

Merit Staffing Policy

335.1

APPENDIX A. DEVELOPING A JOB ANALYSIS AND CREDITING PLAN

A-1 Job Analysis and Identification of Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSAs)

A-1.1 Definition

A job analysis is defined as a systematic examination of a job to determine the duties and worker characteristics which are important for successful job performance. The job analysis delineates the major activities of the job and outlines the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for successful performance of each activity.

Knowledge, skills, and abilities are factors which are job-related as reflected in the position description and are measurable.

A. Knowledge statements refer to an organized body of information, usually of a factual or procedural nature.

B. Skill statements refer to the proficient manual, verbal, or mental manipulation of data or things. Skills can be measured by a performance test (for example, typing).

C. Ability statements refer to the power to perform an observable activity at the present time.

A-1.2 Development of Job Analysis

The job analysis will be developed by the personnel representative and subject matter expert (SME) using the HUD Job Analysis Form.

A. The position description will be reviewed and the major activities will be underlined. The major activities will be recorded on the HUD Job Analysis Form under the column marked Job Activity. Each job activity identified will be analyzed to determine what KSAs are required for successful performance.

B. Those KSAs which are mandatory for successful job performance are marked with an "M" on the HUD Job Analysis Form. These are selective placement factors (SPFs), and consist of those KSAs which must be brought to the position, i.e., cannot be learned on the job in a timely manner.

C. The KSAs which are not mandatory for successful job performance but are desirable characteristics and contribute to outstanding job performance are called quality ranking factors (QRFs). These KSAs are used to distinguish various levels of quality among candidates who demonstrate possession of all of the mandatory KSAs (selective placement factors). Any factor on the

HUD Job Analysis Form which is not designated as mandatory (i.e., is not marked with an "M") is a quality ranking factor. In some instances, it may be desirable to use a KSA identified as a selective placement factor as a quality ranking factor as well. This is particularly true when a minimum level of possession of a KSA is essential, and it is desirable to measure a higher level of competency in the crediting plan.

D. The relative importance of KSAs also is identified on the HUD Job Analysis Form. It is based on such considerations as the amount of time spent using each KSA, the difficulty/complexity of the KSAs, or the consequences inherent in performing the KSAs either well or poorly. (NOTE: Mandatory KSAs are not necessarily considered the "most important"). The following scale is used to determine relative importance:

Most important = 1

Important = 2

Least important = 3

E. After completing the above analysis, the personnel representative and the subject matter expert (SME) will identify the final KSAs to be used in the evaluation process. Starting with the KSAs identified as most important and working to those least important, they must consider the following questions regarding the use of each KSA until a sufficient number of KSAs has been identified for successful evaluation:

1. Are the KSAs ratable?

2. Do the KSAs distinguish superior candidates from barely acceptable candidates? (FOR QRFs ONLY)

With respect to the first question, they must make a judgment about whether the KSA can be measured on the basis of information contained in the SF-171, OF-612, resume, supplemental qualification statement, or other information required in the vacancy announcement. If the KSA is not ratable in this manner, it cannot be used in the evaluation process, although it may be necessary for successful job performance.

With respect to the second question, they should ensure that only KSAs which distinguish various levels of competency are used as QRFs. Only KSAs meeting the criteria of this paragraph may be used in the vacancy announcement.

F. The final step in completing the job analysis is the development of benchmarks for the KSAs identified as ratable and to be used for filling the position. A benchmark is an example of experience, education, and/or training which shows how one could demonstrate possession of a KSA at a particular level of competency. Examples of such experience, education, and/or training which indicates possession of the minimal acceptable level for each KSA will be written on the HUD Job Analysis Form.

This benchmark will be used as the Average Level Benchmark description and will be the starting point for developing the crediting plan.

G. The Subject Matter Expert (SME) and the personnel representative will specify one of the Quality Ranking Factors (QRFs) as being the most critical for successful job performance. That QRF will be used to evaluate the candidates and determine who will be referred as highly/best qualified in cases where an abbreviated form of evaluation is deemed appropriate.

A-2 Crediting Plan

A-2.1 Definition

A crediting plan is a plan developed to rate and rank candidates for a specific position. It is designed to measure the various quality levels at which candidates possess the job-related knowledge, skills, and abilities that are necessary for successful performance in a position.

A-2.2 Development of Crediting Plan

The crediting plan for each grade level will be developed using the KSAs identified as quality ranking factors in Section A-1.2 of this Appendix. For each quality ranking factor, a benchmark must be developed to show the kinds of experience, education, or training which would demonstrate competency at various levels. The benchmarks developed define three quality levels: Outstanding, Above Average, and Average. The description of these quality levels should be broad and flexible since candidates may have acquired the KSAs in a number of ways.

A. Evidence of outstanding levels should not create artificial restrictions. For example, experience gained in a large company or government setting is not automatically an indication of outstanding possession of a KSA. Likewise, not all types of work experience are better than education. Avoid writing benchmarks which emphasize length of and/or regency of experience.

B. Although stated broadly and with flexibility, statements must be descriptive and specific enough to be meaningful. A benchmark such as "Experience which provides a good understanding of," is not a benchmark. "Experience working in a file room" is a benchmark, but it is not a very good one since it does not describe the specific kind of work (manual, automated, supervisory, etc.) that demonstrates possession of a KSA. "Experience in maintaining and retrieving records" is more specific and makes the benchmark more meaningful.

C. For the Outstanding Level Benchmark, evidence should include extensive or high level education and/or experience which required an application of the KSA. The quality of the evidence is more important than its duration. Examples of evidence appropriate for this level could be based on such things as using the KSA in a variety of settings; or planning, administrative or supervisory work requiring its application. This benchmark level represents three points.

D. For the Above Average Level Benchmark, evidence should include education and/or experience similar to that which the majority of candidates have or might be expected to have. This benchmark level represents two points.

E. For the Average Level Benchmark, evidence may or may not be directly related to the duties of the position to be filled. The education, experience, or training could be in another field which demonstrates a likely possession of the KSA and the potential for successful application of the KSA. Evidence should include experience, education, and/or training beyond that required to meet minimum qualifications. This benchmark level represents 1 point.

A-2.3 Points for Quality Ranking Factors

Points are assigned to each benchmark level of the QRFs using a three-point system as described in paragraphs 45c, d, and e. 3, 2, 1 or 0 points must be awarded for each QRF. Scores for each QRF may not be interpolated, i.e., points may not be assigned between the Average and Above Average Levels or between the Above Average and Outstanding Levels. A QRF may be of such importance to successful performance that it may be double-or triple weighted. Factors which are double-weighted are valued at 6, 4, and 2. Factors which are triple-weighted are valued at 9, 6, and 3. Any factors which are double-or triple-weighted must have been stated on the vacancy announcement.