DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ADVISORY SERVICE
4800 MARK CENTER DRIVE
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22350-1100

FOR: CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY COUNCIL MEMBERS

HESTER.DANIEL.J.1134493565 Digitally signed by HESTER.DANIEL.J.1134493565 Date: 2021.09.29 14:19:28 -04'00'

FROM: Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service Director, Mr. Daniel J. Hester

SUBJECT: Department of Defense Accountability Evaluation Master Calendar Fiscal Year 2022

ACTION: Disseminate to all Department of Defense (DoD) Human Resources (HR) Directors and Administrators, Human Capital Accountability and Delegated Examining Program Managers

REFERENCE(S):

a. Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service (DCPAS) and Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Master Evaluation Schedule for Fiscal Year 2022 (Attachment 1)
b. OPM Human Capital (HC) Evaluation System Logic Model (Attachment 2)
c. DoD Human Capital Framework (HCF) Evaluation Handbook (Attachment 3)

BACKGROUND/INTENT: DCPAS is responsible for monitoring Component compliance through the use of HCF evaluations and Component-led Self-Assessment Visits. The DCPAS Planning and Accountability Directorate utilizes the DoD HCF Evaluation Handbook (reference c) to carry out this functional responsibility by conducting compliance assessments for DoD Components, Agencies, and Activities. DCPAS will integrate the HC Evaluation System Logic Model (reference b) to inform and drive continuous improvement efforts.

A part of our communication strategy is the dissemination of the Master Calendar for the DoD and OPM-led evaluations (reference a). To maintain transparency, we will continue to use multiple channels of communication for program awareness. These channels include recurring DCPAS Accountability Program Manager (APM) numbered messages via email and the DCPAS website (under Accountability).

The DCPAS Component APM's will systematically initiate communications to assess the accomplishments of HC strategic goals and objectives for compliance with Federal Statutory, Regulatory, and DoD policy requirements, built on the core principles of the HCF.

The DCPAS Accountability Team has a clear outline and a structured plan that aligns to the OPM HCF and Suitability Program. DCPAS' promise to our stakeholders is to "act with intent, and to integrate the Department's power of three: to deliver talent, maximize employee performance, and transform HR."

POINT OF CONTACT: Ms. Dominique Jeter, DoD Accountability Program Manager, dominique.c.jeter.civ@mail.mil.

Attachment(s):
As stated

DCPAS and OPM TENTATIVE MASTER EVALUATION SCHEDULE for FISCAL YEAR 2022
Delegated Examining (DE) - Human Capital Management (HCME) - Human Capital Framework (HCF)

Evaluation Dates	Evaluation	Component	Activity/Location	Point of Contact
FIRST QUARTER FY2022				
1 Oct-30 Nov 2021 **FY21 Continuation (Phase 2)**	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-WHS-740 **Authority Expiration Date:28-Apr-2022**	4th Estate	Washington Headquarters Service (WHS) Washington, DC	Jose Conejo (jose.conejo.civ@mail.mil) Consiglia Sileo (consiglia.sileo.civ@mail.mil)
29 Nov-12 Dec 2021	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-AF-213 **Authority Expiration Date:22-Apr-2022**	Air Force	AFPC SEU Randolph Air Force Reserve Technician(ART Program)	Lisa Garner (lisa.garner@us.af.mil) Stephanie Erdmann (stephanie.erdmann@us.af.mil)
29 Nov – 10 Dec 2021	DCPAS-Led (HCF) Lead Evaluator TBD	Army	USACE HQ	Megan Emden (megan.e.emden.civ@mail.mil) Melissa Brooks (melissa.n.brooks.civ@army.mil) Kevin Brackney (kevin.m.brackney@usace.army.mil)
Dec 2021	OPM - Led **(HCME/DE-Onsite)** Lead Evaluator: Tracy Ellis	Air Force	Hickman AFB Honolulu, HI	Stephanie Erdman (stephanie.erdmann@us.af.mil) Christina Lhamon (christina.lhamon@us.af.mil) Consondra Christopher-Davis (consondra.y.christopher-davis.civ@mail.mil)
27 Sep-15 Apr 2022	OPM-Led ESA	DoD	DCPAS	Dominique Jeter (dominique.c.jeter.civ@mail.mil) Consondra Y. Davis (consondra.y.christopher-davis.civ@mail.mil)
SECOND QUARTER FY2022				
Jan 2022	OPM Suitability Follow-Up	4th Estate	VAMC Brockton	TBD
Jan 2022	OPM Suitability Follow-Up	4th Estate	VAMC Portland	TBD
17-28 Jan 2022	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-NV-135 **Authority Expiration Date:30-Jun-2022** Lead Evaluator: TBD	Navy	OCHR Southwest San Diego, CA	Matthew Philippi (matthew.philippi@navy.mil) Kaelynn Kurtz (kaelynn.kurtz@navy.mil)

DCPAS and OPM TENTATIVE MASTER EVALUATION SCHEDULE for FISCAL YEAR 2022
Delegated Examining (DE) - Human Capital Management (HCME) - Human Capital Framework (HCF)

Evaluation Dates	Evaluation	Component	Activity/Location	Point of Contact
SECOND QUARTER FY2022				
7-18 Feb 2022	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-AF-223 **Authority Expiration Date:6-Aug-2022** Lead Evaluator: TBD	Air Force	AFMC DEU Hill AFB, UT ***Includes Closeouts: Tinker/Robins/Wright Patterson/WRIGH PAT LAB/HILL***	Stephanie Erdman (stephanie.erdmann@us.af.mil) Marcae Riggs (marcae.riggs@us.af.mil) Christopher Hootman (christopher.hootman.1@us.af.mil)
7-18 Mar 2022	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-AR-008 **Authority Expiration Date:13-Sep-2022**	Army	CHRA European Kaiserslautern, GE	Megan Emden (megan.e.emden.civ@mail.mil) Melissa Brooks (melissa.n.brooks.civ@army.mil)
THIRD QUARTER FY2022				
3rd Quarter (Apr/May/Jun)	*OPM-Led* ***(HCME/DE)*** *DD-NV-133* ***Authority Expiration Date:30-Sep-2022*** Lead Evaluator: Jeremiah Perez	Navy	OCHR East Norfolk, VA	Matthew Philippi (matthew.philippi@navy.mil) Kaelynn Kurtz (kaelynn.kurtz@navy.mil) Kimberly Lane (Kimberly.lane@navy.mil) Consondra Christopher-Davis (consondra.y.christopher-davis.civ@mail.mil)
11-22 Apr 2022	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-AF-224 **Authority Expiration Date:29-Sep-2022**	Air Force	AFPC Randolph San Antonio, TX	Stephanie Erdman (stephanie.erdmann@us.af.mil) Al Tolbert (al.tolbert.1@us.af.mil)
May 2022	OPM Suitability Follow-Up	4th Estate	DLA	Billie Keeler (billie.keeler.civ@mail.mil) Pamela Ries (pamela.ries@dla.mil) Consondra Christopher-Davis (consondra.y.christopher-davis.civ@mail.mil)
13-24 Jun 2022	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-AR-010 **Authority Expiration Date:15-Jan-2023** Lead Evaluator: TBD	Army	CHRA South Central Region Redstone Arsenal, AL	Megan Emden (megan.e.emden.civ@mail.mil) Melissa Brooks (melissa.n.brooks.civ@army.mil)

DCPAS and OPM TENTATIVE MASTER EVALUATION SCHEDULE for FISCAL YEAR 2022
Delegated Examining (DE) - Human Capital Management (HCME) - Human Capital Framework (HCF)

Evaluation Dates	Evaluations	Component	Activity/Location	Point of Contact
THIRD QUARTER FY2022				
30 Jun 2022	Component Annual Audit Plans Due	All	All	dodhra.mc-alex.dcpas.mbx.accountability-team@mail.mil
3rd Quarter (Apr/May/Jun)	OPM – Led **(HCME/DE)** Lead Evaluator: Crystal Harris	Army	Anniston Army Depot	TBD
FOURTH QUARTER FY2022				
Sep 2022	OPM Suitability Follow-Up	Air Force	USAF JBA/ USAF Pentagon	Lisa Garner (lisa.garner@us.af.mil) Marquetia Taylor (marquetia.taylor@us.af.mil) Consondra Christopher-Davis (consondra.y.christopher-davis.civ@mail.mil)
19-29 Sep 2022	DCPAS-Led **(DE)** DD-AR-026 **Authority Expiration Date:23-Jan-2023** Lead Evaluator:	Army	CHRA West Region Fort Huachuca, AZ	Megan Emden (megan.e.emden.civ@mail.mil) Melissa Brooks (melissa.n.brooks.civ@army.mil)
27-Sep-8 Oct 2022	DCPAS-Led (HCF) Lead Evaluator: TBD	Navy	Cyber Excepted Service (TBD) OCHR and Command HRO (TBD)	Partner with CIO (TBD)
TBD	OPM-Led (HCME/DE) Lead Evaluator: Jennifer Trice	National Guard	Army/Air Force	Nancy Zbyszinski (nancy.c.zbyszinski.civ@mail.mil) Joey Keyes (joey.l.keyes.civ@mail.mil) Angela Mullins (angela.m.mullins18.civ@mail.mil) Consondra Y. Davis (consondra.y.christopher-davis.civ@mail.mil)
TBD	OPM Suitability Review	4th Estate	DCSA/DCAF	Dominique Jeter (dominique.c.jeter.civ@mail.mil) Consondra Y. Davis (consondra.y.christopher-davis.civ@mail.mil)

DCPAS and OPM TENTATIVE MASTER EVALUATION SCHEDULE for FISCAL YEAR 2022
Delegated Examining (DE) - Human Capital Management (HCME) - Human Capital Framework (HCF)

Evaluation Dates	Evaluations	Component	Activity/Location	Point of Contact
FOURTH QUARTER FY2022				
TBD	OPM Suitability Review	4th Estate	WHS	Jose Conejo (jose.conejo.civ@mail.mil) Bruce Tweedie (bruce.j.tweedie.civ@mail.mil)
Component-Led Assessments Due 30 September 2022				
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	Army	TBD	Megan Emden (megan.e.emden.civ@mail.mil) Denise Howell Parker (denise.l.howellparker.civ@mail.mil) Melissa Brooks (melissa.n.brooks.civ@army.mil)
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	Air Force	TBD	Lisa Garner (lisa.garner@us.af.mil) Stephanie Erdman (stephanie.erdmann@us.af.mil) Sharon Gunselman (sharon.gunselman@us.af.mil)
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	Navy	TBD	Matthew Philippi (matthew.philippi@navy.mil) Kaelynn Kurtz (kaelynn.kurtz@navy.mil) Kimberly Lane (Kimberly.lane@navy.mil)
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	4th Estate	DCAA	Kimberly Litherland (Kimberly.litherland@dcaa.mil) Nicole Spruill (nicole.spruill@dcaa.mil)
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	4th Estate	DoDEA	Gordon Harmon (gordon.harmon@dodea.edu) Leyla Padilla (leyla.padilla@dodea.edu)
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	4th Estate	DLA	Billie Keeler (billie.keeler@dla.mil) Halawna Johnson (halawna.johnson@dla.mil)

DCPAS and OPM TENTATIVE MASTER EVALUATION SCHEDULE for FISCAL YEAR 2022
Delegated Examining (DE) - Human Capital Management (HCME) - Human Capital Framework (HCF)

Evaluation Due Date	Evaluations	Component	Activity/Location	Point of Contact
Component-Led Assessments Due 30 September 2022				
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	4th Estate	DFAS	Kathleen Hendrickson (kathleen.o.hendrickson.civ@mail.mil) Nitza Rosario (nitza.i.rosario2.civ@mail.mil) Adam Ellis (adam.l.ellis.civ@mail.mil)
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	4th Estate	WHS	Jose Conejo (jose.conejo.civ@mail.mil) Elvira Carter (elvira.l.carter.civ@mail.mil) Consiglia Sileo (*consiglia.sileo.civ@mail.mil*)
30 Sep 2022	Component-Led (HCF & DE)	4th Estate	DECA	Rebecca Haase rebecca.haase@deca.mil

Note: DCPAS Accountability Division is the coordinator of revisions to the Master Evaluation Schedule

As of September 22, 2021

Office of Personnel Management
Human Capital Evaluation System Logic Model

The Human Capital Evaluation System is the lynchpin in ensuring human capital policies, programs, and activities support mission accomplishment. Including HRStat, Independent Audit Program, Human Capital Review, and other evaluation activity, it is guided by and informs the Human Capital Operations Plan (HCOP). The HCOP ensures human capital management (HCM) is aligned with the agency's Annual Performance Plan and quadrennial Strategic Plan (SP), which incorporates the agency's Learning Agenda[1] and supports priorities in the President's Management Agenda and Federal Workforce Priorities Report.

The HCOP is the road map for using human capital to achieve SP goals and the evaluation system is the means for ensuring the road map is accurate, precise, and easy to follow. A strong evaluation system helps the HCOP ensure human capital policies, programs, and practices are implemented effectively, efficiently, compliantly, and in alignment with strategic objectives.

The *Human Capital Evaluation System Logic Model* illustrates how the evaluation system functions over time, ultimately translating inputs into human capital and mission outcomes:

- **Inputs** are resources used to conduct activities and produce outputs.
- **Activities** are events, actions, or strategies.
- **Outputs** are services, products, or deliverables that result from activities. Outputs, like activities, are the *what*. Outputs generally are NOT indicators of success or effectiveness.
- **Outcomes** are the intended *effects* of the system through its activities and outputs. Outcomes are the *why*. Outcomes *are* indicators of success and effectiveness. Long-term outcomes are the best indicators.

With inputs, the evaluation system generates activities, outputs, and outcomes. Outcomes are short-term and long-term, reflecting progressive impacts on HCM, mission accomplishment, and the evaluation system itself. Timeframes are approximate, non-prescriptive, and subject to overlap. For example, it is possible for certain long-term outcomes to be achieved without meeting all the short-term outcomes. However, for long-term outcomes to be met fully, the outputs and short-term outcomes must also be met.

In addition, some outputs and outcomes have a recursive relationship with inputs and activities. For example, communication of evaluation results (output) engages stakeholders (input) in revising the HCOP (activity). Such feedback loops help ensure the agency ultimately can achieve its strategic objectives and other long-term outcomes. As evaluation systems progress to Advanced or Optimal levels of maturity, agencies can achieve outcomes more fully, efficiently, and sustainably.[2]

---

[1] Established as a requirement for all CHCO agencies by the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018, Learning Agendas are systematic plans for identifying and addressing policy questions relevant to agency programs, policies, and regulations. The intent of the Act is to ensure agency program development, operation, and improvement are grounded in reliable and credible information. Agendas must include evidence agencies expect to collect, acquire, and use, and the methods they will use to develop it to inform policymaking. The Human Capital Evaluation System, with program policy and annual implementation plans, should inform and align with the Agenda. The Evaluation System's purpose is like the Agenda's, except with a focus on HCM. For Learning Agenda implementation requirements and guidance, see Presidential Memorandum M-21-27.

[2] For a road map for improving the Evaluation System itself and reaching higher levels of maturity, see OPM's Human Capital Federal Integrated Business Framework, Agency Human Capital Evaluation: A10.1 Lifecycle.

Office of Personnel Management
Human Capital Evaluation System Logic Model

Human Capital (HC) Evaluation System refers to an agency's overarching system for evaluating the results of all human capital planning and implementation of human capital strategies to inform the agency's continuous process improvement efforts. This system is also used for ensuring compliance with all applicable statutes, rules, regulations, and agency policies. (5 CFR 250)

Inputs	Activities	Outputs (Immediate-1 year)	Short-term outcomes (1-3 years)	Long-term outcomes (3-7 years)
Agency leadership, including the agency head, CHCO, CDO, and other members of the C-Suite, Evaluation Officer, Statistical Official, PIO, and APM, support planning, implementing, and improving the HC Evaluation System	Agency engages its leadership and key HC stakeholders in developing an HCOP with objectives, goals, and measures that support FWPR priorities, the PMA, the agency's strategic plan, and the agency's annual performance plan	Agency communicates results from HRStat, independent audits, and other evaluation activities to HC leaders and other stakeholders in accordance with Data Sharing and HC Evaluation System Communications Plans	Agency makes HC decisions driven by data and evaluation results	Agency demonstrates continued organizational performance improvements in support of strategic objectives resulting from optimizing HC program effectiveness, efficiency, and compliance
Agency maintains independent evaluation staffing capacity, including Evaluators, Data Analysts, and Data Scientists	Agency fills staff vacancies and provides training informed by evaluation competency gap assessments	Agency takes timely corrective and improvement action in response to HC evaluation finding	Agency uses results from evaluation activities including HRStat, the IAP, and HCR, to inform changes and updates to the HCOP	Agency regularly meets challenging goals, objectives, and targets in the HCOP, agency annual performance plan, agency strategic plan, PMA, and FWPR
Agency maintains secure HC data such as EHRI, FEVS, automated HRM systems (e.g., staffing and performance management), workforce planning, and competency	Agency assigns staff responsibilities for planning, executing, and reporting on evaluation activities in support of the HCOP to include HRStat, IAP, and HCR	Agency reviews results systematically and as needed to inform HC program decisions in support of goals and objectives in the HCOP and inform revisions, as needed, to its measures and targets	Agency uses the HCOP to frame, guide, and benchmark agency HC decisions, including how to implement the HC Evaluation System	Agency institutionalizes data-based HC decision-making
Agency maintains data analysis and visualization tools to assess data and communicate results	Agency uses data systems, platforms, and tools efficiently and effectively to measure HC outputs and outcomes	Agency engages openly with OPM in the ESA and HCR about its HC system successes and challenges, and utilizes results to plan improvements in HC policies, programs, or procedures, including its HC Evaluation System	Agency realizes improvements in HC policies, programs, or procedures from HC decisions informed by HC Evaluation System results and its engagement with OPM during the HCR	Agency integrates HC Evaluation System with HC Planning & Implementation
Agency commits budgetary resources, including salary, travel, and training expenses, to support data systems, tools, and evaluation activities	Agency conducts data collection and assessment using HRStat, IAP, and other evaluation activities in accordance with its HC Evaluation System policy and timely annual evaluation agendas		Agency maintains aligned, effective, efficient, and compliant HC programs in support of its strategic plan	Agency sustains partnership between HC Evaluation System and HC stakeholders at the strategic, tactical, and operational levels
	Agency plans and conducts evaluations strategically in accordance with an annual HC evaluation agenda to permit measuring performance against targets and benchmarks in the HCOP and to inform related HC decisions		Agency realizes organizational performance improvements tied to improvements in HC programs	Agency fosters and leverages HCM policy partnerships across program offices, Federal agencies, OPM, academia, and industry
	Agency uses HC evaluation results to measure program outputs and outcomes associated with HCOP objectives and targets		Agency integrates HC Evaluation System with HC Planning	Agency attains and sustains Advanced or Optimized levels of maturity in all HC Evaluation System Standards
			Agency uses HC Evaluation System strategically to support HC planning and implementation	
			Agency improves levels of maturity in one or more HC Evaluation System Standards	

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
HUMAN CAPITAL FRAMEWORK
EVALUATION HANDBOOK

INTRODUCTION

Civilian employees within the Department of Defense (DoD) play a critical role in supporting the DoD's mission to deter war and protect the security of our nation. Indispensable to achieving all the Department's roles, missions, and objectives, is a well-managed, effective, and efficient civilian workforce. The Human Capital (HC) Evaluation System described in this Handbook serves as our mechanism to monitor and improve the performance of the various programs and processes within the HC Framework (HCF).

Effective April 11, 2017, Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 250, Subpart B established the HCF, which replaced the HC Assessment and Accountability Framework (HCAAF). The HCF integrates four HC systems – Strategic Planning and Alignment, Performance Culture, Talent Management, and Evaluation. The goal of the HC Evaluation System is to provide a process of evaluation to improve outcomes for HC programs that enable the accomplishment of agency mission objectives.

The Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service, Planning and Accountability (DCPAS/P&A) Directorate is charged with monitoring Component compliance through the use of HCF evaluations and Component-led Self-Assessment Visits. DCPAS/P&A also ensures the resolution of compliance issues and information sharing through feedback mechanisms that flow to all levels of DoD and Component Leadership. The results of these evaluations will be used to ensure DoD's adherence to applicable federal laws, directives, and merit and excepted-service system requirements. The DoD civilian HC Management evaluation systems will continue to evolve and enable our commitment to support the Military Services and Defense Agencies and Field Activities by providing guidance, methodologies, and procedures for conducting evaluations.

Questions regarding this handbook can be addressed to P&A Directorate, DCPAS, at dodhra.mc-alex.dcpas.mbx.accountability-team@mail.mil.

Anita K. Blair

Anita K. Blair
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for
Civilian Personnel Policy

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Background

The Department of Defense (DoD) is a highly diverse global organization, the largest and most complex of all Federal agencies, with a Total Force comprised of military members, civilian employees, and contracted support. A wide range of talent is required to perform our peacetime and wartime mission in support of DoD's global military operations at home and abroad. The civilian workforce must be postured and positioned to support the current and emerging challenges that impact the security of our Nation.

The DoD relies on effective Human Capital (HC) Management (HCM) so that the workforce can meet the current and future mission needs. A major part of a successful HCM program is the establishment of an effective and independent evaluation system. The guidance used government wide to improve program performance is established in sections 1401 and 1402 of chapter 14 of Title 5 United States Code (U.S.C.), Public Law (P.L.) 107-296, the Chief HC Officer (CHCO) Act of 2002, and Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 250, Subpart B. Additional guidance is found in DoD Directive 5124.02, "Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R));" section 1122 of P.L.109-163, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, "Strategic human capital plan for civilian employees of the Department of Defense;" and Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness Memorandum, "Human Capital Strategy Governance," dated June 6, 2006.

Purpose

The purpose of the HC Framework (HCF) Evaluation Handbook is to establish the methodology and procedures for conducting DoD HC policies and program evaluations. These evaluations are used to systematically assess the accomplishment of HC strategic goals and objectives, as implemented in HC activities, for compliance with Federal statutory, regulatory and DoD policy requirements, all of which are built on the core principles of the HCF. The HCF is comprised of four systems: strategic planning and alignment, talent management, performance culture, and evaluation. (See Appendix A)

Scope

This handbook applies to the evaluation of all civilian HC policies and programs DoD-wide. A comprehensive independent evaluation program contributes to the Department's performance by monitoring and evaluating the results of HC policies, programs, and activities; analyzing compliance with merit system principles and the Department's strategic goals; and identifying and monitoring necessary program improvements.

Stakeholder Roles

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy (CPP):

- Oversight of the DoD civilian evaluation program and is charged with conducting enterprise-wide HCF evaluations

Component Civilian Human Resources (HR) Directors or Equivalent:

- Oversight of the Component HCF program and assists in communicating HCF requirements and other coordinating functions within their respective components (inside and outside of HR channels)

Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service (DCPAS):

- Management of the evaluation program
- Coordination of a comprehensive HC assessment schedule which includes coverage of the four HCF systems (Talent Management, Performance Culture, Strategic Planning & Alignment, and Evaluation) in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and DoD Components
- Monitor timely completion and dissemination of HCF DCPAS-led and Component-led self-assessments

Components:

- Conduct HC self-assessments in accordance with DCPAS program guidance
- Report results and analysis of Component- led evaluation activities
- Actively participate in OPM and DCPAS-led HCF evaluations

Program Tenets

Results Driven:

- Enables innovative HC program outcomes in the redesign of guidance, policy, methodologies and procedures through evaluation results and measures

Data Driven:

- Target opportunities to enhance program performance and make mission-related decisions based on reliable data

Strategically Guided:

- Establish high success standards through strategic and operational planning activities to achieve program performance expectations and mission outcomes with clear stakeholder communication strategies (strategic, operational, and employee level)

Compliant:

- Ensure efficiency, effectiveness, and legal and regulatory compliance through review of all HCM systems, programs, policies, and practices

HCF Standards and Outcomes

The following is an outline of the standards and outcomes that align the four elements of the HCF into a holistic evaluation program model:

Strategic Planning and Alignment

Standards:

The standards for the Strategic Planning and Alignment System require DoD to ensure HCM strategies, plans, and practices:

- Integrate strategic plans, annual performance plans and goals, and other relevant budget, finance, and acquisition plans;
- Contain measurable and observable performance targets; and
- Communicate in an open and transparent manner to facilitate collaboration across DoD to achieve mission objectives.

Outcomes:

Mission focused operations: The goals, objectives, and expected outcomes for executives, managers, supervisors, and employees are all aligned with the DoD mission, creating a common understanding of expectations throughout the agency. These direct linkages also create a cascading process that fosters enhanced communication, increased employee engagement, and more efficient and effective operations.

Clear opportunities for best practices: Informed and engaged stakeholders. DoD leaders establish and foster collaboration across DoD to achieve common goals and objectives. Senior executives ensure that their staff partner across functional areas to leverage program experiences and expertise to resolve challenging issues. The lessons learned and outcomes of these collaborative efforts are captured, collected, and shared across DoD as a way to showcase and strengthen the collaborative process.

Focused measures and evaluation: Strategic, operational, and employee measures are aligned with the mission and goals of the DoD specific programs. Evaluation occurs at multiple levels and provides the foundation for communicating mission-related outcomes.

Talent Management

Standards:

The standards for the Talent Management System requires DoD to:

- Plan for and manage current and future workforce needs;
- Design, develop, and implement proven strategies and techniques and practices to attract, hire, develop, and retain talent; and
- Make progress toward closing any knowledge, skill, and competency gaps throughout DoD.

Outcomes:

Ready workforce: The workforce is positioned to address and accomplish evolving priorities and objectives based on anticipated and unanticipated events.

Employee investment: DoD invests in its employees through formal and informal learning and development related activities to close competency gaps and enhance mission-related outcomes.

Efficient operation: The workforce is aligned, positioned, and trained to provide efficient and effective services to the DoD internal and external stakeholders.

Increased retention: Retention strategies create an environment where employees understand and are committed to the DoD mission and empowered to make a difference.

Increased customer satisfaction: Learning and development activities demonstrate enhancements in program management and service delivery yielding increases in customer satisfaction.

Trusted labor/management relationship: Labor and Management partner to ensure the workforce receives the tools, resources, and training to accomplish the DoD mission.

Performance Culture

Standards:

The standards for the Performance Culture System require DoD to have:

- Strategies and processes to foster a culture of engagement and collaboration;

- A diverse, results-oriented, high-performing workforce; and
- A performance management system that differentiates levels of performance of staff, provides regular feedback, and links individual performance to identified goals.

Outcomes:

A valued diverse and inclusive workforce and environment: Executives, managers, supervisors, and employees share unique insights based on their diverse backgrounds, experience, and knowledge in order to achieve mission-related goals, objectives, and expected outcomes.

A sustainable Work-Life balance: DoD leadership and employees undertake Work-Life policies, practices, and approaches as a way to achieve mission-related goals, objectives, and expected outcomes.

Efficient and effective Labor/Management relations: Labor/Management agreements are designed in true partnership and focused on ways of building and maintaining efficient and effective operations at all levels of the organization (strategic, operational, and employee).

Motivated workforce operating at highest potential: Employees are engaged and have a clear understanding of the goals, objectives, and expected outcomes of the DoD.

Increased customer, managerial, and employee satisfaction: Fostering and sustaining performance-related activities and enhancements leads to higher satisfaction levels within the DoD and throughout the stakeholder community.

An aligned, trusted performance management system based on empowerment and accountability: Elements, standards, recognition, and rewards are established based on what the mission is and how to accomplish it.

Valued rewards and recognition: The foundation of the DoD's performance management systems is viewed as fair and implemented with integrity.

Successful program actions, activities, and outcomes: Key program activities and measures align with, and reflect, mission-related performance goals, objectives, and expected outcomes.

Increased external awareness for mission-related outcomes: DoD strategic, program, and employee goals and objectives achieve expected outcomes and are recognized by key stakeholders as innovative and successful.

Evaluation

Standard:

The standards for the evaluation system require the DoD to:

- Ensure compliance with merit system principles; and
- Identify, implement, and monitor process improvements.

Outcomes:

Continuous and innovative improvement: Executives, managers, supervisors, and employees discover innovative ways to enhance program performance and mission outcomes.

Holistically informed decisions: Executives, managers, supervisors, and employees utilize information from different sources to make program, policy, and mission-related decisions to improve outcomes.

Integrity: DoD leadership makes mission-related decisions on reliable data, serving the interests of the American public.

Excellence: DoD leadership and employees establish high success standards through strategic and operational planning activities and collaborate to achieve program performance expectations and mission outcomes.

Assessment Process

DCPAS will conduct a minimum of 2 HCF evaluations each year, with each Component (see Appendix E) being scheduled for an evaluation at least every 2 years. Additionally, DCPAS will monitor Component compliance by participating in OPM-led HCF evaluations and Component-led HCF Self-Assessment Visits. The evaluations will be broken into two categories: full and partial. A full HCF Evaluation will incorporate all four of the HCF systems and a partial will incorporate three or fewer. This notional schedule is subject to change if there are significant issues reported which require immediate attention (See Appendix B).

Components are required to conduct HCF Self-Assessments, actively participate in OPM and DCPAS-led HCF evaluations, and report results and analysis of Component-led evaluation activities to DCPAS.

Generally, evaluations will be more consultative than investigative in nature and will help advance DoD's understanding of how to achieve and evaluate HCM for results. The consultative process will:

1. Involve key HC staff;
2. Focus on building on the positives;
3. Highlight linkages to organizational goals and objectives;
4. Use assessment results to drive policy development and/or updates;
5. Encourage information-sharing on a continuous basis; and
6. Facilitate positive change.

Conducting the Evaluation in Phases

Phase 1: Pre-evaluation

The pre-evaluation phase is the first of three phases and represents approximately 60% of the evaluation time. In this phase, the strategy to develop the evaluation approach is the key to a successful evaluation. The first step in this phase is to identify the coverage and scope. The evaluation team reviews HC and Evaluation plan/policy measures and associated activities to determine the direction of the evaluation.

Review Coverage

Evaluation review coverage may target one or more HCF business processes, part of a single process (e.g., delegated examining (DE)), or aspects of a HR program within a process (e.g., training program evaluation). Determination of the coverage will further dictate the base evaluation time, generally 3 to 5 business days, and the determination of location (on-site, off-

site [virtual], or partially on-site). These determinations are key when identifying required resources.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be comprised of DCPAS team members with supplemental participation from the Components and OPM (based on the type of evaluation being conducted). Throughout the evaluation process, the lead evaluator will work with Component points of contact who are the responsible Component leads for the program areas identified for evaluation (e.g., Employee/Leadership Development, Performance Management, Diversity, or other designees as determined by the scope). These DCPAS system leads will support the lead evaluator throughout all phases of the evaluation.

Sources of Information

There are many sources of information that are necessary to conduct a thorough evaluation. The lead evaluator will collect as much background data as possible from available sources to minimize requests for information. For example, background data and activities may consist of reviewing and analyzing the Component's prior evaluation report of findings; the latest Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) (or other agency employee survey) results; Strategic HCM Plan and/or any implementation initiative plans; results of other assessments; applicable collective bargaining agreements, and data from the Defense Civilian Personnel Data System. After this background assessment is completed, the lead evaluator, in consultation with the identified system leads, will determine the need for additional information from the Component. Based on the availability of background information and the level of analysis necessary to prepare for the evaluation, the lead evaluator will identify the applicable period of review and contact the Component regarding these timelines.

Evaluation Notification and Timeframe

The Director, DCPAS, (or delegate) will issue a notification of evaluation to the Component's responsible management official for the HC Office at least 90 calendar days prior to the evaluation, detailing the type of evaluation, date, scope, coverage, and the Advance Information Request (AIR). The Component's point of contact (POC) will return the advance information 60 calendar days prior to the evaluation. Appendix C of this handbook includes typical requests included in the sample AIR document. In turn, the lead evaluator and system leads will determine the appropriate sample size of selected cases and provide a listing to the POC. This consideration is particularly important since the Component's staff may require significant time to upload supporting case documentation to USAStaffing and/or eOPF or have documentation available on-site.

Records reviews should cover a reasonable timeframe of HR activity, typically the last 12 months, and provides information that is not available from statistical reports, interviews, or analysis of survey responses.

Setting up the Interviews

The lead evaluator and system leads will assess the advance material and identify interview participants. The lead evaluator will send interview notifications, distribute participant surveys, and plan interview conversations with the Component's POC. The lead evaluator will coordinate a schedule with the Component's POC at least 2 weeks before the review. The schedule sets the time and duration of the entrance briefing (usually in the morning of the first day), individual and group interviews (usually 1.5 to 2 hours in length will occur on days 2 and 3), daily Component's POC briefings, records reviews, daily team meetings, technical briefing (1 day prior to exit briefing), and the exit briefing on the last day. Using the current employee listing, the lead evaluator and system leads will identify which supervisors, managers, and employees to interview or invite to participate in focus groups. The Component's POC will be responsible for fulfilling any labor obligations, reserving meeting rooms, and/or ensuring logistical support/access (e.g., conference line/phone) for interviews and focus-group sessions. The lead evaluator will meet with the evaluation team to ensure understanding and use of advance information, discuss work assignments and findings documentation, review schedule and logistics, and assure system access is working properly.

Key Considerations

An on-site visit may impose travel expenses and requires planning for logistics. Virtual evaluations are the least expensive method yet may require extensive coordination for teleconference briefings and interviews and consideration to participant time zones. A partial evaluation requires less travel expense while allowing some direct interaction with the Component, specifically between HC staff and evaluation team members.

Phase 2: Evaluation

Conducting the evaluation represents approximately 20% of the evaluation time. Ongoing collaboration among OPM, team evaluators, and the Component's POCs and other participating Component's staff is typical during the evaluation period (usually 1 week). Formal interaction includes entrance and exit briefings with key participants and management officials. Interviews and focus groups are also formal in nature. Individual interviews and focus-group sessions provide information to support or amplify findings derived from other data and documents. Interviews and focus-group sessions also provide information on the impact of HC programs and

practices on the serviced population.

Interviews/Focus Groups/Surveys

While conducting interviews or focus group sessions, team participants (usually interviewer and note taker(s)) will briefly describe the purpose of the review. The team will inform interviewees that group interviews are being used to obtain perceptions and opinions of employees, supervisors, and managers about the Component's HCM practices. The interviewer will provide assurance to the interviewees that their comments and the information they provide is not for attribution and will ask the interviewee(s) not to disclose topics or information discussed and not to discuss questions or responses from other focus-group participants.

Generally, interviews will be conducted with the following individuals and groups:

1. One or two groups of 8–10 non-supervisory employees (depending on the size of the organization)
2. One group of 8–10 first-level supervisors
3. One group of 6–8 managers
4. HR specialists
5. HR program managers for the functional area being evaluated (Training Program Manager, Workforce Planning Manager, Performance Program Manager, etc.)
6. DE staff and selecting officials
7. DE Program Manager
8. HC/Resources Officer
9. Executive Management Officials

In some cases, such as when personnel are assigned to sites that are geographically separated, virtual surveys can be used as an option. These surveys are used in the same fashion as interviews and focus groups, and should be focused in order to gather feedback on the impact of HC programs and practices on the serviced population.

Records Review

Pre-defined checklists will be used to maintain consistency and to ensure the appropriate review of required actions. The team will analyze relevant data from personnel action trends, review previous HC report findings, and evaluate related FEVS results. Examples of records to review for individual actions may include:

1. Hiring records and associated case files
2. Standard Form (SF)-50s and SF-52s in electronic Official Personnel Folders

3. Employee performance files (e.g., performance appraisals and awards) and Training records
4. Disciplinary and performance-based action case files
5. Labor/management relations files (e.g., certificates of representative, collective bargaining agreements, taxpayer-funded union time records)
6. Workforce-shaping files (e.g., Priority Placement Program, Voluntary Separation Incentive Payment, Reduction-in-Force)
7. Incentive written documentation and service agreements

The evaluation team will compare the Component's processes/activities against applicable laws, regulations, policies, standard operating procedures, etc. If the evaluation team has questions related to processes or activities, or need additional information, they will submit a written inquiry to the Component. All written inquiries will be reviewed and tracked by the evaluation lead prior to submission to the Component POC for response. The Component will usually have 24 hours (1 business day) from the time of issuance to respond to the inquiry. This will provide the Component time to review the inquiry and formulate a response. If deficient actions are found the HR Officer (HRO), or Component's HR point of contact, will be given the opportunity to correct them during the evaluation. Individual deficiencies that are corrected during the evaluation will not be identified in the formal report unless they are significant or part of a systemic issue.

Team meetings and briefings

The majority of work accomplished by the evaluation team during the evaluation week includes assessment of programs and cases, communication with HR supervisor(s), and frequent team discussions and meetings of a professional but informal nature. The team meetings are to discuss evaluation progress, and to compare notes, common findings, or concerns. The evaluation lead will conduct daily meetings with the Component's POC to discuss findings, status of outstanding written inquiries, and any major concerns that arise during that day's review activities. This process ensures continuous communication and clarity of findings throughout the evaluation. The evaluation lead will also conduct a technical findings briefing with the Component's HC/HR management. The purpose of this separate briefing is to provide specific case information (e.g., announcement numbers, applicant names) on the tentative findings prior to the general exit briefing. The exit briefing provides a preview of tentative findings and identifies potential corrective actions that may be required.

Phase 3: Post-evaluation

Post-evaluation activities represent approximately 20% of the evaluation time. These activities include research, reporting, and follow-up with the Component to close out the evaluation. At

the close of an evaluation week, the lead evaluator and system leads will review, assess, compile, and consolidate data and information obtained from interactions with HR staff and observations made by evaluation team members. Both the lead evaluator and team members will analyze the review of data and information in relation to specific measures and expected outcomes. This process further identifies and establishes the findings and solutions that may improve the Component's HCM. This is also the opportunity to identify, collect, and document notable best practices for Departmental sharing. These are procedures, processes, or methods which might be useful to other Components to improve HCM.

Evaluation Report

DCPAS provides an evaluation report with required and recommended actions to the Component's evaluation point of contact no later than 60 calendar days after completion of a partial HCF evaluation and no later than 120 calendar days after completion of a full HCF evaluation or DoD-wide study. Specific distribution of the report may vary based on the scope of the evaluation and the findings. The Component will have 60 calendar days from issuance of the report of findings to respond with an outline of the actual or planned steps to address the required and recommended actions identified in the report. Supporting documentation and action plans with timelines, deadlines, and responsible officials must be included in the response.

Final Steps in the Evaluation Process

DCPAS will forward a copy to OPM's lead evaluator for DoD. The Component's response and plans will be assessed by the lead evaluator and system lead for accuracy and completion and will be used to document and track identified actions. DCPAS will follow up with the Component, as necessary, on completion of corrective actions. All issues resulting from the evaluation must be resolved within 90 calendar days from the issuance of the report. DCPAS will evaluate the time expectations on a case-by-case basis (policy revisions, variation requests, etc.). The Component must retain all records associated with the evaluation in accordance with established records distribution schedules. The Director, DCPAS, (or delegate) will ensure compliance by working with the HRO or with the Component-level official, as appropriate. Issuance of close-out notification will occur in the same manner as previous evaluation activities upon validation and verification that adequate corrective or improvement actions have been met. As part of HRStat and initiatives to strengthen the evaluation system, the Civilian Personnel Policy Council will receive periodic briefings regarding evaluation activities, trends, and notable/promising best practices.

Conclusion

The results of these evaluations will be used to ensure DoD's adherence to applicable federal laws, directives, merit and excepted-service system requirements, and help to identify emerging trends and promising best practices. The DoD civilian HCM evaluation systems will continue to evolve and enable our commitment to support the Department and its Components by providing guidance, methodologies, and procedures for conducting evaluations.

Contacts

Planning and Accountability Directorate
Defense Civilian Policy Advisory Service (DCPAS)
Email: dodhra.mc-alex.dcpas.mbx.accountability-team@mail.mil
Address:
4800 Mark Center Drive
Suite 06D23-10
Alexandria, VA 22350

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix A: Human Capital Framework

Human Capital Framework (HCF)

The HCF provides direction on human capital planning, implementation, and evaluation in the Federal environment. The HCF guides agencies to effectively manage an organization's talent by promoting the use of sound talent management practices. It provides talent management strategies that support and shape an organization's current workforce, while preparing for the future. Additionally, HCF provides guidance on evaluation techniques that measure progress and outcomes for program and policy effectiveness, and prepares organizations for change by providing a foundation for organizational agility.

These **four** systems are:

Strategic Planning & Alignment (Plan)

Definition: A system that ensures agency HC programs are aligned with agency mission, goals, and objectives through analysis, planning, investment, and measurement.

Talent Management (Implement)

Definition: A system that promotes a high-performing workforce identifies and closes skill gaps; implements and maintains programs to attract, acquire, develop, promote, and retain quality and diverse talent.

Performance Culture (Implement)

Definition: A system that engages, develops, and inspires a diverse, high-performing workforce by creating, implementing, and maintaining effective performance management strategies, practices, and activities that support mission objectives and drive outcomes.

Evaluation (Evaluate)

Definition: A system that contributes to agency performance by monitoring and evaluating outcomes of its HCM strategies, policies, programs, and activities.

Appendix B: HCF Evaluation Schedule

Department of Defense

Human Capital Framework Evaluation Schedule

Notional Schedule																
Component	**FY 2021**				**FY 2022**				**FY 2023**				**FY 2024**			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Dept of Army		**HCF**								**HCF**						
Dept of Navy				**HCF**								**HCF**				
Dept of Air Force						**HCF**								**HCF**		
Fourth Estate / Defense-Wide								**HCF**								**HCF**

The Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service, Planning and Accountability (DCPAS/P&A) Directorate accomplishes various evaluation activities annually. This notional schedule is reflective of the Human Capital Framework (HCF) Evaluations only. A consolidated schedule reflecting the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), DCPAS, and Component-led HCF evaluations will be published yearly. DCPAS will conduct a comprehensive analysis of historical HCF evaluations reports to guide the development of the annual integrated HCF evaluation schedule.

DCPAS will conduct a minimum of two HCF Evaluations scheduled each year, with each Component (see Appendix E for definition) being scheduled for an evaluation at least every 2 years. DCPAS will monitor Component compliance through DCPAS-led HCF evaluations and by participating in OPM-led HCF evaluations and Component-led Self-Assessment Visits. This schedule is subject to change if CPP, DCPAS, or OPM determines there are significant issues relating to the Department, a Component, or a sub-component that require immediate attention.

The methodology for selecting the activity to be evaluated will be based on one or a combination of the following factors:

1. At the DoD Component's request;
2. Known or suspected issues requiring follow-up;
3. An agency that has not been reviewed in 2 or more years; and
4. At the request of DoD Leadership (e.g., the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy; Director, DCPAS).

Appendix C: Sample Advance Information Request (Human Capital Assessment)

Specified items below may call for a wider review period to examine trends, as noted. More or less information may be requested depending on the nature and extent of the evaluation being conducted (full or partial evaluation).

1.0 General Information

1.1. Most current organizational chart(s) of (Agency/Component)

1.2. A list of all positions within the serviced population, sorted by organization. Include employee name, title, series, grade, supervisory code, and duty location. (We will use this list to select interview and survey participants.)

1.3. Most current organizational chart(s) of (Agency/Component) HR

1.4. A list of all HR staff, including employee name, program responsibility, title, series, grade, and duty location

1.5. Copies of the agency's bargaining unit agreement(s)

2.0 Strategic Planning and Alignment

2.1. Annual Performance (and Budget) Plan

2.2. Strategic HC planning documents

2.3. Information regarding recent/planned reorganizations/restructuring

2.4. Documents addressing the use of VERA/VSIP during the review period

2.5. Guidance, policy, or other documentation outlining HR staff responsibilities

2.6. Description of any major initiatives and/or recent changes that affect/support HR decision-making (e.g., hiring freezes, furloughs, etc.)

2.7. Information about any existing/planned HR outsourcing

2.8. Description of major HR initiatives or accomplishments within the previous two years or planned for next year

2.9. Description of any HR self-assessment processes in place and results of application of these processes

2.10. Information addressing how agency leaders are held accountable for effective implementation of HC management

2.11. Description of any systematic approach to evaluating organizational effectiveness

2.12. Change-management documents that address reviewing, implementing, and communicating organizational enhancements

2.13. Description of any systematic approach to communicating the agency's mission, vision, core values, and strategic objectives to employees

2.14. Any other materials showing serviced management's approach to HR management effectiveness and evaluation

3.0 Talent Management

3.1. Copies of all logs for merit promotion and direct hire activity. At a minimum, logs should contain the USA Staffing (USAS) vacancy identification number (VIN); title, series, and grade(s) at which announced; whether permanent, term, or temporary; open and close dates; if selections were made; name of the individual(s) selected; legal authority used; and name of the specialist assigned the case. Logs should cover the review period indicated above.

3.2. List of all Mission-Critical Occupations (MCO)

3.3. Counts of MCO new hires, separations, and training completed during the review period (please see example data table below)

MCO Data	Number of New Hires	Percent of Turnover	Number of Instances of Training Completed
MCO (position title/series)			
MCO (position title/series)			
MCO (position title/series)			

3.4. Workforce analysis and planning documents identifying gaps in short and long-term MCOs/competencies

3.5. Documents related to succession planning and the use of leadership and executive development programs, including participation rates in both (please see example data table below)

Type of Program	Participation Rates (number of employees that participated / number of employees that were eligible to participate)
Executive Development Programs (Supervisory)	
EDP 1 (title)	
EDP 2 (title)	
Leadership Development Programs (Non-Supervisory)	
LDP 1 (title)	
LDP 2 (title)	

3.6. Documented recruitment and retention strategies to address occupation/competency gaps, as well as special-emphasis programs and any utilization data and/or accomplishment reports

related thereto (please see example data table below). Include a list and utilization rate of flexible compensation strategies during the review period.

Type of Special Emphasis Program (SEP)	Number of Candidates Generated	Number of Hires Generated	Percent of All Hires (number of SEP hires / number of all hires)
Special Emphasis Program 1 (title)			
Special Emphasis Program 2 (title)			

3.7. List of EEO-related position incumbents (e.g., EEO Officer, Special Emphasis Program Managers, etc.). Please include employee name, title, series, grade, organization, and specific program responsibility.

3.8. Policy statements, directives, memos, etc., related to the use and evaluation of flexible compensation strategies

3.9. Policy statements, directives, memos, etc., related to the use and evaluation of "on-boarding" processes

3.10. Merit Promotion Plan(s) used for personnel actions for serviced employees

3.11. Agency-specific Delegated Examining (DE) policies, guidance, memos, etc.

3.12. Description of any knowledge-management and/or knowledge-sharing initiatives (e.g., communities of practice and informal teaching networks initiated by HR, exchange of best practices, innovations, and lessons learned both within the agency and with other agencies)

3.13. Policies and guidance on employee development and training, including the use of Individual Development Plans or other means of identifying training needs

3.14. Data-based assessment of the impact and effectiveness of training and development programs and practices

3.15. Internal and external reviews/reports assessing and addressing workforce concerns and issues

3.16. Description of or copy of any moratorium or other significant limitations on outside hiring during the review period

3.17. Description of any outreach efforts of HR and managers in partnering to attract diverse and qualified candidates

3.18. Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Plan(s) and Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Plan(s), including the latest accomplishment reports

DE Information:

For the audit coverage period of (Dates), provide information about DEU activity and selections in the boxes below:		
Total # applications processed:	**Total # certificates issued:**	**Total # selections:**
Total # preference eligible selections:	**Total # certificates returned with no selection:**	

3.19. Copies of all logs of DE activity. At a minimum, logs should contain the USAS VIN; title, series, and grade(s) at which announced; open and close dates; if selections were made; name of the individual(s) selected; whether the selectee was a veteran; whether the superior qualifications or special needs pay authority was used; and name of the specialist assigned the case. Logs should cover the review period indicated above. Please identify the titles, series, and grades for all positions for which standing inventories (registers) are maintained.

3.20. A list of all staff who performed DE activities during the review period, including name, title, series, grade, program responsibility, length of DE experience, and date of most recent DE training by OPM

3.21. The names, phone numbers, and email addresses of 20 selecting officials who have worked DE certificates (selections and no selections) during the review period. Include title, series, and grade for the certificates issued to the selecting official and the number of selections (if any) they made.

3.22. Guidance or policy regarding how lost-certification and priority-consideration cases are handled. A list of applicants who are currently entitled to or have received lost-certification referral benefits during the review period, as well as a description of the cause of the lost certification.

3.23. Guidance or policy regarding the acceptance of late applications and maintenance of applications from 10-point veterans who file late for positions filled through case-examining procedures

3.24. The total number of objections submitted during the review period, including those for preference-eligibles and the certificate number(s) associated with each

3.25. The total number of pass-overs of preference-eligibles during the review period and the certificate number(s) associated with each

3.26. The findings from your most recent internal annual DEU audit, actions taken in response to any resulting requirements and recommendations, the organization or person(s) responsible for conducting the audit, and the date(s) it was accomplished

3.27. The total number of applicants currently entitled to priority consideration and total number of applicants who have received priority consideration during the review period

3.28. Documents that establish and implement a DE evaluation system

4.0 Performance Culture

4.1. Agency policies and guidance on performance management and awards

4.2. Complete list of performance appraisal ratings of record for FY##, by employee, for serviced population

4.3. Complete list of awards for FY##, by employee, for serviced population

4.4. A list of employees (name, title, series, grade) to whom Performance Improvement Plans were issued during the review period

4.5. Data-based assessment of the impact and effectiveness of the performance appraisal program

4.6. Data-based assessment of the impact and effectiveness of the awards program

4.7. Description of any employee engagement initiatives and assessment of their impact and effectiveness

4.8. Description of any agency programs devoted to continuous learning consistent with mission-critical competencies and organizational needs, e.g., mentoring, cross-training, coaching, etc.

4.9. Description of any diversity and inclusion goals or initiatives and assessment of their impact and effectiveness

4.10. Information about any labor/management forums, committees, programs, and/or practices aimed at identifying problems and proposing solutions

4.11. A list of grievances and EEO complaints filed during the review period related to leadership and employee training and development, performance management and awards, and/or staffing. Please provide the nature of the complaints and the organization name, if possible. Please have case files available for review.

4.12. Copies of any settlements, arbitrator awards, and court or administrative decisions affecting the staffing, performance management, and awards programs during the review period

4.13. Policy statements, directives, memos, etc., related to the use and evaluation of work-life programs. Include a list and utilization rate of work-life programs during the review period (please see example data table below).

Type of Work-Life Program	**Frequency of Use** **(number of employees participating in program / number of employees eligible to participate in program)**
Telecommuting	
Flexible Work Week	
Other Program 1 (title)	
Other Program 2 (title)	

5.0 Evaluation

5.1. Guidance, policy, or other documentation addressing the evaluation of HC management systems (i.e., strategic planning and alignment, talent management, performance culture, evaluation) for mission alignment, effectiveness, and efficiency

5.2. Information or documentation defining the roles, responsibilities, and types of engagement agency leaders and program managers have in planning, implementing, and improving the evaluation system

5.3. Cost-benefit analysis or data-based assessment of the impact and effectiveness of HC management systems

5.4. Data-based assessment of progress and results of strategic HC goals/objectives

5.5. A list of employees (name, title, series, grade) who are tasked with measuring and evaluating HC policies, programs, and initiatives

5.6. Description of any agency resources that have been provided to track and evaluate HC policies, programs, and initiatives and how those resources are allocated

5.7. Data-based assessment of linkages between HC policies, programs, and initiatives and organizational performance to identify HC drivers and predictors of performance

5.8. Description of any agency mechanisms in place to collect persistent, reliable, and valid HC data and systematically develop new data-collection methods, as needed, to inform decision making

5.9. Information addressing how the HC function communicates data and analyses to leadership that are relevant to accomplishment of mission, strategic goals and objectives, and annual organizational performance plans

5.10. Description of any actions the agency has taken to improve HC policies and programs and correct deficiencies based on data-driven analysis and audit results

Appendix D: U.S. Office of Special Counsel Annual Certification Checklist

U.S. Office of Special Counsel

1730 M Street NW, Suite 218
Washington, DC 20036-4505
(202) 804-7163 certification@osc.gov

U.S. Office of Special Counsel's Annual Certification Checklist

The U.S. Office of Special Counsel's (OSC) Certification Program allows federal agencies to meet the statutory obligations of 5 U.S.C. § 2302(c), the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act, and the Office of Special Counsel Reauthorization Act of 2017. In addition to the existing requirements of the program, these statutes require agency heads to ensure that their employees receive yearly information about whistleblower protection laws and to provide annual *supervisory* training on how to respond to complaints involving whistleblower protections. Certified agencies must complete this checklist each year to ensure their compliance with ongoing and new annual requirements. The completed checklist should be emailed to certification@osc.gov. Questions about completing this form should be directed to OSC's Diversity, Outreach, and Training Unit, which can be reached at 202-804-7163 or certification@osc.gov.

General Information

Agency or Office Completing Checklist: Click or tap here to enter text.

Agency and OIG ☐
Agency ☐
OIG ☐
Component (please indicate parent agency) Click or tap here to enter text.

Contact Information

Please provide the contact information for the official responsible for implementing OSC's Certification Program (the individual's name and phone number will be placed on OSC's website as the point of contact once the agency is certified).

Name: Click or tap here to enter text.
Title: Click or tap here to enter text.
Email: Click or tap here to enter text.
Phone: Click or tap here to enter text.

Address (to send certificate): Click or tap here to enter text.

Requirement Checklist Information

☐1. Verified that the agency has the most current OSC posters on display throughout the agency

☐2. Confirmed that new employees received information on PPPs and whistleblower disclosures within 180 days of employment (OSC handouts)

☐3. Disseminated (by head of agency or designee) annual notification to all employees emphasizing the importance of whistleblower protection laws and including links to educational information on PPPs and whistleblower disclosures (OSC handouts)

☐4. Trained supervisors on how to respond to complaints alleging a violation of whistleblower protections (OSC in-person or virtual training or PowerPoint presentation)

☐5. Checked the links to OSC's website on both the agency's website and intranet

☐6. Ensured that the agency has identified means for disclosing classified information or information prohibited from release by law to the: (I) Special Counsel; (II) the Inspector General of an agency; (III) Congress; or (IV) another employee of the agency who is designated to receive such disclosures.

Comments (optional): Click or tap here to enter text.

Confirmation of Completion

Signature of official responsible for implementing OSC's Certification Program: ×_____

Appendix E: Glossary of Acronyms and Commonly-used Terms

Account Program Manager (APM). The DCPAS SME for HC Assessment and Evaluation. Partners with OPM and Component oversight counterparts to evaluate compliance of HC programs. Provides policy and procedural guidance to Components.

Agency. Executive departments, government corporations and independent establishments excluding the Central Intelligence Agency, the Government Accountability Office, the United States Postal Service, and the Postal Regulatory Commission. For purposes of the HCF evaluation program, the DoD is considered the "Agency."

Agency Performance Plan (APP). An annual plan that defines the levels of performance expected to be achieved towards strategic objectives within a strategic plan. This plan includes performance goals with performance measures, milestones, and may include Component-level strategic and performance plan and Federal priority goal content. The APP identifies quarterly reporting requirements and performance expectations.

Audit. An audit is a process used to determine whether something was done correctly, such as checking personnel records to verify their accuracy or personnel action processing to ensure prescribed steps were followed. Audits deal with facts that are not open to dispute and address process violations through corrective action.

Best Practice. A reliable method or technique that has been generally accepted as superior to any alternatives because it produces results that are superior to those achieved by other means or because it has become a standard way of doing things.

Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO). The agency's senior leader whose primary duties are to: (1) Advise and assist the head of the agency and other agency officials in carrying out the agency's responsibilities for selecting, developing, training, and managing a high-quality productive workforce in accordance with merit system principles; and (2) Implement the rules and regulations of the President, OPM, and the laws governing the civil service within the agency.

CHCO Act. The CHCO Act of 2002 or, Title 13 of the Homeland Security Act, establishes CHCOs in agencies. The CHCO Council, led by the Director of OPM, leads the development of strategic HCM systems, the relationship of strategic HCM to agency performance plans and reports, and HR flexibilities. It clarifies management accountability for managing human resources.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Codified general and permanent rules published in the Federal Register by the Executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Communication. The agency process for sharing information and ideas about the organization with all employees. This vital process includes eliciting employee feedback and involvement in order for all employees to play an appropriate role in planning and executing the mission.

Compliance. Being in accordance with laws, rules, regulations, standards, or requirements. For example, in conducting a records review of personnel actions, an evaluator would determine if each action examined conformed to the appropriate requirements. At the program level, compliance addresses agency adherence to merit system principles and any required processes.

Component. For the purposes of the HCF evaluation program, the Components refer to the Military Departments, as well as the collection of Defense Agencies and DoD Field Activities and other organizations usually referred to as the "Fourth Estate" or "Defense-Wide Programs."

Continuous Learning. Providing opportunities for continuous development and encouraging employees to participate. Leaders invest in education, training, and other developmental opportunities to help themselves and their employees build competencies.

Corrective Action. Any steps or measures required by OPM to rectify violations of law, rule, Executive order, or regulation. This term is generally used interchangeably with required action.

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civilian Personnel Policy (DASD(CPP)). DoD's HR policy office. The DASD(CPP) formulates plans, policies, and programs to manage the civilian workforce effectively and humanely and supports DoD with personnel policy leadership and with support from the Defense Civilian Personnel Advisory Service (DCPAS). The DASD(CPP) also manages the Nonappropriated Fund personnel system and provides guidance for the foreign national employment program within DoD.

Defense Civilian Personnel Data System (DCPDS). DoD's enterprise-wide automated HR information and transaction processing system for DoD civilian employees. This system contains classification, staffing, training, employee benefits, Equal Employment Opportunity complaints action tracking, and data retrieval information on DoD civilian employees. Each DoD HR Regional Service Center uses DCPDS to process its civilian HR actions. Data from DCPDS flows to Customer Support Unit databases at each Regional HR office, as well as to the Corporate Management Information System (CMIS). These databases are read-only and query-only. In addition, personnel data also flows to a variety of external interfaces, some of which are bi-directional. (Note: DCPDS will be replaced with the Defense Civilian Human Resources Management System (DCHMRS)).

Defense Civilian Personnel Data System-Corporate Management Information System (DCPDS-CMIS). Data warehouse system comprised of current and historical data on all DoD civilian employees serviced by DCPDS. Tools for extracting data include the business objects query tool, the web intelligence query tool, direct structured query language queries, and manager dashboards. Users may obtain reporting data through standard corporate reports, ad hoc queries, or standard dashboard metrics.

Delegated Examining Unit (DEU). A DEU is an agency or installation that carries out examining operations that have been specifically delegated to the organization by OPM by means of a signed delegation agreement under the provisions of Title 5, USC, Chapter 11, Section 1104. DEUs are reviewed periodically by OPM evaluators to assure compliance with governing regulations and MSP's.

Defense Personnel Management Appraisal Program (DPMAP). A department-wide performance management program. This program links individual performance to DoD values and organization mission and ensures ongoing recognition and communication between employees and supervisors.

Effectiveness. The level of achievement of program goals and the results intended (as defined in strategic plans and in legislation). Examples include the percentage of trainees employed 1 year after completing job training, the rate of compliance in filing tax returns, and the percentage of customers/employees satisfied in relation to relevant indices.

Efficiency. The degree to which programs are executed or activities are implemented to achieve results while avoiding wasted resources, effort, time, and/or money.

Evaluation. Individual, systematic studies to assess how well an entire program or some specific strategy or an aspect of a program is working to achieve intended results or outcomes. Evaluations may address questions related to the overall performance of the program, the implementation of the program, the effectiveness of program strategies, or factors that relate to variability in effectiveness of the program or strategies. Evaluations can also examine questions related to measurement of progress, such as the reliability of performance data, identifying appropriate goals or targets for performance, and understanding the contextual factors surrounding a program.

Evaluation System. An agency's overarching system for evaluating the results of all HC planning to inform the agency's continuous process improvement efforts. This system also is used for ensuring compliance with all applicable statutes, rules, regulations, and agency policies.

Electronic Official Personnel Folder (eOPF). Web-enabled system used by OPM to maintain employment records on civilian Federal employees. Content is organized and stored in accordance with the Guide to Personnel Recordkeeping and other pertinent legal and regulatory guidance. Evaluators may leverage this technology to virtually assess employment records of a geographically dispersed workforce.

Estimated Onboard Date (**EOD). S**tart date for a new hire.

Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (**FEVS).** Administered annually by OPM and has OMB visibility. The survey focuses on employee perceptions regarding how effectively agencies manage their workforce. Questions focus on critical areas such as employee work-life, job satisfaction, commitment, and engagement. HCF indices data are computed and used to produce government-wide rankings. Results within the DoD are segregated by Component, Agency and Activity. Results are utilized to inform HC evaluation efforts and meet legislatively mandated reporting requirements.

Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Modernization Act (GPRAMA) of 2010. The law that requires agencies to set strategic goals, measure performance, and report on the degree to which goals are met. The GPRAMA requires agencies to set long-term goals and objectives as well as specific, near-term performance goals.

High Risk Mission-Critical Occupations (MCOs). Occupations that are most at risk for staffing or skill gaps based on recruitment, retention, and environmental indicators.

Human Resources (HR). The population of employees who make up the workforce, business sector, or economy. HR may also refer to the organization that is authorized to perform HR functions such as staffing, compensation, workforce planning and policy, labor and employee relations, and more.

Human Capital Evaluation Framework. Formed by three HC evaluation mechanisms (HRStat, Audits, and HC Strategic Reviews) to create a central evaluation framework that integrates the outcomes from each to provide OPM and agencies with an understanding of how HC policies and programs are supporting missions.

Human Capital Framework (**HCF).** Provides comprehensive guidance on the principles of strategic HCM in the Federal Government. The framework provides direction on HC planning, implementation, and evaluation in the Federal environment.

Human Capital Operating Plan (**HCOP).** An agency's annual HC implementation document which describes how an agency will support the HC elements stated within its Annual Performance Plan (APP). Program specific workforce investments and strategies (e.g., hiring, closing skills gaps,

etc.) should be incorporated into the APPs as appropriate. The HCOP should clearly execute each of the four systems of the HCF. The HC Strategy, HCOP, and Human Capital Strategic Review (HCSR) should align with GPRAMA annual performance plans and timelines.

Human Capital Planning. The agency designs a coherent framework of human capital policies, programs, and practices to achieve human capital requirements to directly support the agency's strategic plan.

Human Capital Strategic Review. OPM's review of an agency's design and implementation of its HCOP, independent audit, and HRStat programs to support mission accomplishment and human capital outcomes.

HRStat. A strategic HC performance evaluation process that identifies, measures, and analyzes HC data to inform the impact of agency HC on organizational results and to improve HC outcomes. HRStat is a component of an agency's evaluation system that is a part of the Human Capital Evaluation Framework.

Independent Audit Program (IAP). A component of an agency's evaluation system designed to review all HCM systems and select HR transactions to ensure efficiency, effectiveness, and legal and regulatory compliance.

Investigations & Resolutions Case Management System (IRCMS). A DCPAS-owned and operated database management system designed to augment existing available automation and to standardize processes and procedures related to evaluating and reporting on work performed by DEUs. The DE module of IRCMS has been designed to coincide with USA Staffing workflow, eOPF structure, and OPM-endorsed program and action checklists. Data entry, storage, retrieval and manipulation will be standardized. Reporting and trend analysis capabilities will be available for individual DEU, combined Component, and total Department levels. Automatically generated report capability will expedite the feedback communication process with DEU supervisors and Component managers.

Leadership Defined:

- First Level Supervisor: A position requiring the exercise of supervisory responsibility that meets, at least, the minimum requirements for application of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), the Federal Wage System (FWS) Job Grading Standard for Supervisors, or similar standards of minimum supervisory responsibility specified by position classification standards or other directives of the applicable pay system.

- Mid-level Supervisor: A position that meets the criteria defined under 1st level supervisor above and, in addition, directs work through at least two or more subordinate supervisors

who meet the definition of 1st level supervisor. Mid-level supervisors do not exercise managerial authority as defined under "Manager" below.

- Manager: In addition to meeting the criteria defined under mid-level supervisor above and minimum requirements for coverage of the GSSG, positions in the General Schedule or other white collar pay plans, the manager position assumes the authority vested in some positions under the General Schedule which direct the work of an organizational unit, are held accountable for the success of specific line or staff functions, monitor and evaluate the progress of the organization toward meeting goals, and make adjustments in objectives, work plans, schedules, and commitment of resources. As described in Title 5 U.S.C. Section 5104, such positions may serve as head or assistant head of a major organization within a bureau; or direct a specialized program of marked difficulty, responsibility, and national significance.

Legal Authority. The law, Executive Order, rule, regulation, or other basis that provides the legal authority for a personnel action. It is the basis that authorizes an appointing officer to effect a personnel action on an employee.

Merit System Principles (MSPs). Nine MSPs governing Federal personnel management, as delineated in Title 5 U.S.C. Section 2301.

Metrics. Measurements that provide a basis for comparison. Strategic HCM requires a reliable and valid set of metrics that provides an accurate baseline against which individual agency progress can be assessed.

Milestones. A scheduled event signifying the completion of a major deliverable or a phase of work.

Mission-Critical Occupations (MCOs). Occupations or occupational groups that set direction, directly impact, or execute performance of mission critical functions or services. An occupation having the potential to put a strategic program or goal at risk of failure related to HC deficiencies.

National Defense Authorization Act (**NDAA).** The annual appropriations authority for military activities of the DoD, military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy.

National Defense Strategy. Serves as the DoD Capstone document that establishes the objectives for the plans for military force structure, force modernization, business processes, supporting infrastructure, and required resource.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Serves the President of the United States in overseeing the implementation of his policy, budget, management and regulatory objectives and to fulfill the agency's statutory responsibilities.

Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Provides HR leadership and support to Federal agencies to include policy and oversight for all policy created to support Federal HR departments, from classification and qualifications systems to hiring authorities, and from performance management to pay, leave, and benefits.

Performance Metric. A target level of performance expressed as a tangible, measurable objective against which actual performance can be compared, including a goal expressed as a quantitative or qualitative standard, value, or rate. Performance measures are directly linked to one or more metrics (targets).

Performance Culture System. A system that engages, develops, and inspires a diverse, high-performing workforce by creating, implementing, and maintaining effective performance management strategies, practices, and activities that support mission objectives.

Program Evaluation. Individual, systematic studies to assess how well a program is working to achieve intended results or outcomes. Program evaluations are often conducted by experts external to the program either inside or outside an agency.

Prohibited Personnel Practices (PPPs). Title 5 U.S.C. Section 2302 defines 14 personnel practices that are prohibited by law. These practices describe results or outcomes of poor management practices and should never occur. Managers are held accountable for making HR decisions free of PPPs.

Recommended Action. A recommendation is a solution that eliminates the true cause of a problem identified during an evaluation of an organization's HRM program. Recommended actions are distinguished from required actions that must be taken to prevent, correct, or regularize violations of laws or regulations, including MSP/PPPs as provided in Title 5 U.S.C. Sections 2301-2302.

Regularize. To bring a personnel action which violated law, rule, or regulation into conformity with the requirements of law, rule, or regulation. The action(s) taken to correct such a violation will depend on the nature of the violation and other pertinent circumstances.

Required Action. A solution for correcting personnel actions or programs that are not in compliance with either legal and regulatory requirements or MSP's or both. It is also referred to as corrective action.

Skills Gap. A variance between the current and projected workforce size and skills needed to ensure an agency has a cadre of talent available to meet its mission, and make progress towards its goals and objectives.

Solution. A solution is the action(s) that need to be taken to eliminate the true cause of the problem. Solutions are presented as recommendations if they do not involve legal or regulatory violations and as required actions if they do.

Standard. A consistent practice within HCM in which agencies strive towards in each of the four HCF systems. Standards ensure that an agency's HCM strategies, plans, and practices ensure that Federal HCM practices that strive towards achieving a high level of (measureable) quality that ensures the attainment of organizational goals.

Strategic Planning and Alignment. A system led by senior management, typically the CHCO, that promotes alignment of HCM strategies with agency mission, goals, and objectives through analysis, planning, investment, measurement, and management of HC programs.

Recruitment. The workforce plan drives the aggressive and strategic recruitment of diverse and qualified candidates for the agency‘s workforce.

Retention. Leaders, managers, and supervisors create and sustain effective working relationships with employees. The workplace is characterized by: a motivated and skilled workforce; attractive and flexible working arrangements; and compensation packages and other programs used to hire and retain employees who possess mission-critical skills, knowledge, and competencies.

Strategic Plan. A formal description of how an agency will carry out its mission over a period of time. The strategic plan must include the agency's mission, its strategic goals, the strategies to be used to achieve the goals (including workforce adjustments, staff skills, and HR programs), a description of the relationship between annual program performance goals and the agency's strategic framework, key factors that could affect achievement of strategic goals, and a description of program evaluations used in preparing the strategic plan. GPRA requires agencies to develop and maintain strategic plans covering a 5-year period, which is updated every 3 years.

Talent Management. A system that promotes a high-performing workforce, identifies and closes skills gaps, and implements and maintains programs to attract, acquire, develop, promote, and retain quality and diverse talent**.**

Title 5. The codification of Federal regulations based on the law and govern civilian HR. The laws under this title are referenced as Title 5 United States Code (U.S.C.). Implementing regulations and rules for this title are referenced as Title 5 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

Veterans' Preference. Comes from the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, and is now codified in various provisions of Title 5, United States Code. By law, veterans who are disabled or who served on active duty in the Armed Forces during certain specified time periods or in military campaigns are entitled to preference over others in hiring from competitive lists of eligibles and also in retention during reductions in force. In addition to receiving preference in competitive appointments, veterans may be considered for special noncompetitive appointments.

USAStaffing. OPM's hiring software solution for Federal agencies and is compliant with Federal hiring regulations and meets Federal Information Technology (IT) security requirements. The software equips users to develop and post job opportunity announcements; create web-based assessment tools determined by job analysis data; store and reuse assessment and announcement templates; review applications, resumes, and other documents online; rate and rank applicants using single or multiple assessments; electronically refer candidates to hiring officials for review and selection; notify applicants of their status throughout the hiring process; audit certificates of eligible candidates online; electronically onboard selected applicants; document the recruitment process in compliance with rules and regulations; and achieve the 80-day hiring timeline standards.

Violation. This is an action which is contrary to law, rule, Executive order, or regulation.

Workforce Planning. The organization identifies the HC required to meet organizational goals; conducts analyses to identify competency gaps; develops strategies to address HC needs and close competency gaps; and ensures the organization is appropriately structured.

Appendix F: References

Summary of the 2018 National Defense Strategy
https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2018-National-Defense-StrategySummary.pdf

DoD Civilian Human Capital Operating Plan
https://www.dcpas.osd.mil/Content/documents/PA/FY20_21_HumanCapitalOperatingPlan_1119.pdf

Department of Defense (DoD) FY Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 Agency Performance Plan & FY 2018 Annual Performance Report
https://cmo.defense.gov/Publications/Annual-Performance-Plan-and-Performance-Report/

Department of Defense FY2018-FY2022 National Defense Business Operations Plan
https://cmo.defense.gov/Publications/NDBOP.aspx

Directive-type Memorandum (DTM)-17-004, Department of Defense Expeditionary Civilian Workforce
https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dtm/DTM-17-004.pdf?ver=2019-01-02-072423-843

Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) Website
https://www.opm.gov/fevs/

Federal Workforce Priorities Report
https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/human-capital-management/federal-workforce-priorities-report/2018-federal-workforce-priorities-report.pdf

Government Performance and Results Act Modernization Act of 2010 (GPRAMA)
https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-111publ352/pdf/PLAW-111publ352.pdf

Human Capital Framework (HCF) and HCF Diagnostic Tool
https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/human-capital-framework/

National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010, Public Law No. 111-84
https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-111publ84/content-detail.html

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-17-22, Comprehensive Plan for Reforming the Federal Government and Reducing the Federal Civilian Workforce
https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/memoranda/2017/M-17-22.pdf

President's Management Agenda
https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/management/pma

Title 5, Civilian Federal Regulation (C.F.R.), Subpart B250, Federal Register
https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-12-12/pdf/2016-29600.pdf

Chief Human Capital Officers (CHCO) Act of 2002
https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-107publ296/pdf/PLAW-107publ296.pdf

Office of Personnel Management (OPM), Evaluation System Standards, October 2017
https://chcoc.gov/sites/default/files/Evaluation-System-Standards%20%28508%29.pdf

OPM, Human Capital Reviews, May 2018
https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/human-capital-framework/reference-materials/tools/human-capital-reviews.pdf

Title 5, United States Code, § 2301: Merit system principles
http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=5%2BUSC%2B2301&f=treesort&num=4&amp&edition=prelim&amp