

**UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
All India Services Branch**

**Guidelines/procedures for categorization of State Civil/Police/Forest Service officers and preparation of a list of suitable officers by the Selection Committee for promotion to the Indian Administrative Service/Indian Police Service/Indian Forest Service in terms of Regulation 5(4) and 5(5) of the Promotion Regulations.**

The Chairman/President of the Selection Committee for promotion of State Civil Service/State Police Service/State Forest Service officers to the Indian Administrative Service/Indian Police Service/Indian Forest Service may suitably brief the other Members of the Committee at the beginning for conducting its business like laying down the procedure/criteria for assessment and also that all Members attending the meeting may remain present throughout the meeting except in matters of grave urgency with due permission of the Chair.

2.1 For preparing the Select Lists, the *crucial date* for reckoning the eligibility of officers is to be taken as the 01<sup>st</sup> January of the year (*Vacancy* year) in which the promotion quota vacancies arise. The Selection Committee normally meets in the year following the vacancy year (*SCM* year). In case of preparation of year-wise Select Lists, the year in which the Selection Committee actually meets is to be considered as *SCM* year. The notional date for reckoning the availability of eligible officers in the State Services for consideration for promotion is to be taken as 31<sup>st</sup> December of the vacancy year.

2.2 In these Guidelines, while reference is made to the provisions of the Indian Administrative Service (Appointment by Promotion) Regulations, the corresponding provisions of the Indian Police Service and Indian Forest Service Regulations would be applicable while preparing the Indian Police Service and Indian Forest Service Select Lists respectively.

2.3 In accordance with Regulation 5(4) of the Promotion Regulations, the Selection Committee has to classify the eligible officers as '*Outstanding*', '*Very Good*', '*Good*' or '*Unfit*' as the case may be on an overall relative assessment of their **service records** (i.e. ACRs and the documents kept therein by the competent authority). For making an overall relative assessment, the Committee will not depend solely on the grading recorded by the

reporting/reviewing/accepting authority but will make its independent assessment of the service records of the eligible officers as per the procedure indicated below.

**A. SPAN/SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT**

3.1 The Selection Committee would go through the service records of each of the eligible officers, with special reference to the performance of the officer during the last five years including the vacancy year, and after deliberation will record the assessment of the Committee in the Assessment Sheet comprising the **Assessment Matrix** [*Officer x Year-wise assessment*] and the Column for **Overall Assessment** of the officers.

3.2 As the Selection Committee actually meets in the year following the vacancy year, the ACRs upto the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March (where ACRs are written on a financial year-wise basis) or 31<sup>st</sup> December (where ACRs are written on calendar year-wise basis) of the vacancy year are to be taken into consideration by the Selection Committee.

3.3 As the overall assessment of the officer cannot be withheld because of non-availability of ACRs, the Selection Committee would make a categorization on the basis of available ACRs. Thus, where one or more ACRs of an officer have not been written for a year or more on account of his being on leave, training or because no officer supervised his work for more than three months or for any other valid reason during the relevant period, the Selection Committee should consider the ACRs of the years preceding the period of five years indicated in paras 3.1 and 3.2 above.

**B. PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSMENT**

***B.1 General Procedure for filling up the Assessment Matrix***

4.1 The Selection Committee will go through the records of the eligible officers and make their assessment after deliberating on the quality of the officer as indicated in the various columns recorded by the Reporting/Reviewing officer/ Accepting Authority in the ACRs for different years and then finally arrive at the classification to be assigned to each officer. The Selection Committee would take into account orders regarding appreciation for the meritorious work done by the concerned officers. Similarly it would also keep in view orders awarding

penalties or any adverse remarks communicated to the officer, which, even after due consideration of his representation, have not been completely expunged.

4.2 The Selection Committee would not be guided merely by the overall grading, if any, that may be recorded in the ACRs but would make its own assessment on the basis of the entries in the ACRs because sometimes the overall grading in an ACR may be inconsistent with the grading under various parameters or attributes. Further, if the Reviewing Authority or the Accepting Authority, as the case may be, has differed from the assessment made by the reporting officer or the Reviewing Authority, as the case may be, the remarks of the latter authority should be taken as the final remarks for the purpose of assessment provided it is apparent from the relevant entries that the higher authority has come to a different assessment consciously after due application of mind. If the remarks of the Reporting officer, Reviewing Authority are complementary to each other and does not have the effect of overruling the other, then the remarks should be read together and final assessment made by the Selection Committee as indicated in para 4.1 . This is also in accordance with the DPC guidelines of DOP&T, as contained in its OM NO. 22011/5/86-Estt.(D) dated 10.04.1989 as amended from time to time.

### ***B.2 Consistency in Assessment Matrix across successive SCMs***

4.3 The Selection Committee, before finalizing the assessments in respect of the eligible officers, may compare the individual years' grading with the year-wise grading assigned by the previous Committee. The year-wise grading assigned by the Selection Committee should, as far as possible, be in consonance with the year-wise grading assigned by the previous Committee unless the present Committee comes to the conclusion that there are adequate reasons for variance in the same. If this variation is leading to a change in the overall grading of the officer, specific reasons for the change should be appropriately recorded by the Selection Committee in the assessment sheet.

### ***B.3 Overall Assessment / Categorisation of officers***

4.4 While finalising the Overall Assessment of the officers [para 3.1 above refers], an officer shall be graded as:

- A. “**Outstanding**”, if in the opinion of the Selection Committee, the service records of the officer reflect that he is of outstanding merit possessing exceptional attributes and abilities and these characteristics are reflected in at least four of the

ACRs for the last five years as indicated in paras 3.1 and 3.2 above including the ACR for the last year *provided he is graded at least “Good” in the ACR of the remaining year*. While grading an officer as “Outstanding”, the following indicative guidelines would be observed.

- (i) Whilst the overall grading in the ACRs will have its relevance, however, in order to have a final view, it will be essential to carefully peruse and assess all the individual attributes/ columns in the ACRs like, Work Performance, Targets Achieved, Supervision, Managerial capabilities, personality traits etc. before the Committee decides to grade an officer as ‘Outstanding’.
- (ii) Thus, there should be an in-depth analysis of the performance of the officer before he is rated as ‘Outstanding’. There should also be consistency in the grading given by different Committees in different years.
- (iii) Considering the fact that such ‘Outstanding’ officers are going to supersede other officers, there is a greater need to ensure that such an officer has met the stringent norms of being graded as ‘Outstanding’. For such purposes, the ACRs of the concerned officer should elaborate his significant achievements or exceptional nature of work in the areas of law and order, disaster management, implementation of developmental schemes etc.
- (iv) Postings are not within the competence of an officer for which he ought not to be discriminated. However, the Committee may also like to examine the various positions that such ‘Outstanding’ officers have occupied and the nature of duties performed by him over the years in the process of assessing the officer.

B. **“Very Good”**, if in the opinion of the Selection Committee, his ACRs reflect that the officer has done highly meritorious work and possesses positive attributes and these characteristics are reflected in at least four of the last five ACRs as indicated in paras 3.1 and 3.2 above provided he is graded at least “Good” in the ACR of the remaining year.

- C. “**Good**” if in the opinion of the Selection Committee, the service records reflect that the officer’s performance is generally good and he is considered fit for promotion and those characteristics are reflected in each of the ACRs for the last five years as indicated in paras 3.1 and 3.2 above.
  
- D. An officer may be categorized as “**Unfit**” if his reports are lacking any positive merit or whose performance is not generally satisfactory or if there are entries in some of the latest ACRs which adversely reflect on his suitability for promotion or if the ACRs contain orders of penalty which in the opinion of the Selection Committee would render the officer unsuitable for promotion.

#### ***B.4 Treatment of Penalties***

4.5 The following guidelines of the Commission may be kept in view by the Committee with regard to the effect of penalties imposed on the officers in the zone of consideration on the Assessment Matrix as also on the Overall Assessment. The following definitions/concepts may be kept in view by the Committee:

4.6 The Selection Committee, while preparing Select Lists, may take into account the effect of ‘**Censure**’ as under:

- (a) If the date of imposition of the ‘censure’ falls within any of the years in the Assessment Matrix, the Committee would categorise the officer as ‘Unfit’ for the year in which it is imposed for the first Select List prepared in which he is eligible to be considered. Thereafter, the Overall Assessment of the officer may be made as per the procedure given in section B.3 of the Guidelines.
  
- (b) If the date of imposition of the ‘censure’ is subsequent to the last year in the Assessment Matrix, and upto the date of the SCM, the Committee would categorise the officer as ‘Unfit’ in the overall Assessment for the first Select List prepared in which he is eligible to be considered.

- (c) The penalty of ‘censure’ would be ignored for the subsequent Select Lists for which the officer may be eligible to be considered.

4.7 The Selection Committee, while preparing Select Lists, may take into account the effect of currency of penalties other than ‘censure’ as under:

The currency of the Penalty is taken from the date from which it is imposed/effective to the date it ceases to be in force.

4.7.1 The Selection Committee meets to prepare the Select List for the **current year** only.

- (a) If the **currency of the penalty flows into the SCM year**, the officer would be graded as ‘Unfit’ in the Overall Assessment for the current year.
- (b) If the **currency/effect of the penalty lapses before the SCM year**, but is having implications on any of the years in the Assessment Matrix, the Committee would categorise the officer as “Unfit” for the relevant year(s) in the Assessment Matrix **when the penalty was current**. Thereafter, the Overall Assessment of the officer may be made as per the procedure given in Section B.3 above.

4.7.2 The Selection Committee meets to prepare year-wise Select Lists of earlier years **including/excluding** the current Select List:

- (a) If the **currency of the penalty flows into the SCM year**, the officer would be graded as “Unfit” in the Overall Assessment for **all** the Select Lists being prepared.
- (b) If the **currency/effect of the penalty lapses before the SCM year**, but is having implications on any of the years in the Assessment matrix, the Committee would categorise the officer as ‘Unfit’ for the relevant year(s) (in the Assessment Matrix) **when the penalty was current**. Thereafter, the Overall Assessment of the officer may be made as per the procedure given in Section B.3 above.

- (c) If the **penalty is imposed after the last Select List under preparation**, but **lapses before the SCM year**, the Committee would categorise the officer as '**Unfit**' in the Overall Assessment for **all** the Select Lists being prepared.

**C. TREATMENT OF ADVERSE REMARKS**

5. As per Govt. of India, DPAR OM No.14015/14/81-AIS(I) dated 07.07.1981, the Commission is requesting the State Govts to send the following statement of adverse remarks while sending the proposals to the Commission for convening the Selection Committee Meetings:-

- (i) Adverse remarks in the Character Rolls of the eligible officers have not been communicated by the State Govt. to the officers concerned.
- (ii) Adverse remarks in respect of the eligible officers have been communicated, but no representation has so far been received from the officers concerned and the time limit to represent is not yet over.
- (iii) Representations against adverse entries in respect of the eligible officers received within the stipulated time but the decision of the State Govt. is yet to be taken.

5.1 In view of this, the Selection Committee may keep the following in view in the treatment of adverse remarks in the ACRs of the officers in the zone:-

5.1.1 The Selection Committee may **not ignore** the adverse entries made in the confidential report of an officer and duly communicated to him if he has not submitted a representation against such remarks within the stipulated period as per State Service Rules.

5.1.2 The Selection Committee may in the following cases, include the name of the officer in the list **provisionally subject to expunction of adverse remarks** from the confidential report concerned, if on the basis of the totality of his performance as reflected in his service records, he is considered suitable for promotion

- (i) If the adverse remarks have been communicated to him as per the State Service Rules and **there is yet time for submitting his/her representation** and the meeting of the Selection Committee is held prior to the expiry of the period.

- (ii) If the adverse remarks have been communicated to the officer and he has also represented within the stipulated time and **the representation of the officer is under consideration by the State Govt.** at the time of the meeting of the Selection Committee.

5.2 The Selection Committee may **ignore** the adverse remarks in the confidential reports which have not at all been communicated to him.

**D. TREATMENT OF INTEGRITY CERTIFICATE/ DEPARTMENTAL PROCEEDINGS/ CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, ETC.**

6. The name of the officer, whose integrity certificate has been withheld by the State Government or against whom departmental or criminal proceedings are pending may be **included** in the Select List by the Selection Committee **provisionally** subject to grant of integrity certificate or clearance in the departmental or criminal proceedings, if the Selection Committee finds the officer as otherwise suitable for promotion on the basis of an overall assessment of his ACRs as per the procedure indicated in the paragraphs 4.1 to 4.5 above. The proceedings **shall be treated as pending** only if a charge-sheet has actually been issued to the officer in disciplinary proceedings or filed in a court of law in criminal proceedings, as the case may be.

**E. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE**

7.1 The Selection Committee after taking into account all the aforementioned factors will make an overall assessment and classification in respect of each eligible officer, as indicated in Regulation 5(4) and indicate the same in the 'Minutes/Recommendations'.

7.2 On the basis of the categorization assigned to each officer by the Selection Committee as "Outstanding", "Very Good", "Good" and "Unfit" as the case may be in terms of Regulation 5(4) of the Promotion Regulations, the Selection Committee would proceed to include the names in the list of suitable officers for promotion to the Indian Administrative Service/Indian Police Service/Indian Forest Service in terms of Regulation 5(5) i.e. by including the required number of names first from amongst the officers finally classified as "Outstanding", then from amongst those similarly classified as "Very Good" and thereafter from amongst those similarly classified as "Good" and the order of names inter se within each category shall be in the order of their seniority in the State Civil Service.

7.3 The Selection Committee will arrive at the overall assessment of the officers in the zone of consideration after due deliberation and on mutual consensus basis. In the event that the members of the Committee differ on the overall assessment of one or more officers, the Committee may make further attempts through discussions on the service records of these officers for resolving the differences. In case the differences persist, the issue may be suitably mentioned in the minutes alongwith the specific views of the President of the Selection Committee on the issues.

**F. SELECTIONS DISTINCT FROM DPC GUIDELINES**

8. The promotions of State Service Officers to the All India Services are distinct from the promotions within the same Cadre of the State Govt./Central Govt. The promotions to All India Services are governed by the provisions of Promotion Regulations whereas the in-line (same cadre/service) promotions are governed by the DPC guidelines issued by the State Govt./Central Govt. As such, there is no concept of “Bench Mark” or assessment as “Fit/Unfit” in the Promotion Regulations. Further, the officers against whom disciplinary/criminal proceedings are pending or whose integrity certificate is withheld are included provisionally in the Select List as per the provisions of the Promotion Regulations. The concept of “Sealed Cover Procedure” as indicated in the DPC guidelines is not provided for in the Promotion Regulations. The eligibility of officers in the zone of consideration is verified by the Commission in terms of the specific provisions of the Promotion Regulations. Further, as per the present policy of the Govt. of India, reservations for SC/ST officers are not applicable in respect of promotions to the All India Services.

**G. GUIDELINES RELATING TO RETENTION OF EARLIER YEAR GRADING BY THE REVIEW SCM**

9. The Promotion Regulations do not provide for *suo-motu* review of the Select List already prepared, approved by the Commission and acted upon by the Central Govt. However, sometimes, on specific directions of the competent courts, the Select Lists are required to be reviewed. While convening Review SCMs in compliance with the directions of courts on account of revision of seniority or to rectify some procedural irregularity that crept in the proceedings of the original Selection Committee, if the officer has already been considered by an earlier Selection Committee, in the first instance the State Government may be requested to indicate whether there is any material change in the relevant record of the concerned officer after

consideration of his case by the initial Committee for promotion to the Indian Administrative Service/Indian Police Service/Indian Forest Service. In the event the State Government certifies that there is no material change in the service records of the officer in the relevant years, the Review Committee may not change the grading of the officer already assigned by the earlier Committee. In exceptional circumstances, in case the Selection Committee recommends any change in the grading, specific reasons for the change should be appropriately recorded by the Review Committee in the minutes.

#### **H. INTERPOLATION OF NAMES IN THE SELECT LIST AFTER REVIEW**

10. Consequent on interpolation of additional names in the original Select Lists, the size of the original Select List is likely to exceed the statutory limit of the size of the Select List. This matter has been agitated in various courts. The matter relating to amendments in Promotion Regulations regarding increase in size of the Select List consequent on interpolation of additional officers in the original Select List after review is pending a final decision with the Govt. of India, DOPT. The Commission have, therefore, decided that till the Promotion Regulations are suitably amended, the following para may be indicated in the minutes of the Review Selection Committee Meeting.

*“The Committee noted that as a consequence of this assessment and inclusion of Shri ----  
----- in the Select List of -----, the size of the Select List would increase from the  
statutory size of --- to ---. The Committee were also informed that the policy issue of  
interpolation of officers in the Select Lists is pending a final decision by the Government  
of India, DOP&T. The recommendation would, therefore, be subject to the decision of  
the Govt. of India and Court Orders, if any, on the matter of interpolation.”*

#### **I. ISSUES NOT COVERED**

11. The above guidelines are indicative and not exhaustive. In the event that a clarification is required on the issues not covered under the above guidelines, a reference may be drawn to the corresponding provisions of the Promotion Regulations, the clarification and instructions of the Govt. of India (DOPT in particular) and the DPC guidelines issued by the Govt. of India, Department of Personnel & Training, as amended from time to time and thereafter a decision may be arrived at by the Selection Committee.

\*\*\*\*\*