

81ST CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 3125

PROVIDING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF PERFORMANCE-RATING PLANS FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEPTEMBER 21, 1950.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7824]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7824) to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to ~~the~~ amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 5, line 10, of the House engrossed bill insert after the period the following: *If an officer or employee with a current performance rating of satisfactory has not requested and obtained a review of such rating as provided in subsection (a), such officer or employee, upon written appeal to the chairman of the appropriate board of review established under subsection (b), shall be entitled, as a matter of right, to a hearing and decision on the merits of the appealed rating.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7824) to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment is of a clerical nature, and is made necessary by the recession on the part of the House on amendment No. 2. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Section 2 (b) of the House bill excluded 10 categories of employees from the operation of the bill. The Senate amendment adds an eleventh category consisting of employees outside the continental United States who are paid in accordance with local native prevailing wage rates for the area in which they are employed. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Section 6 of the House bill required that each performance-rating plan should provide for ratings of "excellent," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory." The Senate amendment substitutes for the rating of "excellent" the rating of "outstanding." The conference committee believes that the Senate amendment will assist in carrying out the intent of the bill to reserve the highest rating for a comparatively few employees whose performance deserves special recognition. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This is a clarifying amendment to make it clear that when several boards of review are established in one department, their jurisdiction will be on the same level and an appellant would not have successive appeals from one board to another board. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: Section 7 (c) of the House bill provided that, in addition to the performance-rating appeal provided in subsection (a), any officer or employee with a current performance rating of less than "excellent" was entitled to appeal his rating to the appropriate board of review established under section 7 (b). The Senate amendment provides for such an appeal only if the current performance rating is less than "satisfactory." The House recedes with an amendment adding to section 7 (c) a new sentence which provides that an officer or employee with a current performance rating of "satisfactory" shall, if he so elects, have the right to an appeal under subsection (b), in lieu of a review of his performance rating under subsection (a).

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.