Reclassification and Requalification SI-Enabled Position Review Toolkit



U.S. Office of Personnel Management

NOVEMBER 2026

Reclassification and Requalification (RCRQ)

Toolkit — Super Intelligence (SI)-Enabled Position Review

Introduction

Through the Reclassification and Requalification (RCRQ) initiative, OPM is issuing Competency Based Classification and Qualification Standards in 22 successive cycles beginning in Fiscal Year 2026, transitioning more than 600 occupational series to skills-based standards. The Director's memorandum to Heads of Departments and Agencies sets the release cadence and the standing implementation timelines for those cycles. Each cycle memorandum from OPM to Chief Human Capital Officers identifies the series in scope, the products in that package, and the implementation tasks and outside dates that apply.

This toolkit is a standing product issued once, alongside the Skills-Based Hiring Guide, to support agencies in carrying out those implementation tasks. It is not specific to any cycle and is not an attachment to any cycle memorandum. It is the single home for the position-review methodology, the prompt sets agencies may use to conduct that review at scale, and the guardrails governing SI-assisted review; cycle memoranda cross-reference this toolkit rather than restating its content. OPM will expand the toolkit as agencies report experience, and revisions do not require reissuance of any memorandum.

Questions on this toolkit may be directed to fedclass@opm.gov.

1. Purpose and Status

This toolkit helps your agency move from its current classification and hiring practice to the updated Competency Based Classification Standards without starting over. Most agencies already hold much of the evidence these standards call for. The task is to connect that evidence to what the standards now require — not to rebuild it.

This toolkit is not prescriptive. OPM recommends SI-enabled review as a strategy to augment and accelerate an agency's review of large volumes of position descriptions and is agnostic as to the tools agencies select. The cadence and prompts in this toolkit are offered as options, not authoritative guidance; each agency should determine the strategy best suited to its mission, workforce, and technology environment.

2. How to Use This Toolkit

The methodology in Section 3 applies to the position inventory and position review tasks in any cycle. The prompt sets in Sections 4 through 6 support triage and prioritization of that review. Section 7 states what each prompt should produce. The guardrails in Section 8 apply to every prompt in this toolkit and to any other SI-assisted review an agency conducts under these standards.

3. Start from Your Existing Job Analysis

Your current job analysis is the strongest bridge to these standards, and OPM asks agencies to treat it as the starting point rather than commissioning new analysis first. A job analysis that identifies the tasks performed and the competencies required to perform them already contains most of what is needed to test alignment between an existing position description and the updated standard. For each covered position:

- Locate the most recent job analysis and confirm it reflects the work as currently performed.
- Map the tasks and competencies in that analysis to the work and competencies in the updated standard. Where they correspond, the position is likely aligned and requires only documented confirmation.
- Treat gaps as findings, not failures. A task in the analysis that no longer appears in the standard — or a competency in the standard the analysis does not capture — identifies exactly where the position description, the qualification requirements, or the assessment plan needs to change to reflect it.
- Document the mapping. The crosswalk between your job analysis and the updated standard is the record supporting each classification determination, and it will shorten the review in every subsequent cycle.

Where a current job analysis is missing or dated, prioritize the positions with the largest incumbent populations and the highest hiring volume.

4. Prompt Set 1 — Job Analysis Bridge

The prompts below support the job analysis bridge described in Section 3. They compare evidence your agency already holds against the updated standard; they do not make classification determinations, and every output requires examination and approval by a qualified human reviewer under Section 8.

4.1 Using the attached job analysis and the attached position description, identify every task in the job analysis that is not reflected in the position description, and every duty in the position description that the job analysis does not support. Quote the source language for each finding.

4.2 Compare the competencies and proficiency levels or assessment criteria in the attached job analysis against the competencies in the attached Competency Based Classification Standard for series [NNNN]. Produce a three-column table: competency in the job analysis, the corresponding competency in the standard, and whether the match is direct, partial, or absent.

4.3 Assess whether the attached job analysis is still current. List any tasks that reference superseded tools, systems, processes, or organizational structures, and identify work described in the attached standard that has no counterpart in the analysis.

4.4 Using the attached job analysis, draft the questions an agency subject-matter expert should be asked to confirm that the analysis still describes the work as it is performed today.

4.5 Using the attached job analysis, position description, and standard, summarize whether this position appears aligned to the updated standard, what evidence supports that conclusion, and what additional evidence a classification specialist would need to confirm it.

4.6 Rank the attached set of positions by how far their job analyses diverge from the attached standard, so the agency can sequence its review. Explain the basis for each ranking.

5. Prompt Set 2 — Position Management Review

These prompts support position management analysis across an organization rather than reviewing a single position. The guardrails in Section 8 apply.

5.1 Cluster the attached position descriptions by duty similarity. Report each cluster, the number of positions in it, and the duty statements that distinguish it from adjacent clusters.

5.2 Across the attached position descriptions for one organization, identify duplicated duties, duties assigned at more than one grade level, or positions whose stated supervisory responsibilities are inconsistent with their grade. (Attach the General Schedule Supervisory Guide along with the position descriptions when running this prompt.)

5.3 Compare the attached organizational chart and position descriptions and identify positions whose described work no longer supports the organization's stated mission functions.

5.4 Report the distribution of grades and series across the attached position inventory and identify where grade differences are not explained by differences in the duty statements.

5.5 Identify positions in the attached inventory whose duties could be described by a single standardized position description and draft that description.

6. Prompt Set 3 — Position Description Alignment

The prompts below support the position inventory, position review, and position description update tasks set out in each cycle memorandum. They triage and prioritize; they do not make classification determinations. Every output requires examination and approval by a qualified human reviewer under Section 8.

6.1 Extract from the attached position description every task statement, and for each task identify the competency it requires and the classification factor it supports. Present the result as a table.

6.2 Compare the attached position description against the attached Competency Based Classification Standard for series [NNNN]. Identify (a) duties in the position description not described in the standard, (b) competencies in the standard not reflected in the position description, and (c) the work in the standard that best matches the position. Quote the specific language you relied on for each finding.

6.3 Using the attached job analysis and the attached standard, produce a crosswalk mapping each competency in the job analysis to the corresponding competency in the standard. Flag any competency that appears in only one of the two documents.

6.4 Review the attached position description against the Factor Level Descriptions in the attached standard for all grades covered by the standard. For each factor, state the level the position description language would support and quote that language. Do not assign a grade.

6.5 Identify which of the attached position descriptions appear to be classified in the wrong series given the revised series definitions and occupational distinctions in the attached standards. Rank the flags by confidence level and explain the basis for each.

6.6 Compare the attached position description against the attached updated classification

standard, identify the gaps, and draft revised duty statements that close them. Cite the language in the standard supporting each revised statement.

7. What Each Prompt Should Produce

The prompts in Sections 4 through 6 produce working products, not determinations. This section states the output an agency should expect from each prompt and what the agency does with it. If a prompt returns something materially different from what is described here, treat the output as unreliable and re-run it with the source documents attached. Every output remains subject to the guardrails in Section 8.

Prompt Set 1 — Job Analysis Bridge (Section 4)

Prompt	What the prompt asks for	Outcome to expect
4.1	Compare a job analysis against the position description and quote the source language.	A two-part gap list: tasks in the analysis the position description does not reflect, and duties in the position description the analysis does not support. Use it to decide whether the position description needs amendment, the analysis needs refresh, or both.
4.2	Compare competencies and proficiency levels in the analysis against the competencies in the standard.	A three-column competency crosswalk marking each match direct, partial, or absent. The partial and absent rows are the qualification and assessment work for that position.
4.3	Test whether the job analysis is still current against the standard.	A currency assessment listing tasks that reference superseded tools, systems, processes, or structures, and work in the standard with no counterpart in the analysis. Tell the agency whether the analysis can be reused as-is.
4.4	Draft subject-matter expert confirmation questions from the analysis.	A question set usable as the agenda for a validation discussion and as documentation that the work was confirmed as currently performed.
4.5	Summarize alignment for one position using the analysis, position description, and standard.	A position-level alignment summary stating the apparent conclusion, the supporting evidence, and the evidence a classification specialist still needs. Draft narrative for the record, not a determination.

Prompt	What the prompt asks for	Outcome to expect
4.6	Rank a set of positions by divergence between their job analyses and the standard.	A ranked sequencing order for the review with the basis for each ranking. Not a finding about any individual position.

Prompt Set 2 — Position Management Review (Section 5)

Prompt	What the prompt asks for	Outcome to expect
5.1	Cluster position descriptions by duty similarity.	Duty clusters with position counts and the statements that distinguish each cluster. Clusters with many positions and few distinguishing statements are candidates for a standardized position description.
5.2	Identify duplicated duties, duties at more than one grade, and inconsistent supervisory responsibility across one organization.	An exceptions list for management review. These are position-management findings, not classification decisions.
5.3	Compare the organizational chart and position descriptions against stated mission functions.	A list of positions whose described work no longer supports the organization's mission functions, with the basis stated. Input on structure and workforce-planning discussions.
5.4	Report grade and series distribution across the inventory.	A distribution with grade differences flagged where the duty statements do not explain them. Flags identify where to look; they do not establish that a grade is wrong.
5.5	Identify positions that a single standardized position description could cover, and draft it.	A candidate position group plus a draft standardized position description for agency review and adaptation.

Prompt Set 3 — Position Description Alignment (Section 6)

Prompt	What the prompt asks for	Outcome to expect
6.1	Extract task statements and link each to a competency and classification factor.	A task-to-competency-to-factor table for one position description. Raw material for the evaluation statement.
6.2	Compare the position description against the standard and quote the language relied on.	A three-part alignment finding: duties not described in the standard, competencies in the standard not reflected in the position description, and the work in the standard that best matches the position.
6.3	Crosswalk competencies in the job analysis to competencies in the standard.	A competency crosswalk flagging any competency that appears in only one document. One-sided competencies mark where assessment or documentation is incomplete.
6.4	Test position description language against the Factor Level Descriptions, without assigning a grade.	A factor-by-factor statement of the level the language would support, with that language quoted. Where the quoted language is thin, the position description — not necessarily the grade — is what needs work.
6.5	Identify positions that may be in the wrong series under the revised definitions.	A confidence-ranked list of possible series misclassifications with the basis for each flag. Each flag requires specialist confirmation before any action.
6.6	Draft revised duty statements that close identified gaps, citing the standard.	Draft duty statements with supporting citations — starting points for the classification specialist and the supervisor of record.

Across all three sets, the output is evidence and draft language. The classification determination — series, title, and grade — remains an agency responsibility under Section 8.

8. Guardrails

These guardrails are the single governing statement for SI-assisted position review under these standards. They apply to every prompt in this toolkit and to any other SI-assisted review an agency conducts. Cycle memoranda cross-reference this section rather than restating it.

- Do not submit personally identifiable information or non-public data to any tool that has not been approved under the agency's SI governance, privacy, and records policies.
- Document the human reviewer of record for every determination informed by an SI-assisted output.
- Retain prompts and outputs as part of the classification record, consistent with agency records requirements.
- Do not use these tools to set series, title, or grade. The classification determination remains an agency responsibility.

9. Credit the Practices You Already Have

Agencies have been moving toward skills-based practice since Executive Order 13932, Executive Order 14170, the Chance to Compete Act of 2024, and the Merit Hiring Plan. Work already completed under those authorities counts toward implementation of these standards and should not be duplicated. Practices that carry over directly include:

- Competency models and proficiency scales developed for agency workforce planning or career-path work.
- Technical and alternative assessments already validated for the covered series, including structured interviews, work samples, situational judgment tests, and subject-matter expert resume review.
- Vacancy announcements already rewritten to describe required skills rather than credentials, including the removal of unnecessary degree requirements where no positive education requirement applies by law.
- Job analyses conducted to support assessment design, which are directly reusable under Section 3.

Inventory these before planning new work. For many agencies the implementation gap is narrower than it first appears.

10. Feedback and Expansion

OPM will cover this toolkit in the agency implementation sessions described in each cycle memorandum and will expand the prompt sets based on agency experience. Agencies should send suggested prompts, results, and implementation questions to fedclass@opm.gov.

U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Workforce Policy and Innovation
1900 E Street NW, Washington DC 20415

OPM.gov