

The 2010 COER

A Brief Summary of Changes

Basic Structural Changes

- There are 8 officer evaluation factors
 1. Leadership
 2. Initiative and Growth
 3. Communication Skills
 4. Interpersonal Skills
 5. Planning and Organization
 6. Professional Competencies
 7. Analysis, Judgment and Decision-Making
 8. Overall Effectiveness
- The scale changed from “A to E” to “1 – 7”
- Attachment 1 is now page 2 of the COER
- Attachment 2 is a comment box
- New section: Strengths and Areas for Improvement

- The summary of the Commissioned Officers' Effectiveness Report (COER) presentation includes a summary of the changes made in order to obtain a more objective measure of officer performance. The changes include reducing the number of questions from 18 to eight including Leadership, Initiative and Growth, Communication Skills, Interpersonal Skills, Planning and Organization, Professional Competencies, Analysis, Judgment and Decision-Making, and Overall Effectiveness.

- The rating scales were changed from A through E or F to “1” through “7” with behavioral guidelines.
- The officer Attachment 1 is now page 2 so the officer can continue to provide a statement.
- Attachment 2 is now a comment box on page 4.
- On page 1 of the 2010 COER, there is a new section on Strengths and Areas for Improvement; each has text boxes available for comments.

Business Process Change

- Initial Review by Reviewing Official (RO)
 - review the COER
 - give feedback to the Rater before releasing to officer
- Rater must consider RO's comments but does not have to make changes
- Final Review by RO
 - receives the COER for final review after officer's concurrence
 - agree or disagree with the evaluation and make comments

- The Reviewing Official (RO) now has the opportunity to provide an initial review of the COER and to give feedback to the Rater before it is released to the officer.
- While the Rater must take the RO's comments into consideration, the Rater does not have to make changes.
- The RO receives the COER for the final review after the Officer's concurrence. It is at this point that the RO can agree or disagree with the evaluation and make comments.

Sample Question

Rating Factor

3. *Communication Skills* – Conveys clear and succinct written and verbal messages that are appropriate to the audience. Listens to and understands information from others.

Scale

①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

- Needs assistance in expressing main thoughts clearly, both orally and in writing, and clarifying the meaning and intent of others' communication.

- Uses correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation to create simple documents.

- Tailors communication (verbal and written) to the level and experience of the audience, ensuring that messages are organized, useful and accurate.

- Utilizes strong listening skills to formulate direct, responsive answers to questions.

- Organizes and expresses complex ideas, both orally and in writing, to successfully inform and influence individual and managerial decisions that advance the organization's mission.

- Is a confident and effective speaker, asks open-ended questions, and recognizes and accommodates a vast diversity of ideas and traditions.

Examples to Help Rater

- Using “Communication Skills” as a sample, there is the rating factor followed by a definition. Underneath, there is a “1” through “7” rating scale with behavioral guideline examples to guide the rater.

What Happened to the Old Attachment 1?

- Officers often want to be able to tell their story, particularly to the members of the promotion board!
- It is now page 2 of the COER.

- The Attachment 1 that is prepared by the officer is still part of the evaluation, but as page 2. The officer will enter the information for Attachment 1 into the designated boxes on page 2 of the COER.

A new section

Strengths and Areas for Improvement

- **The COER process encourages dialogue between the officer and supervisor.**
- **There is a comment box for the rater to list “strengths” and “areas for improvement.”**



- The Strengths and Areas for Improvement is a new section provided to encourage dialogue and enhance communication between the officer and their supervisor. Comment boxes are available for each on page 1.

A New Section

Reviewing Official's Role

- Has the option to dialogue with the Rater prior to the release of the scores and comments to the officer
- Concurs or disagrees after the officer's concurrence
- Advises whether the Rater was lenient or demanding
- Has the option to enter comments

- The reviewing official has added roles in the 2010 COER. The reviewing official will have the option to dialogue with the rater before the officer views the scores and comments, concur or disagree after the officer, indicate whether the rater is lenient or demanding, and enter comments.

Next Steps

- Coordinate for a successful launch
- Deployed for the 2010 annual COER cycle
- Convened the COER Education Advisory Panel
- Assess after the annual COER cycle

Next Steps

- OCCFM, OCCO and CCSB are working together to assure a successful launch of the 2010 COER.
- The revised COER was deployed for the 2010 annual COER cycle.
- OCCFM and OCCO convened a COER Education Advisory Panel to assist with developing educational materials in support of the revised COER.
- After the annual COER cycle, we will assess how the instrument performed and identify weaknesses that need to be resolved.

Implementation

- For now
 - Maintain current profile
 - Review COER with rater and reviewing official
- Paper COER successfully launched
 - July 1, 2010, paper COER instrument
- Online COER
 - October 6, 2010

Current Profile

- It is important that each officer maintain the most current contact information in Direct Access including:
 - email addresses, phone numbers, supervisor information
- On July 1, 2010, such information was imported from Direct Access into the COER System. The email on profile as of July 1, 2010 will be the one used to correspond with the officers.

Review and Dialogue

- Officers and raters are encouraged to use the 2010 paper COER instrument posted on CCMIS to maintain dialogue about performance.
- The billet information is in the eOPF and, if necessary, can only be changed as a result of a personnel order. For issues related to personnel orders contact DCCOS at 240-453-6000.

Paper vs Online COER

- Paper
 - The paper COER will be used for officer/supervisor transfers occurring on or after July 1, 2010.
 - The form will be available by contacting the COER Coordinator
- Online
 - The online COER system will be launched with the annual 2010 COER cycle on October 6, 2010.

Comparative Analysis of Ratings Using the 'Old' and 'New' COER

Purpose

- Compare the new 2010 scale with the old scale
- Determine the usability of the 2010 version
- Train and education

- The purpose of the study was to compare the scores from the 2010 scale with the old scale, and determine the usability of the 2010 version, and identify appropriate intervention in terms of training and education.

Methods

- Sample
 - 2% of the officers
 - 45% response rate

- Statistical methods
 - Dichotomous variables
 - Hypergeometric distribution,
Non-Parametric Independent

- For the target population, a 2% random sample of officers was drawn and got a 45% response rate.
- The data obtain was of hypergeometrically distribution and a non parametric independent data set. For statistical analysis, the variables were dichotomized to examine the significance of association.

Results

- Proportion of high score per factor
 - E, 70-86%; 7, 26-36%
- Inflation
 - All Es, 66%; all 7s, 14%
- Factors on overall job performance / effectiveness
 - E on Question 18, 87%; 7 on Question 8, 28%

- The proportion of high scores per factor was higher using the old scale.
- The ratings with all Es were much higher using the old scale, then 7s with the 2010 scale.
- The ratings on overall job performance / effectiveness factors 87% for Question 18 and 28% for Question 8.

Results and conclusions

- Representative sample
 - Clinician & women: $p < 0.001$
 - Junior Officer & Officer Rater: $p = 0.02$
- Rating of instruments, all $p > 0.05$
- More random, higher variability scores
- The old instrument does not measure what the new instrument measures
- The ratings are different, individually and overall

- The sample was representative. Women were more likely to be in a clinical category and junior officers were more likely to be rated by an officer.
- The old and 2010 instruments are different. This means the scores are more random, higher variability. The old instrument does not measure what the 2010 instrument measures. The ratings are different, individually and overall.

Thank you!

Please address additional questions to

COER Coordinator

LT Francine Barnett

phscoers@hhs.gov