

§ 49.3

as true copies of the original of the material involved.

[60 FR 44277, Aug. 25, 1995; 60 FR 61290, Nov. 29, 1995]

§ 49.3 Examination of the material.

Documentary material, answers to interrogatories, or transcripts of oral testimony produced pursuant to the Act, while in the custody of the custodian, shall be for the official use of officers, employees, and agents of the Department of Justice in accordance with the Act. Upon reasonable notice to the custodian—

(a) Such documentary material or answers to interrogatories shall be made available for examination by the person who produced such documentary material or answers to interrogatories, or by any duly authorized representative of such person; and

(b) Such transcripts of oral testimony shall be made available for examination by the person who produced such testimony, or by such person's counsel, during regular office hours established for the Department of Justice. Examination of such documentary material, answers to interrogatories, or transcripts of oral testimony at other times may be authorized by the Assistant Attorney General or the custodian.

[60 FR 44277, Aug. 25, 1995; 60 FR 61290, Nov. 29, 1995]

§ 49.4 Deputy custodians.

Deputy custodians may perform such of the duties assigned to the custodian as may be authorized or required by the Assistant Attorney General.

PART 50—STATEMENTS OF POLICY

Sec.

50.2 Release of information by personnel of the Department of Justice relating to criminal and civil proceedings.

50.3 Guidelines for the enforcement of title VI, Civil Rights Act of 1964.

50.5 Notification of Consular Officers upon the arrest of foreign nationals.

50.6 Antitrust Division business review procedure.

50.7 Consent judgments in actions to enjoin discharges of pollutants.

50.8 [Reserved]

50.9 Policy with regard to open judicial proceedings.

28 CFR Ch. I (7–1–25 Edition)

50.10 Policy regarding obtaining information from, or records of, members of the news media; and regarding questioning, arresting, or charging members of the news media.

50.12 Exchange of FBI identification records.

50.14 Guidelines on employee selection procedures.

50.15 Representation of Federal officials and employees by Department of Justice attorneys or by private counsel furnished by the Department in civil, criminal, and congressional proceedings in which Federal employees are sued, subpoenaed, or charged in their individual capacities.

50.16 Representation of Federal employees by private counsel at Federal expense.

50.17 *Ex parte* communications in informal rulemaking proceedings.

50.18 [Reserved]

50.19 Procedures to be followed by government attorneys prior to filing recusal or disqualification motions.

50.20 Participation by the United States in court-annexed arbitration.

50.21 Procedures governing the destruction of contraband drug evidence in the custody of Federal law enforcement authorities.

50.22 Young American Medals Program.

50.23 Policy against entering into final settlement agreements or consent decree that are subject to confidentiality provisions and against seeking or concurring in the sealing of such documents.

50.24 Annuity broker minimum qualifications.

50.25 Assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction in certain areas of Indian country.

50.26–50.28 [Reserved]

AUTHORITY: 5 U.S.C. 301; 18 U.S.C. 1162; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 516, and 519; 42 U.S.C. 1921 *et seq.*, 1973c; and Pub. L. 107–273, 116 Stat. 1758, 1824.

§ 50.2 Release of information by personnel of the Department of Justice relating to criminal and civil proceedings.

(a) *General.* (1) The availability to news media of information in criminal and civil cases is a matter which has become increasingly a subject of concern in the administration of justice. The purpose of this statement is to formulate specific guidelines for the release of such information by personnel of the Department of Justice.

(2) While the release of information for the purpose of influencing a trial is, of course, always improper, there are valid reasons for making available to

Department of Justice

§ 50.2

the public information about the administration of the law. The task of striking a fair balance between the protection of individuals accused of crime or involved in civil proceedings with the Government and public understandings of the problems of controlling crime and administering government depends largely on the exercise of sound judgment by those responsible for administering the law and by representatives of the press and other media.

(3) Inasmuch as the Department of Justice has generally fulfilled its responsibilities with awareness and understanding of the competing needs in this area, this statement, to a considerable extent, reflects and formalizes the standards to which representatives of the Department have adhered in the past. Nonetheless, it will be helpful in ensuring uniformity of practice to set forth the following guidelines for all personnel of the Department of Justice.

(4) Because of the difficulty and importance of the questions they raise, it is felt that some portions of the matters covered by this statement, such as the authorization to make available Federal conviction records and a description of items seized at the time of arrest, should be the subject of continuing review and consideration by the Department on the basis of experience and suggestions from those within and outside the Department.

(b) *Guidelines to criminal actions.* (1) These guidelines shall apply to the release of information to news media from the time a person is the subject of a criminal investigation until any proceeding resulting from such an investigation has been terminated by trial or otherwise.

(2) At no time shall personnel of the Department of Justice furnish any statement or information for the purpose of influencing the outcome of a defendant's trial, nor shall personnel of the Department furnish any statement or information, which could reasonably be expected to be disseminated by means of public communication, if such a statement or information may reasonably be expected to influence the outcome of a pending or future trial.

(3) Personnel of the Department of Justice, subject to specific limitations imposed by law or court rule or order, may make public the following information:

(i) The defendant's name, age, residence, employment, marital status, and similar background information.

(ii) The substance or text of the charge, such as a complaint, indictment, or information.

(iii) The identity of the investigating and/or arresting agency and the length or scope of an investigation.

(iv) The circumstances immediately surrounding an arrest, including the time and place of arrest, resistance, pursuit, possession and use of weapons, and a description of physical items seized at the time of arrest.

Disclosures should include only incontrovertible, factual matters, and should not include subjective observations. In addition, where background information or information relating to the circumstances of an arrest or investigation would be highly prejudicial or where the release thereof would serve no law enforcement function, such information should not be made public.

(4) Personnel of the Department shall not disseminate any information concerning a defendant's prior criminal record.

(5) Because of the particular danger of prejudice resulting from statements in the period approaching and during trial, they ought strenuously to be avoided during that period. Any such statement or release shall be made only on the infrequent occasion when circumstances absolutely demand a disclosure of information and shall include only information which is clearly not prejudicial.

(6) The release of certain types of information generally tends to create dangers of prejudice without serving a significant law enforcement function. Therefore, personnel of the Department should refrain from making available the following:

(i) Observations about a defendant's character.

(ii) Statements, admissions, confessions, or alibis attributable to a defendant, or the refusal or failure of the accused to make a statement.

§ 50.3

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

(iii) Reference to investigative procedures such as fingerprints, polygraph examinations, ballistic tests, or laboratory tests, or to the refusal by the defendant to submit to such tests or examinations.

(iv) Statements concerning the identity, testimony, or credibility of prospective witnesses.

(v) Statements concerning evidence or argument in the case, whether or not it is anticipated that such evidence or argument will be used at trial.

(vi) Any opinion as to the accused's guilt, or the possibility of a plea of guilty to the offense charged, or the possibility of a plea to a lesser offense.

(7) Personnel of the Department of Justice should take no action to encourage or assist news media in photographing or televising a defendant or accused person being held or transported in Federal custody. Departmental representatives should not make available photographs of a defendant unless a law enforcement function is served thereby.

(8) This statement of policy is not intended to restrict the release of information concerning a defendant who is a fugitive from justice.

(9) Since the purpose of this statement is to set forth generally applicable guidelines, there will, of course, be situations in which it will limit the release of information which would not be prejudicial under the particular circumstances. If a representative of the Department believes that in the interest of the fair administration of justice and the law enforcement process information beyond these guidelines should be released, in a particular case, he shall request the permission of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General to do so.

(c) *Guidelines to civil actions.* Personnel of the Department of Justice associated with a civil action shall not during its investigation or litigation make or participate in making an extrajudicial statement, other than a quotation from or reference to public records, which a reasonable person would expect to be disseminated by means of public communication if there is a reasonable likelihood that such dissemination will interfere with a fair trial and which relates to:

(1) Evidence regarding the occurrence or transaction involved.

(2) The character, credibility, or criminal records of a party, witness, or prospective witness.

(3) The performance or results of any examinations or tests or the refusal or failure of a party to submit to such.

(4) An opinion as to the merits of the claims or defenses of a party, except as required by law or administrative rule.

(5) Any other matter reasonably likely to interfere with a fair trial of the action.

[Order No. 469-71, 36 FR 21028, Nov. 3, 1971, as amended by Order No. 602-75, 40 FR 22119, May 20, 1975]

§ 50.3 Guidelines for the enforcement of title VI, Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(a) Where the heads of agencies having responsibilities under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 conclude there is noncompliance with regulations issued under that title, several alternative courses of action are open. In each case, the objective should be to secure prompt and full compliance so that needed Federal assistance may commence or continue.

(b) Primary responsibility for prompt and vigorous enforcement of title VI rests with the head of each department and agency administering programs of Federal financial assistance. Title VI itself and relevant Presidential directives preserve in each agency the authority and the duty to select, from among the available sanctions, the methods best designed to secure compliance in individual cases. The decision to terminate or refuse assistance is to be made by the agency head or his designated representative.

(c) This statement is intended to provide procedural guidance to the responsible department and agency officials in exercising their statutory discretion and in selecting, for each noncompliance situation, a course of action that fully conforms to the letter and spirit of section 602 of the Act and to the implementing regulations promulgated thereunder.

I. ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION

A. ULTIMATE SANCTIONS

The ultimate sanctions under title VI are the refusal to grant an application for assistance and the termination of assistance being rendered. Before these sanctions may be invoked, the Act requires completion of the procedures called for by section 602. That section requires the department or agency concerned (1) to determine that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) to consider alternative courses of action consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statutes authorizing the particular financial assistance, (3) to afford the applicant an opportunity for a hearing, and (4) to complete the other procedural steps outlined in section 602, including notification to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

In some instances, as outlined below, it is legally permissible temporarily to defer action on an application for assistance, pending initiation and completion of section 602 procedures—including attempts to secure voluntary compliance with title VI. Normally, this course of action is appropriate only with respect to applications for noncontinuing assistance or initial applications for programs of continuing assistance. It is not available where Federal financial assistance is due and payable pursuant to a previously approved application.

Whenever action upon an application is deferred pending the outcome of a hearing and subsequent section 602 procedures, the efforts to secure voluntary compliance and the hearing and such subsequent procedures, if found necessary, should be conducted without delay and completed as soon as possible.

B. AVAILABLE ALTERNATIVES

1. Court Enforcement

Compliance with the nondiscrimination mandate of title VI may often be obtained more promptly by appropriate court action than by hearings and termination of assistance. Possibilities of judicial enforcement include (1) a suit to obtain specific enforcement of assurances, covenants running with federally provided property, statements or compliance or desegregation plans filed pursuant to agency regulations, (2) a suit to enforce compliance with other titles of the 1964 Act, other Civil Rights Acts, or constitutional or statutory provisions requiring nondiscrimination, and (3) initiation of, or intervention or other participation in, a suit for other relief designed to secure compliance.

The possibility of court enforcement should not be rejected without consulting the Department of Justice. Once litigation has been begun, the affected agency should consult with the Department of Justice before taking any further action with respect to the noncomplying party.

2. Administrative Action

A number of effective alternative courses not involving litigation may also be available in many cases. These possibilities include (1) consulting with or seeking assistance from other Federal agencies (such as the Contract Compliance Division of the Department of Labor) having authority to enforce nondiscrimination requirements; (2) consulting with or seeking assistance from State or local agencies having such authority; (3) bypassing a recalcitrant central agency applicant in order to obtain assurances from, or to grant assistance to complying local agencies; and (4) bypassing all recalcitrant non-Federal agencies and providing assistance directly to the complying ultimate beneficiaries. The possibility of utilizing such administrative alternatives should be considered at all stages of enforcement and used as appropriate or feasible.

C. INDUCING VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE

Title VI requires that a concerted effort be made to persuade any noncomplying applicant or recipient voluntarily to comply with title VI. Efforts to secure voluntary compliance should be undertaken at the outset in every noncompliance situation and should be pursued through each stage of enforcement action. Similarly, where an applicant fails to file an adequate assurance or apparently breaches its terms, notice should be promptly given of the nature of the noncompliance problem and of the possible consequences thereof, and an immediate effort made to secure voluntary compliance.

II. PROCEDURES

A. NEW APPLICATIONS

The following procedures are designed to apply in cases of noncompliance involving applications for one-time or noncontinuing assistance and initial applications for new or existing programs of continuing assistance.

1. *Where the Requisite Assurance Has Not Been Filed or Is Inadequate on Its Face.*

Where the assurance, statement of compliance or plan of desegregation required by agency regulations has not been filed or where, in the judgment of the head of the agency in question, the filed assurance fails on its face to satisfy the regulations, the agency head should defer action on the application pending prompt initiation and completion of section 602 procedures. The applicant should be notified immediately and attempts made to secure voluntary compliance. If such efforts fail, the applicant should promptly be offered a hearing for the purpose of determining whether an adequate assurance has in fact been filed.

If it is found that an adequate assurance has not been filed, and if administrative alternatives are ineffective or inappropriate,

§ 50.3

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

and court enforcement is not feasible, section 602 procedures may be completed and assistance finally refused.

2. *Where it Appears that the Field Assurance Is Untrue or Is Not Being Honored.*

Where an otherwise adequate assurance, statement of compliance, or plan has been filed in connection with an application for assistance, but prior to completion of action on the application the head of the agency in question has reasonable grounds, based on a substantiated complaint, the agency's own investigation, or otherwise, to believe that the representations as to compliance are in some material respect untrue or are not being honored, the agency head may defer action on the application pending prompt initiation and completion of section 602 procedures. The applicant should be notified immediately and attempts made to secure voluntary compliance. If such efforts fail and court enforcement is determined to be ineffective or inadequate, a hearing should be promptly initiated to determine whether, in fact, there is noncompliance.

If noncompliance is found, and if administrative alternatives are ineffective or inappropriate and court enforcement is still not feasible, section 602 procedures may be completed and assistance finally refused.

The above-described deferral and related compliance procedures would normally be appropriate in cases of an application for noncontinuing assistance. In the case of an initial application for a new or existing program of continuing assistance, deferral would often be less appropriate because of the opportunity to secure full compliance during the life of the assistance program. In those cases in which the agency does not defer action on the application, the applicant should be given prompt notice of the asserted noncompliance; funds should be paid out for short periods only, with no long-term commitment of assistance given; and the applicant advised that acceptance of the funds carries an enforceable obligation of non-discrimination and the risk of invocation of severe sanctions, if noncompliance in fact is found.

B. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUATION OR RENEWAL OF ASSISTANCE

The following procedures are designed to apply in cases of noncompliance involving all submissions seeking continuation or renewal under programs of continuing assistance.

In cases in which commitments for Federal financial assistance have been made prior to the effective date of title VI regulations and funds have not been fully disbursed, or in which there is provision for future periodic payments to continue the program or activity for which a present recipient has previously applied and qualified, or in which as-

sistance is given without formal application pursuant to statutory direction or authorization, the responsible agency may nonetheless require an assurance, statement of compliance, or plan in connection with disbursement or further funds. However, once a particular program grant or loan has been made or an application for a certain type of assistance for a specific or indefinite period has been approved, no funds due and payable pursuant to that grant, loan, or application, may normally be deferred or withheld without first completing the procedures prescribed in section 602.

Accordingly, where the assurance, statement of compliance, or plan required by agency regulations has not been filed or where, in the judgment of the head of the agency in question, the filed assurance fails on its face to satisfy the regulations, or there is reasonable cause to believe it untrue or not being honored, the agency head should, if efforts to secure voluntary compliance are unsuccessful, promptly institute a hearing to determine whether an adequate assurance has in fact been filed, or whether, in fact, there is noncompliance, as the case may be. There should ordinarily be no deferral of action on the submission or withholding of funds in this class of cases, although the limitation of the payout of funds to short periods may appropriately be ordered. If noncompliance is found, and if administrative alternatives are ineffective or inappropriate and court enforcement is not feasible, section 602 procedures may be completed and assistance terminated.

C. SHORT-TERM PROGRAMS

Special procedures may sometimes be required where there is noncompliance with title VI regulations in connection with a program of such short total duration that all assistance funds will have to be paid out before the agency's usual administrative procedures can be completed and where deferral in accordance with these guidelines would be tantamount to a final refusal to grant assistance.

In such a case, the agency head may, although otherwise following these guidelines, suspend normal agency procedures and institute expedited administrative proceedings to determine whether the regulations have been violated. He should simultaneously refer the matter to the Department of Justice for consideration of possible court enforcement, including interim injunctive relief. Deferral of action on an application is appropriate, in accordance with these guidelines, for a reasonable period of time, provided such action is consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with the action taken. As in other cases, where noncompliance is found in the hearing proceeding, and

Department of Justice

§ 50.5

if administrative alternatives are ineffective or inappropriate and court enforcement is not feasible, section 602 procedures may be completed and assistance finally refused.

III. PROCEDURES IN CASES OF SUBGRANTEES

In situations in which applications for Federal assistance are approved by some agency other than the Federal granting agency, the same rules and procedures would apply. Thus, the Federal Agency should instruct the approving agency—typically a State agency—to defer approval or refuse to grant funds, in individual cases in which such action would be taken by the original granting agency itself under the above procedures. Provision should be made for appropriate notice of such action to the Federal agency which retains responsibility for compliance with section 602 procedures.

IV. EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

The Attorney General should be consulted in individual cases in which the head of an agency believes that the objectives of title VI will be best achieved by proceeding other than as provided in these guidelines.

V. COORDINATION

While primary responsibility for enforcement of title VI rests directly with the head of each agency, in order to assure coordination of title VI enforcement and consistency among agencies, the Department of Justice should be notified in advance of applications on which action is to be deferred, hearings to be scheduled, and refusals and terminations of assistance or other enforcement actions or procedures to be undertaken. The Department also should be kept advised of the progress and results of hearings and other enforcement actions.

[31 FR 5292, Apr. 2, 1966]

§ 50.5 Notification of Consular Officers upon the arrest of foreign nationals.

(a) This statement is designed to establish a uniform procedure for consular notification where nationals of foreign countries are arrested by officers of this Department on charges of criminal violations. It conforms to practice under international law and in particular implements obligations undertaken by the United States pursuant to treaties with respect to the arrest and detention of foreign nationals. Some of the treaties obligate the United States to notify the consular officer only upon the demand or request of the arrested foreign national. On the other hand, some of the treaties re-

quire notifying the consul of the arrest of a foreign national whether or not the arrested person requests such notification.

(1) In every case in which a foreign national is arrested the arresting officer shall inform the foreign national that his consul will be advised of his arrest unless he does not wish such notification to be given. If the foreign national does not wish to have his consul notified, the arresting officer shall also inform him that in the event there is a treaty in force between the United States and his country which requires such notification, his consul must be notified regardless of his wishes and, if such is the case, he will be advised of such notification by the U.S. Attorney.

(2) In all cases (including those where the foreign national has stated that he does not wish his consul to be notified) the local office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the local Marshal's office, as the case may be, shall inform the nearest U.S. Attorney of the arrest and of the arrested person's wishes regarding consular notification.

(3) The U.S. Attorney shall then notify the appropriate consul except where he has been informed that the foreign national does not desire such notification to be made. However, if there is a treaty provision in effect which requires notification of consul, without reference to a demand or request of the arrested national, the consul shall be notified even if the arrested person has asked that he not be notified. In such case, the U.S. Attorney shall advise the foreign national that his consul has been notified and inform him that notification was necessary because of the treaty obligation.

(b) The procedure prescribed by this statement shall not apply to cases involving arrests made by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in administrative expulsion or exclusion proceedings, since that Service has heretofore established procedures for the direct notification of the appropriate consular officer upon such arrest. With respect to arrests made by the Service for violations of the criminal provisions of the immigration laws, the U.S. Marshal, upon delivery of the foreign national into his custody, shall be responsible for informing the U.S.

§ 50.6

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

Attorney of the arrest in accordance with numbered paragraph 2 of this statement.

[Order No. 375-67, 32 FR 1040, Jan. 28, 1967]

§ 50.6 Antitrust Division business review procedure.

Although the Department of Justice is not authorized to give advisory opinions to private parties, for several decades the Antitrust Division has been willing in certain circumstances to review proposed business conduct and state its enforcement intentions. This originated with a “railroad release” procedure under which the Division would forego the initiation of criminal antitrust proceedings. The procedure was subsequently expanded to encompass a “merger clearance” procedure under which the Division would state its present enforcement intention with respect to a merger or acquisition; and the Department issued a written statement entitled “Business Review Procedure.” That statement has been revised several times.

1. A request for a business review letter must be submitted in writing to the Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530.

2. The Division will consider only requests with respect to proposed business conduct, which may involve either domestic or foreign commerce.

3. The Division may, in its discretion, refuse to consider a request.

4. A business review letter shall have no application to any party which does not join in the request therefor.

5. The requesting parties are under an affirmative obligation to make full and true disclosure with respect to the business conduct for which review is requested. Each request must be accompanied by all relevant data including background information, complete copies of all operative documents and detailed statements of all collateral oral understandings, if any. All parties requesting the review letter must provide the Division with whatever additional information or documents the Division may thereafter request in order to review the matter. Such additional information, if furnished orally, shall be promptly confirmed in writing. In connection with any request for review the Division will also conduct whatever independent investigation it believes is appropriate.

6. No oral clearance, release or other statement purporting to bind the enforcement

discretion of the Division may be given. The requesting party may rely upon only a written business review letter signed by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division or his delegate.

7. (a) If the business conduct for which review is requested is subject to approval by a regulatory agency, a review request may be considered before agency approval has been obtained only where it appears that exceptional and unnecessary burdens might otherwise be imposed on the party or parties requesting review, or where the agency specifically requests that a party or parties request review. However, any business review letter issued in these as in any other circumstances will state only the Department’s present enforcement intentions under the antitrust laws. It shall in no way be taken to indicate the Department’s views on the legal or factual issues that may be raised before the regulatory agency, or in an appeal from the regulatory agency’s decision. In particular, the issuance of such a letter is not to be represented to mean that the Division believes that there are no anticompetitive consequences warranting agency consideration.

(b) The submission of a request for a business review, or its pendency, shall in no way alter any responsibility of any party to comply with the Premerger Notification provisions of the Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, 15 U.S.C. 18A, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, 16 CFR, part 801.

8. After review of a request submitted hereunder the Division may: state its present enforcement intention with respect to the proposed business conduct; decline to pass on the request; or take such other position or action as it considers appropriate.

9. A business review letter states only the enforcement intention of the Division as of the date of the letter, and the Division remains completely free to bring whatever action or proceeding it subsequently comes to believe is required by the public interest. As to a stated present intention not to bring an action, however, the Division has never exercised its right to bring a criminal action where there has been full and true disclosure at the time of presenting the request.

10. (a) Simultaneously upon notifying the requesting party of and Division action described in paragraph 8, the business review request, and the Division’s letter in response shall be indexed and placed in a file available to the public upon request.

(b) On that date or within thirty days after the date upon which the Division takes any action as described in paragraph 8, the information supplied to support the business review request and any other information supplied by the requesting party in connection with the transaction that is the subject of the business review request, shall be indexed and placed in a file with the request and the Division’s letter, available to the public

Department of Justice

§ 50.9

upon request. This file shall remain open for one year, after which time it shall be closed and the documents either returned to the requesting party or otherwise disposed of, at the discretion of the Antitrust Division.

(c) Prior to the time the information described in subparagraphs (a) and (b) is indexed and made publicly available in accordance with the terms of that subparagraph, the requesting party may ask the Division to delay making public some or all of such information. However the requesting party must: (1) Specify precisely the documents or parts thereof that he asks not be made public; (2) state the minimum period of time during which nondisclosure is considered necessary; and (3) justify the request for nondisclosure, both as to content and time, by showing good cause therefor, including a showing that disclosure would have a detrimental effect upon the requesting party's operations or relationships with actual or potential customers, employees, suppliers (including suppliers of credit), stockholders, or competitors. The Department of Justice, in its discretion, shall make the final determination as to whether good cause for nondisclosure has been shown.

(d) Nothing contained in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) shall limit the Division's right, in its discretion, to issue a press release describing generally the identity of the requesting party or parties and the nature of action taken by the Division upon the request.

(e) This paragraph reflects a policy determination by the Justice Department and is subject to any limitations on public disclosure arising from statutory restrictions, Executive Order, or the national interest.

11. Any requesting party may withdraw a request for review at any time. The Division remains free, however, to submit such comments to such requesting party as it deems appropriate. Failure to take action after receipt of documents or information whether submitted pursuant to this procedure or otherwise, does not in any way limit or stop the Division from taking such action at such time thereafter as it deems appropriate. The Division reserves the right to retain documents submitted to it under this procedure or otherwise and to use them for all governmental purposes.

[42 FR 11831, Mar. 1, 1977]

§ 50.7 Consent judgments in actions to enjoin discharges of pollutants.

(a) It is hereby established as the policy of the Department of Justice to consent to a proposed judgment in an action to enjoin discharges of pollutants into the environment only after or on condition that an opportunity is afforded persons (natural or corporate)

who are not named as parties to the action to comment on the proposed judgment prior to its entry by the court.

(b) To effectuate this policy, each proposed judgment which is within the scope of paragraph (a) of this section shall be lodged with the court as early as feasible but at least 30 days before the judgment is entered by the court. Prior to entry of the judgment, or some earlier specified date, the Department of Justice will receive and consider, and file with the court, any written comments, views or allegations relating to the proposed judgment. The Department shall reserve the right (1) to withdraw or withhold its consent to the proposed judgment if the comments, views and allegations concerning the judgment disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the proposed judgment is inappropriate, improper or inadequate and (2) to oppose an attempt by any person to intervene in the action.

(c) The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Land and Natural Resources Division may establish procedures for implementing this policy. Where it is clear that the public interest in the policy hereby established is not compromised, the Assistant Attorney General may permit an exception to this policy in a specific case where extraordinary circumstances require a period shorter than 30 days or a procedure other than stated herein.

[Order No. 529-73, 38 FR 19029, July 17, 1973]

§ 50.8 [Reserved]

§ 50.9 Policy with regard to open judicial proceedings.

Because of the vital public interest in open judicial proceedings, the Government has a general overriding affirmative duty to oppose their closure. There is, moreover, a strong presumption against closing proceedings or portions thereof, and the Department of Justice foresees very few cases in which closure would be warranted. The Government should take a position on any motion to close a judicial proceeding, and should ordinarily oppose closure; it should move for or consent to closed proceedings only when closure is plainly essential to the interests of justice. In furtherance of the Department's

§ 50.10

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

concern for the right of the public to attend judicial proceedings and the Department's obligation to the fair administration of justice, the following guidelines shall be adhered to by all attorneys for the United States.

(a) These guidelines apply to all federal trials, pre- and post-trial evidentiary proceedings, arraignments, bond hearings, plea proceedings, sentencing proceedings, or portions thereof, except as indicated in paragraph (e) of this section.

(b) A Government attorney has a compelling duty to protect the societal interest in open proceedings.

(c) A Government attorney shall not move for or consent to closure of a proceeding covered by these guidelines unless:

(1) No reasonable alternative exists for protecting the interests at stake;

(2) Closure is clearly likely to prevent the harm sought to be avoided;

(3) The degree of closure is minimized to the greatest extent possible;

(4) The public is given adequate notice of the proposed closure; and, in addition, the motion for closure is made on the record, except where the disclosure of the details of the motion papers would clearly defeat the reason for closure specified under paragraph (c)(6) of this section;

(5) Transcripts of the closed proceedings will be unsealed as soon as the interests requiring closure no longer obtain; and

(6) Failure to close the proceedings will produce;

(i) A substantial likelihood of denial of the right of any person to a fair trial; or

(ii) A substantial likelihood of imminent danger to the safety of parties, witnesses, or other persons; or

(iii) A substantial likelihood that ongoing investigations will be seriously jeopardized.

(d) A government attorney shall not move for or consent to the closure of any proceeding, civil or criminal, except with the express authorization of:

(1) The Deputy Attorney General, or,

(2) The Associate Attorney General, if the Division seeking authorization is under the supervision of the Associate Attorney General.

(e) These guidelines do not apply to:

(1) The closure of part of a judicial proceeding where necessary to protect national security information or classified documents; or

(2) *In camera* inspection, consideration or sealing of documents, including documents provided to the Government under a promise of confidentiality, where permitted by statute, rule of evidence or privilege; or

(3) Grand jury proceedings or proceedings ancillary thereto; or

(4) Conferences traditionally held at the bench or in chambers during the course of an open proceeding; or

(5) The closure of judicial proceedings pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3509 (d) and (e) for the protection of child victims or child witnesses.

(f) Because of the vital public interest in open judicial proceedings, the records of any proceeding closed pursuant to this section, and still sealed 60 days after termination of the proceeding, shall be reviewed to determine if the reasons for closure are still applicable. If they are not, an appropriate motion will be made to have the records unsealed. If the reasons for closure are still applicable after 60 days, this review is to be repeated every 60 days until such time as the records are unsealed. Compliance with this section will be monitored by the Criminal Division.

(g) The principles set forth in this section are intended to provide guidance to attorneys for the Government and are not intended to create or recognize any legally enforceable right in any person.

[Order No. 914-80, 45 FR 69214, Oct. 20, 1980, as amended by Order No. 1031-83, 48 FR 49509, Oct. 26, 1983; Order No. 1115-85, 50 FR 51677, Dec. 19, 1985; Order No. 1507-91, 56 FR 32327, July 16, 1991]

§ 50.10 Policy regarding obtaining information from, or records of, members of the news media; and regarding questioning, arresting, or charging members of the news media.

(a) *Statement of principles.* (1) Because freedom of the press can be no broader than the freedom of members of the news media to investigate and report the news, the Department's policy is intended to provide protection to members of the news media from certain

Department of Justice

§ 50.10

law enforcement tools, whether criminal or civil, that might unreasonably impair lawful newsgathering activities. The policy is not intended to extend special protections to members of the news media who are the focus of criminal investigations for conduct not based on, or within the scope of, such activities.

(2) In determining whether to seek information from, or records of, members of the news media, the approach in every instance must be to strike the proper balance among several vital interests: protecting national security, ensuring public safety, promoting effective law enforcement and the fair administration of justice, and safeguarding the essential role of the free press in fostering government accountability and an open society.

(3) The Department views the use of certain law enforcement tools, including subpoenas, court orders issued pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2703(d) or 3123, and search warrants to seek information from, or records of, non-consenting members of the news media as extraordinary measures, not standard investigatory practices.

(4) Investigative activities pursuant to this policy may also be subject to the Privacy Protection Act of 1979, 42 U.S.C. 2000aa.

(b) *Scope*—(1) *Covered individuals and entities.* (i) The policy governs the use of certain law enforcement tools to obtain information from, or records of, members of the news media.

(ii) Regardless of affiliation with the news media, the protections of the policy do not extend to any individual or entity who is or is reasonably likely to be—

(A) A foreign power or agent of a foreign power, as those terms are defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801);

(B) A member or affiliate of a foreign terrorist organization designated under section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a));

(C) Designated as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist by the Department of the Treasury under Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001 (66 FR 49079);

(D) A terrorist organization as that term is defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(vi) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(vi));

(E) Committing or attempting to commit a crime of terrorism, as described in 18 U.S.C. 2331(5) or 2332b(g)(5);

(F) Committing or attempting to commit a crime involving the provision of material support or resources to a terrorist organization; or

(G) Aiding, abetting, or conspiring in illegal activity with a person or organization described in paragraphs (b)(1)(ii)(A) through (F) of this section.

(2) *Covered law enforcement tools and records.* (i) The policy governs the use by law enforcement authorities of subpoenas or, in civil matters, other similar compulsory process such as civil investigative demands (collectively “subpoenas”) to obtain information from members of the news media, including documents, testimony, and other materials; and the use by law enforcement authorities of subpoenas, or court orders issued pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2703(d) (“2703(d) orders”) or 18 U.S.C. 3123 (“3123 orders”), to obtain from third parties communications records or business records of members of the news media.

(ii) The policy also governs applications for warrants to search the premises or property of members of the news media pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 41, or to obtain from third-party communication service providers the communications records of members of the news media, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2703(a) and (b).

(3) *Definitions*—(i) *Communications records.* (A) Communications records include the contents of electronic communications as well as source and destination information associated with communications, such as email transaction logs and local and long distance telephone connection records, stored or transmitted by a third-party communication service provider with which the member of the news media has a contractual relationship.

(B) Communications records do not include information described in 18 U.S.C. 2703(c)(2)(A), (B), (D), (E), and (F).

§ 50.10

28 CFR Ch. I (7–1–25 Edition)

(ii) *Communication service provider.* A communication service provider is a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service as defined, respectively, in 18 U.S.C. 2510(15) and 18 U.S.C. 2711(2).

(iii) *Business records.* (A) Business records include records of the activities, including the financial transactions, of a member of the news media related to the coverage, investigation, or reporting of news, which records are generated or maintained by a third party with which the member of the news media has a contractual relationship. Business records are limited to those that could provide information about the newsgathering techniques or sources of a member of the news media.

(B) Business records do not include records unrelated to lawful newsgathering activities, such as those related to the purely commercial, financial, administrative, or technical operations of a news media entity.

(C) Business records do not include records that are created or maintained either by the government or by a contractor on behalf of the government.

(c) *Issuing subpoenas to members of the news media, or using subpoenas or court orders issued pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2703(d) or 3123 to obtain from third parties communications records or business records of a member of the news media.* (1) Except as set forth in paragraph (c)(3) of this section, members of the Department must obtain the authorization of the Attorney General to issue a subpoena to a member of the news media; or to use a subpoena, 2703(d) order, or 3123 order to obtain from a third party communications records or business records of a member of the news media.

(2) Requests for the authorization of the Attorney General for the issuance of a subpoena to a member of the news media, or to use a subpoena, 2703(d) order, or 3123 order to obtain communications records or business records of a member of the news media, must be approved by the United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible for the matter.

(3) Exceptions to the Attorney General authorization requirement may be made as follows:

(i)(A) A United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible

for the matter may authorize the issuance of a subpoena to a member of the news media (*e.g.*, for documents, video or audio recordings, testimony, or other materials) if the member of the news media expressly agrees to provide the requested information in response to a subpoena. This exception applies, but is not limited, to both published and unpublished materials and aired and unaired recordings.

(B) In the case of an authorization under paragraph (c)(3)(i)(A) of this section, the United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible for the matter shall provide notice to the Director of the Criminal Division's Office of Enforcement Operations within 10 business days of the authorization of the issuance of the subpoena.

(ii) Authorization of the Attorney General will not be required of members of the Department in the following circumstances:

(A) To issue subpoenas to news media entities for purely commercial, financial, administrative, or other information unrelated to lawful newsgathering activities; or for information or records relating to personnel not involved in lawful newsgathering activities.

(B) To use subpoenas to obtain information from, or to use subpoenas, 2703(d) orders, or 3123 orders to obtain communications records or business records of, members of the news media who may be perpetrators or victims of, or witnesses to, crimes or other events, when such status (as a perpetrator, victim, or witness) is unrelated to their lawful newsgathering activities.

(iii) In the circumstances identified in paragraphs (c)(3)(ii)(A) and (B) of this section, the United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible for the matter must—

(A) Authorize the use of the subpoena or court order;

(B) Consult with the Criminal Division regarding appropriate review and safeguarding protocols prior to issuing a subpoena or requesting a court order; and

(C) Provide a copy of the subpoena or court order to the Director of the Office of Public Affairs and to the Director of the Criminal Division's Office of

Department of Justice

§ 50.10

Enforcement Operations within 10 business days of the issuance of the subpoena or court order.

(4) Considerations for the Attorney General in determining whether to authorize the issuance of a subpoena to a member of the news media, or whether to authorize the use of a subpoena, 2703(d) order, or 3123 order to obtain from third parties the communications records or business records of a member of the news media.

(i)(A) In criminal matters, there should be reasonable grounds to believe, based on public information, or information from sources other than the member of the news media who would be the target of the requested compulsory process, that a crime has occurred, and that the information sought is essential to a successful investigation or prosecution. The subpoena or court order should not be used to obtain peripheral, nonessential, or speculative information.

(B) In civil matters, there should be reasonable grounds to believe, based on public information or information from sources other than the member of the news media who would be the target of the requested compulsory process, that the information sought is essential to the successful completion of the investigation or litigation in a case of substantial importance. The subpoena should not be used to obtain peripheral, nonessential, cumulative, or speculative information.

(ii) The government should have made all reasonable attempts to obtain the information, communications records, or business records from alternative sources.

(iii)(A) The government should have pursued negotiations with the affected member of the news media, unless the Attorney General determines that such negotiations would pose a substantial threat to the integrity of the investigation, risk grave harm to national security, or present an imminent risk of death or serious bodily harm.

(B) The requirement that members of the Department secure authorization from the Attorney General to question a member of the news media, as required in paragraph (f)(1) of this section, does not apply to negotiations described in paragraph (c)(4)(iii)(A) of

this section. Accordingly, members of the Department do not need to secure authorization from the Attorney General to pursue such negotiations.

(iv) In investigations of unauthorized disclosures of national defense information or of classified information, where the relevant Department or agency head certifies to the Attorney General the significance of the harm raised by the unauthorized disclosure and that the information disclosed was properly classified, and reaffirms the Department's or agency's continued support for the investigation and prosecution, the Attorney General may authorize the Department of Justice, in such investigations, to issue subpoenas to members of the news media. The Attorney General may also authorize the Department, in such investigations, to use subpoenas, 2703(d) orders, or 3123 orders to obtain communications records or business records of a member of the news media.

(v) The proposed subpoena or court order should be narrowly drawn. It should be directed at material and relevant information regarding a limited subject matter, should cover a reasonably limited period of time, should avoid requiring production of a large volume of material, and should give reasonable and timely notice of the demand.

(vi) If appropriate, investigators should propose to use search protocols designed to minimize intrusion into potentially protected materials or newsgathering activities unrelated to the investigation, including but not limited to keyword searches (for electronic searches) and filter teams (reviewing teams separate from the prosecution and investigative teams).

(d) *Applying for warrants to search the premises, property, or communications records of members of the news media.* (1) Members of the Department must obtain the authorization of the Attorney General to apply for a warrant to search the premises, property, or communications records of a member of the news media.

(2) All requests for authorization of the Attorney General to apply for a warrant to search the premises, property, or communications records of a

§ 50.10

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

member of the news media must be approved by the United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible for the matter.

(3) In determining whether to authorize an application for a warrant to search the premises, property, or communications records of a member of the news media, the Attorney General should take into account the considerations identified in paragraph (c)(4) of this section.

(4) In executing a warrant authorized by the Attorney General or by a Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, investigators should use search protocols designed to minimize intrusion into potentially protected materials or newsgathering activities unrelated to the investigation, including but not limited to keyword searches (for electronic searches) and filter teams (reviewing teams separate from the prosecution and investigative teams).

(e) *Notice to affected member of the news media.* (1)(i) When the Attorney General has authorized the use of a subpoena, court order, or warrant to obtain from a third party communications records or business records of a member of the news media, the affected member of the news media shall be given reasonable and timely notice of the Attorney General's determination before the use of the subpoena, court order, or warrant, unless the Attorney General determines that, for compelling reasons, such notice would pose a substantial threat to the integrity of the investigation, risk grave harm to national security, or present an imminent risk of death or serious bodily harm.

(ii) The mere possibility that notice to the affected member of the news media, and potential judicial review, might delay the investigation is not, on its own, a compelling reason to delay notice.

(2) When the Attorney General has authorized the use of a subpoena, court order, or warrant to obtain communications records or business records of a member of the news media, and the affected member of the news media has not been given notice of the Attorney General's determination before the use of the subpoena, court order, or war-

rant, the United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible for the matter shall provide to the affected member of the news media notice of the order or warrant as soon as it is determined that such notice will no longer pose a substantial threat to the integrity of the investigation, risk grave harm to national security, or present an imminent risk of death or serious bodily harm. In any event, such notice shall occur within 45 days of the government's receipt of any return made pursuant to the subpoena, court order, or warrant, except that the Attorney General may authorize delay of notice for an additional 45 days if he or she determines that, for compelling reasons, such notice would pose a substantial threat to the integrity of the investigation, risk grave harm to national security, or present an imminent risk of death or serious bodily harm. No further delays may be sought beyond the 90-day period.

(3) The United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible for the matter shall provide to the Director of the Office of Public Affairs and to the Director of the Criminal Division's Office of Enforcement Operations a copy of any notice to be provided to a member of the news media whose communications records or business records were sought or obtained at least 10 business days before such notice is provided to the affected member of the news media, and immediately after such notice is, in fact, provided to the affected member of the news media.

(f) *Questioning members of the news media about, arresting members of the news media for, or charging members of the news media with, criminal conduct they are suspected of having committed in the course of, or arising out of, the coverage or investigation of news, or while engaged in the performance of duties undertaken as members of the news media.*

(1) No member of the Department shall subject a member of the news media to questioning as to any offense that he or she is suspected of having committed in the course of, or arising out of, the coverage or investigation of news, or while engaged in the performance of duties undertaken as a member of the news media, without providing

notice to the Director of the Office of Public Affairs and obtaining the express authorization of the Attorney General. The government need not view the member of the news media as a subject or target of an investigation, or have the intent to prosecute the member of the news media, to trigger the requirement that the Attorney General must authorize such questioning.

(2) No member of the Department shall seek a warrant for an arrest, or conduct an arrest, of a member of the news media for any offense that he or she is suspected of having committed in the course of, or arising out of, the coverage or investigation of news, or while engaged in the performance of duties undertaken as a member of the news media, without providing notice to the Director of the Office of Public Affairs and obtaining the express authorization of the Attorney General.

(3) No member of the Department shall present information to a grand jury seeking a bill of indictment, or file an information, against a member of the news media for any offense that he or she is suspected of having committed in the course of, or arising out of, the coverage or investigation of news, or while engaged in the performance of duties undertaken as a member of the news media, without providing notice to the Director of the Office of Public Affairs and obtaining the express authorization of the Attorney General.

(4) In requesting the Attorney General's authorization to question, to arrest or to seek an arrest warrant for, or to present information to a grand jury seeking an indictment or to file an information against, a member of the news media for an offense that he or she is suspected of having committed in the course of, or arising out of, the coverage or investigation of news, or while engaged in the performance of duties undertaken as a member of the news media, a member of the Department shall state all facts necessary for a determination by the Attorney General.

(g) *Exigent circumstances.* (1) A Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division may authorize the use of a subpoena or court order, as de-

scribed in paragraph (c) of this section, or the questioning, arrest, or charging of a member of the news media, as described in paragraph (f) of this section, if he or she determines that the exigent use of such law enforcement tool or technique is necessary to prevent or mitigate an act of terrorism; other acts that are reasonably likely to cause significant and articulable harm to national security; death; kidnapping; substantial bodily harm; conduct that constitutes a specified offense against a minor (as those terms are defined in section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, 34 U.S.C. 20911), or an attempt or conspiracy to commit such a criminal offense; or incapacitation or destruction of critical infrastructure (for example, as defined in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act, 42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).

(2) A Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division may authorize an application for a warrant, as described in paragraph (d) of this section, if there is reason to believe that the immediate seizure of the materials at issue is necessary to prevent the death of, or serious bodily injury to, a human being, as provided in 42 U.S.C. 2000aa(a)(2) and (b)(2).

(3) Within 10 business days of a Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division approving a request under paragraph (g) of this section, the United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General responsible for the matter shall provide to the Attorney General and to the Director of the Office of Public Affairs a statement containing the information that would have been given in requesting prior authorization.

(h) *Failure to comply with policy.* Failure to obtain the prior approval of the Attorney General, as required by this section, may constitute grounds for an administrative reprimand or other appropriate disciplinary action.

(i) *General provision.* This policy is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

[90 FR 18786, May 2, 2025]

§ 50.12

§ 50.12 Exchange of FBI identification records.

(a) The Federal Bureau of Investigation, hereinafter referred to as the FBI, is authorized to expend funds for the exchange of identification records with officials of federally chartered or insured banking institutions to promote or maintain the security of those institutions and, if authorized by state statute and approved by the Director of the FBI, acting on behalf of the Attorney General, with officials of state and local governments for purposes of employment and licensing, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 92-544, 86 Stat. 1115. Also, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78q, 7 U.S.C. 21 (b)(4)(E), and 42 U.S.C. 2169, respectively, such records can be exchanged with certain segments of the securities industry, with registered futures associations, and with nuclear power plants. The records also may be exchanged in other instances as authorized by federal law.

(b) The FBI Director is authorized by 28 CFR 0.85(j) to approve procedures relating to the exchange of identification records. Under this authority, effective September 6, 1990, the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division has made all data on identification records available for such purposes. Records obtained under this authority may be used solely for the purpose requested and cannot be disseminated outside the receiving departments, related agencies, or other authorized entities. Officials at the governmental institutions and other entities authorized to submit fingerprints and receive FBI identification records under this authority must notify the individuals fingerprinted that the fingerprints will be used to check the criminal history records of the FBI. The officials making the determination of suitability for licensing or employment shall provide the applicants the opportunity to complete, or challenge the accuracy of, the information contained in the FBI identification record. These officials also must advise the applicants that procedures for obtaining a change, correction, or updating of an FBI identification record are set forth in 28 CFR 16.34. Officials making such determinations should not deny the license or employment based on infor-

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

mation in the record until the applicant has been afforded a reasonable time to correct or complete the record, or has declined to do so. A statement incorporating these use-and-challenge requirements will be placed on all records disseminated under this program. This policy is intended to ensure that all relevant criminal record information is made available to provide for the public safety and, further, to protect the interests of the prospective employee/licensee who may be affected by the information or lack of information in an identification record.

[Order No. 2258-99, 64 FR 52229, Sept. 28, 1999]

§ 50.14 Guidelines on employee selection procedures.

The guidelines set forth below are intended as a statement of policy of the Department of Justice and will be applied by the Department in exercising its responsibilities under Federal law relating to equal employment opportunity.

UNIFORM GUIDELINES ON EMPLOYEE SELECTION PROCEDURES (1978)

NOTE: These guidelines are issued jointly by four agencies. Separate official adoptions follow the guidelines in this part IV as follows: Civil Service Commission, Department of Justice, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor.

For official citation see section 18 of these guidelines.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1. Statement of Purpose
 - A. Need for Uniformity—Issuing Agencies
 - B. Purpose of Guidelines
 - C. Relation to Prior Guidelines
2. Scope
 - A. Application of Guidelines
 - B. Employment Decisions
 - C. Selection Procedures
 - D. Limitations
 - E. Indian Preference Not Affected
3. Discrimination Defined: Relationship Between Use of Selection Procedures and Discrimination
 - A. Procedure Having Adverse Impact Constitutes Discrimination Unless Justified
 - B. Consideration of Suitable Alternative Selection Procedures
4. Information on Impact
 - A. Records Concerning Impact

Department of Justice

§ 50.14

- B. Applicable Race, Sex and Ethnic Groups For Record Keeping
- C. Evaluation of Selection Rates. The "Bottom Line"
- D. Adverse Impact And The "Four-Fifths Rule"
- E. Consideration of User's Equal Employment Opportunity Posture
- 5. General Standards for Validity Studies
 - A. Acceptable types of Validity Studies
 - B. Criterion-Related, Content, and Construct Validity
 - C. Guidelines Are Consistent with Professional Standards
 - D. Need For Documentation of Validity
 - E. Accuracy and Standardization
 - F. Caution Against Selection on Basis of Knowledges, Skills or Abilities Learned in Brief Orientation Period
 - G. Method of Use of Selection Procedures
 - H. Cutoff Scores
 - I. Use of Selection Procedures for Higher Level Jobs
 - J. Interim Use of Selection Procedures
 - K. Review of Validity Studies for Currency
- 6. Use of Selection Procedures Which Have Not Been Validated
 - A. Use of Alternate Selection Procedures to Eliminate Adverse Impact
 - B. Where Validity Studies Cannot or Need Not Be Performed
 - (1) Where Informal or Unscored Procedures Are Used
 - (2) Where Formal And Scored Procedures Are Used
- 7. Use of Other Validity Studies
 - A. Validity Studies not Conducted by the User
 - B. Use of Criterion-Related Validity Evidence from Other Sources
 - (1) Validity Evidence
 - (2) Job Similarity
 - (3) Fairness Evidence
 - C. Validity Evidence from Multi-Unit Study
 - D. Other Significant Variables
- 8. Cooperative Studies
 - A. Encouragement of Cooperative Studies
 - B. Standards for Use of Cooperative Studies
- 9. No Assumption of Validity
 - A. Unacceptable Substitutes for Evidence of Validity
 - B. Encouragement of Professional Supervision
- 10. Employment Agencies and Employment Services
 - A. Where Selection Procedures Are Devised by Agency
 - B. Where Selection Procedures Are Devised Elsewhere
- 11. Disparate Treatment
- 12. Retesting of Applicants
- 13. Affirmative Action
 - A. Affirmative Action Obligations
 - B. Encouragement of Voluntary Affirmative Action Programs

TECHNICAL STANDARDS

- 14. Technical Standards for Validity Studies
 - A. Validity Studies Should be Based on Review of Information about the Job
 - B. Technical Standards for Criterion-Related Validity Studies
 - (1) Technical Feasibility
 - (2) Analysis of the Job
 - (3) Criterion Measures
 - (4) Representativeness of the Sample
 - (5) Statistical Relationships
 - (6) Operational Use of Selection Procedures
 - (7) Over-Statement of Validity Findings
 - (8) Fairness
 - (a) Unfairness Defined
 - (b) Investigation of Fairness
 - (c) General Considerations in Fairness Investigations
 - (d) When Unfairness Is Shown
 - (e) Technical Feasibility of Fairness Studies
 - (f) Continued Use of Selection Procedures When Fairness Studies not Feasible
 - C. Technical Standards for Content Validity Studies
 - (1) Appropriateness of Content Validity Studies
 - (2) Job Analysis for Content Validity
 - (3) Development of Selection Procedure
 - (4) Standards For Demonstrating Content Validity
 - (5) Reliability
 - (6) Prior Training or Experience
 - (7) Training Success
 - (8) Operational Use
 - (9) Ranking Based on Content Validity Studies
 - D. Technical Standards For Construct Validity Studies
 - (1) Appropriateness of Construct Validity Studies
 - (2) Job Analysis For Construct Validity Studies
 - (3) Relationship to the Job
 - (4) Use of Construct Validity Study Without New Criterion-Related Evidence
 - (a) Standards for Use
 - (b) Determination of Common Work Behaviors
- DOCUMENTATION OF IMPACT AND VALIDITY EVIDENCE
- 15. Documentation of Impact and Validity Evidence
 - A. Required Information
 - (1) Simplified Recordkeeping for Users With Less Than 100 Employees
 - (2) Information on Impact
 - (a) Collection of Information on Impact
 - (b) When Adverse Impact Has Been Eliminated in The Total Selection Process
 - (c) When Data Insufficient to Determine Impact

§ 50.14

28 CFR Ch. I (7–1–25 Edition)

- (3) Documentation of Validity Evidence
 - (a) Type of Evidence
 - (b) Form of Report
 - (c) Completeness
- B. Criterion-Related Validity Studies
 - (1) User(s), Location(s), and Date(s) of Study
 - (2) Problem and Setting
 - (3) Job Analysis or Review of Job Information
 - (4) Job Titles and Codes
 - (5) Criterion Measures
 - (6) Sample Description
 - (7) Description of Selection Procedure
 - (8) Techniques and Results
 - (9) Alternative Procedures Investigated
 - (10) Uses and Applications
 - (11) Source Data
 - (12) Contact Person
 - (13) Accuracy and Completeness
- C. Content Validity Studies
 - (1) User(s), Location(s), and Date(s) of Study
 - (2) Problem and Setting
 - (3) Job Analysis—Content of the Job
 - (4) Selection Procedure and its Content
 - (5) Relationship Between Selection Procedure and the Job
 - (6) Alternative Procedures Investigated
 - (7) Uses and Applications
 - (8) Contact Person
 - (9) Accuracy and Completeness
- D. Construct Validity Studies
 - (1) User(s), Location(s), and Date(s) of Study
 - (2) Problem and Setting
 - (3) Construct Definition
 - (4) Job Analysis
 - (5) Job Titles and Codes
 - (6) Selection Procedure
 - (7) Relationship to Job Performance
 - (8) Alternative Procedures Investigated
 - (9) Uses and Applications
 - (10) Accuracy and Completeness
 - (11) Source Data
 - (12) Contact Person
- E. Evidence of Validity from Other Studies
 - (1) Evidence from Criterion-Related Validity Studies
 - (a) Job Information
 - (b) Relevance of Criteria
 - (c) Other Variables
 - (d) Use of the Selection Procedure
 - (e) Bibliography
 - (2) Evidence from Content Validity Studies
 - (3) Evidence from Construct Validity Studies
- F. Evidence of Validity from Cooperative Studies
- G. Selection for Higher Level Jobs
- H. Interim Use of Selection Procedures

DEFINITIONS

16. Definitions

APPENDIX

- 17. Policy Statement on Affirmative Action (see Section 13B)
- 18. Citations

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

SECTION 1. *Statement of purpose*—A. *Need for uniformity—Issuing agencies.* The Federal government’s need for a uniform set of principles on the question of the use of tests and other selection procedures has long been recognized. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice jointly have adopted these uniform guidelines to meet that need, and to apply the same principles to the Federal Government as are applied to other employers.

B. *Purpose of guidelines.* These guidelines incorporate a single set of principles which are designed to assist employers, labor organizations, employment agencies, and licensing and certification boards to comply with requirements of Federal law prohibiting employment practices which discriminate on grounds of race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. They are designed to provide a framework for determining the proper use of tests and other selection procedures. These guidelines do not require a user to conduct validity studies of selection procedures where no adverse impact results. However, all users are encouraged to use selection procedures which are valid, especially users operating under merit principles.

C. *Relation to prior guidelines.* These guidelines are based upon and supersede previously issued guidelines on employee selection procedures. These guidelines have been built upon court decisions, the previously issued guidelines of the agencies, and the practical experience of the agencies, as well as the standards of the psychological profession. These guidelines are intended to be consistent with existing law.

SEC. 2. *Scope*—A. *Application of guidelines.* These guidelines will be applied by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the enforcement of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (hereinafter “Title VII”); by the Department of Labor, and the contract compliance agencies until the transfer of authority contemplated by the President’s Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1978, in the administration and enforcement of Executive Order 11246, as amended by Executive Order 11375 (hereinafter “Executive Order 11246”); by the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies subject to section 717 of title VII; by the Civil

Service Commission in exercising its responsibilities toward State and local governments under section 208(b)(1) of the Intergovernmental-Personnel Act; by the Department of Justice in exercising its responsibilities under Federal law; by the Office of Revenue Sharing of the Department of the Treasury under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, as amended; and by any other Federal agency which adopts them.

B. *Employment decisions.* These guidelines apply to tests and other selection procedures which are used as a basis for any employment decision. Employment decisions include but are not limited to hiring, promotion, demotion, membership (for example, in a labor organization), referral, retention, and licensing and certification, to the extent that licensing and certification may be covered by Federal equal employment opportunity law. Other selection decisions, such as selection for training or transfer, may also be considered employment decisions if they lead to any of the decisions listed above.

C. *Selection procedures.* These guidelines apply only to selection procedures which are used as a basis for making employment decisions. For example, the use of recruiting procedures designed to attract members of a particular race, sex, or ethnic group, which were previously denied employment opportunities or which are currently underutilized, may be necessary to bring an employer into compliance with Federal law, and is frequently an essential element of any effective affirmative action program; but recruitment practices are not considered by these guidelines to be selection procedures. Similarly, these guidelines do not pertain to the question of the lawfulness of a seniority system within the meaning of section 703(h), Executive Order 11246 or other provisions of Federal law or regulation, except to the extent that such systems utilize selection procedures to determine qualifications or abilities to perform the job. Nothing in these guidelines is intended or should be interpreted as discouraging the use of a selection procedure for the purpose of determining qualifications or for the purpose of selection on the basis of relative qualifications, if the selection procedure had been validated in accord with these guidelines for each such purpose for which it is to be used.

D. *Limitations.* These guidelines apply only to persons subject to title VII, Executive Order 11246, or other equal employment opportunity requirements of Federal law. These guidelines do not apply to responsibilities under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, not to discriminate on the basis of age, or under sections 501, 503, and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, not to discriminate on the basis of handicap.

E. *Indian preference not affected.* These guidelines do not restrict any obligation imposed or right granted by Federal law to users to extend a preference in employment to Indians living on or near an Indian reservation in connection with employment opportunities on or near an Indian reservation.

SEC. 3. *Discrimination defined: Relationship between use of selection procedures and discrimination—A. Procedure having adverse impact constitutes discrimination unless justified.* The use of any selection procedure which has an adverse impact on the hiring, promotion, or other employment or membership opportunities of members of any race, sex, or ethnic group will be considered to be discriminatory and inconsistent with these guidelines, unless the procedure has been validated in accordance with these guidelines, or the provisions of section 6 below are satisfied.

B. *Consideration of suitable alternative selection procedures.* Where two or more selection procedures are available which serve the user's legitimate interest in efficient and trustworthy workmanship, and which are substantially equally valid for a given purpose, the user should use the procedure which has been demonstrated to have the lesser adverse impact. Accordingly, whenever a validity study is called for by these guidelines, the user should include, as a part of the validity study, an investigation of suitable alternative selection procedures and suitable alternative methods of using the selection procedure which have as little adverse impact as possible, to determine the appropriateness of using or validating them in accord with these guidelines. If a user has made a reasonable effort to become aware of such alternative procedures and validity has been demonstrated in accord with these guidelines, the use of the test or other selection procedure may continue until such time as it should reasonably be reviewed for currency. Whenever the user is shown an alternative selection procedure with evidence of less adverse impact and substantial evidence of validity for the same job in similar circumstances, the user should investigate it to determine the appropriateness of using or validating it in accord with these guidelines. This subsection is not intended to preclude the combination of procedures into a significantly more valid procedure, if the use of such a combination has been shown to be in compliance with the guidelines.

SEC. 4. *Information on impact—A. Records concerning impact.* Each user should maintain and have available for inspection records or other information which will disclose the impact which its tests and other selection procedures have upon employment opportunities of persons by identifiable race, sex, or ethnic group as set forth in paragraph B below in order to determine compliance with

§ 50.14

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

these guidelines. Where there are large numbers of applicants and procedures are administered frequently, such information may be retained on a sample basis, provided that the sample is appropriate in terms of the applicant population and adequate in size.

B. *Applicable race, sex, and ethnic groups for recordkeeping.* The records called for by this section are to be maintained by sex, and the following races and ethnic groups: Blacks (Negroes), American Indians (including Alaskan Natives), Asians (including Pacific Islanders), Hispanic (including persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish origin or culture regardless of race), whites (Caucasians) other than Hispanic, and totals. The race, sex, and ethnic classifications called for by this section are consistent with the Equal Employment Opportunity Standard Form 100, Employer Information Report EEO-1 series of reports. The user should adopt safeguards to insure that the records required by this paragraph are used for appropriate purposes such as determining adverse impact, or (where required) for developing and monitoring affirmative action programs, and that such records are not used improperly. See sections 4E and 17(4), below.

C. *Evaluation of selection rates. The "bottom line."* If the information called for by sections 4A and B above shows that the total selection process for a job has an adverse impact, the individual components of the selection process should be evaluated for adverse impact. If this information shows that the total selection process does not have an adverse impact, the Federal enforcement agencies, in the exercise of their administrative and prosecutorial discretion, in usual circumstances, will not expect a user to evaluate the individual components for adverse impact, or to validate such individual components, and will not take enforcement action based upon adverse impact of any component of that process, including the separate parts of a multipart selection procedure or any separate procedure that is used as an alternative method of selection. However, in the following circumstances the Federal enforcement agencies will expect a user to evaluate the individual components for adverse impact and may, where appropriate, take enforcement action with respect to the individual components: (1) Where the selection procedure is a significant factor in the continuation of patterns of assignments of incumbent employees caused by prior discriminatory employment practices, (2) where the weight of court decisions or administrative interpretations hold that a specific procedure (such as height or weight requirements or no-arrest records) is not job related in the same or similar circumstances. In unusual circumstances, other than those listed in (1) and (2) above, the Federal enforcement agencies may request a user to evaluate the

individual components for adverse impact and may, where appropriate, take enforcement action with respect to the individual component.

D. *Adverse impact and the "four-fifths rule."* A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths ($\frac{4}{5}$) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact. Smaller differences in selection rate may nevertheless constitute adverse impact, where they are significant in both statistical and practical terms or where a user's actions have discouraged applicants disproportionately on grounds of race, sex, or ethnic group. Greater differences in selection rate may not constitute adverse impact where the differences are based on small numbers and are not statistically significant, or where special recruiting or other programs cause the pool of minority or female candidates to be atypical of the normal pool of applicants from that group. Where the user's evidence concerning the impact of a selection procedure indicates adverse impact but is based upon numbers which are too small to be reliable, evidence concerning the impact of the procedure over a longer period of time and/or evidence concerning the impact which the selection procedure had when used in the same manner in similar circumstances elsewhere may be considered in determining adverse impact. Where the user has not maintained data on adverse impact as required by the documentation section of applicable guidelines, the Federal enforcement agencies may draw an inference of adverse impact of the selection process from the failure of the user to maintain such data, if the user has an underutilization of a group in the job category, as compared to the group's representation in the relevant labor market or, in the case of jobs filled from within, the applicable work force.

E. *Consideration of user's equal employment opportunity posture.* In carrying out their obligations, the Federal enforcement agencies will consider the general posture of the user with respect to equal employment opportunity for the job or group of jobs in question. Where a user has adopted an affirmative action program, the Federal enforcement agencies will consider the provisions of that program, including the goals and timetables which the user has adopted and the progress which the user has made in carrying out that program and in meeting the goals and timetables. While such affirmative action programs may in design and execution be race, color, sex, or ethnic conscious, selection procedures under such programs should

be based upon the ability or relative ability to do the work.

SEC. 5. *General standards for validity studies—A. Acceptable types of validity studies.* For the purposes of satisfying these guidelines, users may rely upon criterion-related validity studies, content validity studies or construct validity studies, in accordance with the standards set forth in the technical standards of these guidelines, section 14 below. New strategies for showing the validity of selection procedures will be evaluated as they become accepted by the psychological profession.

B. Criterion-related, content, and construct validity. Evidence of the validity of a test or other selection procedure by a criterion-related validity study should consist of empirical data demonstrating that the selection procedure is predictive of or significantly correlated with important elements of job performance. See section 14B below. Evidence of the validity of a test or other selection procedure by a content validity study should consist of data showing that the content of the selection procedure is representative of important aspects of performance on the job for which the candidates are to be evaluated. See section 14C below. Evidence of the validity of a test or other selection procedure through a construct validity study should consist of data showing that the procedure measures the degree to which candidates have identifiable characteristics which have been determined to be important in successful performance in the job for which the candidates are to be evaluated. See section 14D below.

C. Guidelines are consistent with professional standards. The provisions of these guidelines relating to validation of selection procedures are intended to be consistent with generally accepted professional standards for evaluating standardized tests and other selection procedures, such as those described in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests prepared by a joint committee of the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education (American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 1974) (hereinafter "A.P.A. Standards") and standard textbooks and journals in the field of personnel selection.

D. Need for documentation of validity. For any selection procedure which is part of a selection process which has an adverse impact and which selection procedure has an adverse impact, each user should maintain and have available such documentation as is described in section 15 below.

E. Accuracy and standardization. Validity studies should be carried out under conditions which assure insofar as possible the adequacy and accuracy of the research and the report. Selection procedures should be

administered and scored under standardized conditions.

F. Caution against selection on basis of knowledges, skills, or ability learned in brief orientation period. In general, users should avoid making employment decisions on the basis of measures of knowledges, skills, or abilities which are normally learned in a brief orientation period, and which have an adverse impact.

G. Method of use of selection procedures. The evidence of both the validity and utility of a selection procedure should support the method the user chooses for operational use of the procedure, if that method of use has a greater adverse impact than another method of use. Evidence which may be sufficient to support the use of a selection procedure on a pass/fail (screening) basis may be insufficient to support the use of the same procedure on a ranking basis under these guidelines. Thus, if a user decides to use a selection procedure on a ranking basis, and that method of use has a greater adverse impact than use on an appropriate pass/fail basis (see section 5H below), the user should have sufficient evidence of validity and utility to support the use on a ranking basis. See sections 3B, 14B (5) and (6), and 14C (8) and (9).

H. Cutoff scores. Where cutoff scores are used, they should normally be set so as to be reasonable and consistent with normal expectations of acceptable proficiency within the work force. Where applicants are ranked on the basis of properly validated selection procedures and those applicants scoring below a higher cutoff score than appropriate in light of such expectations have little or no chance of being selected for employment, the higher cutoff score may be appropriate, but the degree of adverse impact should be considered.

I. Use of selection procedures for higher level jobs. If job progression structures are so established that employees will probably, within a reasonable period of time and in a majority of cases, progress to a higher level, it may be considered that the applicants are being evaluated for a job or jobs at the higher level. However, where job progression is not so nearly automatic, or the time span is such that higher level jobs or employees' potential may be expected to change in significant ways, it should be considered that applicants are being evaluated for a job at or near the entry level. A "reasonable period of time" will vary for different jobs and employment situations but will seldom be more than 5 years. Use of selection procedures to evaluate applicants for a higher level job would not be appropriate:

(1) If the majority of those remaining employed do not progress to the higher level job;

(2) If there is a reason to doubt that the higher level job will continue to require essentially similar skills during the progression period; or

(3) If the selection procedures measure knowledges, skills, or abilities required for advancement which would be expected to develop principally from the training or experience on the job.

J. Interim use of selection procedures. Users may continue the use of a selection procedure which is not at the moment fully supported by the required evidence of validity, provided: (1) The user has available substantial evidence of validity, and (2) the user has in progress, when technically feasible, a study which is designed to produce the additional evidence required by these guidelines within a reasonable time. If such a study is not technically feasible, see section 6B. If the study does not demonstrate validity, this provision of these guidelines for interim use shall not constitute a defense in any action, nor shall it relieve the user of any obligations arising under Federal law.

K. Review of validity studies for currency. Whenever validity has been shown in accord with these guidelines for the use of a particular selection procedure for a job or group of jobs, additional studies need not be performed until such time as the validity study is subject to review as provided in section 3B above. There are no absolutes in the area of determining the currency of a validity study. All circumstances concerning the study, including the validation strategy used, and changes in the relevant labor market and the job should be considered in the determination of when a validity study is outdated.

SEC. 6. Use of selection procedures which have not been validated—A. Use of alternate selection procedures to eliminate adverse impact. A user may choose to utilize alternative selection procedures in order to eliminate adverse impact or as part of an affirmative action program. See section 13 below. Such alternative procedures should eliminate the adverse impact in the total selection process, should be lawful and should be as job related as possible.

B. Where validity studies cannot or need not be performed. There are circumstances in which a user cannot or need not utilize the validation techniques contemplated by these guidelines. In such circumstances, the user should utilize selection procedures which are as job related as possible and which will minimize or eliminate adverse impact, as set forth below.

(1) *Where informal or unscored procedures are used.* When an informal or unscored selection procedure which has an adverse impact is utilized, the user should eliminate the adverse impact, or modify the procedure to one which is a formal, scored or quantified measure or combination of measures and then validate the procedure in accord with these

guidelines, or otherwise justify continued use of the procedure in accord with Federal law.

(2) *Where formal and scored procedures are used.* When a formal and scored selection procedure is used which has an adverse impact, the validation techniques contemplated by these guidelines usually should be followed if technically feasible. Where the user cannot or need not follow the validation techniques anticipated by these guidelines, the user should either modify the procedure to eliminate adverse impact or otherwise justify continued use of the procedure in accord with Federal law.

SEC. 7. Use of other validity studies—A. Validity studies not conducted by the user. Users may, under certain circumstances, support the use of selection procedures by validity studies conducted by other users or conducted by test publishers or distributors and described in test manuals. While publishers of selection procedures have a professional obligation to provide evidence of validity which meets generally accepted professional standards (see section 5C above), users are cautioned that they are responsible for compliance with these guidelines. Accordingly, users seeking to obtain selection procedures from publishers and distributors should be careful to determine that, in the event the user becomes subject to the validity requirements of these guidelines, the necessary information to support validity has been determined and will be made available to the user.

B. Use of criterion-related validity evidence from other sources. Criterion-related validity studies conducted by one test user, or described in test manuals and the professional literature, will be considered acceptable for use by another user when the following requirements are met:

(1) *Validity evidence.* Evidence from the available studies meeting the standards of section 14B below clearly demonstrates that the selection procedure is valid;

(2) *Job similarity.* The incumbents in the user's job and the incumbents in the job or group of jobs on which the validity study was conducted perform substantially the same major work behaviors, as shown by appropriate job analyses both on the job or group of jobs on which the validity study was performed and on the job for which the selection procedure is to be used; and

(3) *Fairness evidence.* The studies include a study of test fairness for each race, sex, and ethnic group which constitutes a significant factor in the borrowing user's relevant labor market for the job or jobs in question. If the studies under consideration satisfy (1) and (2) above but do not contain an investigation of test fairness, and it is not technically feasible for the borrowing user to conduct an internal study of test fairness, the borrowing

user may utilize the study until studies conducted elsewhere meeting the requirements of these guidelines show test unfairness, or until such time as it becomes technically feasible to conduct an internal study of test fairness and the results of that study can be acted upon. Users obtaining selection procedures from publishers should consider, as one factor in the decision to purchase a particular selection procedure, the availability of evidence concerning test fairness.

C. *Validity evidence from multiunit study.* If validity evidence from a study covering more than one unit within an organization satisfies the requirements of section 14B below, evidence of validity specific to each unit will not be required unless there are variables which are likely to affect validity significantly.

D. *Other significant variables.* If there are variables in the other studies which are likely to affect validity significantly, the user may not rely upon such studies, but will be expected either to conduct an internal validity study or to comply with section 6 above.

SEC. 8. *Cooperative studies—A. Encouragement of cooperative studies.* The agencies issuing these guidelines encourage employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies to cooperate in research, development, search for lawful alternatives, and validity studies in order to achieve procedures which are consistent with these guidelines.

B. *Standards for use of cooperative studies.* If validity evidence from a cooperative study satisfies the requirements of section 14 below, evidence of validity specific to each user will not be required unless there are variables in the user's situation which are likely to affect validity significantly.

SEC. 9. *No assumption of validity—A. Unacceptable substitutes for evidence of validity.* Under no circumstances will the general reputation of a test or other selection procedures, its author or its publisher, or casual reports of its validity be accepted in lieu of evidence of validity. Specifically ruled out are: Assumptions of validity based on a procedure's name or descriptive labels; all forms of promotional literature; data bearing on the frequency of a procedure's usage; testimonial statements and credentials of sellers, users, or consultants; and other nonempirical or anecdotal accounts of selection practices or selection outcomes.

B. *Encouragement of professional supervision.* Professional supervision of selection activities is encouraged but is not a substitute for documented evidence of validity. The enforcement agencies will take into account the fact that a thorough job analysis was conducted and that careful development and use of a selection procedure in accordance with professional standards enhance the probability that the selection procedure is valid for the job.

SEC. 10. *Employment agencies and employment services—A. Where selection procedures are devised by agency.* An employment agency, including private employment agencies and State employment agencies, which agrees to a request by an employer or labor organization to devise and utilize a selection procedure should follow the standards in these guidelines for determining adverse impact. If adverse impact exists the agency should comply with these guidelines. An employment agency is not relieved of its obligation herein because the user did not request such validation or has requested the use of some lesser standard of validation than is provided in these guidelines. The use of an employment agency does not relieve an employer or labor organization or other user of its responsibilities under Federal law to provide equal employment opportunity or its obligations as a user under these guidelines.

B. *Where selection procedures are devised elsewhere.* Where an employment agency or service is requested to administer a selection procedure which has been devised elsewhere and to make referrals pursuant to the results, the employment agency or service should maintain and have available evidence of the impact of the selection and referral procedures which it administers. If adverse impact results the agency or service should comply with these guidelines. If the agency or service seeks to comply with these guidelines by reliance upon validity studies or other data in the possession of the employer, it should obtain and have available such information.

SEC. 11. *Disparate treatment.* The principles of disparate or unequal treatment must be distinguished from the concepts of validation. A selection procedure—even though validated against job performance in accordance with these guidelines—cannot be imposed upon members of a race, sex, or ethnic group where other employees, applicants, or members have not been subjected to that standard. Disparate treatment occurs where members of a race, sex, or ethnic group have been denied the same employment, promotion, membership, or other employment opportunities as have been available to other employees or applicants. Those employees or applicants who have been denied equal treatment, because of prior discriminatory practices or policies, must at least be afforded the same opportunities as had existed for other employees or applicants during the period of discrimination. Thus, the persons who were in the class of persons discriminated against during the period the user followed the discriminatory practices should be allowed the opportunity to qualify under less stringent selection procedures previously followed, unless the user demonstrates that the increased standards are required by business necessity. This section does not prohibit a user who has not previously followed merit

standards from adopting merit standards which are in compliance with these guidelines; nor does it preclude a user who has previously used invalid or unvalidated selection procedures from developing and using procedures which are in accord with these guidelines.

SEC. 12. *Retesting of applicants.* Users should provide a reasonable opportunity for retesting and reconsideration. Where examinations are administered periodically with public notice, such reasonable opportunity exists, unless persons who have previously been tested are precluded from retesting. The user may however take reasonable steps to preserve the security of its procedures.

SEC. 13. *Affirmative action—A. Affirmative action obligations.* The use of selection procedures which have been validated pursuant to these guidelines does not relieve users of any obligations they may have to undertake affirmative action to assure equal employment opportunity. Nothing in these guidelines is intended to preclude the use of lawful selection procedures which assist in remedying the effects of prior discriminatory practices, or the achievement of affirmative action objectives.

B. Encouragement of voluntary affirmative action programs. These guidelines are also intended to encourage the adoption and implementation of voluntary affirmative action programs by users who have no obligation under Federal law to adopt them; but are not intended to impose any new obligations in that regard. The agencies issuing and endorsing these guidelines endorse for all private employers and reaffirm for all governmental employers the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council's "Policy Statement on Affirmative Action Programs for State and Local Government Agencies" (41 FR 38814, September 13, 1976). That policy statement is attached hereto as appendix, section 17.

TECHNICAL STANDARDS

SEC. 14. *Technical standards for validity studies.* The following minimum standards, as applicable, should be met in conducting a validity study. Nothing in these guidelines is intended to preclude the development and use of other professionally acceptable techniques with respect to validation of selection procedures. Where it is not technically feasible for a user to conduct a validity study, the user has the obligation otherwise to comply with these guidelines. See sections 6 and 7 above.

A. Validity studies should be based on review of information about the job. Any validity study should be based upon a review of information about the job for which the selection procedure is to be used. The review should include a job analysis except as provided in section 14B(3) below with respect to criterion-related validity. Any method of job

analysis may be used if it provides the information required for the specific validation strategy used.

B. Technical standards for criterion-related validity studies—(1) Technical feasibility. Users choosing to validate a selection procedure by a criterion-related validity strategy should determine whether it is technically feasible (as defined in section 16) to conduct such a study in the particular employment context. The determination of the number of persons necessary to permit the conduct of a meaningful criterion-related study should be made by the user on the basis of all relevant information concerning the selection procedure, the potential sample and the employment situation. Where appropriate, jobs with substantially the same major work behaviors may be grouped together for validity studies, in order to obtain an adequate sample. These guidelines do not require a user to hire or promote persons for the purpose of making it possible to conduct a criterion-related study.

(2) Analysis of the job. There should be a review of job information to determine measures of work behavior(s) or performance that are relevant to the job or group of jobs in question. These measures or criteria are relevant to the extent that they represent critical or important job duties, work behaviors or work outcomes as developed from the review of job information. The possibility of bias should be considered both in selection of the criterion measures and their application. In view of the possibility of bias in subjective evaluations, supervisory rating techniques and instructions to raters should be carefully developed. All criterion measures and the methods for gathering data need to be examined for freedom from factors which would unfairly alter scores of members of any group. The relevance of criteria and their freedom from bias are of particular concern when there are significant differences in measures of job performance for different groups.

(3) Criterion measures. Proper safeguards should be taken to insure that scores on selection procedures do not enter into any judgments of employee adequacy that are to be used as criterion measures. Whatever criteria are used should represent important or critical work behavior(s) or work outcomes. Certain criteria may be used without a full job analysis if the user can show the importance of the criteria to the particular employment context. These criteria include but are not limited to production rate, error rate, tardiness, absenteeism, and length of service. A standardized rating of overall work performance may be used where a study of the job shows that it is an appropriate criterion. Where performance in training is used as a criterion, success in training should be properly measured and the relevance of the training should be shown either through a comparison of the content of

the training program with the critical or important work behavior(s) of the job(s), or through a demonstration of the relationship between measures of performance in training and measures of job performance. Measures of relative success in training include but are not limited to instructor evaluations, performance samples, or tests. Criterion measures consisting of paper and pencil tests will be closely reviewed for job relevance.

(4) *Representativeness of the sample.* Whether the study is predictive or concurrent, the sample subjects should insofar as feasible be representative of the candidates normally available in the relevant labor market for the job or group of jobs in question, and should insofar as feasible include the races, sexes, and ethnic groups normally available in the relevant job market. In determining the representativeness of the sample in a concurrent validity study, the user should take into account the extent to which the specific knowledges or skills which are the primary focus of the test are those which employees learn on the job.

Where samples are combined or compared, attention should be given to see that such samples are comparable in terms of the actual job they perform, the length of time on the job where time on the job is likely to affect performance, and other relevant factors likely to affect validity differences; or that these factors are included in the design of the study and their effects identified.

(5) *Statistical relationships.* The degree of relationship between selection procedure scores and criterion measures should be examined and computed, using professionally acceptable statistical procedures. Generally, a selection procedure is considered related to the criterion, for the purposes of these guidelines, when the relationship between performance on the procedure and performance on the criterion measure is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance, which means that it is sufficiently high as to have a probability of no more than one (1) in twenty (20) to have occurred by chance. Absence of a statistically significant relationship between a selection procedure and job performance should not necessarily discourage other investigations of the validity of that selection procedure.

(6) *Operational use of selection procedures.* Users should evaluate each selection procedure to assure that it is appropriate for operational use, including establishment of cut-off scores or rank ordering. Generally, if other factors remain the same, the greater the magnitude of the relationship (e.g., correlation coefficient) between performance on a selection procedure and one or more criteria of performance on the job, and the greater the importance and number of aspects of job performance covered by the criteria, the more likely it is that the procedure will be appropriate for use. Reliance

upon a selection procedure which is significantly related to a criterion measure, but which is based upon a study involving a large number of subjects and has a low correlation coefficient will be subject to close review if it has a large adverse impact. Sole reliance upon a single selection instrument which is related to only one of many job duties or aspects of job performance will also be subject to close review. The appropriateness of a selection procedure is best evaluated in each particular situation and there are no minimum correlation coefficients applicable to all employment situations. In determining whether a selection procedure is appropriate for operational use the following considerations should also be taken into account: The degree of adverse impact of the procedure, the availability of other selection procedures of greater or substantially equal validity.

(7) *Overstatement of validity findings.* Users should avoid reliance upon techniques which tend to overestimate validity findings as a result of capitalization on chance unless an appropriate safeguard is taken. Reliance upon a few selection procedures or criteria of successful job performance when many selection procedures or criteria of performance have been studied, or the use of optimal statistical weights for selection procedures computed in one sample, are techniques which tend to inflate validity estimates as a result of chance. Use of a large sample is one safeguard: Cross-validation is another.

(8) *Fairness.* This section generally calls for studies of unfairness where technically feasible. The concept of fairness or unfairness of selection procedures is a developing concept. In addition, fairness studies generally require substantial numbers of employees in the job or group of jobs being studied. For these reasons, the Federal enforcement agencies recognize that the obligation to conduct studies of fairness imposed by the guidelines generally will be upon users or groups of users with a large number of persons in a job class, or test developers; and that small users utilizing their own selection procedures will generally not be obligated to conduct such studies because it will be technically infeasible for them to do so.

(a) *Unfairness defined.* When members of one race, sex, or ethnic group characteristically obtain lower selection scores on a selection procedure than members of another group, and the differences in scores are not reflected in differences in a measure of job performance, use of the selection procedure may unfairly deny opportunities to members of the group that obtains the lower scores.

(b) *Investigation of fairness.* Where a selection procedure results in an adverse impact on a race, sex, or ethnic group identified in accordance with the classifications set forth in section 4 above and that group is a significant factor in the relevant labor market, the

user generally should investigate the possible existence of unfairness for that group if it is technically feasible to do so. The greater the severity of the adverse impact on a group, the greater the need to investigate the possible existence of unfairness. Where the weight of evidence from other studies shows that the selection procedure predicts fairly for the group in question and for the same or similar jobs, such evidence may be relied on in connection with the selection procedure at issue.

(c) *General considerations in fairness investigations.* Users conducting a study of fairness should review the A.P.A. Standards regarding investigation of possible bias in testing. An investigation of fairness of a selection procedure depends on both evidence of validity and the manner in which the selection procedure is to be used in a particular employment context. Fairness of a selection procedure cannot necessarily be specified in advance without investigating these factors. Investigation of fairness of a selection procedure in samples where the range of scores on selection procedures or criterion measures is severely restricted for any subgroup sample (as compared to other subgroup samples) may produce misleading evidence of unfairness. That factor should accordingly be taken into account in conducting such studies and before reliance is placed on the results.

(d) *When unfairness is shown.* If unfairness is demonstrated through a showing that members of a particular group perform better or poorer on the job than their scores on the selection procedure would indicate through comparison with how members of other groups perform, the user may either revise or replace the selection instrument in accordance with these guidelines, or may continue to use the selection instrument operationally with appropriate revisions in its use to assure compatibility between the probability of successful job performance and the probability of being selected.

(e) *Technical feasibility of fairness studies.* In addition to the general conditions needed for technical feasibility for the conduct of a criterion-related study (see section 16, below) an investigation of fairness requires the following:

(i) An adequate sample of persons in each group available for the study to achieve findings of statistical significance. Guidelines do not require a user to hire or promote persons on the basis of group classifications for the purpose of making it possible to conduct a study of fairness; but the user has the obligation otherwise to comply with these guidelines.

(ii) The samples for each group should be comparable in terms of the actual job they perform, length of time on the job where time on the job is likely to affect performance, and other relevant factors likely to af-

fect validity differences; or such factors should be included in the design of the study and their effects identified.

(f) *Continued use of selection procedures when fairness studies not feasible.* If a study of fairness should otherwise be performed, but is not technically feasible, a selection procedure may be used which has otherwise met the validity standards of these guidelines, unless the technical infeasibility resulted from discriminatory employment practices which are demonstrated by facts other than past failure to conform with requirements for validation of selection procedures. However, when it becomes technically feasible for the user to perform a study of fairness and such a study is otherwise called for, the user should conduct the study of fairness.

C. *Technical standards for content validity studies*—(1) *Appropriateness of content validity studies.* Users choosing to validate a selection procedure by a content validity strategy should determine whether it is appropriate to conduct such a study in the particular employment context. A selection procedure can be supported by a content validity strategy to the extent that it is a representative sample of the content of the job. Selection procedures which purport to measure knowledges, skills, or abilities may in certain circumstances be justified by content validity, although they may not be representative samples, if the knowledge, skill, or ability measured by the selection procedure can be operationally defined as provided in section 14C(4) below, and if that knowledge, skill, or ability is a necessary prerequisite to successful job performance.

A selection procedure based upon inferences about mental processes cannot be supported solely or primarily on the basis of content validity. Thus, a content strategy is not appropriate for demonstrating the validity of selection procedures which purport to measure traits or constructs, such as intelligence, aptitude, personality, commonsense, judgment, leadership, and spatial ability. Content validity is also not an appropriate strategy when the selection procedure involves knowledges, skills, or abilities which an employee will be expected to learn on the job.

(2) *Job analysis for content validity.* There should be a job analysis which includes an analysis of the important work behavior(s) required for successful performance and their relative importance and, if the behavior results in work product(s), an analysis of the work product(s). Any job analysis should focus on the work behavior(s) and the tasks associated with them. If work behavior(s) are not observable, the job analysis should identify and analyze those aspects of the behavior(s) that can be observed and the observed work products. The work behavior(s) selected for measurement should be critical

work behavior(s) and/or important work behavior(s) constituting most of the job.

(3) *Development of selection procedures.* A selection procedure designed to measure the work behavior may be developed specifically from the job and job analysis in question, or may have been previously developed by the user, or by other users or by a test publisher.

(4) *Standards for demonstrating content validity.* To demonstrate the content validity of a selection procedure, a user should show that the behavior(s) demonstrated in the selection procedure are a representative sample of the behavior(s) of the job in question or that the selection procedure provides a representative sample of the work product of the job. In the case of a selection procedure measuring a knowledge, skill, or ability, the knowledge, skill, or ability being measured should be operationally defined. In the case of a selection procedure measuring a knowledge, the knowledge being measured should be operationally defined as that body of learned information which is used in and is a necessary prerequisite for observable aspects of work behavior of the job. In the case of skills or abilities, the skill or ability being measured should be operationally defined in terms of observable aspects of work behavior of the job. For any selection procedure measuring a knowledge, skill, or ability the user should show that (a) the selection procedure measures and is a representative sample of that knowledge, skill, or ability; and (b) that knowledge, skill, or ability is used in and is a necessary prerequisite to performance of critical or important work behavior(s). In addition, to be content valid, a selection procedure measuring a skill or ability should either closely approximate an observable work behavior, or its product should closely approximate an observable work product. If a test purports to sample a work behavior or to provide a sample of a work product, the manner and setting of the selection procedure and its level and complexity should closely approximate the work situation. The closer the content and the context of the selection procedure are to work samples or work behaviors, the stronger is the basis for showing content validity. As the content of the selection procedure less resembles a work behavior, or the setting and manner of the administration of the selection procedure less resemble the work situation, or the result less resembles a work product, the less likely the selection procedure is to be content valid, and the greater the need for other evidence of validity.

(5) *Reliability.* The reliability of selection procedures justified on the basis of content validity should be a matter of concern to the user. Whenever it is feasible, appropriate statistical estimates should be made of the reliability of the selection procedure.

(6) *Prior training or experience.* A requirement for or evaluation of specific prior

training or experience based on content validity, including a specification of level or amount of training or experience, should be justified on the basis of the relationship between the content of the training or experience and the content of the job for which the training or experience is to be required or evaluated. The critical consideration is the resemblance between the specific behaviors, products, knowledges, skills, or abilities in the experience or training and the specific behaviors, products, knowledges, skills, or abilities required on the job, whether or not there is close resemblance between the experience or training as a whole and the job as a whole.

(7) *Content validity of training success.* Where a measure of success in a training program is used as a selection procedure and the content of a training program is justified on the basis of content validity, the use should be justified on the relationship between the content of the training program and the content of the job.

(8) *Operational use.* A selection procedure which is supported on the basis of content validity may be used for a job if it represents a critical work behavior (i.e., a behavior which is necessary for performance of the job) or work behaviors which constitute most of the important parts of the job.

(9) *Ranking based on content validity studies.* If a user can show, by a job analysis or otherwise, that a higher score on a content valid selection procedure is likely to result in better job performance, the results may be used to rank persons who score above minimum levels. Where a selection procedure supported solely or primarily by content validity is used to rank job candidates, the selection procedure should measure those aspects of performance which differentiate among levels of job performance.

D. *Technical standards for construct validity studies*—(1) *Appropriateness of construct validity studies.* Construct validity is a more complex strategy than either criterion-related or content validity. Construct validation is a relatively new and developing procedure in the employment field, and there is at present a lack of substantial literature extending the concept to employment practices. The user should be aware that the effort to obtain sufficient empirical support for construct validity is both an extensive and arduous effort involving a series of research studies, which include criterion related validity studies and which may include content validity studies. Users choosing to justify use of a selection procedure by this strategy should therefore take particular care to assure that the validity study meets the standards set forth below.

(2) *Job analysis for construct validity studies.* There should be a job analysis. This job analysis should show the work behavior(s) required for successful performance of the job,

or the groups of jobs being studied, the critical or important work behavior(s) in the job or group of jobs being studied, and an identification of the construct(s) believed to underlie successful performance of these critical or important work behaviors in the job or jobs in question. Each construct should be named and defined, so as to distinguish it from other constructs. If a group of jobs is being studied the jobs should have in common one or more critical or important work behaviors at a comparable level of complexity.

(3) *Relationship to the job.* A selection procedure should then be identified or developed which measures the construct identified in accord with paragraph (2) above. The user should show by empirical evidence that the selection procedure is validly related to the construct and that the construct is validly related to the performance of critical or important work behavior(s). The relationship between the construct as measured by the selection procedure and the related work behavior(s) should be supported by empirical evidence from one or more criterion-related studies involving the job or jobs in question which satisfy the provisions of section 14B above.

(4) *Use of construct validity study without new criterion-related evidence—(a) Standards for use.* Until such time as professional literature provides more guidance on the use of construct validity in employment situations, the Federal agencies will accept a claim of construct validity without a criterion-related study which satisfies section 14B above only when the selection procedure has been used elsewhere in a situation in which a criterion-related study has been conducted and the use of a criterion-related validity study in this context meets the standards for transportability of criterion-related validity studies as set forth above in section 7. However, if a study pertains to a number of jobs having common critical or important work behaviors at a comparable level of complexity, and the evidence satisfies paragraphs 14B (2) and (3) above for those jobs with criterion-related validity evidence for those jobs, the selection procedure may be used for all the jobs to which the study pertains. If construct validity is to be generalized to other jobs or groups of jobs not in the group studied, the Federal enforcement agencies will expect at a minimum additional empirical research evidence meeting the standards of paragraphs section 14B (2) and (3) above for the additional jobs or groups of jobs.

(b) *Determination of common work behaviors.* In determining whether two or more jobs have one or more work behavior(s) in common, the user should compare the observed work behavior(s) in each of the jobs and should compare the observed work product(s) in each of the jobs. If neither the observed

work behavior(s) in each of the jobs nor the observed work product(s) in each of the jobs are the same, the Federal enforcement agencies will presume that the work behavior(s) in each job are different. If the work behaviors are not observable, then evidence of similarity of work products and any other relevant research evidence will be considered in determining whether the work behavior(s) in the two jobs are the same.

DOCUMENTATION OF IMPACT AND VALIDITY EVIDENCE

SEC. 15. *Documentation of impact and validity evidence—A. Required information.* Users of selection procedures other than those users complying with section 15A(1) below should maintain and have available for each job information on adverse impact of the selection process for that job and, where it is determined a selection process has an adverse impact, evidence of validity as set forth below.

(1) *Simplified recordkeeping for users with less than 100 employees.* In order to minimize recordkeeping burdens on employers who employ one hundred (100) or fewer employees, and other users not required to file EEO-1, *et seq.*, reports, such users may satisfy the requirements of this section 15 if they maintain and have available records showing, for each year:

(a) The number of persons hired, promoted, and terminated for each job, by sex, and where appropriate by race and national origin;

(b) The number of applicants for hire and promotion by sex and where appropriate by race and national origin; and

(c) The selection procedures utilized (either standardized or not standardized).

These records should be maintained for each race or national origin group (see section 4 above) constituting more than two percent (2%) of the labor force in the relevant labor area. However, it is not necessary to maintain records by race and/or national origin (see section 4 above) if one race or national origin group in the relevant labor area constitutes more than ninety-eight percent (98%) of the labor force in the area. If the user has reason to believe that a selection procedure has an adverse impact, the user should maintain any available evidence of validity for that procedure (see sections 7A and 8).

(2) *Information on impact—(a) Collection of information on impact.* Users of selection procedures other than those complying with section 15A(1) above should maintain and have available for each job records or other information showing whether the total selection process for that job has an adverse impact on any of the groups for which records are called for by sections 4B above. Adverse impact determinations should be made at least annually for each such group which constitutes at least 2 percent of the labor

force in the relevant labor area or 2 percent of the applicable workforce. Where a total selection process for a job has an adverse impact, the user should maintain and have available records or other information showing which components have an adverse impact. Where the total selection process for a job does not have an adverse impact, information need not be maintained for individual components except in circumstances set forth in subsection 15A(2)(b) below. If the determination of adverse impact is made using a procedure other than the "four-fifths rule," as defined in the first sentence of section 4D above, a justification, consistent with section 4D above, for the procedure used to determine adverse impact should be available.

(b) *When adverse impact has been eliminated in the total selection process.* Whenever the total selection process for a particular job has had an adverse impact, as defined in section 4 above, in any year, but no longer has an adverse impact, the user should maintain and have available the information on individual components of the selection process required in the preceding paragraph for the period in which there was adverse impact. In addition, the user should continue to collect such information for at least two (2) years after the adverse impact has been eliminated.

(c) *When data insufficient to determine impact.* Where there has been an insufficient number of selections to determine whether there is an adverse impact of the total selection process for a particular job, the user should continue to collect, maintain and have available the information on individual components of the selection process required in section 15(A)(2)(a) above until the information is sufficient to determine that the overall selection process does not have an adverse impact as defined in section 4 above, or until the job has changed substantially.

(3) *Documentation of validity evidence—(a) Types of evidence.* Where a total selection process has an adverse impact (see section 4 above) the user should maintain and have available for each component of that process which has an adverse impact, one or more of the following types of documentation evidence:

- (i) Documentation evidence showing criterion-related validity of the selection procedure (see section 15B, below).
- (ii) Documentation evidence showing content validity of the selection procedure (see section 15C, below).
- (iii) Documentation evidence showing construct validity of the selection procedure (see section 15D, below).
- (iv) Documentation evidence from other studies showing validity of the selection procedure in the user's facility (see section 15E, below).

(v) Documentation evidence showing why a validity study cannot or need not be performed and why continued use of the procedure is consistent with Federal law.

(b) *Form of report.* This evidence should be compiled in a reasonably complete and organized manner to permit direct evaluation of the validity of the selection procedure. Previously written employer or consultant reports of validity, or reports describing validity studies completed before the issuance of these guidelines are acceptable if they are complete in regard to the documentation requirements contained in this section, or if they satisfied requirements of guidelines which were in effect when the validity study was completed. If they are not complete, the required additional documentation should be appended. If necessary information is not available the report of the validity study may still be used as documentation, but its adequacy will be evaluated in terms of compliance with the requirements of these guidelines.

(c) *Completeness.* In the event that evidence of validity is reviewed by an enforcement agency, the validation reports completed after the effective date of these guidelines are expected to contain the information set forth below. Evidence denoted by use of the word "(Essential)" is considered critical. If information denoted essential is not included, the report will be considered incomplete unless the user affirmatively demonstrates either its unavailability due to circumstances beyond the user's control or special circumstances of the user's study which make the information irrelevant. Evidence not so denoted is desirable but its absence will not be a basis for considering a report incomplete. The user should maintain and have available the information called for under the heading "Source Data" in sections 15B(11) and 15D(11). While it is a necessary part of the study, it need not be submitted with the report. All statistical results should be organized and presented in tabular or graphic form to the extent feasible.

B. *Criterion-related validity studies.* Reports of criterion-related validity for a selection procedure should include the following information:

(1) *User(s), location(s), and date(s) of study.* Dates and location(s) of the job analysis or review of job information, the date(s) and location(s) of the administration of the selection procedures and collection of criterion data, and the time between collection of data on selection procedures and criterion measures should be provided (Essential). If the study was conducted at several locations, the address of each location, including city and State, should be shown.

(2) *Problem and setting.* An explicit definition of the purpose(s) of the study and the circumstances in which the study was conducted should be provided. A description of

existing selection procedures and cutoff scores, if any, should be provided.

(3) *Job analysis or review of job information.* A description of the procedure used to analyze the job or group of jobs, or to review the job information should be provided (Essential). Where a review of job information results in criteria which may be used without a full job analysis (see section 14B(3)), the basis for the selection of these criteria should be reported (Essential). Where a job analysis is required a complete description of the work behavior(s) or work outcome(s), and measures of their criticality or importance should be provided (Essential). The report should describe the basis on which the behavior(s) or outcome(s) were determined to be critical or important, such as the proportion of time spent on the respective behaviors, their level of difficulty, their frequency of performance, the consequences of error, or other appropriate factors (Essential). Where two or more jobs are grouped for a validity study, the information called for in this subsection should be provided for each of the jobs, and the justification for the grouping (see section 14B(1)) should be provided (Essential).

(4) *Job titles and codes.* It is desirable to provide the user's job title(s) for the job(s) in question and the corresponding job title(s) and code(s) from U.S. Employment Service's Dictionary of Occupational Titles.

(5) *Criterion measures.* The bases for the selection of the criterion measures should be provided, together with references to the evidence considered in making the selection of criterion measures (essential). A full description of all criteria on which data were collected and means by which they were observed, recorded, evaluated, and quantified, should be provided (essential). If rating techniques are used as criterion measures, the appraisal form(s) and instructions to the rater(s) should be included as part of the validation evidence, or should be explicitly described and available (essential). All steps taken to insure that criterion measures are free from factors which would unfairly alter the scores of members of any group should be described (essential).

(6) *Sample description.* A description of how the research sample was identified and selected should be included (essential). The race, sex, and ethnic composition of the sample, including those groups set forth in section 4A above, should be described (essential). This description should include the size of each subgroup (essential). A description of how the research sample compares with the relevant labor market or work force, the method by which the relevant labor market or work force was defined, and a discussion of the likely effects on validity of differences between the sample and the relevant labor market or work force, are also desirable. De-

scriptions of educational levels, length of service, and age are also desirable.

(7) *Description of selection procedures.* Any measure, combination of measures, or procedure studied should be completely and explicitly described or attached (essential). If commercially available selection procedures are studied, they should be described by title, form, and publisher (essential). Reports of reliability estimates and how they were established are desirable.

(8) *Techniques and results.* Methods used in analyzing data should be described (essential). Measures of central tendency (e.g., means) and measures of dispersion (e.g., standard deviations and ranges) for all selection procedures and all criteria should be reported for each race, sex, and ethnic group which constitutes a significant factor in the relevant labor market (essential). The magnitude and direction of all relationships between selection procedures and criterion measures investigated should be reported for each relevant race, sex, and ethnic group and for the total group (essential). Where groups are too small to obtain reliable evidence of the magnitude of the relationship, need not be reported separately. Statements regarding the statistical significance of results should be made (essential). Any statistical adjustments, such as for less than perfect reliability or for restriction of score range in the selection procedure or criterion should be described and explained; and uncorrected correlation coefficients should also be shown (essential). Where the statistical technique categorizes continuous data, such as biserial correlation and the phi coefficient, the categories and the bases on which they were determined should be described and explained (essential). Studies of test fairness should be included where called for by the requirements of section 14B(8) (essential). These studies should include the rationale by which a selection procedure was determined to be fair to the group(s) in question. Where test fairness or unfairness has been demonstrated on the basis of other studies, a bibliography of the relevant studies should be included (essential). If the bibliography includes unpublished studies, copies of these studies, or adequate abstracts or summaries, should be attached (essential). Where revisions have been made in a selection procedure to assure compatibility between successful job performance and the probability of being selected, the studies underlying such revisions should be included (essential). All statistical results should be organized and presented by relevant race, sex, and ethnic group (essential).

(9) *Alternative procedures investigated.* The selection procedures investigated and available evidence of their impact should be identified (essential). The scope, method, and

findings of the investigation, and the conclusions reached in light of the findings, should be fully described (essential).

(10) *Uses and applications.* The methods considered for use of the selection procedure (e.g., as a screening device with a cutoff score, for grouping or ranking, or combined with other procedures in a battery) and available evidence of their impact should be described (essential). This description should include the rationale for choosing the method for operational use, and the evidence of the validity and utility of the procedure as it is to be used (essential). The purpose for which the procedure is to be used (e.g., hiring, transfer, promotion) should be described (essential). If weights are assigned to different parts of the selection procedure, these weights and the validity of the weighted composite should be reported (essential). If the selection procedure is used with a cutoff score, the user should describe the way in which normal expectations of proficiency within the work force were determined and the way in which the cutoff score was determined (essential).

(11) *Source data.* Each user should maintain records showing all pertinent information about individual sample members and raters where they are used, in studies involving the validation of selection procedures. These records should be made available upon request of a compliance agency. In the case of individual sample members these data should include scores on the selection procedure(s), scores on criterion measures, age, sex, race, or ethnic group status, and experience on the specific job on which the validation study was conducted, and may also include such things as education, training, and prior job experience, but should not include names and social security numbers. Records should be maintained which show the ratings given to each sample member by each rater.

(12) *Contact person.* The name, mailing address, and telephone number of the person who may be contacted for further information about the validity study should be provided (essential).

(13) *Accuracy and completeness.* The report should describe the steps taken to assure the accuracy and completeness of the collection, analysis, and report of data and results.

C. *Content validity studies.* Reports of content validity for a selection procedure should include the following information:

(1) *User(s), location(s) and date(s) of study.* Dates and location(s) of the job analysis should be shown (essential).

(2) *Problem and setting.* An explicit definition of the purpose(s) of the study and the circumstances in which the study was conducted should be provided. A description of existing selection procedures and cutoff scores, if any, should be provided.

(3) *Job analysis—Content of the job.* A description of the method used to analyze the

job should be provided (essential). The work behavior(s), the associated tasks, and, if the behavior results in a work product, the work products should be completely described (essential). Measures of criticality and/or importance of the work behavior(s) and the method of determining these measures should be provided (essential). Where the job analysis also identified the knowledges, skills, and abilities used in work behavior(s), an operational definition for each knowledge in terms of a body of learned information and for each skill and ability in terms of observable behaviors and outcomes, and the relationship between each knowledge, skill, or ability and each work behavior, as well as the method used to determine this relationship, should be provided (essential). The work situation should be described, including the setting in which work behavior(s) are performed, and where appropriate, the manner in which knowledges, skills, or abilities are used, and the complexity and difficulty of the knowledge, skill, or ability as used in the work behavior(s).

(4) *Selection procedure and its content.* Selection procedures, including those constructed by or for the user, specific training requirements, composites of selection procedures, and any other procedure supported by content validity, should be completely and explicitly described or attached (essential). If commercially available selection procedures are used, they should be described by title, form, and publisher (essential). The behaviors measured or sampled by the selection procedure should be explicitly described (essential). Where the selection procedure purports to measure a knowledge, skill, or ability, evidence that the selection procedure measures and is a representative sample of the knowledge, skill, or ability should be provided (essential).

(5) *Relationship between the selection procedure and the job.* The evidence demonstrating that the selection procedure is a representative work sample, a representative sample of the work behavior(s), or a representative sample of a knowledge, skill, or ability as used as a part of a work behavior and necessary for that behavior should be provided (essential). The user should identify the work behavior(s) which each item or part of the selection procedure is intended to sample or measure (essential). Where the selection procedure purports to sample a work behavior or to provide a sample of a work product, a comparison should be provided of the manner, setting, and the level of complexity of the selection procedure with those of the work situation (essential). If any steps were taken to reduce adverse impact on a race, sex, or ethnic group in the content of the procedure or in its administration, these steps should be described. Establishment of time limits, if any, and how these limits are related to the speed with which duties must

be performed on the job, should be explained. Measures of central tendency (e.g., means) and measures of dispersion (e.g., standard deviations) and estimates of reliability should be reported for all selection procedures if available. Such reports should be made for relevant race, sex, and ethnic subgroups, at least on a statistically reliable sample basis.

(6) *Alternative procedures investigated.* The alternative selection procedures investigated and available evidence of their impact should be identified (essential). The scope, method, and findings of the investigation, and the conclusions reached in light of the findings, should be fully described (essential).

(7) *Uses and applications.* The methods considered for use of the selection procedure (e.g., as a screening device with a cutoff score, for grouping or ranking, or combined with other procedures in a battery) and available evidence of their impact should be described (essential). This description should include the rationale for choosing the method for operational use, and the evidence of the validity and utility of the procedure as it is to be used (essential). The purpose for which the procedure is to be used (e.g., hiring, transfer, promotion) should be described (essential). If the selection procedure is used with a cutoff score, the user should describe the way in which normal expectations of proficiency within the work force were determined and the way in which the cutoff score was determined (essential). In addition, if the selection procedure is to be used for ranking, the user should specify the evidence showing that a higher score on the selection procedure is likely to result in better job performance.

(8) *Contact person.* The name, mailing address, and telephone number of the person who may be contacted for further information about the validity study should be provided (essential).

(9) *Accuracy and completeness.* The report should describe the steps taken to assure the accuracy and completeness of the collection, analysis, and report of data and results.

D. *Construct validity studies.* Reports of construct validity for a selection procedure should include the following information:

(1) *User(s), location(s), and date(s) of study.* Date(s) and location(s) of the job analysis and the gathering of other evidence called for by these guidelines should be provided (essential).

(2) *Problem and setting.* An explicit definition of the purpose(s) of the study and the circumstances in which the study was conducted should be provided. A description of existing selection procedures and cutoff scores, if any, should be provided.

(3) *Construct definition.* A clear definition of the construct(s) which are believed to underlie successful performance of the critical or important work behavior(s) should be pro-

vided (essential). This definition should include the levels of construct performance relevant to the job(s) for which the selection procedure is to be used (essential). There should be a summary of the position of the construct in the psychological literature, or in the absence of such a position, a description of the way in which the definition and measurement of the construct was developed and the psychological theory underlying it (essential). Any quantitative data which identify or define the job constructs, such as factor analyses, should be provided (essential).

(4) *Job analysis.* A description of the method used to analyze the job should be provided (essential). A complete description of the work behavior(s) and, to the extent appropriate, work outcomes and measures of their criticality and/or importance should be provided (essential). The report should also describe the basis on which the behavior(s) or outcomes were determined to be important, such as their level of difficulty, their frequency of performance, the consequences of error or other appropriate factors (essential). Where jobs are grouped or compared for the purposes of generalizing validity evidence, the work behavior(s) and work product(s) for each of the jobs should be described, and conclusions concerning the similarity of the jobs in terms of observable work behaviors or work products should be made (essential).

(5) *Job titles and codes.* It is desirable to provide the selection procedure user's job title(s) for the job(s) in question and the corresponding job title(s) and code(s) from the United States Employment Service's dictionary of occupational titles.

(6) *Selection procedure.* The selection procedure used as a measure of the construct should be completely and explicitly described or attached (essential). If commercially available selection procedures are used, they should be identified by title, form and publisher (essential). The research evidence of the relationship between the selection procedure and the construct, such as factor structure, should be included (essential). Measures of central tendency, variability and reliability of the selection procedure should be provided (essential). Whenever feasible, these measures should be provided separately for each relevant race, sex and ethnic group.

(7) *Relationship to job performance.* The criterion-related study(ies) and other empirical evidence of the relationship between the construct measured by the selection procedure and the related work behavior(s) for the job or jobs in question should be provided (essential). Documentation of the criterion-related study(ies) should satisfy the provisions of section 15B above or section 15E(1) below, except for studies conducted prior to the effective date of these guidelines (essential). Where a study pertains to a group of jobs,

and, on the basis of the study, validity is asserted for a job in the group, the observed work behaviors and the observed work products for each of the jobs should be described (essential). Any other evidence used in determining whether the work behavior(s) in each of the jobs is the same should be fully described (essential).

(8) *Alternative procedures investigated.* The alternative selection procedures investigated and available evidence of their impact should be identified (essential). The scope, method, and findings of the investigation, and the conclusions reached in light of the findings should be fully described (essential).

(9) *Uses and applications.* The methods considered for use of the selection procedure (e.g., as a screening device with a cutoff score, for grouping or ranking, or combined with other procedures in a battery) and available evidence of their impact should be described (essential). This description should include the rationale for choosing the method for operational use, and the evidence of the validity and utility of the procedure as it is to be used (essential). The purpose for which the procedure is to be used (e.g., hiring, transfer, promotion) should be described (essential). If weights are assigned to different parts of the selection procedure, these weights and the validity of the weighted composite should be reported (essential). If the selection procedure is used with a cutoff score, the user should describe the way in which normal expectations of proficiency within the work force were determined and the way in which the cutoff score was determined (essential).

(10) *Accuracy and completeness.* The report should describe the steps taken to assure the accuracy and completeness of the collection, analysis, and report of data and results.

(11) *Source data.* Each user should maintain records showing all pertinent information relating to its study of construct validity.

(12) *Contact person.* The name, mailing address, and telephone number of the individual who may be contacted for further information about the validity study should be provided (essential).

E. *Evidence of validity from other studies.* When validity of a selection procedure is supported by studies not done by the user, the evidence from the original study or studies should be compiled in a manner similar to that required in the appropriate section of this section 15 above. In addition, the following evidence should be supplied:

(1) *Evidence from criterion-related validity studies—*a. *Job information.* A description of the important job behavior(s) of the user's job and the basis on which the behaviors were determined to be important should be provided (essential). A full description of the basis for determining that these important work behaviors are the same as those of the

job in the original study (or studies) should be provided (essential).

b. *Relevance of criteria.* A full description of the basis on which the criteria used in the original studies are determined to be relevant for the user should be provided (essential).

c. *Other variables.* The similarity of important applicant pool or sample characteristics reported in the original studies to those of the user should be described (essential). A description of the comparison between the race, sex and ethnic composition of the user's relevant labor market and the sample in the original validity studies should be provided (essential).

d. *Use of the selection procedure.* A full description should be provided showing that the use to be made of the selection procedure is consistent with the findings of the original validity studies (essential).

e. *Bibliography.* A bibliography of reports of validity of the selection procedure for the job or jobs in question should be provided (essential). Where any of the studies included an investigation of test fairness, the results of this investigation should be provided (essential). Copies of reports published in journals that are not commonly available should be described in detail or attached (essential). Where a user is relying upon unpublished studies, a reasonable effort should be made to obtain these studies. If these unpublished studies are the sole source of validity evidence they should be described in detail or attached (essential). If these studies are not available, the name and address of the source, an adequate abstract or summary of the validity study and data, and a contact person in the source organization should be provided (essential).

(2) *Evidence from content validity studies.* See section 14C(3) and section 15C above.

(3) *Evidence from construct validity studies.* See sections 14D(2) and 15D above.

F. *Evidence of validity from cooperative studies.* Where a selection procedure has been validated through a cooperative study, evidence that the study satisfies the requirements of sections 7, 8 and 15E should be provided (essential).

G. *Selection for higher level job.* If a selection procedure is used to evaluate candidates for jobs at a higher level than those for which they will initially be employed, the validity evidence should satisfy the documentation provisions of this section 15 for the higher level job or jobs, and in addition, the user should provide: (1) A description of the job progression structure, formal or informal; (2) the data showing how many employees progress to the higher level job and the length of time needed to make this progression; and (3) an identification of any anticipated changes in the higher level job. In addition, if the test measures a knowledge,

skill or ability, the user should provide evidence that the knowledge, skill or ability is required for the higher level job and the basis for the conclusion that the knowledge, skill or ability is not expected to develop from the training or experience on the job.

H. *Interim use of selection procedures.* If a selection procedure is being used on an interim basis because the procedure is not fully supported by the required evidence of validity, the user should maintain and have available (1) substantial evidence of validity for the procedure, and (2) a report showing the date on which the study to gather the additional evidence commenced, the estimated completion date of the study, and a description of the data to be collected (essential).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. *Definitions.* The following definitions shall apply throughout these guidelines:

A. *Ability.* A present competence to perform an observable behavior or a behavior which results in an observable product.

B. *Adverse impact.* A substantially different rate of selection in hiring, promotion, or other employment decision which works to the disadvantage of members of a race, sex, or ethnic group. See section 4 of these guidelines.

C. *Compliance with these guidelines.* Use of a selection procedure is in compliance with these guidelines if such use has been validated in accord with these guidelines (as defined below), or if such use does not result in adverse impact on any race, sex, or ethnic group (see section 4, above), or, in unusual circumstances, if use of the procedure is otherwise justified in accord with Federal law. See section 6B, above.

D. *Content validity.* Demonstrated by data showing that the content of a selection procedure is representative of important aspects of performance on the job. See section 5B and section 14C.

E. *Construct validity.* Demonstrated by data showing that the selection procedure measures the degree to which candidates have identifiable characteristics which have been determined to be important for successful job performance. See section 5B and section 14D.

F. *Criterion-related validity.* Demonstrated by empirical data showing that the selection procedure is predictive of or significantly correlated with important elements of work behavior. See sections 5B and 14B.

G. *Employer.* Any employer subject to the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, including State or local governments and any Federal agency subject to the provisions of section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and any Federal contractor or subcontractor or federally assisted construction contractor or subcon-

tractor covered by Executive Order 11246, as amended.

H. *Employment agency.* Any employment agency subject to the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.

I. *Enforcement action.* For the purposes of section 4 a proceeding by a Federal enforcement agency such as a lawsuit or an administrative proceeding leading to debarment from or withholding, suspension, or termination of Federal Government contracts or the suspension or withholding of Federal Government funds; but not a finding of reasonable cause or a conciliation process or the issuance of right to sue letters under title VII or under Executive Order 11246 where such finding, conciliation, or issuance of notice of right to sue is based upon an individual complaint.

J. *Enforcement agency.* Any agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government which adopts these guidelines for purposes of the enforcement of the equal employment opportunity laws or which has responsibility for securing compliance with them.

K. *Job analysis.* A detailed statement of work behaviors and other information relevant to the job.

L. *Job description.* A general statement of job duties and responsibilities.

M. *Knowledge.* A body of information applied directly to the performance of a function.

N. *Labor organization.* Any labor organization subject to the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and any committee subject thereto controlling apprenticeship or other training.

O. *Observable.* Able to be seen, heard, or otherwise perceived by a person other than the person performing the action.

P. *Race, sex, or ethnic group.* Any group of persons identifiable on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Q. *Selection procedure.* Any measure, combination of measures, or procedure used as a basis for any employment decision. Selection procedures include the full range of assessment techniques from traditional paper and pencil tests, performance tests, training programs, or probationary periods and physical, educational, and work experience requirements through informal or casual interviews and unscored application forms.

R. *Selection rate.* The proportion of applicants or candidates who are hired, promoted, or otherwise selected.

S. *Should.* The term "should" as used in these guidelines is intended to connote action which is necessary to achieve compliance with the guidelines, while recognizing that there are circumstances where alternative courses of action are open to users.

T. *Skill.* A present, observable competence to perform a learned psychomotor act.

U. *Technical feasibility.* The existence of conditions permitting the conduct of meaningful criterion-related validity studies. These conditions include: (1) An adequate sample of persons available for the study to achieve findings of statistical significance; (2) having or being able to obtain a sufficient range of scores on the selection procedure and job performance measures to produce validity results which can be expected to be representative of the results if the ranges normally expected were utilized; and (3) having or being able to devise unbiased, reliable and relevant measures of job performance or other criteria of employee adequacy. See section 14B(2). With respect to investigation of possible unfairness, the same considerations are applicable to each group for which the study is made. See section 14B(8).

V. *Unfairness of selection procedure.* A condition in which members of one race, sex, or ethnic group characteristically obtain lower scores on a selection procedure than members of another group, and the differences are not reflected in differences in measures of job performance. See section 14B(7).

W. *User.* Any employer, labor organization, employment agency, or licensing or certification board, to the extent it may be covered by Federal equal employment opportunity law, which uses a selection procedure as a basis for any employment decision. Whenever an employer, labor organization, or employment agency is required by law to restrict recruitment for any occupation to those applicants who have met licensing or certification requirements, the licensing or certifying authority to the extent it may be covered by Federal equal employment opportunity law will be considered the user with respect to those licensing or certification requirements. Whenever a State employment agency or service does no more than administer or monitor a procedure as permitted by Department of Labor regulations, and does so without making referrals or taking any other action on the basis of the results, the State employment agency will not be deemed to be a user.

X. *Validated in accord with these guidelines or properly validated.* A demonstration that one or more validity study or studies meeting the standards of these guidelines has been conducted, including investigation and, where appropriate, use of suitable alternative selection procedures as contemplated by section 3B, and has produced evidence of validity sufficient to warrant use of the procedure for the intended purpose under the standards of these guidelines.

Y. *Work behavior.* An activity performed to achieve the objectives of the job. Work behaviors involve observable (physical) components and unobservable (mental) components. A work behavior consists of the performance of one or more tasks. Knowledges, skills, and abilities are not behaviors, al-

though they may be applied in work behaviors.

APPENDIX

17. *Policy statement on affirmative action* (see section 13B). The Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council was established by act of Congress in 1972, and charged with responsibility for developing and implementing agreements and policies designed, among other things, to eliminate conflict and inconsistency among the agencies of the Federal Government responsible for administering Federal law prohibiting discrimination on grounds of race, color, sex, religion, and national origin. This statement is issued as an initial response to the requests of a number of State and local officials for clarification of the Government's policies concerning the role of affirmative action in the overall equal employment opportunity program. While the Coordinating Council's adoption of this statement expresses only the views of the signatory agencies concerning this important subject, the principles set forth below should serve as policy guidance for other Federal agencies as well.

(1) Equal employment opportunity is the law of the land. In the public sector of our society this means that all persons, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin shall have equal access to positions in the public service limited only by their ability to do the job. There is ample evidence in all sectors of our society that such equal access frequently has been denied to members of certain groups because of their sex, racial, or ethnic characteristics. The remedy for such past and present discrimination is twofold.

On the one hand, vigorous enforcement of the laws against discrimination is essential. But equally, and perhaps even more important are affirmative, voluntary efforts on the part of public employers to assure that positions in the public service are genuinely and equally accessible to qualified persons, without regard to their sex, racial, or ethnic characteristics. Without such efforts equal employment opportunity is no more than a wish. The importance of voluntary affirmative action on the part of employers is underscored by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 11246, and related laws and regulations—all of which emphasize voluntary action to achieve equal employment opportunity.

As with most management objectives, a systematic plan based on sound organizational analysis and problem identification is crucial to the accomplishment of affirmative action objectives. For this reason, the Council urges all State and local governments to develop and implement results oriented affirmative action plans which deal with the problems so identified.

§ 50.14

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

The following paragraphs are intended to assist State and local governments by illustrating the kinds of analyses and activities which may be appropriate for a public employer's voluntary affirmative action plan. This statement does not address remedies imposed after a finding of unlawful discrimination.

(2) Voluntary affirmative action to assure equal employment opportunity is appropriate at any stage of the employment process. The first step in the construction of any affirmative action plan should be an analysis of the employer's work force to determine whether percentages of sex, race, or ethnic groups in individual job classifications are substantially similar to the percentages of those groups available in the relevant job market who possess the basic job-related qualifications.

When substantial disparities are found through such analyses, each element of the overall selection process should be examined to determine which elements operate to exclude persons on the basis of sex, race, or ethnic group. Such elements include, but are not limited to, recruitment, testing, ranking certification, interview, recommendations for selection, hiring, promotion, etc. The examination of each element of the selection process should at a minimum include a determination of its validity in predicting job performance.

(3) When an employer has reason to believe that its selection procedures have the exclusionary effect described in paragraph 2 above, it should initiate affirmative steps to remedy the situation. Such steps, which in design and execution may be race, color, sex, or ethnic "conscious," include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) The establishment of a long-term goal, and short-range, interim goals and timetables for the specific job classifications, all of which should take into account the availability of basically qualified persons in the relevant job market;

(b) A recruitment program designed to attract qualified members of the group in question;

(c) A systematic effort to organize work and redesign jobs in ways that provide opportunities for persons lacking "journeyman" level knowledge or skills to enter and, with appropriate training, to progress in a career field;

(d) Revamping selection instruments or procedures which have not yet been validated in order to reduce or eliminate exclusionary effects on particular groups in particular job classifications;

(e) The initiation of measures designed to assure that members of the affected group who are qualified to perform the job are included within the pool of persons from which the selecting official makes the selection;

(f) A systematic effort to provide career advancement training, both classroom and on-the-job, to employees locked into dead end jobs; and

(g) The establishment of a system for regularly monitoring the effectiveness of the particular affirmative action program, and procedures for making timely adjustments in this program where effectiveness is not demonstrated.

(4) The goal of any affirmative action plan should be achievement of genuine equal employment opportunity for all qualified persons. Selection under such plans should be based upon the ability of the applicant(s) to do the work. Such plans should not require the selection of the unqualified, or the unneeded, nor should they require the selection of persons on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin. Moreover, while the Council believes that this statement should serve to assist State and local employers, as well as Federal agencies, it recognizes that affirmative action cannot be viewed as a standardized program which must be accomplished in the same way at all times in all places.

Accordingly, the Council has not attempted to set forth here either the minimum or maximum voluntary steps that employers may take to deal with their respective situations. Rather, the Council recognizes that under applicable authorities, State and local employers have flexibility to formulate affirmative action plans that are best suited to their particular situations. In this manner, the Council believes that affirmative action programs will best serve the goal of equal employment opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,

HAROLD R. TYLER, Jr.,
Deputy Attorney General and Chairman of the Equal Employment Coordinating Council.

MICHAEL H. MOSKOW,
Under Secretary of Labor.

ETHEL BENT WALSH,
Acting Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

ARTHUR E. FLEMMING,
Chairman, Commission on Civil Rights.

Because of its equal employment opportunity responsibilities under the State and Local Government Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (the revenue sharing act), the Department of Treasury was invited to participate in the formulation of this policy statement; and it concurs and joins in the adoption of this policy statement.

Done this 26th day of August 1976.

RICHARD ALBRECHT,
General Counsel, Department of the Treasury.

SECTION 18. Citations. The official title of these guidelines is "Uniform Guidelines on

Department of Justice

§ 50.15

Employee Selection Procedures (1978)”. The Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978) are intended to establish a uniform Federal position in the area of prohibiting discrimination in employment practices on grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. These guidelines have been adopted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, and the Civil Service Commission.

The official citation is:

“Section ____, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR ____ (August 25, 1978).”

The short form citation is:

“Section __, U.G.E.S.P. (1978); 43 FR __ (August 25, 1978).”

When the guidelines are cited in connection with the activities of one of the issuing agencies, a specific citation to the regulations of that agency can be added at the end of the above citation. The specific additional citations are as follows:

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
29 CFR Part 1607
Department of Labor
Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs
41 CFR Part 60-3
Department of Justice
28 CFR 50.14
Civil Service Commission
5 CFR 300.103(c)

Normally when citing these guidelines, the section number immediately preceding the title of the guidelines will be from these guidelines series 1-18. If a section number from the codification for an individual agency is needed it can also be added at the end of the agency citation. For example, section 6A of these guidelines could be cited for EEOC as follows: “Section 6A, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978); 43 FR __, (August 25, 1978); 29 CFR part 1607, section 6A.”

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

ALAN K. CAMPBELL,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

RAY MARSHALL,
Secretary of Labor.

GRIFFIN B. BELL,
Attorney General.

[Order No. 668-76, 41 FR 51735, Nov. 23, 1976, as amended at 43 FR 38295, Aug. 25, 1978]

§ 50.15 Representation of Federal officials and employees by Department of Justice attorneys or by private counsel furnished by the Department in civil, criminal, and congressional proceedings in which Federal employees are sued, subpoenaed, or charged in their individual capacities.

(a) Under the procedures set forth below, a federal employee (hereby defined to include present and former Federal officials and employees) may be provided representation in civil, criminal and Congressional proceedings in which he is sued, subpoenaed, or charged in his individual capacity, not covered by §15.1 of this chapter, when the actions for which representation is requested reasonably appear to have been performed within the scope of the employee's employment and the Attorney General or his designee determines that providing representation would otherwise be in the interest of the United States. No special form of request for representation is required when it is clear from the proceedings in a case that the employee is being sued solely in his official capacity and only equitable relief is sought. (See USAM 4-13.000)

(1) When an employee believes he is entitled to representation by the Department of Justice in a proceeding, he must submit forthwith a written request for that representation, together with all process and pleadings served upon him, to his immediate supervisor or whomever is designated by the head of his department or agency. Unless the employee's employing federal agency concludes that representation is clearly unwarranted, it shall submit, in a timely manner, to the Civil Division or other appropriate litigating division (Antitrust, Civil Rights, Criminal, Land and Natural Resources or the Tax Division), a statement containing its findings as to whether the employee was acting within the scope of his employment and its recommendation for or against providing representation. The statement should be accompanied by all available factual information. In emergency situations the litigating division may initiate conditional representation after a telephone request

§ 50.15

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

from the appropriate official of the employing agency. In such cases, the written request and appropriate documentation must be subsequently provided.

(2) Upon receipt of the individual's request for counsel, the litigating division shall determine whether the employee's actions reasonably appear to have been performed within the scope of his employment and whether providing representation would be in the interest of the United States. In circumstances where considerations of professional ethics prohibit direct review of the facts by attorneys of the litigating division (e.g. because of the possible existence of inter-defendant conflicts) the litigating division may delegate the fact-finding aspects of this function to other components of the Department or to a private attorney at federal expenses.

(3) Attorneys employed by any component of the Department of Justice who participate in any process utilized for the purpose of determining whether the Department should provide representation to a federal employee, undertake a full and traditional attorney-client relationship with the employee with respect to application of the attorney-client privilege. If representation is authorized, Justice Department attorneys who represent an employee under this section also undertake a full and traditional attorney-client relationship with the employee with respect to the attorney-client privilege. Any adverse information communicated by the client-employee to an attorney during the course of such attorney-client relationship shall not be disclosed to anyone, either inside or outside the Department, other than attorneys responsible for representation of the employee, unless such disclosure is authorized by the employee. Such adverse information shall continue to be fully protected whether or not representation is provided, and even though representation may be denied or discontinued. The extent, if any, to which attorneys employed by an agency other than the Department of Justice undertake a full and traditional attorney-client relationship with the employee with respect to the attorney-client privilege, either for purposes of

determining whether representation should be provided or to assist Justice Department attorneys in representing the employee, shall be determined by the agency employing the attorneys.

(4) Representation generally is not available in federal criminal proceedings. Representation may be provided to a federal employee in connection with a federal criminal proceeding only where the Attorney General or his designee determines that representation is in the interest of the United States and subject to applicable limitations of § 50.16. In determining whether representation in a federal criminal proceeding is in the interest of the United States, the Attorney General or his designee shall consider, among other factors, the relevance of any non-prosecutorial interests of the United States, the importance of the interests implicated, the Department's ability to protect those interests through other means, and the likelihood of a conflict of interest between the Department's prosecutorial and representational responsibilities. If representation is authorized, the Attorney General or his designee also may determine whether representation by Department attorneys, retention of private counsel at federal expense, or reimbursement to the employee of private counsel fees is most appropriate under the circumstances.

(5) Where representation is sought for proceedings other than federal criminal proceedings, but there appears to exist the possibility of a federal criminal investigation or indictment relating to the same subject matter, the litigating division shall contact a designated official in the Criminal, Civil Rights or Tax Division or other prosecutive authority within the Department (hereinafter "prosecuting division") to determine whether the employee is either a subject of a federal criminal investigation or a defendant in a federal criminal case. An employee is the subject of an investigation if, in addition to being circumstantially implicated by having the appropriate responsibilities at the appropriate time, there is some evidence of his specific participation in a crime.

(6) If a prosecuting division of the Department indicates that the employee

Department of Justice

§ 50.15

is not the subject of a criminal investigation concerning the act or acts for which he seeks representation, then representation may be provided if otherwise permissible under the provisions of this section. Similarly, if the prosecuting division indicates that there is an ongoing investigation, but into a matter unrelated to that for which representation has been requested, then representation may be provided.

(7) If the prosecuting division indicates that the employee is the subject of a federal criminal investigation concerning the act or acts for which he seeks representation, the litigating division shall inform the employee that no representation by Justice Department attorneys will be provided in that federal criminal proceeding or in any related civil, congressional, or state criminal proceeding. In such a case, however, the litigating division, in its discretion, may provide a private attorney to the employee at federal expense under the procedures of § 50.16, or provide reimbursement to employees for private attorney fees incurred in connection with such related civil, congressional, or state criminal proceeding, provided no decision has been made to seek an indictment or file an information against the employee.

(8) In any case where it is determined that Department of Justice attorneys will represent a federal employee, the employee must be notified of his right to retain private counsel at his own expense. If he elects representation by Department of Justice attorneys, the employee and his agency shall be promptly informed:

(i) That in actions where the United States, any agency, or any officer thereof in his official capacity is also named as a defendant, the Department of Justice is required by law to represent the United States and/or such agency or officer and will assert all appropriate legal positions and defenses on behalf of such agency, officer and/or the United States;

(ii) That the Department of Justice will not assert any legal position or defense on behalf of any employee sued in his individual capacity which is deemed not to be in the interest of the United States;

(iii) Where appropriate, that neither the Department of Justice nor any agency of the U.S. Government is obligated to pay or to indemnify the defendant employee for any judgment for money damages which may be rendered against such employee; but that, where authorized, the employee may apply for such indemnification from his employing agency upon the entry of an adverse verdict, judgment, or other monetary award;

(iv) That any appeal by Department of Justice attorneys from an adverse ruling or judgment against the employee may only be taken upon the discretionary approval of the Solicitor General, but the employee-defendant may pursue an appeal at his own expense whenever the Solicitor General declines to authorize an appeal and private counsel is not provided at federal expense under the procedures of § 50.16; and

(v) That while no conflict appears to exist at the time representation is tendered which would preclude making all arguments necessary to the adequate defense of the employee, if such conflict should arise in the future the employee will be promptly advised and steps will be taken to resolve the conflict as indicated by paragraph (a) (6), (9) and (10) of this section, and by § 50.16.

(9) If a determination not to provide representation is made, the litigating division shall inform the agency and/or the employee of the determination.

(10) If conflicts exist between the legal and factual positions of various employees in the same case which make it inappropriate for a single attorney to represent them all, the employees may be separated into as many compatible groups as is necessary to resolve the conflict problem and each group may be provided with separate representation. Circumstances may make it advisable that private representation be provided to all conflicting groups and that direct Justice Department representation be withheld so as not to prejudice particular defendants. In such situations, the procedures of § 50.16 will apply.

(11) Whenever the Solicitor General declines to authorize further appellate

§ 50.15

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

review or the Department attorney assigned to represent an employee becomes aware that the representation of the employee could involve the assertion of a position that conflicts with the interests of the United States, the attorney shall fully advise the employee of the decision not to appeal or the nature, extent, and potential consequences of the conflict. The attorney shall also determine, after consultation with his supervisor (and, if appropriate, with the litigating division) whether the assertion of the position or appellate review is necessary to the adequate representation of the employee and

(i) If it is determined that the assertion of the position or appeal is not necessary to the adequate representation of the employee, and if the employee knowingly agrees to forego appeal or to waive the assertion of that position, governmental representation may be provided or continued; or

(ii) If the employee does not consent to forego appeal or waive the assertion of the position, or if it is determined that an appeal or assertion of the position is necessary to the adequate representation of the employee, a Justice Department lawyer may not provide or continue to provide the representation; and

(iii) In appropriate cases arising under paragraph (a)(10)(ii) of this section, a private attorney may be provided at federal expense under the procedures of § 50.16.

(12) Once undertaken, representation of a federal employee under this subsection will continue until either all appropriate proceedings, including applicable appellate procedures approved by the Solicitor General, have ended, or until any of the bases for declining or withdrawing from representation set forth in this section is found to exist, including without limitation the basis that representation is not in the interest of the United States. If representation is discontinued for any reason, the representing Department attorney on the case will seek to withdraw but will take all reasonable steps to avoid prejudice to the employee.

(b) Representation is not available to a federal employee whenever:

(1) The conduct with regard to which the employee desires representation does not reasonably appear to have been performed within the scope of his employment with the federal government;

(2) It is otherwise determined by the Department that it is not in the interest of the United States to provide representation to the employee.

(c)(1) The Department of Justice may indemnify the defendant Department of Justice employee for any verdict, judgment, or other monetary award which is rendered against such employee, provided that the conduct giving rise to the verdict, judgment, or award was taken within the scope of employment and that such indemnification is in the interest of the United States, as determined by the Attorney General or his designee.

(2) The Department of Justice may settle or compromise a personal damages claim against a Department of Justice employee by the payment of available funds, at any time, provided the alleged conduct giving rise to the personal damages claim was taken within the scope of employment and that such settlement or compromise is in the interest of the United States, as determined by the Attorney General or his designee.

(3) Absent exceptional circumstances as determined by the Attorney General or his designee, the Department will not entertain a request either to agree to indemnify or to settle a personal damages claim before entry of an adverse verdict, judgment, or award.

(4) The Department of Justice employee may request indemnification to satisfy a verdict, judgment, or award entered against the employee. The employee shall submit a written request, with appropriate documentation including copies of the verdict, judgment, award, or settlement proposal if on appeal, to the head of his employing component, who shall thereupon submit to the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, in a timely manner, a recommended disposition of the request. Where appropriate, the Assistant Attorney General shall seek the views of the U.S. Attorney; in all such cases the Civil Division shall be consulted. The

Department of Justice

§ 50.16

Assistant Attorney General shall forward the request, the employing component's recommendation, and the Assistant Attorney General's recommendation to the Attorney General for decision.

(5) Any payment under this section either to indemnify a Department of Justice employee or to settle a personal damages claim shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds of the employing component of the Department of Justice.

[Order No. 970-82, 47 FR 8172, Feb. 25, 1982, as amended at Order No. 1139-86, 51 FR 27022, July 29, 1986; Order No. 1409-90, 55 FR 13130, Apr. 9, 1990]

§ 50.16 Representation of Federal employees by private counsel at Federal expense.

(a) Representation by private counsel at federal expense or reimbursement of private counsel fees is subject to the availability of funds and may be provided to a federal employee only in the instances described in § 50.15(a) (4), (7), (10), and (11), and in appropriate circumstances, for the purposes set forth in § 50.15(a)(2).

(b) To ensure uniformity in retention and reimbursement procedures among the litigating divisions, the Civil Division shall be responsible for establishing procedures for the retention of private counsel and the reimbursement to an employee of private counsel fees, including the setting of fee schedules. In all instances where a litigating division decides to retain private counsel or to provide reimbursement of private counsel fees under this section, the Civil Division shall be consulted before the retention or reimbursement is undertaken.

(c) Where private counsel is provided, the following procedures shall apply:

(1) While the Department of Justice will generally defer to the employee's choice of counsel, the Department must approve in advance any private counsel to be retained under this section. Where national security interests may be involved, the Department of Justice will consult with the agency employing the federal defendant seeking representation.

(2) Federal payments to private counsel for an employee will cease if the

private counsel violates any of the terms of the retention agreement or the Department of Justice.

(i) Decides to seek an indictment of, or to file an information against, that employee on a federal criminal charge relating to the conduct concerning which representation was undertaken;

(ii) Determines that the employee's actions do not reasonably appear to have been performed within the scope of his employment;

(iii) Resolves any conflict described herein and tenders representation by Department of Justice attorneys;

(iv) Determines that continued representation is not in the interest of the United States;

(v) Terminates the retainer with the concurrence of the employee-client for any reason.

(d) Where reimbursement is provided for private counsel fees incurred by employees, the following limitations shall apply:

(1) Reimbursement shall be limited to fees incurred for legal work that is determined to be in the interest of the United States. Reimbursement is not available for legal work that advances only the individual interests of the employee.

(2) Reimbursement shall not be provided if at any time the Attorney General or his designee determines that the employee's actions do not reasonably appear to have been performed within the scope of his employment or that representation is no longer in the interest of the United States.

(3) Reimbursement shall not be provided for fees incurred during any period of time for which representation by Department of Justice attorneys was tendered.

(4) Reimbursement shall not be provided if the United States decides to seek an indictment of or to file an information against the employee seeking reimbursement, on a criminal charge relating to the conduct concerning which representation was undertaken.

[Order No. 970-82, 47 FR 8174, Feb. 25, 1982, as amended by Order No. 1409-90, 55 FR 13130, Apr. 9, 1990]

§ 50.17

§ 50.17 *Ex parte* communications in informal rulemaking proceedings.

In rulemaking proceedings subject only to the procedural requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553:

(a) A general prohibition applicable to all offices, boards, bureaus and divisions of the Department of Justice against the receipt of private, *ex parte* oral or written communications is undesirable, because it would deprive the Department of the flexibility needed to fashion rulemaking procedures appropriate to the issues involved, and would introduce a degree of formality that would, at least in most instances, result in procedures that are unduly complicated, slow, and expensive, and, at the same time, perhaps not conducive to developing all relevant information.

(b) All written communications from outside the Department addressed to the merits of a proposed rule, received after notice of proposed informal rulemaking and in its course by the Department, its offices, boards, and bureaus, and divisions or their personnel participating in the decision, should be placed promptly in a file available for public inspection.

(c) All oral communications from outside the Department of significant information or argument respecting the merits of a proposed rule, received after notice of proposed informal rulemaking and in its course by the Department, its offices, boards, bureaus, and divisions or their personnel participating in the decision, should be summarized in writing and placed promptly in a file available for public inspection.

(d) The Department may properly withhold from the public files information exempt from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. 552.

(e) The Department may conclude that restrictions on *ex parte* communications in particular rulemaking proceedings are necessitated by considerations of fairness or for other reasons.

[Order No. 801-78, 43 FR 43297, Sept. 25, 1978, as amended at Order No. 1409-90, 55 FR 13130, Apr. 9, 1990]

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

§ 50.18 [Reserved]

§ 50.19 Procedures to be followed by government attorneys prior to filing recusal or disqualification motions.

The determination to seek for any reason the disqualification or recusal of a justice, judge, or magistrate is a most significant and sensitive decision. This is particularly true for government attorneys, who should be guided by uniform procedures in obtaining the requisite authorization for such a motion. This statement is designed to establish a uniform procedure.

(a) No motion to recuse or disqualify a justice, judge, or magistrate (*see, e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. 144, 455) shall be made or supported by any Department of Justice attorney, U.S. Attorney (including Assistant U.S. Attorneys) or agency counsel conducting litigation pursuant to agreement with or authority delegated by the Attorney General, without the prior written approval of the Assistant Attorney General having ultimate supervisory power over the action in which recusal or disqualification is being considered.

(b) Prior to seeking such approval, Justice Department lawyer(s) handling the litigation shall timely seek the recommendations of the U.S. Attorney for the district in which the matter is pending, and the views of the client agencies, if any. Similarly, if agency attorneys are primarily handling any such suit, they shall seek the recommendations of the U.S. Attorney and provide them to the Department of Justice with the request for approval. In actions where the United States Attorneys are primarily handling the litigation in question, they shall seek the recommendation of the client agencies, if any, for submission to the Assistant Attorney General.

(c) In the event that the conduct and pace of the litigation does not allow sufficient time to seek the prior written approval by the Assistant Attorney General, prior oral authorization shall be sought and a written record fully reflecting that authorization shall be subsequently prepared and submitted to the Assistant Attorney General.

(d) Assistant Attorneys General may delegate the authority to approve or

deny requests made pursuant to this section, but only to Deputy Assistant Attorneys General or an equivalent position.

(e) This policy statement does not create or enlarge any legal obligations upon the Department of Justice in civil or criminal litigation, and it is not intended to create any private rights enforceable by private parties in litigation with the United States.

[Order No. 977-82, 47 FR 22094, May 21, 1982]

§ 50.20 Participation by the United States in court-annexed arbitration.

(a) *Considerations affecting participation in arbitration.* (1) The Department recognizes and supports the general goals of court-annexed arbitrations, which are to reduce the time and expenses required to dispose of civil litigation. Experimentations with such procedures in appropriate cases can offer both the courts and litigants an opportunity to determine the effectiveness of arbitration as an alternative to traditional civil litigation.

(2) An arbitration system, however, is best suited for the resolution of relatively simple factual issues, not for trying cases that may involve complex issues of liability or other unsettled legal questions. To expand an arbitration system beyond the types of cases for which it is best suited and most competent would risk not only a decrease in the quality of justice available to the parties but unnecessarily higher costs as well.

(3) In particular, litigation involving the United States raises special concerns with respect to court-annexed arbitration programs. A mandatory arbitration program potentially implicates the principles of separation of powers, sovereign immunity, and the Attorney General's control over the process of settling litigation.

(b) *General rule consenting to arbitration consistent with the department's regulations.* (1) Subject to the considerations set forth in the following paragraphs and the restrictions set forth in paragraphs (c) and (d), in a case assigned to arbitration or mediation under a local district court rule, the Department of Justice agrees to participate in the arbitration process under the local rule. The attorney for

the government responsible for the case should take any appropriate steps in conducting the case to protect the interests of the United States.

(2) Based upon its experience under arbitration programs to date, and the purposes and limitations of court-annexed arbitration, the Department generally endorses inclusion in a district's court-annexed arbitration program of civil actions—

(i) In which the United States or a Department, agency, or official of the United States is a party, and which seek only money damages in an amount not in excess of \$100,000, exclusive of interest and costs; and

(ii) Which are brought (A) under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. 1346(b), 2671 *et seq.*, or (B) under the Longshoreman's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. 905, or (C) under the Miller Act, 40 U.S.C. 270(b).

(3) In any other case in which settlement authority has been delegated to the U.S. Attorney under the regulations of the Department and the directives of the applicable litigation division and none of the exceptions to such delegation apply, the U.S. Attorney for the district, if he concludes that a settlement of the case upon the terms of the arbitration award would be appropriate, may proceed to settle the case accordingly.

(4) Cases other than those described in paragraph (2) that are not within the delegated settlement authority of the U.S. Attorney for the district ordinarily are not appropriate for an arbitration process because the Department generally will not be able to act favorably or negatively in a short period of time upon a settlement of the case in accordance with the arbitration award. Therefore, this will result in a demand for trial de novo in a substantial proportion of such cases to preserve the interests of the United States.

(5) The Department recommends that any district court's arbitration rule include a provision exempting any case from arbitration, sua sponte or on motion of a party, in which the objectives of arbitration would not appear to be realized, because the case involves

complex or novel legal issues, or because legal issues predominate over factual issues, or for other good cause.

(c) *Objection to the imposition of penalties or sanctions against the United States for demanding trial de novo.* (1) Under the principle of sovereign immunity, the United States cannot be held liable for costs or sanctions in litigation in the absence of a statutory provision waiving its immunity. In view of the statutory limitations on the costs payable by the United States (28 U.S.C. 2412(a), 2412(b), and 1920), the Department does not consent to provisions in any district's arbitration program providing for the United States or the Department, agency, or official named as a party to the action to pay any sanction for demanding a trial de novo—either as a deposit in advance or as a penalty imposed after the fact—which is based on the arbitrators' fees, the opposing party's attorneys' fees, or any other costs not authorized by statute to be awarded against the United States. This objection applies whether the penalty or sanction is required to be paid to the opposing party, to the clerk of the court, or to the Treasury of the United States.

(2) In any case involving the United States that is designated for arbitration under a program pursuant to which such a penalty or sanction might be imposed against the United States, its officers or agents, the attorney for the government is instructed to take appropriate steps, by motion, notice of objection, or otherwise, to apprise the court of the objection of the United States to the imposition of such a penalty or sanction.

(3) Should such a penalty or sanction actually be required of or imposed on the United States, its officers or agents, the attorney for the government is instructed to:

- (i) Advise the appropriate Assistant Attorney General of this development promptly in writing;
- (ii) Seek appropriate relief from the district court; and
- (iii) If necessary, seek authority for filing an appeal or petition for mandamus.

The Solicitor General, the Assistant Attorneys General, and the U.S. Attorneys are instructed to take all appro-

priate steps to resist the imposition of such penalties or sanctions against the United States.

(d) *Additional restrictions.* (1) The Assistant Attorneys General, the U.S. Attorneys, and their delegates, have no authority to settle or compromise the interests of the United States in a case pursuant to an arbitration process in any respect that is inconsistent with the limitations upon the delegation of settlement authority under the Department's regulations and the directives of the litigation divisions. See 28 CFR part 0, subpart Y and appendix to subpart Y. The attorney for the government shall demand trial de novo in any case in which:

(i) Settlement of the case on the basis of the amount awarded would not be in the best interests of the United States;

(ii) Approval of a proposed settlement under the Department's regulations in accordance with the arbitration award cannot be obtained within the period allowed by the local rule for rejection of the award; or

(iii) The client agency opposes settlement of the case upon the terms of the settlement award, unless the appropriate official of the Department approves a settlement of the case in accordance with the delegation of settlement authority under the Department's regulations.

(2) Cases sounding in tort and arising under the Constitution of the United States or under a common law theory filed against an employee of the United States in his personal capacity for actions within the scope of his employment which are alleged to have caused injury or loss of property or personal injury or death are not appropriate for arbitration.

(3) Cases for injunctive or declaratory relief are not appropriate for arbitration.

(4) The Department reserves the right to seek any appropriate relief to which its client is entitled, including injunctive relief or a ruling on motions for judgment on the pleadings, for summary judgment, or for qualified immunity, or on issues of discovery, before proceeding with the arbitration process.

Department of Justice

§ 50.21

(5) In view of the provisions of the Federal Rules of Evidence with respect to settlement negotiations, the Department objects to the introduction of the arbitration process or the arbitration award in evidence in any proceeding in which the award has been rejected and the case is tried de novo.

(6) The Department's consent for participation in an arbitration program is not a waiver of sovereign immunity or other defenses of the United States except as expressly stated; nor is it intended to affect jurisdictional limitations (e.g., the Tucker Act).

(e) *Notification of new or revised arbitration rules.* The U.S. Attorney in a district which is considering the adoption of or has adopted a program of court-annexed arbitration including cases involving the United States shall:

(1) Advise the district court of the provisions of this section and the limitations on the delegation of settlement authority to the United States Attorney pursuant to the Department's regulations and the directives of the litigation divisions; and

(2) Forward to the Executive Office for United States Attorneys a notice that such a program is under consideration or has been adopted, or is being revised, together with a copy of the rules or proposed rules, if available, and a recommendation as to whether United States participation in the program as proposed, adopted, or revised, would be advisable, in whole or in part.

[Order No. 1109-85, 50 FR 40524, Oct. 4, 1985]

§ 50.21 Procedures governing the destruction of contraband drug evidence in the custody of Federal law enforcement authorities.

(a) *General.* The procedures set forth below are intended as a statement of policy of the Department of Justice and will be applied by the Department in exercising its responsibilities under Federal law relating to the destruction of seized contraband drugs.

(b) *Purpose.* This policy implements the authority of the Attorney General under title I, section 1006(c)(3) of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, Public Law 99-570 which is codified at 21 U.S.C. 881(f)(2), to direct the destruction, as necessary, of Schedule I and II contraband substances.

(c) *Policy.* This regulation is intended to prevent the warehousing of large quantities of seized contraband drugs which are unnecessary for due process in criminal cases. Such stockpiling of contraband drugs presents inordinate security and storage problems which create additional economic burdens on limited law enforcement resources of the United States.

(d) *Definitions.* As used in this subpart, the following terms shall have the meanings specified:

(1) The term *Contraband drugs* are those controlled substances listed in Schedules I and II of the Controlled Substances Act seized for violation of that Act.

(2) The term *Marijuana* is as defined in 21 U.S.C. 801(15) but does not include, for the purposes of this regulation, the derivatives hashish or hashish oil for purposes of destruction.

(3) The term *Representative sample* means the exemplar for testing and a sample aggregate portion of the whole amount seized sufficient for current criminal evidentiary practice.

(4) The term *Threshold amount* means:

(i) Two kilograms of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of heroin;

(ii) Ten kilograms of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of—

(A) Coca leaves, except coca leaves and extracts of coca leaves from which cocaine, ecgonine, and derivatives of ecognine or their salts have been removed;

(B) Cocaine, its salts, optical and geometric isomers, and salts of isomers;

(C) Ecgonine, its derivatives, their salts, isomers, and salts of isomers; or

(D) Any compound, mixture, or preparation which contains any quantity of any of the substances referred to in paragraphs (d)(4)(ii) (A) through (C) of this section;

(iii) Ten kilograms of a mixture or substance described in paragraph (d)(4)(ii)(B) of this section which contains cocaine base;

(iv) Two hundred grams of powdered phencyclidine (PCP) or two kilograms of a powdered mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of phencyclidine (PCP) or 28.35 grams of a

§ 50.21

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

liquid containing a detectable amount of phencyclidine (PCP);

(v) Twenty grams of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of Lysergic Acid Diethylamide (LSD);

(vi) Eight hundred grams of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of N-phenyl-N[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidiny]propanamide (commonly known as fentanyl) or two hundred grams of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of any analogue of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl]propanamide; or

(vii) Twenty kilograms of hashish or two kilograms of hashish oil (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(D), 960(b)(4)).

In the event of any changes to section 401(b)(1) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1) as amended occurring after the date of these regulations, the threshold amount of any substance therein listed, except marijuana, shall be twice the minimum amount required for the most severe mandatory minimum sentence.

(e) *Procedures.* Responsibilities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Administration.

When contraband drug substances in excess of the threshold amount or in the case of marijuana a quantity in excess of the representative sample are seized pursuant to a criminal investigation and retained in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or Drug Enforcement Administration, the Agency having custody shall:

(1) Immediately notify the appropriate U.S. Attorney, Assistant U.S. Attorney, or the responsible state/local prosecutor that the amount of seized contraband drug exceeding the threshold amount and its packaging, will be destroyed after sixty days from the date notice is provided of the seizures, unless the agency providing notice is requested in writing by the authority receiving notice not to destroy the excess contraband drug; and

(2) Assure that appropriate tests of samples of the drug are conducted to determine the chemical nature of the contraband substance and its weight sufficient to serve as evidence before the trial courts of that jurisdiction; and

(3) Photographically depict, and if requested by the appropriate prosecutorial authority, videotape, the contraband drugs as originally packaged or an appropriate display of the seized contraband drugs so as to create evidentiary exhibits for use at trial; and

(4) Isolate and retain the appropriate threshold amounts of contraband drug evidence when an amount greater than the appropriate threshold amount has been seized, or when less than the appropriate threshold amounts of contraband drugs have been seized, the entire amount of the seizure, with the exception of marijuana, for which a representative sample shall be retained; and

(5) Maintain the retained portions of the contraband drugs until the evidence is no longer required for legal proceedings, at which time it may be destroyed, first having obtained consent of the U.S. Attorney, an Assistant U.S. Attorney, or the responsible state/local prosecutor;

(6) Notify the appropriate U.S. Attorney, Assistant U.S. Attorney, or the responsible state/local prosecutor to obtain consent to destroy the retained amount or representative sample whenever the related suspect(s) has been a fugitive from justice for a period of five years. An exemplar sufficient for testing will be retained consistent with this section.

(f) *Procedures.* Responsibilities of the U.S. Attorney or the District Attorney (or equivalent state/local prosecutorial authority). When so notified by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Drug Enforcement Administration of an intent to destroy excess contraband drugs, the U.S. Attorney or the District Attorney (or equivalent) may:

(1) Agree to the destruction of the contraband drug evidence in excess of the threshold amount, or for marijuana in excess of the representative sample, prior to the normal sixty-day period. The U.S. Attorney, or the District Attorney (or equivalent) may delegate to his/her assistants authority to enter into such agreement; or

(2) Request an exception to the destruction policy in writing to the Special Agent in Charge of the responsible division prior to the end of the sixty-day period when retaining only the

Department of Justice

§ 50.22

threshold amount or representative sample will significantly affect any legal proceedings; and

(3) In the event of a denial of the request may appeal the denial to the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division. Such authority may not be re-delegated. An appeal shall stay the destruction until the appeal is complete.

(g) *Supplementary regulations.* The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration are authorized to issue regulations and establish procedures consistent with this section.

[Order No. 1256-88, 53 FR 8453, Mar. 15, 1988, as amended by Order No. 2920-2007, 72 FR 69144, Dec. 7, 2007]

§ 50.22 Young American Medals Program.

(a) *Scope.* There are hereby established two medals, one to be known as the Young American Medal for Bravery and the other to be known as the Young American Medal for Service.

(b) *Young American Medal for Bravery.*

(1)(i) The Young American Medal for Bravery may be awarded to a person—

(A) Who during a given calendar year has exhibited exceptional courage, attended by extraordinary decisiveness, presence of mind, and unusual swiftness of action, regardless of his or her own personal safety, in an effort to save or in saving the life of any person or persons in actual imminent danger;

(B) Who was eighteen years of age or younger at the time of the occurrence; and

(C) Who habitually resides in the United States (including its territories and possessions), but need not be a citizen thereof.

(ii) These conditions must be met at the time of the event.

(2) The act of bravery must have been public in nature and must have been acknowledged by the Governor, Chief Executive Officer of a State, county, municipality, or other political subdivision, or by a civic, educational, or religious institution, group, or society.

(3) No more than two such medals may be awarded in any one calendar year.

(c) *Young American Medal for Service.*

(1) The Young American Medal for Service may be awarded to any citizen

of the United States eighteen years of age or younger at the time of the occurrence, who has achieved outstanding or unusual recognition for character and service during a given calendar year.

(2) Character attained and service accomplished by a candidate for this medal must have been such as to make his or her achievement worthy of public report. The outstanding and unusual recognition of the candidate's character and service must have been public in nature and must have been acknowledged by the Governor, Chief Executive Officer of a State, county, municipality, or other political subdivision, or by a civic, educational, or religious institution, group, or society.

(3) The recognition of the character and service upon which the award of the Medal for Service is based must have been accorded separately and apart from the Young American Medals program and must not have been accorded for the specific and announced purpose of rendering a candidate eligible, or of adding to a candidate's qualifications, for the award of the Young American Medal for Service.

(4) No more than two such medals may be awarded in any one calendar year.

(d) *Eligibility.* (1) The act or acts of bravery and the recognition for character and service that make a candidate eligible for the respective medals must have occurred during the calendar year for which the award is made.

(2) A candidate may be eligible for both medals in the same year. Moreover, the receipt of either medal in any year will not affect a candidate's eligibility for the award of either or both of the medals in a succeeding year.

(3) Acts of bravery performed and recognition of character and service achieved by persons serving in the Armed Forces, which arise from or out of military duties, shall not make a candidate eligible for either of the medals, provided, however, that a person serving in the Armed Forces shall be eligible to receive either or both of the medals if the act of bravery performed or the recognition for character and service achieved is on account of acts and service performed or rendered

§ 50.22

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

outside of and apart from military duties.

(e) *Request for information.* (1) A recommendation in favor of a candidate for the award of a Young American Medal for Bravery or for Service must be accompanied by:

(i) A full and complete statement of the candidate's act or acts of bravery or recognized character and service (including the times and places) that supports qualification of the candidate to receive the appropriate medal;

(ii) Statements by witnesses or persons having personal knowledge of the facts surrounding the candidate's act or acts of bravery or recognized character and service, as required by the respective medals;

(iii) A certified copy of the candidate's birth certificate, or, if no birth certificate is available, other authentic evidence of the date and place of the candidate's birth; and

(iv) A biographical sketch of the candidate, including information as to his or her citizenship or habitual residence, as may be required by the respective medals.

(f) *Procedure.* (1)(i) All recommendations and accompanying documents and papers should be submitted to the Governor or Chief Executive Officer of the State, territory, or possession of the United States where the candidate's act or acts of bravery or recognized character and service were demonstrated. In the case of the District of Columbia, the recommendations should be submitted to the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(ii) If the act or acts of bravery or recognized character and service did not occur within the boundaries of any State, territory, or possession of the United States, the papers should be submitted to the Governor or Chief Executive Officer of the territory or other possession of the United States wherein the candidate habitually maintains his or her residence.

(2) The Governor or Chief Executive Officer, after considering the various recommendations received after the close of the pertinent calendar year, may nominate therefrom no more than two candidates for the Young American Medal for Bravery and no more than two candidates for the Young

American Medal for Service. Nominated individuals should have, in the opinion of the appropriate official, shown by the facts and circumstances to be the most worthy and qualified candidates from the jurisdiction to receive consideration for awards of the above-named medals.

(3) Nominations of candidates for either medal must be submitted no later than 120 days after notification that the Department of Justice is seeking nominations under this program for a specific calendar year. Each nomination must contain the necessary documentation establishing eligibility, must be submitted by the Governor or Chief Executive Officer, together with any comments, and should be submitted to the address published in the notice.

(4) Nominations of candidates for medals will be considered only when received from the Governor or Chief Executive Officer of a State, territory, or possession of the United States.

(5) The Young American Medals Committee will select, from nominations properly submitted, those candidates who are shown by the facts and circumstances to be eligible for the award of the medals. The Committee shall make recommendations to the Attorney General based on its evaluation of the nominees. Upon consideration of these recommendations, the Attorney General may select up to the maximum allowable recipients for each medal for the calendar year.

(g) *Presentation.* (1) The Young American Medal for Bravery and the Young American Medal for Service will be presented personally by the President of the United States to the candidates selected. These medals will be presented in the name of the President and the Congress of the United States. Presentation ceremonies shall be held at such times and places selected by the President in consultation with the Attorney General.

(2) The Young American Medals Committee will officially designate two adults (preferably the parents of the candidate) to accompany each candidate selected to the presentation ceremonies. The candidates and persons designated to accompany them

will be furnished transportation and other appropriate allowances.

(3) There shall be presented to each recipient an appropriate Certificate of Commendation stating the circumstances under which the act of bravery was performed or describing the outstanding recognition for character and service, as appropriate for the medal awarded. The Certificate will bear the signature of the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States.

(4) There also shall be presented to each recipient of a medal, a miniature replica of the medal awarded in the form of a lapel pin.

(h) *Posthumous awards.* In cases where a medal is awarded posthumously, the Young American Medals Committee will designate the father or mother of the deceased or other suitable person to receive the medal on behalf of the deceased. The decision of the Young American Medals Committee in designating the person to receive the posthumously awarded medal, on behalf of the deceased, shall be final.

(i) *Young American Medals Committee.* The Young American Medals Committee shall be represented by the following:

- (1) Director of the FBI, Chairman;
- (2) Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, Member;
- (3) Director of the U.S. Marshals Service, Member; and
- (4) Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Member and Executive Secretary.

(Authority: The United States Department of Justice is authorized under 42 U.S.C. 1921 *et seq.* to promulgate rules and regulations establishing medals, one for bravery and one for service. This authority was enacted by chapter 520 of Pub. L. 81-638 (August 3, 1950).)

[61 FR 49260, Sept. 19, 1996]

§ 50.23 Policy against entering into final settlement agreements or consent decree that are subject to confidentiality provisions and against seeking or concurring in the sealing of such documents.

(a) It is the policy of the Department of Justice that, in any civil matter in which the Department is representing the interests of the United States or its agencies, it will not enter into final settlement agreements or consent de-

crees that are subject to confidentiality provisions, nor will it seek or concur in the sealing of such documents. This policy flows from the principle of openness in government and is consistent with the Department's policies regarding openness in judicial proceedings (see 28 CFR 50.9) and the Freedom of Information Act (see Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies from the Attorney General *Re: The Freedom of Information Act (Oct. 4, 1993)*).

(b) There may be rare circumstances that warrant an exception to this general rule. In determining whether an exception is appropriate, any such circumstances must be considered in the context of the public's strong interest in knowing about the conduct of its Government and expenditure of its resources. The existence of such circumstances must be documented as part of the approval process, and any confidentiality provision must be drawn as narrowly as possible. Non-delegable approval authority to determine that an exception justifies use of a confidentiality provision in, or seeking or concurring in the sealing of, a final settlement or consent decree resides with the relevant Assistant Attorney General or United States Attorney, unless authority to approve the settlement itself lies with a more senior Department official, in which case the more senior official will have such approval authority.

(c) Regardless of whether particular information is subject to a confidentiality provision or to seal, statutes and regulations may prohibit its disclosure from Department of Justice files. Thus, before releasing any information, Department attorneys should consult all appropriate statutes and regulations (e.g., 5 U.S.C. 552a (Privacy Act); 50 U.S.C. 403-3(c)(6) (concerning intelligence sources and methods), and Execution Order 12958 (concerning national security information). In particular, in matters involving individuals, the Privacy Act regulates disclosure of settlement agreements that have not been made part of the court record.

(d) The principles set forth in this section are intended to provide guidance to attorneys for the Government

§ 50.24

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

and are not intended to create or recognize any legally enforceable right in any person.

[Order No. 2270-99, 64 FR 59122, Nov. 2, 1999]

§ 50.24 Annuity broker minimum qualifications.

(a) *Minimum standards.* The Civil Division, United States Department of Justice, shall establish a list of annuity brokers who meet minimum qualifications for providing annuity brokerage services in connection with structured settlements entered by the United States. Those qualifications are as follows:

(1) The broker must have a current license issued by at least one State, the District of Columbia, or a Territory of the United States as a life insurance agent, producer, or broker;

(2) The broker must have a current license or appointment issued by at least one life insurance company to sell its structured settlement annuity contracts or to act as a structured settlement consultant or broker for the company;

(3) The broker must be currently covered by an Errors and Omissions insurance policy, or an equivalent form of insurance;

(4) The broker must never have had a license to be a life insurance agent, producer, or broker revoked, rescinded, or suspended for any reason or for any period of time;

(5) The broker must not have been convicted of a felony; and

(6) The broker must have had substantial experience in each of the past three years in providing structured settlement brokerage services to or on behalf of defendants or their counsel.

(b) *Procedures for inclusion on the list.*

(1) An annuity broker who desires to be included on the list must submit a "Declaration" that he or she has reviewed the list of minimum qualifications set forth in paragraph (a) of this section and that he or she meets those minimum qualifications. A sample of the Declaration for annuity brokers to submit is available from the Civil Division's Web site (<http://www.usdoj.gov/civil/home.html>) or by written request to the address in this section. These minimum qualifications must be continually met for a broker who has been in-

cluded on the list to remain included when the list is updated thereafter. The Declaration must be executed under penalty of perjury in a manner specified in 28 U.S.C. 1746.

(2) Each broker must submit a new Declaration annually to be included on updated lists. For a broker to be included on the initial list to be established by May 1, 2003, the Torts Branch, Civil Division, must receive the broker's Declaration no later than April 24, 2003. If the broker wishes to be included on updated lists, the Torts Branch must receive a new Declaration from the broker between January 1 and April 10 of each successive calendar year. After the Declaration is completed and signed, the original must be mailed to the United States Department of Justice, Civil Division, FTCA Staff, Post Office Box 888, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044. The Department of Justice will not accept a photocopy or facsimile of the Declaration.

(3) A Declaration will not be accepted by the Department of Justice unless it is complete and has been signed by the individual annuity broker requesting inclusion on the list. A Declaration that is incomplete or has been altered, amended, or changed in any respect from the Declaration at the Civil Division's Web site will not be accepted by the Department of Justice. Such a Declaration will be returned to the annuity broker who submitted it, and the Department of Justice will take no further action on the request for inclusion on the list until the defect in the Declaration has been cured by the annuity broker.

(4) The Department of Justice will retain a complete Declaration signed and filed by an annuity broker requesting to be on the list. Because this rule does not require the submission of any additional information, the Department retains discretion to dispose of additional information or documentation provided by an annuity broker.

(5) The Department of Justice will not accept a Declaration submitted by an annuity company or by someone on behalf of another individual or group of individuals. Each individual annuity broker who desires to be included on

Department of Justice

§ 50.25

the list must submit his or her own Declaration.

(6) An annuity broker whose name appears on the list incorrectly may submit a written request that his or her name be corrected. An annuity broker whose name appears on the list may submit a written request that his or her name be removed from the list.

(7) To the extent practicable, a name correction or deletion will appear on the next revision of the list immediately after receipt of the written request for a name correction or deletion. A written request for a name correction or deletion must be mailed to the United States Department of Justice, Civil Division, FTCA Staff, Post Office Box 888, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044. Facsimiles will not be accepted.

(8) The list of annuity brokers established pursuant to this section will be updated periodically, but not more often than twice every calendar year, beginning in calendar year 2004.

(c) *Disclaimers.* (1) The inclusion of an annuity broker on the list signifies only that the individual declared under penalty of perjury that he or she meets the minimum qualifications required by the Attorney General for providing annuity brokerage services in connection with structured settlements entered into by the United States. Because the decision to include an individual annuity broker on the list is based solely and exclusively on the Declaration submitted by the annuity broker, the appearance of an annuity broker's name on the list does not signify that the annuity broker actually meets those minimum qualifications or is otherwise competent to provide structured settlement brokerage services to the United States. No preferential consideration will be given to an annuity broker appearing on the list except to the extent that United States Attorneys utilize the list pursuant to section 11015(b) of Public Law 107-273.

(2) By submitting a Declaration to the Department of Justice, the individual annuity broker agrees that the Declaration and the list each may be made public in its entirety, and the annuity broker expressly consents to

such release and disclosure of the Declaration and list.

[Order No. 2667-2003, 68 FR 18120, Apr. 15, 2003]

§ 50.25 Assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction in certain areas of Indian country.

(a) *Assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction.* (1) Under 18 U.S.C. 1162(d), the United States may accept concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction to prosecute violations of 18 U.S.C. 1152 (the General Crimes, or Indian Country Crimes, Act) and 18 U.S.C. 1153 (the Major Crimes, or Indian Major Crimes, Act) within areas of Indian country in the States of Alaska, California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin that are subject to State criminal jurisdiction under Public Law 280, 18 U.S.C. 1162(a), if the tribe requests such an assumption of jurisdiction and the Attorney General consents to that request. Once the Attorney General has consented to an Indian tribe's request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction, the General Crimes and Major Crimes Acts shall apply in the Indian country of the requesting tribe that is located in any of these "mandatory" Public Law 280 States, and criminal jurisdiction over those areas shall be concurrent among the Federal Government, the State government, and (where applicable) the tribal government. Assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. 1162(d) does not require the agreement, consent, or concurrence of any State or local government.

(2) Under 25 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2), the United States may exercise concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction in other areas of Indian country as to which States have assumed "optional" Public Law 280 criminal jurisdiction under 25 U.S.C. 1321(a), if a tribe so requests and after consultation with and consent by the Attorney General. The Department's view is that such concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction exists under applicable statutes in these areas of Indian country, even if the Federal Government does not formally accept such jurisdiction in response to petitions from individual tribes. This

§ 50.25

28 CFR Ch. I (7-1-25 Edition)

rule therefore does not establish procedures for processing requests from tribes under 25 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2).

(b) *Request requirements.* (1) A tribal request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. 1162(d) shall be made by the chief executive official of a federally recognized Indian tribe that occupies Indian country listed in 18 U.S.C. 1162(a). For purposes of this section, a chief executive official may include a tribal chairperson, president, governor, principal chief, or other equivalent position.

(2) The tribal request shall be submitted in writing to the Director of the Office of Tribal Justice at the Department of Justice. The first page of the tribal request shall be clearly marked: “Request for United States Assumption of Concurrent Federal Criminal Jurisdiction.” The tribal request shall explain why the assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction will improve public safety and criminal law enforcement and reduce crime in the Indian country of the requesting tribe. The tribal request shall also identify each local or State agency that currently has jurisdiction to investigate or prosecute criminal violations in the Indian country of the tribe and shall provide contact information for each such agency.

(c) *Process for handling tribal requests.*

(1) Upon receipt of a tribal request, the Office of Tribal Justice shall:

- (i) Acknowledge receipt; and
- (ii) Open a file.

(2) Within 30 days of receipt of a tribal request, the Office of Tribal Justice shall:

(i) Publish a notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, seeking comments from the general public;

(ii) Send written notice of the request to the State and local agencies identified by the tribe as having criminal jurisdiction over the tribe’s Indian country, with a copy of the notice to the governor of the State in which the agency is located, requesting that any comments be submitted within 45 days of the date of the notice;

(iii) Seek comments from the relevant United States Attorney’s Offices, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other Department of Justice com-

ponents that would be affected by consenting to the request; and

(iv) Seek comments from the Department of the Interior (including the Bureau of Indian Affairs), the Department of Homeland Security, other affected Federal departments and agencies, and Federal courts.

(3) As soon as possible but not later than 30 days after receipt of a tribal request, the Office of Tribal Justice shall initiate consultation with the requesting tribe, consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Presidential Memoranda on tribal consultation.

(4) To the extent appropriate and consistent with applicable laws and regulations, including requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 552a, governing personally identifiable information, and with the duty to protect law enforcement sensitive information, the Office of Tribal Justice may share with the requesting tribe any comments from other parties and provide the tribe with an opportunity to respond in writing.

(5) An Indian tribe may submit a request at any time after the effective date of this rule. However, requests received by February 28 of each calendar year will be prioritized for decision by July 31 of the same calendar year, if feasible; and requests received by August 31 of each calendar year will be prioritized for decision by January 31 of the following calendar year, if feasible. The Department will seek to complete its review of prioritized requests within these time frames, recognizing that it may not be possible to do so in each instance.

(d) *Factors.* Factors that will be considered in determining whether or not to consent to a tribe’s request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction include the following:

(1) Whether consenting to the request will improve public safety and criminal law enforcement and reduce crime in the Indian country of the requesting tribe.

(2) Whether consenting to the request will increase the availability of law enforcement resources for the requesting tribe, its members, and other residents of the tribe’s Indian country.

(3) Whether consenting to the request will improve access to judicial resources for the requesting tribe, its members, and other residents of the tribe's Indian country.

(4) Whether consenting to the request will improve access to detention and correctional resources for the requesting tribe, its members, and other residents of the tribe's Indian country.

(5) Other comments and information received from the relevant United States Attorney's Offices, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other Department of Justice components that would be affected by consenting to the request.

(6) Other comments and information received from the Department of the Interior (including the Bureau of Indian Affairs), the Department of Homeland Security, other affected Federal departments and agencies, and Federal courts.

(7) Other comments and information received from tribal consultation.

(8) Other comments and information received from other sources, including governors and State and local law enforcement agencies.

(e) *Decision.* (1) The decision whether to consent to a tribal request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction shall be made by the Deputy Attorney General after receiving written recommendations from the Office of Tribal Justice, the Executive Office for United States Attorneys, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(2) The Deputy Attorney General will:

(i) Consent to the request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction, effective as of some future date certain within the next twelve months (and, if feasible, within the next six months), with or without conditions, and publish a notice of the consent in the FEDERAL REGISTER;

(ii) Deny the request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction; or

(iii) Request further information or comment before making a final decision.

(3) The Deputy Attorney General shall explain the basis for the decision in writing.

(4) The decision to grant or deny a request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction is not appealable. However, at any time after a denial of such a request, a tribe may submit a renewed request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction. A renewed request shall address the basis for the prior denial. The Office of Tribal Justice may provide appropriate technical assistance to any tribe that wishes to prepare and submit a renewed request.

(f) *Retrocession of State criminal jurisdiction.* Retrocession of State criminal jurisdiction under Public Law 280 is governed by 25 U.S.C. 1323(a) and Executive Order 11435 of November 21, 1968. The procedures for retrocession do not govern a request for assumption of concurrent Federal criminal jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. 1162(d).

[AG Order No. 3314-2011, 76 FR 76042, Dec. 6, 2011]

§§ 50.26-50.28 [Reserved]

PART 51—PROCEDURES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF SECTION 5 OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED

Subpart A—General Provisions

- Sec.
- 51.1 Purpose.
- 51.2 Definitions.
- 51.3 Delegation of authority.
- 51.4 Date used to determine coverage; list of covered jurisdictions.
- 51.5 Termination of coverage.
- 51.6 Political subunits.
- 51.7 Political parties.
- 51.8 Section 3 coverage.
- 51.9 Computation of time.
- 51.10 Requirement of action for declaratory judgment or submission to the Attorney General.
- 51.11 Right to bring suit.
- 51.12 Scope of requirement.
- 51.13 Examples of changes.
- 51.14 Recurrent practices.
- 51.15 Enabling legislation and contingent or nonuniform requirements.
- 51.16 Distinction between changes in procedure and changes in substance.
- 51.17 Special elections.
- 51.18 Federal court-ordered changes.
- 51.19 Request for notification concerning voting litigation.