began planning this phase of the CGHRMS deployment almost two years ago. The implementation date of early August 2002 was carefully selected to minimize the impact on the Servicewide Exam cycle and enlisted advancements. Following development of the EER module earlier this year, a broad cross-section of units and members participated in a series of field tests from March through June 2002 to identify shortcomings in the application and tutorial. Their feedback helped us further refine the product before it was formally deployed. I appreciate the efforts of the members and units who volunteered to assist us during the testing phase! This iterative process has been time consuming, yet is the right way to provide the best possible product for the Coast Guard. We've listened to your ideas and considered all of your input.

I mentioned that the EER module provides several advantages to our members and the Coast Guard. First, it gives us the opportunity to capture administrative remarks directly on the evaluation form. This was a significant shortcoming of the Enlisted Performance Evaluation Form and frequently a source of frustration for selection panels as they tried to determine the best-qualified members for command cadre positions, advanced education

opportunities, or special assignments. With the new EER, commands are required to comment on the leadership and potential of all members E-6 and above. While this will slightly increase the workload in the field, I believe it will pay big dividends in the years to come and is more than offset by the savings realized from the ease of incorporating administrative remarks.

Second, we'll be able to track enlisted evaluations and maintain better quality control. Prior to the deployment of this module, it was virtually impossible to monitor delinquent enlisted evaluations. Administrative errors resulted in inefficiencies and delays. Using CGHRMS, we can ensure all enlisted members receive timely performance feedback, which is a hallmark of great organizations. Third, and looking to the future, we can easily modify the competencies (previously, performance dimensions) for each type of EER. This allows us to maintain an evaluation system that is dynamic, in step with the needs of our Service. Fourth, the member will be able to check all of their EER, online, at their convenience. Finally, I'm confident that the EER module in CGHRMS will reduce paperwork at our units, significantly increase the accuracy of enlisted evaluations, and improve the timeliness of the system as a whole.

Members from HRSIC and CGPC are visiting a number of Coast Guard units to conduct just-in-time training on the Enlisted Employee Review. Several of the more frequently asked questions with answers are appended to this Flag Voice. Please take this opportunity to learn about the module. As always, I welcome your feedback and look forward to serving you. Thanks!

Electronic Employee Review (EER)

FAQ's

Q: With the current system, I know it is time to fill out an evaluation form because I receive an bar-coded label and/or the marks sheet with the label already affixed. What type of cue is in the new system to tell me it is time to do an evaluation?

A: Currently there is no reminder function built into the CGHRMS ERR system. However personnel with the appropriate access can always check the status of marks, print out an employee review summary, as well as the number of days since personnel were last marked.

Q: In addition to the administrative remarks sections, are there other changes to the form from the ones I am familiar with now?

A: Yes. Performance Dimensions are now called competencies. The competencies are exactly like the Performance Dimensions in definition. You can view the definition by clicking the yellow icon on the far right of the page for the competency being evaluated.

Q: As a supervisor, will I still need to prepare a CG-3307 for marks of 1, 2 & 7?

A: No. However, you'll be required to use the space by each competency for remarks to support the marks of 1,2,7, Unsat. Conduct or Not Recommended for Advancement. This will save supervisors time on producing a separate report and the formatting required on the current CG-3307. There is also room on the EER for the new required 'future leadership potential' comments for all E-6 and above.

Q: What were shortcomings or problems identified by the alpha and beta testing done by field units from March through June 2002? How were they addressed?

A: A majority of the concerns raised in the initial review were not so much with the functionality of CGHRMS but more around how each command is going to incorporate this new functionality at their unit. Questions such as "can I route a paper copy if I want" or "can I print the marks sheet off and take it home to mark a person" accounted for the majority of queries. And the answer to both of those questions is yes, you can.

Q: Will I still need to route a paper copy of evaluations?

A: In the majority of cases, no. But commands may route paper copies internally if that system works better for their circumstances. Prior to transmission, a copy of the completed EER will be printed out for use as a counseling tool and for the member to acknowledge receipt of the marks. The original of this paper copy will be given to the member with a copy retained at the unit.

Q: How will units with no WS III connectivity, either underway or remotely located, submit marks?

A: This is one of the few exceptions to the "no paper required" functionality. The command would send a completed EER marks worksheet to its Administrative Support unit for input to the CGHRMS system. In unusual cases where the administrative support unit is unable to enter the evaluation, they can be sent to HRSIC (adv) for entry.

Q: If I have departed PCS from a unit and then discover that marks were not done, will my previous unit still be able to perform this function?

A: When you or your new unit discovers that marks were required and not done, your new unit will contact the previous unit who will be able to initiate the missing review.

Q: What are the "Factor Weight" and Weight %" blocks for?

A: Those can be disregarded. They are part of the off-the-shelf software package that the Coast Guard is not using and do not have to be filled in.

Q: Why did the implementation team chose to convert our existing performance dimensions and seven-point rating scale to CGHRMS in lieu of the five-point scale developed by EAST?

A: The existing EPEF format is mirrored in the EER to provide several years of electronic access while still using a very familiar format. A two-step, phased approach was selected to avoid too much change at one time.

Q: How will this affect the appeal process?

A: The process and timeline detailed in the PERSMAN, Art. 10.B.10 will be unchanged as we transition from the EPEF to the EER.

Q: Who will be accountable for ensuring the marks are recorded?

A: Units will have the flexibility of forwarding subordinates' employee reviews up through the chain of command. They would then designate an individual/s within the chain of command to finalize inputs. At small units this may be the XPO/XO, or anyone in the rating chain. At larger units, it may be a command YN/secretary. Once "final" is entered, the marks become part of the record.

Regards, Ken Venuto



[Flag Voice Contents](#)

This page is maintained by [HR Webmaster \(CG-1A\)](#)