BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

**HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT**

**Portland, Oregon**

**PERSONNEL LETTER NO. 430-1 (Revised)DATE:** May 28, 2008

**SUBJECT:** Performance Appraisal

##### PURPOSE

This Personnel Letter -

Serves as a tool for supervisor/managers and employees to give and receive feedback in improving their ability to perform mission related work.

Provides a basis for performance-based actions, as specified by law, regulation, and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) policy.

Describes BPA’s three tier performance appraisal system for non-supervisory and non-managerial annual positions, all hourly positions, and hourly supervisors within BPA.

Incorporates a Departmental requirement to establish a critical safety element in the performance plans of all employees.

Reflects changes that will take effect at the start of the FY08 performance appraisal period.

Replaces Personnel Letter 430-1, dated November 7, 2005.

**POLICY SUMMARY**

This performance appraisal system applies to all paid civil service employees except those excluded under the Coverage section. This system serves as the basis for formally assessing employee performance. At least once a year an employee will receive a progress review evaluating his or her performance against established performance standards. If performance on a critical element is deemed unacceptable at any time during the performance appraisal period, the employee’s Rating Official shall initiate formal efforts to assist the employee to improve performance. Performance ratings are linked to other personnel actions, including performance-based monetary awards that ensure top performers are rewarded in proportion to their achievements.
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**DEFINITIONS**

**Advisory Rating**

An unscheduled summary rating which is completed under special circumstances and must be considered in assigning the next rating-of-record.

**Appraisal**

The act or process of reviewing and evaluating the performance of an employee against the described performance standard(s).

**Appraisal Period**

The period of time established in the appraisal program for which an employee’s performance will be evaluated annually. BPA’s appraisal period for employees covered under this issuance is specified in Section VII.

**Control to achieve**

A performance result that the employee is able to achieve directly through the employee’s own personal efforts or significantly influence through the employee’s actions, including leadership of other employees.

**Critical Element**

A work assignment or responsibility of such importance that **“Unacceptable”** performance in this area would result in **“Unacceptable”** performance in the position as a whole.

**Days**

All references to “days” in these procedures mean consecutive calendar days.

**Element Rating**

A rating assigned to an employee’s performance in an individual critical or non-critical performance element as measured against the performance standards established for that element.

**Employee**

Unless otherwise noted, employee means all employees who are covered by the provisions of this Personnel Letter.

**Generic Safety Element**.

A critical element with specified performance standards appropriate to employees who do not execute safety responsibilities in their daily work. This element is rated as “Meets Expectations” or “Unacceptable” only. (Note: Some employees will not have this generic element. Employees who execute safety responsibilities as part of their day-to day work assignments will have a more substantial critical safety element in their performance plans and rated at one of the three rating levels specified in this Personnel Letter)

**Minimum Appraisal Period**

The minimum amount of time an employee must serve in a position with a written performance plan in order to receive an advisory rating or a rating of record. BPA’s minimum rating period is 90 days under an established performance plan with the same Rating Official.

**Non-Critical Element**

A dimension or aspect of performance, which while important, does not have the same impact on overall performance as does a Critical Element. Non-Critical Elements are used in determining Summary Rating levels at or above **“Meets Expectations”** performance levels (see Section VIII. A & B). An employee rated as “Unacceptable” on a Non-Critical Element cannot receive a Summary Rating of “Unacceptable” unless one or more Critical Elements are also rated as “Unacceptable”.

**Opportunity Period**

An amount of time established in a Performance Improvement Plan for an employee to improve **“Unacceptable”** performance.

**Performance Plan**

The critical elements, sub-elements, and performance standards established for a position, against which an employee’s performance is evaluated.

**Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)**

A plan for improvement provided to an employee whose performance in one or more critical elements has been determined to be **“Unacceptable”**.

**Performance Standard**

The written expectations or requirements established for a position by management that must be met to be appraised at a particular level of performance. A performance standard may include, but is not limited to, measures of quality, quantity, timeliness, and manner of performance.

**Progress Review**

A periodic review and communication with an employee on his/her performance as compared to the employee’s performance plan.

**Rating Official**

The individual, normally the immediate supervisor or manager, with the authority to appraise the performance of an employee.

**Rating-of-Record**

The summary rating:

Required at the time specified by the performance appraisal system (normally at the end of an employee’s annual rating period); or,

At other times specified by this Personnel Letter, such as for documenting an “acceptable level of competence” determination for within-range increase purposes, at the end of the “opportunity to improve” period specified in a Performance Improvement Plan, and at the end of an annual rating period that is extended to satisfy minimum rating period requirements.

**Reviewing Official**

A higher-level manager, normally the rated employee’s second-level manager, who reviews and approves performance plans and performance ratings in keeping with the provisions of this Personnel Letter.

**Summary Rating**

The rating used to describe an employee’s overall performance level.

# COVERAGE

This performance appraisal system applies to all paid employees except:

Annual employees in positions with duties that meet the minimum requirements for application of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), which is published by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). (The supervisory status code for such positions is coded as “2” in HRMIS). [See Personnel Letter 430-2, September 17, 2004, for BPA policy regarding assessing performance of these BPA employees]);

Employees covered by the Departmental SES performance appraisal system;

Presidential appointees;

Experts and consultants;

Employees in non-career executive assignments under 5 CFR, Part 305;

Employees whose employment is not reasonably expected to exceed 120 days in a consecutive 12-month period;

Employees that move from a BPA position not covered by the provisions of this Personnel Letter (PL) into a position covered between September 1 and October 31 (until a new appraisal period starts on November 1). Instead, for performance appraisal purposes, and other related personnel actions, the employee’s BPA rating-of-record for the year will be based on the prior position and assigned in keeping with the provisions of the performance appraisal program covering the prior position; and,

A new BPA employee who enters on duty with BPA between September 1 and October 31, such as new appointee, transfer or movement from another Federal agency or component of DOE, etc., until a new appraisal period starts on November 1.

**RESPONSIBILITIES/AUTHORITY**

The **Chief Executive Officer** shall ensure that subordinate executives are aware of their responsibilities under these procedures.

The **Chief Operating Officer** and **Vice Presidents** are responsible for administering the performance appraisal system within their respective organizations in accordance with this Personnel Letter and shall:

Ensure managers and supervisors under their jurisdiction attend needed training;

Ensure performance plans are approved at the beginning of the rating period and employees’ performance is appraised and documented in a timely manner;

Ensure performance appraisals are fair, objective, and collectively reflect the organization’s performance; and,

Ensure “Unacceptable” performance is dealt with on a timely basis in accordance with the section “Dealing with ‘Unacceptable’ Performance,” below (also see Personnel Letter 432-1).

The Chief **Human Capital Officer** is responsible for:

Establishing and publishing local policy.

Monitoring the effectiveness of the performance appraisal program in meeting intended purposes.

Maintaining liaison with OPM and the Department of Energy on related policy and regulatory matters.

Ensuring appropriate coordination with BPA’s recognized bargaining units.

Providing technical and operational support and advice to Rating and Reviewing Officials to help them administer the performance appraisal program in a manner consistent with the provisions in this Personnel Letter (PL) and applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

Arranging for necessary training and orientation on the performance appraisal program and related matters.

Ensuring performance appraisal documentation is maintained in the Headquarters Human Capital Management office as required within 5 CFR, Parts 293 and 297.

Ensuring ratings-of-record are entered into the Human Resource Management Information System (HRMIS) in a timely and accurate manner.

**Reviewing Officials** are responsible for:

Ensuring established performance plans are tied to BPA’s mission, business objectives, organizational Balanced Scorecards or other organizational work plans, and leadership and supervisory responsibilities in support of BPA’s People and Culture objectives;

Approving performance appraisal ratings, with the purpose of ensuring that the ratings reflect actual performance and result in appropriate and meaningful distinctions among performers when warranted;

Ensuring **“Unacceptable”** performance is dealt with in a timely manner.

Ensuring performance appraisal program results are linked appropriately to other personnel actions, including rating-based monetary awards that ensure top performers are rewarded commensurate to their achievements.

**Rating Officials** are responsible for:

Ensuring performance plans are established and communicated to employees within 30 days of the beginning of employees’ appraisal periods or their assignment to a new position, as required in this PL (except as provided for in Section II.G & H);

Ensuring performance plans are tied to BPA’s mission, business objectives, organizational Balanced Scorecards and other organizational work plans, and leadership and supervisory responsibilities in support of BPA’s People and Culture objectives;

Monitoring employee performance against performance plan expectations throughout the appraisal period, periodically informing employees of how they are performing, and conducting at least one formal progress review at about the midpoint of the appraisal period;

Initiating action to deal with **Unacceptable** performance in a timely manner.

Assigning advisory ratings and ratings-of-record on a timely basis as required in this PL and ensuring the ratings reflect actual performance and result in meaningful distinctions among performers, as appropriate;

Ensuring performance appraisal program results are linked appropriately to other personnel actions, including performance-based monetary awards that ensure top performers are rewarded commensurately with their achievements; and,

Ensuring their employees are given an opportunity to participate in the establishment of their performance plans, as described in paragraph VI.E.

**APPRAISAL PERIODS**

**Minimum Appraisal Period**: The minimum appraisal period is 90 days under a performance plan (established under the provisions of this PL) with the same Rating Official.

**Official Appraisal Period**: The appraisal period is from November 1 through October 31.

**Time Requirements**: Unless an extension of an appraisal period is needed under paragraph D below, all ratings must be assigned and forwarded to Human Capital Management (HCM) not later than 30 days after the appraisal period ends. Ratings may be assigned up to 30 days in advance of the end of the appraisal period in order to balance workload. Ratings for employees who are on leave or extended training and are otherwise due, should be delayed until the employee returns unless a within-range increase determination is due. If the decision is to deny within-range, the employee’s signature is not required but the Rating Official must discuss the rating with the employee orally, that is via telephone.

**Criteria for Extending Appraisal Periods**:

Employees who have not been in the same position, under the same Rating Official with established performance plans for at least 90 days, will have their appraisal periods extended until the 90-day minimum appraisal period requirement is met (i.e., the end date of the period covered will be indicated on the appraisal form). However, as indicated in Section X.C., if an advisory rating has been issued, under the provisions of this issuance (as opposed to under a different performance appraisal program) within 90 days of the end of the appraisal period, it may become the rating-of-record.

An appraisal period may be extended until an opportunity period for improving **“Unacceptable”** performance has been completed. When the appraisal period is extended for this reason, the employee shall be notified in writing of the extension of the appraisal period to the end of the opportunity period and that the current performance plan will remain in effect until that time. In such cases, the rating-of-record shall be completed within 30 days after the completion of the extended appraisal period. The ending date of the extended appraisal period covered will be indicated on the appraisal form and shall correspond to the end of the opportunity period.

**NUMBER OF RATING LEVELS**

The following three rating levels are used for all performance elements: “**Significantly Exceeds Expectations**” (S), “**Meets Expectations**” (M), and “**Unacceptable**” (U). The generic safety element is rated only at the “Meets Expectations” or “Unacceptable” levels and is not factored into the summary rating unless it is Unacceptable. The rating levels are used to rate performance both on a critical/non-critical element and to assign a summary rating to reflect overall performance in the position.

The intent of these rating levels are described below:

“**Significantly Exceeds Expectations”** is intended to reflect exceptional performance that clearly exceeds the expectations established in the underlying performance standards and is reserved for top-level performance.

**“Meets Expectations”** is intended to reflect a broad range of performance that is considered successful, with the upper end reflecting performance that exceeds expectations in many respects but does not meet the definition of performance at the Significantly Exceeds Expectations level.

**“Unacceptable”** is intended to reflect performance that fails to meet expectations in one or more important respects. For a Critical Element only, such performance also warrants consideration of removal from the position (i.e., federal service) or reduction in grade if performance is not improved within a reasonable period of time with assistance.

# PERFORMANCE PLANS

**Documentation**: All performance plans shall be established and documented on BPA Form 3430.03e, a copy of which is attached as Appendix A. The generic safety element, where used, must be established and documented on BPA Form 3430.03e.

**Minimum Content of Performance Plans:**

**All Non-supervisory Annual and Hourly Employees**: All performance plans shall contain at least three Critical Elements. One Critical Element must cover critical technical performance expectations of an employee’s position. The other Critical Element must cover critical behavioral performance expectations of an employee’s position. A third required Critical Element covers working safely(see below).

**Supervisory Hourly Employees**: In addition to the three Critical Elements covering technical, behavioral performance expectations, and safety, performance plans for BPA hourly supervisory employees must also contain an additional Critical Element covering leadership, management and supervision. This Critical Element requires performance assessment under four sub-elements:

**Leadership**: Covering setting direction and managing work.

**Talent:** Covering building and fostering a talented workforce.

**Motivation/Alignment:**  Covering motivating and aligning staff around organizational purpose, goals, strategies, and results.

**Positive Work Environment:** Workforce and workplace diversity, supportive work environment, communication, and conflict resolution.

**Critical Safety Element:**  Each employee’s performance plan must contain at least one critical safety element. Employees who execute safety responsibilities on a daily basis (such as hourly workers, as well as some annual employees, must have an element that reflects the complexity of those responsibilities to be rated as “Significantly Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” or “Unacceptable.” These employees will not use the generic safety element.

Employees who do not execute safety responsibilities on a daily basis, such as accountants or human capital management specialists, must use a generic safety element. This generic safety element will be rated only at either the “Meets Expectations” or “Unacceptable” Levels. The generic safety element for non-supervisory annual and hourly employees has been incorporated into the performance plan and appraisal form.

**Additional Elements:** Other Critical or Non-Critical Elements may be established as part of an employee’s performance plan to appropriately address performance expectations associated with the employee’s assigned responsibilities.

**Performance Standards:** One or more discrete performance standards will be established under each critical and non-critical element in an employee’s performance plan. If sub-elements are used, (as they must be for the leadership, management and supervision critical element for hourly supervisors), the discrete performance standards are established for each of the relevant sub-elements. Performance standards are the measures or targets that reflect the performance expectations established by the Rating and Reviewing Officials for the employee being appraised. Performance standards reflect expected results and are based on such measures as quality, quantity, timeliness, and manner of performance. See Appendix B for additional guidance on how to avoid common errors in writing performance standards.

**Level of Difficulty:** Performance standards are written at the **“Meets Expectations”** level of performance. If necessary or desirable, standards may also be written for the **“Significantly Exceeds Expectations”** and/or “**Unacceptable**” levels (except that the generic performance standards for the generic safety element are written only at the “Meets Expectations” level.

**Range of Performance:** It is permissible and often advisable to describe a range of performance at the **“Meets Expectations”** level of performance. For example, a standard could state, “an average of 3-5 days is needed to process requests”, “an average of 3-5 meetings per year are held separately with each employee to discuss the employee’s developmental needs and progress,” etc.

*(Note: These are descriptive measures and like the content of all standards, should be written in a manner that is within an employee’s control to achieve. “Control to achieve” is defined as a result that an employee is able to: [a] achieve directly through his/her own personal efforts; or, [b] significantly influence through his/her own actions, including leadership of other employees. Consequently, in the case of an hourly supervisor, within the employee’s “control to achieve” can include being held accountable for the collective results of the group of employees working in the supervisor’s organization.)*

**“Sample” Behavioral Performance Standards (see Appendix C):** While not dictating the content of performance standards, BPA does make available some “sample” standards to assist managers and supervisors in understanding the types of measures to be covered under this element. The actual content of performance standards is determined by Rating and Reviewing Officials.

**Employee Involvement:** A performance plan is to be established by the Rating Official with the participation and input of the employee. The Rating Official has the final authority regarding the substance of the performance plan, subject only to the plan’s approval by the Reviewing Official. In establishing the performance plan, the Rating Official is responsible for ensuring that the employee understands both the substance of the performance expectations and how the employee’s performance results will be assessed. **[Note**: For hourly employees (and in some cases annual employees who are in identical positions in which duties, responsibilities, and performance expectations are the same), common performance plans may be centrally developed and used for each separate craft/function. Employee involvement in such cases will occur by means of providing affected employees an opportunity to provide comments when such plans are developed or revised**.]**

**Time Requirements:** Performance plans are to be established (signed and dated by the employee, Rating Official, and Reviewing Official) within 30 days following the beginning of: (1) the annual appraisal period; (2) any work assignment expected to exceed 120 days, for example, temporary promotion, detail, etc.; or, (3) appointment or permanent assignment to a new position more than 90 days in advance of the end of the appraisal period.

**Changes in Performance Plans:** Performance plans are not intended to be set in place and never changed. Instead, the performance plan should be reviewed during the appraisal period and should be revised whenever appropriate, such as a change in direction or strategy may trigger the need to amend, revise, or delete performance standards. At a minimum, the appropriateness of the performance plan should be reviewed during the formal progress review that is required by this PL. When a change is needed, the Rating Official should discuss the matter with the employee, both should initial any changes that are annotated on the appraisal form, and the Rating Official should share the changes with the Reviewing Official.

**Relationship to Balanced Scorecard and Core Values:** Elements within each individual employee’s performance plan are linked to organizational Balanced Scorecards because each employee’s work efforts are to be supportive of the overall efforts of an organization to accomplish its goals and objectives. Balanced Scorecards use four perspectives: Stakeholder (or Customer) perspective, Financial perspective, Internal (Systems and Processes) perspective, and Learning and Growth (or People and Culture) perspective. These perspectives are used to define **organizational** performance expectations. Individual performance plans focus on the responsibilities of the employee being rated and may not have a one-to-one correlation with Balanced Scorecard perspectives. Performance plans are, nevertheless, supportive of an organization’s overall accomplishments. Additionally, whenever possible, performance standards should reflect BPA’s core values of operational excellence, collaborative relationships, and trustworthy stewardship.

**MONITORING AND EVALUATING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE DURING THE APPRAISAL PERIOD**

**Progress Reviews:** Performance evaluation is an ongoing process. Therefore, informal discussions of performance should be held periodically with employees. Frequent progress reviews are encouraged and are particularly appropriate when there are: (1) noteworthy accomplishments; (2) any conclusive indication of a performance problem; (3) any significant change in the nature or importance of an element, sub-element, or accompanying performance standard; and, (4) at the conclusion of a major project or assignment when the employee’s performance can be recalled easily. At a minimum, Rating Officials shall conduct at least one formal progress review, usually at about the midpoint of the appraisal period, with each employee. For an employee’s performance that spans the entire annual appraisal period, the midpoint review would occur on or around the beginning of May.

**Performance at the “Unacceptable” Level:** If performance is determined to be at the **“Unacceptable”** level, the Rating Official will initiate formal efforts to bring about improvements in keeping with the requirements in Section X. In all instances of **“Unacceptable”** performance in a critical element, managers must seek the advice and assistance of the Employee Relations staff in Human Capital Management.

**Performance that Falls Short of Meeting All Expectations at the “Meets Expectations” Level:** Although this system does not provide for a rating level between the **“Meets Expectations”** and the **“Unacceptable”** levels, Rating Officials should pay attention to performance that may be somewhat less than that envisioned in all aspects of a particular performance standard but is not deemed to be actionable at the **“Unacceptable”** level. In such cases, it is important for the Rating Official to provide informal guidance to the employee by means of suggesting actions that the employee could take in order to avoid further deterioration in their performance that could lead to an **“Unacceptable”** performance rating.

**Advisory Ratings:**

Advisory ratings are assigned when: (a) an employee completes a detail or temporary promotion over 120 days; (b) an employee has served at least 90 days under a performance plan and changes positions during the annual appraisal period; or; (c) the employee’s Rating Official leaves his/her position during the appraisal period, provided the employee has completed the minimum 90-day appraisal period. Advisory ratings are documented on the appraisal form in Appendix A (specifically, in item 10 of the appraisal form). A copy of the rating must be provided to the new Rating Official and to the employee.

When an employee is detailed outside of BPA, a reasonable effort shall be made to obtain an advisory rating from the outside entity to which the employee has been detailed.

Advisory ratings shall be considered by the new Rating Official in assigning the rating-of-record.

An advisory rating issued under the provisions of this policy (as opposed to under a different performance appraisal program) may become the rating-of-record if it is issued within 90 days of the end of the annual appraisal period.

# RATING-OF-RECORD

**General Requirements:**

Ratings must be assigned in writing on the appraisal form (Appendix A) and must be discussed with employees. Rating Officials shall provide employees with the opportunity to present feedback on their performance, such as self-appraisals, if requested by the employee.

The employee’s immediate manager or supervisor normally serves as the Rating Official. If the immediate manager or supervisor position of record is vacant or if the current manager or supervisor has not supervised the employee for the minimum appraisal period, then the next higher-level manager may serve as the Rating Official, unless the prior manager or supervisor of record assigned an advisory rating within 90 days of the end of the appraisal period and it is determined that the advisory rating should be treated as the rating of record.

Ratings reflect performance during the appraisal period only. Such performance shall be considered carefully and thoroughly. This includes any feedback or other measurements used in determining the level of results achieved related to any applicable performance expectations.

For hourly supervisors, in rating performance against the Leadership, Management and Supervision element, Rating Officials will obtain feedback from direct reports and take such feedback into consideration in assessing performance. (BPA F 3430.05e, Hourly Supervisor Performance Feedback form is available for this purpose.) The feedback should be assessed carefully in conjunction with an overview of any performance or conduct problems being addressed with such direct reports. In such cases, Rating Officials may want to contact Employee Relations staff to gain insight into a possible correlation of negative employee feedback to performance/conduct problems that are being addressed within the unit by the supervisor.

**Timing Requirements:** Ratings-of-record are assigned at the end of an appraisal period and not later than 30 days after the period has ended. Under certain circumstances such ratings are also assigned in connection with within-range increase determinations and after employees have completed opportunity periods to improve performance.

**Steps in Assigning Ratings:** The following steps are followed to assign a summary rating:

**Assess Performance:** The employee’s performance under each separate element’s (critical and non-critical) performance standard is assessed and the individual element rating of **“Significantly Exceeds Expectations” (S), “Meets Expectations” (M),** or **“Unacceptable” (U)** is entered on the appraisal form for that element (*except the generic safety element, for which only the* ***“Meets Expectations”*** *and* ***“Unacceptable” Levels are used).***

**Non-Ratable Standards:** If any performance standard is considered non-ratable, for example no opportunity for the employee to achieve the desired results, it should be noted as non-ratable on the appraisal form, with the initials of the Rating Official and the employee and the date of such determination.

**Determine Summary Rating:** The summary rating is based on all element ratings and entered in item 11 on the appraisal form:

**“Significantly Exceeds Expectations” (S):** Highest summary rating level is assigned only if all Critical Elements are rated **“Significantly Exceeds Expectations” (S)** and no non-Critical Element is rated below the **“Meets Expectations” (M)** level. In the event that the generic safety element is used, it must be rated at the “Meets Expectations” level.

**“Unacceptable” (U):** This rating level is only assigned if one or more Critical Elements are rated as **“Unacceptable” (U)** (According to Federal personnel law, no number of non-Critical Elements rated below the **“Meets Expectations” [M]** level can result in a summary rating of **“Unacceptable” [U]** unless one or more Critical Elements is also rated as **“Unacceptable” [U**]).

**“Meets Expectations” (M):** All other combinations of Critical and non-Critical element ratings will result in a summary rating of **“Meets Expectations” (M)**.

BPA does not require Rating Officials to provide narrative documentation of employee’s specific accomplishments to support individual element ratings or the overall summary rating.

**Employee Signature on Receipt of Rating:** An employee shall be requested to sign the appraisal form when s/he receives the form. The employee’s signature indicates only that s/he has seen the summary rating and was given the opportunity to discuss the element ratings. A performance rating is valid even when the employee refuses to sign the form. If the employee refuses to sign the form, the Rating Official will annotate the form accordingly. A copy of the completed form will be provided to the employee. Employees may provide written comments on element rating(s), and such comments will be retained with the appraisal form as part of the formal record.

**Review and Approval of Ratings:** Reviewing Officials approve performance appraisal ratings to ensure ratings reflect actual performance and result in appropriate and meaningful distinctions among performers when warranted. If the Rating and Reviewing Officials do not agree on an employee’s rating for any element, the Reviewing Official’s judgment will prevail. If necessary, the Reviewing Official shall annotate the appraisal form accordingly, discuss the rating with the employee, and ensure that the employee receives a copy. Reviewing Officials may require that Rating Officials confer with them on expected ratings before Rating Officials meet with employees to assign ratings.

**Review and Submission of Completed Ratings:** Completed ratings are forwarded in keeping with the process established by each organization to HCM for official filing.

**PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL RECORDS**

**Types of Records:** Official performance appraisal records consist of the Performance Plan and Appraisal Form (BPA Form 3430.03e).

**Maintenance:**

Managers and/or supervisors are responsible for sending completed ratings-of-record, to include the performance plans on which the ratings are based, to the HCM office in a confidential and sealed envelope. Completed performance ratings-of-record, including the performance plans on which the ratings are based, and other performance-related documents, are filed separate from the Official Personnel Folders (OPFs) in the HCM office.

All advisory ratings should be sent to the gaining manager or supervisor responsible for assigning the next rating-of-record.

The HCM office is responsible for entering ratings-of-record into HRMIS and generally will use common “effective” dates in doing so. However, for purposes of a Reduction In Force (RIF), the official date for a rating will correspond to the date that the appraisal was signed by the Reviewing Official.

**Availability:** The Privacy Act covers performance appraisal records. The HCM office shall provide access to any performance appraisal document to the employee, the employee’s representative designated in writing, or another official having a need for the document. All requests for performance appraisal documents made to managers or supervisors should be referred to the HCM office.

**Retention:** Completed performance ratings-of-record, including performance plans on which they are based and other performance-related documents are retained for four (4) years.

**DEALING WITH “UNACCEPTABLE” PERFORMANCE**

At such time during the rating period that a Rating Official regards an employee’s performance to be **“Unacceptable”** in one or more critical elements in his/her performance plan, the Rating Official will, in consultation with the Employee Relations staff, promptly initiate special efforts to assist the employee in improving performance. See BPA Manual 400/700 for BPA’s policy on unacceptable performance, and see Personnel Letter 432-1 for specific instructions on dealing with unacceptable performance, including issuing a performance-improvement plan (PIP) and providing the employee with an opportunity to improve his/her performance.

**RELATIONSHIP OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL TO OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIONS**

**Within-Range Increases (WRIs – formerly referred to as “with-in grade increase” (WGI))**

To receive a WRI, in addition to meeting other requirements listed in 5 CFR, Part 531, a current rating-of-record of **“Meets Expectations” (M)** is required (i.e., performance at an Acceptable-Level-of-Competence [ALOC] or higher).

If an employee’s rating-of-record is **“Meets Expectations” (M)** or higher but the employee’s performance is not at an ALOC at the time a WRI is otherwise due, a new rating-of-record must be prepared to support the decision to withhold the WRI. However, if an employee is due to receive his/her WRI during an opportunity period for improving **“Unacceptable” (U)** performance (see Personnel Letter 432-1, Taking Action Based on Unacceptable Performance); the ALOC determination may be postponed until the end of the opportunity period. In all cases of performance below the ALOC (i.e., the **“Meets Expectations” [M]** level), managers must seek the advice and assistance of the Employee Relations staff in HCM.

If the current rating-of-record is below an ALOC, the HCM office will not process a WRI that is otherwise due unless a new rating-of-record is assigned reflecting an ALOC. See Personnel Letter 531-1 for specific requirements and procedures for granting and denying WRIs.

**Quality Step Increase (QSI):** Employees are eligible for a QSI, provided that:

They receive **“Significantly Exceeds Expectations” (S)** rating-of-record; and,

Are approved for a QSI by management, as documented in a justification statement that demonstrates sustained high quality performance that substantially and consistently exceeds the **“Meets Expectations” (M)** level.

(See PL 531/451, Quality Step Increase, for specific instructions regarding awarding a QSI.)

**Performance Awards:**

Subject to funding availability, except as noted in paragraph C. 4 below, all employees receiving a summary rating of **“Significantly Exceeds Expectations” (S)** shall receive a performance award, provided such awards are funded by BPA.

Subject to funding availability, employees receiving a summary rating of **“Meets Expectations” (M)** are eligible to receive a performance award under the following conditions:

At least 50% of all Critical Elements in the employee’s performance plan, exclusive of the generic safety element, if used, are rated at the **“Significantly Exceeds Expectations” (S)** level; and,

No performance element in the employee’s performance plan is rated below the **“Meets Expectations” (M)** level.

Performance Award Payout By Summary Rating Level - The average Performance Award amount (expressed as a percentage of the recipient’s base pay) for those who receive a Significantly Exceeds Expectations rating must be at least double the corresponding average award amount for those rated Meets Expectations. In making Performance Award decisions and ensuring compliance with this requirement, award amounts for employees who receive Significantly Exceeds Expectations ratings, and are also granted (or will be granted) Quality Step Increases on the basis of those ratings, are not included. Refer to PL 451-1, BPA Recognition System for more information on how this requirement is administered.

Performance awards are discretionary for employees rated **“Significantly Exceeds Expectations” (S)** if they receive a Quality Step Increase (QSI). In addressing such situations, managers should give consideration to both the ongoing value of the QSI and the amounts of performance bonuses given to other employees, including those rated **“Meets Expectations” (M)**.

Policy and procedures governing performance awards for employees covered by the provisions of this issuance are contained in PL 451-1.

**Reduction-in-Force (RIF):** Entitlement to additional service credit and to assignment rights for RIF purposes is based, in whole or in part, on performance. Determinations of such credit are to be made consistent with PL 351-1. A rating-of-record will not be assigned for the sole purpose of affecting competitive standing in a RIF. In the event of a RIF, scheduled ratings-of-record may be postponed if all of the following conditions are met:

The BPA Chief Executive Officer determines that the RIF cannot be postponed for specific, related reasons;

The scheduled rating dates for employees in the competitive area are such that it will not be possible to process all ratings before the date that specific RIF notices are to be issued;

There are persuasive reasons why ratings cannot be processed prior to the scheduled rating date so that all ratings can be processed before the date that specific notices are issued; and,

Issuance of general RIF notices, reducing the time required for specific notices (and, therefore, extending the time available to process ratings) will not resolve the problem.

**Promotions:**

**Career Promotion:** An employee must have a current rating-of-record of **“Meets Expectations”** to receive a career promotion.

**Merit Promotion:** PL 335-1 requires that candidates be appraised on the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the position to be filled, rather than performance in the candidate’s present position. Thus, there is no direct link between a candidate’s overall performance rating level in their position of record and the merit promotion position for which they have applied; however, selecting officials should give due weight to current performance ratings of job applicants as an indicator of the quality of prior experience in making selection decisions.

**Training:** Subject to internal controls, Rating Officials may authorize training to improve an employee’s performance in the employee’s present job as well as for developmental purposes. The performance appraisal process should identify areas where remedial training may be necessary for an employee to meet or surpass specified performance standards.

**Probationary Periods:**

**New Employee Probationary Period:** New employees must be carefully observed and appraised during their probationary periods to determine whether they can perform their assigned duties acceptably and have the qualities needed to become successful career employees. Information generated during the performance appraisal process may provide a basis to determine progress during the probationary period and will assist Rating Officials in deciding whether to retain an employee in the Federal Service. (Additional information is provided in PL 315-2, Probationary or Trial Periods for New Employees.) Managers and supervisors must seek advice and assistance from the Employee Relations staff prior to removing an employee during his/her probationary period.

**Supervisory Probationary Period for Hourly Supervisors:** New supervisors must be carefully observed and appraised during their probationary periods to determine if they can perform their duties acceptably and have the qualities needed to become successful supervisors. Information generated during the performance appraisal process will provide a basis for deciding whether to retain these employees in supervisory positions. Additional information is provided in PL 315-1, Probationary Period for New Managers and Supervisors.

**ORIENTATION**

During initial orientation, all new BPA annual and hourly employees will be presented with a copy of this Personnel Letter and be informed about supervisory and employee participation in, responsibilities under, and the impact(s) of the Performance Appraisal process.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The application of the policy contained in this Personnel Letter should be reviewed annually. The Executive Vice President for Internal Business Services is responsible for issuing a report prior to February 1 of each year to the Chief Operating Officer. The report may contain statistical information regarding the previous year’s application of this policy throughout BPA, an analysis of any identified problems, and recommendations for changes in the policy and/or implementation/application processes associated with the policy.

**REFERENCES AND RELATED INFORMATION**

5 U.S.C., Chapter 43, Performance Appraisal

5 CFR, Parts 293 and 297, Personnel Records and Privacy Procedures for Personnel Records, respectively

5 CFR, Part 430, Performance Management

BPA Manual, Chapter 400/300, Employment

BPA Manual, Chapter 400/430, Performance Appraisal

BPA Manual, Chapter 400/451, BPA Recognition System

BPA Manual, Chapter 400/700A, Employee Relations Program

Personnel Letters No. 335-1 and No. 335-2, regarding BPA Merit Promotion Plans for Annual and Hourly Jobs

Personnel Letter No. 351, Reduction-in-Force

Personnel Letter No. 430-2, Performance Appraisal Program for Managers

Personnel Letter No. 432-1, Unacceptable Performance

Personnel Letter No. 451-1, BPA Recognition System

Personnel Letter No. 531/451, Quality Step Increase

Personnel Letter No. 531-1, Requirements for Granting and Denying Within-Range Increases

DOE Memorandum dated November 30, 2006, subject: Safety Performance Standards for All Employees

Guy Kyle

Acting Chief Human Capital Officer

Appendix A - Performance Plan and Appraisal Form

Appendix B - Avoiding Common Errors in Writing Performance Standards

Appendix C - Sample Behavioral Performance Standards

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Beginning on page 3, parts of this form is protected. The unprotected areas provide more flexibility to paste information from other documents. Note, pasting information with different formatting, may alter the design of the form.

This form in its basic layout contains “**CRITICAL PERFORMANCE ELEMENT # 1** –Technical Performance Expectations” and “**CRITICAL PERFORMANCE ELEMENT # 2** – Behavioral Performance Expectations”.

The following elements can be added by positioning the cursor where you want to insert the element and pressing the appropriate Insert button located on the menu bar:

**Critical Performance Element #3 – For Hourly Supervisors Only** with all sub-elements.

**Performance Element #?**

**Critical Element – Works Safely.**

## AVOIDING COMMON ERRORS IN WRITING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

# Reasonableness of Performance Standards

Performance standards must be applied in a reasonable manner and should be based on objective criteria, which is communicated to the employee in advance. Standards that allow for no errors (i.e., absolute performance standards) might not be considered reasonable, except when a single failure to perform under a critical element would result in loss of life, injury, or breach of national security, or great monetary loss.

### Avoid “Backwards” Standards

MSPB case law requires that an employee understand the level of performance needed for retention in the position. A common error to avoid is describing a performance standard in terms of work that does not get done instead of what must be done to meet the standard for retention. Describing such negative performance is considered by MSPB to actually portray Unacceptable performance. For example, a standard that states “fails to meet deadlines” or “performs work inaccurately” allow an employee to do virtually no work or to do it poorly and still meet the performance standard. Hence, MSPB considers such “backward” standards to be invalid.

**Sample Results-Based Behavioral Elements and Standards**

Please note that the following are samples, not finished products, and will not pertain to every job. These samples are meant to be a starting point and stimulate thinking about behaviors that are critical in your organization, and will need to be altered to fit your situation if you choose to make use of them. As with all standards written for your employees, these are to be written with the input of the employee. You should begin by effectively communicating and discussing your performance expectations with your staff, then coaching throughout the year.

Performance Element Title: Effective relations with land owners

Performance Standard Description: Supervisors would measure the success of this standard by tracking logged complaints, and reviewing comments received from landowners.

Meets: No more than \_\_\_valid and avoidable landowner complaints.

Exceeds: Favorable comments from landowners, colleagues and others with knowledge of employee’s relationships.

Performance Element Title: Emergency situations are handled in a calm manner.

Performance Standard Description: Supervisor is satisfied that emergency situations are handled

In a calm and safe manner

In accordance with regulations and established procedures.

Performance Element Title: Engaged employees.

Performance Standard Description: The supervisor observes and receives feedback from the team that the employee regularly solicits ideas and suggestions

from the rest of the team, when appropriate,

when others are involved in the project and/or

when the employee needs additional information.

Performance Element Title: Self-directed employee

Performance Standard Description: The supervisor observes that

The employee works effectively with minimum supervision

Supervisory instructions rarely need to be repeated.

Performance Element Title: Well-planned projects

Performance Standard Description: The supervisor observes that the employee uses

Appropriate project management techniques

The employee regularly checks with others on deliverables

An up-front analysis of the project is completed before undertaking project/assignment.

Performance Element Title: High priority jobs are accomplished before lower priority jobs

Performance Standard Description: The supervisor observes that the employee

Solicits information regarding priority of project, if necessary

Discusses priority of jobs with supervisor, as circumstances change

Performance Element Title: Effective crew member

Performance Standard Description: The supervisor observes that the employee

Meets:

Shares technical knowledge with co-workers

Regularly attends team meetings regularly

Volunteers useful ideas and information;

Demonstrates clear purpose and a positive approach on work assignments, even on undesirable and/or difficult jobs;

Fosters a positive work environment by ensuring that any criticism is constructive and is focused on an individual’s behavior, not personalities.

Exceeds:

Is sought out by others as a resource due to willingness to share technical knowledge and expertise.

Volunteers to take on tasks for the team. Delivers what is promised.

Performance Element Title: Customer focus and satisfaction

Performance Standard Description: The supervisor observes and receives feedback from customers, Account Specialists and field staff that the employee

Resolves customer inquiries and problems, taking ownership of the situation on initial call or within agree-upon time, meeting commitments, using professional and proper telephone etiquette.

Keeps field staff updated and informed of pertinent information relating to agreement renewal and solicits their involvement when needed.

Provides Account specialists with clear, APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION OF A PROPERTY IN THE U.S. WORLD HERITAGE TENTATIVE LIST "French Creole properties of the Mid-Mississippi Valley Corridor"Prerequisites for U.S. World Heritage NominationsPrerequisite 1 - Legal Requirements:A. National Significance:Has the property been formally determined to be nationally significant for its cultural values, natural values, or both (in other words, has it been formally designated as a National Historic Landmark, a National Natural Landmark, or as a Federal reserve of national importance, such as a National Park, National Monument, or National Wildlife Refuge)? If not, are there on-going processes to achieve any of the above designations and what is their status? (Listing in the National Register of Historic Places is not equivalent to National Historic Landmark status.)YES: \_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\_\_NO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Comment:\_\_All of the properties included in the application are National Historic Landmarks. B. Owner Concurrence:Are all the property owners aware of this proposal for the inclusion of the property in the U.S. Tentative List and do all of the property owners agree that it should be considered? If any agreement is uncertain or tentative, or if the ownership situation is disputed, otherwise complicated, or unclear, please explain the issues briefly.YES: \_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\_\_NO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Comment:\_\_\_The owners of all of the properties included in the application are aware that their properties are included , and agree that their properties should be included in the application.C. Willingness to Discuss Protective Measures:If the property is nominated to the World Heritage List, it will be necessary for all of the property owners to work with the Department of the Interior to document fully existing measures to protect the property and possibly to devise such additional measures as may be necessary to protect the property in perpetuity. Are all the property owners willing to enter into such discussions?YES: \_\_x\_\_\_\_\_\_\_NO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Comment: All of the owners are willing to enter into discussions to improve protection. D. Scheduling:If you wish a property to be nominated to the World Heritage List in a particular year during the period 2009-2019, please indicate the reason(s) why and the earliest year in which you feel it will be possible to meet all requirements for nominationPreferred Year: \_\_\_\_No preferred year.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Reasons: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Prerequisite 2 - Specific Requirements for Nomination of Certain Types of Properties:E. Serial (multi-component) Properties:If you are proposing a nomination that includes separate components that could be submitted separately over several years, do you believe that the first property proposed would qualify to be placed on the World Heritage List in its own right? YES: \_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\_NO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Comment:\_\_The application involves a serial nomination of six separate properties which we believe would qualify together for inscription on the World Heritage List. While we believe this proposal is complete in and of itself, we would not want to exclude the possibility of adding additional qualifying properties in future to more fully portray the outstanding universal value of this nomination\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_F. Serial (multi-component) Properties:Are you proposing this property as an extension of or a new component to an existing World Heritage Site?YES: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_x\_\_\_Name of Existing Site: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Prerequisite 3 - Other Requirements:G. Support of StakeholdersIn addition to owners, please list other stakeholders and interested parties who support the property’s proposed inclusion in the Tentative List. Also note any known to be opposed.Supporters:\_ Governor Rod Blagojevich, Illinois Senator Dick Durbin, IllinoisSenator Barak Obama, Illinois12th U.S. Congressional District Representative:  Jerry Costello58th District State Senator:  David Luechtefeld116th District State Representative:  Dan ReitzCongressman Russ Carnahan who represents Ste.Genevieve County in his Congressional District is an ardent supporterand has attended events with us and the French Ambassador. Former Senator Jim Talent, defeated in the lections fall 2005, is another ardent supporter. Missouri's Secretary of State Robin Carnahan.  French Ambassador Jean Levitte visited Ste. Gen. fall 2006 with Congressman Carnahan and promised full French support through his Cultural Attache.Missouri Preservation, a statewide organizationThe French Heritage Society through its East Coast liaison with Ste. Genevieve, Jane Bernback;St. Louis Convention and Visitors Commission; Missouri Tourism; Southwestern Illinois Tourism.Opponents:\_Not aware of any opponents. Comment:This proposal has been discussed many times with elected officials and leaders in the two States, over several years, and has gained strong support. The project also has the strong support of the French Ambassador to the United States who has visited the properties. Information Requested about Applicant Properties1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROPERTY OR PROPERTIES1.a. Country:United States of America1.b. State, Province or Region:In what State(s) and/or Territories is the property located? Also note the locality and give a street address if one is available.The application includes properties in both the States of Illinois and Missouri.In Illinois: Fort de Chartres, R.R.2, Prairie du Rocher, Illinois. (Managed by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency).Pierre Menard House, 4230 Kaskaskia Street,Ellis Grove, Illinois. (Managed by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency).Church of the Holy Family, 116 Church Street, Cahokia, Illinois. (Part of the “Colonial Cahokia State Historic Sites”, four Cahokia historic sites which include the Cahokia Courthouse (1740, but relocated several times), the Martin Boisamenue House (about 1790), and the Jarrt Mansion (1810 – oldest brick building in Illinois) and the Church of the Holy Family Church (1799). In Missouri: The Felix Valle Historic Site, owned by the State  ofMissouri. (Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources) and which includes: the Felix Valle House, 198 Merchant St., Ste Genevieve, the  Bauvais Amoureux House, Ste Genevieve, 327 St. Mary Road, Ste. Genevieve. The Guibord Valle House, , 4th & Merchant Streets Ste Genevieve. (Owned by the Foundation for the Restoration of Ste. Genevieve.)The  Bolduc House, 123 S. Main St. Ste Genevieve. (Owned by the Missouri Society of the Colonial Dames of America. Ste Genevieve.). 1.c. Names of Property:What is the preferred or proposed name of the property or properties proposed for nomination? If the site has multiple names, explain why you chose the primary choice or choices. "French Creole properties of the Mid-Mississippi Valley Corridor" Note: The Encyclopedia of Cajun Culture says that the word “Creole” “derives from the Latin creare, meaning "to beget" or "create."   After the New World’s discovery, Portuguese colonists used the word crioulo to denote a New World slave of African descent.  Eventually, the word was applied to all New World colonists, regardless of ethnic origin, living along the Gulf Coast, especially in Louisiana.  There the Spanish introduced the word as criollo, and during Louisiana’s colonial period (1699-1803) the evolving word Creole generally referred to persons of African or European heritage born in the New World.”  Many of the properties included in this application are described locally as “creole” cottages, “creole buildings” or “creole architecture”. Here the word “creole” is being used to refer to those of French descent, born in the new World, although the suffix French is not being used. It is an important descriptor in this property name because it signifies the importance of what those in the New World added to, or modified of the French traditions that had travelled from France through Canada to the Illinois Country.Naming of serial (multiple component) properties. Group Name: "French Creole properties of the Mid-Mississippi Valley Corridor"1.d.-e. Location, boundaries, and key features of the nominated propertyMaps of individual properties are attached in an appendix at the end of this document.All of the component properties are located on much larger secure properties controlled by public ownership (Fort de Chartres, Pierre Menard House), or situated in historic districts where development is carefully controlled (the case with the 4 Ste. Genevieve properties) or set in a much larger privately controlled and secure enclave (Holy Family Church). Hence the likelihood of adverse development negatively affecting these properties is very, very limited. 1.f. Area of nominated property (ha.)Names and addresses of component properties. In Illinois: Fort de Chartres, R.R.2, Prairie du Rocher, Illinois. (Managed by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency).Pierre Menard House, 4230 Kaskaskia Street,Ellis Grove, Illinois. (Managed by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency).Church of the Holy Family, 116 Church Street, Cahokia, Illinois. In Missouri: The Felix Valle Historic Site, owned by the State  ofMissouri. (Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources) and which includes: the Felix Valle House, 198 Merchant St., Ste Genevieve, the  Bauvais Amoureux House, Ste Genevieve, 327 St. Mary Road, Ste. Genevieve. The Guibord Valle House, , 4th & Merchant Streets Ste Genevieve. (Owned by the Foundation for the Restoration of Ste. Genevieve.)The  Bolduc House, 123 S. Main St. Ste Genevieve. (Owned by the Missouri Society of the Colonial Dames of America. Ste Genevieve.).Approximate areas of component propertiesFort de Chartres: 1,100 acres Pierre Menard House property:1.5 acresHoly Family Church: 14 acresFelix Valle House: 1.5 acresBauvais Amoureux House: 3.0 acresGuibord Valle House: .5 acresBolduc House : .5 acresTotal – about 280 hectares2. DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY OF THE PROPERTY2.a. Description of the Property Background: development of the regionThe property which is the subject of this nomination application includes a number of component properties which together tell the story of early settlement in the Illinois-Missouri region by French settlers from Canada. The French administrators of New France by the early 1670s had begun to encourage western exploration intended to open up passageways to the Pacific, and trade with the native Americans. Joliet and Marquette’s expedition of 1672 brought the French to the Mississippi and established its southward course; within a decade the French led by the Sieur de la Salle had reached the Gulf of Mexico and claimed Louisiana territory (including the Mississippi and its tributaries) for the French. By the end of the 17th century, the French had set out to solidify their territorial claims as a means of confining the English to the eastern seaboard of the United States. This strategy involved establishing settlements at Biloxi in 1699, and Mobile in 1701 on the Gulf Coast and at Detroit at the northern end of the territory. In between, early settlements were established at Cahokia in 1699, and des Peres (within the confines of modern day St. Louis) in 1700, soon abandoned for the strategic mission outpost of Kaskaskia founded in 1703. By 1718, a renegade Scotsman in the Court of France (John Law) had gained a royal patent for the Company of the West, soon to become the Company of the Indies, and had negotiated to wrest administrative control of the Illinois Country from Canadian hands. The Company’s officials established other settlements to enable them to further trade including New Orleans (1718) and Fort de Chartres (1719), which served as the administrative headquarters of French efforts to manage the Illinois Country for over 40 years. These settlements were soon joined by other villages on the eastern side of the Mississippi such as the mining community of St. Philippe (1720), and Prairie du Rocher, established in 1722. The first settlement built on the west bank of the Mississippi was Ste Genevieve established in about 1750 near the site of a long used salt springs. The second settlement established west of the Mississippi was St. Louis, established in about 1763, in the midst of efforts to transfer control of the French Louisiana Territory (to the west of the Mississippi River) to the Spanish, in accord with the Treaty of Paris ending the Seven Years War. The fortunes of the Company of the Indies flagged and waned quickly, and by 1731, Louisiana had been passed back to the Royal Court. Also, at this time, the land to the east of the Mississippi (also part of what was loosely called Illinois Country) was passed from French control to British. By 1787, Cahokia, had become one of the important permanent settlements in the region and in 1801, was named the seat of St. Clair County in the Northwest Territory, itself enlarged to extend to the Canadian border. By the early 19th century, Kaskaskia had become the capital of the Illinois Territory, (1809-1818) , and was later to become the first capital of the State of Illinois, (1818-1820).Ste Genevieve residents, after devastating floods in the 1770s and 1780s moved their community to higher ground, and the new site had been legally established by the mid 1790s. While the near century long occupation of the Illinois Country did not afford the French the trade profits they sought, they had indeed succeeded in their efforts to confine the English in the lands to the east for over a century, and had built a strong base for continuing settlement of the interior of the continent.. Relations of component properties to regional development and historyThe component properties included in the application reflect key moments in the development of the French settlements in the Illinois country. The three properties in Illinois represent key stages in the development of the French occupation of the east bank of the river: the thrice re-built and partly reconstructed Fort de Chartres was once the administrative capital of the French lands; the Holy Family Church in Cahokia, also rebuilt. represents the early presence of the Catholic Church in the expanding French dominions; the Pierre Menard House, built in 1802 for Quebec born merchant Pierre Menard, who was to become the first Lieutenant Governor of the new State of Illinois in 1818, is a free standing outlying remnant of the original settlement of Kaskaskia village, built originally across the river on Kaskaskia Island, later to become the Capital of the Illinois Country, and in the late 19th century, fully inundated and destroyed by the Mississippi River. The houses in Ste Genevieve reflect the later efforts of French settlers to build a strong community on the west bank of the Mississippi in the period after the Illinois country passed to the Spanish. This territory passed back to the French (1800) and finally under Jefferson to American ownership with the Louisiana Purchase (1803). The properties included in the application straddle these important transition years. These include the 1790s Bolduc House, which may include some fragments of an earlier Bolduc house built in 1770 in the first town site of Ste Genevieve near the agricultural lands of the community, the “Grand Champ”. The Bauvais Amoureux House also built facing the “Grand Champ”, once a part of the “breadbasket of the Illinois country”and still extant today, in 1792. In the heart of Ste Genevieve stand the Guibord Valle House built in 1806, after the Louisiana Purchase had passed Ste Genevieve to American hands, but still strongly reflecting French influences in its design form and unique Norman style truss, and the Felix Valle House, built in 1818 in an American “federal style” as both store and residence, but employing French masonry construction.. Which features or aspects of the property do you believe qualify it for the World Heritage List? In simple terms, the individual properties which make up the property proposed for World Heritage nomination in this property, tell different aspects of the story of efforts by the French throughout the 18th century to develop and settle the interior of the North American continent. The properties selected well illustrate epochs and places important in both the mercantile and administrative development of what was initially called the Illinois Country and which today are located in modern day Illinois and Missouri. All of the structures chosen are accessible to the public, and all property owners are in full agreement with this proposal to nominate these individual properties within a single serial nomination to the USA World Heritage Tentative List. What are the important present or proposed uses of the property and how do they compare with the traditional or historic uses of it? Only the Holy Family Church in Cahokia serves the purposes for which it was built, that is, as a place of worship for its Roman Catholic parishioners. All of the other houses are no longer residences but today function essentially as “historic sites” managed and preserved to pass significant historic messages and stories to those who visit them. 2.b. History and Development of the PropertyNote: Since section 2(a) includes an historical overview of the development of the region, this section will look at the details of the historical development of component properties. Fort de Chartres, The current Fort de Chartres, named after Louis, Duc de Chartres, son of the Regent of France, built in stone and enclosing 4 acres, is the third on the present site, and dates from the 1750s. The first two forts, built in 1720 and in 1725, were modest wooden palisades with flanking bastions at the four corners, enclosing a small number of buildings. In spite of the failure of the Company of the Indies, France felt it important to establish a permanent fort (in masonry) to help stabilize conditions for trade, and chose the site of the earlier wooden forts to do this rather to build in Kaskaskia, a location favoured by many. The British took control of the Fort in 1763 following the end of the Seven Years War, and renamed it Fort Cavendish, only to abandon it in the 1770s, following incursions by the Mississippi River. By 1900, most of the building materials had been salvaged for use in other structures, but for the powder magazine, built in 1754 and which had survived relatively intact through more than a century of neglect. This may be the oldest standing building in Illinois. The fort is an early example of publically funded reconstruction. Acquired by the State of Illinois in 1913 for its historical and archaeological importance, the WPA rebuilt the entrance gate to the fort in the 1920s, and slightly later (1928, 1934) two principal buildings in stone, as well as over time reconstructing various bastions, musket ports and embrasures in stone. A number of structures have more recently been framed in wood to suggest or “ghost” their earlier forms, without full rebuilding. Pierre Menard House, Sitting at the foot of the bluffs leading down from the remains of Fort Kaskaskia, the Pierre Menard Home is an excellent example of an early 19th century building employing French forms, construction techniques and details. Pierre Menard (1766-1844), born in St. Antoine sur Richelieu, in French Canada, had migrated to the region in 1791 from modern day Quebec, attracted to the Illinois Territory by the trading opportunities in place for a young entrepreneur. His house employs the French vernacular construction which had been in use throughout the 18th century in the Illinois country and whose use would continue into the 19th century for at least several decades. His structure is poteaux sur solle (post on sill), that is, timber frame construction employing closely spaced vertical uprights mortised and tenoned into plate above and sill below, and pegged in place. Interstices are filled with various forms of bousillage: insulating combinations of mud and twigs. The main house is accompanied with a number of outbuildings: a kitchen connected by a stone walkway to the main house, a spring house, a smoke house, and a carriage house, all still existing. It also included slave quarters built at the foot of the bluffs behind the house, but these have now all vanished. Menard, as his house indicates, prospered quickly, and soon was seeking public office. By 1812, he had been elected President of the first Illinois territorial legislature. Later tasked with writing the Constitution for the new State of Illinois, in 1813, he became the State's first Lieutenant Governor – but only after the Constitution was amended to allow foreign born officers resident for at least two years.. Menard built his home across the river from the original village of Kaskaskia and his home is today one of the last tangible testimonies of the role played by Kaskaskia in the development of territorial government. Church of the Holy Family, The Holy Family Parish Log Church in Cahokia, Illinois was first established in 1699 by a French Catholic missionary from Quebec, Father St. Cosme. The first log church and its log successor, built in 1730, were both destroyed by fire. Construction of the present log church was begun immediately but the finished church was not dedicated until 1799. A number of religious objects which survived the fires have been preserved, among them a chalice used by Pope John Paul II during his visit to the site. The church was built employing the typical French vernacular architectural structure of the era, poteaux-sur-solle (post-on-sill). The verticals are understood to be durable walnut posts fitted into grooved mortises in horizontal plates and sills. The roof structure consists of heavy oak rafters, covered over by cypress clapboards and sycamore shingles all pegged together, as are all the framed elements of the building. Clapboarded in 1913, memory of the log church was lost until 1949, when Father Joseph Mueller discovered what lay behind the clapboard; this discovery prompted a restoration project, carried out in time for the parish’s 250th anniversary.   Ste Genevieve, MissouriThe four houses included in the application and named below are set in Ste Genevieve, a small community which holds the greatest concentration of 18th and early 19th century French built vertical timber frame houses in the United States, indeed in all of North America, including the modern day province of Quebec. The date of 1735 has been popularly associated with Ste. Genevieve's founding and while some structures may have existed at that time within the original townsite of Ste Genevieve in the Mississippi flood plain, the village of Ste. Genevieve was probably not established until 1750. Ste Genevieve was the first permanent European settlement established on the west bank of the Mississippi, set in what is now the state of Missouri. Originally established to function as a trading outpost, the hardy community survived increasing episodes of disastrous flooding as the 18th century wore on and by the 1780s, most residents were shifting their houses to higher ground. The new community of Ste Genevieve, formally established in the 1790s, thrived and attracted those involved with the mining of lead and farming as well as with trade. The French influence on building continued through the years of Spanish occupation which followed the Treaty of Paris and the cession of lands to the west of the Mississippi. With the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, ownership of these lands was acquired from the French (who had reacquired the lands from the Spanish in 1800), and from that point on, the century old influence of the French began to wane and new buildings were generally built in brick in various American styles. As noted above, this application includes four buildings open to the public in modern day Ste Genevieve, and which represent the various phases of the transition from the French period through to the American. These four buildings are described below:The Felix Valle House The Felix Valle House was built in 1818 by Jacob Philipson, to accommodate a mercantile enterprise and associated residence. Marking the beginning of a departure from wood frame buildings of French style and construction, the structure was built in stone in a simple Federal style. The house passed to Jean Baptiste Vallé in 1824, and then to his son Felix in 1835, who occupied it throughout the 19th century with his wife Odile-Celeste Pratte (1805 - 1894). The  Bauvais Amoureux HouseThe  Bauvais Amoureux House, facing le grand champ, the agricultural fields of colonial Ste. Genevieve, still in place, very much evokes the character of late 18th c. and early 19th century Ste Genevieve through its close connection to the surrounding landscape. The house, built in 1792, by Jean Baptiste Ste Gemme Bauvais provides a rare illustration of the poteaux en terre French vernacular construction, much rarer than the poteaux sur solle of most of the early houses included in this application. Here, employing a fairly crude construction technology, the upright timbers are set directly into an excavated earthen trench, rather than into a timber sill straddling a stone foundation. Some reports claim that only five such buildings are known in the United States (and variously that two - or three - of these are in Ste Genevieve). The Guibord Valle House The Guibord Valle House was built by Jacques Guibord, a French citizen who arrived in the Illinois Territory via St. Domingues. Espaping from an uprising there, he migrated north to Ste Genevieve. Acquiring the land on which the house sits in 1799 by virtue of a Spanish land grant, he married Ursule Barbeau, of Prairie du Rocher across the river in modern day Illinois, and by 1806 had begun the house which still stands today. The house is built in the local vernacular poteaux sur solle fashion, and includes an unusual example of a French medieval roof truss form. The house was acquired by Jules Felix Valle (a descendant of Francois Valle, first commandant of Ste Genevieve) in 1831. In time, the property came to include an enclosed garden of particular character and beauty. The  Bolduc HouseIt has long been claimed that the the Louis Bolduc House was built in 1770 within the original Ste Genevieve town site by Louis Bolduc, a Canadian merchant and businessman, and moved, at least in part, after the great flood of 1783 from the original townsite, then in the process of being abandoned, to the heart of the current site of Ste Genevieve , where it presently sits. The house is a restored example of the French vernacular construction methods already described: poteaux sur solle construction , and encircling hipped roof and galleries. The house was restored to its original appearance, including reinstatement of a surrounding wooden stockade, in 1956-57 with the support of the National Society of Colonial Dames. Investigations during the restoration work, and later dendrochronology testing suggest that the house dates to the early 1790s. . It is worthy of note that the restoration of this house was directed by Dr. Ernest Allan Connelly, later an Associate Director of the National Park Service and the Secretary-General of ICOMOS when the World Heritage Convention was first being implemented in 1978. . This project is credited by many as being one of the first American efforts to restore a house for its architectural importance, rather than its historical importance. 2.c. Boundary SelectionThe boundary of the property which is the subject of this application is the sum of the boundaries of the component properties of the proposed serial nomination. These individual component property boundaries correspond to the legal limits of ownership registered on title for each property, and which therefore provide assurance of control within the component properties. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Are all the elements and features that are related to the site’s significance included inside the proposed boundaries?YES: \_\_x\_\_\_\_\_\_\_NO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_If no, please explain: Yes: The essential story of the French settlement of the Illinois Territory is well and completely told by the selected components of the proposed serial inscription. Other features could certainly be added in time to enrich and extend this story, but at present, as previously noted, this selection reflects the different phases of the French development of the territory set within all of the major French period settlements of modern day Illinois and Missouri , and accommodated within houses and structures accessible to the public, and whose owners are very much in support of the application and eventual nomination of the overall property to the World Heritage List.Are there any enclaves or inholdings within the property and, if so, do they contain uses or potential uses contrary to the conservation or preservation of the site as a whole?YES: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_NO: \_\_x\_\_\_\_\_\_If yes, please explain: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_3. JUSTIFICATION FOR INSCRIPTION IN THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST 3.a. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (ii)exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; \_x\_\_\_ This criterion applies to the property I am proposingReason:\_The property which is the subject of this application exhibits the influence of French thinking and ideas in shaping the interior of the North American continent, and in turn demonstrates how French motifs and ideas were adapted to prevailing local conditions for about a century and emerged as Creole expression.. (iii)bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; \_\_x\_\_ This criterion applies to the property I am proposingReason:\_\_The property which is the subject of the application\_bears an exceptional testimony to the colonial traditions of France and associated efforts to bring French civilization to the interior of the North American continent. (iv)be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; \_\_x\_\_ This criterion applies to the property I am proposingReason:\_The structures included in the application are outstanding examples of French vernacular wood frame building construction technology in the New World, imported from France, generally through Canada, and adapted to local conditions, and reflective of the period during the 18th century when the French sought to establish dominion over the Louisiana and Illinois countries along the Mississippi and its tributaries for trading purposes, and the development of a continent. 3.b. Proposed statement of outstanding universal valueStatement of Outstanding Universal ValueThis property embodies the bold and ambitious efforts of the French, working directly, and through their Canadian agents to develop the interior of the North American continent, open it up for trade and settlement, and to imprint French civilization over a vast extent of the then unknown and remote New World wilderness, over more than a century, from the 1670s through the early 19th century. The property illustrates the application of French know-how and technology to the solving of mercantile, military and administrative problems in the oversight of a continent, and how in turn, French approaches were adapted to local circumstances ultimately melding within, shaping and informing the development of American approaches to, and mechanisms for the management of the burgeoning continent. The Creole structures contained within the nominated serial property are outstanding examples of French vernacular wood frame building construction technology imported to the New World, from France, generally through Canada, and adapted to local conditions. Their forms, design and structure are reflective of a period (the 18th century) when the French sought to establish dominion over the Louisiana and Illinois countries along the Mississippi and its tributaries. The component properties of this nomination should be preserved in the authenticity of their materials, details, and spatial organization, and in the integrity of their setting to ensure that the imprint of this story of courage, foresight and endeavour in the New World can continue to be studied, and inspire present and future citizens of contemporary Missouri and Illinois, home to these remarkable and worthy early efforts. Their associations with the leaders of this century long effort (the Menards, the Valles, the Bolducs, and many others) to provide an organizing framework for the transplant of European (French) ideas to the New World, are important to recognize and maintain in all operations designed to preserve these properties and present them to the public. CommentaryIt has been stated on many occasions by regional scholars that the story of the French efforts to settle and command the development of the interior of a continent is told in a truly remarkable way by the surviving French structures of Ste Genevieve, unparalleled in their concentration, and in their quality elsewhere in North America. Linking many of the key structures of Ste Genevieve, with key French period structures in Illinois strengthens this application immensely, allowing the proposed nomination to link historic sites critical to understanding the development of two States, and to understand how these sites expose key themes in stimulating the growth, mercantile development and orderly administration of this immense territory. Concerning the role of Ste Genevieve in telling the story of the French in this territory, Janet Snyder Matthews, Associate Director for Cultural Resources, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, in a statement made in hearings on the suitability of Bill S. 323 on April 2006, noted that the bill would authorize the Secretary to complete a study on the suitability and feasibility of designating the French Colonial Heritage Area as a unit of the National Park System. She noted that the area under consideration – which contains all of the properties included in this application – “contains some of the only existing examples of the French Colonial Period settlement, including two of the five poteaux-en-terre (post-in-the-ground) vertical log French buildings remaining in North America, dating from circa 1785, in addition to several other important historical resources. The Area is located within the expanded boundaries of Ste. Genevieve National Historic District (District), a National Historic Landmark. No current National Park System unit has comparable historic features providing the cultural backdrop required to adequately interpret the story of the early French in the New World.” \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_3.c. Comparison of proposed property to similar or related properties (including state of preservation of similar properties)There are many studies of the various forms of French architectural expression in the New World. (A number of works which touch these questions indirectly and directly are included below). It is necessary however before exploring these to be clear about the framework to be used for comparison. The starting point for comparative analysis of this proposed nomination involves defining what the property represents. What is the set of similar expressions that we can usefully compare this property to? All examples of French building outside France? All French efforts at colonization globally? Or something more local? Given the primary focus of this proposed nomination, that is, the reflections of the efforts of the French to colonize the interior of the North American continent, the most useful comparisons are those with other French efforts and groups to achieve similar goals in North America. Hence the analysis below looks at comparable pockets of development of French buildings, within the same time span (approximately the 18th century), across North America (directed toward the development of a continent by a colonizing group, and employing the same general wood frame structural vernacular (poteaux sur sole, poteaux en terre) derived from precedent in Normandy, passed to Canada and beyond. The heartland of the French efforts to settle North America is in Quebec province where seven million French speaking Quebecers today occupy land settled from the 1500s onward by those from France seeking opportunity in the New World. The cultural heritage of Quebec is remarkably distinct and very much the object of conscious and well supported preservation efforts. However only a very limited number of 18th century wooden vertical timber structures are known to exist at present in the entire province - probably less than half a dozen. The best known of these – the Lamontagne House in Rimouski – is illustrated herein. It seems in general, that the harsh winters in Quebec, combined with fears of fire quickly moved builders to a preference for building in masonry. And for reasons not so clear, when building in wood, the French soon evinced a preference for piece-sur-piece – the use of horizontal logs grooved into mortises in widely separated vertical posts. While this building technique – invented in the New World – was spread by the voyageurs across North America by the fur trade – and may be found in from New Brunswick to British Columbia, no such examples may be found in the lllinois Country. French settlement was also very active in the part of the Canadian Maritimes known as Acadia (modern day Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick), prior to the so-called Acadian expulsion of 1751, which resulted in the forcible deportation of many thousand Acadians to New Orleans and its immediate the vicinity – the people today we call “cajuns”. Until recently, pre-Acadian architectural expression in Canada was thought to have been entirely lost. However in the past 20 years, a number of Maritime buildings or partial buildings have been “discovered” to have Acadian structures – usually vertical timber structures, covered up by horizontal wooden cladding. One of the best known of these is the Adams Ritchie House, in Annapolis Royal, (Nova Scotia), recently restored to its later 1785 two storey English Georgian appearance, but containing within it at ground level, a one storey 1710 vertical timber structure. The numbers of surviving 18th c.timber frame buildings of French inspiration in Canada are dwarfed by the numbers of such structures to be found in the United States, in the area covered by this proposition (Illinois- Missouri), and to the south, in the former Louisiana territory. The concentration of such 18th c.- early 19th c. French structures in Ste Genevieve alone exceeds those to be found in Canada by a factor of 10 or more. French buildings and structures were created as part of the efforts of France to develop trade in the interior of the North American continent. Most of these early structures have long since disappeared, been replaced in recent years by modern symbolic reconstructions or have lost their original historic context. The first French settlement in the Mississippi Valley was Fort Maurepas, a wooden palisaded fort, established in 1699, near modern day Ocean Springs, Mississippi, around which the early village of Biloxi grew up. The Fort was the first capital of French Louisiana for only two years, and was abandoned in 1702. A modern reconstruction of the Fort near the Bay of Biloxi is a tourist attraction and serves as a reminder of the first French settlement on the Mississippi. Present day Mobile which was the capital of French Louisiana for 9 years at the beginning of the 18th century contains little more than place names to recall its early history. A bicentennial reconstruction of mid 18th c. Fort Conde serves as a visitor centre for Mobile today.Fort Pontchartrain du Détroit, was founded by French officer Antoine de la Mothe Cadillacin 1701. The settlement, on the north bank of the Detroit River offered protection to French ships and traders on the Great Lakes, and .prospered for 60 years until surrendered to British Major Robert Rogers on November 29, 1760. In 1796, Detroit passed to the United States under the Jay Treaty but in 1805, fire destroyed most of the settlement and all structures from the period of its French origins.A full reconstruction of Fort Toulouse (1717) also in Alabama at the eastern extremity of the Louisiana Territory was created following excavation of the site in the 1970s.The 1751 rebuilding of this fort was planned by engineer Francis Saucier, also responsible for rebuilding Fort de Chartres. New Orleans has continuously developed since its founding in 1718 and continues to do so today, following the disastrous flooding associated with Hurricane Katrina in 2005. In spite of the continuous pace of urban intensification, a number of “Creole cottages” remain as testimonies of 18th century French building practices similar to those included within the proposed nomination. These are now relatively isolated within the Vieux Carre, and the adjacent Faubourg Marigny, but are still of high interest; these include the well known “Lafitte Blacksmith Shop” probably a residence of the 1770s, and “Madame John’s Legacy” at 632 Dumaine Street, also a late 18th c. structure, both in the Vieux Carre. The historic town of Natchitoches, Louisiana has a legitimate claim however to early French origins and a great number of intact structures able to provide testimony to some of that early history. Natchitoches was founded in 1714 within a village inhabited by a group of Natchitoches Indians, as a bulwark against Spanish incursions into the territory. The village, set on the Red River, soon thrived as a trading centre, and eventually became after New Orleans the second busiest port in the Louisiana Territory. But when the Red River changed course in the early 19th century, the town lost its commercial vitality. The slow pace of development has allowed many of the town’s early historic structures to survive. Among structures recalling the 19th century period of French efforts to control the interior of the continent are the following: The Wells House (1776), a one story poteaux sur solle house, and certainly one of the oldest houses in the Louisiana Territory.The Chamard Dunahoe house, second half of the 18th century, with French vertical timber construction and some external American features – a house in transition.The mid 19th century Badin-Roque House, the only poteaux en terre structure in Louisiana. The Roque House, built in the early 19th century, in colombage with brick infill, moved to Natchitoches from Bermuda, several miles away, in 1967. The Prudhomme Roquier House of the early 19th century, an unusual two story bousillage house, later clothed in a Greek Revival exterior.A 1979 reconstruction of Fort St. Jean Baptiste first constructed in 1716,. This reconstruction is not on its original site.In Natchitoches, the thirty-three block Historic District of Natchitoches, which includes more than fifty centuries-old buildings, has been designated a National Historic Landmark by the U.S. Department of the Interior. As well, the Cane River National Heritage Area (116,000 acres) contains many early French structures including later Creole plantations. The Cajun French past of Louisiana is also present, in cities such as Lafayette, founded in the 1770s by the Acadians exiled from Canada, and settlements such as St. Martinville, founded before the Acadian arrvival. Much of the early French vernacular has been collected and moved to open air museums outside Lafayette. However this chapter of the French past is quite distinct from the efforts elsewhere to strengthen and solidify the French presence throughout the territory. In conclusion, in comparing structures and settlements which tell the story of 18th c. and early 19th c, French presence and expansion through the interior of the North American continent, the properties selected for inclusion in this application comprise an exemplary set of buildings and structures capable of telling that story. It would be possible to consider adding additional structures to this proposal, particularly from New Orleans and Natchitoches but in general, even in Natchitoches which has a large concentration of French period buildings, such buildings do not represent those associated with the leadership of the French during this period to the same extent as those properties which form the subject of this nomination. Also please make note of any major works that evaluate the property in comparison to similar properties anywhere else in the world.The following references offer commentary which assist in making these comparisons. None of these however directly evaluate the property under consideration to other similar properties elsewhere in the world. The property under consideration is a serial nomination created for the purpose of possible World Heritage inscription and comprises a unique selection of component properties not previously assembled for purposes of comparison.BELTING, Natalia Maree. Kaskaskia Under the French Regime. Southern Illinois University Press. 1948- 1976. 140 p.BROWN, Margaret K. The Voyageur in the Illinois Country. Centre for French Colonial Studies, Number 3. 2002. 38 p.Commission des biens culturels du Québec. Répertoire des motifs des biens classés et reconnus. Québec, 2003. s.p.FOLEY, William E. The Genesis of Missouri: From Wilderness Outpost to Statehood. University of Missouri Press. Columbia and London. 1989. 367 p.GAGNON, Paul. « Maison Lamontagne ». Commission des biens culturels du Québec. Les chemins de la mémoire. Monuments et sites historiques du Québec. Tome I. Québec, Les Publications du Québec, 1990, p. 512.LESSARD, Michel et Gilles VILANDRÉ.La maison traditionnelle au Québec. Construction, inventaire, restauration.Montréal, Les Éditions de l'Homme, 1974.493p.LESSARD, Michel et.MARQUIS, Huguette. Encylopedie de la Maison Quebecoise. Montréal, Les Éditions de l'Homme, 1972. 728p.KATZ, Ron, French America. French Heritage Society. EDM, Singapore, 2004. 224 p \_NAEGER, Bill and Patti, and EVANS, Mark L. Ste. Genevieve: A Leisurely Stroll Through History. Merchant Street Publishing. Ste Genevieve. 1999. 226 p.PETERSON, Charles E. Colonial St. Louis. The Patrice Press: Tuscon. 2001. RICHARDSON, A. J. H.. A Comparative Historical Study of Timber Building in Canada Bulletin of the Association for Preservation Technology, Vol. 5, No. 3. (1973), pp 77-102.ROBITAILLE, Andre. Habiter La Nouvelle France. 1534-1648. MNH: Quebec. 1996. THURMAN, Melvin D. Building a House in 18th Century Ste. Genevieve. 1984. Pendragon’s Press. Ste Genevieve. 28 p.http://www.patrimoineculturel.gouv.qc.ca/RPCQ//recherche.do?methode=detailBien&bienId=92664 Repertoire du patrimoine culturel du Quebec. Maison Lamontagne, Rimouski, Bas-Saint-Laurent, Quebec. 3.d. Integrity and/or AuthenticityAuthenticity: Does the property retain its original design, materials, workmanship and setting?\_ YES: \_\_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\_NO: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Comment:\_\_The property in general retains its authenticity.Authenticity is looked for in the World Heritage Operational Guidelines in terms of design, materials, workmanship and setting, use, tradition, language, spirit and other factors. It should also be noted that authenticity is not necessarily conceived by the World Heritage Committee to be linked exclusively to the original state of the heritage, rather to the degree to which the attributes associated with the property can be understood to faithfully (credibly, truthfully, honestly, genuinely, etc.) carry the identified values. “Attributes” may be understood to refer to those factors of design, materials, workmanship and setting, use, tradition, spirit referred to above. Authenticity does not need to reside in all attribute areas, but only in those which are significant carriers of a property’s outstanding universal value. It is worth however looking at authenticity in relation to each of the component properties in turn. In general, as all the properties but one are historic sites of one kind or another, currently mandated to tell the story of French settlement in the Illinois territory, and the exception, the Holy Family Church, fully functional as a place of faith, also very consciously presents its history to visitors, authenticity analysis has something to do with measuring the degree to which the setting, the chosen design forms and surviving historic materials faithfully reflect the stories attributed to the properties. Fort de Chartres. Fort de Chartres would be viewed by some as a reconstruction and hence ineligible for inclusion on the World Heritage List. (The Operational Guidelines note that “In relation to authenticity, the reconstruction of archaeological remains or historic buildings or districts is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances. Reconstruction is acceptable only on the basis of complete and detaileddocumentation and to no extent on conjecture”). The development of the reconstructed portions of Fort de Chartres were however undertaken with extreme care. In situ remains were carefully stabilized and their identity preserved within reconstruction work; the early reconstruction work is itself of sufficient age (80 years or so) that it provides telling historic testimony of early efforts to recognize important history in the USA. Later reconstruction work has been in an indicative style providing building outlines to “suggest” earlier forms but not involving full recreation of vanished forms and materials. And all surviving 18th c. material including the single surviving building , the powder magazine, itself the oldest European built structure in Illinois, have been carefully preserved, stabilized and where necessary (as with the powder magazine) restored. In summary, I think the exceptional circumstances noted by the Operational Guidelines are sufficiently present here to justify the inclusion of this property within the nomination. Pierre Menard HouseThe Pierre Menard House and the several outbuildings on the property have been very carefully restored by the State Of Illinois Historic Preservation Agency to portray the property as it was during the lifetime of Pierre Menard. Church of the Holy Family, The Church of the Holy Family was restored more than 50 years ago to expose the original construction techniques of the 1799 structure, and today offers an authentic image of the church when first constructed. Most of the original structural timber members of roof and walls are still in place. The “Felix Valle Historic Site” owned by the State  ofMissouri. and which includes:The Felix Valle House, This house has been restored to its appearance in about 1830, to the period when it was occupied by Jean Baptiste Vallé, during the period when he was in business with Pierre Menard, (builder and owner of the Pierre Menard House across the river in then-Kaskaskia). The restoration has been carefully carried out to incorporate significant amounts of original material, including the floor and ceiling of the original ground floor store, and responds to evidence uncovered during the research phase of work which helped restorers recreate store shelves and fittings. . The Bauvais Amoureux House. The Bauvais Amoureux House is one of the most authentic representations of a surviving late 18th century French house in the country. Occupied by the Bauvais family for about 60 years, it passed in 1852 to Benjamin Amoureux whose family held it for about 80 years. The Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources, over time, has carried out removal of some additions, and alteration of later changes to bring the property closer to its original appearance and layout, and to knit together surviving original materials including the poteaux en terre structure, the medieval “Norman” roof truss, and the ground floor beams spanning the full width of the house. All of this work has been carried out very carefully exposing the original to the extent possible, given the relative uniqueness of what the building portrays.The Guibord Valle HouseThe Guibord Valle House has been carefully conserved to reflect both the French construction features of the original house including the so-called Norman truss roof, and some original casement windows, and also the period when it was occupied by the Jules Felix Valle family after 1831 when it was one of the most elegantly furnished houses in Ste Genevieve.The  Bolduc HouseThe Louis Bolduc House, built possibly in the 1770s and re-built in the 1780s in the second town of Ste Genevieve, was occupied by the same family until 1949. The restoration work carried out in 1956-57 by the National Society of Colonial Dames of America in the State of Missouri is often reported to be one of the best examples of restoration of a French colonial house in the Mississippi Valley, perhaps because of the hands on involvement of Dr. Ernest Allan Connally.. The house has been restored to its original appearance in the 1770s, and provides an authentic depiction of the appearance of Frenconcise and accurate information regarding agreements on their accounts and transmits the appropriate reports weekly or monthly, depending on requirements

Performance Element Title: Informed Supervisor

Performance Standard Description: Supervisor:

Is kept informed by the employee of major problems, issues and status of projects

Can locate the employee when necessary and in a reasonable timeframe

Performance Element Title: Responsibility and Accountability

Performance Standard Description: Supervisor observes or receives feedback that employee

Sets well-defined and realistic professional goals; displays initiative, effort and commitment towards completing assignments in a timely manner while maintaining the integrity of the organization

Identifies problems; determines accuracy and relevance of information; uses sound judgment to generate and evaluate alternatives and to make recommendations.

Willingly accepts personal responsibility and accountability for individual contributions and those made as a member of a team

Completes professional development requirements and opportunities to maintain state-or-the-art skills.

Adheres to relevant government and organization policies and regulations

Performance Element Title: Effective Communication

Performance Standard Description: Supervisor observes or receives feedback that employee

Shares information openly and regularly with others

Presents complex/technical information in a logical, understandable and persuasive manner, where appropriate.

Written/oral communications are clear, accurate, concise, and well-organized.

Listens to other’s ideas and points-of-view, and seeks to clarify for understanding.

Performance Element Title: Effective Teamwork

Performance Standard Description: Supervisor observes or receives feedback that employee

Builds and maintains collegial, effective relationships that facilitate achieving desired goals

Uses collaborative decision making techniques to facilitate teamwork

Exhibits willingness to support others in the accomplishment of their assignments

Actively contributes to accomplishment of organizational goals.

Supports organizational decisions once they are made

Shares knowledge, expertise, information and credit freely across levels and functions

Performance Element Title: Innovation/Quality Improvements

Performance Standard Description: Supervisor observes or receives feedback that employee

Initiates and/or supports quality improvements in systems, services, or work processes

Recommends alternatives to established thinking, policies, practices, methods and approaches designed to achieve organizational efficiency, cost savings/avoidance, etc.

Is cooperative, constructive, and adaptable in response to new ideas, to changing situations, and to technological innovations.

Performance Element Title: Effective Customer Service

Performance Standard Description: Supervisor observes or receives feedback that employee

Responds appropriately and in a timely fashion to customers/stakeholders concerns and requests, reacting constructively to changes in needs and priorities

Consistently helps customers and partners overcome problems or difficulties

Keeps customers and partners up to date on progress

Designs and adapts products and services to meet customer needs

Meets schedules and commitments