

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES

1. REINFORCES THAT A COMPASSIONATE REASSIGNMENT (CR) IS SUBJECT TO MISSION REQUIRMENTS AND MANAGEMENT DISCRETION. ADDS THAT AN EMPLOYEE HAS NO BASIS TO APPEAL OR GRIEVE DENIAL OF A CR.
2. NO CHANGE (NC).
3. NC.
 - 3.a. UPDATES JTR REFERENCE ONLY.
 - 3.b. NC.
 - 3.c. EDITORIAL IMPROVEMENT FOR CLARIFICATION.
 - 3.d. SPECIFIES STEPS TO INITIATE THE PROCESS OF REQUESTING A CR. THIS WAS BACKWARDS (3.e.) IN OLD CR POLICY, WHICH STARTED WITH THE FINDINGS REQUIRED FOR A CR. INCLUDES REQUIREMENT FOR SUCCESSFUL LEVEL III OR HIGHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL (WAS IN 3.f. OF OLD POLICY).
 - 3.e. MINOR CHANGE - WAS 3.d. IN OLD POLICY.
 - 3.f. REQUIREMENT FOR SUCCESSFUL LEVEL III OR HIGHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL MOVED TO STEP 3.d.
 - 3.g. ADDS PPP CLEARANCE REQUIREMENT FOR A POTENTIAL VACANCY. ADDS INELIGIBILITY FOR GRADE AND PAY RETENTION FOR CR DOWNGRADE. OTHER MINOR CHANGES FOR CLARITY.
 - 3.h. REVISED FOR CLARITY.
 - 3.i. SINCE THIS HAS BEEN A PROBLEM AREA, INFO CONCERNING PCS ENTITLEMENTS IS GREATLY EXPANDED.
 - 3.j. ADDS THAT A CR MUST NOT CAUSE ADVERSE IMPACT ON ANOTHER EMPLOYEE. MOVES REFERENCE TO JOB SWAPS TO 3.k. BELOW.
 - 3.k. EXPANDS TREATMENT OF JOB SWAPS OPTION.
 - 3.l. WAS 3.k. IN OLD POLICY. 3.l.(4) REVISED TO CLARIFY THE SITUATION FOR EXCLUSION, I.E., IF EITHER THE EMPLOYEE OR THE SPOUSE INITIATED THE REQUEST FOR THE RELOCATION....
 - 3.m. IMPROVEMENT OF OLD 3.l.
 - 3.n. NC FROM OLD 3.m.
 - 3.o. NC FROM OLD 3.n.
 - 3.p. ADDS CPAC COORDINATION.
4. NC