



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL
1322 PATTERSON AVENUE SA, SUITE 3000
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD DC 20374-5066

JAG/CNLSCINST 12271.1
Code 14
26 Apr 17

JAG / CNLSC INSTRUCTION 12271.1

From: Assistant Judge Advocate General (Operations & Management)

Subj: EXTENSION OF CIVILIAN ATTORNEY SELECTION PROCEDURES

Ref: (a) OPNAVINST 5215.17A

1. The above instruction has been reviewed, and the effective date extended for one year in accordance with reference (a).


G. E. SHARP

Releasability and distribution:

This instruction is cleared for public release and is available electronically only via The Judge Advocate General's Web site www.jag.navy.mil.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL
1322 PATTERSON AVENUE SE, SUITE 3000
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD DC 20374-5066

IN REPLY REFER TO:
JAG/CNLSCINST 12271.1
Ser 14
JUN 6 2012

JAG/COMNAVLEGSVCCOM INSTRUCTION 12271.1

From: Judge Advocate General
Commander, Naval Legal Service Command

Subj: CIVILIAN ATTORNEY SELECTION PROCEDURES

Ref: (a) DOD Instruction 1442.02 of 30 Sept 2010
(b) SECNAVINST 5430.27D
(c) GC Memo to JAG dated 3 Feb 2011
(d) JAG Memo to CNLSC dated 27 May 2011

Encl: (1) JAG/CNLSC Civilian Attorney Resume Assessment Matrix
(2) JAG/CNLSC Civilian Attorney Interview Matrix
(3) JAG/CNLSC Civilian Attorney Interview Computation Sheet
(4) JAG/CNLSC Sample Recommendation Memo

1. Purpose. To establish a standard procedure for evaluating and recommending appointment of civilian attorneys. References (a) and (b) establish procedures for personnel actions for civilian attorneys and define the Office of the Judge Advocate General (OJAG) and Naval Legal Service Command's (NLSC) responsibility for supervising and providing legal services. Reference (c) provides delegated qualifying authority to the Judge Advocate General (JAG) to approve civilian attorneys who work under the cognizance of the JAG. Reference (d) provides delegated authority to Commander, Naval Legal Service Command (CNLSC) to approve civilian attorneys who work for Naval Legal Service Command.

2. Background. Mission accomplishment within the Navy legal community is substantially affected by the quality of personnel selected for employment. The guidelines contained herein are designed to standardize the process by which management officials recommend the best qualified applicants for civilian attorney positions.

3. Applicability. This instruction applies to all civilian attorney billets where approval by the JAG or CNLSC is required.

JUN 6 2012

This instruction shall determine the procedures to be used once the Recommending Official (RO) receives the applications for a vacant civilian attorney position.

4. Responsibilities

a. Recommending Official. The Recommending Official (RO) is the management official responsible by position or specific assignment to evaluate and make a selection recommendation for a civilian attorney position. Normally the RO will be the appropriate Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (DAJAG)/Division Director in the case of OJAG positions or the Commanding Officer for NLSC commands. The RO will be responsible for developing core competencies for the billet, designating the Selection Committee, overseeing the evaluation and selection process, and preparing and forwarding a recommendation memorandum to JAG or CNLSC via the OJAG Civilian Personnel Management Services Division (Code 66).

b. Selection Committee. The Selection Committee (Committee) is the group responsible for evaluating applicants for a civilian attorney position. The RO chairs the Committee. The cognizant Assistant Judge Advocate General or Chief of Staff will appoint at least two other members (either military or civilian) to serve on the Committee. Committee members should be selected based upon their experience, seniority and familiarity with the duties and responsibilities associated with the advertised position. Committee members should not include persons who work for, are related to, or who because of their prior relationship with any applicant may appear to be biased as a Committee member. The same Committee members should evaluate all applicants.

5. Core Competencies. Core competencies are those skills identified by the RO as being the most critical to the successful performance of the duties of the position. These competencies may be determined by reference to the position description, performance standards, classification standards, and other relevant sources. The number of competencies will vary depending on the position requirements, but in no case will number less than three. These competencies will be used to evaluate the applicants' resumes and writing samples (if applicable), and to conduct interviews.

JUN 6 2012

6. Evaluation Process. Applicants will be evaluated based upon the core competencies using the following procedure with the sole object of selecting the most qualified applicant.

a. Veterans' preference eligibility must be treated as outlined in reference (a), enclosure 3, paragraph 2(f).

b. Each applicant must meet the minimum requirements found in enclosure (3) of reference (a) and the announcement. Any applicant whose resume does not meet these minimum requirements shall be eliminated from further consideration.

c. If the number of resumes precludes efficient resume evaluation, at the discretion of the RO, the Committee may conduct pre-screening of the resumes using one of the core competencies, for example, (two years experience in a specific area). Normally pre-screening will only be used when the number of eligible applicants exceeds 15. Any criteria used for pre-screening and a justification for use shall be included in the recommendation memorandum.

d. Applicants' packages will be evaluated using the core competencies. The Committee will consider each applicant's skills, background, knowledge, and relevant experience. If an applicant's package contains other factors that the Committee determines would significantly contribute to the applicant's ability to successfully perform the duties of the position, these factors should be noted in the "Other" column on the Attorney Resume Assessment Matrix (Enclosure (1)). Examples of such factors include academic credentials, legal or non-legal professional experience, effectiveness of writing sample, or quality of references. After reviewing the applications, each member of the Committee will rate each applicant on each core competency using the Resume Assessment Matrix on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the most proficient and 1 being the least proficient. Any factor noted in the "Other" column may be awarded one point and shall contribute to the applicant's overall score.

e. Once the resumes have been reviewed and rated, the Committee will select the top scoring applicants to interview. Normally at least three persons should be interviewed for any position, but the number may be higher or lower depending on the number of qualified applicants. If less than three applicants are interviewed for a position, the RO's recommendation memo shall specify the reason.

JUN 6 2012

7. Interview Process. The sole objective of this step is to interview, select and recommend the most qualified applicant; consequently, the applicants selected for interview shall be evaluated without regard to the scores awarded them in the application evaluation process. Applicants shall be evaluated using the following procedure:

a. The interview shall normally be conducted by the entire Committee. In unusual circumstances, an interview may be conducted without the full Committee, but never without the RO. Interviews may be in person or telephonic, but all applicants shall be interviewed in the same fashion using the same questions, though based upon any applicant's response the Committee should feel free to follow up with questions appropriate to the response. Prior to the first interview, an Attorney Interview Matrix (enclosure (2)) will be prepared that identifies those applicants selected for interview.

b. The interviews should be conducted to enable the Committee to assess the applicants' qualifications for the position, response to interviewer questions, and overall demeanor during the session. The scope and breadth of questions will be determined by the Committee, but should focus on the core competencies and the duties and responsibilities of the position.

c. Immediately after each interview, the members of the Committee shall review their notes and discuss the interview. The Committee members will then individually rate the applicant on the core competencies and their overall interview presence. Applicants will be rated using the same rating scale as discussed above in the evaluation process section. If other factors are elicited in the interview that reflect upon the applicant's ability to successfully perform the duties of the position these should be noted in the Other column on the Interview Assessment Matrix. Examples of such factors include academic credentials, legal or non-legal professional experiences, effectiveness of writing sample, or quality of references. Each factor noted in the Other column may be awarded one additional point and shall contribute to the applicant's overall score. Specific notations regarding the rationale for the ratings are strongly encouraged.

d. Following the last interview, the Committee will conduct a final review of each application and all information obtained through the interviews and then tally the scores on the Attorney

JUN 6 2012

Interview Computation Sheet in enclosure (3). The RO will certify the applicant with the highest score as the recommended applicant.

8. Recommendation Memorandum. The RO is responsible for preparing a recommendation memorandum for JAG/CNLSC nominating the identified best qualified applicant for the position. The RO's memorandum shall follow the format in enclosure (4) and provide:

a. the total number of applicants, the number of applicants that met the minimum qualifications in enclosure (3) of reference (a), any prescreening criteria with a justification for use, and the number of applicants that were rated in the evaluation process;

b. discussion of the core competencies used in the evaluation and interview processes;

c. applicants selected for interview and, if applicable, a justification for interviewing less than three applicants;

d. RO's recommendation for the position and a discussion of how the recommended applicant meets the minimum requirements and core competencies;

e. Interview Computation Sheet;

f. resumes of the applicants who were interviewed;


g. recommended applicant's certificate of good standing; and


h. other relevant information for JAG/CNLSC consideration as determined by the RO.

9. Routing the Recommendation Memo. The RO shall forward a complete copy of the recommendation memo to Director, Civilian Personnel Management Services Division, Code 66. Code 66 will prepare a decision recommendation and appointment letter and route the entire package via the appropriate Assistant Judge Advocate General/Chief of Staff, Naval Legal Service Command to JAG/CNLSC for approval or disapproval.

JUN 6 2013

10. Internal Guidance Only. This instruction provides internal guidance on JAG/CNLSC civilian attorney hiring processes. It is not intended to and does not create any rights or benefits, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any person. This instruction does not limit the lawful prerogatives of the Department of the Navy or its officials.


NANETTE M. DERENZI
Commander, Naval Legal Service
Command


JAMES W. HOUCK
Judge Advocate General

Distribution:
Electronic only via the OJAG Website, <http://www.jag.navy.mil>;
Navy Knowledge on Line, <https://wwwa.nko.navy.mil/portal/home>;
and the Department of the Navy Issuances website,
<http://doni.daps.dla.mil>.

JUN 6 2012

JAG/CNLSC Civilian Attorney Resume Assessment Matrix

Office: _____
Vacancy Announcement: _____
Resume Evaluator: _____
Date of Evaluation: _____

Applicant Name	Core Competency 1	Core Competency 2	Core Competency 3	Core Competency 4	Other _____	Score

JUN 6 2000

JAG/CNLSC Civilian Attorney Interview Matrix

Office: _____
Vacancy Announcement: _____
Interviewer: _____

Applicant Name	Core Competency 1	Core Competency 2	Core Competency 3	Overall Interview Presence	Other	Score

JUN 6 2010

JAG/CNLSC Civilian Attorney Interview Computation Sheet

Applicant Name	Evaluator 1 _____	Evaluator 2 _____	Evaluator 3 _____	Total Score

JUN 6 1997

JAG/CNLSC SAMPLE RECOMMENDATION MEMO

Date

MEMORANDUM

From: Commanding Officer/Director, _____
 To: JAG or CNLSC
 Via: (1) OJAG, Code 66
 (2) Appropriate AJAG/DCOM

Subj: RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF _____, TO THE
 POSITION OF _____, GS-__

Ref: (a) DODINST 1442.02
 (b) JAG/COMNAVLEGSVCCOMINST _____

Encl: (1) Attorney Advisor GS-_____ Position Description
 (2) Resumes of Interviewed Applicants
 (3) Interview Computation Worksheet
 (4) Certificate of Good Standing

1. I respectfully recommend that _____ be appointed as
 (Position Title) for (Code/Command) _____. Enclosures (1)
 through (5) are forwarded for your review.

2. There were (#) applicants for this position. The selection
 committee consisted of _____. We first
 eliminated applicants who did not meet the minimum requirements
 found in both DoD Instruction 1442.02 and in the position
 announcement, leaving (#) applicants. We also considered
 Veterans' preference eligibility as specified in DoD Instruction
 1442.02, enclosure 3, paragraph 2(f).

3. If applicable, discuss any pre-screening criteria and a
 justification for use (for example, due to the large number of
 applicants that met the minimum requirements of the position, we
 prescreened the applicants using the criteria of _____.)

4. The remaining (#) applicants were then evaluated according
 to the following core competencies: _____. (Discuss
 these core competencies as they relate to the position).

5. The Committee scored the applicants and selected the top
 four based upon their cumulative scores. Each of these four
 applicants was offered an interview. The applicants we
 interviewed were _____,
 and _____. (If applicable, include justification if less

Enclosure (4)

than three applicants were interviewed.) We determined after the interviews that the top applicant was _____ due to _____.

6. State the selected applicant's qualifications and your reason for selection. SAMPLE: [Provide background on applicant, i.e., degrees, prior work/military experience, etc.] _____ received his B.A. and M.A. in _____, respectively, and his *Juris Doctor* in 1985 from _____. Mr./Ms. _____ also has significant [describe] experience. [Explain how qualifications and experience make applicant the most qualified.] This experience, combined with his education and interpersonal skills, make him the most qualified applicant.

7. Any other relevant information.

RECOMMENDING OFFICIAL NAME