

## **SAMPLE TITLE 42 CANDIDATE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

### **Determining Eligibility**

To receive an eligible rating, the applicant must show that he/she has the required training (doctoral-level degree or equivalent) and be a U.S. citizen or be a citizen of a country with which the U.S. has an appropriate defense treaty. The servicing Human Resources Management Office will screen all applicants and only refer those who meet the above eligibility criteria.

### **Evaluation of Eligible Candidates**

Eligible applicants will be evaluated on their knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics as specified below, as these attributes relate to the specific job description.

There are four rating factors. The first three factors are given a weight of “1” while Factor 4 is given double weighting (“2”). The double weighting of Factor 4 is comparable to the double weighting of Factor IV “Qualifications and Contributions” in the Office of Personnel Management’s Research Grade Evaluation Guide for research positions.

Numerical scores are used as an aid in evaluating the applicants’ strengths, to help clarify differences between applicants, and to facilitate review by the collective panel members. It is therefore imperative that all panelists follow the criteria given here in determining applicants’ qualifications and stature for appointment to Title 42 positions.

Working independently, each Evaluation Panel member is to complete the scoring for all eligible applicants. All information (CV, cover letter containing specified information, and any other information required by the organization) will be considered. Each panel member should come to the rating panel meeting prepared to discuss the strengths and abilities of each applicant as they relate to the strengths and abilities needed to perform the job successfully.

**Candidates will be scored on each evaluation factor using this rating scale, and the explanation provided for each in the factors provided below:**

**SUPERIOR..... 5 POINTS**  
**GOOD ..... 3 POINTS**  
**SATISFACTORY.....1 POINT**  
**UNACCEPTABLE .....0 POINTS**

\*\*Please note: intervening points of 2 and 4 may be used, but no fractional scores.

A “Fully Qualified” applicant must be scored 1 (“Satisfactory”) or better on all four of the rating factors. **If an applicant is scored 0 (“Unacceptable”) on one or more of these factors, that applicant will be rated “Minimally Qualified” for the position.**

During the rating panel meeting, the panel will collectively classify applicants into the following categories: “Minimally Qualified,” “Fully Qualified,” or “Best Qualified.” To the extent possible, natural breaks in the distribution of the grand total of the panelists’ scores will be used to distinguish between each category and place an applicant in the appropriate category.

At the end of the selection process, each candidate will be notified whether or not they were among the group of applicants who were categorized as “Best Qualified.” Those applicants found to be “Best Qualified” will be referred to the Selecting Official for further consideration. There will be no ranking amongst those determined to be “Best Qualified.” The Selecting Official may choose to interview and/or select any one, all, or some of the applicants referred in the group.

If the “Best Qualified” applicants are unavailable for appointment due to declination of a job offer or other withdrawal from the recruitment process, the Selecting Official may request referral of the “Fully Qualified” applicants for selection consideration.

**RATING FACTOR 1**

**Leadership:** In the research area specifically covered by this position, there is evidence of successfully leading and guiding a research program.

**FACTOR WEIGHT= 1X**

<b>Points</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
5	SUPERIOR	Extensive experience in leading scientific, research efforts that require integration across programs within and outside the candidate's organization and engage high-level officials in a variety of sectors. Strong documentation of success/impact as provided by the candidate and knowledge of panelists.
3	GOOD	Demonstrated experience in leading scientific efforts that require integration across programs within the candidate's organization and engage high-level officials within his/her organization. Some documentation of success/impact is provided.
1	SATISFACTORY	Experience in leading scientific programs within the candidate's organization.
0	UNACCEPTABLE	Candidate does not demonstrate any of the attributes necessary for this factor.

**SCORE= \_\_\_\_\_ X 1=\_\_\_\_\_.**

**NAME OF APPLICANT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NAME OF PANELIST:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PROVIDE COMMENTS DOCUMENTING RATING SCORE:.**

**RATING FACTOR 2**

**Networking/Working Relationships:** In the research area specifically covered by this position, there is evidence of experience and success promoting, establishing, and maintaining effective working relationships with key individuals and groups within the pertinent scientific community.

**FACTOR WEIGHT= 1X**

<b>Points</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
5	SUPERIOR	Extensive demonstrated experience, both nationally and internationally, in collaborating with scientists and organizations. This experience is documented by co-authored publications and invitations to speak from a broad and diverse group of well-known and respected experts from multiple outside organizations. The outcomes of these collaborations are regarded as by panelists as highly successful.
3	GOOD	Demonstrated experience, both nationally and internationally, in collaborating with scientists and organizations. This experience is documented by co-authored publications and invitations to speak from a broad and diverse group of well-known and respected experts from multiple outside organizations.
1	SATISFACTORY	Experience putting together collaborative efforts with multiple groups/organizations is demonstrated on a national scale
0	UNACCEPTABLE	Candidate does not demonstrate any of the attributes necessary for this factor.

**SCORE= \_\_\_\_\_ X 1= \_\_\_\_\_.**

**NAME OF APPLICANT: \_\_\_\_\_**

**NAME OF PANELIST: \_\_\_\_\_**

**PROVIDE COMMENTS DOCUMENTING RATING SCORE:**

**RATING FACTOR 3**

**Communications:** In the research area specifically covered by this position, there is evidence of experience communicating scientific/technical information, program needs, and future directions via briefings, meetings, presentations, and seminars.

**FACTOR WEIGHT= 1X**

Points	Rating	Explanation
5	SUPERIOR	Extensive demonstrated experience presenting scientific/technical information as noted above, and serving as spokesperson for scientific programs/organizations to communicate complex issues with internal and external management officials and in national and international forums.
3	GOOD	Demonstrated experience presenting technical information as noted above, and serving as spokesperson for scientific programs/organizations to communicate complex issues with internal and external management officials.
1	SATISFACTORY	Has experience presenting technical information as noted above, or serving as spokesperson for scientific programs/organizations to communicate complex issues with internal officials.
0	UNACCEPTABLE	Candidate does not demonstrate any of the communication attributes necessary for this factor.

**SCORE= \_\_\_\_\_ X 1= \_\_\_\_\_.**

**NAME OF APPLICANT: \_\_\_\_\_**

**NAME OF PANELIST: \_\_\_\_\_**

**PROVIDE COMMENTS DOCUMENTING RATING SCORE:**

**RATING FACTOR 4**

**Scientific Knowledge, Expertise and Recognition:** In the area specifically covered by this position, evidence is provided of the candidate’s primary technical knowledge and expertise as reflected in requests for advice and consultation, receipt of scientific awards, serving in a leadership role on workgroups and committees, research publications, research reports or other scholarly works and invitations to chair and/or present in national/international forums.

**FACTOR WEIGHT= 2X**

<b>Points</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
5	SUPERIOR	Evidence of national and international scientific recognition of conducting sophisticated research in the pertinent areas which address increasingly complex problems, as reflected in frequent requests to advise/consult prominent organizations on environmental issues of high public significance, receipt of scientific achievement awards within and outside the organization, numerous research publications or other scholarly works and frequent invitations to serve as a chair of scientific working groups, keynote speaker and/or presenter in prestigious national and international forums.
3	GOOD	Evidence of national scientific recognition of conducting research in the pertinent areas as reflected in scientific achievement awards from within or outside the organization, research publications or other scholarly works and invitations to present at national and/or international forums or invited memberships in scientific working groups.
1	SATISFACTORY	Evidence of national scientific recognition of conducting research in the pertinent areas as reflected in research publications or other scholarly works and invitations to present at national meetings.
0	UNACCEPTABLE	Candidate does not demonstrate any of the attributes necessary for this factor.

**SCORE= \_\_\_\_\_ X 2=\_\_\_\_\_.**

**NAME OF APPLICANT: \_\_\_\_\_**

**NAME OF PANELIST: \_\_\_\_\_**

**PROVIDE COMMENTS DOCUMENTING RATING SCORE:**

**RATING FACTORS SUMMARY**

**GRAND TOTAL= SCORES FOR**

**FACTOR 1= \_\_\_\_\_**

**FACTOR 2= \_\_\_\_\_**

**FACTOR 3= \_\_\_\_\_**

**FACTOR 4= \_\_\_\_\_**

**GRAND TOTAL= \_\_\_\_\_**

**After discussion of all panel members, the group decision is to place the applicant in one of the following CATEGORICAL GROUPINGS (check one):**

- Best Qualified (referred to Selection Official)**
- Fully Qualified**
- Minimally Qualified**