

Objective Standards Of Performance

Introduction	1
Section A - Laboratory Leadership	2
Section B – Science And Technology	5
Section C - Performance Objectives, Criteria And Measures	7
1 Environment, Safety, And Health.....	7
2 Project/Facilities And Construction Management.....	11
3 Financial Management	14
4 Human Resources	15
5 Procurement.....	17
6 Property Management	18
Section D - Assessment And Appraisal	20

Introduction

This Appendix contains the performance objectives, criteria, and measures (POCMs) which are the components of the performance-based management system that the University and DOE will utilize for Laboratory oversight as described in Clause 2.6, Performance-Based Management. The POCMs will be clear and reasonable objective standards against which the University's overall compliance with obligations under this contract will be assessed.

The POCMs will be subject to annual review and may be modified by the agreement of the Parties in accordance with the procedures set forth in Clause 2.6, Performance-Based Management, Clause 5.1, Contract Modifications, and Clause 5.3, Program Performance Fee. It is understood that the changes in the POCMs may be proposed based on cost/risk/benefit analysis. The DOE and UC rating processes will give primary emphasis and consideration to the Contractor's self-assessment against Appendix F POCMs, recognizing that the UCLAO and the Contracting Officer may take into account other pertinent information (for example, major ES&H performance issues or significant mission disruption) consistent with Clause 2.6 (d)(3) and Clause 2.6(e) to arrive at the annual rating of Laboratory performance.

This Appendix contains a description of the process to be used by the University and DOE to evaluate the Contractor's performance of administration, and operations and by DOE-SC to evaluate the, science, and technology at the Laboratory.

Business systems may require modification as POCMs are revised in accordance with Clause 2.6, Performance-Based Management. Where systems are so modified in the course of a review period, DOE agrees to take such modification into account in the appraisal.

Section A - Laboratory Leadership

Performance Objective

1.0 Laboratory Leadership

Assess Laboratory leadership activities that enable successful planning and implementation of research programs for DOE missions and ensure the stewardship and viability of the institution. (Weight = 100%)

Note: The Gradient for each measure is shown in the attachment based on Approach/Deployment and Results.

Criterion

1.1 Institutional Stewardship and Viability

Evaluation of Laboratory senior management's approach, deployment and results for ensuring that the institution is capable of executing its current and future missions. (Weight = 100%)

Performance Measures

1.1.a Planning and Strategic Direction

Evaluation of management's approach for strategic planning that aligns Laboratory vision, goals, resources, and infrastructure with divisional programmatic needs, and DOE missions and strategic plans. (Weight = 40.0%)

1.1.b Communications, Educational and Community Outreach, and Diversity

Evaluation of management's approach and effectiveness for external and internal communications, educational outreach, and diversity awareness and planning. (Weight = 30.0 %)

1.1.c Stewardship and Accountability

Evaluation of management's approach for the establishment of roles, responsibilities, and authorities that provides accountability and effective resource management. (Weight = 30.0 %)

Gradient

The performance expectation for each performance measure will use the scoring criteria indicated in Table 1 below. Each performance measure indicates the relative weights between the Approach/Deployment criteria and the Results criteria.

Table 1. Appraisal Scoring Guidelines for Laboratory Management

Narrative Rating (Score Range)	Approach/Deployment	Results
Unsatisfactory (59% and Below)	Little or no systematic approach evident; anecdotal information	Little or no results in key mission and business areas.
Marginal (60 to 69%)	Beginning of a systematic approach to the key mission and business areas. Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation. Major gaps exist in deployment that would inhibit progress in achieving the key mission and business objectives.	Early stages of developing; some improvements and/or early good performance level in a few key mission and business areas.
Good (70 to 79%)	A sound systematic approach, responsive to the key mission and business areas. A fact-based improvement process in place in key areas; more emphasis is placed on improvement than on reaction to problems. No major gaps in deployment, though some areas may be in the very early stages of deployment.	Improvement trends and/or good performance levels reported for most key mission and business areas. No pattern of adverse trends and/or poor performance levels in the key mission and business areas. Some trends and/or current performance levels show areas of strength and/or good to very good relative performance levels.
Excellent (80 to 89%)	A sound systematic approach, responsive to the key mission and business areas. A fact-based improvement process is a key management tool; clear evidence of refinement and improved integration as a result of improvement cycles and analysis. Approach is well developed, with no major	Current performance is Excellent in most key mission and business areas. Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels are sustained in most other areas. Many to most trends and/or

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

Modification No.: M394
 Supplemental Agreement to
 Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098

	gaps; deployment may vary in some areas.	current performance levels show areas of leadership and very good relative performance levels.
Outstanding (90 to 100%)	<p>A sound systematic approach, fully responsive to key mission and business areas.</p> <p>A very strong fact-based improvement process is a key management tool; strong refinement and integration - backed by Excellent analysis.</p> <p>Approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in the key areas.</p>	<p>Current performance is Outstanding in most key mission and business areas.</p> <p>Excellent performance levels in most other areas.</p> <p>Strong evidence of industry and benchmark leadership demonstrated in many areas.</p>

Section B – Science and Technology

The DOE Office of Science will perform and document an appraisal of the Science and Technology performance of the Laboratory for FY2004. The appraisal will use, but not be limited to, the Science and Technology Assessment Criteria outlined below. The Contractor will continue to use external peer reviews to provide advice to internal management on the overall quality of the technical work, the effectiveness of Laboratory management in fostering an atmosphere conducive to scientific inquiry, and other aspects affecting the ability of the Laboratory to continue to respond effectively to the DOE's mission.

Criteria for Science & Technology Performance Assessment

- Quality of Science-Recognized indicators of excellence, including impact of scientific contributions, leadership in the scientific community, innovativeness, and sustained achievement will be assessed as appropriate. As appropriate, other performance measures such as publications, citations, and awards may be considered. This criterion is to be applied to all aspects of technical work, including science, engineering, and technical development
- Relevance to National Needs and Agency Mission-The impact of Laboratory research and development on the mission needs of the Department of Energy and other agencies funding the programs will be assessed in the reviews. Such considerations include energy policy, economic competitiveness, and national environmental goals, as well as the goals of DOE and other Laboratory funding agencies in advancing fundamental science and strengthening science education. The impact of Laboratory programs on industrial competitiveness and national technology needs will be assessed. The assessment will include characteristics that are not easily measured, including relevance of research programs to national technology needs and effectiveness of outreach efforts to industry. As appropriate, they may also consider such performance measures as licenses and patents, collaborative agreements with industry, and the value of commercial spin-offs.
- Performance in the Technical Development and Operation of Major Research Facilities-Performance measures include success in meeting scientific and technical objectives, technical performance specifications, and user availability goals. Other considerations may include the quality of user science performed, extent of user participation and user satisfaction, operational reliability and efficiency, and effectiveness of planning for future improvements, recognizing that DOE programmatic needs are considered to be primary when balanced against user goals and user satisfaction
- Program Management and Planning-The assessment should focus on broad programmatic goals, including meeting established technical milestones, carrying out work within budget and on schedule, satisfying the sponsors, providing cost-effective performance, planning for orderly completion or continuation of the programs, and appropriate publication and

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

dissemination of scientific and technical information. In assessing the effectiveness of programmatic and strategic planning, the reviewers may consider the ability to execute projects in concert with overall mission objectives, programmatic responsiveness to changes in scope or technical perspective, and strategic responsiveness to new research missions and emerging national needs. In the evaluation of the effectiveness of program management, consideration include morale, quality of leadership, effectiveness in managing scientific resources (including effectiveness in mobilizing interdisciplinary teams), effectiveness of organization, and efficiency of facility operations.”

Section C - Performance Objectives, Criteria And Measures

1 Environment, Safety, And Health

Preamble

The Laboratory's overall goal is to accomplish its scientific mission while striving for an injury-free workplace, protecting the public and the environment, and minimizing waste from its operations.

It is the objective of the LBNL ES&H Program to support the Laboratory mission by delivering quality ES&H counsel and services, and to advance the frontiers of science by providing a competitive and cost effective advantage for scientists throughout the Lab. In order to achieve this objective, the Balanced Scorecard approach will be applied to the ES&H Program to measure selected activities for continuous improvement resulting in the competitive advantage desired. The Balanced Scorecard incorporates measurements in the following categories:

- Customer
- Financial
- Operations
- People
- Ethics Governance Compliance

It is also the intent of LBNL to continue to operate the Laboratory in a manner that builds on the proven concept and practice of Integrated Safety Management (ISM). The concepts of Balanced Scorecard and ISM are complementary. The elements of the Balanced Scorecard are embedded in ISM and results of internal Balanced Scorecard metrics roll up into the five core functions of ISM.

The following Performance Objective, Criteria and Measures evaluate the effectiveness of ISM while addressing the four categories in the Balanced Scorecard.

Performance Period: Unless otherwise specified in the measures, the performance period is October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.

Performance Objective

The Laboratory uses ISM, best practices, certification, and validation of ES&H Management Systems to integrate ES&H into Lab work processes at all levels so those missions are accomplished while protecting the worker, the public and the environment.

Criterion 1.0

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

The Laboratory will assess, develop, and implement best practices and certified/independently validated ES&H management systems based upon industry best practices and international/national standards.

Performance Measure 1.1: Best Practices and Certified/Independently Validated ES&H Management Systems

To meet efficiency and effectiveness standards of its internal business processes, the Laboratory is satisfactorily progressing towards certification, validation, or accreditation (CVA) of its ES&H Management Systems and implementing actions from its best practices studies. **(weight = 40%)**

Performance Gradients

Unsatisfactory	Little or no effort has been demonstrated towards the achievement of the performance measure.
Marginal	Some effort is demonstrated however results fall short of the expectations for the good gradient.
Good	CVA progress and best practices implementation are significant but impediments have occurred that delay the completion of some certified, validated, or accredited ES&H management system milestones and best practices milestone (>75% of milestones completed).
Excellent	CVA progress is on-schedule with few delays in the completion of certified, validated, or accredited ES&H management system milestones and best practice milestones (>85% of milestones completed).
Outstanding	CVA progress is on-schedule with no significant delays in the completion of certified, validated, or accredited ES&H management system milestones and best practice milestones (>95% of milestones completed).

Assumptions

- ES&H management systems have been identified as part of the FY03 Appendix F POCMs. The Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) identified last year has been replaced with the Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series (OHSAS) 18001 certification.
- Action plans for the identified ES&H management systems, with the exception of OHSAS 18001, have been reviewed and approved as part of the FY03 Appendix F POCMs. The action plan for OHSAS 18001 certification will be reviewed and approved by BSO as soon as feasible.
- CVA of ES&H management systems is a multi-year effort. Future events, issues, or circumstances may result in required or recommended changes to the CVA action plans or in the elimination/ addition of candidate ES&H management systems. Any changes to the action plans or list of candidate ES&H management systems must be mutually agreed to by DOE/BSO and LBNL.

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

- Best Practice assessments of hazard analysis and self-assessment were completed in FY03. Follow-up actions as identified in the best practice improvement plans are to be completed as part of the FY04 Appendix F POCMs. Best practice actions are identified as best practice milestones.

Criterion 2.0

The Laboratory will measure the effectiveness of ISM through its ISM Balanced Scorecard (BSC).

Performance Measure 2.1: ISM System

The Laboratory has an effective Integrated Safety Management (ISM) System that protects Lab employees, the public and the environment while supporting the scientific mission of the Lab. (weight = 60%)

Performance Gradients

Performance is rated through the ISM Balanced Scorecard. (The balanced scorecard gradients are in the ES&H ISM Performance Assessment Model agreed to by LBNL and BSO. They are incorporated by reference). Adjectival rating is based on the following percent score:

BSC Overall Percent Score	Performance Gradients
Less than 60%	Unsatisfactory
> 60% to < 70%	Marginal
> 70% to < 80%	Good
> 80% to < 90%	Excellent
More than 90%	Outstanding

Assumptions

- The ISM Balanced Scorecard shall be used to evaluate ISM effectiveness.
- Supplemental information on the quality and effectiveness of the Berkeley Lab's ISM program can be provided through the BSO/LBNL Operational Awareness (OA) Program. Current data gathered to address Appendix F measures from previous performance periods can be used as supplemental information in evaluating specific ISM functions. In particular, the Lab will continue to gather data to monitor worker radiation dose,

unplanned radiation exposure, radiation contamination, environmental releases, and overexposure to chemical, biological and physical agents.

The evaluation of this measure is the DOE validation of the effectiveness of ISM implementation.

ISM Balanced Scorecard
Section C - Performance Objectives, Criteria And Measures

2 Project/Facilities and Construction Management

It is the objective of Facilities Management Program to support the Laboratory mission by delivering quality counsel and services, and to advance the frontiers of science by providing a competitive and cost effective advantage for scientists throughout the Lab. In order to achieve this objective, the Balanced Scorecard approach will be applied to Facilities Management Program to measure selected activities for continuous improvement resulting in the competitive advantage desired. The Balanced Scorecard incorporates measurements in the following categories:

- Customer Satisfaction, both internal and external (to included regulatory compliance)
- Financial
- Internal Processes
- Ethics/Governance/Compliance
- People

The following Performance Objective, Criteria and Measures evaluate the effectiveness of Facilities while addressing the five categories in the Balanced Scorecard.

Performance Period: Unless otherwise specified in the measures, the performance period is October 1, 2003 to September 30, 2004.

Performance Objective

The Laboratory uses Physical Assets Planning and Real Property, Construction Project Management, and Facilities and Infrastructure Management to achieve excellence in the management of the Facilities at LBNL.

Criterion 1.0

The Laboratory will develop, document, and maintain a comprehensive integrated planning process that is aligned with DOE mission needs. Real property will be managed consistent with mission, requirements and DOE direction.

Performance Measures 1.0: Physical Assets Planning and Real Property Management

The intent will be to measure the effectiveness, completeness, and timeliness of implementation of Physical Assets Planning and Real Property Management actions. Milestones will be established using Facilities Information Management System completeness, office space utilization, substandard building space conversion, real property leases, and Physical Assets Planning activities and deliverables. Facilities will revise the Project Call process to enhance financial controls. Facilities will develop Business Ethics training for managers. Milestones will be established in partnership with DOE and made a matter of record at the beginning of the fiscal year. Gradient Points will be determined by multiplying 100 by the weighted value of the milestones completed and dividing by the weighted value of the milestones scheduled for completion.

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

(Weight = 30%)

Criterion 2.0

The Laboratory will complete construction projects within approved budgets, schedules and scopes.

Performance Measure 2.0: Construction Project Management

The intent will be to measure actual progress against that planned for the fiscal year and for the Laboratory to execute projects and cost project funds in a timely manner. The Laboratory will initiate practices/procedures to support the implementation of Project Management Manual (DOE M 413.3-1). Facilities will develop a curriculum specifically to help train facilities supervisors. Milestones will be established for all active projects over \$500K regardless of type of funds. Milestones will be established in partnership with DOE and made a matter of record at the beginning of the fiscal year. Each active project will have at least one milestone per year. By mutual agreement between the Laboratory and DOE, milestones may be weighted for project significance, for project size/cost, for late/early completion, for improved/diminished scope, etc. Milestones will not be interpreted as baseline change approval. Gradient Points will be determined by multiplying 100 by the weighted value of the milestones completed and dividing by the weighted value of the milestones scheduled for completion.

(Weight = 30%)

Criterion 3.0

The Laboratory will maintain capital assets to ensure reliable operations in a safe and cost-effective manner. Energy initiatives will be managed consistent with a comprehensive energy management plan.

Performance Measure 3.0: Facility and Infrastructure Management

The intent will be to measure the effectiveness of the Laboratory's facility maintenance and energy management programs and plans. The laboratory will seek to achieve the Office of Science Maintenance Investment Index (MII) goal of 1.4% of Replacement Plant Value (RPV) for FY04. The laboratory will implement the utilization of Advance Maximo for Maintenance and Projects. Facilities will seek APPA and IFMA membership for managers. Milestones will be established using Energy Facility Contractors Group benchmarking indicators, operational awareness activities, annual maintenance summary report, Energy Management Plan and others as mutually agreed. Milestones will be established in partnership with DOE and made a matter of record at the beginning of the fiscal year. Gradient Points will be determined by multiplying 100 by the weighted value of the milestones completed and dividing by the weighted value of the milestones scheduled for completion.

(Weight = 40%)

Gradient:

Points	Rating
< 60 Points	Unsatisfactory
≥ 60 but < 70 Points	Marginal
≥ 70 but < 80 Points	Good

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

Modification No.: M394
Supplemental Agreement to
Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098

≥ 80 but < 90 Points	Excellent
≥ 90 Points	Outstanding

Section C - Performance Objectives, Criteria And Measures

3 Financial Management

Performance Objective

1.0 Effective Financial Management

The Laboratory will implement effective financial management practices in accordance with DOE policies, procedures and requirements and provide quality customer service that supports the mission of the Laboratory. (Weight = 100%)

Criterion

1.1 The Laboratory will assess, develop, document and report performance results in accordance with established submeasures contained in the Financial Management Performance Assessment Model (FMPAM). (Weight = 100%)

Performance Measure

1.1.a Method of Measurement

An overall performance rating will be determined as a result of the points achieved using the FMPAM. (Weight = 100%)

Gradients:

Points	Rating
≤ 599	Unsatisfactory
600-690	Marginal
700-799	Good
800-899	Excellent
≥ 900	Outstanding

Section C - Performance Objectives, Criteria And Measures

4 Human Resources

Performance Objective

1.0 Effectiveness of HR Operations

Human Resources programs, services and processes support the operational needs and scientific mission of the Laboratory.

(Weight = 100%)

Criterion

1.1 Certified Human Resource Management System

Human Resources will design, develop and implement a certified Human Resource Management system based upon the HR Best Practices and/or national standards using an independent third-party to validate the system, and measure its effectiveness by using an HR Balanced Scorecard.

(Weight = 100%)

Performance Measure

1.1.a Certified Human Resource Management System

The Human Resources Management system achieves certification against mutually agreed upon best practices and/or national standards, and the metrics contained in the HR Balanced Scorecard.

(Weight = 100%)

Assumptions

It is expected that to accomplish this measure will be a multiple year effort.

This objective is consistent with the HR five-year (FY03-FY07) strategic plan.

A certified HR Management System will include the following elements:

Requirements will be based upon the DOE Office of Science (Card) principles of Line Management Accountability, National Standards, Oversight, Contractor Accountability, Vision, and Incentives

Components of the certified system will consist of standards, self-assessment against the standards, certification, and peer review

Best practices national standards for self-assessment will be established for the following areas: Workforce Planning, Compensation & Benefits, Development, and Labor and Employee Relations

Metrics will be defined in the HR Balanced Scorecard for the following areas: Customer, Ethics/Governance/Compliance, Finance, People, and Operations/Internal Processes.

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

Gradients

Balanced Scorecard Metrics Score	Gradient
Unsatisfactory	< 60%
Marginal	≥ 60% but < 70%
Good	≥ 70% but < 80%
Excellent	> 80% but < 90%
Outstanding	≥ 90%

Gradient Description

Unsatisfactory Little or no effort has been demonstrated towards the achievement of the performance measure.

Marginal Some effort is demonstrated however results fall short of the expectations for the good gradient.

Good Best practices or national standards have been reviewed and/or developed, and a gap analysis completed for four balanced scorecard categories agreed to by LBNL, UC, and DOE.

Excellent In addition to the good gradient, HR has developed a transition plan responsive to the gap analysis for three balanced scorecard categories.

Outstanding In addition to the excellent gradient, HR has implemented a transition plan responsive to the gap analysis for two balanced scorecard category.

Section C - Performance Objectives, Criteria And Measures

5 Procurement

Performance Objective

Procurement Excellence

The Laboratory will maintain a procurement system that ensures Procurement programs incorporate best practices as applicable, promotes customer service, and operates in accordance with policies and procedures approved by DOE and the requirements of the Prime Contract. (Weight = 100%)

Criterion

1.1 Assessing Degree of Excellence Achieved

The Laboratory will document and report its performance results against established submeasures contained in the Procurement Assessment Model (PROAM). (Weight = 100%)

Performance Measure

1.1.a Measuring System and Service Levels

An overall Procurement excellence score will be determined as a result of the points achieved on the PROAM. The PROAM is the management system framework that establishes and maintains a customer focus, a continuous and breakthrough process improvement culture, and an emphasis on results. (Weight = 100%)

Gradients:

Points	Rating
< 70.4 Points	Unsatisfactory
≥ 70.4 but < 80.0 Points	Marginal
≥ 80.0 but < 90.0 Points	Good
≥ 90.0 but < 95.0 Points	Excellent
≥ 95.0 Points	Outstanding

Section C - Performance Objectives, Criteria And Measures

6 Property Management

Objective

Personal Property Excellence (Weight = 100%)

The Laboratory will maintain a personal property system that ensures Property programs incorporate best practices as applicable, promotes customer service, and operates in accordance with policies and procedures approved by DOE and the requirements of the Prime Contract.

The primary purpose of the Personal Property system is to control the assets of LBNL and the Department of Energy. The secondary purpose of the Personal Property system is to support the scientific mission of the Laboratory by ensuring the acquisition, control, identification, and utilization of property to benefit researchers, the Laboratory, and taxpayers.

Criterion

Assessing Degree of Excellence Achieved (Weight = 100%)

The Laboratory documents and reports its performance results against established sub-measures contained in the Personal Property Assessment Model (PPAM).

Performance Measure

1.1.a Measuring System and Service Levels (Weight = 100%)

An overall score will be used to determine the approval status of the Laboratory Personal Property Management System. The score is based on points achieved against the established sub-measures in the PPAM. The PPAM provides the management system framework that establishes and maintains a customer focus, a continuous and breakthrough process improvement culture, and an emphasis on results.

Points	Rating
< 352 Points	Unsatisfactory
≥ 352 but < 400	Marginal
≥ 400 but < 450 Points	Good
≥450 but < 475 Points	Excellent
≥ 475 Points	Outstanding

Appendix F - Objective Standards of Performance

The intent will be to measure the effectiveness, completeness, and timeliness of implementation of Personal Property Management actions. Score Cards will be issued for each Division for all Internal Business measure, similar to EH&S "At-A-Glance Matrix". Milestones will be established using a single, comprehensive, assessment model designed to provide a systematic, ongoing measurement and evaluation of the LBNL property management system. Milestones will be established in partnership with DOE and made a matter of record at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Section D - Assessment And Appraisal

<p>Part 1 - UC Self-Assessment and Rating Process</p>
--

The UC Management team evaluates Laboratory Management and operations and administration systems for each Laboratory in each functional area (, Environment, Safety & Health, Facilities Management, Financial Management, Human Resources, Procurement, and Property Management) on the basis of established performance measures.

Weighting of points for each area is established at the beginning of each annual evaluation cycle. Numerical scores expressed as percentages are assigned to each functional area based upon the performance assessment ratings listed below. These percentages multiplied by the maximum points allocated for each functional area result in the total points for that area. UC will provide ratings for Laboratory Management and for Operations and Administration Systems.

Part 2 - DOE Evaluation and Appraisal



Evaluation of Laboratory Management
 60 pts

Evaluation of Operations and
 Administration Systems 240 pts

Evaluation of Science and Technology
 700 pts

Environment, Safety and Health	60 pts
Project/Facilities/Construction Mgt	30 pts
Financial Management	30 pts
Human Resources	30 pts
Procurement	60 pts
Property Management	30 pts

700 points

Evaluation of Laboratory
 Management

+

Evaluation of Operations &
 Administration Systems

+

Evaluation of S&T

Total 60 points

Total 240 Points

Total 700 Points

Part 3 - Performance Appraisal

Example

	Rating (*See Table 1)	% x	Max pts	Pt Score
Laboratory Management	Excellent	85% x	60 =	51 pts
Total of Laboratory Management				51 pts
Science & Technology	Excellent	85% x	700 =	595 pts
Total of Science and Technology				646 pts
 Operations & Administration Systems				
Environment, Safety & Health	Good	75% x	60 =	45 pts
Project/Facilities/Construction Mgt	Good	75% x	30 =	22.5 pts
Financial Management	Good	75% x	30 =	22.5 pts
Human Resources	Excellent	85% x	30 =	22.5 pts
Procurement	Outstanding	95% x	60 =	57 pts
Property Management	Good	75% x	30 =	25.5 pts
Total of Operations and Administration Systems				195 pts
Total of Laboratory Management, Science & Technology and Operations & Administration Systems				841 pts

Table 1 - Adjectival Rating/Points Conversion

Adjectival Rating	Total Points
Outstanding	900 - 1000 points
Excellent	800 - 899 points
Good	700 - 799 points
Marginal	600 - 699 points
Unsatisfactory	0 - 599 points

Table 2 - DOE - UC Rating Adjectives

Numerical Range	Adjectival Description	Definition
< 60	Unsatisfactory	Significantly below the standard of performance; deficiencies are serious, and may affect overall results, immediate senior management attention, and prompt corrective action is required.
69- 60	Marginal	Below the standard of performance; deficiencies are such that management attention and corrective action are required.
79 - 70	Good	Meets the standard of performance; assigned tasks are carried out in an acceptable manner - timely, efficiently, and economically. Deficiencies do not substantively affect performance.
89-80	Excellent	Exceeds the standard of performance; although there may be room for improvement in some elements, better performance in all other elements offset this
100-90	Outstanding	Significantly exceeds the standard of performance; achieves noteworthy results; accomplishes very difficult tasks in a timely manner

This page intentionally left blank