

Torres Rojas, Genara

FOI#12763

**From:**  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 14, 2013 11:44 AM  
**To:** Duffy, Daniel  
**Cc:** Torres Rojas, Genara; Van Duyne, Sheree  
**Subject:** Freedom of Information Online Request Form

Information:

First Name: Louis  
Last Name: Vitale  
Company: Private  
Mailing Address 1:  
Mailing Address 2:  
City:  
State:  
Zip Code:  
Email Address:  
Phone:  
Required copies of the records: Yes

List of specific record(s):

I am seeking records, to include policy, handbooks, guidelines, e-mails, memos, etc. pertaining to employee evaluations and accompanying guidance and instructions provided to management staff during the period December 2012 through February 2013.

**THE PORT AUTHORITY** OF NY & NJ

*FOI Administrator*

March 22, 2013

Mr. Louis Vitale

Re: Freedom of Information Reference No. 13768

Dear Mr. Vitale:

This is a response to your February 14, 2013 request, which has been processed under the Port Authority's Freedom of Information Code (the "Code") for copies of records related to policy, handbooks, guidelines, e-mails and memos pertaining to employee evaluations and accompanying guidance and instructions provided to management staff during the period December 2012 through February 2013.

Material responsive to your request and available under the Code can be found on the Port Authority's website at <http://www.panynj.gov/corporate-information/foi/13768-O.pdf>. Paper copies of the available records are available upon request.

Please refer to the above FOI reference number in any future correspondence relating to your request.

Very truly yours,



Daniel D. Duffy  
FOI Administrator

---

**From:** Mohr, Roseann

**Sent:** Monday, February 04, 2013 1:49 PM

**To:** DL - HRD - Business Mgrs

**Cc:** Sinisgalli, Nicholas; Kiley, Cristina; Oberhelm, Brian; Kellman, Lisette; Dennis, Christine; Pannone, Ronald; Joyce, Terence; Montgomery, Ruth; Lim Griggs, Judith; Stanton, Richard; Kern, Michael; Cestari, Kenneth

**Subject:** Revised Guidance for Completion of 2012 RaMPs

### Revised Guidance for Completion of 2012 RaMPs

As previously announced, the agency is shifting to an annual calendar year cycle for all employees currently evaluated through eRaMP (plus non-represented Clerical employees). In addition, a comparative peer rating process is being implemented for these employees, adhering to a new, more normalized distribution of final Overall Performance ratings.

In HRD's January 23, 2013 Performance Management Policies statement, departments were advised that any complete 2012 eRaMPs would be reopened, enabling Managers to include post-calibrated final Overall Performance ratings, and to modify comments, if necessary, to reflect year-end accomplishments that would not otherwise have been accounted for in the employee's initial, anniversary-based eRaMP. Although that approach provided for modification to the new calendar year rating period, it did not preserve original documents, which would have been overridden to reflect post calibrated final Overall Performance ratings under the more normalized distribution.

Based on feedback received from departments, HRD has developed an alternative approach that will, for historical review purposes, preserve all initially completed 2012 eRaMPs, and provide for the development of new 2012 eRaMPs that comply with the annual calendar year cycle.

In addition to notifying you about the preservation of already completed 2012 eRaMPs, this document serves to provide clearer instructions on handling each possible scenario encountered by raters as they close all 2012 eRaMPs. **Regardless of the scenario, every employee must have one completed 2012 eRaMP document with an end date of 12/31/12 to reflect post calibrated Overall Performance ratings under the more normalized distribution.** While some 2012 eRaMPs may include information on achievements prior to 1/1/12, that information should not be considered in assigning a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating.

Below are guidelines and a revised deadline for the completion of 2012 RaMPs:

- **Employee has a "complete" 2012 RaMP and HAS NOT yet started a later eRaMP:**  
If an employee has an eRaMP with a 2012 end date where the final document has already been approved, acknowledged, or made available for review, a new document must be created by the employee or manager, with the dates 1/1/12 – 12/31/12 manually entered. This document will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance ratings under the more normalized distribution.

- **Employee has a “complete” 2012 RaMP and HAS started a new eRaMP with a 2013 end date:**  
If an employee has an eRaMP with a 2012 end date where the final document has been approved, acknowledged, or made available for review, and a new document with a 2013 end date, the 2013 document will automatically be adjusted through a PeopleSoft process to reflect a 12/31/12 end date, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance ratings under the more normalized distribution.
- **Employee has an open 2012 eRaMP that has NOT yet been “completed”:**  
If an employee has an open 2012 eRaMP at any stage prior to being made available for review, acknowledged, or approved, this document will be used to measure 2012 performance. The 2012 document will automatically be adjusted through a PeopleSoft process to reflect a 12/31/12 end date, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating under the more normalized distribution (While this document may contain information on achievements prior to 1/1/12, only 2012 achievements should be considered when assigning a peer comparison rating.)
- **Employee has an open 2012 eRaMP AND an open 2013 eRaMP, and neither have been “completed”:**  
In this case, the open 2012 eRaMP (at any stage prior to being made available for review, acknowledged, or approved) will be used to measure 2012 performance. The 2012 document will automatically be adjusted through a PeopleSoft process to reflect a 12/31/12 end date, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating under the more normalized distribution (While this document may contain information on achievements prior to 1/1/12, only 2012 achievements should be considered when assigning a peer comparison rating.) The 2013 document will also have dates adjusted to 1/1/13 – 12/31/13, where this document will be used moving forward to evaluate the employee’s 2013 performance.
- **Employee has no open eRaMP documents with end dates in 2012 or 2013:**  
The employee or manager must create a 2012 document, and manually change the dates of that document to 1/1/12 – 12/31/12. This document will be used for evaluating 2012 performance and the assignment of a post-calibration final Overall Performance rating, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating under the more normalized distribution

Using the guidance above, by Tuesday, February 12, all employees and managers/supervisors should complete the appropriate 2012 RaMP document. As previously communicated, managers/supervisors will use the attached document to evaluate employees on a relative basis and provide a recommended overall rating for the calibration process. Upon approval by Department Directors, Chiefs, and HRD, managers/supervisors will then be able to finalize the RaMP and discuss the final overall rating with each employee.

An HR Broadcast will go out this week to give employees an overview of the agency’s performance management program. If you have any questions about the process, please reach out to your HR Business Partner. If you have technical questions related to the eRaMP system\*, you may contact Ken Cestari, Terence Joyce, Mike Kern, or Ron Pannone.

*\*Please note: Date changes in RaMP documents are expected to be complete by Thursday, February 7.*

## *Overall Rating Guidelines for Individual Contributors / Agency Leaders*

Consider the employee's Objective and Competency ratings entered in eRaMP, and think about their relative contribution toward achieving Division / Department / Agency goals. Then check the individual behaviors to determine an appropriate Overall Performance Rating for this review period.

	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Building Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional Performance
<b>Impact:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Made minimal contribution to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was far below peer contributions; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Made some contributions to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Needs some development to achieve expected impact at a level comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Competently supported Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was comparable to peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in positive impact; Exceeded peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in major impact; Significantly exceeded peer contributions
<b>Quality / Quantity:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work often failed to meet expectations and was considerably less than peers; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work sometimes did not meet expectations or was less than peers; Needs some development	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work consistently met expectations; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work exceeded expectations and peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Distinguished performance through superior quality and quantity of work that significantly exceeded peers
<b>Achievement:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Failed to achieve one or more critical Objectives and was considerably less than peers; Rated Needs Significant Improvement or Needs Some Improvement on one or more Competencies that notably impacted performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not meet one or more Objectives; Rated Needs Some Improvement or Needs Significant Improvement on one or more Competencies; Needs some development to be comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met Objectives and demonstrated solid proficiency in required Competencies; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met and exceeded peer contributions on most essential Objectives; Demonstrated required Competencies with some rated Highly Effective or Exceptional Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Significantly exceeded peers on Objectives and consistently demonstrated an exceptional level of Competencies with several rated as an Exceptional Strength
<b>Effort:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth minimal effort; Was complacent taking the easiest way; Often let others carry the work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs significant improvement to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth moderate effort; At times, did not carry expected work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth required effort; Achieved goals and carried expected work load in required timeframes; Gave extra effort when required; Comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Often put forth extra effort, initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently put forth extra effort; Exhibited initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation at levels that were significantly above peers
<b>Demonstrated Ability:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently had difficulty meeting basic job standards; Work often required supervisory correction or close review; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Had some difficulty meeting job standards; Work sometimes required supervisory correction or close review; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong, solid, dependable performer who capably handled standard assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Was an outstanding performer; Is capable of independently handling more complex assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently was "go-to" person for the most complex issues; Fixed difficult problems; Is capable of independently handling more complex future assignments

**From:** Kellman, Lisette  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 07, 2013 1:45 PM  
**To:** Crowley, Susan; Denardo, Amy  
**Subject:** eRamp and Calibration - Note to Staff

Ladies,

Here is another clarifying email template you can use to send to staff. Read through and feel free to send the one that will best suit your needs, and as discussed, revise the dates as you see fit. The attachment also speaks about special circumstances for temps, mobilities, etc. Please let me know if you have questions. If you'd like to speak, I'll be back in the office tomorrow. I have meetings for the rest of the day.

Best,  
Lisette

\*\*\*\*\*

The Port Authority is transitioning to a new performance management program with a more normalized distribution of performance ratings. This process will begin with the completion of 2012 RaMPs for all non-represented staff by Tuesday, 2/12. Evaluation periods for this process will be the calendar year 2012, meaning evaluation periods for all employees will end 12/31/12. The attached document ("Guidance for Completion of 2012 RaMPs") provides instructions on how each scenario should be handled.

Objective and competency ratings should measure an employee's absolute performance against objectives and competencies. This information must be entered into PeopleSoft by Tuesday, 2/12. Please do not enter an overall rating yet and do not hold discussions with staff on your recommended overall rating for them. \*If necessary, you can also access RaMP at home through PeopleSoft Self Service at <https://pastaff.panynj.gov>.

Overall ratings will be based on an employee's relative performance, compared with fellow employee contributions, on a normalized distribution curve, as follows:

- Exceptional Performance (5): 15%
- Outstanding Performance (4): 30%
- Strong Performance (3): 40%
- Building Performance (2) and Unacceptable Performance (1): 15%

Please use the attached form ("Relative Overall Rating Form") to submit your recommended overall rating for each employee. This form helps you to rate each employee on a relative basis, taking into account their impact, quality/quantity of work, achievement, effort, and demonstrated ability. These forms should be submitted to [INSERT NAME HERE] by close of business Tuesday, 2/12.

Thank you for your cooperation in this effort. Feel free to reach out to me with any questions.

Employee Name:

Manager Name:

## Overall Rating Guidelines for Individual Contributors / Agency Leaders

Consider the employee's Objective and Competency ratings entered in eRaMP, and think about their relative contribution toward achieving Division / Department / Agency goals. Then check the individual behaviors to determine an appropriate Overall Performance Rating for this review period.

	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Building Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional Performance
<b>Impact:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Made minimal contribution to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was far below peer contributions; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Made some contributions to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Needs some development to achieve expected impact at a level comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Competently supported Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was comparable to peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in positive impact; Exceeded peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in major impact; Significantly exceeded peer contributions
<b>Quality / Quantity:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work often failed to meet expectations and was considerably less than peers; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work sometimes did not meet expectations or was less than peers; Needs some development	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work consistently met expectations; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work exceeded expectations and peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Distinguished performance through superior quality and quantity of work that significantly exceeded peers
<b>Achievement:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Failed to achieve one or more critical Objectives and was considerably less than peers; Rated Needs Significant Improvement or Needs Some Improvement on one or more Competencies that notably impacted performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not meet one or more Objectives; Rated Needs Some Improvement or Needs Significant Improvement on one or more Competencies; Needs some development to be comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met Objectives and demonstrated solid proficiency in required Competencies; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met and exceeded peer contributions on most essential Objectives; Demonstrated required Competencies with some rated Highly Effective or Exceptional Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Significantly exceeded peers on Objectives and consistently demonstrated an exceptional level of Competencies with several rated as an Exceptional Strength
<b>Effort:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth minimal effort; Was complacent taking the easiest way; Often let others carry the work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs significant improvement to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth moderate effort; At times, did not carry expected work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth required effort; Achieved goals and carried expected work load in required timeframes; Gave extra effort when required; Comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Often put forth extra effort, initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently put forth extra effort; Exhibited initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation at levels that were significantly above peers
<b>Demonstrated Ability:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently had difficulty meeting basic job standards; Work often required supervisory correction or close review; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Had some difficulty meeting job standards; Work sometimes required supervisory correction or close review; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong, solid, dependable performer who capably handled standard assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Was an outstanding performer; Is capable of independently handling more complex assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently was "go-to" person for the most complex issues; Fixed difficult problems; Is capable of independently handling more complex future assignments

## Guidance for Completion of 2012 RaMPs

The Port Authority is shifting to an annual calendar year cycle for all employees currently evaluated through eRaMP (plus non-represented Clerical employees). In addition, a comparative peer rating process is being implemented for these employees, adhering to a new, more normalized distribution of final Overall Performance ratings.

HRD has developed an alternative approach that will, for historical review purposes, preserve all initially completed 2012 eRaMPs, and provide for the development of new 2012 eRaMPs that comply with the annual calendar year cycle.

This document serves to provide clearer instructions on handling each possible scenario encountered by raters as they close all 2012 eRaMPs. **Regardless of the scenario, every employee must have one completed 2012 eRaMP document with an end date of 12/31/12 to reflect post calibrated Overall Performance ratings under the more normalized distribution.** While some 2012 eRaMPs may include information on achievements prior to 1/1/12, that information should not be considered in assigning a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating.

Below are guidelines and a revised deadline for the completion of 2012 RaMPs:

- **Employee has a “complete” 2012 RaMP and HAS NOT yet started a later eRaMP:**  
If an employee has an eRaMP with a 2012 end date where the final document has already been approved, acknowledged, or made available for review, a new document must be created by the employee or manager, with the dates 1/1/12 – 12/31/12 manually entered. This document will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance ratings under the more normalized distribution.
- **Employee has a “complete” 2012 RaMP and HAS started a new eRaMP with a 2013 end date:**  
If an employee has an eRaMP with a 2012 end date where the final document has been approved, acknowledged, or made available for review, and a new document with a 2013 end date, the 2013 document will automatically be adjusted through a PeopleSoft process to reflect a 12/31/12 end date, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance ratings under the more normalized distribution.
- **Employee has an open 2012 eRaMP that has NOT yet been “completed”:**  
If an employee has an open 2012 eRaMP at any stage prior to being made available for review, acknowledged, or approved, this document will be used to measure 2012 performance. The 2012 document will automatically be adjusted through a PeopleSoft process to reflect a 12/31/12 end date, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating under the more normalized distribution (While this document may contain information on achievements prior to 1/1/12, only 2012 achievements should be considered when assigning a peer comparison rating.)

- **Employee has an open 2012 eRaMP AND an open 2013 eRaMP, and neither have been “completed”:**

In this case, the open 2012 eRaMP (at any stage prior to being made available for review, acknowledged, or approved) will be used to measure 2012 performance. The 2012 document will automatically be adjusted through a PeopleSoft process to reflect a 12/31/12 end date, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating under the more normalized distribution (While this document may contain information on achievements prior to 1/1/12, only 2012 achievements should be considered when assigning a peer comparison rating.) The 2013 document will also have dates adjusted to 1/1/13 – 12/31/13, where this document will be used moving forward to evaluate the employee’s 2013 performance.

- **Employee has no open eRaMP documents with end dates in 2012 or 2013:**

The employee or manager must create a 2012 document, and manually change the dates of that document to 1/1/12 – 12/31/12. This document will be used for evaluating 2012 performance and the assignment of a post-calibration final Overall Performance rating, and this will be used to record a post calibrated final Overall Performance rating under the more normalized distribution

Using the guidance above, by **Tuesday, February 12**, all employees and managers/supervisors should complete the appropriate 2012 RaMP document. As previously communicated, managers/supervisors will use the attached document to evaluate employees on a relative basis and provide a recommended overall rating for the calibration process. Upon approval by Department Directors, Chiefs, and HRD, managers/supervisors will then be able to finalize the RaMP and discuss the final overall rating with each employee.

An HR Broadcast will go out this week to give employees an overview of the agency’s performance management program. If you have any questions about the process, please reach out to your HR Business Partner. If you have technical questions related to the eRaMP system\*, you may contact Ken Cestari, Terence Joyce, Mike Kern, or Ron Pannone.

*\*Please note: Date changes in RaMP documents are expected to be complete by Thursday, February 7.*

**Performance Management**  
**Guidelines for Special Scenarios**

**Time Away From Work** (e.g. Sick, Maternity Leave, FMLA, etc.)

- Employee's performance should be evaluated assuming whatever performance they had during the time they were here would have continued for the entire duration of the year.
- An employee who was on a leave should not be negatively impacted simply based on that time away from work.

**Project Employees (FTEs) & Temporary Employees**

- Project employees should have a 2012 RaMP completed and be included in the calibration process.
- Regular PA temps are not included.

**New Hires / Transfers / Promotions**

- **New hires** (external) should only be included if they were hired on June 30, 2012 or earlier. Hires on July 1 or after would, in theory, not have reached the interim review stage yet, and therefore would not be included in 2012 calibration.
- **Transfers** from other departments should be included in the calibration for the department they are currently in. Departments are encouraged to work with the employee's previous department to get information on their performance to develop a blended rating.
- **Promotions** should take into account a blend of old and new performance.

**Mobility Assignments**

- **External:** Employees on an external mobility assignment should be included in the department's calibration process. Departments should work with the outside organization to get information on the employee's performance.
- **Internal:** Employees should be calibrated in the department they are currently sitting in. Depending on when the assignment started, the department may need to work with the employee's previous department to get information on their performance to develop a blended rating.

---

**From:** Kellman, Lisette

**Sent:** Thursday, February 07, 2013 3:25 PM

**To:** Moglia, Camille; Roman, Marle; Heun, Flo; Beard-Wilcher, Kimberly; Evans, Janice (MBD); Molina, Aurea; McKnight, Lottie; Pidlich, Cindy; Vespoli, Linda

**Subject:**

Good afternoon,

Attached is a document that will assist you in answering questions that may come up with your managers in the calibration sessions. Please feel free to forward.

Best,  
Lisette

**Performance Management**  
**Guidelines for Special Scenarios**

**Time Away From Work** (e.g. Sick, Maternity Leave, FMLA, etc.)

- Employee's performance should be evaluated assuming whatever performance they had during the time they were here would have continued for the entire duration of the year.
- An employee who was on a leave should not be negatively impacted simply based on that time away from work.

**Project Employees (FTEs) & Temporary Employees**

- Project employees should have a 2012 RaMP completed and be included in the calibration process.
- Regular PA temps are not included.

**New Hires / Transfers / Promotions**

- **New hires** (external) should only be included if they were hired on June 30, 2012 or earlier. Hires on July 1 or after would, in theory, not have reached the interim review stage yet, and therefore would not be included in 2012 calibration.
- **Transfers** from other departments should be included in the calibration for the department they are currently in. Departments are encouraged to work with the employee's previous department to get information on their performance to develop a blended rating.
- **Promotions** should take into account a blend of old and new performance.

**Mobility Assignments**

- **External:** Employees on an external mobility assignment should be included in the department's calibration process. Departments should work with the outside organization to get information on the employee's performance.
- **Internal:** Employees should be calibrated in the department they are currently sitting in. Depending on when the assignment started, the department may need to work with the employee's previous department to get information on their performance to develop a blended rating.

---

**From:** Kellman, Lisette  
**Sent:** Monday, February 04, 2013 5:23 PM  
**To:** Moglia, Camille  
**Subject:** Performance Management Program  
**Importance:** High

Good evening Camille,

Thanks for our brief chat today. I'll be working with you within the Financial Analysis and Capital Planning Departments, as well as the CFO. Please feel free to review the following email template below and forward to your departmental managers as you see fit. The attachments are referenced in the sample email and were developed by HRD as tools to assist you with the Performance Management Program.

As always, please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Best,  
Lisette

---

LISETTE KELLMAN | HR BUSINESS PARTNER  
The Port Authority of NY & NJ | Human Resources Department  
225 Park Avenue South, 10th Floor  
Phone: (212) 435-2847 | Fax: (212) 435-2882

*Planning ahead for Retirement?*

No matter where you are on your retirement journey, you can learn more by visiting the new HR Retirement eNet page:

At work: <http://enet/hrd/svcs-retirement.html>

From home: <http://paenet.panynj.gov>

\*\*\*\*\*

As you are aware, the Agency is embarking on a new Performance Management Program. The program changes include a streamlined process, a move to a calendar-year cycle and, most significantly, relative performance ratings that compare employee performance to other employees.

To assist you in the compilation of ratings for 2012 performance, the calibrating of ratings against peer groups and the overall eRamp cycle, I am attaching a number of documents and tools for your reference and use.

Please find attached:

- Performance Management Policy Guidelines
- Performance Management Calibration Guide
  - This will guide you as you consider the absolute and relative performance of your staff and the normalized distribution that must be achieved for your department:
    - 15% - Exceptional Performance (5 rating)
    - 30% - Outstanding Performance (4 rating)
    - 40% - Strong Performance (3 rating)
    - 15% - Unacceptable Performance (1-2 rating)
- Overall Rating Guidelines Sheet:
  - Please use this to come up with the preliminary rating of each employee in your department
  - Submit a sheet for each of your employees to your business manager by Friday, February 8
- Ratings Spreadsheet
  - To be filled out by the Business Manager

I will facilitate a calibration session for your department to help you achieve the normalized distribution. To prepare for this session, each manager should come prepared with a list of achievements, or contributions, for each staff member; a completed eRaMP for each staff member (objectives, performance against objectives and development needs); an overall performance rating guidelines sheet for each employee and finally a rank order of your employees.

Below are important timelines and dates for the implementation of the new Performance Management Program:

1. As Soon As Possible: complete eRaMP ratings for all non-represented employees
2. As Soon As Possible: complete overall ratings sheet for all non-represented employees
3. Mid February/early March: calibration meetings occur; be ready to discuss your overall ratings and 2012 accomplishments for your employees at these meetings.

Please let me know if you have any issues or concerns prior to our calibration session. Your Business Manager or I will get back you with the time and date of our session. Thank you for your attention to this matter.



Performance  
Management Guideli.Guidelines-1.24.1...



Calibration  
Guidelines-1.24.1...



Overall Rating  
Sheet.docx



Calibration  
Spreadheet.xls

# Performance Management Policies

January 23, 2013

## 1. 2013 Performance Management Program

The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey is committed to employing the latest, best-in-practice performance management system designed to:

- Develop meaningful performance objectives for staff that link to important department and agency objectives.
- Ensure employees understand the important goals and deliverables on which they will be evaluated.
- Provide constructive feedback to employees on their performance with achievable development and performance improvement recommendations.
- Provide meaningful and differentiated recognition to employees commensurate with their performance.

The current eRaMP system, first implemented in 2008, was a major improvement over the previous performance management system. However, to keep our program up to date and relevant, changes to our eRaMP system and performance management program will be implemented in 2013 with a calendar year cycle, new competencies, streamlined processing and, most significantly, relative performance ratings that compare employee contributions to that of other employees. The agency is committed to the success of this performance management program and HR will closely monitor its implementation to ensure a fair and unbiased application, while recognizing those truly deserving based on performance and merit.

## 2. Performance Ratings

Calibration can be very useful to an organization in identifying how best to recognize its staff, and allows an organization to provide meaningful differentiation of top-level performers. Evaluation of employee performance is a two-step process that begins with an assessment of absolute performance (i.e. how well one accomplishes the goals and objectives set forth in their eRaMP document and their competency ratings), and then considers relative performance (how employees' contributions compare to the contributions of peers). The employee's immediate supervisor/manager evaluates an employee's absolute performance based on the qualitative and quantitative criteria associated with each objective. The evaluation of relative performance is accomplished through the calibration process, which involves managers of similar groups of employees meeting together to compare the contributions of those reporting to them. Each manager has an opportunity to discuss how his/her employee compares with other employees in the group and, through this process, managers ultimately array employees according to a more normalized distribution. The process then "rolls up" to the Director's reporting structure, who similarly calibrate the managers into the normalized distribution. Department Directors perform the final calibration on their department subject to the review of their Chief.

## 3. The Annual eRaMP Cycle and Key Administration Dates

Beginning in January 2013, the agency will evaluate employee performance (eRaMP) on a calendar year

# Performance Management Policies

January 23, 2013

cycle. This means that each December, PeopleSoft will automatically generate new eRaMP documents for staff covering the prospective review period of January 1 through December 31. Departments must ensure that all objectives are entered into the eRaMP system no later than January 2nd of the cycle. Managers and employees will engage in performance discussions and complete required documentation throughout the year. Departments must complete performance evaluations with final ratings in compliance with the normalized distribution immediately following the close of the review cycle by a date in January that will be announced in annual operational guidance instructions. Upon completion, Department Directors must provide their Chiefs with their ratings distribution for their review and approval. Chiefs must notify HRD by the required due date that their departments have finalized their ratings in PeopleSoft and that the required distribution has been achieved. Chiefs have discretion to allow departments some deviation from the distribution in order to consider the larger population across multiple departments in assigning ratings. However, overall submissions must achieve the normalized rating distribution.

#### 4. Performance Review Meetings/Discussions

Managers will follow the recommended performance management protocol of setting objectives, providing ongoing feedback, conducting interim reviews, identifying and implementing development recommendations and/or performance improvement plans, and completing final reviews. Final reviews will include discussions about the level of absolute performance staff achieved against objectives, competencies and development plans as well as the level of relative achievement and contribution to the department and the agency. Managers will conduct final review discussions with employees after all normalized overall rating distributions are confirmed by HR.

#### 5. Transition Guidance for Completion of 2012 eRaMPs

The following guidelines are intended to help Departments and staff transition to the normalized rating distribution and annual rating eRaMP cycle:

- A 2012 eRaMP must be completed for all staff evaluated through the eRaMP process.
- For staff whose 2012 eRaMPs are not yet completed as of the date of this notice, managers should conduct performance review discussions but refrain from providing overall ratings until normalized distribution decisions are completed. Managers will add comments that define the rating period as concluding on December 31, 2012.
- For staff whose 2012 eRaMPs were completed during the calendar year, HRD will reopen these documents. After calibration is completed, managers will re-enter post calibrated final overall ratings reflecting the normal distribution. Managers will add comments that define the rating period as concluding on December 31, 2012. As indicated above, managers should refrain from providing overall ratings until normalized distribution decisions are completed.

## Performance Management Policies

January 23, 2013

- HRD Business Partners will brief managers on transitioning to the normalized overall rating distribution, and will facilitate departmental calibration meetings to help departments determine their overall ratings. A timing and submission schedule is provided.

### 2012 RaMP Completion Timing and Submission Schedule

Completion Date	Action
2/5/13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Managers</b> determine 2012 Objectives and Competencies ratings; Recommend Overall Ratings; Enter ratings into eRaMP system (Save eRaMP document but do not make available for review)</li><li>• <b>Managers</b> discuss ratings with Department Reviewer and recommend Overall Ratings</li></ul>
3/15/13	<b>HRD Business Partners</b> facilitate <b>Department</b> calibration meetings to determine normalized Overall Rating distributions and appropriateness of ratings
3/22/13	<b>Departments</b> finalize Overall Ratings in eRaMP system and submit for Chief Review
3/29/13	<b>Chiefs</b> submit normalized Overall Rating distributions for final <b>HRD</b> review
4/5/13	<b>HRD Business Partners</b> notify <b>Departments</b> that final Overall Ratings are approved
4/30/13	<b>Departments</b> make eRaMPs available for Staff review; conduct performance review discussions; complete remaining eRaMP steps including <b>Staff</b> Acknowledgement and Approval by Department Reviewer

## Performance Management Policies

January 23, 2013

### 2013 eRaMP Completion Timing and Submission Schedule

Completion Date	Action
1/31/13	PeopleSoft automatically creates 2013 eRaMP documents
2/28/13	<b>Managers and Staff</b> enter 2013 eRaMP Objectives*
6/15/13 – 7/15/13	<b>Managers</b> enter 2013 Interlm Reviews into eRaMP and make available to <b>Staff</b> *
6/15/13 – 7/31/13	<b>Managers</b> conduct 2013 Interim Review discussions with <b>Staff</b> *
12/1/13 – 1/7/14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Managers</b> determine 2013 Objectives and Competencies ratings; Recommend Overall Ratings; Enter ratings into eRaMP system (Save eRaMP document but do not make available for review)</li> <li>• <b>Managers</b> discuss ratings with Department Reviewer and recommend Overall Ratings</li> </ul>
1/8/14 – 1/22/14	<b>HRD Business Partners</b> facilitate <b>Department</b> calibration meetings to determine normalized Overall Rating distributions and appropriateness of ratings
1/23/14	<b>Departments</b> finalize Overall Ratings in eRaMP system
1/24/14	<b>Departments</b> submit normalized Overall Rating distribution for <b>Chief</b> review
2/5/14	<b>Chiefs</b> submit normalized Overall Rating distributions for final <b>HRD</b> review
2/11/14	<b>HRD Business Partners</b> notify <b>Departments</b> that final Overall Ratings are approved
2/11/14- 3/27/14	<b>Departments</b> make eRaMPs available for Staff review; conduct performance review discussions; complete remaining eRaMP steps including <b>Staff</b> Acknowledgement and Approval by Department Reviewer

\*Note: These processes will be reviewed by Directors, Business Managers and HRD to ensure compliance.

# Performance Management Policies

January 23, 2013

## 2012/2013 Rating Distribution

5	Exceptional	15%
4	Outstanding	30%
3	Strong Performer	40%
2	Building Performance	15%
1	Unacceptable	

# Performance Management Policies

January 23, 2013

## Anticipated 2014 Rating Distribution



5	Exceptional	15%
4	Outstanding	20%
3	Strong Performer	50%
2	Building Performance	15%
1	Unacceptable	15%

### eRaMP Support Team

Terence Joyce 212-435-2831

Ken Cestari 212-435-2890

Mike Kern 201-216-2305

HRBPs

# A Guide to Calibrating Overall Performance Ratings: Relative Performance Ratings and the Agency's Normalized Distribution

## Purpose of this guide

The following guidelines are intended for HRD Business Partners and Managers as they prepare for, facilitate or participate in department calibration meetings throughout the Agency. The purpose of these calibration meetings is to:

- Consider the performance of staff to determine their Overall Performance Ratings in a manner that adheres to the Agency's normalized distribution. The Overall Performance Rating is determined by considering:
  - **Absolute Performance** – Absolute performance is determined by individual Managers evaluating their direct reports. To do this, Managers independently evaluate each staff member by comparing actual year-end accomplishments to pre-established eRaMP objectives and ratings on essential competencies required to accomplish that work.
  - **Relative Performance** - Relative performance is determined through a calibration session where several Managers evaluate how the contributions of individual employees compare to each other. To do this, Managers collaboratively rank staff members by comparing the Impact, Quality / Quantity, Achievement, Effort and Demonstrated Ability of staff.

## Preparation for the Calibration Meeting:

1. HRD Business Partners will meet with Departments to provide specific rating allocations that adhere to the Agency's normalized rating distribution and plan the calibration session. The distributions for 2013 and 2014 are indicated below:

Rating	Overall Performance Category	2013	2014
(5)	Exceptional Performance	15%	15%
(4)	Outstanding Performance	30%	20%
(3)	Strong Performance	40%	50%
(2)	Building Performance	15%	15%
(1)	Unacceptable Performance		

2. Departments and HRD Business Partners will determine appropriate rating groups to begin the calibration process (units, divisions, facilities, etc.). Generally, these rating groups should consist of similar functional areas made up of 15 to 60 staff.

3. Managers prepare for the calibration meeting considering the following guidelines:
- Managers must have a thorough understanding of their employees' contributions. This is best accomplished by asking staff to prepare a list of their achievements linked to the objectives on their eRaMPs, as well as other accomplishments.
  - The discussion of employee performance during the calibration meeting is based on the descriptions provided on the Overall Rating Guidelines to ensure that consistent standards are applied. Contributions are evaluated according to what could reasonably be expected by employees at their level.
  - Managers should be prepared to communicate a clear understanding of their employees' accomplishments (the "what" and the "how") to other managers participating in the calibration discussion.
  - Managers prepare their initial recommended overall ratings for staff that reflect the normalized distribution, and they should rank order staff contributions from high to low prior to the calibration meeting. This information is essential to resolve issues when more staff are rated at a certain performance level than the normalized distribution allocation allows.
  - Managers must be open to changing their assessment of their employees based on input and feedback received from other managers during the discussion.
  - Managers provide relevant observations on the contributions of all employees presented during the discussion.

### **Conducting the Calibration Meeting**

The calibration meeting may last between 3-4 hours or even up to 8 hours depending on the size of the group and the discussion of the participants. The format of the meeting will include individual presentation, group discussion, analysis, and decision making.

#### **Step 1: Facilitator Opens Meeting**

The calibration meeting is started by the facilitator. He/she outlines the purpose and process for the session and restates the "ground rules" for reviewing and comparing performance and for designating employees at each overall performance rating.

Typical ground rules enforced by the facilitator during calibration sessions include:

- Discussions will focus on *this year's performance only*, not improvement over previous years. Overall performance ratings are based primarily on accomplishments and contributions. Competencies and potential are also considered.
- Participants are encouraged to provide specific results and examples. Contributions are considered along with the employees' levels.
- Consensus means everyone has had an opportunity to be heard and is committed to, if not in total agreement with, the outcome.
- Participants will be encouraged to "police" each other in the process, noting when others are becoming too much of an advocate or discussing information not appropriate for the performance calibration process.

## Step 2: Discussion of Employees in Highest Clusters

The focus of discussion will begin with the highest performing employees—those who are being recommended for “5” and “4” ratings. By reviewing both “5” and “4” ratings, the group can get a view across the whole range of top performers.

To facilitate participation and variation, a “Round Robin” approach can be used. Managers take turns presenting one top performer—starting with the most highly ranked employee—with a quick summary. After all managers have presented in the first round, the facilitator asks each participant to provide a rating for each employee discussed, and records these responses on a flipchart. The ratings are “5”, “Borderline 5”, “4”, and “Borderline 4”. Each employee is given a preliminary rating of 5 or 4, depending on the distribution of responses.

For example, Manager 1 submits Employee A as her top ranked employee, and based on the following distribution of responses, the facilitator assigns Employee A a preliminary rating of 5:

Manager 1	Manager 2	Manager 3	Manager 4	Manager 5	Manager 6	Manager 7	Manager 8
--	5	Borderline 5	5	Borderline 5	5	5	4

Next, the second round begins where managers present in the same order their second top performer (provided they are in the highest cluster). This continues until the entire pool of top performers has been presented.

## Step 3: Consensus on Top Contributors Reached

After the various Round Robin sessions, the facilitator leads an exercise to enable the distribution of preliminary ratings to conform to the performance distribution guidelines. Generally this begins with a ranking of employees based on the group’s initial responses, and a discussion of those with the least favorable responses.

For example, eight of the 40 employees that report to this group of managers have a preliminary rating of 5, and performance distribution guidelines limit this number to six. Based on the group’s initial responses, Employee F, Employee G, and Employee H are the most likely candidates to be moved to the “4” category.

	Manager 1	Manager 2	Manager 3	Manager 4	Manager 5	Manager 6
Employee A	--	5	5	5	5	5
Employee B	5	--	5	5	5	5
Employee C	5	5	--	5	5	5
Employee D	5	5	Borderline 5	--	5	5
Employee E	Borderline 5	5	5	5	--	5
Employee F	5	5	Borderline 5	5	Borderline 5	--
Employee G	--	Borderline 5	5	4	5	5
Employee H	5	--	5	Borderline 5	5	4

If a manager contests any of the outcomes for one of their staff, they may request more in-depth discussion. Also, at this stage, participants may challenge the *exclusion* of any employee who is not recommended to be in the highest cluster.

#### **Step 4: Discussion of Employees in Lowest Clusters**

This step repeats the activities in Step 2 for employees in each manager's lowest cluster. Not unexpectedly, this step often results in an under identification of candidates. If that is the case, each manager must submit the name of one middle-cluster employee for group discussion of movement to the lowest cluster.

#### **Step 5: Final Rating Assignments and Review of Results**

Staff who are not assigned to the highest and lowest clusters are generally assigned a rating of 3. With the preliminary assignment of ratings accomplished, the managers conduct a review of all ratings to evaluate their work and discuss any discrepancies or outstanding issues.

#### **Step 6: Output from Calibration Meeting**

To ensure that the meeting results are accurately recorded and provided to the next higher level of management, the calibration meeting results will be documented. This documentation typically includes each employee's name, the rating they were assigned, and any supporting comments.

### **After the Calibration Meeting**

#### **Roll-Up of Performance Calibration Results**

After the initial calibration meeting, the managers' overall performance ratings are determined in meeting with the Department Director's reporting structure (generally Assistant and Deputy Directors) to compare the contributions of managers. Department Directors perform the final calibration on their direct reports and confirm their Department's calibration and rating distributions for transmittal to their Chief.

The results of each calibration meeting are typically "rolled up" to successively higher levels of management for their review and approval. Staff recognize that adjustments to overall performance rating results may occur as a result of issues encountered during roll up.

#### **Communication of Results**

After all overall performance rating decisions have been approved by HR and approval has been communicated to Departments, managers conduct performance reviews and inform each of their employees of their overall performance rating.

## **Roles and Responsibilities**

**Managers** – Managers adhere to the ground rules indicated in Step 1 above.

**Next Level Manager** - The Next-Level-Up Manager is ultimately responsible for seeing that calibration outcomes are achieved and that the process through which they are achieved adheres to the ground rules. He/she carries results forward for Senior Staff review.

**Facilitator** - The facilitator is responsible for running the meeting. He or she kicks off the meeting, keeps it rolling according to the recommended process indicated above, and wraps it up. During the calibration process, the facilitator helps ensure that decisions are based on data, not emotions, style, perceptions or stereotypes.

Employee Name:

Manager Name:

## *Overall Rating Guidelines for Individual Contributors / Agency Leaders*

Consider the employee's Objective and Competency ratings entered in eRaMP, and think about their relative contribution toward achieving Division / Department / Agency goals. Then check the individual behaviors to determine an appropriate Overall Performance Rating for this review period.

	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Unacceptable Performance</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Building Performance</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Strong Performance</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Outstanding Performance</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exceptional Performance</b>
<b>Impact:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Made minimal contribution to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was far below peer contributions; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Made some contributions to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Needs some development to achieve expected impact at a level comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Competently supported Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was comparable to peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in positive impact; Exceeded peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in major impact; Significantly exceeded peer contributions
<b>Quality / Quantity:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work often failed to meet expectations and was considerably less than peers; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work sometimes did not meet expectations or was less than peers; Needs some development	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work consistently met expectations; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work exceeded expectations and peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Distinguished performance through superior quality and quantity of work that significantly exceeded peers
<b>Achievement:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Failed to achieve one or more critical Objectives and was considerably less than peers; Rated Needs Significant Improvement or Needs Some Improvement on one or more Competencies that notably impacted performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not meet one or more Objectives; Rated Needs Some Improvement or Needs Significant Improvement on one or more Competencies; Needs some development to be comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met Objectives and demonstrated solid proficiency in required Competencies; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met and exceeded peer contributions on most essential Objectives; Demonstrated required Competencies with some rated Highly Effective or Exceptional Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Significantly exceeded peers on Objectives and consistently demonstrated an exceptional level of Competencies with several rated as an Exceptional Strength
<b>Effort:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth minimal effort; Was complacent taking the easiest way; Often let others carry the work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs significant improvement to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth moderate effort; At times, did not carry expected work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth required effort; Achieved goals and carried expected work load in required timeframes; Gave extra effort when required; Comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Often put forth extra effort, initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently put forth extra effort; Exhibited initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation at levels that were significantly above peers
<b>Demonstrated Ability:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently had difficulty meeting basic job standards; Work often required supervisory correction or close review; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Had some difficulty meeting job standards; Work sometimes required supervisory correction or close review; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong, solid, dependable performer who capably handled standard assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Was an outstanding performer; Is capable of independently handling more complex assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently was "go-to" person for the most complex issues; Fixed difficult problems; Is capable of independently handling more complex future assignments



## Revised Management Competencies

*Effective January 1, 2013*

- I. Charts the Course** (*Managers/Supervisors only*) - Organizes and develops roadmaps for success
  - 1) Provides Direction**

Develops and implements long- and short-range objectives and strategies consistent with the Agency's mission, vision, and priorities; Outlines and tracks key milestones toward goal accomplishment; Drives change to capitalize on opportunities while balancing exposure to potential risks
  - 2) Manages Performance and Builds Staff Capabilities**

Identifies and communicates performance objectives; provides effective and timely feedback; implements development activities that result in employee growth; holds staff accountable for building their skills portfolio and organizational value
  - 3) Engages Staff to Perform at their Highest Levels**

Creates an enthusiastic work climate and motivates staff to perform at their full potential; Empowers staff to take charge of their work and career; Cultivates employee engagement and commitment
  
- II. Navigates Toward Success** - Succeeds through innovation in a challenging environment
  - 1) Problem Solving and Decision Making**

Develops creative and innovative solutions to workplace problems; Takes decisive action in uncertain situations; reaches sound conclusions after considering options
  - 2) Project and Resource Management**

Establishes plans and priorities; Organizes human, physical, and financial resources to achieve optimal outcomes
  - 3) Change Management**

Identifies and implements new approaches to improve Agency effectiveness
  
- III. Collaborates with Others** - Promotes teamwork, interacts effectively & values the opinions of others
  - 1) Teamwork**

Builds strong interpersonal relationships and works professionally with others, both within and outside the Agency; Respects diversity and welcomes differing ideas and points of view; Encourages participation
  - 2) Persuasion and Influence**

Convinces others to accept ideas or points of view when appropriate; Negotiates in a clear and confident manner to achieve desired outcomes
  
- IV. Builds Expertise** - Develops functional knowledge and understands how the Agency works
  - 1) Technical Expertise**

Demonstrates functional expertise, industry knowledge, and relevant best practices to complete work; Is a technical resource for others
  - 2) Agency Expertise**

Cultivates and understands Agency business and culture; Works within organizational structures and through formal and informal channels; Understands key internal and external stakeholders
  - 3) New Skill Development**

Implements development activities to expand knowledge and build personal skills portfolio; Acquires new skills and applies learning to increase organizational value
  
- V. Gets the Job Done** - Overcomes obstacles and drives tasks to completion
  - 1) Flexibility and Adaptability**

Is willing and able to change approach when needed; Shifts priorities based on work demands
  - 2) Drive and Motivation**

Works hard to achieve goals and objectives; Shows a strong desire and enthusiasm to complete tasks; Strives to produce optimal results

1/23/2013

Talent Management Division

## Overall Rating Guidelines for Individual Contributors / Agency Leaders

Consider the employee's Objective and Competency ratings entered in eRaMP, and think about their relative contribution toward achieving Division / Department / Agency goals. Then check the individual behaviors to determine an appropriate Overall Performance Rating for this review period.

	<input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Building Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional Performance
<b>Impact:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Made minimal contribution to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was far below peer contributions; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Made some contributions to Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Needs some development to achieve expected impact at a level comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Competently supported Division, Department or Agency initiatives; Impact was comparable to peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in positive impact; Exceeded peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Led and delivered Division, Department or Agency initiatives that resulted in major impact; Significantly exceeded peer contributions
<b>Quality / Quantity:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work often failed to meet expectations and was considerably less than peers; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality or quantity of work sometimes did not meet expectations or was less than peers; Needs some development	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work consistently met expectations; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and quantity of work exceeded expectations and peer contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> Distinguished performance through superior quality and quantity of work that significantly exceeded peers
<b>Achievement:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Failed to achieve one or more critical Objectives and was considerably less than peers; Rated Needs Significant Improvement or Needs Some Improvement on one or more Competencies that notably impacted performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not meet one or more Objectives; Rated Needs Some Improvement or Needs Significant Improvement on one or more Competencies; Needs some development to be comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met Objectives and demonstrated solid proficiency in required Competencies; Was comparable with peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently met and exceeded peer contributions on most essential Objectives; Demonstrated required Competencies with some rated Highly Effective or Exceptional Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Significantly exceeded peers on Objectives and consistently demonstrated an exceptional level of Competencies with several rated as an Exceptional Strength
<b>Effort:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth minimal effort; Was complacent taking the easiest way; Often let others carry the work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs significant improvement to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth moderate effort; At times, did not carry expected work load or exceeded required timeframes; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Put forth required effort; Achieved goals and carried expected work load in required timeframes; Gave extra effort when required; Comparable to peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Often put forth extra effort, initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently put forth extra effort; Exhibited initiative, drive, tenacity and motivation at levels that were significantly above peers
<b>Demonstrated Ability:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently had difficulty meeting basic job standards; Work often required supervisory correction or close review; Needs significant improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Had some difficulty meeting job standards; Work sometimes required supervisory correction or close review; Needs some development for contribution to be at a level expected of peers	<input type="checkbox"/> Strong, solid, dependable performer who capably handled standard assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Was an outstanding performer; Is capable of independently handling more complex assignments	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently was "go-to" person for the most complex issues; Fixed difficult problems; Is capable of independently handling more complex future assignments

# *Catalyst Team Meeting*

January 28, 2013

# *Performance Management*

---

# ***2013 Performance Management Program***

## ***Guiding Principles***

---

- Develop meaningful performance objectives for staff that link to important department and agency objectives
- Ensure employees understand the goals and deliverables on which they will be evaluated
- Provide constructive performance feedback based on achievable development and performance improvement recommendations
- Provide meaningful and differentiated recognition to employees, commensurate with their performance

# ***Performance Ratings***

## ***Absolute and relative performance***

---

Employee evaluation is a two-step process:

- **Absolute performance:**  
Determined by ratings on objectives and competencies
- **Relative performance:**  
Determined by comparing employees' achievements through a calibration session

# ***Performance Management Timeframe***

## ***The annual calendar-year cycle***

---

Agency will evaluate employee performance based on a calendar year cycle

- eRaMP document automatically generated in PeopleSoft for review period (January 1 – December 31)
- All objectives must be entered into the eRaMP system by January 2 of the cycle
- The cycle concludes on December 31, with ratings due in January

## ***Performance Review Meetings***

---

- Managers will follow performance management protocol for:
  - Setting objectives
  - Providing ongoing feedback
  - Conducting interim reviews
  - Identifying and implementing development recommendations
  - Completing final reviews
- Managers will conduct final review discussions after all normalized overall rating distributions are confirmed by HR

# ***Transition Guidance***

## ***Completing 2012 eRaMPs***

---

- A 2012 eRaMP must be completed for all staff evaluated through the eRaMP process
- Staff whose 2012 eRaMPs are not yet completed:
  - Managers should conduct performance review discussions
  - *Refrain from providing overall ratings until normalized distribution decisions are completed*
- Staff whose 2012 eRaMPs were completed during the calendar year:
  - HRD will reopen these documents
  - Following calibration, managers will re-enter post-calibrated final overall ratings reflecting the normal distribution
  - *Refrain from providing overall ratings until normalized distribution decisions are completed*

# Normalized Distribution

- Immediate action
- Change responsibilities
- Move jobs
- Manage out

- Check competencies
- Check capabilities vs. responsibilities
- Coach for performance
- Time & experience
- Support & encourage
- Monitor & build consistency

- Achieving success
- Consistent results
- Continuous improvement
- Stretch & broaden
- Build confidence
- Development awareness

- Consistently outstanding contributor
- Recognition
- Raise the bar
- Development awareness

- Demonstrates a distinguished level of performance
- Distinguished contribution to unit and organizational outcomes
- Displays a number of exceptional competency strengths

**Unacceptable Performance**

**Building Performance**

**Strong Performance**

**Outstanding Performance**

**Exceptional Performance**

<b>Year 1</b>		15%	40%	30%	15%
<b>Year 2</b>	5%	10%	50%	20%	15%

# 2012 eRaMP Completion

## Timing and Submission Schedule

Completion Date	Action
2/5/13	<p><b><u>Managers:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine 2012 Objectives and Competencies ratings</li> <li>• Recommend Overall Ratings</li> <li>• Enter ratings into eRaMP system (save eRaMP document but do not make available for review)</li> <li>• Discuss ratings with Department Reviewer and recommend Overall Ratings</li> </ul>
3/15/13	<p><b><u>HRD Business Partners:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate <b>Department</b> calibration meetings to determine normalized Overall Rating distributions and appropriateness of ratings</li> </ul>
3/22/13	<p><b><u>Departments:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize Overall Ratings in eRaMP system and submit for Chief Review</li> </ul>
3/29/13	<p><b><u>Chiefs:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit normalized Overall Rating distributions for final <b>HRD</b> review</li> </ul>
4/5/13	<p><b><u>HRD Business Partners:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notify <b>Departments</b> that final Overall Ratings are approved</li> </ul>
4/30/13	<p><b><u>Departments:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make eRaMPs available for Staff review</li> <li>• Conduct performance review discussions</li> <li>• Complete remaining eRaMP steps, including <b>Staff</b> Acknowledgement and approval by Department Reviewer</li> </ul>

# 2013 eRaMP Completion Timing and Submission Schedule

Completion Date	Action
1/31/13	PeopleSoft automatically creates 2013 eRaMP documents
2/28/13	<b>Managers and Staff:</b> Enter 2013 eRaMP Objectives*
6/15/13 – 7/15/13	<b>Managers:</b> Enter 2013 Interim Reviews into eRaMP and make available to <b>Staff</b> *
6/15/13 – 7/31/13	<b>Managers:</b> Conduct 2013 Interim Review discussions with <b>Staff</b> *
12/1/13 – 1/7/14	<b>Managers:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine 2013 Objectives and Competencies ratings</li> <li>• Recommend Overall Ratings</li> <li>• Enter ratings into eRaMP system (Save eRaMP document but do not make available for review)</li> <li>• Discuss ratings with Department Reviewer and recommend Overall Ratings</li> </ul>
1/8/14 – 1/22/14	<b>HRD Business Partners:</b> Facilitate <b>Department</b> calibration meetings to determine normalized Overall Rating distributions and appropriateness of ratings
1/23/14	<b>Departments:</b> Finalize Overall Ratings in eRaMP system
1/24/14	<b>Departments:</b> Submit normalized Overall Rating distribution for <b>Chief</b> review
2/5/14	<b>Chiefs:</b> Submit normalized Overall Rating distributions for final <b>HRD</b> review
2/11/14	<b>HRD Business Partners:</b> Notify <b>Departments</b> that final Overall Ratings are approved
2/11/14 - 3/27/14	<b>Departments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make eRaMPs available for Staff review</li> <li>• Conduct performance review discussions</li> <li>• Complete remaining eRaMP steps including <b>Staff</b> Acknowledgement and Approval by Department Reviewer</li> </ul>

Note: These processes will be reviewed by Directors, Business Managers and HRD to ensure compliance



**THE PORT AUTHORITY** OF NY & NJ

## PORT AUTHORITY ATTENDANCE POLICY

The Port Authority furnishes the public with many vital services through the operation and maintenance of its facilities. Because of the critical and important nature of these services any disruption or loss in efficiency due to excessive absences can have serious consequences for thousands of people. An employee who is at home sick cannot perform his or her job; consequently, in order for the Port Authority to fulfill its obligations and responsibilities, every employee should be on duty at the time he or she is scheduled to work. In short, every employee is expected to report for work regularly and on time.

Employees should remember that attendance and the sick leave benefit are different subjects. The first is a condition, while the second is a monetary benefit. The Port Authority would be just as concerned with employee lost time and its detrimental effect on our operation even if there were no sick leave benefit.

Because absences weaken our ability to furnish essential services to the public, all employees are expected to strive for perfect attendance by:

- Maintaining good health standards and taking precautions against illness.
- Not allowing minor indispositions or inconveniences to keep them away from their work.
- Attending to personal affairs and obligations, whenever possible, at times other than their working hours.

Due to the important role an individual's attendance plays in his/her work performance, an employee's absence record must be reviewed before considering him or her for a promotion or merit increase. Supervisors are responsible not only for insuring that an employee with a poor attendance record is not rewarded with a promotion or merit increase, but that the employee is aware of the role which an absence record plays in promotional activity. The fact that the Human Resources Department considers attendances records when reviewing educational refunds, merit increase, and promotions should merely be a reinforcement of the supervisor's evaluation. Remember, an employee with a substandard absence record who receives a promotion or merit increase sets a poor example for all the employees in a unit.