



Schola Europaea/ Office of the Secretary-General
Human Resources Unit

Ref.: 2019-02-D-31-en-8

Orig.: FR

Implementing Rules for the Evaluation and Progression of Members of the AAS of the European Schools

Decision of the Board of Governors of the European Schools Meeting on 12,13 and 14 April 2023 in Dublin (Ireland) - Hybrid

***NB** To make the text readable and not too clunky, the masculine has been used to refer to all job roles.*

Table of contents

1 – Introduction – Background	3
2 – Proposal to the Board of Governors	4
3 – Proposals of the AAS Working Group	4
3.1 Current situation	4
3.2 Concept of progression in step and progression in grade	5
1. Initial grade and step.....	5
2. Progression in step	6
3. Progression in grade.....	6
3.3 Evaluation process	7
1. Evaluation interval.....	7
2. Evaluators	8
3. Evaluation Committee	8
3.4 Individual evaluation.....	8
Step 1: Notification by the HR manager.....	8
Step 2: Preparation for the interview	8
Step 3: Evaluation interview	9
Step 4: Draft evaluation report	9
Step 5: Evaluation by the Director/Secretary-General	9
Step 6: Second interview with the AAS member.....	9
Step 7: Submission of the evaluation report	9
3.5 Objection procedure	10
4 – Entry into force.....	10
Annex 1: Performance evaluation report.....	11

1 – Introduction – Background

At the meeting of the Board of Governors (BoG) in Athens, which was held from 9 to 12 April 2019, the Board significantly amended the Service Regulations for the Administrative and Ancillary Staff of the entire European Schools (ES) system (see document 2019-02-D-30).

Among other changes, it inaugurated a new harmonised salary grid applicable from 1 January 2020 to all staff (Single Spine).

One of the essential concepts of this new system is that staff development in the new salary grid is derived from two elements: first, the experience acquired with each year of service and second, merit.

As regards merit, it was decided at the BoG meeting in Athens that the performance of all members of the administrative and ancillary staff (AAS) would be evaluated every two years.

Due to the increasing importance of these evaluations, clear guidelines were drawn up to harmonise the policy with and across all schools and the OSG. The result was the 'Implementing Rules for the Evaluation and Progression of Members of the AAS of the European Schools'.

At the time, the working group proposed re-examining these implementing rules within two years of their entry into force in light of the experience acquired during that period.

The aim of the current proposal is therefore to improve the evaluation procedure and the evaluation grid itself.

As explained in point 3 below, there are two aspects in particular that could be improved: firstly, meeting the deadlines for the evaluation procedure, and secondly, an in-depth review of the evaluation grid itself, especially as regards the evaluation criteria.

It is important to meet the procedure's tight deadlines because the staff members' performance is one of the factors that affects their progression up the salary scale. The working group believes that, because of delays to evaluations being completed, the legitimate expectations of staff members of being correctly positioned in the salary grid were not met.

The review of the evaluation grid is deemed necessary for three reasons: firstly, the way in which certain criteria were worded prevented the evaluator from being able to use all evaluation levels; secondly, some of the criteria that had been proposed could lead to confusion and misinterpretation; and thirdly, the evaluation grid focused solely on 'administrative staff' and was therefore not suitable for evaluating teaching, healthcare or technical staff (ancillary staff).

Revising an evaluation grid is no mean feat and the working group had several options available. One of these was to aim for the evaluations to comply with 'SMART' criteria, another was to significantly limit the criteria so that only the most important were retained, and another was to instead broaden the criteria to take into account a larger number of essential aspects and thus ensure good-quality professional development both for the person being evaluated and for the system.

Despite the number of people to be evaluated, the working group opted for the last of these options. It felt that, as the evaluation only takes place every two years, it was important for the line managers to dedicate the necessary time to every member of their staff. In accordance with the principles identified during the 2019 salary grid reform, it was also deemed essential for the evaluation to be not only a 'judgement' but also an opportunity to communicate and discuss professional progress and development.

Besides the members of the AAS Working Group, the management of the Office of the Secretary-General and of each of the Schools was also consulted.

2 – Proposal to the Board of Governors

The proposal was presented to the Budgetary Committee which gave a unanimously positive opinion; the Board of Governors is therefore requested to adopt the proposal presented to it.

3 – Proposals of the AAS Working Group

3.1 Current situation

The current Implementing Rules are linked to the rules on evaluation and progression as outlined in Article 21 of the Service Regulations for the Administrative and Ancillary Staff of the European Schools approved by the Board of Governors at its meeting in April 2019¹.

Nevertheless, two aspects of these Implementing Rules, which entered into force on 1 January 2020, need to be amended:

- It must be made clear that strict deadlines need to be set and met for carrying out statutory evaluations;
- The evaluation grids, which up to now were very general, need to have their wording refined in order to avoid any misinterpretation and have also been adapted to take into account the very specific nature of certain roles.

This proposal, which aims to be a consolidated document, therefore contains the provisions that were adopted in 2019 as well as text appearing in bold, italic and double underlined to make it as easy as possible to identify.

That said, the entirety of Annex 1, which sets out the evaluation grid in the strictest sense, should be considered part of the current proposal.

¹ See document 2019-02-D-30-fr-3.

3.2 Concept of progression in step and progression in grade

1. Initial grade and step

a) Initial grade and step for new members of the AAS

According to Article 7.1 of the Service Regulations, successful candidates shall be appointed at a **grade** corresponding to the occupational category for which they have been appointed.

Without prejudice to paragraphs 4 to 8 of Article 7 of the Service Regulations, the initial grade will be:

- Grade 1 if the candidate has up to 15 years of relevant professional experience;
- Grade 2 if the candidate has up to 25 years of relevant professional experience;
- Grade 3 if the candidate has more than 25 years of relevant professional experience;

According to Article 7.4 of the Service Regulations, the management may decide to derogate from this rule and place the successful candidate in a higher grade of the same occupational category in the event that no qualified candidate could be recruited due to the competitive situation on the local labour market. Any such decision must be communicated to the next meeting of the Administrative Board.

The **initial step** within the grade depends on the grade linked to the occupational category.

If the candidate is placed in grade 1 of the occupational category, the management may decide, after consulting with the interview board, to place them on step 1, 2 or 3.

If the candidate is placed in grade 2 or 3, their initial step must be the first step of this grade.

b) Initial step and grade of members of the AAS appointed before 1 January 2020

According to Article 37.3 of the Service Regulations, each member of the AAS of the European Schools appointed before 1 January 2020 will be placed in a grade as set out in Annex 2 of the Service Regulations corresponding to their professional category.

AAS members will keep their seniority and will progress from one step to the next in the new salary scale as previously set out in these Implementing Rules. The introduction of the new salary scheme will not affect their seniority.

The new salary scale will apply to all AAS members from 1 January 2020.

The AAS member's new step must match a salary that is at least equal to their old salary prior to 31 December 2019.

If the highest step in the occupational category of an AAS member is lower than their current or future salary as provided for in the salary scale that applied prior to 31

December 2019, they will be placed in and will finish their career in the next grade up in the scale that applies from 1 January 2020.

Without prejudice to national legislation, all AAS members must achieve an evaluation score that is not 'negative' (= grade C) in order to progress to the next step. For more information, please see Chapter II.2 and Chapter III of these Implementing Rules.

The School's Administrative Board must be informed of the new (planned) grade and step of AAS members appointed before 1 January 2020.

2. Progression in step

According to Article 21.2 of the revised Service Regulations, a member of the AAS who has spent two years at a step in their current grade may access the next step in the grade for their occupational category provided that the results of their evaluation are not 'negative' (= grade C).

This two-yearly advancement will continue until the AAS member reaches the final step in their grade or the next grade up in their occupational category.

3. Progression in grade

In order for AAS members to progress to a higher grade in their occupational category, they must have accumulated at least 10 points during their evaluations at their current grade.

The following 'grading system' is to be used:

Grade	Description	Points
A+	The performance of the member of staff has generally exceeded the expected level of service – 'very good to excellent performance'.	3
A	The performance of the member of staff has regularly and consistently achieved the expected level of service – 'good performance'.	2
B	The performance of the member of staff has sometimes but inconsistently achieved the expected level of service – 'performance satisfactory but could be improved'.	1
C	The performance of the member of staff has often not achieved the expected level of service – 'performance unsatisfactory'.	0

AAS members accumulate points during evaluations for the grade that they occupy. When they move up a grade, any 'excess' points are transferred as credit.

New AAS members who are initially ranked at step 2 of grade 1 are credited with two points.

New AAS members who are initially ranked at step 3 of grade 1 are credited with four points.

AAS members who took up their role before 1 January 2020 are credited with a number of points that corresponds to their new step.

Initial step / New step for members of the AAS who took up their role before 1 January 2020	Number of points awarded
1	0
2	2
3	4
4 ²	6

The Director/Secretary-General will ensure a global, balanced approach by making sure that the average score of the evaluations is generally between 1.7 and 2.3 points in any given calendar year.

At the start of the calendar year, the Director will inform the Administrative Board of the general results of the evaluations (distribution of scores) for the previous calendar year.

3.3 Evaluation process

1. Evaluation interval

Each AAS member must be evaluated every two years. The first evaluation must be completed two years after the member of staff is appointed to their role.

If their direct superior changes (for example, because the member of staff has changed unit or the direct superior has left), an 'intermediate evaluation' should take place if it has been at least 12 months since the last evaluation.

The results of the 'intermediate evaluation' will form part of the regular two-yearly evaluation.

Interim measures for AAS members who took up their role before 1 January 2020:

For AAS members who took up their role before 1 January 2020, the following interim measures apply:

- For AAS members appointed from 19 April 2007, the previous two-yearly evaluation interval will be maintained;
- For AAS members appointed before 19 April 2007 who had not reached the final step in their occupational category before the revised Service Regulations came into force or who reached the final step in their occupational category after 31 December 2017, the previous two-yearly evaluation interval will be maintained;
- For AAS members appointed before 19 April 2007 who reached the final step in their occupational category before 31 December 2017, the next evaluation will take place within a year of these Implementing Rules coming into force,

² Only applicable to staff who are already in their post.

depending on the actual date (month) when the AAS member took up their current post.

2. Evaluators

Each AAS member will be evaluated by two of their hierarchical superiors. The first evaluator will be a direct superior designated by the Director/Secretary-General (for example, the Deputy Director Finance and Administration, the Deputy Director Nursery and Primary Cycle, the Deputy Director Secondary Cycle, the Head of Unit or Head of Sector).

If necessary, the first evaluator may be assisted by a person of their choice.

The second evaluator will be the Director/Secretary-General. It is their responsibility to ensure that everybody is treated equally within the School/the OSG and they will make the final decision regarding the AAS member's final score.

Each Director will draw up a structural chart for their School showing the direct superior of each AAS member. The Secretary-General will do the same for the OSG.

3. Evaluation Committee

The 'Evaluation Committee' will consist of the Director/Secretary-General, all of the first evaluators and the AAS representatives.

Once a year, during the last two weeks of November, the Director/Secretary-General will call the members of the Evaluation Committee to an 'evaluation conference' for the purpose of reviewing the previous evaluation period and ensuring a harmonised approach for future evaluation processes. In particular, they will ensure that everybody is interpreting the definition of the different grades in the same way.

3.4 Individual evaluation

The individual evaluation consists of seven consecutive steps.

Step 1: Notification by the HR manager

The School's/OSG's HR manager must notify the AAS member in question and their direct superior at least eight weeks before an evaluation is due to take place. The evaluation template and most recent job description for the AAS member will be attached to the HR manager's email.

Step 2: Preparation for the interview

The direct superior and the AAS member will agree on a date for the evaluation interview.

To allow enough time to prepare for the interview, the date must be agreed at least three days in advance.

It is recommended that both parties block out at least one hour in their diaries for the interview.

The AAS member will carry out a self-evaluation in preparation for the interview.

Step 3: Evaluation interview

Both parties will discuss the achievements of the last two years and review the most important projects, the AAS member's strengths and areas for improvement, their training needs and their future priorities. The job description will also be reviewed at this point.

The direct superior will share their opinion on the AAS member's strengths and areas for improvement, but they will not discuss their evaluation score.

The AAS member may ask for a staff representative or another AAS member of their choice to attend the interview. This member of staff will act as an observer.

Step 4: Draft evaluation report

The direct superior will write up the evaluation report on the interview. This report will also contain recommendations for future tasks and mention any training needs.

The draft report, which will be signed by the direct superior, will be sent to the Director/Secretary-General via the HR manager **within 15 working days of the evaluation interview.**

Step 5: Evaluation by the Director/Secretary-General

The Director/Secretary-General will finalise the report within 15 **working days of the HR manager sending the evaluation.** They will ensure that all staff within the School/OSG are treated equally.

The final evaluation score will reflect the average of the scores given in the different categories on the evaluation form.

If the Director/Secretary-General disagrees with the first evaluator, they will arrange a meeting with the first evaluator to reach a mutual agreement.

The Director/Secretary-General will make the final decision as to the final score.

They will submit the signed report to the direct superior of the AAS member via the HR manager.

Step 6: Second interview with the AAS member

The direct superior will discuss the final evaluation with the AAS member.

The AAS member must acknowledge receipt of the evaluation and may make comments in writing.

The AAS member may ask for a staff representative or another AAS member of their choice to attend the interview. This member of staff will act as an observer.

Step 7: Submission of the evaluation report

The duly signed evaluation report must be sent to the HR manager and filed in the AAS member's personal records. The AAS member will receive a copy.

3.5 Objection procedure

If the parties disagree about an evaluation report, they will attempt to settle the disagreement through mediation.

If, at the end of the mediation process, a member of staff is still not satisfied with their evaluation report, they may dispute it by raising an objection with the Evaluation Committee.

The Director/Secretary-General will appoint three members of the Evaluation Committee, as referred to in Chapter 3, to examine the objection: a Deputy Director/Head of Unit who was not the first evaluator for the member of staff in question; the HR manager/Head of the HR Unit; and a staff representative.

These three members of the Evaluation Committee will assess whether the evaluation report was at all arbitrary or discriminatory.

The Director/Secretary-General will make the final decision regarding the objection, taking due account of the opinion of the Evaluation Committee.

This final decision may be the subject of a contentious appeal in accordance with Article 36 of the AAS Service Regulations.

4 – Entry into force

To give every person involved in the evaluation process enough time to familiarise themselves with the changes that have been introduced and organise themselves accordingly, this new version of the 'Implementing Rules for the Evaluation and Progression of Members of the AAS of the European Schools' will enter into force on 1 September 2023.

Explanation of the assessments

A+ = The performance of the member of staff has generally exceeded the expected level of service – 'very good to excellent performance'.

A = The performance of the member of staff has regularly and consistently achieved the expected level of service – 'good performance'.

B = The performance of the member of staff has sometimes but inconsistently achieved the expected level of service – 'performance satisfactory but could be improved'.

C = The performance of the member of staff has often not achieved the expected level of service – 'performance unsatisfactory'.

Please indicate any evaluation criterion that does not apply (n/a).

I. ASPECTS COMMON TO ALL OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

1. **SKILLS:** knowledge linked to the function, method, judgement and purpose of the organisation.

A. Technical skills						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
1.1.1 The member of staff has regularly updated the basic technical skills needed to perform their functions.						
1.1.2 The member of staff is familiar with the IT tools and other specific tools and procedures generally required to perform their functions.						
1.1.3 Their knowledge of languages enables the member of staff (whose mother tongue is) to carry out their tasks normally ³ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • French • English • German • Other language (1) • Other language (2) • Other language (3) 						

³ The aim here is not to evaluate the linguistic knowledge of the member of staff as such, but to determine whether their language skills enable them to perform the tasks entrusted to them easily and normally, simply in order to determine whether they need language courses (basic or advanced). This language skills evaluation means that the mother tongue of the member of staff is taken into account (specify).

B. Written and oral communication						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
1.2.1 The member of staff expresses themselves clearly, concisely and precisely.						
1.2.2 The member of staff expresses themselves in a language other than their mother tongue when the service so demands.						
1.2.3 The member of staff prepares clear, concise and structured documents that need only minor correction.						
1.2.4 The member of staff shares clear information and explains how it should be processed and what the criteria for success are.						

C. Participation in meetings						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
1.3.1 The member of staff generally participates positively in meetings, makes relevant observations and proposes constructive solutions.						

D. Analysis of problems and implementation of solutions						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
1.4.1 The member of staff analyses problems in a relevant manner, tries to trace their origin and adopts an efficient and systematic approach.						

1.4.2 The member of staff adheres to ⁴ the instructions of their superior(s); they know and follow the rules and procedures specific to their role.					
1.4.3 The member of staff is capable of finding possible solutions and implementing them effectively.					
1.4.4 The member of staff manages their workload independently.					
1.4.5 The member of staff takes the initiative.					
Summary of SKILLS: knowledge linked to the function, method, judgement and purpose of the organisation.					

⁴ Adherence to hierarchical instructions does not stop them from maintaining a critical mindset, particularly if these instructions seem to run contrary to the regulations in force.

2. EFFICIENCY: consistency, respect for priorities, speed and precision, capacity to adapt.

A. Work management/planning						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
2.1.1 The member of staff takes into account aspects such as the order of priority of the tasks entrusted to them and the workload that they represent.						
2.1.2 The member of staff reacts rapidly in response to new or unexpected tasks.						

B. Execution/quality of work						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
2.2.1 The member of staff manages a series of projects and files efficiently and simultaneously.						
2.2.2 The member of staff adheres to the policies and procedures of the European Schools when performing their functions.						
Summary of EFFICIENCY: consistency, respect for priorities, speed and precision, capacity to adapt.						

3. CONDUCT IN THE DEPARTMENT: team spirit, collaborative attitude, interpersonal skills, sense of their responsibilities, seriousness, professionalism.

A. Teamwork						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
3.1.1 The member of staff contributes to the achievement of common goals.						
3.1.2 The member of staff accepts comments on their work and learns from their errors.						
3.1.3 The member of staff spontaneously acknowledges the results obtained by other members of the team.						
3.1.4 The member of staff maintains constructive relationships with their colleagues to enable them to perform their duties, while at the same time striving to attend to their needs and giving them advice where necessary.						
3.1.5 The member of staff informs their hierarchical superiors and colleagues about their tasks and sends them information that might be of general interest to the team/Unit/European Schools.						

B. Service culture						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
3.2.1 The member of staff demonstrates appropriate behaviour, adapting it to different people or situations. They demonstrate patience, courtesy and respect.						

3.2.2 The member of staff ensures that their actions, whatever they may be, reflect a positive and professional image of the European Schools.						
3.2.3 The member of staff is conscious of their multicultural environment and appreciates and respects different cultures and opinions.						

C. Commitment to their work						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
3.3.1 The member of staff assumes responsibility for their tasks and willingly accepts that these may evolve over time.						
3.3.2 The member of staff shows themselves to be proactive regarding their tasks. They work independently but, if necessary, do not hesitate to ask their colleagues and/or superiors for help and advice.						
3.3.3 The member of staff knows and adheres to the workplace safety rules and uses personal protective equipment correctly.						
3.3.3 The member of staff takes care to maintain confidentiality when performing their functions.						
Summary of CONDUCT IN SERVICE: team spirit, collaborative attitude, interpersonal qualities, sense of responsibility, seriousness, professionalism.						

4. LEADERSHIP: Team management, working in the general interest while respecting individual personalities.

(Only concerns staff in charge of a service comprising a number of colleagues)

A. Leadership						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
4.1.1 The member of staff demonstrates integrity and respect in their relationships with all members of their team and takes into account their cultural and social characteristics.						
4.1.2 The member of staff takes care to maintain confidentiality when performing sensitive tasks or dealing with issues relating to staff.						
4.1.3 The member of staff establishes and maintains a monitoring system in order to help their team to accomplish its tasks efficiently and achieve its objectives.						
4.1.4 The member of staff distributes tasks in a balanced and transparent way between the members of their team and gives clear instructions on how they should be handled, as well as on the criteria for success.						
Summary of LEADERSHIP: Team management, working in the general interest while respecting individual personalities.						

5. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT: Professional development, relations with colleagues, possibility of individual development.

A. Personal development in the professional context						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
5.1.1 The member of staff agrees to acquire new knowledge and skills to take on new responsibilities or adopt new working methods (notably through training).						
5.1.2 The member of staff seeks to improve procedures by making constructive suggestions.						
5.1.3 The member of staff shares their knowledge and skills easily with their colleagues.						
5.1.4 The member of staff generally has a positive attitude to work and in their professional relationships with others.						
Summary of PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT: Professional development, relations with colleagues, possibility of individual development.						

II. ASPECTS SPECIFIC TO CERTAIN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

A. Teaching staff						
Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
1. The member of staff designs, makes or uses materials appropriate to their function.						
2. The member of staff helps pupils with their oral and written communication.						
3. The member of staff knows how to adapt to the working methods of each teacher and each pupil.						
4. The member of staff chooses varied, appropriate and recognised pedagogical approaches in order to develop the skills covered by the curriculum.						
5. The member of staff creates conditions that encourage teachers and pupils to become involved in projects and makes the necessary resources available to them.						
6. The member of staff implements and uses routines that permit class activities to be conducted efficiently.						
7. The member of staff has the necessary numeracy skills and uses ICT effectively to communicate, search for information and resolve problems.						
8. The member of staff contributes to actions of the education community and cooperates with partners of the school.						

9. The member of staff provides all teachers and all pupils with appropriate attention and support.						
10. The member of staff supports pupils in understanding and applying instructions and assists them with activities.						
11. The member of staff makes pupils feel welcome and included by building their confidence.						
12. The member of staff promotes communication and interaction between pupils and their environment.						

B. Medical and nursing staff

Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
1. The member of staff is capable of identifying risks and managing them correctly while taking priorities into account.						
2. The member of staff maintains regular contact with the local health network, community medicine and/or hospital establishments.						
3. The member of staff is involved in health education and prevention strategies in collaboration with local public/private bodies.						

C. Technical staff (*ancillary*)

Evaluation standards	Comments	EVALUATION				
		A+	A	B	C	n/a
1. In compliance with the safety instructions given to them, the member of staff applies all safety						

measures indispensable to themselves and others.						
2. The member of staff is respectful of the equipment and tools that they use every day.						
Summary of the assessment of ASPECTS SPECIFIC TO CERTAIN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES:						

III. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Evaluation standards	Comments	Evaluation
A+: The performance of the member of staff has generally exceeded the expected level of service – 'very good to excellent performance'.		
A = The performance of the member of staff has regularly and consistently achieved the expected level of service – 'good performance'.		
B = The performance of the member of staff has sometimes but inconsistently achieved the expected level of service – 'performance satisfactory but could be improved'.		
C = The performance of the member of staff has often not achieved the expected level of service – 'performance unsatisfactory'.		

1) The evaluator		3) The AAS member being evaluated	
Surname/First name		Surname/First name	
Date		Date	
Signature		Signature (*)	
2) The Director/Secretary-General		<i>The signature of the evaluated staff member does not mean that they accept the evaluation, only that they are aware of it</i>	
Surname/First name			
Date		Objection against the evaluation	Yes/No
Signature		Date of submission of the objection	
4) To be completed only in the event of mediation: result of the mediation			
5) To be completed only in the event of objection being submitted to the Evaluation Committee			
Surnames/First names of the members of the Evaluation Committee appointed by the Director/Secretary-General			
Opinion of the Evaluation Committee			
Date of the opinion of the Evaluation Committee			
Decision of the Director/Secretary-General	Final evaluation (circle/delete) A+ A B C		
Date of the decision of the Director/Secretary-General			

6) To be completed by the HR unit	
	Number of points prior to the evaluation
	Number of points acquired through the evaluation
	Grade/Step before the evaluation
	Grade/Step after the evaluation
	Number of points to be carried forward
	Date of application of the new position in the salary grid
7) Final decision of the Director/Secretary-General	
The Director/Secretary-General	
Surname/First name	
Date	
Signature	

<u>Additional remarks</u>			
<u>Evaluator</u>	<u>Evaluated member of staff</u>	<u>Evaluation Committee</u>	<u>Director/Secretary-General</u>