

Guidance on using the five-point rating scale for the overall performance rating

The following guidelines aim to support managers in using the five-point rating scale for the overall performance rating.

The overall rating should be based on the [description in the rating scale](#) and must be consistent with the individual ratings and their relative importance. The relative importance of the outputs and competencies is an important element to take into account to ensure a consistent overall rating at the End of Cycle.

Discussions at the Beginning of Cycle, Mid-term Review and End of Cycle help to build a common understanding of this relative importance.

Beginning of Cycle

Providing a solid foundation at the start of the performance period sets the stage for strong performance and facilitates a quality assessment.

- Clarify what needs to be accomplished (outputs) and how the work should be achieved (competencies).
- Ensure that outputs are SMART and can be measured effectively using the five-point scale.
- Discuss the relative importance of outputs and competencies:

When determining the relative importance of outputs, consider:

- The importance of successful achievement during the performance period
- The impact to the work unit/department/organization if the output is not achieved
- The range of clients/stakeholders impacted by achievement
- The importance of each output relative to other outputs
- The complexity of the output (e.g., interdependencies, breadth of client/stakeholder groups, organizational resistance, level of ambiguity)
- The degree of challenge taking into account the technical and professional knowledge required to deliver

When determining the relative importance of the behavioural competencies, consider:

- The positive impact of the required behaviour within the work unit and across the Office as a whole.
- The potential negative impact if the behaviour is not displayed
- The importance of the behaviour in successfully achieving the agreed outputs

Mid-term Review

- In addition to discussing progress against what was planned at the start of the performance period and making any necessary adjustments to work deliverables, review the relative importance of each output and competency. This will contribute to a quality End of Cycle assessment.

End of Cycle

- During the End of Cycle discussion, revisit the relative importance of each output and competency.
- Evaluate the individual outputs and competencies.
- Prior to determining the overall performance rating, review the description of how the different ratings in the scale are characterized (see [Overall Performance Ratings](#)). Reflect also on the staff member's self-assessment and your own ratings and comments at the output/competency level, as well as the relative importance of each output and competency.

When determining the overall performance rating, consider:

- The overall performance rating should be based on the description in the rating scale and must be consistent with the individual ratings and their relative importance.
- If all ratings are the same e.g., ratings of 3 (Fully Met), then the overall performance rating should be the same e.g., 3 (Fully Met).
- If there are a mix of ratings, the overall performance rating should take into account the ratings for the most important deliverables and competencies.
- If there are individual ratings of 5 (Consistently Exceeded) for any output or competency, careful consideration should be given before assigning an overall rating of 1 (Did Not Meet) or 2 (Partially Met).
- If there are individual ratings of 1 (Did Not Meet) for any output or competency, careful consideration should be given before assigning an overall rating of 4 (Frequently Exceeded). A rating of 5 (Consistently Exceeded) is not appropriate in such cases.
- Any overall performance rating of 1 (Did Not Meet), 2 (Partially Met), 4 (Frequently Exceeded) or 5 (Consistently Exceeded) must be justified on the form and if there are a mix of ratings at the output/competency level, this should be explained.

For further guidance contact PMCOACHING@ilo.org

Overall Performance Ratings

Consistently exceeded performance requirements (5)

- Performance at this level is considered extraordinary. This rating is characterized not only by achieving exceptional results in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness, but by consistently going beyond those normally expected for the position.

Frequently exceeded performance requirements (4)

- Performance at this level is considered outstanding. This rating is characterized not only by achieving excellent results in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness, but by frequently going beyond those normally expected for the position.

Fully met the expected performance requirements (3)

- This rating describes performance that fully met requirements in terms of the quality, quantity and timeliness of results achieved and represents the fully acceptable level of performance for the position.

Partially met performance requirements (2)

- This rating describes performance that partially met requirements. Quality and timeliness of work reflect shortcomings, or the quantity produced falls short of the established measures of performance. Some results are inadequate after consideration of any relevant circumstances beyond the staff member's control. Certain assignments are only accomplished with a level of help or supervision that is disproportionate to that which would reasonably be expected from an individual in this role and at this level.

Did not meet performance requirements (1)

- This rating describes performance that did not meet requirements. Quality and timeliness of work reflect serious shortcomings, or the quantity produced falls well short of the established measures of performance. Results are inadequate after consideration of any relevant circumstances beyond the staff member's control. Failure to complete assignments properly or to meet deadlines have a negative impact on the ability of the work unit to achieve its goals.