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Canadian Forces Personnel Appraisal System

CURRENT
- Multiple performance appraisal forms (rank or occupation specific)
- Lack of consistent underlying competency framework
- Limited compliance for completion of the forms
- Grievances
- Rating inflation
- Limited integration with other personnel management components
- Processing Time (150+ man years annually)

FUTURE
- Use of the Leadership Development Framework as the underlying set of competencies
- Increase compliance and reduce processing time
- New rating scale to reduce inflation
- Heighten the perception of fairness and transparency

Motivation to change
# The Leadership Development Framework (LDF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Ideology</th>
<th>Change Capacities</th>
<th>Social Capacities</th>
<th>Cognitive Capacities</th>
<th>Professional Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility/Impact</td>
<td>Learning Organization</td>
<td>Partnering</td>
<td>Creative/Abstract</td>
<td>Strategic and Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>Group Directed</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>Military and Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Ethos</td>
<td>Self-Development</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist and Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic and Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>Military and Organizational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Professional Expertise**
  - Strategic and Institutional
  - Military and Organizational
  - Specialist and Technical
  - Strategic and Institutional
  - Military and Organizational
Development of Competency Dictionary

Operationalization of the LDF

- Clear, concrete, and validated definitions of competencies and their respective behavioral indicators at different levels
  - Improved standardization
  - Improved assessment/selection of leaders
  - Improved identification of personnel strengths and weaknesses
  - Improved and more tailored developmental and learning activities
- Common language throughout the institution
- Better and more logical linkage for members between the different HR activities, especially performance appraisal, promotion/succession planning, and career/talent management
- Dictionary now fully validated at Colonel/Captain(N) rank, and in first phase of validation at Brigadier General/Commodore rank

FUTURE

- Use of the Leadership Development Framework as the underlying set of competencies
- Increase compliance and reduce processing time
- Need for new rating scale to reduce inflation
The CF Leadership Competencies Dictionary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Ideology</th>
<th>Change Capacities</th>
<th>Social Capacities</th>
<th>Cognitive Capacities</th>
<th>Professional Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility and Impact</td>
<td>Behavioral Flexibility</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Analytical/ Systems Thinking</td>
<td>Visioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Reasoning</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Organizational Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Military Ethos</td>
<td>Developing Self and Others</td>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Orientation and Initiative</td>
<td>Stress Tolerance and Management</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td>Result Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proof of Concept Project:: Innovative Approach to Performance Appraisal for the CF

The development of a Computerized Adaptive Rating Scales (CARS) for the CF:

- Partnered with Walter Borman (PDRI)
- Using a subset of the CF Dictionary of competencies
  - Commitment to Military Ethos
  - Action orientation and Initiative
  - Teamwork
  - Developing Self and Others
  - Behavioral Flexibility/Change Management
  - Communication
  - Analytical Thinking
  - Result Management
- Using four group rankings
  - Officers: Lt/Capt & Maj/LCol
  - NCMs: Cpl/MCpl & Sgt/WO

CURRENT

- Multiple performance appraisal forms (rank and occupation specific)
- Lack of consistent underlying competency framework
- Limited compliance for completion of the forms
- Grievances
- Rating inflation
- Limited integration with other pers mngt components
- Processing Time (150+ man years annually)
Computerized Adapting Rating Scales (CARS)

• Uses computer adaptive technology
• Evaluators compare a series of pairs of behaviors

Example:
1. Tailors his/her communication to fit the needs of different individuals or audiences.
2. Provides direct reports and key stakeholders with the information that is of greatest interest to them, but misses opportunities to share other relevant information.

• Better aligned with evaluators cognitive processes
• Used in assessment of personality
  – Much quicker, less faking
• Lab studies when used to assess performance
  – More reliable ratings
  – Increased precision in measurement
CARS Performance Estimation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Item Pair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Pair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Pair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Pair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Estimated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proof of Concept Project: Innovative Approach to Performance Appraisal for the CF

Using **CARS** to assess CF personnel performance should

**FUTURE**

- Use of the Leadership Development Framework as the underlying set of competencies
- Increase compliance and reduce processing time
- Reduce rating inflation
- Heighten the perception of fairness and transparency
Project Status

• Collection of Behavioral Statements:
  – 27 workshops conducted across Canada to generate behaviors reflecting a wide range of effectiveness for each competency (n=133).
  – over 3000 behavioral statements were generated by the participants.
    • Statements were written so as to cover varying levels of effectiveness for each competency for each rank grouping
  – 1148 Statements were edited by PDRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>NCMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>RCAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Project Status (cont)

- **Re-translation exercise:**
  - Of the 1148 statements edited by PDRI, 688 were chosen for the project
  - The 688 statements were re-translated by a team of SMEs at PDRI as well as with military SMEs in the CF.
    - Statements were presented to SMEs according to a particular rank grouping
    - For each statements, SMEs were asked to identify the competency being assessed and the level of effectiveness of the behavior (1-7)
    - Data from the CF and PDRI was compared and merged
    - PDRI staff populated the CARS program and simulations were ran until the selective iterations and final ratings were deemed appropriate
Project Status (cont)

• Pilot study (Fall-Winter 2012/2013):
  – 150 ratees
  – Multiple raters (3) per ratee
  – Assess accuracy of the ratings
  – Compare to accuracy obtained through the current CF PA form (PER)
  – Assess and compare inter-rater reliability
  – Collect perceptions of both raters and ratees on:
    • the accuracy of new measure
    • fairness/objectivity of new measure
    • Transparency
    • ease of use (for raters)
• Project end date March 2013
Questions?
Thank You!

line.st-pierre@forces.gc.ca