ARMY REGULATION
No. 690-335-1

HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON, DC, *1 January 1981*

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEES FOR PROMOTION AND INTERNAL PLACEMENT

Effective 15 February 1981 or upon receipt, whichever is first.

This regulation provides HQDA policy guidance that supplements the material contained in FPM Supplement 335-1.

Interim changes to this regulation are not official unless they are authenticated by The Adjutant General. Except for retention of a reference copy (CPR 272.2-2a(5)), users will destroy interim changes on their expiration dates unless sooner superseded or rescinded.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Purpose. This regulation provides HQDA policy guidance on the evaluation of employees for promotion and internal placement. It must be used in conjunction with FPM Supplement 335-1.

2. Applicability. This regulation prescribes policies and procedures applicable to Army civilian employees, including USAR technicians, except where such policies and procedures are modified by AR 140-315. This regulation does not apply to Army National Guard technicians employed under the provisions of 32 U.S.C. 709, unless specifically made applicable by the NGB.

3. Filing instructions. *a.* File the pages listed below with the corresponding subchapters of FPM Supplement 335-1:

Insert pages 1-1, 2-1, 3-1, and 7-1

b. File this transmittal sheet immediately preceding FPM Supplement 335-1.

The proponent agency of this regulation is the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) direct to HQDA(DAPE-CPS), WASH DC 20310.

This copy is a reprint which includes current pages from Change 1 through 3.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

E. C. MEYER
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:
J. C. PENNINGTON
Major General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

DISTRIBUTION:
Active Army, ARNG, USAR: To be distributed in accordance with DA Form 12-4 requirements for CPR-CPC.

CHANGE
No. 3

HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON, DC, *1 April 1987*

Civilian Personnel

EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEES FOR PROMOTION AND INTERNAL PLACEMENT

Effective upon receipt

This change eliminates the requirement for HQDA approval of written tests and deletes material that repeats material in FPM Supplement 335-1.

1. AR 690-335-1 is changed as indicated below. The pages of this regulation are interfiled with the subchapters of FPM Supplement 335-1 to which they relate.

Remove pages	*Insert pages*
i (C 2)	i
1-1	.....
2-1	.....
3-1	3-1
7-1	.....

2. File this transmittal sheet in front of FPM Supplement 335-1.

3. The latest installment to FPM Supplement 335-1 at the time this change was forwarded for publication was number 6 dated 20 August 1982.

4. Army regulations in the 690 series that are interfiled with the FPM use the following mechanical aids to assist readers:

a. When revised pages are issued—

(1) New or changed material is indicated by a right-hand arrow (➡) at the beginning and a left-hand arrow (⬅) at the end.

(2) The deletion of text is indicated by two stars (★).

b. A row of five asterisks (*) is used to alert the reader that, at that point, there is material in the FPM that HQDA is not supplementing.

c. A double dagger (‡) appearing before a major division (i.e., chapter, subchapter, paragraph, or subparagraph) means there is no corresponding division in the FPM.

The proponent agency of this regulation is the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) directly to HQDA(DAPE-CP), WASH, DC 20310-0300.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

JOHN A. WICKHAM, JR.
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:

R. L. DILWORTH
Brigadier General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

DISTRIBUTION:

Active Army, USAR, ARNG: To be distributed in accordance with DA Form 12-4 requirements for the Federal Personnel Manual and for FPM Supplement 335-1.

CHANGE
NO. 2

HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON, DC, *1 December 1986*

Civilian Personnel

EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEES FOR PROMOTION AND INTERNAL PLACEMENT

Effective upon receipt.

Appendix B is revised. Changes include addition of simplified candidate evaluation policy for evaluating small numbers of candidates; modification of the definition of high quality candidates; and modification of the requirement to rate and rank.

1. AR 690-335-1 is changed as indicated below. The pages of this regulation are interfiled with Federal Personnel Manual (FPM) Supplement 335-1.

Remove pages	*Insert pages*
.....	i
B-1 and B-2 (C 1)	B-1 through B-3

2. File this transmittal sheet in front of FPM Supplement 335-1.

3. The latest installment to FPM Supplement 335-1 at the time this change was forwarded for publication was number 6 dated 20 August 1982.

4. Army regulations in the 690 series that are interfiled with the FPM use the following mechanical aids to assist readers:

a. When revised pages are issued—

(1) New or changed material is indicated by a right-hand arrow (➡) at the beginning and a left-hand arrow (⬅) at the end.

(2) The deletion of part of a paragraph is indicated by two stars (★).

(3) The deletion of an entire paragraph is indicated by a line of stars.

b. A row of five asterisks (*) is used to alert the reader that, at that point, there is material in the FPM that HQDA is not supplementing.

c. A double dagger (‡) appearing before a major division (i.e., chapter, subchapter, paragraph, or subparagraph) means there is no corresponding division in the FPM.

The proponent agency of this regulation is the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) directly to HQDA(DAPE-CPE), WASH, DC 20310-0300.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

JOHN A. WICKHAM, JR.
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:

R. L. DILWORTH
Brigadier General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

DISTRIBUTION:

Active Army, USAR, ARNG: To be distributed in accordance with DA Form 12-4, Requirements for Federal Personnel Manual and FPM Supplement 335-1: Eval. of Employees for Promotion and Internal Placement.

CHANGE No. 1

HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON, DC *15 December 1983*

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEES FOR PROMOTION AND INTERNAL PLACEMENT

Effective upon receipt

1. AR 690–335–1 is changed as indicated below. The pages transmitted by this change are to be interfiled with appendix B of FPM Supplement 335–1. Insert new pages B–1 through B–2.

2. File this transmittal sheet in front of FPM Supplement 335–1.

3. Army regulations in the 690 series that are interfiled with the Federal Personnel Manual use the following mechanical aids to assist readers:

a. When revised pages are issued—

(1) New or changed material is indicated by a right-hand arrow (⧫) at the beginning and a left-hand arrow (⧫) at the end.

(2) The deletion of part of a paragraph is indicated by 2 stars (★).

(3) The deletion of an entire paragraph is indicated by a line of stars.

b. A row of five asterisks (*) is used to alert the reader that, at that point, there is material in the FPM that HQDA is not supplementing.

c. A double dagger (‡) appearing before the major division (i.e., chapter, subchapter, paragraph, or subparagraph) means there is no corresponding division in the FPM.

4. The latest installment to FPM Supplement 335–1 at the time this change was forwarded for publication was number 6 dated 20 August 1982.

*This change supersedes HQDA Letter 690–82–37, 13 December 1982.

The proponent agency of this regulation is the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) directly to HQDA(DAPE–CPR), WASH DC 20310.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

JOHN A. WICKHAM, JR.
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:
ROBERT M. JOYCE
Major General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

Distribution:
Active Army, ARNG, USAR: To be distributed in accordance with DA Form 12–4 requirements for Federal Personnel Manual.

To be filed with FPM Supplement 335-1

Evaluation of Employees for Promotion and Internal Placement

Contents

★ ★

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER S3. Responsibility for Approval of Evaluation Procedures

S3-1. General

★ ★

* * * * *

S3-3. Evaluation Procedures Requiring Specific Office of Personnel Management Approval

* * * * *

★ ★

APPENDIX B. Guidelines for Evaluating Employees for Promotion and Internal Placement

To be Filed with FPM Supplement 335-1

Subchapter S1. Introduction.

S1-2. Applicability.

Each staff and operating CPO will assess its evaluation procedures at least once each year to determine the impact on minorities and women. Use racial, sex, and ethnic data from agency records to compute adverse impact on agency employees. Collect and analyze similiar data on outside candidates per OPM guidance. Use the "four fifths rule" as an initial indicator that adverse impact may exist in a selection procedure. The "four fifths rule" is explained in appendix A in the answers to questions 10 thru 25 (beginning on page 61). Twenty to 30 selections are enough to obtain needed data in applying the "four fifths rule." When fewer than this number occur in the year, data from use of the "four fifths rule" may not be as meaningful. Therefore, review the procedures, using rational judgment for obvious areas where bars exist and those bars may be removed or confirmed. When procedures cause discrimination, analyze each part of the procedure and determine the causes(s). Confirm or replace such procedures in favor of others which do not result in adverse impact. Advise HQDA(PECC-FS) of mandatory requirements of law or OPM regulation which cause an adverse impact.

To be Filed with FPM Supplement 335-1

Subchapter S2. Responsibility for Proper Use of Evaluation Procedures.

S2-1. Agency Responsibilities.

Each staff and operating CPO will take needed action to improve the quality and validity of evaluation methods.

S2-2. Need for technical competence.

Commanders to whom authority has been delegated for personnel management, through the COPs designated to act for them, are responsible for insuring that—

a. Personnel involved in the development, administration, and evaluation of programs, plans, procedures, and methods for promotions and related placement actions have the needed technical competence.

b. Wherever required, special training is provided to insure such technical competence.

To be filed with FPM Supplement 335-1

Subchapter S3. Responsibility for Approval of Evaluation Procedures

S3-1. General

* * * * *

d. ➡Each staff and operating CPO will assess selection procedures used and document the determinations made on each procedure. The review will include the impact of evaluation procedures on minorities and women. When overall procedures cause discrimination, analyze each part of the procedure to determine the cause(s) in order to determine if such procedures should be changed or eliminated. Advise HQDA(PECC-CM) of mandatory requirements of law or OPM regulations which cause an adverse impact. ⬅

* * * * *

★ ★

S3-3. Evaluation Procedures Requiring Specific Office of Personnel Management Approval

* * * * *

b. Submit requests for approval through MACOM to ➡HQDA(PECC-CM), ALEX, VA 22332-0300.⬅

To be Filed With FPM Supplement 335-1

Subchapter S7. Review of the Personnel Measurement Program.

S7-1. General.

a. Within DA, each staff and operating personnel office will annually review selection procedures used and document the determinations made on each procedure.

b. HQDA(PECC-PE) Survey Teams will review a selected sample of selected procedures to confirm that they have been properly developed, documented, approved, and applied.

c. HQDA may review procedures developed by staff and operating civilian personnel offices and approve or disapprove their continued use.

To Be Filed With FPM Supplement 335-1

APPENDIX B

Guidelines for Evaluating Employees for Promotion and Internal Placement

B-1. INTRODUCTION

This appendix clarifies current minimum required procedures for evaluating candidates for promotion and internal placement. These procedures cover evaluation based on knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA). Any candidate evaluation procedure that meets the needs of the activity and that complies with regulatory requirements may be used; however, KSA-based procedures are generally used within the Department of the Army (DA).

* * * * *

→B-4. OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

a. **General.**

* * * * *

(2) Combining screening and ranking. Simplified candidate evaluation procedures may be used when there are 10 or fewer candidates who meet minimum qualifications. However, the ease and timeliness of preparing referral lists under simplified procedures must not be a basis for avoiding the affirmative action process. Therefore, prior to using such procedures, recruitment efforts must be expanded when the work force composition and a review of past merit promotion actions indicate a scarcity of qualified applicants from underrepresented groups.

‡(3) When applying simplified candidate evaluation procedures, all candidates who are determined to be high quality may be referred as the best qualified without assigning scores. High-quality candidates are those who, in the rater's judgment, possess the KSA identified by a job analysis. When making high-quality determinations, the performance appraisal must be used by any one or combination of the following:

(*a*) As a screenout to determine basic eligibility for promotion. Under this method, initial consideration may be given to candidates who have a rating of at least fully successful on their performance appraisal. It is not permissible, however, to group candidates initially on the basis of ratings higher than fully successful (i.e., highly successful or exceptional ratings). When candidates do not have a current performance appraisal, a fully successful rating may be presumed as long as there is no known adverse performance information. Appraisals may be used to this extent without regard to specific matching of KSA.

(*b*) As one of the evaluation instruments for making high-quality judgments.

(*c*) For review by the selecting official during the selection process.←

* * * * *

B-5. STEPS IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluation must include the following four elements:

a. Job analysis.
b. Evaluation instruments.
c. Crediting plan.
d. Documentation.

* * * * *

B-7. NEED FOR ANALYSIS ON JOBS

a. →**Importance of job analysis.**←

Candidate evaluation procedures must be based on a job analysis (5 CFR 300.103). The job analysis, as well as the criteria developed, may cover a single position or a group of positions with common characteristics. If a job analysis has been completed and the documentation is still accurate, a later analysis need not be as thorough.

b. →**Scope of job analysis.**←

The evaluation criteria developed in the job analysis must go beyond the standards for determining basic eligibility, but they must not exceed those expected of the grade of the job.

* * * * *

→‡*d.* **Subject matter expert.**←

At least one subject matter expert (SME) must provide information for the job analysis that is con-

ducted by the personnel specialist. The SME must be knowledgeable of the requirements of the job to be filled. In some situations the personnel specialist may be an SME of the job to be analyzed. Reliability may be improved and additional job information may be obtained by using more than one SME; however, this is not required.

→‡*e.* **Documentation.**←

Documentation of the job analysis is essential to show that the candidate evaluation procedures are job related. The documentation must include—

(1) The principal tasks, duties, or responsibilities of the position.

(2) The KSA needed to carry out those tasks, duties, or responsibilities.

(3) Identification of the KSA that must be brought to the job and the KSA that may be learned or developed on the job.

(4) Identification of the KSA that will distinguish high quality from marginal or average performers.

(5) Identification of selective placement factors, if any, and the justification for their use.

B-8. TYPES OF EVALUATION METHODS

a.→**A variety of methods are available for evaluating qualifications.**←

When the evaluation criteria are identified, determine appropriate evaluation instruments (measures of qualifications). Examples of evaluation instruments are evaluation of training and experience; written, oral, and performance tests; interviews; performance appraisals; and assessment centers.

(1) The instruments chosen must—

(*a*) Provide information specifically related to the KSA of the job to be filled.

(*b*) Provide a valid measure of the KSA needed for high quality performance in the job to be filled.

(*c*) Make meaningful distinctions among candidates based on expected performance.

(*d*) Be practical and feasible in the terms of cost, time, and ease of administration.

(2) Multiple measures of qualifications (e.g., supervisory appraisals, assessment centers, performance tests, etc.) must be used to determine the best qualified candidates (FPM Supplement 335-1, para S4-1.b).

b.→**Evaluation of training, education and experience.**←

Although evaluation of training, experience, and education is not required to be used as one of the multiple measures, it is often used within DA to evaluate the candidate's level of KSA. Training, experience, and education provide opportunities, to increase knowledge or improve skills and abilities.

(1) In evaluating training, experience, and education, determine how well these have prepared the candidate for the job to be filled. Evaluate the type and quality of training, experience, and education the candidate has relative to the requirements of the job to be filled.

(2) Purely quantitative factors such as length of experience or amount of education may be used only when there is a clear and positive relationship to quality of performance. Some examples are increases in accuracy, speed or performance, and quality of workmanship. Unless there is evidence that a specific amount of education or training or a specific length of experience produces the required knowledge, abilities, or skills (and any lesser amount does not), it is not appropriate to use length or amount of experience as a criterion factor. (This does not rule out using length of service or length of experience as a tie breaker, if provided for in the merit placement plan or in the negotiated agreement.)

(3) At least one level of demonstrated possession of each KSA must be included in a rating guide. This level may be described as part of the KSA definition, a separate statement describing the necessary level of KSA, or description of various levels of performance of each KSA. Fewer rating levels result in fewer distinctions that can be made among candidates; this causes more ties. For a large number of candidates, it would be appropriate to have more levels so that real distinctions can be made.

* * * * *

→‡*g.* **Evaluating awards.**←

When evaluating awards, determine if the supporting justification gives information about the candidate's KSA that relates to requirements of the job to be filled. A mechanical system of crediting awards is not a substitute for this judgment and may not be used.

* * * * *

‡B-16. CREDITING PLAN

a. The crediting plan is a documented summary

of the developed candidate evaluation methods for a specific job or a number of similar jobs. Crediting plans must be developed and used for each position or group of positions to be filled. Also these plans must become part of the placement record. The documentation must include—

(1) Basic qualification standard to be applied.

(2) Position descriptions of the jobs covered by the plan.

(3) The evaluation criteria to determine candidates' qualifications.

(4) The evaluation methods to be used and the rating guides. Indicate how evaluations will be made for each criterion. A rating guide describes how scores, ➡ if used, or judgments will be assigned for KSA rating levels. (Note that judgments must always be documented, but assignment of scores is not required when evaluating candidates for promotion.)⬅

(5) How information resulting from applying each evaluation method will be combined for a final rating ➡ or judgment ⬅ for each candidate.

(6) Tie breaking factors, if any.

(7) Description of the method for ranking candidates.

(8) The complete job analysis documentation.

(9) The name, title, series, and grade of each person who provided information for the job analysis.

(10) The name, title, series, and grade of each person who participated in developing the rating guides.

b. First evaluate (rate) basically eligible candidates against the high quality performance criteria, then rank these candidates in order of relative merit to identify the best qualified. The best qualified are qualified candidates who rank at the top when compared with other eligible candidates (FPM chapter 335). Intermediate steps such as determination of "highly qualified" are not required. ➡Candidates can be ranked into quality groups without assigning numerical scores.⬅

c. Identify in the merit placement folder the name, title, series, and grade of the personnel specialist and SME, if any, who participated in the rating and ranking of candidates.

‡B-17. DOCUMENTATION

Each merit placement folder will include the required documentation described in paragraph B-16. The documentation will allow a complete audit and reconstruction of the action by an independent reviewer. If the documentation is not included, state where the documentation can be located. Data on sex, race and national origin of applicants should be maintained for analysis, as required, by the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures.*

★★

*U.S. Government Printing Office: 1993 — 342-074/92240