



***NASA DESK GUIDE***  
***for***  
***Human Resources***  
***Operations Assessment***

***NASA Headquarters***  
***Office of Human Capital Management***  
***Workforce Systems and Assessment Division***  
***August 2010***

## Reviewers Tips for Using This Guide

The Agency and Centers are accountable for systematically conducting self-assessments of their human capital management to ensure that its personnel practices are consistent with policy and program objectives. In broad terms, internal self-assessment covers the goals, results, leadership, processes and work climate for customer service within applicable laws and regulation, and may include such things as how the Agency

- uses first-hand knowledge and insights of employees and employee groups to develop responsive human resource policies,
- integrates Agency human resource strategies with Center organizational and core mission practices,
- sustains the leadership and employee characteristics needed to achieve specific mission goals,
- benchmarks and streamlines personnel administrative processes, and
- ensures that human resource management decisions fall within the scope of applicable legal and ethical considerations.

This Guide primarily serves Agency-led or Center-led assessments on principal regulatory and procedural program items for human resources operations, however:

- Specific items are targeted (*by an asterisk throughout the Guide and compiled in Section F*) for review under the agency implementation of the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act and OMB Circular A-123.
- Assessment guidance on benefits programs is available in OPM's *Self Evaluation Guide for Agency Administration of Employee Benefit Programs*.
- Work environment can be assessed using local, Agency or Federal-wide survey results related to human resources issues.
- For Federal-wide assessment guidance on human resource management success indicators, refer to the General Accounting Office Human Capital Self-Assessment Checklist for Agency Leaders and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Human Capital Accountability and Assessment Framework
- Additional program and process metrics/milestones can be found in various Agency human capital strategic planning documents, such as: the HR Hiring Initiative, Agency HR dashboards and the NASA Shared Services Center Service Level Agreement.
- 

The Guide may be modified to encompass local procedural requirements and process checklists, expand sampling to include Agency/local concerns, or reflect recent changes in regulations and agency policy. Various case review checklists used by OPM and agency reviewers are available through the assessment program POC. Coordinate with the local Labor Relations Officer to identify and obtain guidance in assessing respective local collective bargaining contract provisions.

The Guide assumes a general familiarity with proper personnel functional operation by reviewers performing a self-assessment and may also serve as a reference tool for developmental assignments, for example: a trainee may be assigned to a senior HR specialist who can use the Guide for instruction, or an experienced HR specialist may use it to refresh or develop their knowledge in another program area. Additionally, reviewers of delegated examining must be certified in examining.

The reviewer is expected to review program policies and references, identify data collection needs (documents, cases, interviews, surveys etc.), develop a work plan, complete an analysis, and document findings in sufficient detail to serve as the basis for improvement or corrective action. Sampling suggestions in the Guide are to be used with judgment. Generally, a few actions of each specific type, somehow randomly selected, is all that is needed to feel confident that the sampling is a good faith test of a process. Moreover, the goal of sampling is to reflect on the health of operational quality control and not to just fix cases.

The Guide includes a column to document whether the review element was met or not met, describe how sampling was conducted, explain the need for improvement or corrective action and describe findings that are particularly noteworthy. As such, it serves as the reviewer's working papers and provides sufficient documentation in developing summary reports. It is advisable to maintain this documentation until the completion of a subsequent review. However, annual review documentation of delegated examining must be maintained for a period of 3 years and include a list of deficiencies and corrective actions whether performed by OPM, Agency or other independent entity.

A complete review of human resources operations is to be completed using this Guide (or an equivalent) at least once over a 3-year cycle. Required corrective actions shall begin at the time any deficiency is recognized with a follow-up assessment conducted within a year. An annual summary of assessment activity is to be provided by September 1 to Headquarters, Office of Human Capital Management.

# NASA Human Resources Operations Assessment Desk Guide Index

## **A. STAFFING**

1. Recruitment
2. Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program
3. Delegated Examining Authority
4. Competitive Placement Plan
5. PMF and Other Special Programs
6. Probation Period
7. Experts and Consultants
8. Non-Competitive Details
9. Additional Staffing Authorities
10. Personnel Action Review

## **B. CLASSIFICATION AND POSITION MANAGEMENT**

1. Classification Practices
2. Understanding of Classification
3. Classification Standards
4. Classification Appeal Decisions
5. Position Management

## **C. COMPENSATION**

1. Absence and Leave
2. Pay Adjustment for Supervisors
3. Annual Premium Pay
4. Highest Previous Rate
5. Hours of Duty
6. Overtime
7. Pay Rate Special Factors
8. Recruitment/Relocation/Redesignation/Retention Bonuses
9. Student Loan Repayment Program
10. Superior Qualifications

## **D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS**

1. Performance Appraisal
2. Incentive/Performance Awards Program
3. Suggestion/Employee Involvement Program
4. Quality Step Increases
5. Within-Grade Increases/Denials
6. Actions Based on Unacceptable Performance
7. Adverse Actions and Discipline
8. Appeals and Grievances
9. Employee Responsibilities and Conduct
10. Prohibited Personnel Practices
- 11a. Drug Free Workplace Program (Centers)
- 11b. Drug Free Workplace Program (NSSC)

## **E. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS**

1. Management Support
2. Consultation/Bargaining/Partnerships
3. Representation by Labor Organizations
4. Use of Official Time
5. Contingency Plans
6. Unfair Labor Practice Allegations/Grievances

## **F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS**

1. Summary Report on Control Environment
2. Deficiency Resolution

## **G. NASASTARS WORKSHEETS\***

- 1. Announcements**
- 2. Certificates**
- 3. Selections**

\* Scheduled to be revised and included by December 2010



<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>2. FEDERAL EQUAL OPPORTUNITY RECRUITMENT PROGRAM</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 720.101-305 &amp; Subpart B, FEORP; &amp; references below)</i>
<p>a. <b><u>Underrepresentation</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there a method to determine underrepresentation of minorities and women by occupation groups at this Center?</p> <p>(2) How was this method developed?</p> <p>b. <b><u>Recruitment Planning</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are targeted under-represented groups and positions identified in the recruitment plan?</p> <p>(2) How does the identification of under-represented groups or positions affect the recruitment plans?</p> <p>(3) Have potential causes of under-representation been identified? Have means to remedy this underrepresentation been identified?</p> <p>(4) Has underrepresentation declined in any occupation group?</p> <p>c. <b><u>Recruitment Practices</u></b></p> <p>(1) Have resources been allocated for external recruiting?</p> <p>(2) Are internal and external recruitment activities, including inter-agency activity, defined? Is visibility maintained with colleges and universities during depressed recruitment activity?</p> <p>(3) Have trainee and development jobs (through job redesign) been identified including bilingual/cultural skill requirements?</p> <p>(4) Have new recruitment methods and resources evolved from use of the plan?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>PAGE A2</b></p> <p><i>(115 S.Ct. 2097, 1995 Adarand Decision)</i></p> <p><i>(115 S.Ct. 2097 (1995))</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. DELEGATED EXAMINING AUTHORITY</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 332 &amp; references below)</i> <b>PAGE A3</b>
<p>(1) Is delegated examining staff properly certified before independently performing examining duties?</p> <p>(2) Does staff receive recertification training at least every 3 years?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Select at least 7 appointments made under delegated examining procedures from actions taken during the preceding 12 months.</p> <p>(3) Is the position included in the delegation agreements?</p> <p>(4) Priority selection clearances:</p> <p>(a) Were individuals entitled to selection priority in the Reemployment Priority List (RPL) properly selected?</p> <p>(b) Were individuals entitled to selection priority under NASA's Career Transition Assistance Program (CTAP) and the Interagency Career Transition Assistance Program (ICTAP) properly selected?</p> <p>(5) Were the requirements of adequate public notice met, including open period, area of consideration and required notice information?</p> <p>(6) If a single notice is used to solicit both internal and external applications, does it contain language explaining that status candidates will only be considered under merit promotion procedures?</p> <p>(7) Are 10 point veterans informed of the conditions under which their applications will be retained?</p> <p>(8) Is there a process in place to retain applications from 10 point veterans for future consideration?</p> <p>(9) Was there proper documentation of the use and results of any supplemental application materials?</p> <p>(10) Are applications date stamped on receipt, postmarked envelopes retained and applications accepted in accordance with regulations?</p> <p>(11) Are minimum qualifications determined properly?</p>	<p><i>(Delegation Agreement, Delegated Examining Operations Handbook (www.opm.gov/deu)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330 Subpart B)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330, Subpart F and G)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330.102 &amp; Subpart G; 5 USC 3327; Delegation Agreement, 5 USC 2301)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332, Subpart C)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332, Subpart C; Delegated Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Operating Manual: Qualifications Standards for General Schedule Positions @ www.opm.gov/qualifications)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. DELEGATED EXAMINING AUTHORITY - (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 332 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A4</b>
(12) Was the Aerospace Technologist standard used to evaluate applicants qualifying on the basis of education for AST positions?	<i>(NPR 3300.1 Ch 2)</i>
(13) Are selective factors properly documented and required for performance on the job?	<i>(Operating Manual: Qualifications Standards for General Schedule Positions @ www.opm.gov/qualifications )</i>
(14) If AST qualifications are based on the unconditional acceptance provisions, is the file properly documented?	<i>(NPR 3300.1 Ch 2)</i>
(15) If degree or specific course work is required, is proper documentation obtained and maintained in file?	<i>(Same reference as item 13)</i>
(16) Are applications reviewed for citizenship requirements?	<i>(5 CFR 338)</i>
(17) Is there proper documentation of the required job analysis?	<i>(29 CFR 1607, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection; 5 CFR 300.103)</i>
(18) Is veterans preference properly adjudicated including OPM medical determinations when required?	<i>(Delegation Agreement; Guide to Processing Personnel Actions; 5 CFR 332 and 339)</i>
(19) Are ineligible ratings based on suitability or medical considerations properly adjudicated?	<i>(5 CFR 339) and (5 CFR 731)</i>
(20) Are applicants properly listed in rank or relative standing order?	<i>(5 CFR 332)</i>
(21) Are procedures for breaking ties established and followed?	<i>(Delegated Examining Operations Handbook)</i>
(22) Are procedures followed for issuing certificates, adding names of veterans entitled to reopen examinations, adding names of individuals entitled to priority consideration due to lost consideration and issuing supplemental certificates?	<i>(5 CFR 332)</i>
(23) Are selections from certificates properly made in accordance with the rule of 3?	<i>(5 CFR 332)</i>
(24) Are objections and passovers properly documented and approved (forwarded to OPM for final approval when required)?	<i>(5 CFR 332; 5 USC 3318(b))</i>
(25) Is selection based on 10 point preference fully documented?	<i>(Guide to Processing Personnel Actions, Ch 7)</i>
(26) Was selection made within the time frames required for selection?	

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. DELEGATED EXAMINING AUTHORITY - (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 332 -- more references below)</i>
<p>(27) If certificate is cancelled/not used, is reason documented in case file?</p> <p>(28) Are applicants notified of the status of their applications for the position(s) for which they applied?</p> <p>(29) Have procedures for reconsideration of examining decisions been established and followed?</p> <p>(30) Are mistakes in certification corrected in accordance with required procedures?</p> <p>(31) Are audits of actions taken on certificates conducted and properly documented?</p> <p>(32) Is a file or record maintained for priority referral of eligibles who lost opportunity for certification or who did not receive bona fide consideration?</p> <p>(33) Are the requirements of the Freedom of Information or Privacy Act being met e.g., appropriate documentation including denial of disclosure, etc.?</p> <p>(34) Are recordkeeping requirements including disposition of records met in accordance to the schedules provided?</p> <p>(35) Is there complete documentation in the file so that actions can be reconstructed, including documentation of candidate declinations, failure to respond to inquiry, and failure to report for an interview?</p> <p>(36) Are quarterly reports properly prepared and submitted on time?</p> <p>(37) Are annual audits conducted to assure regulatory compliance?</p> <p>(38) Are procedures (including recordkeeping requirements) for Direct Hire Authorities followed in accordance with the requirements?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>PAGE A5</b></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 294)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement; Records Retention Schedule)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Operations Handbook)</i></p>



<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>4. COMPETITIVE PLACEMENT PLAN (CPP)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 335.101-105; NPR 3335.1)</i> <b>PAGE A6</b>
<p>*a. <b><u>Communications of CPP</u></b></p> <p>(1) Has required information concerning the CPP been published at least once a year?</p> <p>(2) Does such communication contain information which conforms to pertinent requirements?</p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Select a sample of at least 10% of the total number of CPP records; including a representative number of (1) competitive placements, (2) career promotions, and (3) other exceptions to the use of competitive placement procedures. Also, assure that your sample includes at least one promotion, reassignment, detail, temporary promotion, term promotion, transfer, reinstatement, and appointment. Select the sample only from actions taken since implementation of the plan or during the preceding 12 months, whichever date is later.</p> <p>*b. <b><u>Placement Consideration and Selection Priority Clearance</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are employees offered appropriate special placement consideration, are referrals properly made, are reasons of selection/non-selection documented?</p> <p>(a) Special consideration for repromotion for employees demoted without personal cause or who have retained grade status.</p> <p>(b) Priority consideration for subsequent vacancies for employees not previously afforded proper consideration in competitive promotion actions.</p> <p>(2) Are employees provided a mechanism for consideration and are referrals properly made?</p> <p>(a) Consideration for promotion as vacancies occurs for employees absent in military services, IPA assignments, assignments with public international organizations or on Federal employees' compensation.</p> <p>(3) Priority selection clearances:</p> <p>(a) Were individuals entitled to selection priority on the Reemployment Priority List (RPL) properly selected?</p> <p>(b) Were individuals entitled to selection priority under NASA's Career Transition Assistance Program (CTAP) and the Interagency Career Transition Assistance Program (ICTAP) properly selected?</p>	<p><i>*(NPG 3335.1; 5 CFR 335)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3335.1)</i></p> <p>*</p> <p><i>(NPR 3335.1)</i></p> <p><i>( NPR 3335.1)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330 Subpart B)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330, Subpart F)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>4. COMPETITIVE PLACEMENT PLAN - (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 335.101-105; NPR 3335.1)</i> <b>PAGE A7</b>
<p>*c. <b><u>When Competitive Procedures Are Not Required</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are career promotions and other actions in which competitive placement procedures are not required, made and documented properly?</p> <p>*d <b><u>Competitive Placement Procedures</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is a Competitive Placement record established and sufficiently documented to permit reconstruction of each personnel action taken under the competitive procedure provision of NPR 3335.1?</p> <p>(2) Is the proper set of procedures used (i.e. CPP, bargaining unit supplement or local personnel office supplement)</p> <p>(3) Is vacancy information made known to employees through vacancy announcements?</p> <p>(4) Do vacancy announcements contain the information prescribed in NPR 3335.1?</p> <p>(5) Are areas of consideration established in accordance with NPR 3335.1? (or local supplements, as appropriate)</p> <p>(6) Are the proper qualification standards used?</p> <p>(7) Do selecting officials participate in the <u>identification</u> of selective factors?</p> <p>(8) Do position descriptions reflect the <u>justification</u> for selective factors?</p> <p>(9) Are selective factors made a part of minimum qualification requirements?</p> <p>(10) Are the qualification standards used available for review by candidates?</p> <p>(11) Are justifications for the use of selective factors recorded in the competitive placement record?</p>	<p>*</p> <p><i>(NPR 3335.1; Ch 3)</i></p> <p>*</p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335.102)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335.102)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335.102)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3335.1)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335.102; NPR 3335.1)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>4. COMPETITIVE PLACEMENT PLAN - (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 335.101-105; NPR 3335.1 &amp; Amendments)</i> <b>PAGE A8</b>
<p>(12) Is basic eligibility of applicants for promotion determined by screening against minimum qualification standards and time-in-grade and time after competitive appointment requirements?</p> <p>(13) Is basic eligibility of candidates determined accurately?</p> <p>(14) Do selecting officials participate in the job analysis procedures in determining the competencies/skills to be used in identifying the best available candidates for a position</p> <p>(15) Are competencies/skills properly developed and supported by sufficient documentation so that the process reveals appropriate technical steps showing evidence of job- relatedness?</p> <p>(16) Is use of rating panels/SMES in rating for various kinds and levels of positions in accordance with NPR 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p> <p>(17) Are promotion certificates properly prepared?</p> <p>(18) Do areas of consideration used produce sufficient candidates for consideration by selecting officials?</p> <p>(19) Are selections made in accordance with the provisions of NPr 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p> <p>(20) Are selections documented on promotion certificates by selecting officials?</p> <p>(21) Are the candidates selected released from their positions in accordance with the provisions of NPR 3335.1 (and only local supplements)?</p> <p>(22) Is information to candidates for competitive placement provided in accordance with provisions of NPR 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p> <p>Are employee complaints concerning the Merit Promotion Program handled in accordance with the provisions of NPR 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 338.301; 5 CFR 300, Subpart F; 5 CFR 330.501)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3335.1)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335.102)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3335.1)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335.102)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335.102A)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. PMF and OTHER SPECIAL PROGRAMS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <b>PAGE A9</b>
<p><b>a. <u>Presidential Management Fellowship (PMF) Program</u></b></p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review all or 5 cases over the last year, whichever is least..</p> <p>(1) Has a system been established to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Canvass organizations for PMF participation?</li> <li>(b) Assess PMF candidates for appointments at the GS-9, GS-11, and GS-12 levels based on education and experience?</li> <li>(c) Develop IDP’s for each PMF two-year internship period?</li> <li>(d) Monitor PMF promotion and conversion dates?</li> </ul> <p>(2) A copy of the PMF approval request was forwarded to HQ OHCM 90 days prior to conversion to PMF.</p> <p>(3) A copy of the Executive Resources Board approval memo was received from OHCM prior to the conversion effective date.</p> <p><b>b. <u>Part-Time Career Employment</u></b></p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Select three part-time career appointments (or Conversion Actions) from actions taken during the period covered by the preceding 12 months.</p> <p>(1) Has a part-time career employment program been established and a program coordinator designated?</p> <p>(2) Has the program been implemented with due consideration being given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) program goals and timetable</li> <li>(b) review of vacancies and established/proposed positions</li> <li>(c) procedure to permit current employees to convert to part-time</li> <li>(d) appropriate communications: notification to public; consultation with interested groups; keeping management/employees informed</li> <li>(e) records maintenance</li> </ul>	<p><i>(5 CFR 362 - When new regulations for Senior PMF are finalized, both will be incorporated in NPR’s)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 362.203)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 362.203)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 362.204 (d)(2))</i></p> <p><i>(5 USC 3401-3408; Public Law 95-437; 5 CFR 340)</i></p> <p><i>(5 USC 3402-7)</i></p> <p><i>(5 USC 3402-7)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. SPECIAL PROGRAMS (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <b>PAGE A10</b>
<p><b>c. <u>Employees with Disabilities &amp; Disabled Veterans Programs</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there an Center Affirmative Action Program Plan for the Employment of Disabled Individuals and Disabled Veterans?</p> <p>(2) Are managers aware of delegated authorities available to hire persons with disabilities?</p> <p><b>d. <u>Student Education Employment Programs (Student Temporary Employment Program and Student Career Experience Program)</u></b></p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Select a few cases under each of the above programs.</p> <p>(1) Are eligibility requirements for candidates being met?</p> <p>(2) Are positions for student employment programs being properly classified?</p> <p>(3) Do students have performance plans in place?</p> <p>(4) Is there a signed agreement with the student’s university or college? (Student Career Experience Program only)</p> <p>(5) Are Program requirements for non-competitive conversion satisfied? (Student Career Experience Program only)</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 720.301-307; NASA AAP)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 213.3102)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 213.3202(a) and (b))</i></p> <p><i>[5 CFR 213.3202(a) and (b)]</i></p> <p><i>[5 CFR 213.3202(a)(11) and (b)(14)]</i></p> <p><i>[5 CFR Part 430 Subpart B]</i></p> <p><i>[5 CFR 213.3202(b)(12)]</i></p> <p><i>[5 CFR 213.3202(b)(11)]</i></p>
<p><b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b>  <b>6. PROBATION PERIOD</b></p>	<p><b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b>  <i>(5 CFR 315 -- more references below)</i></p>
<p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Select a maximum of 5 actions each of (a) appointments and (b) first assignments to a supervisory/managerial position.</p> <p>Is there a system for making probationary period determinations (for both appointment and first assignment to a supervisory/managerial position)?</p> <p>Is there adherence to regulatory requirements?</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 315, Subparts H and I)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>*7. EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>*(42 USC 2473(c)(9); 5 USC 3109; 5 CFR 304 -- more references below) PAGE A11</i>
<p>(1) Have services been obtained for an appropriate purpose and with appropriate levels of approval?</p> <p>(2) Do appointees meet the OPM definition of “expert” with no preference given to annuitants?</p> <p>(3) Was there appropriate documentation of pre-employment review and approval of individual expert/consultant?</p> <p>(4) Has a system for internal review during employment been established and followed? Does the system monitor the actual number of days each expert or consultant works?</p> <p>(5) Have statements of Financial Interest been obtained in a timely manner?</p> <p>(6) Have pay rates been appropriately established?</p> <p>(7) Do services provided meet the organization’s specific need?</p>	<p><i>[NPR 3300.1, CH 4; 5 CFR 304.103]</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 304.102; NPR 3300.1, Ch 4)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3300.1, Ch 4)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 304.108; NPR 3300.1, Ch 4)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3300.1, Ch 4)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 304.106)</i></p>
<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>8. NON-COMPETITIVE DETAILS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>5 USC 3371-3376; 5 USC 9808 – more references below</i>
<p>NOTE: Details requiring competition will be reviewed under the Competitive Placement Plan Review.</p> <p><b>a. <u>Details Within NASA</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are procedures in place to advise management concerning requirements, control and proper documentation?</p> <p>(2) Are details processed in accordance with legal requirements (120 day increments) and limited to shortest practicable time?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Details to Other Federal Agencies</u></b></p> <p>(1) Have there been details to other agencies or organizations?</p> <p>(2) Have requests been approved by the required level of authority?</p> <p>(3) Have these details been properly controlled and recorded.</p>	<p><i>(5 USC 3341)</i></p> <p><i>(5 USC 3341)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3300.1, CH 8)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 33001, CH 8)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>8. NON-COMPETITIVE DETAILS (Continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>5 USC 3371-3376; 5 USC 9808 – more references below</i>
<p><b>c. <u>Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) Assignments</u></b></p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review at least two of four types of IPA assignments: (a) by detail from a non-Federal organization to NASA, (b) by temporary appointment to NASA while on leave without pay (LWOP) from a non-Federal organization, (c) by detail from NASA to a non-Federal organization, (d) by temporary appointment to a non-Federal organization while on LWOP from NASA.</p> <p>(1) Has a system been established to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Review and approve organizations for IPA participation?</li> <li>(b) Ensure that all proposed assignments, whether by detail or appointments (including extensions), are approved in advance by the appropriate official?</li> <li>(c) Monitor adherence to assignment and service time requirements? *</li> <li>(d) Establish and document OPF’s?</li> </ul> <p>(2) Was an IPA agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Prepared for each assignment</li> <li>(b) Signed by NASA, the assignee, and the non-Federal entity, , and</li> <li>(c) Complies with the requirements specified in the IPA checklist in Appendix C of the IPA Desk Guide?</li> </ul> <p>(3) Were proper pay rates established and are the salaries monitored?</p> <p>(4) Are copies of approvals of non-profit organizations to participate in the IPA program on file with the IPA agreements?</p> <p>(5) Have copies of participation approval letters to organizations and IPA agreement(s) been forwarded to Headquarters OHCM and to Center’s Financial Management Officer for file retention?</p> <p>(6) Do services provided meet the organization’s specific needs?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>PAGE A12</b></p> <p><i>(5CFR Part 334, NPR 3300.1, Ch 6; 5 USC 9808)</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">*</p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>9. ADDITIONAL STAFFING AUTHORITIES</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(42 USC 2473(c)(9); 5 USC 3109; 5 CFR 304 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A13</b>
<p><b>a. <u>Payment of Travel/Transportation to First Duty Post</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is payment under this authority in accordance with Federal Travel Regulations?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Payment of Travel for Interview at GS-13 and below</u></b></p> <p>(1) Does payment of expenses meet Federal Travel Regulations?</p> <p>(2) Are records of interview payments maintained for reconstruction purposes?</p> <p><b>c. <u>Time-Limited Promotions</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are promotions made for limited term that does not exceed 5 years?</p> <p>(2) Are Competitive Placement Plan Procedures used?</p> <p>(3) Do employees receive written notice of conditions of promotions?</p> <p><b>d. <u>Conversion to Competitive from Excepted Appointments</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are requirements, including documentation requirements, for conversion of excepted employees to competitive appointments fully met?</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 572.101 to 103)</i></p> <p><i>(41 CFR Ch 301 to 304)</i></p> <p><i>(41 CFR Ch 301 to 304)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 315; Guide to Processing Personnel Actions)</i></p>



A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS 10. PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEW	WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENT (Guide for Processing Personnel Action -- more references below)      PAGE A14
--	--

**SAMPLE:** Randomly select 60-80 actions for the period covered by the preceding 12 months. A Personnel Action Review Sampling Worksheet is provided to cover most kinds of personnel actions.

- (1) All aspects of each action are to be reviewed.
- (2) Use FPPS data to count how many actions of each type have occurred during the selected time period and to generate lists of actions for selecting which cases to review.
- (3) Because sampling sizes may be quite small for a given type of action, the reviewer may need to expand the sample to determine if errors are isolated or have wider patterns of occurrence.
- (4) Determinations on qualifications of candidates, veterans preference determinations, propriety of actions, etc. will be coordinated between the member reviewing the actions and the members responsible for functional review.
- (5) Adequate random sampling can be assured if action case lists are pre-sorted only by action type (personnel action & legal authority codes) and cases are selected using the random sample determiner described on the Worksheet.
- (6) Are personnel records maintained in accordance with requirements? \*
- (7) Are personnel records properly safeguarded against any unauthorized access or the preparation of fictitious records? \*

\*

\*

**A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS**

**10. PERSONNEL ACTION REVIEW (SAMPLING WORKSHEET)**

Period Covered: _____	(A) # of Actions in Period	(B) # of Actions to Review	(C) Random Sample Determiner	(D) Added Actions
TYPE OF ACTION (ACTION CODES)				
1. CAREER APPTS (100, 500)				
2. CAREER CONDITIONAL APPTS (101, 501)				
3. EXCEPTED APPTS SCHED A&B (170-71, 570-71)				
4. SES APPOINTMENTS (142-149)				
5. CONVERSION TO SES APPT (542-43, 546, 548-49)				
6. TERM APPTS (108, 508)				
7. TEMPORARY APPTS (115, 515, 117, 517)				
8. CHANGE IN TENURE GROUP (180)				
9. TRANSFER (130)				
10. REINSTATEMENTS (140-41, 540-41)				
11. REASSIGNMENTS (721)				
12. DETAILS (730-732)				
13. PROMOTIONS (702, 703)				
14. QUALITY INCREASE (892)				
15. WITHIN-GRADE INCREASE (893, 888)				
16. CHANGE TO LOWER GRADE (713)				
17. SUSPENSIONS (450, 452)				
18. REMOVALS (330)				
19. RESIGNATIONS (317, 312)				
20. PAY ADJUSTMENT (894)				
TOTAL			XXXXXXXXXXXX	

(B) **# OF ACTIONS TO REVIEW:** In determining how many of each type of action to review, take into account any local factors such as previous review findings, new staff, recent changes in processing requirements, etc. Unless otherwise indicated, for each type of action choose from 3 to 8 cases for review.

(C) **RANDOM SAMPLE DETERMINER:** Divide the number of each action type (Column A) by the number of that type to be reviewed (Column B). The result (rounded down) represents the frequency determiner for the selection of actions to be reviewed. For example, if the number in Column A is 43 and the number of that kind of action to review is 5, then the frequency determiner for this action type is 8 ( $43/5 = 8.6$  rounded down). From a list of the 43 actions, select the 8th action and all subsequent actions based on a multiple of the determiner (in this case, the 8th, 16th, 24th, 32nd, and 40th action on the list).

(D) **ADDED ACTIONS:** Add at least one of each of the following cases for review if not already randomly selected. For APPTS or CONVERSIONS add a reemployed annuitant, part-time appt/conversion, VRA placement & Taper appt. For EXCEPT APPT (type 3) add an assistant for a deaf or blind employee, alien scientist, expert/consultant, COOP student & employee with disability. For TEMPORARY APPT (type 7) add a 30% disabled veteran. For PROMOTIONS (type 13) add a reclassification, upgrading & first assignment to a supervisory/managerial position. For WGI (type 15) add an increase withheld for both GS & GM employee. For CLG (type 16) add a case with retained grade/pay.

<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. CLASSIFICATION PRACTICES</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 USC 5101-5115 &amp; 5 CFR 511-- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE B1</b>
<p>(1) Do locally developed program documents comply with OPM and NASA requirements? <i>(For example, classification policy, position description guides, guidance for appeals, guidance on specific positions such as program support positions, accretion of duties, etc.)</i></p> <p>(2) Is there a written delegation covering each official that classifies positions at the Center? *</p> <p>(3) Are all positions entered into the electronic Position Description System (ePDS)?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review a two percent (2%) sample of all positions that represent major OPM series and various grade levels at the full performance level. Include (a) supervisory and leader positions; (b) positions whose classification in some measure reflects the impact of the incumbent on the position; (c) mixed series AST positions; and (d) positions for which there are no specific published grade-level criteria.</p> <p>(4) Do position descriptions meet standards of adequacy?</p> <p>(a) The position description has been reviewed and certified by the first- line supervisor. *</p> <p>(b) Position has been classified by an official to whom classification authority is delegated. *</p> <p>(c) Position description adheres to format requirements.</p> <p>(d) NASA classification <u>and</u> OPM title, series, and grade are shown on position description.</p> <p>(e) Based on the duties in the position description, a Fair Labor Standard Act determination has been made and annotated on the position description. <i>(Note: FLSA exemption status ultimately rests on the work actually performed by the employee (5 CFR 551.202(e). )</i></p> <p>(f) NASA Position Designation Record has been completed ensuring correct designation of public trust positions and investigation requirements</p> <p>(g) Position sensitivity is appropriately documented on the position description</p>	<p><i>Introduction to Position Classification Standards, Section III; The Classifier’s Handbook; NPR 3511.1C</i></p> <p>* <i>(NPR 3511.1C Ch 1)</i></p> <p><i>(Personnel Bulletin-2009-10JY; extended to December 31, 2010)</i></p> <p><i>(Introduction to Position Classification Standards, Section III; The Classifier’s Handbook, Chapter 3, NPR 3511.1C)</i></p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p><i>(5 CFR 551.201, Electronic Position Description System (ePDS) position description)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 731.106; NPR 1600.1 Appendix M, ePDS position description)</i></p> <p><i>(CFR 732, NPR1600.1, ePDS position description)</i></p>

<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. CLASSIFICATION PRACTICES (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 511-- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE B2</b>
<p>(h) Positions in certain scientific and engineering series are coded in accordance with National Science Foundation scheme (functional classification codes).</p> <p>(i) Student trainees are classified to the GS-XX99 series for the appropriate occupational group.</p> <p>(j) Written analyses are prepared for positions (1) whose classification basis is not readily apparent and (2) showing factor levels and point values where appropriate.</p>	<p><i>(Introduction to Position Classification Standards Appendix 2; OPM Operating Manual, The Guide to Personnel Data Standards)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 213.3202(b)(14); OPM Handbook of Occupational Groups and Series of Classes Definition of GS-099, General Student Trainee Series)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3511.1C; The Classifier’s Handbook, Ch 2 &amp; 3)</i></p>
<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>2. UNDERSTANDING OF POSITION MANAGEMENT AND CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b>
<p>(1) Discussion with managers, supervisors, and the classification staff shows that they understand their roles and responsibilities in this area (assigning work, structuring positions, updating positions descriptions of subordinates when changes in work occur, etc.) and have received appropriate training or information on the subject</p> <p>(2) Based on available records (SATERN, course syllabus and local records), what percentage of managers and supervisors have received training on ePDS and the classification responsibilities described above?</p>	<p><i>(Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, Section III NPR 3511.1C)</i></p>
<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 511; Position Classification Handbook -- more references below)</i>
<p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review documentation on several occupations for which new position classification and job grading standards have been issued within the preceding 12 months.</p> <p>(1) Have new standards been applied to positions within a reasonable time period (i.e., within 12 months unless a longer period was requested from and approved by OPM through the Agency Classification Officer)?</p>	<p><i>(OPM Memo Subject: Change in Classification Implementation Policy, January 20, 2006)</i></p>

<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>4. CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISIONS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 511 Subpart F – more references below)</i>
<p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review classification appeal decisions over the last 2 years and check the OPF’s of affected individuals.</p> <p>(1) Were corrective personnel actions processed in a timely fashion, e.g., within four pay period from the date of the decision unless the decision specified a later date?</p> <p>(2) Are classification appeals filed appropriately and processed within required timeframes?</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 511.702)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3511.1C)</i></p>
<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. POSITION MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 511-- more references below)</i>
<p>(1) Do local issuances on position management comply with NASA requirements? *</p> <p>(2) Interview local program official to ascertain that specific measures and procedures are in place and designed to ensure:</p> <p>(a) accomplishment of the work through establishment of a position structure which ends the skills and assignments of employees with the goal of successfully performing the Center’s mission,</p> <p>(b) the organizational structure effects a logical balance between the number of employees needed to perform the Center’s major functions and the number of employees needed to provide adequate support; between professional employees and technicians; between full performance and trainee positions; between supervisors and subordinates, and the use of deputy positions, and</p> <p>(c) individual performance plans are linked with duties not only assigned but actually performed; and organization performance measures are linked with individual performance measures to determine overall organization effectiveness.</p>	<p>* ( <i>Introduction to Position Classification Standards, Section III; NPR 3511.1C</i> )</p>

<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. ABSENCE AND LEAVE</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(References Below)</i> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>PAGE C1</b></p>
<p>(1) Is there a written delegation of authority to approve absence and leave?</p> <p>(2) Does the Center have guidelines for planning, scheduling, and rescheduling, annual leave?</p> <p>(3) Have the Center procedures been established and communicated to employees?</p> <p>(4) Does the Center have guidelines in place to ensure that employees are allowed to use leave as entitled under the Family and Medical Leave Act and the Family Friendly Leave Act?</p> <p>(5) Does the Center have guidelines in place for the operation of a Voluntary Leave Transfer Program, including establishing and maintaining separate leave accounts for leave recipients?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review 3 requests for restoration of annual leave and 3 cases of leave transfer to determine that:</p> <p>(6) Actions taken are in compliance with regulatory provisions.</p> <p>(7) Actions are fully and properly documented.</p> <p>(8) The restoration was approved by an official with proper authority.</p> <p>(9) Separate leave accounts have been established for restored leave and for donated leave.</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 630.101-1211)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630.308)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630, Subparts D and L)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630, Subpart I)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630, Subpart C)</i></p>

<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>2. PAY ADJUSTMENT FOR SUPERVISORS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 575.401-407 - more references below)</i>
<p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review a few actions of supervisory differential to determine that:</p> <p>(1) Documentation shows rationale for adjusting pay.</p> <p>(2) The justification complies with OPM/NASA regulations and guide-lines.</p> <p>(3) The pay adjustment was authorized by an official with the proper authority. *</p> <p>(4) Is there a follow-up system to discontinue supervisory differential when no longer justified?</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 5)</i></p> <p><i>*( NPR 3530.1C Ch 1.2 &amp; Ch 5.4.3)</i></p>
<b>3. ANNUAL PREMIUM PAY</b>	<i>(5 CFR 550, Subpart A – more references below)</i>
<p>(1) Do local delegations comply with Agency requirements?</p> <p>(2) Is there a follow-up system to discontinue annual premium pay when no longer justified?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review annual premium pay documentation to determine that:</p> <p>(3) Justification is based on adequate historical records of standby duty and/or overtime.</p> <p>(4) The percentage is derived from OPM regulations.</p> <p>(5) Cases are approved by officials with delegated authority. *</p> <p>(6) Employee is not ineligible under availability pay.</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 13)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 550.161-162)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 550.141-164)</i></p> <p><i>* (NPR 3530.1C Ch 1.2 and Ch 13.2)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 550.181)</i></p>

<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>4. HIGHEST PREVIOUS RATE</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b> <i>(5 CFR 531, Subpart B - more references below)</i>
<p>(1) Are local issuances consistent with OPM regulations and Agency policy?</p> <p>(2) Based on review of OPF’s, are individual exceptions to Agency policy properly granted and documented? *</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review 3 to 4 highest previous rate actions (including exceptions to Agency policy) to determine if the highest previous rate rule is properly and consistently applied and documented.</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 2)</i></p> <p>* <i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 2.2)</i></p>
<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. HOURS OF DUTY</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b> <i>(5 CFR 610.101-404)</i>
<p>(1) Do local delegations comply with Agency requirements? *</p> <p>(2) Do local policy issuances comply with Agency regulations, especially on approval of first - 40 tours of duty and special educational tours of duty?</p> <p>(3) Do justifications for first - 40 tours and educational tours comply with OPM, Agency, and Center regulations?</p> <p>(4) Are work schedules established in accordance with legal and regulatory requirements?</p> <p>(5) Does the administration of credit hours, holidays, core hours, and premium pay under flexible or compressed schedules comply with legal, regulatory, and Agency (including local) requirements?</p>	<p>* <i>(NPG 3600.1A)</i></p> <p><i>(5 USC Chapter 61, 5 CFR 610)</i></p> <p><i>(5 USC Chapter 61, 5 CFR 550 and 551)</i></p>



<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>6. OVERTIME</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b> <i>(5 CFR 550.111-114 - more references below)</i> <b>PAGE C4</b>
<p>(1) Do local delegations comply with Agency requirements?</p> <p>(2) Do local policy issuances comply with OPM regulations and agency policy, especially on approval and use of compensatory time? *</p> <p>(3) Are known overtime requirements scheduled into regularly scheduled administrative workweeks?</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 3)</i></p> <p><i>* (5 CFR 550, Subpart A; NPR 3530.1C Ch 3)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 551, Subpart E)</i></p>
<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>7. PAY RATE SPECIAL FACTORS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b> <i>(Guide for Processing Personnel Actions)</i>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u></b>: Review personnel actions for employees with a pay rate determinant other than zero to include (if applicable): at least 1 retained grade, 1 retained pay, 1 superior qualifications case; and 1 promotion from a special rate position to a non-special rate position to determine that:</p> <p>(1) The rate of pay has been set properly. *</p> <p>(2) The SF 50s clearly document special factors, e.g., superior qualifications rate, retained grade, special rate.</p>	<p><i>* (5 CFR 531, Subpart B; 5 CFR 536)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 531, Subpart B; 5 CFR 536)</i></p>

<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>8. RECRUITMENT, RELOCATION, REDESIGNATION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b> <b>PAGE C5</b>
<p>(1) Do local delegations/policies comply with Agency requirements?</p> <p>(2) Do local policy issuances meet the criteria specified in regulatory requirements and agency policy especially on the payment of bonuses?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE A:</b> Review 5 cases of payment of recruitment, relocation and retention bonuses paid under 5 USC 575 3 and 5754 to determine that:</p> <p>(1) Bonuses were not used in any manner that could be perceived as an automatic entitlement.</p> <p>(2) Employee has signed a written service agreement.</p> <p>(3) Approval was by an official at a higher level than the official who recommended the bonus.</p> <p>(4) Approval for recruitment and relocation bonuses was based on a written determination that, in the absence of a bonus, the center will encounter difficulty filling the position.</p> <p>(5) Approval for retention allowances was based on a written determination that the unusually high or unique qualifications of the employee or special need of the Center for the employee’s services makes it essential to retain that employee.</p> <p><b>SAMPLE B:</b> Review 5 cases of payment of recruitment, relocation, redesignation, and retention bonuses paid under NASA Flexibility Act of 2004 to determine that:</p> <p>(1) Bonuses paid in excess of 25% required competencies to meet a “critical need” as defined in the Agency’s Workforce Plan</p> <p>(2) Bonuses of up to 25% are calculated on rate of basic pay (excluding locality pay)</p> <p>(3) Bonus level eligibility meets agency criteria</p> <p>(4) Bonus levels beyond the minimum are supported by documentation</p> <p>(5) Determine that the total amount of recruitment, redesignation, relocation or retention bonuses paid to supervisors and managers during the fiscal year does not exceed 25% of the total amount paid out.</p> <p>(6) Used Agency templet to submit all bonuses for supervisors and managers to HQ for approval.</p>	<p><i>(NPD 3000.1B &amp; NPR 3530.1C Ch 14-16)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR, Part 575 &amp; NPR 3530.1C)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 575.106 and 575.206)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 575 105(c), 110, 205d- e, 210 &amp; 310)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 575.107; 5 CFR 575.207 &amp;5 CFR 575.307)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 575108; 5 CFR 575.208)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR, Part 575.308)</i></p> <p><i>( 5 USC 9804 &amp; 9805; NPD 3530.1C Ch 14 &amp; 15)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 14.13 &amp; Ch 15.12)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch.14.4.2b and Ch. 15.4.2b)</i></p> <p><i>(Personnel Bulletin 2009-3-CC; March 10, 2009)</i></p>

<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>9. STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b> <i>(% USC 5379; 5 CFR Part 537 – more references below)</i> <b>PAGE C6</b>
<p>(1) Do local delegations/policies comply with Agency requirements?</p> <p>(2) Do local policy issuances meet the criteria specified in regulatory requirements and agency policy?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> review 3 cases of student loan repayments to determine that:</p> <p>(3) Any employee receiving a student loan repayment has signed a minimum 3-year service agreement.</p> <p>(4) The service agreement obligates the employee to remain in the employment of NASA for the duration of the service agreement.</p> <p>(5) Approval was made by an official who has the authority to approve or waive student loan repayments.</p> <p>(6) Records were established and maintained on student loan repayment use indicating the number of employees selected to receive the benefit, employee job classifications and grades, and the total amount paid for student loans.</p>	<p><i>(NPD 3000;NPR 3530.1C Ch 11)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 537.107)</i></p> <p><i>(5CFR 537.107)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 11)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 537.110)</i></p>
<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>10. SUPERIOR QUALIFICATIONS/SPECIAL NEEDS PAY SETTING</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b>
<p>(1) Has appropriate internal guidelines and evaluation procedures for using superior qualifications authority been established?</p> <p>(2) Is the superior qualification/special need appropriately justified and documented?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review cases to ensure that the documentation allows for reconstruction and includes the following:</p> <p>(3) In all cases, approving officials must consider the option of authorizing a recruitment bonus prior to authorizing pay set above the minimum rate</p> <p>(4) Superior qualification of individual and/or special need of the agency justifies the use of authority?</p> <p>(5) Factors were considered in determining the individual’s existing pay?</p> <p>(6) Reasons for authorizing an advanced rate instead of or in addition to a recruitment bonus.</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 531.212; NPR 3530.1 Ch 4)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 212 (e))</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3530.1C Ch 4.2)</i></p> <p><i>(5CFR 531.212 (b))</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 531.212 (c))</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 531.212 (d))</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 430; NPR 3430.1C - more references below)</i>
<p>(1) Has the Center implemented the performance appraisal program in compliance with Agency and OPM requirements?</p> <p>(2) Has a performance plan been established for each employee for the current appraisal cycle? *</p> <p>(3) Does the HR Office have documentation to show that each employee has received a signed or otherwise documented performance summary rating for the most recently completed rating period?</p> <p>(4) Have the performance standards (that is, measurable results) for the Program/Project/Functional Objective (PPFO) performance element changed/been improved over prior years?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review the performance plans for the most recently completed appraisal period for 5 /supervisory and 5 non-supervisory employees to include at least one position with an EO requirement, and one case with performance summary rating of “Unacceptable”.</p> <p>(5) Does each performance plans contain at least one critical element (that is, the PPFO) which addresses individual performance and its alignment with the Agency’s Strategic Plan?</p> <p>(6) For each performance plan, are the PPFO performance element and standards clear and reflect individual work assignments and responsibilities?</p> <p>(7) Do the PPFO performance element(s) link to organizational /Agency performance goals and objectives?</p> <p>(8) Does the performance plan for the position with an EO Program requirement appropriately identify specific requirements in support of the EO Program?</p> <p>(9) Are the performance standards of the PPFO performance element clear, measurable and based on results?</p>	<p><b>PAGE D1</b></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 430.204; NPR 3430.1C)</i></p> <p><i>* (5 CFR 430.206(b)(2); NPR 3420.1C Ch 5.2)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.4)</i></p> <p><i>(Describe results of any quality reviews of plans, historical and comparative trends in rating distributions and employee survey results.)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.2)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.2)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.2)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.2)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3713.2H, 5.c)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch.5.3)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL (Continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 430; NPR 3430.1C - more references below)</i>
<p>(10) Does each performance plan reflect at least one progress review?</p> <p>(11) Is each performance summary rating supported by a narrative summary of the employee’s performance?</p> <p>(12) Is the performance summary rating based on the ratings of each performance element?</p> <p>(13) Does each performance summary rating meet the definition for such?</p> <p>(14) Has a performance summary rating of Distinguished, Needs Improvement, or Unacceptable been reviewed and approved by a higher level management official?</p>	<p><i>(5CFR 430.208; NPR3430.1C, Ch 5.4)</i></p> <p><i>(5CFR 430.208; NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.4)</i></p> <p><i>(5CFR 430.208; NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.4)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C, Ch 5.4)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>2. INCENTIVE/PERFORMANCE AWARDS PROGRAM</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 451.101-.203, NPR 3451.1B -- more references below)</i> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>PAGE D3</b></p>
<p>(1) Has the Center established a program in conformance with applicable Agency and OPM requirements?</p> <p>(2) Does the program receive positive support from all levels of management?</p> <p>(3) Are awards granted to individuals, groups, and supervisors so as to encourage meeting organizational goals or improving efficiency, effectiveness and economy of operations?</p> <p>(4) Is there publicized recognition for employee contributions?</p> <p>(5) Have all individual awards that exceeded \$10,000 been forwarded to HQ for submission and prior approval by the OPM prior to the granting of the award?</p> <p>(6) Have controls been established to prevent a time-off award being converted to a cash payment? *</p> <p>(7) Has the accumulation of time-off awards for a single employee (exception being an astronaut) been restricted to the maximum of 80 hours in a leave year?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review 10 performance awards granted during the past year (include five each of non-supervisory employees and supervisors with at least 2 each of monetary and time-off awards)..</p> <p>(8) Are awards granted in accordance with applicable OPM, Agency and Center requirements?</p> <p>(9) Have awards been processed through the NASA Automated Awards System (NAAS) and Federal Personnel Payroll System (FPPS) to enable accurate reporting to OPMs Central Personnel Data File?</p> <p>(10) Is justification for awards not based on a performance rating of record filed in Employee’s Performance File? *</p> <p>(11) Does justification for awards not based on performance rating of record conform to requirements?</p> <p>(12) Were awards approved at the proper level under delegated authorities? *</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3451.1B)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3451.1B Preface 1)</i></p> <p><i>(5CFR 451.107; NPR 3451.1B Ch 1.1.1.4.1)</i></p> <p><i>* ( 5 CFR 451.104 (f); NPR 3451.1B Ch 2.6.4.3)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3451.1B CH 2.6.3.3)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 451; NPR 3451.1B)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 451.106(g); NPR 3451.1B Ch1.5.1.</i></p> <p><i>* (5 CFR 451.103 (c) (2); CFR 430.203 &amp; OPM Operating Guide to Personnel Recordkeeping Chapter 3 Table 3-C; and 5 CFR 293.403 (b) (2))</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3451.1B Ch 1)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3451.1B Ch 1)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. SUGGESTION/EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 451.101-.203; NPR 3451.1B, 1.5.1.6, Ch 3)</i> <b>PAGE D4</b>
<p>(1) Is there evidence of management support and publicity of the program?</p> <p>(2) Have all individual awards that exceeded \$10,000 been forwarded to HQ for submission and prior to the granting of the awards?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review four of the suggestions submitted within the last 3 years to determine if the Center’s active program complies with OPM, Agency and Center requirements.</p> <p>(3) Was the suggestor a government employee at the time the contribution was made?</p> <p>(4) Have suggestions been outside of the suggestor’s job responsibilities or, if within them, so superior that it warranted special recognition?</p> <p>(5)</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3451.1B)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 451.107; NPR 341.1B Ch 1.1.1.4.1)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3451.1B Ch 3)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3451.1B Ch 3)</i></p> <p><i>Note: No longer “publish” such Table.</i></p>
<b>4. QUALITY STEP INCREASES</b>	<i>(CFR 531.501-508; NPR 3430.1C, 5.9; NPR 3451.1B, 2.3 - more references below)</i>
<p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review five of the quality step increases granted during the past year to determine if Center processed QSI in compliance with OPM, Agency, and Center requirements.</p> <p>(1) Were QSI’s approved at the proper level under delegated authority? *</p> <p>(2) Was a QSI granted only once to an employee during the past 52 weeks? *</p> <p>(3) Were the QSI’s granted only to employees that received the highest performance summary level (that is, Distinguished)?</p> <p>(4) Were the QSI’s granted the only monetary award, based on the Rating of Record, given to the employees?</p> <p>(5) Were the QSI’s effected within 120 calendar days following the end of the appraisal period?</p>	<p><i>*(CFR 531.501 &amp; NPR 3451.1B Ch 1)</i></p> <p><i>*(NPR 3451.1B Ch 2.3)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.9 &amp; NPR 3451.1B, 2.3)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.9 &amp; NPR 3451.1B Ch 2.3)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.9; NPR 3451.1B Ch 2.3)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. WITHIN-GRADE INCREASES</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(CFR 531: NPR 3430.1C -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE D5</b>
<p><b>a. <u>Processing WIG’s</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there adequate training on WIG’s to supervisors and employees?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review five WIG’s to determine that they are processed in accordance with Agency, OPM and local collective bargaining requirements.</p> <p>(2) Was acceptable level of competence (ALOC) determined based on most recent rating of record?</p> <p>(3) How does management assure that work reflects an ALOC (i.e., WIG not granted on an automatic basis)?</p> <p>(4) Is proper documentation in eOPF?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Denials of WIG’s</u></b></p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review three of the WIG denials to determine that these are processed in accordance with requirements.</p> <p>(1) Was the denial of WIG approved at the proper level under delegated authorities?</p> <p>(2) Was the negative determination done in a timely manner?</p> <p>(3) Is there adequate documentation in the case file?</p> <p>(4) Was the reconsideration of a negative determination done in a timely manner?</p>	<p>(5 CFR 531.409; NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.12)</p> <p>(CFR 531.409; NPR 3430.1C Ch 5.12)</p> <p>(NPR 3430.1C Ch 1.6 and 1.7)</p> <p>(5 CFR 531.409)</p> <p>(5 CFR 531.410)</p>



<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>6. ACTIONS BASED ON UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 432; NPR 3432.1 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE D6</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u></b>: Review at least 2 of the actions based on unacceptable performance for each of the last 3 years to determine that actions taken conform to applicable Agency, OPM and collective bargaining requirements.</p> <p>(1) Was the employee on a performance plan for at least 90 days prior to issuance of a Performance Improvement Plan?</p> <p>(2) Was the employee allowed a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate acceptable performance after the receipt of Performance Improvement Plan notice (minimum of 30 days)?</p> <p>(3) Was proposed action based on instances of unacceptable performance which occur within a 1 year period ending on the date of the notice of proposed action?</p> <p>(4) Were reasons for the action stated clearly and supported by the evidence?</p> <p>(5) Were actions proposed and decided by an appropriate official? *</p> <p>(6) Were actions taken within appropriate time frames?</p> <p>(7) Was the employee informed of his/her right to be represented to review the material relied on and to reply orally and/or in writing?</p> <p>(8) Did the decision letter include appropriate appeal rights? *</p> <p>(9) Was a file of all relevant documents maintained as required?</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 430.207 (a); NPR 3430.1C Ch 4)</i></p> <p><i>(CFR 432.104; NPR 3420.1C Ch 5.13)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 432.105)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3432.1)</i></p> <p><i>* (NPR 3432.1)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 432.105; NPR 3432.1)</i></p> <p><i>* (5 CFR 432.106; NPR 3432.1)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 432.107)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>7. ADVERSE ACTIONS AND DISCIPLINE</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 752; NPR 3752.1)</i> <b>PAGE D7</b>
<p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review at least 2 of the disciplinary and 2 of the adverse action files (i.e., reprimands, suspensions, demotions/removals, reprimands) for each of the past 3 years to determine that actions taken conform to applicable Agency, OPM and collective bargaining requirements.</p> <p>(1) Were actions proposed and taken by appropriate officials? *</p> <p>(2) Were the reasons for the action stated clearly and the charges supported by the evidence?</p> <p>(3) Were the employees informed of their right to be represented, to review the evidence relied upon and to reply orally and/or in writing?</p> <p>(4) Were penalties generally within the guidelines set out in the NASA Desk Guide for Table of Disciplinary Offenses Penalties (or Center equivalent) if any? (Douglas factors considered as appropriate?)</p> <p>(5) Did the decision letter include appropriate appeal or grievance rights? *</p> <p>(6) Were actions proposed, processed and taken without unnecessary delay?</p> <p>(7) Was the case file maintained as required?</p>	<p>* <i>(NPG 3752.1)</i></p> <p><i>(CFR 752.203; 5CFR 752.404)</i></p> <p><i>(CFR 752.203; 5CFR 752.404)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 752.406)</i></p> <p>*<i>(5 CFR 752.203; 5 USC 752.405)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 752.406)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>8. APPEALS AND GRIEVANCES</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 771; NPR 3771.1)</i>
<p>(1) Is a mechanism available to inform employees about the various processes available to deal with their concerns, e.g. grievances, Office of Special Counsel, equal opportunity, etc.?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review a minimum of three each of administrative and negotiated grievances filed during each of the past 3 years to determine that grievances are processed in accordance with Agency, OPM and collective bargaining requirements.</p> <p>(2) Were grievance files established and maintained in accordance with requirements? *</p> <p>(3) Were grievances rejected only for proper reasons?</p> <p>(4) Were deciding officials properly identified?</p> <p>(5) Were grievance fact finders properly selected?</p> <p>(6) Were processing time requirements met or reasons for delays documented?</p>	<p><i>(5CFR 771; NPR 3771.1)</i></p> <p><i>*( NPG 3771.1)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3771.1 Appendix B)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>9. EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 735, 2634, 2635, 6901; NPR 1900.3B)</i> <b>PAGE D9</b>
<p>(1) Are standards of conduct/ethics training provided for employees in accordance with regulations?</p> <p>(2) Are copies of laws, E.O. Agency regulations and OPM regulations and instructions relating to ethical and other conduct available for review by employees?</p> <p>(3) Are files relating to requests for permission to engage in outside employment maintained and updated on a regular basis?</p> <p>(4) Are statements of Employment and Financial Interest (OGE Form 450) processed timely, and maintained (filed) in a manner that ensures their confidentiality at all times? *</p>	<p><i>( 5 CFR 2635; NPR 1900.3B CH 7)</i></p> <p><i>( 5 CFR 2635; NPR 1900.3B CH 7)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 6901)</i></p> <p><i>*(5 CFR Part 2634, subpart I)</i></p>
<b>10. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES/WHISTLEBLOWING</b>	<i>(5 USC Chapter 23)</i>
<p>(1) Is a mechanism available to annually inform employees about Prohibited Personnel Practices/Whistleblower Protection Provisions?</p> <p>(2) Is a procedure in place to provide training to supervisors and managers every three years to ensure their understanding of their responsibilities under the Prohibited Personnel Practices and Whistleblower Protection Provisions?</p>	<p><i>5 USC 2302(c)</i></p> <p><i>5 USC 2302(c)</i></p> <p><i>Actions taken in accordance with Office of Special Counsel (OSC) Certification requirements</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>11 a. DRUG FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM (Centers)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(E.O. 12564; HHS Mandatory Guidelines; and NPR 3792.1B)</i> <b>PAGE D10</b>
<p><b>a. <u>Notifying Employees in Testing Designated Positions (TDP)</u></b></p> <p>(1) Discussions with managers, supervisors, and the HR staff show that they understand their roles and responsibilities to evaluate job duties against TDP criteria.</p> <p>(2) Are all TDP’s periodically reviewed to verify the accuracy of the designation 1 for random drug testing?</p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Review up to 8 cases to include at least a couple of each of the following types of actions: reclassified position, position the duties of which changed without resulting in reclassification, and reassignment from/to a TDP.</p> <p>(3) As job duties change, are positions systematically reviewed to verify determinations as a TDP or non-TDP?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Vacancy Announcements</u></b></p> <p>(1) For any position/set of duties determined to be a TDP for which there has been a vacancy announcement, an Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) agreement, etc., has the announcement or agreement clearly stated that the position/set of duties is designated as a TDP and subject to pre-employment and random drug testing?</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3792.1B Appendix C)</i></p> <p><i>Note: Notices are retained by NSSC Drug Testing Team (See Section D11b below).</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3792.1B Appendix C)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3792.1B)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>11a. DRUG FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM (Centers - Continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(E.O. 12564; HHS Mandatory Guidelines; and NPR 3792.1B)</i>
<p><b>c. <u>Education and Training</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is adequate information regarding the NASA Drug-Free Workplace Program (the NASA Plan for a Drug-Free Workplace, brochure, etc.) provided to new employees at the time of entrance on duty?</p> <p>(2) Does the Center have a continuing drug education program which provides information regarding drug abuse and rehabilitation to all employees on a periodic basis?</p> <p>(3) Have all supervisors been trained in accordance with regulations and Agency requirements in recognizing and addressing illegal drug use?</p> <p>(4) Is training timely and appropriately recorded for reporting purposes?</p> <p>(5) Have managers, supervisors, HR, Employee Assistance Program (EAP) staff, and the Center’s Medical Review Officer received appropriate guidance on their roles and responsibilities as they pertain to the DFWP?</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3792.1B)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>11b. DRUG FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM (NSSC)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(E.O. 12564; HHS Mandatory Guidelines; and NPG 3792.1C)</i>
<p><b>a. <u>Notifying Employees in Testing Designated Positions (TDP)</u></b></p> <p>Is there a procedure in place to require an acknowledgment of receipt of the “Thirty (30) Day Notice to Employee in Testing Designated Position” for every employee occupying a TDP?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Testing for Illegal Drug Use</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is twenty-five percent (25%) of the Center’s employees in TDP’s randomly tested for illegal drug use on an annual basis? *</p> <p>(2) For any employee referred through administrative channels following successful completion of a rehabilitative program, has the employee been subject to unannounced drug testing at least 4 times during the following one-year period?</p> <p>(3) For any employee scheduled for random or follow-up drug testing who is unavailable for legitimate reasons (i.e., travel, leave, time critical work assignment), is the official test list appropriately annotated to specify the reason for not testing the employee?</p> <p>(4) Is the collection of urine specimens for the purpose of testing for illegal drug use conducted in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Mandatory Guidelines?</p> <p>(5) Are all employees tested for illegal drug use notified of their test results in a timely manner?</p> <p>(6) Does the number of QC specimens submitted to the lab equal 10% of the Center’s randomly collected urine specimens?</p> <p>(7) Is approximately 80% of the QC’s submitted to the lab for analysis negative (i.e., certified to contain no drug) and the remaining QC’s positive for only those drugs for which the Agency tests (i.e., marijuana and cocaine) and submitted proportionally (i.e., for every QC spiked with marijuana there is a QC spiked with cocaine)?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>PAGE D12</b></p> <p><i>(NASA Plan for a Drug-Free Workplace)</i></p> <p>*</p>

**c. Records Retention and Safeguarding**

(1) Is all drug testing information specifically relating to employees, including the results of such testing and an employee's participation in the NASA EAP, maintained in accordance with all applicable law and regulations?

*(HHS Mandatory Guidelines)*

(2) Is the above information appropriately safeguarded against unauthorized access?

*(PL 101-71, Sec. 503(e); HHS Mandatory Guidelines, Sec. 2.7; 42 CFR, Part 2)*



<b>E. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 USC Ch.71)</i>
<p>(1) Is there a published local policy statement or is the Agency’s Labor-Management Relations (LMR) policy available?</p> <p>(2) Does the LMR staff have access to key management officials?</p> <p>(3) Does the LMR staff have the opportunity to review and provide input to new or proposed changes in personnel policies and practices and other actions that affect working conditions of bargaining unit employees prior to implementation?</p> <p>(4) Is LMR training provided for managers and supervisors who supervise bargaining unit employees?</p> <p>(5) Are copies of the labor agreement given to managers and supervisors who have direct responsibility for the work performed by members of the bargaining unit and to all bargaining unit employees?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>PAGE E1</b></p>
<b>2. CONSULTATION/BARGAINING</b>	
<p>(1) Are labor organizations given the opportunity to meet at reasonable times and to consult/bargain in a good faith effort to reach agreement with respect to conditions of employment of bargaining unit members? *</p> <p>(2) Are issues that are discussed or agreed upon between management and union documented?</p> <p>(3) Is management represented at negotiations or third-party actions by someone with authority to commit management to a written agreement?</p>	<p><i>*(5 U.S.C. 7103 (a) (12), 5 USC 7117 and EO 12871)</i></p>

<b>E. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. REPRESENTATION BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <b>PAGE E2</b>
<p>(1) Are labor organization given the opportunity to be represented at formal discussions between management and employees or employee representatives concerning grievances, personnel policies and practices, or other general conditions of employment? *</p> <p>(2) Are employees in exclusive bargaining units notified annually of their right to be represented at any examination of an employee by a management representative where the employee (a) believes discipline may result and (b) requests such representation? (Weingarten right) (</p>	<p><i>*(5 U.S.C. 7121 (b) (3) (A) (B); 5 USC 7114)</i></p> <p><i>*[5 U.S.C. 7114 (a) (3)]</i></p>
<b>4. USE OF OFFICIAL TIME</b>	
<p>(1) Have procedures and controls been developed and maintained to account for official time used by employee bargaining unit representatives? *</p>	<p><i>*(5 USC 7131)</i></p>
<b>5. CONTINGENCY PLANS</b>	
<p>(1) Have current contingency plans been developed establishing local procedures for dealing with work stoppages or other disruptive activities?</p>	<p><i>[5 USC 7103 (a) (4) (D); 7116 (b) (7); 7311 (3); OPM Guidance Bulletin No. 14, June 1982, “Strike Contingency Plan”</i></p>
<b>6. UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE (ULP) ALLEGATIONS/GRIEVANCES</b>	
<p>(1) Are ULP’s reviewed to determine if any basic management practices need to be addressed/changed to avoid future problems?</p> <p>(2) Are grievances under the collective bargaining unit reviewed to determine if any basic management practices need to be addressed/changed to avoid future problems?</p>	

<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>1. SUMMARY REPORT ON CONTROL ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> (NASA Desk Guide Sections A through E) <span style="float: right;"><b>PAGE G1</b></span>
<p>Cyclic summary reports verify that the overall personnel office environment effectively assures internal controls are in place and used as planned. Documentation of the following items form the basis of a cyclic management control review and are to be maintained for at least 6 months after the date of the summary report.</p> <p><b>a. <u>Data &amp; records are up-to-date and accurate.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are personnel processing action records maintained in accordance with OPM and NASA requirements?</p> <p>(2) Have procedures and controls been developed to insure accurate accounting of official time used by employee bargaining unit representatives?</p> <p>(3) Is justification for those awards not based on performance rating of record, filed in Employee’s Performance File?</p> <p>(4) Was a QSI granted only once to an employee during the past 52 weeks?</p> <p>(5) Are grievance files established and maintained in accordance with requirements?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Program operating procedures and activities are clearly documented &amp; adequate upon examination.</u></b></p> <p>(1)</p> <p>(2) Do competitive placement procedures follow requirements?</p> <p>(3) Does employment of experts/consultants follow guideline requirements?</p> <p>(4) Do Intergovernmental Personnel Act assignments adhere to assignment and service time requirements?</p> <p>(5) Do local issuances on position management comply with NASA requirements?</p> <p>(6) Have pay rates been properly set?</p> <p>(7) Have controls been established to prevent a time-off award being converted to a cash payment?</p>	<p><i>Item A10 (6)</i></p> <p><i>Item E4 (1)</i></p> <p><i>Item D2 (10)</i></p> <p><i>Item D4 (2)</i></p> <p><i>Item D8 (3)</i></p> <p><i>Item A4b through d</i></p> <p><i>Item A7 (1) through (7)</i></p> <p><i>Item A8 c (1)( c)</i></p> <p><i>Item B5 (1)</i></p> <p><i>Item C7 (1)</i></p> <p><i>Item D2 (6)</i></p>

<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>1. SUMMARY REPORT ON CONTROL ENVIRONMENT (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(NASA Desk Guide Sections A through E)</i> <b>PAGE G2</b>
<p><b>c. <u>Appropriate procedures are established and followed to assign and approve work of HR functional staff.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are recruitment travel costs considered reasonable including cost for interview trips?</p> <p>(2) Are performance plans developed for <u>all</u> personnel office employees?</p> <p><b>d. <u>Significant activities are authorized and performed only by persons acting within their assigned authority.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there a written delegation covering each official that classifies positions at the Center?</p> <p>(2) Were the following actions authorized by officials with proper authority: supervisory pay adjustments, annual premium pay, highest previous rate, hours of duty, compensatory time and awards?</p> <p>(3) Were the following actions approved at the proper level under delegated authority: quality step increases, actions based on unacceptable performance, and adverse and disciplinary actions.</p> <p>(4) Are the labor organizations given the opportunity to meet at reasonable times and to consult/bargain/partner in good faith effort to reach agreement with respect to conditions of employment of bargaining unit members?</p> <p><b>e. <u>Key duties and responsibilities are separated among individuals.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Were position descriptions reviewed and certified by the first-line supervisors?</p> <p>(2) Have positions been classified by an official to whom classification authority is delegated?</p> <p>(3) Are there indications of major problems in recruitment planning regarding management participation in plan development?</p>	<p><i>Item A1b (3)</i></p> <p><i>Item D1 (2) modified</i></p> <p><i>Item A1a (4)</i> <i>Item B1 (2)</i></p> <p><i>Items C2 (3), C3 (5), C4 (3), C5 (1), C6 (2) and D2 (11)</i></p> <p><i>Items D4 (1), D6 (5) and D7 (1)</i></p> <p><i>Item E2 (1)</i></p> <p><i>Item B1 (4) (a)</i></p> <p><i>Item B1 (43) (b)</i></p> <p><i>Item A1a(4)</i></p>

<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>1. SUMMARY REPORT ON CONTROL ENVIRONMENT (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(NASA Desk Guide Sections A through E)</i> <b>PAGE G3</b>
<p>(4) Were the employees notified of appropriate appeal rights in actions based on unacceptable performance, adverse actions, or discipline?</p> <p>(5) Is 25% of the employee’s in TDP’s randomly tested for illegal drug use on an annual basis?</p> <p>(6) Are labor organizations given the opportunity to be represented at formal discussions between management and employees or employee representatives concerning grievances, personnel polices and practices, or other general conditions of employment?</p> <p>(7) Are employees in exclusive bargaining units notified annually of their right to be represented at any examination of an employee by a management representative where the employee (a) believes discipline may result and (b) requests such representation? (Weingarten right)</p> <p><b>f. <u>Procedures are followed to limit access of resources/records to authorized personnel.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are personnel action records properly safeguarded against any unauthorized access or the preparation of fictitious records?</p> <p>(2) Have steps been taken to assure the confidentiality of statements of Employment and Financial Interest (OGF Form 450) at all times.</p>	<p><i>Items D6 (8), D7 (5)</i></p> <p><i>Item D11 b(1)</i></p> <p><i>Item E3 (1)</i></p> <p><i>Item E3 (2)</i></p> <p><i>Item A10 (7)</i></p> <p><i>Item D9 (4)</i></p>
<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>2. DEFICIENCY RESOLUTION</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(NASA Desk Guide Sections A through E)</i>
<p>(1) Corrective action is initiated for any deficiency identified above within 60 days of its discovery through self-assessment.</p> <p>(2) Since the most recent self-assessment summery report, do OPM reviews of delegated examining operations confirm satisfactory program operation?</p>	<p><i>(Most recent OPM Report on delegated examining)</i></p>