

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

Upon recommendation of the Promotion Task Force, the Chief Professional Officers (CPO) and Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairs in consultation with their constituent category members, developed benchmarks for the first four promotion precepts with the Office of Force Readiness and Deployment (OFRD) developing the benchmarks for the fifth precept. After reviewing the proposed benchmarks, the Acting Assistant Secretary for Health (ASH) in consultation with the Surgeon General approved their use and the dissemination of this information. The Acting ASH also approved the annual review and update of the benchmarks in order to assure that they reflect, to the extent possible, the evolving demands on the Commissioned Corps.

The Benchmarks are the guideposts used by promotion boards as they review the service records of each officer under consideration for promotion. Historically, this type of information was developed at the convening of the Board and by the board members present, prior to the actual review of records. As a result, officers were unaware of the specifics of how their respective category assessed each of the precepts used by the board. It is our desire to make this process transparent to officers and their managers.

PLEASE NOTE that the Promotion Board members are asked to exercise their professional judgment and discretion in the review and rating of each record. *The benchmarks serve as a guide to the board members in their deliberations and are not criteria required for promotion.*

Any comments or suggestions that you may have on updating your category's benchmarks must be submitted to your CPO or PAC (see "About Us" on the Commissioned Corps Management Information System (CCMIS) web site for a listing of CPOs and PAC Chairs).

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

<i>1. Performance</i>			
BENCHMARK/GRADE	0-4	0-5	0-6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COERs and COER attachments (past 3 years) 	<p>The primary focus in reviewing the COER should be on the accompanying narrative. Narrative indicates progression of responsibility, achievement and contributions to the agency mission. A secondary assessment of the COER will include a review of the COER score, in the context of looking at performance trends. The officer should be in a billet at or above their grade.</p>	<p>The primary focus in reviewing the COER should be on the accompanying narrative. Narrative indicates progression of responsibility, achievement and contributions to the agency mission. A secondary assessment of the COER will include a review of the COER score, in the context of looking at performance trends. The officer should be in a billet at or above their grade.</p>	<p>The primary focus in reviewing the COER should be on the accompanying narrative. Narrative indicates progression of responsibility, achievement and contributions to the agency mission. A secondary assessment of the COER will include a review of the COER score, in the context of looking at performance trends. The officer should be in a billet at or above their grade.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Award History -- □ CC Honor Awards □ Non-Corps Awards 	<p>A continuum of awards that emphasize quality not just quantity at the Achievement Medal or below.</p> <p>Yes, Value added</p> <p>Division, Institute and Agency awards (including from non-DHHS agencies) and professional organization awards and recognition such as letters of commendation.</p>	<p>A continuum of awards that emphasize quality not just quantity at the Commendation Medal or below. There should be a progression of awards across the career of the officer.</p> <p>Yes, Value added</p> <p>Division, Institute and Agency awards (including from non-DHHS agencies) and professional organization awards and recognition such as letters of commendation.</p>	<p>A continuum of awards that emphasize quality not just quantity at the OSM or below. There should be a progression of awards across the career of the officer.</p> <p>Yes, Value added</p> <p>Division, Institute and Agency awards (including from non-DHHS agencies) and professional organization awards and recognition such as letters of commendation.</p>


2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

<i>1. Performance – continued</i>			
BENCHMARK/GRADE	0-4	0-5	0-6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing Official's Assessment -- □ Promotion Readiness (Y/N) □ Leadership Attributes (i.e., influencing, operating, and improving the mission of the PHS) □ Mission Contribution 	<p>Yes, and Comments</p> <p>Contributes as a member of a formal task force or similar group at the Branch, division, agency, or CC level. Identifies leadership role.</p> <p>Contributes to the mission of the PHS through publications or other written or oral presentations.</p> <p>As assigned by the supervisor and demonstrating direct contribution to the mission.</p>	<p>Yes, and Comments</p> <p>Volunteers for and demonstrates leadership as a contributing member of a formal task force or similar group at the division, agency, or CC level.</p> <p>Contributes to the mission of the PHS through publications or other written or oral presentations.</p> <p>In addition to assigned duties, actively seeks outside activities that also contribute to the mission.</p>	<p>Yes, and Comments</p> <p>Volunteers for and serves in a leadership role (e.g., Chair, vice-chair) of a formal task force or similar group at the agency, CC, or PHS level.</p> <p>Contributes to the mission of the PHS through publications or other written or oral presentations.</p> <p>Clear evidence that career (duties and outside activities) has and will continue to contribute significantly to PHS (impact evident).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrity/Duty 	<p style="text-align: center;">Unquestioned</p> <p>No outstanding disciplinary or behavioral issues.</p> <p>Displaying honor and integrity as an officer.</p> <p>Without an official Letter of Reprimand or other review board decision for disciplinary action.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Unquestioned</p> <p>No outstanding disciplinary or behavioral issues.</p> <p>Displaying honor and integrity as an officer.</p> <p>Without an official Letter of Reprimand or other review board decision for disciplinary action.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Unquestioned</p> <p>No outstanding disciplinary or behavioral issues.</p> <p>Displaying honor and integrity as an officer.</p> <p>Without an official Letter of Reprimand or other review board decision for disciplinary action.</p>

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

<i>2. Education, Training and Professional Development</i>			
BENCHMARK/GRADE	0-4	0-5	0-6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degrees 	No degree beyond qualifying degree	No degree beyond qualifying degree See Attachment A	No degree beyond qualifying degree See Attachment A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certification/Credentialing 	All certifications/credentials required by law for the officer's discipline/billet See Attachment B	All certifications/credentials required by law for the officer's discipline/billet See Attachment B	All certifications/credentials required by law for the officer's discipline/billet See Attachment B
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensure 	All licenses required by law for their discipline/billet See Attachment B	All licenses required by law for their discipline/billet See Attachment B	All licenses required by law for their discipline/billet See Attachment B
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing Education Dependent on career pathway of officer (clinical, technical scientific, or leadership/management) 	Minimum of 30 <u>contact hours/year</u> See Attachment C	Minimum of 35 <u>contact hours/year</u> See Attachment C	Minimum of 40 <u>contact hours/year</u> See Attachment C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Health Training/Experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BOTC/IOTC (with Training Ribbon); - Evidence of additional coursework in public health and emergency preparedness training; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completion of OFRD Basic Level plus 10 or more additional modules; - BOTC/IOTC (with Training Ribbon); - Additional course work or experience in public health, or related to job that could contribute to current or future PHS assignments (e.g., Epidemiologic Methods, Community Preparedness; Information Systems Technology, Bioterrorism) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Completion of OFRD Basic Level plus 10 or more additional modules; - BOTC/IOTC (with Training Ribbon); AND - Leadership role and work experience in leading public health initiatives in current setting (facility, agency, local, state, or national.) OR Advanced course work, experience or expertise in public health discipline that contributes to current or future PHS assignments OR Leadership role in PHS or PHS agency that furthers the goals of PHS and DHHS

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

<i>3. Career Progression and Potential</i>			
BENCHMARK/GRADE	0-4	0-5	0-6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Billets 	At least O-4	At least O-5	At least O-6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignments, including collateral duties 	<p>Shows progression in responsibility, leadership and independence</p> <p>Independently conducts projects of moderate complexity with limited guidance</p>	 <p>Independently performing professional tasks with complex technical difficulty. Provides leadership as a team or project leader</p>	<p>Expert in their specialty with responsibility for independently conducting projects of exceptional technical difficulty</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobility (Programmatic and/or Geographic) For Scientist officers, Programmatic mobility (including TDYs and Details) is considered more important than Geographic mobility 	<p>No minimum level [Combined programmatic and/or geographic moves]</p>	<p>1 or more during career [Combined programmatic and/or geographic moves]</p>	<p>3 or more during career [Combined programmatic and/or geographic moves] - May consider fewer moves for an expert or specialist as long as moves reflect increasing responsibility and leadership</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assimilation 	Applied (if eligible)	Applied and/or Assimilated (if eligible)	Assimilated or applied at earliest possible date (if eligible)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Award History: CC Honor Awards Non CC Award 	<p>Avg. 1 award for every 3 years of service Unit/individual/agency/institution</p>	<p>Avg. 1 award for every 3 years of service Unit/individual/agency/institution, at least 1 of which must be CC</p>	<p>Avg. 1 award for every 2 years of service Unit/individual/agency/institution, at least 2 of which must be CC, with 1 being at the Commendation level</p>

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

<i>4. Characteristics of Career Officer and Service to the Corps</i>			
BENCHMARK/GRADE	0-4	0-5	0-6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership/Involvement in PAC or other Commissioned Corps Committees or Advisory Groups (e.g., JOAG, MOLC) (also described in Officer's Statement) 	Volunteer or elected member including field reps/subcommittee members, etc., with demonstrated participation.	Elected member, assume level of responsibility by Chairing a Task Force or subcommittee, or equivalent.	Elected member, serves in Chair or Vice-Chair leadership roles.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associate Recruiter • Mentoring 	<p>Member, formal appointment, active participation.</p> <p>Value added</p> <p>Contribution of informal mentoring should be documented.</p>	<p>Member, formal appointment, active participation.</p> <p>Leadership Recognition</p> <p>Contribution of informal mentoring should be documented.</p>	<p>Member, formal appointment, active participation.</p> <p>Leadership Recognition</p> <p>Contribution of informal mentoring should be documented.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BOTC/IOTC 	Yes, with Ribbon	Yes with Ribbon	Yes with Ribbon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Organizations 	Active member	Serves as a contributing member of a Committee or subcommittee.	Serves as Chair, Vice-Chair or in other significant leadership roles in Committees or as a member of the Board.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Awards • Special Assignment Award • Isolated Hardship Award • Hazardous Duty • NEPA/CRSA • Foreign Duty 	≥ 1	≥ 2	≥ 3

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

<i>4. Characteristics of Career Officer and Service to the Corps-continued</i>			
BENCHMARK/GRADE	0-4	0-5	0-6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to Visibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Daily wearing of uniform <input type="checkbox"/> Presentations/outreach acknowledge the Corps 	Daily.	Daily.	Daily.
	Speeches include discussion of the Corps.	Speeches include discussion of the Corps.	Speeches include discussion of the Corps.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Official Commissioned Corps/PHS Activities (i.e., Honor Guard, Color Guard, PHS Ensemble, Aide-de-Camp, COA) 	Yes, Demonstrated Participation	Yes, Demonstrated Participation	Yes, Demonstrated Participation

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

5. Readiness			
BENCHMARK/GRADE	0-4	0-5	0-6
	<p>For PY 2007, officers can meet this standard by meeting <u>all</u> of the requirements of the “OFRD Basic Level” of readiness that are in place for the OFRD program as referenced in the Manual Circular, “PHS Readiness Standards”.</p> <p>Application of Benchmark Standard:</p> <p>Officers who satisfy <u>all</u> the requirements for PY 2007 will be given the maximum number of points under the Readiness Precept.</p> <p>Officers who do not satisfy <u>all</u> the requirements for PY 2007 will receive zero points under the Readiness Precept.</p>	<p>For PY 2007, officers can meet this standard by meeting <u>all</u> of the requirements of the “OFRD Basic Level” of readiness that are in place for the OFRD program as referenced in the Manual Circular, “PHS Readiness Standards”.</p> <p>Application of Benchmark Standard:</p> <p>Officers who satisfy <u>all</u> the requirements for PY 2007 will be given the maximum number of points under the Readiness Precept.</p> <p>Officers who do not satisfy <u>all</u> the requirements for PY 2007 will receive zero points under the Readiness Precept.</p>	<p>For PY 2007, officers can meet this standard by meeting <u>all</u> of the requirements of the “OFRD Basic Level” of readiness that are in place for the OFRD program as referenced in the Manual Circular, “PHS Readiness Standards”.</p> <p>Application of Benchmark Standard:</p> <p>Officers who satisfy <u>all</u> the requirements for PY 2007 will be given the maximum number of points under the Readiness Precept.</p> <p>Officers who do not satisfy <u>all</u> the requirements for PY 2007 will receive zero points under the Readiness Precept.</p>

Note: Officers may submit a request for a temporary medical waiver to the Medical Affairs Branch for medical issues related to vaccinations or the Annual Physical Fitness Test.

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

Attachment A

Explanation of Degree Benchmark

Recommendation by SciPAC: No degree beyond qualifying degree.

Rationale:

- Officers are called to active duty with a “terminal degree,” that is, the qualifying degree for the Scientist Category is the doctoral degree.
 - Conferring of a doctoral degree in a particular field of study represents an individual’s mastery and expertise within that subject matter.
 - It is not common practice in academia or the military services for scientists to “collect” degrees or for professions to expect scientists to obtain degrees beyond what is considered the pinnacle of their education.
 - Setting benchmarks at successively higher academic degree levels by grade makes little sense for the Scientist Category.
- The SciPAC does support the idea that it is valuable for officers to obtain further education and that this adds value to the Corps for Scientist Officers.
 - The Scientist Category recommends giving additional points for additional degrees that are not in the same discipline or area of focus (especially from the same school) as the qualifying degree for the officer and are value-added disciplines for PHS service.
 - Thus, an officer up for an O-4, O-5, or O-6 promotion who has a master’s degree in a different discipline or area of focus from their doctoral degree would be ranked higher than an officer without one.
 - On the rare occasion that an officer has an additional doctoral degree or two master’s degrees, that officer would receive more points.
 - Additionally, an officer with a Master of Public Health (MPH) Degree in Epidemiology, and then a doctoral degree in Epidemiology, would receive no additional credit since the master’s degree was a precursor to the doctoral degree.

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

Attachment B

Explanation of Certification/Credentialing and Licensure for Scientist Category

Recommendation by SciPAC: Certification/Credentialing and Licensure for Scientist Category are not appropriate as Scientist Category promotion benchmarks.

Rationale:

- The Scientist Category includes over 40 different professional disciplines (see table below), encompassing public health, psychology, biology, epidemiology, chemistry, microbiology and several other sciences. Credentialing, certification, and licensure differ by discipline and within discipline or are not required at all (other than by educational degree) for many disciplines. To use credentialing, certification or licensure as promotion benchmarks is problematic at best.
- Examples:
 - How do you compare (give advantage to), for promotion purposes, a Scientist Officer who is a practicing clinical psychologist (licensed) to another Scientist Officer who is a research psychologist (not licensed)?
 - How do you use these characteristics to differentiate on a promotion board an epidemiologist (not licensed, certified, or credentialed), and a licensed social worker (credentialed) and a research chemist (not licensed or credentialed)?
- The use of certification, credentialing or licensure for promotion purposes will result in comparing characteristics that are not comparable between groups of Scientist Officers. There is no one standard that can be applied across the entire category.
- There is no equitable way to use certification, credentialing, or licensure to differentiate Scientist Officers for promotion purposes other than requiring the standard credentials, certification and licensure that are needed for certain disciplines (which are part of their requirements for PHS so will be covered by DCP in clearing the officer for promotion).
- It would not be appropriate to give advantage to some officers who can be certified in various arenas when comparing to others who have no opportunity for certification.
- The Scientist Category is very different from the Physician, Nurse, Dental, and Veterinarian Categories for which these precepts are clearly appropriate. Suggestions regarding the appropriate means to use these items in a fair and equitable manner are welcomed. However, at this juncture, the SciPAC contends that standardizing credentialing, certification, and licensure between disciplines for promotion purposes is not possible. The SciPAC acknowledges the need for reliance on the discretion of the ATPB to make sound judgments in this area for disciplines within the Scientist Category.

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

<u>Discipline/Ph.D.</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Discipline/Ph.D.</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
• Microbiology	25	• Experimental Psychology	8
• Chemistry	19	• Counseling Psychology	2
• Biochemistry	11	• Developmental/Child Psych.	1
• Cell/Molecular Biology	5	• Physics, General	5
• Physiology	5	• Nuclear	3
• Immunology	3	• Biophysics	1
• Neuroscience	3	• Pharmacology	8
• Pathology	3	• Pharmacy	1
• Virology	3	• Toxicology	13
• Parasitology	2	• Environmental Health	4
• Genetics	1	• Environmental Science	3
• Bacteriology	1	• Ecology	1
• Endocrinology	1	• Public Health, General	10
• Occupational Therapy	1	• International Health	4
• Epidemiology	60	• Public Health Administration	3
• Clinical Psychology	28	• Health Policy Management	2
• General Psychology	1	• Public Health Education	2
• Dietetics	4	• Zoology	1
• Food Science and Technology	2	• Sociology	4
• Food and Nutrition Science	2	• Biostatistics	3
• Nutritional Sciences	1	• Occupational Safety	2
• Biology, General	9	• Demography	1
• Entomology	5		
• Poultry Science	4		

2007 SCIENTIST BENCHMARKS

Attachment C

Additional Notes for Continuing Education

- The officers represented on the SciPAC believe that continuing education should remain at a high level throughout an officer's career and that officers should remain current with their discipline.
 - Contact hours in training are a more accurate and consistent gauge of continuing education than Continuing Education Units (CEUs) and encourage the ATPB to standardize consideration of officers eligible for promotion on this basis. "Contact hours" should reflect actual time spent in learning activities, including classroom, seminar, conference, web-based, instructional, or other appropriate types of learning.
 - Teaching or training others is considered an integral part of continuing education and should be counted equal in weight to educational activities wherein the officer is in the learning role.
 - The combination of learning and teaching contact hours is expected to increase over the officer's career as they engage in more teaching activities at higher levels of experience.