

FY 2008 OPERATIONS MONETARY AWARD GUIDANCE FOR MANAGERS

FY08 is the first year awards are being distributed since full implementation of the new PACS appraisal system (i.e., where the Element Average is available to determine award eligibility). Since there are changes in both the underlying principles and process for awards, we are providing managers with guidance about the changes and instructions on how to process your awards allocation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	<u>Purpose and Culture of Award Recognition</u>	Page 1
II.	<u>Making Awards Determinations</u>	Page 2
III.	<u>Recognition of Contribution (ROC) Award</u>	Page 5
IV.	<u>Exemplary Contribution or Service Award (ECSA)</u>	Page 7
V.	<u>Award Fund Allocations</u>	Page 7
	<u>Transferring Award Funds</u>	Page 8
VI.	<u>Example</u>	Page 10
VII.	<u>Awards Process Checklist</u>	Page 12
VIII.	<u>Delegations of Authority (Attachment 1)</u>	Page 15
IX.	<u>Fiscal Year 2008 Quality Step Increase (QSI) Cost Factors</u> (Attachment 2)	Page 16

I. PURPOSE AND CULTURE OF AWARD RECOGNITION

Awards have always been very important to managers and employees; monetary awards acknowledge the individual and collaborative accomplishments of employees to promote the success of the Agency mission, goals and objectives. It is very important to administer awards as effectively as we administered appraisals: we need to recognize both high performers, as well as the contributions of employees who perform the full range of duties successfully. However, there is no entitlement to awards. It is important to convey a sense that recognition is earned, just as employees earned the rating they received by the performance they demonstrated. Our ability to accomplish the administration of SSA's mission depends on our ability to effectively manage performance; this requires that we properly recognize contributions through the awards process.

The revised performance management system was designed to change the Agency performance culture - including the awards system. The system was consciously designed to:

- Eliminate a sense of automatic entitlement to awards,
- Move from awards that were perceived as “bonuses” to awards based on, and perceived as, earned recognition,
- Provide recognition commensurate with the contribution,
- Stress the importance of open, honest communication and ongoing feedback about employee contributions, and
- Draw distinctions between the types of awards granted.

This material is intended for use by supervisors and management officials only and it is not to be shared with bargaining unit employees or the Union.

Document Revised 3/7/08

The features of the system itself will alter our experience with awards. For example, since Level 5 is an exclusive level of performance, that level of performance should be reflected in the size and type of award granted. The transition from a Pass/Fail system where virtually all employees were eligible for a performance award to one where only those who achieve an element average of 4.0 may be considered, affects how we approach using award allocations in FY08.

Just as with the PACS appraisal system, the ultimate objective of higher performance is relevant to award decisions. Employee performance is driven higher when employees understand what is expected, are able to connect their contributions to the Agency mission, have managers who are knowledgeable about their contributions, and believe their contributions are accurately acknowledged. We need to continue to emphasize individual and group achievement as we connect our assessment of performance to our award decisions.

We also undertook changing the definition of successful and outstanding performance and sought to differentiate between levels of contribution. Both employees and managers found the lack of distinguishing between differences in employee contributions a major shortcoming of a Pass/Fail system. Employees should not be treated the same for award purposes either. This means that appropriate award administration requires:

- Awards that are based on actual contributions,
- Appropriate determination of the award type and amount,
- Higher awards for higher contributions, and
- Providing a clear basis for the award.

Finally, cultural change is advanced by the way we communicate awards to employees. We need to employ a consistent approach whereby all managers use an open forum to identify the award recipients, as well as the type and basis for award. This meets our goal of open, honest communication, ensures management accountability for awards, and instructs all employees on performance that is worthy of award recognition.

Depending upon how you administered awards in the past, there could be some culture change involved for you and your employees. Particularly in the first year, that change can feel different, or even uncomfortable, but it is very important not to lose sight of the underlying principles when administering awards to avoid sending mixed messages that undermine the overall intent of the system and create negative consequences for both appraisals and awards in future years.

II. MAKING AWARD DETERMINATIONS

It is important that the manager who set expectations, evaluated contributions, and rated employees is involved in determining employee recognition. Only managers with first hand knowledge of employees can accurately judge how to reward contributions and should have control over award allocations at the local level for use in recognizing contributions. (Note: if the appraising manager is no longer assigned to the office, the current local manager assumes this responsibility). (We will discuss how award allocations are determined in a subsequent section of this guidance.)

This material is intended for use by supervisors and management officials only and it is not to be shared with bargaining unit employees or the Union.
Document Revised 3/7/08

Managers are responsible for utilizing their award allocations without exceeding them, meeting established deadlines, processing the award action in the Cash Award Program (CAP) developed by the San Francisco and Seattle Regions, as well as FPPS.

In making award determinations and communicating award activity, managers should consider the following:

1. Base award decisions on employee contributions and make appropriate use of ROC/QSI and ECSA awards.

We must take care not to make employees all “look alike” in the award process. As you determine which employees should be recognized with monetary awards, it is important to recognize the differences in the past and present system and our objectives, take note that a culture change is involved, and focus on principles and the related Operations decisions about award administration. It will be important to distinguish between contributions in choosing the type and amount of award, determining the timing of recognition, and openly acknowledging the contribution.

• **Awards should be based on employee contributions.**

Article 17, Section 2.B states, “*When employees are eligible to be considered for an award, the relative significance and impact of their contributions will be considered in determining which type of award(s) would constitute appropriate recognition, and the amount of money to be awarded.*” Managers worked hard to ensure that they gave employees accurate appraisals when evaluating performance. Those judgments should be reflected in award decisions:

- **Higher performance should be differentiated not just in appraisal ratings, but in award types and amounts.** Higher performance should be rewarded with higher awards. Managers and employees should be able to clearly distinguish the difference between a performance awards granted for Level 5 versus Level 3 performance ratings that are reflected in both the summary rating and the performance reflected in element averages.
 - a. Both the contract and the design of the performance management system envision that employees whose summary ratings demonstrate Level 5 performance will receive higher performance awards than other ROC eligible employees.
 - b. With fewer ROC-eligible employees, higher average ROC award amounts should be encouraged.
 - c. Award decisions should also reflect the difference between performance awards granted for sustained, significant contributions (ROCs) and recognizing a singular exemplary act or service (ECSAs).
 - d. Typically, there has been a significant difference between the average ROC award amount and the average ECSA amount. The average FY 07 ECSA in Operations for bargaining unit employees was \$509; the average ROC award was \$873. Managers should preserve this distinction. Of course, award averages for a particular unit or team may have varied. Managers should review prior award history for their components when determining the appropriate amount for FY08 awards. They should strive to give ROC awards of greater value than

in the past and should preserve the distinction between the typical ROC award and the typical ECSA.

- The fact that Level 3 performance is a successful level of performance should be reinforced through the consideration of performance awards granted to Level 3 summary rating ROC-eligibles (i.e., Element Average of 4.0 or above), and ECSAs for other Level 3 summary rating employees (i.e. Element Average of 3.0 or above) which highlight other contributions that we value and should acknowledge.
- Management officials should ensure that they do not overlook employees who were/are detailed elsewhere or employees who left their organizations after the end of the appraisal period.
- Key to successfully changing our awards culture is to eliminate the sense of entitlement and reinforce the new definitions of performance. Under the definitions used in the performance management system, some employees do not meet eligibility criteria for performance awards; even fewer received a Level 5 summary rating. While possible, it is not envisioned that all the employees in an office would routinely receive an award in the same fiscal year.

2. The timing of awards should be consistent with the contract, PPM and their intent. Ideally, award allocations would be received in October each year, ROC awards would be granted immediately, and ECSAs are granted throughout the year. In reality, award allocations are received later in the year resulting in distributions of ROC awards and some ECSAs at the same time. However, the entire ESCA allocation should not be expended at the time ROC awards are granted. This will ensure that ECSA awards continue throughout the remainder of the year as contributions worthy of ECSA awards occur.

Managers should consider the following when determining the timing of awards:

- ROC/QSI awards, which are based on the prior year's performance, should be processed as close as possible to the end of the appraisal year, once award allocations have been received. All ROC awards in the component should be processed at one time in the CAP program to ensure the appropriate system validations of ROC awards (e.g., Employees with an Element Average of 5.0 must receive a higher ROC award amount than employees with lower Element Averages at the same grade level in the same component.)
- ECSAs, which are based on contributions during the year, may and should be processed throughout the year. While ECSAs are normally granted for services or acts in the current fiscal year, managers should consider any exemplary service or act an employee has performed since ECSAs were last awarded in the prior fiscal year and keep some funds available until a time near the established cutoff for FY08 awards.
- ECSA funds should not be completely expended at the time ROC awards are processed, used to "make whole" employees who did not receive a

performance award, or be granted in amounts that make it difficult to note the difference between the two types of awards. Typically, cash ROC awards have been noticeably higher in value than ECSAs and this distinction should continue.

3. Awards should be appropriately communicated and shared publicly. As with honor awards, individuals who receive a monetary award should be openly recognized for their contributions. In Operations, while managers have some discretion in how they publicly share the award activity (e.g. stand up meeting, group e-mail), publicly sharing the award activity within the component is mandatory under the agreed upon Operations policy. Managers must publicly share information on the award recipient, the type of award received, and the basis for the award.

- ECSA – Managers must provide an explanation of the specific singular act or contribution that lead to granting the award.
- ROC/QSI – Managers are encouraged to provide a reason for granting the award other than generally stating it is for a sustained contribution.

The manager must comply with PPM 451 Section 5.8., which states “The employee will be presented with documentation of the award which may include a certificate. For awards other than a ROC Award, the acknowledgement will include a justification statement.”

It is not necessary to communicate the amount of the award.

Publicly conveying awards with your employees has many benefits:

- It is consistent with principles about the importance of open, honest communications,
- It provides validation to the level of achievement employees earned,
- It provides insight into what we value to all employees,
- It gives us an opportunity to reinforce the notion that Level 3 is indeed, indicative of a “successful” contribution,
- It makes the manager more accountable to his or her employees for the award decisions made, and
- It is responsive to AFGE and employee concerns about the failure to acknowledge contributions in an open fashion.

III. RECOGNITION OF CONTRIBUTION (ROC) AWARD

A ROC Award is based on individual performance and contributions to the Agency's mission during the most recently completed appraisal period.

A ROC may be offered in the form of a cash award or a Quality Step Increase (QSI). To be eligible for a ROC award, an employee must be in good standing at the time of consideration and must have an Element Average of at least 4.0 for cash awards or an Element Average of 5.0 for a QSI. Employees with an Element Average of 5.0 will be considered for a ROC Award while employees with an Element Average of 4.0 or greater, but less than 5.0, may be considered.

This material is intended for use by supervisors and management officials only and it is not to be shared with bargaining unit employees or the Union.

Document Revised 3/7/08

Keep the following provisions in mind when granting ROC awards:

- The following employees are NOT eligible to receive a ROC Award (Cash or QSI):
 - Probationary employees,
 - Employees appraised under a New Hire and Trainee (NHT) performance plan, and
 - Employees with an Element Average of less than 4.0
 - Employees not covered by a performance management plan (e.g. Term Employees, STEP employees)

- QSI Awards:
 - An employee may not be granted more than one QSI within any 52-week period,
 - An employee may not be serving on a temporary promotion when a QSI is to take effect,
 - Employees at the maximum step of their grade are not eligible for a QSI,
 - Approving officials should consider an employee's individual circumstances when determining the appropriateness of a QSI versus a cash ROC Award per the note below:

(Note: WIGI Considerations: QSIs are in addition to within-grade increases (WIGIs) and normally do not affect the waiting period for an employee's next WIGI. The time the employee served at the step prior to the effective date of the QSI will count for the total waiting period for the next WIGI. It is only when a QSI will place the employee at step 4 (the waiting period changes from 52 to 104 weeks) or at step 7 (the waiting period changes from 104 to 156 weeks) that the waiting period for the next WIGI becomes longer. Therefore, managers may wish to delay the processing of a QSI until after the WIGI is effective for an employee who is at step 3 or step 6 and due a WIGI soon. A manager should not, however, delay the QSI beyond the end of the FY award period. If a QSI is to be delayed, a cover note to this effect must accompany the approved QSI action forwarded to the servicing personnel office for processing.)
 - The cash value of all QSIs granted must be charged to an organization's ROC Award allocation. QSI cost factors will be updated and published annually.
 - Components have the authority to reallocate their QSI allocation to another component. However, you must ensure you do not transfer BU QSI allocations to NBU allocations. The process for reallocating QSIs is the same as reallocating award funds. An office's ROC allocation will not change if they reallocate QSIs.

- An employee may not be granted more than one ROC Award for an appraisal period;

- Award Amounts:

- Attachment 1 outlines which managers have authority to approve and disapprove ROC Awards. While these are the national delegations, components should be cognizant of further redelegations which may have occurred at the regional/component level,
- A ROC Award may not exceed 10 percent of an employee's base pay as of the last day of the fiscal year for which the award is being granted,
- All award amounts must be in whole dollars (no cents),
- **Only** for the contract provision requiring that employees with an Element Average of 5.0 receive a higher ROC award amount than employees with a lower Element Average in the same grade in the same component, "same component" has been defined as:
 - The Level 1 Field Office complex/district for the field structure
 - Operations Division or equivalent for large Processing Centers, including OCO
 - Section or equivalent in large TSCs
 - Installation-wide for small TSCs or other small organizations
 - Center or equivalent within Regional Offices
 - Associate Commissioner in DCOSS
- To ensure contract compliance, the comparison outlined above should be based on the employee's grade and component as of the last day of the appraisal year, 9/30/07;
- In meeting this contractual requirement, QSIs will be considered of higher value than any ROC amount under existing delegations since the value of the award extends beyond the immediate year,
- Components may establish, but are not required to use, award ranges at generally the same organizational levels listed above to determine award amounts,
- Components may not establish fixed award amounts.

IV. EXEMPLARY CONTRIBUTION OR SERVICE AWARD (ECSA)

To be eligible for an ECSA, an employee must be in good standing (a rating of record of at least summary level 3 and his/her current performance is at least successful) and must perform an extraordinary service or act in connection with or related to official duty, or demonstrate exemplary individual contributions to group performance that have promoted the mission of the Agency.

It is important that we consider the contributions of all employees in good standing when determining ECSA recipients, so that employees understand the value we place not only on high performers, but all employees in good standing.

Keep the following provisions in mind when granting ECSAs:

- The amount of the award should vary depending on the relative significance and impact of the employee's contribution,
- The amount of an ECSA is typically lower than the amount of a ROC award,
- The minimum amount of an ECSA is \$200,
- There is no restriction on the number of ECSAs that may be granted within an appraisal period,
- Attachment 1 outlines which managers have authority to approve and disapprove ECSAs. While these are the national delegations, components should be

This material is intended for use by supervisors and management officials only and it is not to be shared with bargaining unit employees or the Union.

Document Revised 3/7/08

cognizant of further redelegations which may have occurred at the regional/component level,

- All award amounts must be in whole dollars (no cents),
- NHT employees in good standing are eligible for ECSAs,
- Employees who have received ROCs are also eligible for ECESA awards, and
- ECSAs can be used for individual contributions, as well as for contributions as part of a team.

V. AWARD FUND ALLOCATIONS

In FY08, the change in the number of ROC-eligible employees resulted in a change to the awards allocation process. Therefore, it is important to understand how award funds are distributed.

For a number of years, 55% of award allocations have been set aside for ROC and QSI awards, and 45% went to other awards. ROC allocations are determined based on the payroll in effect at the close of the prior fiscal year; other awards allocations are based on the number of employees on duty on the last day of the prior fiscal year. Separate allocations are provided for the BU and for those outside the BU. ROC/QSI and other award allocations have always been separate and distinct. Each year, the amount of award dollars rises in small increments and will do so again in FY08.

Under the new system, we have changed how allocations are assigned to various award categories: 55% of award dollars will continue to go towards ROCs/QSIs, 20% are assigned to ERAs, and 25% are assigned to ECSAs. Unused ERA funds could be reprogrammed to ECESA allocations. Each component also receives a separate QSI allocation based on a percentage of employees on duty in each component at the close of the previous fiscal year.

Under the Pass/Fail system, virtually all employees were eligible for all types of monetary award consideration. However, under PACS, ROC eligibility is limited to those employees who have an element average of 4.0 or higher. The ROC-eligible population is further limited because employees who received an NHT appraisal do not receive an Element Average, and are therefore, not eligible for ROC awards.

These changes mean that there are fewer ROC-eligible employees than in prior years. [We have an MOU with AFGE that we will transfer funds at the local level from the ROC allocation to the ECESA allocation, if necessary, to prevent not being able to use those funds. This will also ensure that local management recognizes not just high performance but all significant contributions.](#)

Transferring Award Funds

Award Funds must be transferred according to agreed upon parameters. Managers should comply with the following instructions:

- Components calculate and release allocations using existing formulas to local managers who have direct knowledge of employee contributions.
- Utilize the CAP program for all awards processing. See the [CAP User Guide](#) for further instructions.

- Funds/QSIs cannot be transferred from the BU to NBU allocation. Managers have occasionally used funds from their non-bargaining unit allocation to recognize contributions for bargaining unit employees, and may continue to do so in unusual circumstances.
- Transfer of ROC funds to ECSA allocations is permitted only when necessary, and only after considering all ROC eligible employees,
- Before transferring any funds from the ROC to ECSA account, you:
 - Must consider all employees with a 5.0 Element Average (EA),
 - Must ensure that ROC awards given to those with a 5.0 EA are larger than those given to employees with a lower EA in the same grade and same component; therefore, you will need to coordinate with other managers in your component to ensure that you have met this obligation,
 - Must consider all employees who are ROC eligible (Note: the contract says these employees “may” be considered; however, if you intend to transfer funds from the ROC allocation to the ECSA allocation, you “must” consider them),
 - Are encouraged to give higher ROC awards than typical (especially for employees who achieved a Level 5 summary rating) in past experience, and
 - Should continue to give ROC awards that are typically noticeably larger than ECSAs as another means of preserving the distinction between those types of awards.
- Consult with the Component Director (e.g. AD, OM, TSC Director) in the following situations:
 - A manager with unused ROC funds proposes that they will not give all ROC-eligible employees an award, but plans to reallocate the funds to the ECSA allocation for their unit, office or team.
 - [In those rare circumstances when a manager is unable to utilize the full ECSA allocation to make awards appropriate to the contribution \(e.g. the unit is composed of all trainees\), we suggest consultation with your management line and HR staff.](#)
 - A manager proposes to exhaust all ECSA funds before the established cut off point for the fiscal year.
- Transfers may be made only from ROC to ECSA funds; ECSA funds may not be transferred to ROC allocations.
- Operations does not plan on initiating ERA awards in FY08. However, you may use ECSA funds to jointly sponsor such awards with other non-Operations components.

If you have any questions regarding this guidance, you should contact your local Human Resource Specialist. Questions may also be referred to ^PHI PACS Questions.

References:

PPM Chapter 451

Article 17, National Agreement Between SSA and AFGE

CAP User Guide

EXAMPLE

In FY 2007, a Level I office received the following BU Award Allocation:

ROC	ECSA
\$4250	3000

All employees in the office were eligible for ROC awards. The manager gave the following ROC awards to 1/3 of his staff:

# of Awards/Position	Avg. Award Amount
1 TE	1000
3 CRs	850
1 SR	700
TOTAL	\$4250

The manager used his ECSA allocation. He gave out 8 ECSA awards; the average ECSA award was \$375.

In FY 2008, the same Level I office received the following BU Award Allocation:

ROC	ECSA
\$4700	4000

Three employees are ROC-eligible. The manager determines that these three employees have made sustained, significant contributions worthy of ROC recognition. The employees participated on office workgroups, conducted office training, mentored trainees, volunteered to work at the front desk on a routine basis, or made suggestions to improve case processing. They engaged in these activities while maintaining their regular workload. While the manager wants to give higher ROC awards than in the past, he does not want to give an amount that is higher than the contribution merits. Therefore, he makes the following ROC determinations:

# of Awards/Position	Element Average	Award Amount
CR 1 (GS 11)	5.0	QSI
CR 2 (GS 11)	4.5	1300
Field Rep (GS 11)	4.0	1300
TOTAL		\$3450

The manager has two Level 2 Offices in his district; there are 2 CRs in those offices who are also ROC-eligible. While he would normally have to compare the amount of the award given for the CR with a 5.0 element average against the ROCS given to other CRs in the district, his decision to grant a QSI makes further comparison unnecessary since a QSI is automatically considered of higher value than any ROC cash award. You will also note that ROC awards for the same graded positions were higher in FY08 than in FY07.

The manager has \$1250 left over from his BU ROC allocation. He decides to transfer the BU ROC allocation to the BU ECSA allocation; therefore, he consults with his AD;

This material is intended for use by supervisors and management officials only and it is not to be shared with bargaining unit employees or the Union. 10
Document Revised 3/7/08

the AD sends an e-mail to the Regional CAP Administrator to reassign the funds. This transfer increases the BU ECSA allocation to \$5250. Over the rest of the fiscal year, the manager awards 8 ECSA awards to the BU. The basis for three of the eight awards is outlined below:

The TE received two ECSAs. The first ECSA, in the amount of \$500 was for leading an area workgroup to improve medical CDR case processing. Several months later, the TE receives a second ECSA for \$700 for providing support to management in the area of quality analysis.

An SR volunteered to manage the mailroom for one month while the office was short staffed, in addition to completing regular work assignments.

The average ECSA is \$656, which is lower than the average ROC award for the office, and exhausts the office ECSA allocation.

Awards Process Checklist

1.	<p>Allocations Higher level components allocate funds to lower level components in organizational hierarchy (e.g. AD to Level 1 and Level 2 Offices; OM to Module, MOS to Center Directors) through CAP. An office cannot exceed its allocation in any category.</p>
2.	<p>Local managers review ROC and ECSA Allocations for their office. Managers will receive a separate allocation for their Bargaining Unit and Non-Bargaining Unit employees.</p>
3.	<p>Award Determinations Managers should first consider past award history in their office/module and should strive to give larger ROC awards than have been given in the past. Managers should ensure that ROC awards are larger than ECSA awards.</p> <p>See <u>Attachment 1</u> to determine the award amounts which you can approve.</p> <p>Components may establish, but are not required to use, award ranges at the same organizational levels listed in #1.</p> <p>Components may not establish fixed award amounts.</p>
4.	<p>ROC Awards Managers must make ROC award determinations before processing ECSA awards. Managers should consider all ROC-eligible employees for ROC awards. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An employee may not be granted more than one ROC Award for an appraisal period during a fiscal year; • A ROC Award may not exceed 10 percent of an employee's base pay as of the last day of the fiscal year (FY) for which awards are being granted; • Award amounts for employees with an Element Average of 5.0 will be greater than the amounts for employees with lower Element Averages at the same grade level in the component. For Operations, "component" is defined as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Level 1 Field Office, for the field structure • Operations Division or equivalent for large Processing Centers, including OCO, • Section or equivalent in large TSCs • Installation-wide for small TSCs or other small organizations • Center or equivalent within Regional Offices • Associate Commissioner in DCOSS • Award amount should be based on employee's grade as of the last day of the appraisal year, 9/30/07; <p>Remember the following categories of employees are not eligible for ROC awards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probationary employees; • Employees with an Element Average of less than 4.0 ;

This material is intended for use by supervisors and management officials only and it is not to be shared with bargaining unit employees or the Union. 12
Document Revised 3/7/08

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employees not covered by a performance management plan (e.g. Term Employees, STEP employees). <p>QSI Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A QSI is deemed to have a greater cash value than any ROC cash award; Only employees with Level 5 Rating can get a QSI; An employee may not be granted more than one QSI within any 52-week period; An employee may not be serving on a temporary promotion when a QSI is to take effect; and For QSI recipients at Step 3 and Step 6, consider the timing of the QSI in accordance with <u>PPM Chapter 451-1 Section 5.5.4</u>
5.	Input ROC award determinations in CAP and batch together so that system will validate all policy requirements. See <u>CAP Award Guidance</u> for processing instructions in CAP and FPPS. Use CAP to print the award certificate.
6.	<p>If manager has unused ROC funds and plans to reassign these funds to the ECSA allocation at the local level, consult with your management line (e.g. AD, OM) regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROC-eligible employees who will not receive a ROC award How to transfer of ROC funds to office's ECSA allocation (The component administrator will need to reassign funds from ROC to ECSA)
7.	<p>ECSA</p> <p>Determine employees who warrant ECSA awards since last cutoff in prior fiscal year. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The employee must be in good standing (i.e., have a rating of record of at least summary level 3 and his/her current performance is at least successful); The employee must perform an extraordinary service or act in connection with or related to official duty or demonstrate exemplary individual contributions to group performance. The minimum amount that can be awarded for an ECSA is \$200.00. NHT employees are eligible for ECSA awards. There is no restriction on the number of ECSA an employee can receive during the fiscal year. ECSA awards should be given as close to the act or service as possible. Reserve some ECSA funds for distribution later in the fiscal year. <p>In those rare circumstances when a manager is unable to use their full ECSA allocation (e.g. component is comprised of trainees), the manager must consult with their management line to determine the appropriate course of action.</p>
8.	Input ECSA award determinations in CAP. See <u>CAP Award Guidance</u> for processing instructions in CAP and FPPS. Generate award notice in CAP.
9.	There may be rare circumstances when a manager would consider transferring funds from the non-bargaining unit allocation to the bargaining unit allocation. Before doing so, you should consult with your management

	line.
10.	Communicate Award Managers must publicly share all award activity (i.e. award recipient, type and purpose of award; it is not necessary to communicate the amount of the award) generally within the local component. Managers do have flexibility regarding how they will communicate award recipients, the type and purpose of award

Attachment 1

Delegated Authority for Granting ROC/ECSA Awards
(Source: DCO - Redelegations of Personnel and Equal Employment Opportunity Authority, Awards Redelegations, p. 4))

Headquarters

\$3,500

Associate Commissioners

\$2,500

Assistant Associate Commissioners

Division Directors (GS-15 Supervisors/Team Leaders)

\$1,500

One level of supervision below AAC

Regions/OCO

\$3,500

Regional Commissioners

\$2,500

Assistant Regional Commissioners

Area Directors

\$1,500

One level of supervision below ARC

Installation Heads

Module Managers

Mega-TSC Section Chiefs

Fiscal Year 2008 Quality Step Increase (QSI) Cost Factors*

Components must charge the cost of QSIs they grant against their Performance Award allocation, using the cost factors listed below. The cost factor to be used must be based on the awardee's grade and the month in which the QSI is to take effect. This chart only captures the cost of the QSI in FY08. The value of the QSI automatically exceeds the value of any ROC cash awards for purposes of the comparison requested in Article 17, Section 4A.

GS	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT
1	460	420	390	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	40
2	540	490	450	410	370	320	280	230	180	140	90	50
3	680	620	570	520	470	410	350	290	230	170	120	60
4	760	700	640	590	520	460	390	330	260	200	130	70
5	850	780	710	660	580	510	440	370	290	220	150	70
6	950	870	790	730	650	570	490	410	330	240	160	80
7	1060	970	880	810	720	630	540	450	360	270	180	90
8	1170	1070	980	900	800	700	600	500	400	300	200	100
9	1290	1190	1080	1000	890	770	660	550	440	330	220	110
10	1430	1310	1190	1100	970	850	730	610	490	370	240	120
11	1570	1440	1310	1200	1070	940	800	670	540	400	270	130
12	1880	1720	1560	1440	1280	1120	960	800	640	480	320	160
13	2230	2050	1860	1720	1530	1340	1140	950	760	570	380	190
14	2640	2420	2200	2030	1800	1580	1350	1130	900	680	450	230
15	3100	2840	2590	2390	2120	1860	1590	1330	1060	800	530	270

* Only employees paid under the General Schedule (GS) are eligible for a QSI.