



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
333 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

SAMPLE

CESPX-DE

MEMORANDUM FOR (COL) *(name)*, (Acting) Commander, South Pacific Division

SUBJECT: Recommended Selection for *(Position Title)*, GS-*(Series)*-*(Grade)*, *(Organization Title)*, Referral *(Number)*, issued *(Date)*

1. References:

- a. ER 690-1-1203, 1 August 2001, Subject: Corporate Recruitment and Selection
- b. OPM Referral List Number: *(cite)*
- c. Resumix Referral List Number: *(cite)*

2. The purpose of this memo is to provide results of recruitment and recommend selection of *(Title, series, grade, and employing location)* for subject position. (Background: This vacancy stems from *(state reason for vacancy)*). For the reasons articulated at TAB A, I recommend that you select Mr./Ms. *(name, employment location, series, and grade)* as first choice with Mr./Ms. *(name, employment location, series, and grade)* as an alternate. Resumes of first choice and alternate are also at TAB A.

Approved

Disapproved

See Me

3. As required by referenced ER, I approved the recruitment and selection strategy, including the selection criteria used to develop the referral list. TAB B contains the recruitment strategy. This position was open four weeks to federal (status) candidates and four weeks to private sector (non-status) candidates. The referral list (TAB C) contained *(number)* status candidates, *(number)* were minorities and *(number)* were women. *(Number)* were from Army; *(number)* were from outside Army. The OPM Certificate of Eligibles contained *(number)* candidates. *(Number)* were from Army; *(number)* were from outside Army.

4. Upon receipt of the referral list, I chaired a selection panel (TAB D) that used the approved selection criteria (TAB E.) Each member of the selection panel independently evaluated all referred candidates based on available information, e.g., resume. The panel consolidated the names into a list of *(number)* finalists for further consideration (*explain process for determining break point.*) The panel's evaluation is at TAB F.

5. Interviews, selection panel, and Leadership Competency Interviews were offered to *(number)* candidates. The selection panel interviewed the top *(number)* candidates utilizing the interview questions approved by the chair (TAB E). Names of candidates interviewed and the results of the panel's evaluation are at TAB F. TAB F reflects the consideration given to the non-selected candidates. Based on the records presented, the results of the leadership interview, the responses to the questions asked by the selection panel, and the recommendations of past and present supervisors, we recommend, *(Name)*. Our rationale for recommending this individual is at TAB

A. (*TAB A must provide a discussion of the leadership of the recommended selectee and alternate(s), to include where they fall in the three Leadership Competency categories in comparison with all candidates interviewed.*) An alternate selection has been recommended and is at TAB A. I request approval to move to the first and second alternate without additional approval in the case of declinations.

6. The EEO Officer, (*Name, grade, employing activity*), and HR Officer, (*Name, grade, employing activity*) served as observers and advisors concerning the evaluation and selection processes to be used. The panel believes the processes were very thorough, independent, fair to all applicants, and used job-related criteria to determine the candidates to be interviewed.

7. The POC for additional information is (*Name, location, and telephone number.*)

(*SIGNATURE BLOCK OF PANEL CHAIR*)

SAMPLE

Table of Contents

(Title) of (Org), GS-(Grade)
SPX District

<u>Document(s)</u>	<u>TAB</u>
Rationale for Recommended Selectee (including resume of selectee and alternate(s))	A
Recruitment Strategy (including Resumix Announcement, OPM Announcement, Position Description, and RPA)	B
Referral Lists (both from Resumix and OPM announcements)	C
Selection Panel	D
Selection Criteria (including Panel Instructions, Screening Criteria and Interview Questions)	E
Panel Evaluation Matrices (and remainder of Candidate Resumes and ER 690-1-1203 – Corporate Recruitment and Selection Regulation for reference)	F

SUBJECT: Recommended Selection for SPX (*Position Title*) of (*Org*), GS-(*Grade*)

1. Candidates. Both resumix and OPM announcements were open for four weeks. This resulted in (*number*) candidates, (*number*) on each referral.

2. Selection Process.

a. Screening criteria. The panel used a two-stage process to select the best-qualified candidates from the (*total number*) referred candidates for further evaluation.

(1) Minimum Qualifications. All candidates met the minimum qualification at the GS-(*Grade*) or had equivalent private industry experience.

(2) Job Experience and Credentials. The panel individually rank-ordered the (*number*) resumes by evaluating each application packet against predetermined criteria (Tab E). The panel determined (*number*) were not well-qualified and (*number*) declined further consideration. The panel decided the remaining (*number*) were all deserving of an interview:

NAME	SERIES/GRADE	POSITION TITLE	EMPLOYER
Candidate 1 (<i>name</i>)	GS-0801-14	Chief, (<i>cite title</i>)	USACE, SPA
Candidate 2 (<i>name</i>)	GS-0801-14	Supv, (<i>cite title</i>)	USACE, POD
Candidate 3 (<i>name</i>)	GS-0340-13	Lead (<i>cite title</i>)	HQ, USACE
Candidate 4 (<i>name</i>)	GS-0810-14	Chief, (<i>cite title</i>)	USACE, SPN
Candidate 5 (<i>name</i>)	GS-0340-14	Chief, (<i>cite title</i>)	USACE, SPK
Candidate 6 (<i>name</i>)	GS-0801-14	Chief, (<i>cite title</i>)	USACE, SPL

b. Evaluation Criteria. The panel used a three-stage process to evaluate the best-qualified candidates.

(1) Job Experience and Credentials. The panel discussed the qualification and experience of the candidates and evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of each, again using the criteria in Tab E. The results are in paragraph 3, below.

(2) Interview Process. Prior to the panel meeting on (*date*), panel members developed a set of questions to pose to each candidate during the structured interview process (Tab E.) The panel designed the questions to draw responses about: (*Cite key areas here, e.g., planning, engineering or construction expertise, leadership, teamwork, communication, budget, meeting goals, diversity, and problem solving.*) Using the insights gained from the interview, the panel discussed and determined a panel consensus on each finalist's strengths and weaknesses. The results are in paragraph 3, below.

- (3) Leadership Competency Results. Each finalist was give the Leadership Competency interview. Results are in paragraph 3, below.

3. Analysis – in Final Rank Order by Panel

a. *(Name of Candidate)*

(1) Job Qualifications and Experience.

Strengths: PE and DAWIA Level III, served in four districts. Broad and diverse experience.

Weaknesses:

(2) Interview Results.

Strengths: Leadership of diverse organization; strong leadership and supervisory experience, calm demeanor; and integrity. “Train your people” is number one priority. Supervisor since 1981 – no grievances. Solid answers. Listens to opinions before making a decision. Sees workforce diversity as a broad term. Scientific, for example. Recruits for racial/sexual as best as he/she can in rural area. Broad experience in Construction, Operations, Engineering.

Neutral: Willingness to accept based on family concerns.

Weaknesses: Limited recent experience in planning.

(3) Gallup Results. Mr./Ms. *(name)* was rated “qualified” overall. He/she rated “best qualified” in Relationships; “highly qualified” in Drive to Execute; and “highly qualified” in Direction and Management.

b. *(Name of Candidate)*

(1) Job Qualifications and Experience.

Strengths: Strong civil works and water resources experience – varied proven/demonstrated success in delivering challenging projects. Has Con-Ops and Engineering experience.

Weaknesses: No Planning experience.

(2) Interview Results.

Strengths: Experience in Corps and District; calm, well thought-through responses. Demonstrated leadership – strong understanding of regional approach. Strong advocate of regional approach. Re: Operating Budget: would assert himself deliberately. Civil Works experience: Twenty-four years in Civil Works. Ability to analyze situations and deal with variety of staff. Re: Workforce Diversity: Encourage people to apply.

Neutral: Details of examples not given.

Weaknesses: No long-term leadership experience for large organization; some responses could have discussed details of examples.

(3) Leadership Competency Results. Mr./Ms (*name*) was rated “qualified” overall. He/she rated “highly qualified” in Relationships; “highly qualified” in Drive to Execute; and “highly qualified” in Direction and Management.

c. (*Name of Candidate*)

(1) Job Qualifications and Experience.

Strengths: Corps experience. Over twenty years in diverse areas: Engineering and Planning.

Weaknesses:

(2) Interview Results.

Strengths: Corps experience and maturity, background and experience.

Neutral: Specific examples old.

Weaknesses: Technical, citing specific example, examples were often dated.

(3) Leadership Competency Results. Mr./Ms (*name*) was rated “qualified” overall. He rated “highly qualified” in Relationships; “highly qualified” in Drive to Execute; and “qualified” in Direction and Management.

d. (*Name of Candidate*)

(1) Job Qualifications and Experience.

Strengths: Divisional/Big Picture experience; planning experience. Believes must have a strong middle management team. Would have weekly meetings. Workforce diversity can be different beliefs/philosophy.

Weaknesses: Limited specific examples. Leadership experience limited.

(2) Interview Results.

Strengths: Planning experience, but didn't elaborate.

Weaknesses: Impression is competent technical leader (probably Branch Chief) but question leadership at senior level of large organization. Much focus of examples on (XYZ) Project; very little meat on interview responses.

(3) Leadership Competency Results. Mr./Ms. (*name*) was rated “qualified” overall. He/she rated “highly qualified” in Relationships; “qualified” in Drive to Execute; and “highly qualified” in Direction and Management.

e. *(Name of Candidate)*

(1) Job Qualifications and Experience.

Strengths: MSC in Engineering. PE Private Sector Experience; Professional presentations and publications.

Weaknesses: Limited experience in leading large organizations and limited federal experience.

(2) Interview Results.

Strengths: Diverse background. Construction experience. Strong writing skills. Private and public experience.

Weaknesses: Lack of experience as DA Civilian. Discussed details of projects he/she worked on, but little discussion of his/her roles in contributions (with few specifics); no examples that showed how his/her skills and leadership moved organizations forward.

(3) Leadership Competency Results. Mr./Ms. *(name)* was rated “qualified” overall. He/She rated “qualified” in Relationships; “highly qualified” in Drive to Execute; and “highly qualified” in Direction and Management.

f. *(Name of Candidate)*

(1) Job Qualifications and Experience.

Strengths: Strong civil works experience; demonstrated team leadership (successful); various assignments across (XYZ) programs.

Weaknesses: Lack of supervisory experience; especially large organizations.

(2) Interview Results.

Strengths: Sees the big picture; relationship building; relationship and team building skills, customer oriented, familiar with HQ’s programs. Focuses on teamwork. Balances workload/resources.

Weaknesses: Specific examples of technical issue resolution; limited leadership/budget experience. Lack of supervisory and lead of large organization came through in weak responses.

(3) Leadership Competency Results. Mr./Ms. *(name)* was rated “qualified” overall. He/she rated “qualified” in Relationships; “qualified” in Drive to Execute; and “qualified” in Direction and Management.

4. Overall Comparison of Candidates.

- a. Job Qualification and Experience. (insert names below using ><= symbols to compare candidates from strongest to weakest for each element)

Personnel Management

Candidate 4=Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 5>Candidate 6

Program Expertise

Candidate 4=Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 6>Candidate 5

Regional Expert

Candidate 4=Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 6>Candidate 5

Familiarity w/SPD Mission issues

Candidate 4=Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 6>Candidate 5

Awards/Self Development

Candidate 4=Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 5>Candidate 6

Overall Job Qualification and Experience

Candidate 4=Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 6>Candidate 5

- b. Interview.

Content

Candidate 4=Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 6>Candidate 5

Delivery

Candidate 4>Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3=Candidate 6>Candidate 5

Overall Interview

Candidate 4>Candidate 2>Candidate 1>Candidate 3>Candidate 6=Candidate 5

- a. Leadership Competency Results

Leadership Competency rated Candidate 4 (*name*) and Candidate 2 (*name*) as Highly Qualified and Candidate 1 (*name*) as Qualified.

5. Conclusion. The panel concludes that composite ranking of candidates is as follows. Mr./Ms. (*name*), Mr./Ms. (*name*), Mr./Ms. (*name*), Mr./Ms. (*name*) Mr./Ms. (*name*), (tied for fourth) and Mr./Ms. (*name*). The panel further concludes that Mr./Ms (*name*) (first choice) and Mr./Ms. (*name*) (alternate) are particularly suited for the position of (*Title*) of (*Cite*) Division, GS- (*Grade*).

(SIGNATURE BLOCK OF PANEL CHAIR)

SAMPLE

Recruitment Strategy
(Title), of (Org), GS-(Grade)
SPX District

CE Corporate Selection policy processes were followed in this fill action. Army opened a Resumix announcement (for federal, status candidates) from (date) until (date). (Number) candidates were referred. OPM opened an announcement (for private sector, non-status candidates) from (date) until (date). (Number) candidates were referred.

Both announcements were interdisciplinary in nature to maximize the number of qualifying candidates. Qualifying series were (cite, e.g., 0101, 0401, 0801, and 1301.)

The referral list (TAB C) contained (number) status candidates, (number) were minorities and (number) were women. (Number) were from Army; (number) were from outside Army. The OPM Certificate of Eligibles contained (number) candidates. (Number) were from Army; (number) were from outside Army.

Behind this, place copies of the Resumix Announcement, OPM Announcement, Position Description, and RPA.

Insert

Resumix

And

OPM

Referral

Lists

Here



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
333 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

SAMPLE

CESPX-DE

(date)

MEMORANDUM FOR: Panel Members for SPX (*Title*), of (*Org*), GS-(*Grade*)

SUBJECT: Panel Instructions

1. PURPOSE: This memorandum and attachments will serve as panel instructions to select the best-qualified job applicants for the subject position through thorough and fair evaluation, using job related criteria.
2. The selection process will follow the guidance set forth in CEHR Memorandum dated 1 August 2001, SUBJECT: Corporate Recruitment and Selection. The Recruitment Strategy is as shown on Encl 1.
3. The following have agreed to serve on the subject panel:
 - a. Selection Panel Chair – Rank/Mr./Ms. (*name*)
 - b. Rank/Mr./Ms. (*name*) (SPX-DE)
 - c. Mr./Ms. (*name*) (SES/SPX)
 - d. Mr./Ms. (*name*) (SES/HQ)
 - e. Mr./Ms. (*name*) (SPX/DPPM)
 - f. EEO Representative – Mr./Ms. (*name*) Advisory only – non-voting member
 - g. HR Representative – Mr./Ms. (*name*) Advisory only – non-voting member
4. This position will be filled from the group of qualified, interested/available candidates received in response to our recruitment efforts. Hard copies of the interested candidates' resumes are being distributed along with this memo.
5. As stated in Encl 1, Panel Chair's Instructions on the Selection Process, place the candidates on each certificate in rank order, from (OPM) 1 (best) to (*number referred*), and (Resumix) 1 to (*number referred*), based on each candidate's resume.
6. The interviews will be conducted using questions previously approved by the panel chair or modified by agreement of the panel. Each panel member will individually rate each question for each applicant. After all interviews have been completed, the panel will discuss each interviewed candidate's response to determine the final rank order, and the final matrix will be prepared. The names and rankings, along with recommendations, will be forwarded to (*name*), the selection official, for final action.

CESPX-DE

SUBJECT: Panel Instructions

Encls

(SIGNATURE BLOCK OF PANEL CHAIR)

SAMPLE

Panel Chair's Instructions on the Selection Process for
Title, Org, Series, Grade
SPX District

I. Two-Fold Mission

1. Select the best-qualified candidate.
2. Document the process so that those not selected can receive proper career counseling, if requested.

II. Two-Phase Process

1. Each Stage of the process will be done in three steps.

Step 1. Review and discuss criteria.

Step 2. Individually rate the candidates.

Step 3. Discuss individual ratings and come up with a group consensus as to the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate (analysis) and how each candidate ranks against the others, by criteria (comparison).

2. Phase I

Stage 1. Rank order the candidates in direct comparison to each other from one to (*number*)/one to (*number*) on each candidate's resume. Use the Screening Criteria to evaluate and identify the top candidates.

Stage 2. As a group armed with work done individually in Stage 1, above, come up with a consensus on the overall ranking to determine the top candidates from the lower candidates. If a substantial gap exists between the top and lower candidates, only the top candidates will proceed to Phase II.

3. Phase II

Stage 1: The interview will be conducted using questions previously approved by the panel chair or modified by agreement of the panel.

Stage 2: Interview Process. Take notes individually throughout the interview. At the end of each interview, come up with a group evaluation of how each candidate fared in each questions (+ or -). After all interviews, compare candidates to each other, question-by-question.

Stage 3. The panel will discuss each candidate's personal interview to determine the final rank order and the final matrix will be prepared.

Enclosure 1

III. Documentation

--Final Matrix, Panel Instruction, Screening Criteria, Interview Questions, Recruitment Strategy, Panel Recommendations.

--The Analysis portion of the recommendation will include a write-up of recommended candidate and an alternate candidate.

IV. Principles to Remember

--To ensure objectivity, you will not use knowledge about any candidates(s) gained outside of the process we are about to embark on. If you cannot objectively divorce yourself from past relationships with any candidate(s), it is your duty to disqualify yourself from this selection panel.

--This is a combination of individual deliberation, group discussion, and group decision process.

--This is a qualitative, not a quantitative, process whose objectivity is ensured by the measurement of individuals against agreed upon standards (criteria). It is important that everyone has a good understanding of each criterion before proceeding to each step. Only after each candidate has been measured against the criteria (analysis) that they will be rank-ordered (comparison.)

--You are not at liberty to discuss the process or the proceedings, until after the results have been officially announced by the SPD Commander. Even then you are at liberty to discuss only the group consensus, not any individual panel member's analysis, comparisons, or recommendations.

V. Schedule

Phase 1. NLT than (*date*), provide SPD-DE your initial rank order based on criteria provided.

Phase 2. Pre-interview panel meeting (*date*).
Interviews (*date*).
Selection Recommendation NLT (*date*).

SAMPLE

**Position Title, Series, Grade
Organization
Duty Location**

Screening Criteria

1. Experience in working with (*cite examples*):

Examples: Federal, state, and/or local real estate, environmental planning laws, engineering practices, regulations in acquisition, appraisal, management, and disposal of real property and related functions; and various other control functions including planning, programming, budgeting practices, principles, methods, and techniques and sales in the management of a real estate programs, environmental, engineering, etc.

2. Scope/breadth of Experience (*cite examples*):

Examples: Executing responsibilities in a senior management position with requirements to interact with higher-level management, at various government levels and a wide customer base (i.e., at various levels of an organizational structure).

3. Leadership/managerial experience (*cite examples*):

Examples:

- a. *Supervisory experience (demonstrated/potential)*
- b. *Management of specific programs in (functional area) of vacancy*
- c. *Training*
- d. *Ability to lead people to execute large programs*
- e. *Team leader assignments*
- f. *Experience in employee development, EEO, diversity, and employee relations*

4. Regional/interagency interface (*cite examples*):

Examples: Federal, state, local organizations

5. Self development (*cite examples*):

Examples:

- a. *Relevant technical training*
- b. *Developmental assignments*
- c. *Papers/presentations*
- d. *Professional societies*
- e. *Advanced degrees*

6.. Awards/recognition (job related) (*cite examples*):

Examples:

- a. *Performance appraisal assessment*
- b. *Performance awards*

Panel Chair Name/Title

Date

SAMPLE
Interview Questions
(Position Title) of (Org), GS-(Grade)
SPX District

Asked by Panel Chair/Member – (*name*)

1. What is your primary area of planning, engineering or construction expertise? Briefly describe a significant issue which you have dealt with in this particular area. Explain how it was resolved and how you think it should have been resolved. Give your rationale.

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

2. Please tell us about a specific time in your career that you have failed. What did you learn from it?

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

3. Please tell us about a specific situation (or event) when your leadership abilities served you well.

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

4. The (*cite*) Division has over 100 personnel assigned (with skills ranging from civil engineers, environmental scientists, hydrographic surveyors, and economists) in two different locations. How would you proceed in leading this organization given its diverse composition and geographic dispersion?

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

5. Given the importance of teamwork in both hierarchical and multi-disciplinary organizations, please articulate how you would ensure the (*cite*) District's (*cite*) Division works as part of a regional (South Pacific Division – A major subordinate command with four Districts) and District Team?

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

6. Please tell us about a specific situation (or event) when your written or oral communication skills served you well?

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

7. Chief, (*cite*) Division, how would you assert yourself as the supervising manager of the Division's operating budget? This involves diverse aspects such as supervisory overhead costs; labor base management; training expenses; computer hardware and software acquisition; employee recognition, awards, recruitment and promotion.

SAMPLE – cont.
Interview Questions
(Position Title) of (Org), GS-(Grade)
SPX District
(Cont.)

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

8. The District's mission is to plan, design, construct and operate public works projects for the region that balance both economic development and environmental sustainability. What specific strengths do you bring to this position that will contribute to the accomplishment of that mission?

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

9. How would you accomplish obtaining the necessary support of the other Divisions within the District in order to successfully execute your Division's program/requirements? In addition, please explain how you have resolved a difference of opinion on a technical/scientific or programmatic issue between yourself and a peer (or more senior) technician, engineer or scientist?

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

10. What is your understanding of "workforce diversity" and how do you see your role in supporting this concept? Cite any past accomplishments as an example of your role.

Asked by Panel Chair/Member (*name*)

11. Is there anything you would like to elaborate on, given the questions we have asked, or is there anything else you would like for us to consider? If offered this position will you accept?

SAMPLE

Screening Process Results of Resume CESPX, (*Position Title*) of (*Org*), GS-(*Grade*)

Factor 1 – Personnel Management - Ability to mentor, supervise and train personnel at two locations with varying experience levels in planning, design, environmental assessment, economic analysis, and construction oversight in program / project management and civil works authorities. Ability to develop, plan and execute the civil works programs for (*cite*) District.

Factor 2 – Program Expertise - Ability to serve as the program manager and senior SPX advisor and leader on planning, design, environmental assessment, economic analysis, and construction oversight, to include program funding, execution priorities, policy, authorities, economic issues, manpower, and program trends. Ability to evaluate qualifications and select AE firms and to serve as COR on appropriate AE contracts.

Factor 3 – Regional Expert - Ability to represent SPX's interests and concerns on regional/national committees and efforts related to the civil works programs.

Factor 4 - Familiarity with the political, economic and social issues affecting USACE missions in the (*cite*) District and South Pacific Division.

Factor 5 - Awards/Self Development that strengthens overall qualifications: Advanced Degree (1 pt); Professional Registration (1 pt); Professional Associations and/or significant Publications related to the position (1 pt); Long Term Training or Developmental Assignments related to the position (1 pt); Significant awards related to the position (1 pt).

For Factors 1-4, assign points according to the following scale:

5 – Demonstrated experience/ability to perform directly related to this position's requirements

3 – Demonstrated experience/ability related to similar activities

1 – Potential to develop ability based on previous similar experience

0 – No experience/Unable to determine from resume

OPM Candidates	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Total
OPM Candidate 1 –N/A						Not Well-Qual
OPM Candidate 2						
OPM Candidate 3 –N/A						Not Well-Qual
OPM Candidate 4– N/A						Not Well-Qual
OPM Candidate 5						

Resumix Candidates	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Total
R. Candidate 1						
R. Candidate 2						
R. Candidate 3						
R. Candidate 4 – N/A						Declined (<i>date</i>)
R. Candidate 5						
R. Candidate 6						

SAMPLE

CESPX, (*Position Title*), of (*Org*), GS-(*Grade*)
Resume Screening Process Results – in Rank Order

	Panel Chair	Panel Member	Panel Member	Panel Member	Panel Member	Total	Recommend for next step?
Cand. 1	23	23	20	13	21	100	Yes
Cand. 2	24	18	13	22	19	96	Yes
Cand. 3	20	19	19	20	15	93	Yes
Cand. 4	22	21	16	19	13	91	Yes
Cand. 5	21	19	19	15	11	85	Yes
Cand. 6	23	20	9	19	9	80	Yes

Individual Point Totals by Factors

Candidates	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Total
Candidate 1	22	21	23	25	9	100
Candidate 2	24	20	14	12	23	93
Candidate 3	21	16	17	14	12	80
Candidate 4	13	19	25	20	8	85
Candidate 5	24	19	18	14	21	96
Candidate 6	21	15	18	21	16	91

Ranking of “Factor Winners”

Each number in the column under factor headings indicates each individual’s placing for that factor

Candidates	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Final (Same as Above)
Candidate 1	3	1	2	1	5	1st
Candidate 2	1	2	6	6	1	3rd
Candidate 3	4	5	5	4	4	6th
Candidate 4	6	3	1	3	6	5th
Candidate 5	1	3	3	4	2	2nd
Candidate 6	4	6	3	2	3	4th

Initial Interview Screening Results – in Rank Order

Cand.	Panel Chair	Panel Member	Panel Member	Panel Member	Panel Member	Total	Ranking was 1 st to 6 th
Cand. 1	2	1	1	2	1	7	so low score
Cand. 2	1	2	2	3	2	10	“wins.”
Cand. 3	4	4	3	1	3	15	
Cand. 4	3	3	4	5	4	19	
Cand. 5	5	5	6	4	4	24	
Cand. 6	6	6	5	6	6	29	

Sample Final Matrix of Panel Evaluation

(POSITION TITLE, SERIES & GRADE)

CANDIDATE LIST	Panel Chair Name	Panel Member Name	Panel Member Name	Panel Member Name	Panel Member Name	OVERALL SUM Pre-Interview	INTERVIEW	LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW RANKING	SELECTION PANEL CONSENSUS AFTER INTERVIEWS
APPLICANT 1	10	3	5	9	10	37 (7)	NO		--
APPLICANT 2	1	2	2	1	1	7 (1)	YES	TIER 3	2— First Alternate
APPLICANT 3	2	1	3	2	2	10 (2)	YES	TIER 1	1—SELECT
APPLICANT 4	9	10	9	8	8	44 (10)	NO		--
APPLICANT 5	5	9	10	4	9	37 (7)	NO		--
APPLICANT 6	8	8	7	7	7	37 (7)	NO		Not Ranked Further
APPLICANT 7	4	7	6	6	5	28 (5)	YES	TIER 3	Not Ranked Further
APPLICANT 8	6	5	8	10	6	35 (6)	NO		--
APPLICANT 9	3	4	4	3	3	17 (3)	YES	TIER 2	3— Second Alternate
APPLICANT 10	7	6	1	5	4	23 (4)	YES	TIER 3	Not Ranked Further

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Washington, DC 20314-1000

ER 690-1-1203

CEHR-E

Regulation
No. 690-1-1203

1 August 2001

Civilian Personnel
CORPORATE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

Supplementation to this regulation is permitted but not required. If supplements are issued, USACE Commanders will provide a copy of their supplement to HQUSACE (CEHR-E), WASH, DC 20314-1000 through chain of command channels.

1. **Purpose.** The purpose of this regulation is to provide guidance which will ensure effective implementation of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers corporate recruitment and selection policy for GS-15 and Supervisory GS-14 (or equivalent) positions. It includes positions in the Laboratory Demonstration Project. It does not apply to wage grade positions. Commanders may develop policy applicable to Supervisory GS-13 positions by supplementation of this regulation.

2. **Applicability.** This regulation applies to all HQUSACE elements and all USACE commands. Policies and procedures for the selection of attorneys are set forth in DoD Directive 1442.2, AR 690-200, Chapter 213, and the USACE Supplement (Appendix D) to that Army regulation. To the extent that those attorney specific regulations and supplement contain additional or different requirements, the attorney specific regulations and supplement shall control.

3. **Distribution Statement.** Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

4. **References.**

a. DoD Directive 1442.2, Personnel Actions Involving Civilian Attorneys.

b. AR 690-200, Chapter 213, Request for Excepting Positions under Schedule A, B, or C.

c. USACE Supplement 1 to AR 690-200, Chapter 213.

This Engineer Regulation supersedes ER 690-1-1203, dated 01 March 2000.

5. Responsibilities.

a. Commanders and directors will be personally involved in determining the recruitment strategy for each GS-15 and Supervisory GS-14 (or equivalent) fill action that is sufficient to ensure a diverse candidate pool.

b. MSC commanders will chair selection panels for all GS-15 positions at the division, district, and field levels.

c. The Director of the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) will chair selection panels for all positions within ERDC in the Director's supervisory chain. The Commander of ERDC will chair selection panels for Pay Band V positions in the Commander's supervisory chain.

d. HQUSACE General Officers and Senior Executive Service (SES) members (principals) will chair selection panels for all GS-15 positions in their organizations. This includes separate field activities such as the Water Resources Support Center, Marine Design Center, Transatlantic Programs Center and U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville.

e. HQUSACE Deputy Chiefs of Staff will chair selection panels for all GS-15 positions at organizations that do not report to a General Officer or SES member at the headquarters and other field activities such as the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity (HECSA).

f. Appendix A designates the panel chair for Supervisory GS-14 and equivalent positions.

g. Panel chair will approve, in writing, panel membership, and all criteria, including interview questions, to be used for recruitment and selection.

h. Panel composition must include three members as a minimum. For GS-15 (or equivalent) positions, it must include the chair, the supervisor of the position, and a Senior Executive Service (SES) member from outside the activity where the position is located (e.g., outside the division). For Supervisory GS-14 (or equivalent) positions, it must include the chair, the supervisor of the position, and a GS-15 or military (06 or above) from outside the activity where the position is located (e.g., district or HQ Directorate). The panel chair can approve different members for the ad hoc and interview panels as long as the composition (numbers/grades of member) is retained.

i. Panel chair will ensure that selection panel members reach consensus on the recommendation to the selecting official.

j. The selecting official designated at Appendix A will make the selection.

k. The matrix at Appendix A reflects responsibilities at all levels. These may not be further delegated.

6. **Policy.** This command will look at senior selections from a broad, corporate perspective. The Corps' goal is to consider, select, train, and develop a work force with diverse attributes and talents that will exemplify the competencies required to support the USACE Strategic Plan and meet mission requirements. In this context, the term "diverse" has much broader implications than race and gender; it is intended to describe broad and varied life and work experiences. By requiring significant senior level involvement in this process, the Corps reinforces its core values and the importance of selecting the best person for the job, regardless of the source.

a. Assignments to GS-15 and Supervisory GS-14 (and equivalent) level positions will be made competitively. This applies to positions filled on a permanent or temporary basis, by promotion, reassignment, or change to lower grade. The process described at Appendix B will be used. Exceptions are listed in paragraph g below. All other exceptions require approval of the selecting official (see Appendix A).

b. Commanders and directors will, through command channels, obtain the approval of the selecting official when they object to the qualifications of Priority Placement Program candidates proposed for placement.

c. Personal interviews will be conducted. All members, including the panel chair, will participate in the interview, which may be either in person, by telephone or by VTC. The Gallup Leadership Competency Interview will be used for all candidates who are selected for interviews by the selection panel.

d. All recruitment and selection expenses will be funded by the activity where the position is located (e.g., advertisements, TDY expenses for panel members, including HQUSACE SES, and the Gallup Leadership Competency Interviews).

e. Selections should be forwarded to the selecting official no later than 90 days from the date the referral list is issued. Rationale for delays beyond this period must be provided in the selection package; significant delays may cause the recruitment and selection process to begin again.

f. Names of recommended candidates will not be released until the selecting official makes a selection. The selecting official may elect to reconvene a panel, or establish a new panel, upon receipt of a selection recommendation that is not clearly supported by the documentation provided.

g. Exceptions to the policy.

(1) Activity commanders and directors may approve filling a position on a non-competitive basis for 120 days as an exception to the policy without the approval of the selecting official. For critical, hard-to-fill vacancies, they may approve consecutive 120-day non-competitive promotions or assignment for consecutive 120-day periods (one 120-day period per individual) until the position can be filled on a permanent basis.

(2) Panel chairs may approve an exception to the policy without approval of the selecting official for one year. Panel chairs may approve a modified recruitment plan. The Gallup Leadership Interviews are not mandatory. The panel chair must ensure that the area of consideration is broad enough to yield three or more candidates. Panel chairs make the selection.

(3) Exceptions over one year require approval of the selecting official. When circumstances exist which justify an exception not covered, submit requests with justification to the selecting official.

(4) Candidates who competed and were selected to formal developmental programs (e.g., Defense Leadership and Management Program) may be given assignments to these positions consistent with their approved Individual Development Plans as an exception.

(5) Individuals may be placed in lieu of reduction-in-force as an exception.

(6) Position upgrades (including attorneys) resulting from accretion of duties or application of a new standard are an exception to the policy.

(7) Position upgrades resulting in non-competitive promotions to the Pay Band IV or V level as a result of application of Factor IV, Research Grade Evaluation Guide, may be processed as an exception to the Corporate Selection Policy.

(8) When circumstances exist which justify a non-competitive promotion, requests for exception with justification will be forwarded to the selecting official. Requests must be personally signed at each command level and submitted to the selecting official for approval.

7. Procedures.

a. Panel chairs must ensure that they carefully review and document the criteria used by the panel to evaluate the candidates referred. Since these candidates have been referred as "best-qualified", selection procedures involving matrices with finite point assignments can be difficult to validate and impossible to defend against challenge. Instead, the selection panel members should rank the referred candidates based on their overall assessment of the candidate's related experience, leadership abilities, awards, education/training, performance appraisals, etc., without assigning points to categories and subcategories. See sample matrix at Appendix C.

b. Interview results, both personal and Leadership Competency Interviews, should not be given sole weight, but should be considered with the results of other information, such as reference checks with current and former supervisors and/or peers. A search on the Personnel Management and Information Support System (PERMISS) section, Recruitment and Placement Program, Candidate Referral and Selection, at the Army web site <http://www.cpol.army.mil> provides useful information and includes some good discussion on inappropriate interview questions and subjects.

8. Appendix D provides a format to be used by the panel chair to forward a recommendation for selection.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

4 Appendices	ROBERT CREAR
App A - Recruitment & Selection Responsibilities	Colonel, Corps of Engineers Chief of Staff
App B - Recruitment Process	
App C - Sample Matrix of Panel Evaluation	
App D - Sample Selection Recommendation	

APPENDIX A

**Designation of Responsible Officials for Recruitment and Selection
of USACE GS-15 and Supervisory GS-14 (or Equivalent) Positions**

Position	Panel Composition (Minimum of Three)	Chair Selection Panel, Approve: Recruitment Strategy, Selection Criteria, Panel Membership	Selecting Official (Approve Exceptions)
GS-15 HQ CW,MP,CC,RE,RD,RM,HR, CL,PR,HNC,TAC,WRSC,	Panel Chair, SES, Supervisor	<i>Director MP, CW, Chief Counsel, CI, HR, PR, RE, RD, RM</i>	<i>Director MP, CW, Ch Counsel; CI, HR, PR, RE, RD, RM</i>
GS-15 HQ SB, HECSA,OTHER	Panel Chair, SES, Supervisor	<i>Deputy Chiefs of Staff for Operations, Support (HQUSACE)</i>	USACE DCG
GS-15 Division/District	Panel Chair, SES, Supervisor	<i>Division Commander</i>	Division Commander
Pay Band V/GS-15 ERDC	Panel Chair, SES, Supervisor	<i>ERDC Director</i>	ERDC Director
Supv GS-14 HQ CEMP	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside MP	Division Chief	Director MP
Supv GS-14 HNC, TAC	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside Activity	Commander/Director	Director MP
Supv GS-14 HQ CECW	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside CW	Division Chief	Director CW
Supv GS-14 WRSC, MDC	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside CW	Director	Director CW
Supv GS-14 All Other HQ (incl HECSA)	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside Activity	Director/ Separate Office Chief	DCS-S/DCS-O
Supv GS-14 Division	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside Division	Division SES / Deputy Commander	Division Commander
Supv GS-14 District	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside District	Commander	Division Commander
Pay Band IV/GS-14 ERDC	Panel Chair, Supervisor GS-15 Outside ERDC	Lab Director	ERDC Director

SEE PARAGRAPH 5g FOR EXCEPTIONS

APPENDIX B

Recruitment Process

B-1. Each USACE activity will determine what outreach efforts are required to ensure that the applicant pool consists of diverse, well-qualified candidates, including minority and women. This must include the personal involvement of the commander or director with the vacancy. It is important to note that decisions made at this stage can dramatically alter the candidate pool from which a selection is made. There are two major areas to increase opportunities for competition: (1) area of consideration (status/non-status) and (2) classification of the position to different occupational series. Accordingly, commanders/directors should ensure their recruitment plans include the following provisions:

a. For permanent actions an area of consideration which includes all status candidates is encouraged. Including non-status candidates when appropriate and when expected to generate well-qualified candidates is also encouraged. Announcements must remain open at least four weeks. Carefully evaluate the area of consideration for positions filled on a temporary basis, particularly for those exceeding 1 year.

b. Commanders/directors should carefully review the classification of the position to ensure that it properly reflects current duties and organizational setting, including all appropriate occupational series.

B-2. For positions covered by the Army Civilian Career Evaluation System (ACCES), activities may need to assist candidates in getting registered in the appropriate central referral inventory. (*This will require considerable "up front" planning to fill these vacancies.*) or obtaining necessary approval to advertise under merit promotion

B-3. Panel chairs are responsible for approving in writing the recruitment strategy, panel composition, and **all** criteria to be used both to develop the best-qualified list and to make the selection.

B-4. Panel chairs are responsible for approving a selection panel comprised of knowledgeable individuals at or above the grade level of the vacancy. Minimal composition for GS-15 (or equivalent) positions

is the chair, the supervisor of the position, and a SES member; and for Supervisory GS-14 (or equivalent) the chair, the supervisor of the position, and a GS-15/0-6 member outside the activity where the position is located. HR and EEO advisors will participate as observers in an advisory role to the panel. Upon receipt of the referral list, the activity will coordinate with the appropriate chair to convene the panel to review the qualifications of the candidates and determine which candidates to interview. All members, including the panel chair, will participate in the interviews, which may be either in person, telephonic or via VTC. Leadership Competency Interviews will be obtained on all candidates scheduled for a selection panel interview. (Note: some career programs require functional chief involvement in key selections. Army regulatory requirements must be met. Selection or assignment of an attorney requires approval of the Qualifying Authority, the USACE Chief Counsel, prior to finalizing any such action.)

B-5. In the area of panel representation, the following guidance applies:

a. This policy requires an SES member to serve on GS-15 (or equivalent) selection panels. To preclude any perception of bias, SES members must avoid serving as panelists for any position where there could be a perception of favoritism; for example, the SES member's previous assignment was in that division. SES members should discuss questionable situations with the selecting official prior to agreeing to serve.

b. The SES panel member represents the corporate perspective. This member seeks to align selections with the corporate agenda, ensures the process is fair and equitable to all and participates fully in decisions at every step of the selection process. This member does not need to be a subject matter expert and does not focus on technical capabilities to the exclusion of leadership ability. This member must be prepared to discuss panel proceedings with the selecting official, if requested, when the selection package is reviewed.

c. This policy requires a GS-15/0-6 member to serve on Supervisory GS-14 (or equivalent) selection panels. This member must come from outside the activity where the position is located. This will provide an external point of view and help achieve a more corporate focus in the selection process. This individual does not need to be a subject matter expert, but should be knowledgeable about the position requirements.

d. Once the selection panel membership has been established, the panel chair must approve any change in panel membership. The panel chair should clearly document the rationale for this change in the selection package.

e. Once a referral list is issued for a vacancy, the panel chair must ensure that the entire selection panel, including the panel chair, participates fully in all ranking of candidates to determine which candidates will be interviewed. It is not appropriate to delegate this task to a separate panel.

f. The entire selection panel, including the panel chair, must interview the selected candidates together as one panel. It is not appropriate to have some members of the selection panel interview the candidates separately. Interviews can be held in person, by telephone or VTC.

g. The panel chair must ensure that panel members are at or above the grade level of the vacancy. Individuals who may participate in the process who do not meet this criterion must observe only; they must not vote. Also, due to their unique contributions to this process, HR and EEO observers should not vote on panels in which they serve as advisers to the selection panel. This does not preclude HR and EEO officials from serving as voting panel members where they are not designated the HR or EEO adviser.

B-6. Documentation.

a. When higher level approval is required: Once the selection panel has reached a consensus on the recommended candidate and alternates, the panel chair will forward a recommendation to the selecting official in the format prescribed in Appendix D no later than 90 days after the issuance of the referral list. Significant delays require documentation of reasons for the delay and may cause the recruitment and selection process to start again. This recommendation must include a first and second alternate in case the selectee declines the offer. If the selection panel does not recommend an alternate selection, indicate in the package the proposed course of action. The recommendation should include the documentation on the criteria used by the panel, comparison of the candidates and the rationale for the recommendation. If the position has been upgraded, describe circumstances warranting the upgrade and whether it is encumbered. The submission package must provide a discussion of the leadership competencies of the recommended candidate and alternates. Total leadership competency score is the most predictive. Based on the results of the leadership competency interview, describe where candidates fall in the three categories (see below).

b. When the panel chair is the selecting official: If selection is not made within 90 days of issuance of the referral list, reason for the delay will be documented and made part of the selection package available for review. The selection package should include the documentation on the criteria used by the panel, comparison of the candidates and the rationale for the selection. The selection package must provide a discussion of the leadership competencies of the selectee and alternates. Total leadership competency score is the most predictive. Based on the results of the leadership competency interview, describe where candidates fall in the three categories (see below).

(1) - FIRST TIER: Candidates have leadership competence comparable to leadership talents identified in a study of the Corps' best leaders. They should be able to exercise their leadership power and successfully move the organization into the future.

(2) - SECOND TIER: Candidates have some of the leadership competencies identified in the study of the best Corps leaders. They have some potential to drive the organization into the future. However, they are not as powerful as the best of the study group. As a consequence, their impact is likely to be contingent upon how well they fit their particular leadership situation and the support they receive.

(3) - THIRD TIER: Candidates have fewer leadership competencies identified in the study of the best Corps leaders. A move to the next level may not set them up to replicate the successes they are having in their current position. The profile is not a good match based upon the study group.

B-7. The selecting official will notify the appropriate chair of the selectee or will document that selection and return the referral list to the activity where the position is located for further processing.

B-8. The activity is responsible for notifying candidates of the final selection, maintaining the recruitment and selection files and ensuring that the process includes the Civilian Personnel Advisory Center and Civilian Personnel Operations Center representatives at each appropriate step. The activity is also responsible for providing a bio on each approved selection at the GS-15 and Supervisory GS-14 (or equivalent) level to CEHR-E for inclusion in periodic communications. For statistical purpose include with the bio the number of geographical and functional moves, education and date of birth.

APPENDIX C

Sample Matrix of Panel Evaluation

(POSITION TITLE, SERIES & GRADE)

CANDIDATE LIST	Panel Chair Name	Panel Member Name	Panel Member Name	Panel Member Name	Panel Member Name	OVERALL SUM Pre-Interview	INTERVIEW	LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW RANKING	SELECTION PANEL CONSENSUS AFTER INTERVIEWS
APPLICANT 1	10	3	5	9	10	37 (7)	NO		--
APPLICANT 2	1	2	2	1	1	7 (1)	YES	TIER 3	2— First Alternate
APPLICANT 3	2	1	3	2	2	10 (2)	YES	TIER 1	1—SELECT
APPLICANT 4	9	10	9	8	8	44 (10)	NO		--
APPLICANT 5	5	9	10	4	9	37 (7)	NO		--
APPLICANT 6	8	8	7	7	7	37 (7)	NO		Not Ranked Further
APPLICANT 7	4	7	6	6	5	28 (5)	YES	TIER 3	Not Ranked Further
APPLICANT 8	6	5	8	10	6	35 (6)	NO		--
APPLICANT 9	3	4	4	3	3	17 (3)	YES	TIER 2	3— Second Alternate
APPLICANT 10	7	6	1	5	4	23 (4)	YES	TIER 3	Not Ranked Further

MFR: [State process used to determine who was interviewed] For example: “Selection panel members ranked each candidate on their overall assessment of most related experience, leadership abilities, awards, education/training, performance appraisals, etc. (see selection criteria at TAB D). The panel recommended the top 5 for interview, based on the break between scores 28 and 35.” Or “the panel decided to interview all referred candidates.”

[Show the results of the final ranking after the personal and Leadership Interview.] For example: “The selection panel chaired by [name] identified [number] candidates for personal interviews. After the personal and leadership interviews, the panel unanimously ranked the top three candidates in priority order, as shown. No further ranking was done [you may wish to show ranking from 1 to n]. See TAB A for rationale for selection.”

APPENDIX D

Sample Selection Recommendation

CEXXX-

(DATE)

MEMORANDUM FOR (SELECTING OFFICIAL)

SUBJECT: Recommended Selection for (Position Title), GS-(Series)-(Grade), (Organization Title), Referral (Number), issued (Date)

1. Reference ER 690-1-1203, dated 1 March 2000, subject: Corporate Recruitment and Selection Policy.
2. The purpose of this memo is to provide results of recruitment and recommend selection of (Title, series, grade, and employing location) for subject position. For the reasons articulated at TAB A, I recommend that you select (Name, employment location, series, and grade) for subject position. My first and second alternates are also at TAB A, as are the applications.
3. As required by referenced ER, I approved the recruitment and selection strategy, including the selection criteria used to develop the referral list. TAB B contains the recruitment strategy. (If this position has been upgraded describe circumstances warranting the upgrade and whether it is encumbered.) This position was announced under (local merit promotion or career referral procedures) and was open four weeks to federal (status) and private sector (non-status candidates. The referral list (TAB C) contained (number) status candidates, (number) were minorities and (number) were women. (Number) were from Army; (Number) were from outside Army. The OPM Certificate of Eligibles contained (describe composition).
4. Upon receipt of the referral list, I chaired a selection panel (TAB D) that used the approved selection criteria (TAB E).

Each member of the selection panel independently evaluated all referred candidates based on available information (e.g, resume, performance appraisals, etc.). We consolidated the names into a list of (*Number*) finalists for further consideration (*explain process for determining break point*). The panel's evaluation is at TAB F.

5. Interviews, selection panel and Leadership Competency Interviews, were offered to (*number*) candidates. The selection panel interviewed the top (*Number*) candidates utilizing the interview questions approved by the chair (TAB E). Names of candidates interviewed and the results of the panel's evaluation are at TAB F. TAB F reflects the consideration given to the non-selected candidates. Based on the records presented, the results of the leadership interview, the responses to the questions asked by the selection panel, and the recommendations of past and present supervisors, we recommend (*Name*). Our rationale for recommending this individual is at TAB A. (*TAB A must provide a discussion of the leadership of the recommended selectee (and alternates), to include where they fall in the three Leadership Competency categories in comparison with all candidates interviewed.*) Alternate selections have been recommended and are at TAB A. We request approval to move to our first and/or second alternate without prior approval in the case of declinations. (*If alternate selections are not recommended, indicate your recommended course of action.*)

6. The EEO Officer, (*Name, grade, employing activity*), and HR Officer (*Name, grade, employing activity*) served as observers and advisors concerning the evaluation and selection processes to be used. We believe the processes were very thorough, independent, fair to all applicants, and used job-related criteria to determine the candidates to be interviewed.

7. The POC for additional information is (*Name, location, and telephone number*).

(SIGNATURE BLOCK OF PANEL CHAIR)

BACKGROUND TABS

- A** **RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDED SELECTEE &
FIRST & SECOND ALTERNATES** (*Attach records*)
- B** **RECRUITMENT STRATEGY** (*Include vacancy announcements
and position description*)
- C** **COPY OF ANNOTATED REFERRAL LIST(S)**
(*Status and Nonstatus*)
- D** **SELECTION PANEL**
(*Show Name, Rank/Series/Grade, Employing
Activity/Symbol*)
- E** **APPROVED SELECTION CRITERIA**
(*Include all criteria and Interview Questions*)
- F** **MATRIX REFLECTING EVALUATION OF
CANDIDATES BY PANEL**
(*Attach records of remaining candidates
interviewed.*)

