## Performance Ratings: A Distribution Analysis

Fiscal Years 2010-2014

## NARA-Wide Performance Ratings FY 2010-2014

Outstanding Highly Successful $\quad$ Eully Successful $\quad$ < Fully Successful $\quad$ Not Rated

*"Not Rated" applies to employees who did not meet the minimum 90 day appraisal period requirement. Reasons could include Leave Without Pay (LWOP)/(OWCP); entrance to duty less that 90 days before the end of the rating period; and intermittent/unavailable students employees).
*In FY 2010 and FY 2011, the data for Fully Successful includes employees who received less than fully successful. Starting in FY 2012, that data is broken out separately.
*Data for FY 2011 does not match the data shared in NARA Notice 2012-074 because until FY 2013 we had a "split" ratings cycle, with some employees being rated in the Spring.

Performance Ratings by Grade

## GS 1-6 <br> FY 2010-2014

- Outstanding 回 Highly Successful Fully Successful $\quad$ < Fully Successful $\quad$ 回 Not Rated

*In FY 2011, the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) changed from a 3-tier to a 5-tier rating system.
*About 53\% of all GS 1-6 NARA employees are on "production standards." Staff who are assigned production work spend about $60 \%$ of their time on tasks that have a production standard, and generally have at least one critical element in their performance plan related to production work. Employees who meet or exceed the production standard may also receive a quarterly or monthly cash productivity award in addition to any annual performance award.
*In FY 2010 and FY 2011, the data for Fully Successful include employees who received less than Fully Successful. Starting in FY 2012, that data is broken out separately.


## Performance Ratings by Grade GS 7-12 <br> FY 2010-2014

Outstanding Highly Successful Fully Successful $\quad$ < Fully Successful $\quad$ Not Rated

*In FY 2010 and FY 2011, the data for Fully Successful include employees who received less than Fully Successful. Starting in FY 2012, that data is broken out separately.

# Performance Ratings by Grade GS 13-15 <br> FY 2010-2014 


*In FY 2010 and FY 2011, the data for Fully Successful include employees who received less than fully successful. Starting in FY 2012, that data is broken out separately.

Performance Ratings by Grade AD/SL

## FY 2010-2014

$\square$ Outstanding Highly Successful $\quad$ Fully Successful $\quad$ < Fully Successful $\quad$ Not Rated

*AD refers to Administratively Determined Positions, of which NARA has two. SL stands for Senior Level, which includes Presidential Library Directors.

Performance Ratings by Grade SES

## FY 2010-2014




# Performance Rating Comparison Reflecting Number of Employees at GS 1-6 FY 2010-2014 

|  | FY 2010 |  | FY 2011 |  | FY 2012 |  | FY 2013 |  | FY 2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance <br> Rating | \# of <br> Employees |  | \# of <br> Employes |  | \# of <br> Employees |  | \# of <br> Employees |  | \# of <br> Employees |  |
| Outstanding | 380 | $30 \%$ | 358 | $22 \%$ | 349 | $23 \%$ | 456 | $33 \%$ | 284 | $22 \%$ |
| Highly <br> Successful | 268 | $21 \%$ | 407 | $24 \%$ | 440 | $29 \%$ | 415 | $30 \%$ | 367 | $28 \%$ |
| Fully Successful <br> or Less* | 629 | $49 \%$ | 898 | $54 \%$ | 455 | $30 \%$ | 314 | $23 \%$ | 373 | $29 \%$ |
| < Fully <br> Successful | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | $2 \%$ | 25 | $2 \%$ | 27 | $2 \%$ |
| Not Rated | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 243 | $16 \%$ | 162 | $12 \%$ | 249 | $19 \%$ |
| Total | 1,277 | $100 \%$ | 1,663 | $100 \%$ | 1,517 | $100 \%$ | 1,372 | $100 \%$ | 1,300 | $100 \%$ |

*In FY 2010 and FY 2011, the data for Fully Successful includes employees who received less than fully successful. Starting in FY 2012, that data is broken out separately.

## Performance Rating Comparison

 Reflecting Number of Employees at GS 7-12FY 2010-2014

|  | FY 2010 |  | FY 2011 |  | FY 2012 |  | FY 2013 |  | FY 2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance <br> Rating | \# of <br> Employees |  | \# of <br> Employees |  | \# of <br> Employees |  | \# of <br> Employees |  | \# of <br> Employees |  |
| Outstanding | 661 | $60 \%$ | 586 | $50 \%$ | 601 | $53 \%$ | 488 | $45 \%$ | 460 | $44 \%$ |
| Highly <br> Successful | 303 | $27 \%$ | 377 | $32 \%$ | 397 | $35 \%$ | 471 | $43 \%$ | 445 | $43 \%$ |
| Fully Successful <br> or Less* | 142 | $13 \%$ | 208 | $18 \%$ | 91 | $8 \%$ | 111 | $10 \%$ | 106 | $10 \%$ |
| < Fully <br> Successful | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | $<1 \%$ | 6 | $<1 \%$ | 4 | $<1 \%$ |
| Not Rated | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 37 | $3 \%$ | 20 | $2 \%$ | 22 | $2 \%$ |
| Total | 1,106 | $100 \%$ | 1,171 | $100 \%$ | 1,134 | $100 \%$ | 1,096 | $100 \%$ | 1,037 | $100 \%$ |

*In FY 2010 and FY 2011, the data for Fully Successful includes employees who received less than fully successful. Starting in FY 2012, that data is broken out separately.

## Performance Rating Comparison Reflecting Number of Employees at GS 13-15 FY 2010-2014

|  | FY 2010 |  | FY 2011 |  | FY 2012 |  | FY 2013 |  | FY 2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Rating | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  |
| Outstanding | 461 | 81\% | 432 | 71\% | 361 | 61\% | 284 | 47\% | 306 | 51\% |
| Highly Successful | 86 | 15\% | 134 | 22\% | 189 | 32\% | 267 | 44\% | 260 | 43\% |
| Fully Successful or Less* | 25 | 4\% | 44 | 7\% | 35 | 6\% | 37 | 6\% | 24 | 4\% |
| < Fully Successful | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 2 | <1\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | <1\% |
| Not Rated | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 6 | 1\% | 18 | 3\% | 10 | 2\% |
| Total | 572 | 100\% | 610 | 100\% | 593 | 100\% | 606 | 100\% | 601 | 100\% |

*In FY 2010 and FY 2011, the data for Fully Successful includes employees who received less than fully successful. Starting in FY 2012, that data is broken out separately.

## Performance Rating Comparison Reflecting Number of Employees at AD/SL FY 2010-2014

|  | FY 2010 |  | FY 2011 |  | FY 2012 |  | FY 2013 |  | FY 2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Rating | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  |
| Outstanding | 14 | 93\% | 13 | 93\% | 12 | 86\% | 8 | 50\% | 7 | 50\% |
| Highly Successful | 1 | 7\% | 1 | 7\% | 2 | 14\% | 7 | 44\% | 6 | 43\% |
| Fully Successful or Less* | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 1 | 7\% |
| < Fully Successful | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Not Rated | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Total | 15 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% | 16 | 100\% | 14 | 100\% |

[^0]
# Performance Rating Comparison Reflecting Number of Employees at SES FY 2010-2014 

|  | FY 2010 |  | FY 2011 |  | FY 2012 |  | FY 2013 |  | FY 2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Rating | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  | \# of Employees |  |
| Outstanding | 17 | 100\% | 4 | 25\% | 5 | 26\% | 5 | 23\% | 6 | 28\% |
| Highly Successful | 0 | 0\% | 8 | 50\% | 10 | 53\% | 12 | 55\% | 10 | 48\% |
| Fully Successful or Less* | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 19\% | 4 | 21\% | 4 | 18\% | 5 | 24\% |
| < Fully Successful | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 6\% | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 4\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Not Rated | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Total | 17 | 100\% | 16 | 100\% | 19 | 100\% | 22 | 100\% | 21 | 100\% |


[^0]:    *AD refers to Administratively Determined Positions, of which NARA has two. SL stands for Senior Level, which includes Presidential Library Directors.

