Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP

C_THR82

SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Performance and Goals

For More Information – Visit link below:

https://www.examsboost.com/

Product Version

- ✓ Up to Date products, reliable and verified.
- ✓ Questions and Answers in PDF Format.

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A regional freight equipment dealer is configuring SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for quarterly service objectives. Employees can create goals and choose a service-program value. During testing, goals marked as “fleet uptime improvement” are saved in the employee goal plan, but they are not included in the manager’s service-program review counter before approval. The same goals appear when the manager opens the full goal plan, and an administrator confirms that the service-program value is stored. The business requires managers to review fleet-uptime goals separately before approval. The consultant must correct the counter behavior without changing the active template or requiring employees to recreate goals.
Which action should the consultant take first?
Response:

A. Create a calibration session for employees who entered fleet-uptime improvement goals.
B. Ask employees to repeat the service-program value in the goal description field.
C. Validate whether the service-program field is included in the manager review counter binding or filter logic.
D. Move fleet-uptime goals into a performance form section for later manager scoring.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because the goals and service-program value exist, but the counter does not retrieve matching records. The consultant must validate the binding between the configured goal field and the review counter or filter logic used during approval.

Question: 2

An engineering services company is piloting Continuous Performance Management in SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals. Employees can add achievements, and managers can view employee activity histories. However, discussion topics created by managers are not appearing for employees in the expected meeting preparation view. The feature is enabled, and the same managers can see their own created topics in the manager workspace. The pilot is limited to a defined engineering group, and the business does not want to expand CPM access to unrelated departments. The consultant must identify the most likely configuration issue before the pilot communication is sent.
What should the consultant examine first?
Response:

A. Whether the manager-created discussion topic visibility and permission scope allow employees in the pilot group to retrieve the topics.
B. Whether the annual performance form includes a final signature step for employees.
C. Whether the calibration rating distribution chart is refreshed for the engineering group.
D. Whether the goal plan template has a field for recording technical achievements.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because managers can create and view the topics, but employees cannot retrieve them in their meeting preparation context. The consultant must validate whether the configured visibility and target population scope allow the intended employee group to access manager-created discussion artifacts.

Question: 3

A regional nonprofit housing organization is configuring SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for a 360 Reviews cycle for community program leads. Review forms launch successfully, and nominated resident-advisor raters can submit feedback. During testing, resident-advisor comments appear in the review owner’s summary, but the competency-by-rater comparison does not show the resident-advisor group even though enough responses were submitted to meet the confidentiality threshold. Internal peer competency results appear correctly. The business requires resident-advisor feedback to remain separate for development planning. The consultant must correct the comparison output without merging rater groups or restarting the cycle.
What should the consultant examine first?
Response:

A. Whether resident-advisor feedback should be copied into the annual performance form for manager review.
B. Whether calibration grouping has been created for program leads with resident-advisor feedback.
C. Whether the resident-advisor rater group is included in the competency-by-rater comparison configuration.
D. Whether resident-advisor raters can delete submitted feedback before the review owner releases results.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because comments are visible and confidentiality requirements are satisfied, but the rater group is missing from one specific comparison artifact. The consultant must validate the report binding that includes rater-group competency results in the comparison output.

Question: 4

A subscription software company is configuring SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for quarterly customer success objectives. Employees can create goals, and managers can approve them. During testing, a goal category field appears correctly, but goals assigned to the customer-retention category do not appear in the manager's category-filtered review view. The goals are visible when the manager opens the full goal plan, and an administrator can confirm that the category value is saved. The business requires managers to review customer-retention goals separately before approval. The consultant must resolve the filtered-view mismatch without changing the active goal plan template structure.
Which action should the consultant take first?
Response:

A. Ask managers to review all goals without using the category-filtered view.
B. Validate whether the goal category value is correctly bound to the manager review filter or display configuration.
C. Move customer-retention goals into a performance form section for manager review.
D. Create a calibration session that includes only employees with customer-retention goals.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because the goal data exists and is visible in the full plan, but the filtered manager view does not retrieve it. The consultant must validate the configuration path that binds the saved category value to the review display or filter behavior.

Question: 5

A regional behavioral therapy provider is configuring SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for Continuous Performance check-ins between therapy coordinators and supervisors. Coordinators can create activities, and supervisors can add shared progress notes after each meeting. During testing, a shared progress note appears in the coordinator's check-in history, but the linked next-step item is missing from the employee-facing record. The supervisor workspace shows both the note and the next-step item. The pilot is limited to one therapy region, and the business does not want check-in records visible outside that region. The consultant must correct the incomplete employee-facing record without expanding the pilot scope.
Which action should the consultant take first?
Response:

A. Add the next-step item to the annual performance form so it can be reviewed during the final rating.
B. Create a calibration session for coordinators with shared progress notes.
C. Validate whether the employee-facing Continuous Performance view exposes linked next-step items for shared notes within the pilot population.
D. Allow coordinators to delete supervisor-created progress notes after check-ins are closed.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because the shared note is visible, but the related next-step item is not retrieved in the employee-facing view. The consultant must validate field-level visibility and population-scoped display behavior for linked follow-up content.

Question: 6

A regional renewable energy installer is configuring SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for installation quality objectives. Field employees can create goals and select an installation-risk value. During testing, goals marked as “grid inspection dependency” are saved and visible in the employee goal plan, but the manager’s risk-review checklist does not include them before approval. The same goals appear in the full goal plan, and an administrator confirms the risk value is stored on the goal record. The business requires managers to review these dependency-related goals separately before approving the plan. The consultant must correct the checklist behavior without asking employees to recreate goals.
Which action should the consultant take first?
Response:

A. Create a calibration session for employees with grid inspection dependency goals.
B. Ask employees to copy the risk value into the goal description field.
C. Move grid inspection dependency goals into the annual performance form for later review.
D. Validate whether the installation-risk field is bound to the manager risk-review checklist criteria.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because the goal record and risk value exist, but the manager checklist does not retrieve matching goals. The consultant must validate whether the configured risk field is bound to the checklist filter or display criteria used before approval.

Question: 7

A hospitality group is configuring SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for a quarterly goal refresh. Employees can access their active goal plans, and managers can cascade a strategic goal to their teams. During testing, cascaded goals appear for some employees but not for employees assigned to one newly created department. The affected employees can still create personal goals manually, and the goal plan template is active for the same cycle. The business requires department-specific goal alignment, so the team cannot replace cascaded goals with manual employee entry. The consultant must determine why the cascaded goal is not reaching the intended employee group while keeping the existing goal plan design unchanged.
What should the consultant validate first?
Response:

A. Whether the performance form template has a section configured to display cascaded goals.

B. Whether the department-based target population and goal assignment criteria include the newly created department.
C. Whether calibration sessions have been created for employees in the newly created department.
D. Whether employees in the affected department have permission to delete cascaded goals from their goal plan.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because the failure is limited to employees in a newly created department while other employees receive cascaded goals. The consultant must validate whether the assignment criteria and target population binding recognize the new department so the configured cascade can retrieve the correct recipients.

Question: 8

A pharmaceutical division is preparing a calibration session in SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for managers who supervise employees in regulated roles. The session opens and includes the correct employee list, but the rating distribution chart does not reflect the latest final ratings from completed performance forms. Managers confirm that ratings were finalized before the calibration session was opened. The business does not want the employee population changed because the session scope has already been approved. The consultant must identify the correct configuration or lifecycle issue before calibration discussions begin.
What should the consultant verify first?
Response:

A. Whether the calibration session is using the expected performance data source and has refreshed the finalized form data.
B. Whether employees have permission to edit their own goals during the calibration meeting.
C. Whether the 360 Review template includes the same rating scale as the performance form.
D. Whether the goal plan template has been deactivated after the performance cycle closed.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because the employee population is correct, but the calibration artifact does not reflect finalized rating data. The consultant must validate the binding between the session and the performance data source, including whether finalized form data has been retrieved into the calibration view.

Question: 9

A regional veterinary diagnostics company is enabling SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for Continuous Performance check-ins between lab specialists and shift leads. Specialists can create

activities, and shift leads can assign action items after coaching meetings. During testing, assigned action items appear in the shift lead workspace and show a due date, but the specialist's action list shows the item without the due date. The pilot is restricted to one diagnostic lab group, and the business does not want action items visible outside that group. The consultant must identify why the employee-facing action artifact is incomplete while preserving the approved population scope.
Which validation should the consultant perform first?
Response:

A. Whether the annual performance form contains a lab-quality goal section.
B. Whether specialists have permission to delete assigned action items after check-ins.
C. Whether calibration grouping has been configured for the diagnostic lab group.
D. Whether Continuous Performance action item visibility includes the due-date field for employees in the pilot population.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the correct action because the action item is assigned and visible, but the employee-facing view does not retrieve the due-date attribute. The consultant must validate the visibility and population-scoped display configuration that exposes action item fields to specialists in the approved pilot group.

Question: 10

A university administration group is testing SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals for an academic staff review cycle. Employees submit self-assessments successfully, and department heads can open the forms. During validation, the final acknowledgement step appears before the department head rating step for one staff category, causing employees to acknowledge the review before ratings are entered. The same template works correctly for other staff categories. The business must keep a single template because the cycle is shared, but process sequencing must differ only where configured conditions require it. The consultant must identify the setup issue before production launch.
What should the consultant validate first?
Response:

A. Whether the goal plan template contains the same goal categories for all academic staff.
B. Whether the affected staff category has been included in the calibration session population.
C. Whether the route-step condition or template rule is causing the acknowledgement step to trigger before the rating step.
D. Whether department heads have permission to delete forms after employees acknowledge them.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:

This is the correct action because the same template behaves differently for one staff category. The consultant must validate the configuration that controls conditional step execution so the form route binds the affected category to the correct acknowledgement and rating sequence.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Goal Plan Access Across Regional Manager Groups

During UAT, a regional manager can open the team goal plan and view employee goals, but the manager cannot add measurable milestones for several technicians who recently moved into the region. The employees appear in the manager's reporting line, and the goal plan is assigned to them.
What should the consultant validate first?
Response:

A. Whether the goal plan template includes milestone fields and the manager role has field-level edit permission for the transferred employees
B. Whether the annual performance form template includes a goal section for the employees' current job family
C. Whether Continuous Performance Management is enabled for the manager and transferred employees
D. Whether calibration session ownership includes the manager's regional leadership group

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The manager can already see the goal plan, so the likely constraint is not basic assignment but whether milestone fields are editable for that manager population and employee scope. The transferred employees add a second-order dependency because manager relationship and field-level permissions must both align after movement.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Goal Plan Access Across Regional Manager Groups

Aventra wants to shorten UAT by granting regional managers broader goal-plan edit access for all pilot employees. HR compliance objects because some managers would temporarily see employees outside their assigned service region.
Which action best balances speed and governance?
Response:

A. Grant broad edit access during UAT, then remove it before the annual review cycle starts
B. Validate regional manager permission groups and goal-plan field controls before expanding pilot manager access
C. Ask HR administrators to maintain all milestones centrally so managers do not need goal-plan edit access

D. Delay all goal-plan testing until calibration sessions are configured and rating access is validated

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This preserves UAT progress while keeping access scoping aligned to the regional manager model. It addresses both the performance need for manager execution and the governance need to prevent unnecessary cross-region visibility.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Role-Based Performance Form Section Assignment
A field technician transferred into a senior specialist job family before UAT. The employee receives the annual performance form, but the form still displays the technician competency section. The form route map and manager participant appear correct.
Which configuration dependency is most likely incomplete?
Response:

A. Continuous Performance Management feedback permissions were not refreshed for the transferred employee
B. The calibration template does not include the senior specialist in the regional session population
C. The performance template section logic is not using the employee's current job family attributes at launch
D. The goal plan does not allow managers to cascade regional objectives to senior specialists

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The form is launched and routed correctly, so the visible mismatch is specifically in the role-relevant section assignment. The transfer context points to employee attributes and template section logic not aligning at launch.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Role-Based Performance Form Section Assignment
HR prefers one reusable performance form template for all pilot roles, while regional leaders want different section weights for field technicians and office-based service coordinators. The project team wants to avoid creating many templates.
Which design choice best fits the scenario?
Response:

A. Use one reusable form design with controlled role-based section and weighting variation where supported by employee attributes

B. Create a separate performance form template for every manager so regional leaders can adjust weights independently
C. Remove competency sections from the form and measure all employees only through business goals
D. Keep one identical template and identical section weights for every role to reduce maintenance effort

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The scenario favors administrative reuse but still requires role-appropriate review criteria. A controlled reusable template with role-based variation supports maintainability while preserving meaningful evaluation differences.