



U.S. Department of State

FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT DS-5055 INSTRUCTIONS

INTRODUCTION

REPORT FORM

Form DS-5055 must be used for all regular and interim evaluations - for tenured and untenured Foreign Service (FS) employees. For periods under 120 days, employees have the option of using the DS-5055 or the DS-7768 short form. Personnel assigned to language training should use the DS-651. Personnel assigned to training other than language training must use the DS-7772. Career Civil Service employees serving on limited non-career appointments (LNA) also must use form DS-5055. EERs may not be classified or contain classified information.

REPORT SUBMISSION

The post or bureau human resources office will submit the completed EER to the eOPF in Performance Next. EERs must be submitted within 30 days of the end of the rating period. GTM/PE must be notified of any delay over 30 days in submission of an EER. Review Panels should indicate in Section IV C who was responsible for the delay. Note: Exceptions to the use of Performance Next are limited, and the bureau/post HRO must request the exception in advance by contacting GTM-PEQuestions@state.gov.

RATING PERIOD AND REPORT TYPES

There are three types of rating periods and DS-5055 report types.

A. Regular: The annual rating cycle is from April 16 of one year to April 15 of the next year for all tenured Foreign Service employees and untenured specialists, and Civil Service employees serving on an LNA. For untenured generalists, the annual rating cycle begins on the date of arrival in the assignment.

B. Interim: If a change of rater, assignment, or major duties occurs during the regular rating period, an interim report must be prepared for periods of 120 days or more, including for untenured generalists.

C. Voluntary: For periods of fewer than 120 days only when required to document significant developments pertaining to the employee's performance that cannot be adequately documented in the next regular evaluation. Voluntary reports are not typically used to document performance during a detail or temporary duty assignment when the employee will return to his or her regular position and be evaluated for the full period.

DEFINITION OF RATER AND REVIEWER

The employee should be advised in writing at the beginning of the rating period who the rater will be. The rater is usually the employee's official supervisor (see 3 FAH-1 2813.3 regarding regional personnel). The reviewer is usually the rater's supervisor or the next highest-ranking official. Every effort should be made to ensure that employees have a reviewer. If this is not possible, the employee should be informed in writing at the beginning of the rating period that there will be no reviewer.

WORK REQUIREMENTS: Rated employees should be given the opportunity to perform their assigned duties and be evaluated on their performance of the established work requirements. Although the DS-5055 has replaced the requirement for a Work Requirements Statement, with "work responsibilities," rated employees, raters, and reviewers should establish a separate, detailed Work Requirements Statement within the first 45 days of the rating period and a signed copy should be kept by the rated employee, rater, and reviewer. This information will form the basis for the work responsibilities included on the DS-5055. The rater should discuss the work responsibilities and what constitutes acceptable performance with the rated employee at the beginning of the rating period and provide feedback on the employee's performance at consistent intervals during this period, including a minimum of two professional development (formerly known as counseling) sessions, with at least one recorded on Form DS-1974, in which the rater focuses on how best to foster the professional development of the employee. In situations where employees are not performing at an acceptable level, they must be counseled on the issues in documented sessions and afforded a reasonable period of time to improve (normally 30 to 60 days).

Prohibited Discrimination and Participation in Professional Groups and Councils

The Department of State is committed to providing equal opportunity and fair and equitable treatment in employment to all persons without regard to race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy and sexual orientation), national origin, age, disability, genetic information, political affiliation, marital status, and/or protected activity such as whistleblowing, opposition to discrimination, and/or participation in the EEO process, grievance process, use of dissent channel, etc.

Additional information regarding Equal Employment Opportunity provisions can be obtained by contacting S/OCR.

Rated employees may describe their leadership and/or participation in a *specific and identified* Professional Development organization, and may speak in detail about their activities and contributions, but may not identify their own or other's personal characteristics as outlined in 3 FAM 2815.1(b).

Rated employees may describe, in general terms, their leadership and/or participation in an *unspecified and unidentified* Employee Organization but may not name the specific organization or identify their own or others' personal characteristics as outlined in 3 FAM 2815.1(b). One admissible example: "As a member of one of the Department's employee organizations, I took x action this rating period to advocate for change/improvement benefiting my colleagues and the Department." Another admissible example: "I served as President of a Department Employee Organization with over 500 members. I developed a range of initiatives to promote the professional development of the organization's members, receiving regular praise from bureau and/or Department leadership."

PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION I. SUBMISSION CONTROL

This section contains general employee information (name, position title, grade, series, and post or organization) populated from the employee's record in the Global Employment Management System (GEMS). Type of Report and Period Covered are completed by the rater. The rater and reviewer signatures will automatically populate when each certify the report is complete, in conformance with the instructions, and adequately documents performance. "Date Received in Post/Bureau" and "Date Received in eOPF" will populate when the employee acknowledges receipt of the EER and when the review panel chairperson certifies the EER is complete, respectively.

SECTION II. CERTIFICATION OF WORK RESPONSIBILITIES AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW DISCUSSIONS

The rater, reviewer, and rated employee should formalize the employee's work responsibilities within 45 days of the beginning of the rating period. Completion of Section V in Performance Next will automatically populate the respective date block in Section II. The core work responsibilities and goals and objectives requirements may be revised during the rating period to reflect a major change in the employee's responsibilities as documented in the separate Work Requirements Statement (which is no longer part of the EER). All jobs require equal employment opportunity (EEO) leadership and adherence to EEO principles as a mandatory work responsibility.

This section also certifies that the rater reviewed the performance with the rated employee at least twice, at regular intervals, during a rating period, with at least one discussion recorded on Form DS-1974, preferably in Performance Next. Raters should use these sessions to ensure that the employee is apprised of how well he or she is progressing in achieving the work responsibilities and to identify ways to encourage the short and longer term professional development and growth of the employee. Discussions between the rater and the rated employee should address specific areas of accomplishment and/or areas in which the rated employee should focus on to develop skills and expand job-related knowledge.

Assessments included in the final EER should not surprise the rated employee. If the rated employee believes that the dates of performance

review discussions or counseling sessions are inaccurate, the rated employee should note that in Section VI and/or in Section X. Such disagreements should not prevent an employee from acknowledging receipt of the EER in Section III. By signing Section III, the employee merely acknowledges receipt of the EER, not agreement with its contents.

SECTION III. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT

The rated employee should electronically sign and date the cover page to acknowledge receipt of a copy of the EER. The signature does not indicate agreement with the contents of the EER or limit in any way the right of the employee to object to it. If the EER is not completed, signed, and returned after five calendar days by the rated employee, a copy of the unsigned rating is to be submitted by post/bureau to the employee's eOPF in Performance Next. Reviewers are encouraged to provide a reason in the event that the employee has not signed the EER. In cases where the employee has not signed acknowledging receipt of the EER, the review panel should comment on the circumstances in a review panel statement attached to the EER.

SECTION IV. REVIEW PANEL STATEMENT

Bureau and post review panels review EERs before the reports are submitted to the employee's eOPF in Performance Next. They ensure that reports are completed in accordance with regulations and these instructions. Review panel functions are:

(1) Technical - reviewing EERs for inadmissible comments and changing or deleting inadmissible material; confirming that there is no language recommending for or against promotion; and confirming that regulations and instructions are correctly applied and, if not, returning them for correction.

(2) Advisory – returning reports that lack sufficient examples of performance to substantiate comments or that appear to lack internal consistency. The panel must try to have deficiencies corrected. If the effort is unsuccessful, the panel should note the suggested revisions in Section IV of the EER and any reasons for their rejection. A continuation sheet may be used.

(3) Administrative – if an evaluation is submitted to the employee's eOPF after the due date, the review panel should indicate in Section IV C who was responsible for the delay. They may use continuation sheets if the space provided is not sufficient.

Any revision by the rater should be shown to the reviewer and must be shown to the rated employee. A revision of the reviewer's statement must be shown to the rated employee. The employee may then revise Section VI or supplement the narrative in Section X.

If the rated employee's description of accomplishments or optional statement contains negative or pejorative comments concerning the rater or reviewer, or raises significant questions of fact, the panel must provide the employee the opportunity to revise these comments. If the employee declines to do so, the review panel may invite the rater or reviewer, as appropriate, to comment. Any such comments must be shown to the employee, who will have the opportunity to make a final statement. These supplemental statements must be attached to the evaluation report. Although the review panel has the primary responsibility to check for negative and pejorative comments, if GTM/PE identifies such comments it will follow the procedure outlined above.

Assistant secretaries, chiefs of mission, and their equivalents may opt not to submit to review panels their evaluations or those they prepare on their deputies. If this provision is invoked, the appropriate Bureau or Post official submitting the EER should so annotate in the review panel statement section.

SECTION V. POSITION DESCRIPTION, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

(Completed by rater, reviewer, and rated employee)

Department of State guidance requires that all employees and their raters/reviewers should have a separate detailed Work Requirements Statement discussed and signed by the rated employee, rater, and reviewer within the first 45 days of the EER cycle or arrival at new position. This document is not part of the formal EER but should form the basis for Section V.

The rater should complete Section V within 45 days of the beginning of the rating period, in collaboration with the rated employee and with the concurrence of the reviewing officer.

Position Description: The rater should briefly explain the rated employee's position and where it fits in the formal staffing pattern. The rater should explain the employee's rating and reviewing responsibilities for other

employees and the level of financial or other Department resources for which the rated employee exercises operational responsibility.

CORE WORK RESPONSIBILITIES: There are two sections within this box.

Part 1: The first sentence is pre-determined and must be included in all EERs. The security section is a drop box dependent on the employee's personal grade. There is space for 1-3 lines for the employees' broad core work responsibilities.

Part 2: Goals/Specific Objectives – This section sets out the broad goals and specific objectives, which guide the employee's performance for the rating period. They should be listed in priority order, and reflect a clear appreciation for Mission, Bureau, or Department goals. They should be realistic and realizable.

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Here the rater should describe any unusual, unexpected, or unpredictable circumstances that developed during the rating period and that significantly altered operational conditions that affected the ability of the employee to perform his/her job responsibilities and accomplish his/her goals and objectives. This does not include situations that existed at the start of the rating cycle or could reasonably be expected to occur during the rating cycle.

SECTION VI. DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Rated employees should describe their most significant individual and collaborative accomplishments during the rating period, and do so in the context of and with specific reference to the Decision Criteria for Tenure and Promotion (Core Precepts). Employees should provide a factual description of outcomes achieved and how these outcomes advanced Mission or Department goals. Employees should not self-appraise their own performance.

Employees may choose to write their EERs with or without using their proper name in the narrative boxes. Raters' and reviewers' narratives must also refrain from using proper names if the employee has chosen to do so.

The rater and reviewer may suggest changes in this section. The rated employee may accept or decline such suggestions.

SECTION VII. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL

Part A. Appraisal

The rater must not make a statement that recommends for or against promotion, but rather must state and clearly illustrate if, and/or to what extent, the rated employee has or has not demonstrated the potential to perform successfully at the next highest level. The rater must use specific examples to address the employee's performance and potential and should work to link the employee's performance to specific core precepts in the Decision Criteria for Tenure and Promotion. The rater should focus on accomplishments and results and comment on how well the employee has demonstrated the competencies in their performance.

It is the role of the Selection Board alone to determine whether an employee is or is not to be recommended for promotion based on all relevant performance related documents under review. Therefore, any recommendation for or against promotion per se from a rater will not be taken into consideration by a Selection Board and Boards will be instructed accordingly.

The rater has primary responsibility for assessing the rated employee's accomplishments as they relate to the Decision Criteria. If the employee did not fulfill established work responsibilities or did so in a manner that did not meet expectations, the rater must cite specific examples. The Area for Development field will no longer be accessible, and so raters must use the narrative portion to document weaknesses in performance, citing specific examples.

All jobs require adherence to equal employment opportunity (EEO) regulations as a mandatory work responsibility. Raters may document performance that suggests less than full support for the EEO objectives, providing at least one example to support their assessment.

All jobs require sound security awareness. Raters may comment on any failure to meet the Department's core security awareness requirements and are required to comment on any pattern of failure to meet those requirements.

If the rated employee is a supervisor, including supervision of locally employed staff, the rater's comments should describe the employee's effectiveness as a supervisor, including developing subordinates, mentoring, and concern for morale (including issues of work/life balance and professional development) within the section. Any deficit in performance of required supervisory responsibilities should also be documented, such as: failure to comply with performance appraisal requirements; lack of equity in the delegation of assignments, counseling, recommendations for training and placement, and recognition of achievements of subordinates; and failure to establish or maintain effective and appropriate management control systems. In particular, supervisors have a responsibility to address any poor performance, including any actions that impact performance or impede achievement of unit or Department goals. Failure to do so should be documented in the Appraisal. In discussing performance, work done for other agencies or outside the rater's personal supervision may be cited, drawing as appropriate on any evaluations submitted by the beneficiaries of the rated employee's work.

Part B. Rater's Summary Judgment

For all employees, the rater must indicate whether the employee's performance was satisfactory. For all employees, if the performance was unsatisfactory the rater must comply with 3 FAH-1 H-2814.3 and all other provisions to which the section refers. For all employees, a rater may not assign an overall unsatisfactory rating unless the employee has previously been advised in writing of the areas of performance that are inadequate and has been given a reasonable opportunity (normally 30 to 60 days) and adequate guidance to remedy these deficiencies. **In addition, for untenured employees, if the rater assigns an unsatisfactory rating, the EER must be forwarded directly to GTM/PE at GTM-PEQuestions@state.gov.**

For untenured employees, the rater must also indicate whether the employee is recommended for tenure.

Section VIII. Review Statement

The reviewer should independently assess the rated employee's preparedness for assuming positions of greater responsibility, citing examples of performance in the context of and with specific reference to the Core Precepts, and may not rely solely on the views of the rater. The reviewer should describe the employee's relations with his/her rater and document the employee's record of working collaboratively with peers and of supporting the professional development of subordinates, if applicable. If the reviewer disagrees with the evaluation of the employee by the rater, or if relations between the rater and employee are strained, the reviewer should make this clear.

The reviewer shares responsibility for ensuring that the employee is fairly rated. The reviewer may comment on the adequacy and candor the rater showed in preparing the report. The reviewer must not make a statement that recommends for or against promotion, but rather must state and clearly illustrate if, and or to what extent, the rated employee has or has not demonstrated the potential to perform successfully at the next highest level. The reviewer must use specific examples to address the employee's performance and potential and should work to link the employee's performance to specific core precepts in the Decision Criteria for Tenure and Promotion.

It is the role of the Selection Board alone to determine whether an employee is or is not to be recommended for promotion based on all relevant performance related documents under review. Therefore, any recommendation for or against promotion per se from a reviewer will not be taken into consideration by a Selection Board and Boards will be instructed accordingly.

Section IX. Performance Pay

SFS Members – Performance Pay: Raters should evaluate SFS employees for performance pay. Performance Pay precepts are delineated in 3 FAM [2872.3-1](#). Such pay is based solely on performance during the most recent rating period and specifically on established performance pay criteria as specified in the Procedural Precepts for Performance Pay Boards. Those criteria are:

- (1) Significant and substantial contributions to and advancement of U.S. Government or Departmental/Mission policy goals and to the

framework for implementing those goals - political, defense/security, shared prosperity, human security, rule of law, advocacy, and public diplomacy.

- (2) Leadership: strategic thinking and execution; modeling integrity, loyalty, respect and service; fostering the development of and mentoring the next generation and strengthening the institution; forging interagency linkages and collaboration; confronting emerging and transnational challenges and opportunities across the full range of Department interests.
- (3) Management: effective and innovative stewardship of programs, resources, and human resources, including ensuring work/life balance and high morale; getting results in systems, processes, outcomes; safeguarding people, facilities, information, and material; leading and supporting operations at domestic offices and overseas posts and in cooperation with the interagency.
- (4) People: establishing and running a cohesive, productive, collaborative, high performance work environment that respects and inspires employees, engaging in effective communication that influences internal and external audiences, including messaging to and influencing of stakeholders and communities of interest.

More information on the Performance Pay Boards can be found in the Procedural Precepts on the [GTM/PE website](#).

The Department Senior Review Board (DSRB) may recommend up to 15 percent of eligible SFS employees for Presidential Rank Award consideration. SFS employees reviewed for Presidential Rank Awards, in addition to being judged by the four criteria for Performance Pay above, must consistently have demonstrated sustained accomplishment at a superior or extraordinary level as an employee of the SFS, or in equivalent grades. Evidence of significant sustained accomplishment may be found in areas such as the following:

- (1) Significant contributions to U.S. Government and Departmental/Mission policy in the field of foreign affairs, including public diplomacy and international trade and development; or in areas of foreign or domestic policy;
- (2) Service in the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, including the right to freedom of religion;

- (3) Managerial accomplishments in cooperative efforts with other foreign affairs agencies, other Federal agencies, other U.S. Government entities, and/or with the private sector; and/or
- (4) Achievement of Department-wide importance in policy, technical, program, and/or human resource terms.

More information on the DSRB and Presidential Rank Awards can be found in the Procedural Precepts on the [GTM/PE website](#).

Section X. Optional Statement by the Rated Employee

Rated employees may use this section to address any activities or problems that they believe have not been covered adequately. In addition, the rated employee should use this section to identify a disagreement with the rater in Section II regarding the dates of establishment of work responsibilities or performance review discussions. If additional space is required, continuation sheets may be attached. This space should not be used as a continuation of Section VI's Description of Accomplishments.

The employee must be provided five calendar days from the date of receipt of the final EER to review it and prepare a statement. The employee does not have the right to amend this statement at a later date except in response to changes made in the rater's or reviewer's sections. If the rated employee disagrees that counseling sessions have been held, he or she may use this section to explain the disagreement. The employee may use continuation sheets if the space available does not suffice. Neither the rater nor reviewer has a right to see the employee's statement. See section on review panel responsibilities above for exceptions to this rule.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REFERENCES

Regulations

3 FAM 2810 and 3 FAH-1 H-2810 - See below for instructions on inadmissible comments.

Decision Criteria for Promotion

See the GTM Sharepoint site for a copy of the [2022-2025 Core Precepts](#).

INADMISSIBLE COMMENTS

Inadmissible comments may not be included in any section of the evaluation report, or in other forms of evaluative material. Raters and reviewers, as well as review panels, must ensure that employees are not disadvantaged, directly or indirectly, for reasons of race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy and sexual orientation), age, marital status, national origin, disability, genetic information, reasonable accommodation, or means of entry into the Foreign Service. Stereotypes, group assumptions, racist or sexist comments, and ethnic slurs are inadmissible.

Employees, raters, review panels, and HROs are encouraged to consult GTM/PE with questions about what may or may not be admissible.

Please reference [3 FAM 2815](#) for a complete list of the current inadmissible comments.

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

Employee Evaluation Reports are subject to strict confidentiality under section 604 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as amended, and the provisions of the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. 552a.