Agencies internally pan OPM’s bid to overhaul federal performance management - Government Executive

Source: gnews-performance-management | **Published:** January 29, 2026 | **PMS Relevance:** PMS CORE | **Type:** News/Analysis | **Geography:** United States

Source URL: https://news.google.com/rss/articles/CBMivwFBVV95cUxNNVg4T1BEcGYxMGtCcVh1dXF0SzB

Executive Summary

This article addresses the Office of Personnel Management's proposed rulemaking to overhaul federal performance management, specifically its bid to institute forced distribution of performance ratings among federal employees. The author reports that nearly all federal agencies, in internal comments reviewed by Government Executive, opposed the proposal on grounds that it contradicts Merit Systems Principles, introduces arbitrary rating distinctions, and could expose agencies to litigation. Key evidence includes direct quotations from comments submitted by the Departments of Defense, Treasury, NASA, EEOC, and others, warning that forced ranking degrades organizational effectiveness, undermines collaboration, and may conflict with federal regulations requiring objective, criteria-based performance assessments. The White House is reported to have intervened in the rulemaking process by recommending a ban on union grievances over performance ratings — a provision OPM adopted — while also advising OPM on terminology and justification strategy. The article concludes that OPM plans to implement the new system by the fiscal year 2026 performance review season, despite widespread internal resistance and unresolved legal and operational concerns.

Key Insights

1. Federal agencies almost unanimously opposed OPM's forced distribution proposal in internal comments, citing conflicts with Merit Systems Principles that require performance ratings to be based on objective individual criteria rather than relative standing within a quota.
2. The White House directly shaped the rulemaking by recommending the addition of a ban on union grievances over performance ratings, a provision OPM adopted, and by advising on terminology and regulatory justification strategy.
3. Multiple agencies warned that forced distribution could produce arbitrary and inaccurate ratings, particularly in small or uniformly high-performing teams, and that the EEOC cautioned it risks 'turning colleagues into competitors' by discouraging mentoring and collaboration.

Practical Takeaways

- Agencies implementing forced distribution systems may face internal resistance and legal exposure when rating criteria in employee performance plans conflict with quota-based distribution requirements.
- The creation of a new agency-level Performance Management Officer role has been positioned as the mechanism for resolving how forced distribution will be applied and validated across the federal GS workforce.

Critical Analysis

Strengths: The article draws on primary source documents — internal agency comments on a draft notice of proposed rulemaking — providing direct quotations from named federal departments and agencies, which lends factual credibility. The reporting covers multiple institutional perspectives including agencies, OPM, the White House, and the EEOC. Limitations: The article presents agency opposition extensively but does not quote administration officials or OPM leadership at length defending the merits of the proposal, creating an imbalance. The article does not clarify whether all agency comments were reviewed or only a subset. The Social Security Administration's partial support for forced distributions is noted but not elaborated upon. Potential bias: The framing and selection of quotations predominantly reflect anti-forced-distribution perspectives; the headline itself signals internal opposition as the primary narrative. The article does not independently assess whether OPM's cited ratings data — described as showing ratings 'skewed far beyond a normalization' — supports the administration's position.

Organizational Practice

The article describes a proposed federal regulatory overhaul in which OPM would remove the prohibition on forced distribution of performance ratings, eliminate the 'minimally satisfactory' second-level rating from the five-level structure, allow supervisors to assign unacceptable performance ratings without higher-level review, and ban union grievances over performance ratings. Some agencies are reported to have quietly instituted forced distributions ahead of any regulatory change. OPM created a Performance Management Officer role within agencies to manage implementation questions related to rating distribution.

Strategic Implications

The widespread internal opposition from federal agencies suggests that top-down mandates for forced distribution in large, mission-diverse public sector workforces encounter structural and legal friction not present in private sector contexts. The documented reversal of forced ranking by many private sector organizations, cited by the Department of Defense, points to a divergence between the proposed federal policy direction and broader organizational management trends. The White House's active involvement in shaping regulatory terminology and justification strategy indicates that political considerations are influencing the design of performance management frameworks in ways that may complicate administrative law compliance under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Validation Status: passed
