

**Department of Defense
Delegated Examining Operations
Program Evaluation**

Introduction. Delegated examining practices and procedures shall comply with the requirements described in the current Interagency Delegated Examining Agreement (DoD-1) between the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the Department and the current installment of the OPM Delegated Examining Operations Handbook, *A Guide for Federal Agency Examining Units*. When followed, the requirements and procedures shown in the Agreement and Handbook will provide properly announced vacancies, controls over the qualifications process, assignment of veterans' preference, a regulatorily correct certificate, valid audit trails through records construction and retention, and program oversight and assessment. Accordingly, the Agreement together with the Handbook will serve as the foundation of the delegated examining unit (DEU) evaluation program in the Department.

Requirements.

1. The DEU evaluation program of the Department of Defense is a two-tiered system consisting primarily of annual self-assessments and periodic Staff Assistance Visits (SAVs) conducted on-site by the Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS). SAV teams are augmented by Component representatives and representatives of the Office of Personnel Management Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness whenever possible. The self-assessment shall be accomplished by personnel office staff who do not supervise and are not assigned to the DEU and who have completed OPM delegated examining operations training and maintain current certification. The on-site evaluation will focus on DEU operations, but the scope may be expanded if, in the view of the evaluation team leader, such action is warranted.
2. Activity self-assessments form the first tier of the evaluation process. A self-assessment will be accomplished no less frequently than once each twelve months. The initial self-assessment schedule as well as the exact scope and size of the sample, which must be broad enough to represent a valid indicator of performance, will be determined by the respective Component. The Program Review Worksheet, Certificate Review Worksheet, and the Application Review Worksheet templates shall be used for the annual self-assessment and maintained by the DEU until the next on-site evaluation. A written report of self-assessment findings will be prepared using the template provided by CPMS. The report and certification that the annual self-assessment has been completed shall be provided to the servicing OPM Service Center, the respective Component headquarters,

and, through CPMS, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civilian Personnel Policy).

3. The templates contain information that must be verified from each certificate identified in the sample and a representative sample of the applications received in response to vacancy announcements. (See Application Review Worksheet for requirements of a representative sample.) The sample size of cases to be reviewed or number of applications to be reviewed may be expanded at the discretion of the evaluation team leader. Items that do not apply to a specific certificate should be marked not applicable; there should be no blank items. It must also be shown that:

- Applicants had sufficient opportunity to receive vacancy information in sufficient time to apply before closing dates.
- Applicants were evaluated according to Merit System Principles, Veterans' Preference, other applicable laws, and OPM, Department, Component, and local requirements and procedures.
- Telephone numbers listed in vacancy announcements were operational during the period of the announcement.
- Any complaints received from applicants concerning a specific announcement were resolved and settlement documentation was filed in the Announcement folder. Such documents shall be retained for review by cyclic evaluation teams.
- Approvals of selective placement and quality ranking factors accepted by the DEU must be filed in the Announcement folder and be available for review by cyclic evaluation teams.
- Documentation of examining activities can be fully and readily reconstructed.

4. Major discrepancies identified during self-assessments, such as inconsistent application of operating instructions, serious violations (which include statutory violations and violations of OPM regulation), and systemic problems, regardless of whether they lead to serious violations or major discrepancies, plus corrective actions, must be recorded in the report. Corrective action plans shall be tailored to address permanent solutions to identified major discrepancies and serious violations. While a corrective action plan is not mandated for minor discrepancies, the use of a corrective action plan would be a valuable tool when used to eliminate recurring discrepancies. It can also serve as a valuable training instrument.

5. The second tier of the evaluation process is an on-site evaluation of DEU operations by a team composed of DoD, Component, and OPM representatives. This team, which will be led by DoD, will use standard worksheet templates to perform a full program review that will also rely on the results of the self-assessments conducted by the activity. The timeframe for and sample size of the on-site evaluation will be determined at the discretion of the evaluation team leader. The evaluation at a particular DEU may include any part of the examining process, including related staffing processes.

6. A DoD-led program investigation may be initiated by complaints or serious discrepancies when warranted by inquiries (Congressional, applicant, etc.), OPM Service Center input, the identification of significant problems by on-site evaluation, or from information developed by the respective Component. The results of an investigation will be forwarded for Component review and development of a corrective action plan which will be reviewed by the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civilian Personnel Policy) (ODASD(CPP)). If a follow-up inspection is warranted, as determined by the ODASD(CPP) in coordination with the respective Component, the DEU will be either recertified or decertified, depending on the inspection results.

7. Reports resulting from on-site evaluations and a program investigation will be prepared using standard CPMS report templates and formats.

PROGRAM REVIEW WORKSHEET

(DEU Organization Name, DoD Assigned DEU Number, and Location)

ITEM	YES	NO	COMMENT
AUTHORITY			
Delegation authority current?			
Current DEOH in use?			
DEU staff and evaluation team OPM certified?			
Annual audit conducted using only non-DEU team members?			
OPM certificates were obtained and used before any ACWA-covered position appointments were made?			
LOCAL PROCEDURES			
A DEU Accountability Program is in place (quality control, internal review of actions, etc.); documented?			
Local operating procedures are in compliance with DEOH and OPM-DoD DEA (see Update #10) covering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - handling incomplete applications - handling late applications - reconsideration procedures - when to require proof of 5-point veterans' preference - tie-breaking procedures - notification procedures for DEU staff members, relatives, members of household who apply under DEU 			
Special filing and consideration procedures for 10-point veterans' unsolicited applications and others eligible to file late are in place and followed			
Procedures are established for releasing information under FOI Act and Privacy Act			
Unsolicited RNO data was removed from applications and case files			
REPORTS			
Quarterly Workload Reports submitted to CPMS and OPM on correct form? Timely?			
Annual self-audit reported on Quarterly Workload Report?			
RECORDS MAINTENANCE			
Examining records/files secured?			
Records are destroyed on DEOH required destruction timeline			
OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
Recruitment activities yield a balanced pool of quality applicants equitably examined			
Cost of DE program is assessed			

Note: Locally identified items may be added to this checklist.

LEAD EVALUATOR

DATE

CERTIFICATE REVIEW WORKSHEET

Position, Title, Series, Grade _____ **Announcement#** _____

ITEM	YES	NO	COMMENT
AUTHORITY			
Covered duty location?			
ANNOUNCEMENT FILE			
SF-39 request copy (receipt date stamped; complete)			
RPL/PPP clearances documented (5 CFR Part 330)			
Position description			
Vacancy announcement (5 USC 3327)			
- Mandatory items (OPM DE Oper Handbook): title, series, grade, duty location, open/closing dates (open a minimum of 5 calendar days or documented if fewer), quals (KSAs), etc.			
- Additional items, if warranted (maximum entry age; physical requirements; mobility; etc.)			
- Application(s) received/postmarked by closing date (as required by announcement)			
- Targeted recruitment, if any. If yes, included.			
APPLICATIONS			
Date stamped upon receipt			
Late applications accepted (5 CFR 332)			
Late applications from preference eligibles (5 USC 3305)			
Consideration restricted to one gender (5 CFR 332.407)			
Applications from 10 pt veterans retained (5 CFR 332.311)			
Vet pref adjudicated (5 USC 2108)			
Mil spouse pref adjudicated (P.L. 99-145, section 806)			
Age requirements met (DoDD 1400.28 and DoDD 1404.2)			
Citizenship verified (5 CFR 338)			
If position restricted to vets, eligible applicants all veterans? (5 USC 3310)			
Incomplete applications processed consistently for each vacancy			
RATING/RANKING			
Validated Job Analysis & KSAs			
Correct Qualification Standard identified			
Selective qualification factors developed/justified			
Rating procedure/crediting plan documented			
Rating procedure participants names documented			
Veterans' preference applied			
Compensable veterans identified			
Tie-breaking method identified			
Applicant scores documented			
Notices of rating issued; copies retained			
STANDING REGISTERS			
Required information (exam title and number; position grade and geographic area; etc.)			
Order of candidates			
Candidate data revisions			
Record of terminated registers			

CERTIFICATION			
Certifying official signature, date			
Required information (certificate #, certificate issue and due date, title, series, grade, duty location, action/applicant consideration, numerical rating, vet preference code, applicant names)			
Correct number of eligibles certified (5 CFR 332)			
Certification order (Professionals and Scientists GS-9 and above)			
Certification order (all others)			
Names removed or supplemental names added properly			
Supplemental certificate(s) issued properly			
SF-39 report accurately completed			
Declination and failure-to-respond documented			
Eligible objections properly processed (5 CFR 332)			
Veteran passover properly processed (5 USC 3318(b))			
Selections documented			
Certificate audited; within 3 days?			
Register Cards reflect correct action (answer for registers only)			
RECORDS MAINTENANCE			
Records support reconstruction			
DEU staff, staff relative, or household member application properly treated (OPM-DoD DEA #DoD-1)			
Quarterly OPM workload report: completed? timely?			
MISCELLANEOUS			
If selection of retired military within 180 days of retirement, waiver approved? (5 USC 3326) (n/a during periods of declared national emergencies)			

NOTE: References to specific forms include equivalents.

EVALUATOR

DATE

DEU Program Evaluation Report Template

Name of Organization, Location

Period Covered by Evaluation

I. INTRODUCTION

State the location of the DEU, the dates encompassed by the self-evaluation and the purpose of the evaluation. You may cite the requirement of the OPM-DoD Agreement. Sample language: This program evaluation was conducted at (installation) and covered all aspects of its delegated examining activities during the period (inclusive dates). The primary purpose of the evaluation was to assess the success of the delegated examining unit (DEU) in supporting the mission of the installation and its compliance with merit system principles and veterans' preference requirements. The evaluation program is designed to identify areas where process improvements should be made to increase overall efficiency and cost effectiveness of the DEU. It is also designed to identify systemic problems and DEU staff training needs.

Describe the evaluation team. Include names, organizational title and grade, normal assignment, location in the organization, and date each member completed OPM initial or refresher delegated examining operations training.

II. INSTALLATION ENVIRONMENT AND DEU ORGANIZATION

This paragraph will include information concerning environmental factors affecting DEU operation including the structure of the DEU office and its location in the organization and any sizable change in workload or serviced population (both current and anticipated). At a minimum, include the following:

- DEU organization: Office structure, location in the human resources office, location in the installation organizational structure. Include organizational charts as an attachment.
- DEU staff: Number of FTEs supporting the DE operation, DE staff composition, level of expertise, annual turnover rate, and, for each DE staff member, name, title, series, grade, years of DE experience, and date of most recent OPM DE training; and
- DEU activity: Number of applications processed, number of certificates issued, selections reported, passovers/objections requested and number approved, number applicant-requested reconsiderations with number resolved in favor of applicant, and

number of applicants granted priority consideration during the time period of the review as well as the number on the list at the end of the review period.

III. DATA SOURCES

State the sources used as the basis for the report. Summarize the evaluation methodology in this section. Sample language: Evaluators used a variety of information gathering methods: (list those used which may vary from one DEU to another depending on DEU size, candidate pools, and the proximity of the DEU to the serviced installations):

- Interviews with DEU staff members;
- Interviews with selecting supervisors and applicants;
- A sample of (**number**) examining case files and related files maintained by the DEU (Sample size should be 10% of all cases in the review period or a minimum of 25 files; include standing registers, if used. Sample should also be representative of the examining done – GS and WG, Temporary, Term and Permanent, a few large cases, a variety of occupations);
- Lists from automated personnel systems indicating the nature of action code, the date, and appointment type of covered actions; and
- Complaint files relating to the operation of the DEU.

IV. OVERALL EVALUATION RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Expected Results:

When a DEU complies with the merit system principles and veterans' preference requirements and other applicable law in conducting competitive examining:

- Recruitment methods yield a balanced pool of well-qualified applicants. Recruitment considers issues of diversity and imbalance in the workforce or candidate pools.
- There is fair and open competition for vacancies; the application process complies with merit principles and other related legal requirements. Surplus employee programs are properly applied.
- Candidates are assessed using the correct job-related qualification requirements that are equitably applied. Interview and placement practices do not favor or disfavor specific candidates or types of applicants.

- Veterans' preference laws are properly applied in the ranking and selection processes.
- The DEU is effective in filling positions with external candidates. The determination that the DEU is effective is supported by: selecting officials' opinions, timely certification, reasonable cost of operations, establishment and adherence to required local standard procedures, accurate and timely quarterly report submission, security of examining materials, and other locally identified measures.

Summarize the results of the self-evaluation based on criteria above and findings from case file, certificate, and application review. Cite any violations of law (Merit System Principles, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, Privacy Act, EEO, PPP, ICTAP, 5 USC 3305, 5 CFR 332, Subpart C, etc.) including corrective action recommended and taken.

V. FINDINGS AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

The findings and corrective actions identified through both program review and case-specific analysis will be detailed in this section of the report. General findings on the program as a whole may require corrective action or, in those instances where efficiency and effectiveness matters are involved, may require only a recommendation from the evaluation team. The case-specific findings will require corrective action. **Both the findings and the specific corrective actions to be taken will be documented in this section of the report.** The corrective action plan will be developed in conjunction with the respective Component. The ODASD (CPP) will provide oversight to assure required actions are completed in accordance with the plan.

Annual self-evaluation and reports prepared by the investigative teams (those sent to activities having serious discrepancies identified outside the two-tier evaluation program) will conform generally with the format described below, but may have significant variations, particularly when the investigation identified discrepancies adequate for DEU de-certification.

GENERAL FINDINGS:

FINDING

REQUIRED OR RECOMMENDED ACTION

CASE-SPECIFIC FINDINGS:

CASE FILE #1: EXAMINATION FILE # (or similar local reference)

SPECIFICS OF CASE: (number of applications, number qualified and not qualified, number applications reviewed)

FINDING(S):

REQUIRED CORRECTIVE ACTION(S):

STATUS OF CORRECTIVE ACTION(S):

CASE FILE #2:

(Continue as above listing all cases reviewed as part of the evaluation.)

OTHER FINDINGS:

List any findings that have not been addressed in one of the sections above. This section of the report may be omitted if there are no findings that have not been included above.

Signature of Evaluation Team Leader

Date

Printed Name of Evaluation Team Leader

Organizational Title, Series, and Grade (Organization if different from that of DEU)

Telephone Number (commercial and DSN)

E-Mail Address

Delegated Examining Unit
Program Evaluation Report

Installation
(Organization Name)
(Organization Location)

Dates of Evaluation

Evaluation Team
(List names of all team members showing title.)
(Indicate team lead.)