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FOREWORD

This study consists largely of information gathered in the development and installation of an employee performance evaluation system for the State of Ohio. The program was inaugurated as a requirement of law. The preparation for its installation began in July 1953. The first phase of the program consisted of a two month's study of the situation - personalities, prejudices, traditions, and the desires of the people involved.

The actual planning and designing of the rating form and the instruction manual, along with required procedures was carried out by a committee of nineteen persons designated by and representing the various departments of the state government. This group was reduced through self-elimination to approximately nine persons of whom four or five usually carried the major part of the discussion in meetings. This small group also did the most of preparatory work between meetings of the committee as a whole.

The objective of the civil service commission was to provide a sound uncomplicated plan for employee performance evaluation in compliance with requirements of the law. The desire of the commission was to provide a plan which would assist management at all levels to improve employee efficiency and performance. The major emphasis from the researcher's point of view was to apply sound principles of performance evaluation to a specific situation in an effort to test the theories, and to learn some of the problems involved in the application of
theories and principles to a specific situation in a governmental organization. One of the major aims was to determine whether the experience of governmental organizations in the use of employee performance evaluation might offer information which would be of value in the solution of such problems in industrial situations.

A number of matters of fact appear in the conclusions as personal opinion for lack of documentation. The information presented was gathered from official communications, discussions with officials, and discussions with numerous employees of the State. Unofficial discussions with employees of the State often seemed to provide what appeared to be more valuable information than could be found from other sources.
THE DEVELOPMENT, INSTALLATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURES IN THE
STATE SERVICE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study:
The purpose for which this study has been undertaken is to add to the existing fund of management knowledge. It deals specifically with the evaluation of an employee's contribution toward achieving the objectives of the governmental organization of which he is a part. The contribution has particular reference to the organization of the State of Ohio. It is especially directed toward determining whether the policies with respect to employee performance evaluation in the state service may provide information or theories which may be of value in industrial management.

It is expected that a study of the problems in this situation will point out some of the needs for development of new methods of dealing with the problems of employee evaluation. Special attention is given to the application of statistical analysis to the construction of rating scales, and in determining procedures for their use. The greatest contribution is expected to be that of pointing out some of the difficulties in applying merit rating principles and procedures to a specific situation in a governmental organization. Just as the Church, state and military have contributed to the solution of the
problems of organizational structure in business, the size of governmental operations would seem to indicate that a comparative evaluation of employee performance evaluation systems in business and in government will point out practices and procedures in both which will be of value in the other. Thus it is hoped that an interchange of ideas on merit rating between business and governmental organizations will be of value to both in achieving greater production and better service at lower cost, through more efficient utilization of personnel.

Scope of the Study:

The problems here studied are those of selecting forms and procedures, training supervisory personnel, facilitating communication between members of the organization, and the installation and administration of the employee performance evaluation system. The development of the procedure was directed by the Ohio State Civil Service Commission in order to comply with the provisions of the Ohio Revised Code, Section 143.10 (I), which reads as follows:

The state civil service commission shall provide by its rules for the keeping of records of efficiency and performance of each employee. Each department, board and commission shall keep such records of efficiency and performance on the part of employees in such department, board and commission as may be required by the state civil service commission, and shall make such reports on forms to be furnished by said state civil service commission as may be required. Beginning July 1, 1951, each employee who has completed one year, or a major part thereof, in a particular position, office or employment and who is below step 5 in the pay range to which his position, office or employment is assigned, shall receive an automatic salary adjustment equivalent to the next higher step within the pay range for his class or grade. Each year thereafter, until the highest step in the pay range is reached, each employee shall receive an automatic
salary adjustment equivalent to the next higher step within the pay range for his class or grade. The first such adjustment shall become effective as of July 1, following completion of the first year's service, or major part thereof, and as of July 1 of each year thereafter until the maximum salary or wage in the pay range is reached. On and after July 1, 1953, such adjustment shall be automatic for each employee when his service rating, as shown by the current or last performance report is equal to or higher than reasonable standards of efficiency to be fixed by the commission with due consideration, among other factors, of the need for maintaining equality of treatment of employees in the several departments of the state government.  

Amended Substitute House Bill No. 484, enacted by the one-hundredth General Assembly in 1953 amended this paragraph to read in part as follows:

... each employee who has completed *** at least ninety days of service in any position, office or employment and who is below the maximum salary step in the pay range to which his position, office or employment is assigned, shall receive an automatic salary adjustment equivalent to the next higher step within the pay range for his class or grade... Provided further, that any employee given a service rating by his appointing authority which is not equal to or higher than standards of efficiency fixed by the commission, shall have the right to appeal to the commission within ten days after being notified in writing, of such service rating by his appointing authority. The commission, after hearing such appeal, may either affirm or reverse the rating of the appointing authority.

The necessity of working with large and varied groups of people in a political organization required constant care to avoid having the rating system become a matter of rivalry between groups of persons who held divergent political views. Successful development of a

1 The Ohio Revised Code, Section 143.10 (I), The Laws of Ohio, Vol. 124, pp. 712-766, 1951.

2 The State of Ohio, The One-Hundredth General Assembly, House Bill No. 484 (Amended Substitute), 1953.
program required cooperation of a number of persons who shared different political aspirations. As a result of this situation a minor difference of opinion could easily have developed into a contest of political power. It was feared that such rivalry would severely damage, if not completely destroy the merit rating system. The semi-autonomous position of a large number of appointing authorities further complicated the problem. These persons held differing preconceived ideas about merit rating. Most of them had had some contact with merit rating systems but very few appeared to have any clear conceptions of the principles upon which merit rating is based.

Method:

The development of this program began with a study of systems of employee performance evaluation in other similar organizations. It included a search of literature for all available information dealing with employee performance evaluation techniques and principles. Several departmental systems of employee rating were in operation within the State of Ohio. These were studied carefully and the persons who had directed them were asked to cooperate in developing a system for the entire state service. Extensive inquiries were made by correspondence of other state civil service commissions and of the Civil Service Assembly in Chicago. Numerous rating forms and instruction manuals were received as a result of these inquiries. The New York State Department of Civil Service provided the results of an extensive survey on merit rating systems, their uses, weaknesses and their
administration. This survey was conducted by questionnaire among state and large municipal personnel agencies. The responses included a large number of explanations and elaborations by administrators.

Accompanying this study of existing merit rating systems was a study of the organizational structure of the Ohio State Service. An effort was made to bring organizational charts up to date and provide adequate information concerning lines of authority and responsibility to all levels of management.

The procedure followed in this study approached the problem of employee performance evaluation by attempting to place the function of employee evaluation in its proper relation to other functions and phases of management. The first efforts were therefore directed toward achieving a clear understanding of the organizational structure and its functions on the part of all persons in the state service. The problems of organizational structure were complex and required continued attention throughout this project.

The Civil Service Commission set forth the following objectives for the system:

1. To improve the quality of supervision.

2. To aid in improving the quality of performance of all state employees and reduce the cost of state government by:
   a. Pointing up weaknesses and needs for training
   b. Attracting more efficient employees to the service.

3. To induce improvements in, and definition of, the organizational structure of governmental units.

4. To accomplish these goals through the active cooperation of all employees of the state.
One of the chief objectives of the plan of procedure was to achieve acceptance of the final plan by seeking participation of as many state employees as possible. It was expected that such cooperation would give many of the state employees a feeling of having a part in the program and thereby gain their support for its operation in the future.

**Terminology:**

The term "Employee performance evaluation," as here used refers to the systematic procedure designed to evaluate the extent of the contribution made by an employee toward the achievement of the purposes of the organization of which he is a part. The process is an integral part of the function of controlling the operation of the organization for the purpose of efficiently directing the efforts of all personnel and materials toward achieving the objectives of the organization. The term is used here as synonymous with "merit rating." It was adopted partially because it agreed with the term "performance report" used in the law. "The organization" as used here refers to the State Government of Ohio.

The term "merit system," refers to the set of rules and procedures whereby an employee is allegedly hired, promoted, transferred and granted pay increases on the basis of his ability and achievement. Following is a list of legal definitions taken from the Civil Service Laws of Ohio:

1. The term "civil service" includes all offices and positions of trust or employment in the service of the state and the counties, cities and city school districts thereof.
2. The "state service" shall include all such offices and positions in the service of the state, or the counties thereof, except the cities and city school districts.

3. The term "classified service" signifies the competitive classified civil service of the state, the several counties, cities and city school districts thereof.

4. The term "state commission signifies the state civil service commission of Ohio.

5. The term "municipal commission" signifies the municipal civil service commission of a city.

6. The term "appointing authority" signifies the officer, commission, board, or body having the power of appointment to or removal from positions in any office, department, commission, board or institution.

7. The term "commission" shall signify either the state civil service commission of Ohio or the civil service commission of any municipality.

8. The term "employee" or "subordinate" signifies any person holding a position subject to appointment, removal, promotion or reduction by an appointing officer.3

Other terms, except where indicated, are intended to convey the standard dictionary meaning.

Importance of this Study:

A large number of governmental organizations have relied upon a merit system for many years in selecting and maintaining governmental employee groups. Numerous attempts have been made to develop adequate methods of measuring merit for the purpose of determining eligibility for promotion, transfer and pay increases. Most of the governmental units contacted in this study indicated that some form of rating system is in operation as of August 1952 but most administrators expressed

3 Laws of Ohio, Revised Code, Section 143.01.
dissatisfaction with the results achieved by such systems. The attitude of civil service administrators appears to range from enthusiasm on the part of a very few, to complete distrust and a belief that practical merit rating is not possible, on the part of others.  

The acceptance and installation of a merit system would seem to indicate a necessity for some means of measuring achievement if it is in reality to reward capable and efficient employees.

The purposes to be served by a specific system of employee performance evaluation can be established only in relation to the objectives and the limiting factors of that organization. Numerous purposes may be served by a merit-rating system but if its value is to be realized it must meet specific needs in the organization where it is to be used. The functions which it serves in a particular situation will therefore depend to a large extent upon the size and nature of the organization. The purposes of an employee performance evaluation system are to facilitate the achievement of the objectives of the organization. They may be classified as general and specific.

Information taken from a survey of employee performance procedures in fifty-seven state and local governmental organizations, conducted by James S. Quigley and Roy T. Haskell, of the New York State Department of Civil Service; Letters received by the Ohio State Civil Service Commission during August, September and October, 1952; and statements made by civil service officials at the Civil Service Assembly Convention in Cincinnati, Ohio, May 10-13, 1953.


The general purposes relate to the objectives of the entire organization and may include:

1. To improve management by making a formal appraisal of the achievements of the organization at each level of management.

2. To reduce cost by a more efficient utilization of materials and labor.

3. To achieve a more efficient utilization of human resources.

4. To provide fair and equitable rewards to employees for efficiency and achievement.

5. To achieve coordination of interest by bringing about cooperation and interchange of ideas between employees and management.

The specific purposes of employee performance evaluation are to facilitate achievement of unit objectives. The procedures should also aid in accomplishment of collateral and personal objectives and may include:

1. To coordinate the interests of employees and management through the use of cooperation in developing a program.

2. To create a better understanding of the organizational structure on the part of supervisors and employees.

3. To improve supervision by training supervisors in the performance of the evaluation function.

4. To improve supervisors' understanding of personnel problems by requiring the discussion of problems with employees.

---


8 Ralph C. Davis, Fundamentals of Top Management, New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1951, pp. 90-126, gives a thorough treatment of business objectives which may to a large extent be translated into objectives for a governmental organization.
5. To locate personnel problems by requiring supervisors to analyze the performance of each employee.

6. To show needs for training and special supervision by showing up weaknesses in employees' performance.

7. To validate testing procedures.

8. To serve as a basis for promotion, transfer, layoff and ingrade pay increases.

9. To improve supervision by giving supervisors a broader perspective of the organization's problems.9

These functions may be served in varying degrees depending upon the needs of the specific organization. The more vital consideration is that the plan should be developed in proper relationship to the conditions and needs of the organization in which it is to be used. Successful operation of a plan requires the understanding and cooperation of employees as well as all levels of management.10


CHAPTER II

GENERAL THEORY OF MERIT-RATING

Although the term "merit-rating" is new in industry, the process of evaluating an employee's performance by a superior is as old as industry itself. It is probable that the unrecorded and undefended ratings made in a random haphazard fashion have in the past been just as important in determining the future of an employee in an organization as have any of the ratings made by modern merit-rating systems. The question therefore is not whether supervisors should rate employees - this will probably be done in any event - but whether a formal merit-rating system will assist in achieving the objectives of both management and employees.¹

During the past several years an increasing number of contracts between management and labor organizations have contained clauses which made layoff and promotion contingent upon length of service provided other things such as, "job performance, skill, and ability" are equal. Such clauses require some method of determining whether these things are actually equal.² Also there appears to be a trend for state legislatures to provide in-grade pay increases for state employees contingent upon the achievement of some level of efficiency

² Ibid., p. 321.
of performance. Such contracts and laws can not be effectively administered without some means of justifying the judgment of management as to the achievements and the abilities of each employee. To date the best available method of determining the efficiency of an employee has been some form of merit-rating. Merit-rating systems which have been adopted for governmental organizations range from very simple forms listing only the performance traits, to very complex forms listing as many as forty-seven traits. The use which is made of the results obtained from these ratings range from sheer form, meeting the requirements of a law, to cases in which it is a major determinant of personnel actions. Some of the better systems probably serve other purposes which are less tangible and therefore more difficult to establish. Merit-rating systems used in industrial firms appear to be somewhat less complex, utilizing as a rule, from eight to twelve performance traits. Even this number of traits appears to make the performance evaluation form unnecessarily long, complex, expensive and time consuming to construct and apply.

---

3 Correspondence from Civil Service Administrators in the files of the Ohio State Civil Service Commission.

4 Joseph Tiffin, op. cit., p. 320.

5 Correspondence in the files of the Ohio State Civil Service Commission.


A number of psychologists and many forward-looking business men have given considerable attention to the problem of scientifically measuring the contribution of an employee to his organization since about 1900, but the acceptance of merit-rating on a large scale appears to have been born of necessity during World War I. The need for organizing and training a large army in a short period of time required some method of measuring performance. As a result the man-to-man method of rating, which is generally credited to Walter D. Scott, was accepted by the Army. Since 1935 there has been increasing acceptance of formal merit-rating systems by industries employing more than 500 persons. Governmental organizations have employed merit-rating in varying degrees since World War I. Many systems have been adopted, discarded, and later readopted in revised form.

The first modern rating scale devised for use in business was developed by the Bureau of Salesmanship Research in 1916. The rating scale was completed in January 1917 and a special staff from the Bureau of Salesmanship Research was successful in getting the War Department to adopt the rating scale as the official instrument of the Army for selecting candidates for officers schools, selecting

---


10 Correspondence from Civil Service Administrators in the files of the Ohio State Civil Service Commission.
from graduates of such schools those who would receive commissions, and periodic merit-ratings for all commissioned officers.\textsuperscript{11}

This system was called the man-to-man rating system because ratings were arrived at by making direct comparisons of one person with another on selected traits. The rater constructed his rating scale by selecting fifteen to twenty-five officers of his own rank and ranking them in order of quality of performance on each of five traits: 1. Physical Qualities, 2. Intelligence, 3. Leadership, 4. Personal Qualities, 5. General Value to the Service. One of these officers was then selected to represent each of five levels from poorest to best under each trait. The rating process then consisted of comparing the ratee to the persons listed under that trait and assigning him to a level of performance on the basis of that comparison.\textsuperscript{12}

At the conclusion of the war the report issued by the Adjutant General contained the following statement with respect to the rating system:

The accuracy of the result depends largely upon the care with which the rating scale is constructed. When instructions are followed closely and raters do their work conscientiously, the ratings show a high degree of accuracy and uniformity. No other selective system that has ever been devised so completely eliminates the personal equation or so justly determines merit.\textsuperscript{13}


\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., Appendix D, p. 602.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., pp. 188-189.
By 1939 the use of merit-rating systems in business and industry had increased to the point that a survey of sixty-four companies employing from 500 to more than 100,000 employees showed that approximately one-third of these firms were using some type of formal merit-rating program. Since 1939 many factors have operated to increase further the number of firms using merit-rating systems.\textsuperscript{14}

In spite of the advantages in scientific procedures, merit-rating procedures have been a constant source of argument. Both management and labor organizations often fear that they will put a powerful and dangerous tool in the hands of foremen and supervisors.\textsuperscript{15} Such fears have contributed to the failure of many systems of merit-rating, but of more importance has been the failure of preliminary planning. Many of the failures of merit-rating systems may be attributed directly to a failure to define the objectives which should be served by the system or the failure to follow through in achieving the established objectives.\textsuperscript{16} Failure to establish the objectives of a system in proper relationship to the organization and its basic objectives will usually result in failure of the merit-rating system. A merit-rating system, just as any other management device must be planned

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{16} Survey of Civil Service Commissions conducted by the New York State Department of Civil Service.
\end{flushright}
and developed to meet specific needs in a specific situation. Successful operation of a merit-rating system also requires that it be only a part of a well integrated program of management. Unless the over-all management program is so organized and administered as to make adequate use of the results of ratings, the rating plan will probably atrophy regardless of how well the mechanical details of rating may have been worked out.

There are many different types of merit-rating systems and many different purposes which may be accomplished by their use. Before any attempt is made to establish a merit-rating system, the basic question of the purposes to be served should be answered clearly and specifically. These should be the basic purposes which facilitate the achievement of the basic objectives of the organization. The type of system which will best serve any specific situation depends upon the objectives sought in that situation. One type of system may serve quite satisfactorily in some situation and be a complete failure in others. The type of merit-rating system for any situation must therefore be selected and the procedures and forms developed to fit the specific needs of that organization.

---


18 Survey of Civil Service Commissions conducted by the New York State Civil Service Department, 1951.

practicable to do so, lower levels of executives and employees should be given a voice in the development of the rating program. Such a procedure gives supervisors and executives at all levels a definite interest in the system and a familiarity with its operation which will facilitate its administration and use. It will also enable employees to better understand the system and reduce friction from this source. If a merit-rating plan is to be successful it must have the support and cooperation of supervisors, and in many situations it must have at least the acquiescence of employees to its use.  

The field of psychology has provided considerable assistance to business in solving the problems of employee evaluation. The contribution of psychologists to the solution of this problem may be considered to have begun about 1900 with the development of rating scales in studies of stimuli and other human traits and characteristics for which measuring methods were sought. The methods developed in such studies were later applied to many other problems of measurement, among them the measurement of an individual's contribution to the success of the organization by which he is employed. Since the early 1920's psychologists have devoted increasing attention to the problems of employee merit-rating. Such inaccuracies as "constant error," "halo," and other mechanical defects have been sought and attempts

---


made to find means of correcting or eliminating the errors. As a result of these studies many devices for rating the performance of employees have been worked out and applied in industrial and governmental organizations.

The devices used for this purpose are essentially of two different types: those which rate employees against a predefined scale and those which rate employees against other persons. The latter is represented by the variations of the Scott man-to-man rating scale, and the former by the many variations of the graphic scale and the check-list forms. The most recent development in the field, and the one which appears to offer most hope for future application is the forced-choice rating method. A brief description of four types of rating forms is given in Appendix III. The available devices appear to offer adequate mechanical exactness for a satisfactory merit-rating system but far too little attention has been given to the problems of comprehensive planning for the development of a plan and the use of the results.

Dissatisfaction with existing merit-rating systems resulted in an extended effort during World War II to develop an objective system

---


for employee performance reporting. Extensive studies were conducted by forty researchers in an effort to develop such a system for the U. S. Army. The result of this study was the forced-choice system adopted as official by the Army in July, 1947. This method of performance reporting forces the rating officer to describe the performance of his subordinates and leaves the evaluation of that description to be done in the central office. The forced-choice method of performance reporting utilizes statistical techniques to develop a list of descriptive statements concerning an employee's performance. These statements are arranged in blocks of two to five statements. Statements are paired so that both statements of a pair will appear to the rater to be either equally complimentary or equally derogatory, but one of which will be descriptive of the better employee. The rater must choose the statement which is most descriptive of the employee. All statements are taken from within the organization so as to carry as nearly as possible the same meaning to all persons involved.

The end result of this type of performance reporting is that the supervisor is forced to describe the employee, his performance and traits, and the description is evaluated statistically in the central office. When the system was first introduced it was considered to be more difficult to prepare and to be lacking in information which could be communicated to employees. Further studies by the Standard
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Oil Company (New Jersey) and others indicate, however that the time required to construct a good forced-choice system is little if any greater than that required to construct one of the other types which will work properly. Recent studies also indicate that information which can easily be communicated to employees may be obtained from forced-choice ratings without divulging the key to the rating form.\textsuperscript{27}

In addition to the above studies several agencies of the federal government have conducted extensive research on a system of performance reporting known as "work measurement." This system is a type of time and work budgeting developed for the purpose of facilitating management control of an organization. In so far as possible, observable units of work are defined for the individual and for each segment of the organization. Reports are made periodically through channels to top officials on the expenditures of materials, labor, and equipment in each unit of the organization. From these reports the administrator may determine whether each unit of the organization is making proper progress in achieving the objectives of the organization. The reporting system in this type of program enables top management to keep the expenditure of labor and materials and the use of equipment in each unit to such a proportion that a proper balance can be maintained among the various units in achieving the objectives of the organization. Thus the major objectives are broken down into specific objectives which are assigned to each segment of the organization. Standards of performance are established for each segment.

\textsuperscript{27} Govner, op. cit., p. 92.
and standards for the individual worker are established where work can reasonably be measured. The individual work standards are combined to form the standard for each unit and the unit standards are combined to form the standard for the organization. Where individual standards of work can not reasonably be determined time reporting is used. From the time reports the administrator can determine whether the work load is equitably distributed throughout the organization and if the available labor force is properly distributed.

This type of plan, where feasible, has the advantage of requiring that objectives for the organization be established and clearly defined. The need for administrative planning is clearly pointed up by this type of system. Thus avoiding some of the criticisms of other types of performance control systems. The over-all objectives of the organization must be defined and broken down into specific objectives for each unit of the organization and for each level of the organizational structure. The work-measurement system is designed to permit comparison of the operations in any segment of the organization with like operations in any other segment. From the reports a graphic analysis of the entire operation is possible, thus permitting the administrator to locate points of inadequate performance and surpluses or shortages of labor, materials or equipment in any segment of the organization. 28

None of these plans of performance measurement or rating have in any way relieved management of its responsibility to plan and control operations. They serve only to facilitate control. The problems of planning and those of supervision remain and must be solved if the organization is to realize its potential. One of the major reasons for the shortcomings of merit-rating systems in the past has been that the major emphasis has been placed on accuracy of performance rating alone to the neglect of the problems of planning, rater training and communication. These failures are partially due to the fear, by both management and labor, of placing too much power in the hands of foremen and supervisors. To keep employees informed, however, is to utilize one of the best known and most successful learning principles — knowledge of results. "Employees need to feel that their performance is approved by others, particularly their supervisors." 29

The value of merit-ratings in improving performance and attitude has largely been lost to industry because employees have not been informed of their ratings in approximately one-half of the cases where merit-ratings were made. 30 Government agencies appear to have utilized to a somewhat greater extent the value to be gained by communicating ratings to the employees. According to a recent survey a majority of state agencies who make such ratings communicate them to employees and use the occasion to aid substandard employees to improve, and to commend employees who have achieved good or superior

29 Covner, op. cit. p. 89. 30 Ibid. p. 88.
performance. The proper communication of merit ratings to employees offers possibilities for improving inadequate performance and also for improving the attitude and thus maintaining high performance on the part of better workers. This, it should be recognized however, is one of the most difficult phases of any rating program. If the program is to achieve its full value, ratees must be informed of their ratings and given assistance in improving their performance. The communication of ratings must be done with careful consideration for the employee and his appraisal of his own performance. Such a procedure requires that the supervisor have a clear understanding of the functions and obligations of a supervisor and that he be able to appraise his own performance with sufficient objectivity as to avoid placing any blame on the employee for failures which may be the result of his own inadequacies. The need for occasional approval of good employees is also served in this way. The employee who does a good or superior job will be more likely to continue that type of performance or to improve even more if he knows that his work is approved by his superiors, and that he is given credit for what he does.

Merit-rating systems which are established simply to satisfy a requirement of law or to meet a demand of a labor organization, or for the purpose of appearing to practice progressive management

31 Survey of Civil Service Commissions conducted by the New York State Civil Service Department, 1951.

32 Covner, op. cit. pp. 88-98.
methods can have little if any value. If, however, a merit-rating system is established for the purpose of providing accurate and comparable measures of the effectiveness of workers its value may be extensive. It is simply good business to take occasional inventory of employees' strengths and weaknesses for the purpose of efficient utilization of their abilities and improving their weaknesses. The following questions with respect to employees need to be answered occasionally.

1. How are they doing on their jobs? Do they measure up to the standards we need to produce a high-quality product at a competitive price?
2. What are their weaknesses so we can help them improve?
3. What are their strengths so we can make full use of these?
4. Apart from just doing their job, do they fit in generally with our way of doing things?
5. Are they getting ahead as fast and as far as their ability will take them?33

The purposes which a merit-rating system may serve are numerous and probably can never all be served by a single system. A survey of ninety-four companies by the National Industrial Conference Board revealed the following list of purposes:

1. To help in deciding who should be promoted, demoted, or given a raise in pay.
2. To discover workers' weaknesses as a basis for planning training.
3. To uncover exceptional talents.
4. To furnish a basis for discharge of totally unfit employees.
5. To help top supervisors learn how each person is appraised by his foreman.

33 Bittner, op. cit. pp. 20-23.
6. To help top supervisors judge the fairness, severity, or leniency with which supervisors judge their people.
7. To help in assigning work in accordance with workers' abilities.
8. To serve as a check on employment procedures generally and interviews and tests specifically.
9. To stimulate people to improve.
10. To develop people's morale through stimulating confidence in management's fairness. 34

These functions may not all well be served by any one system, in fact it is wise to limit the purposes to as few as practicable for any one system. 35

The forced-choice method of performance reporting has attracted widespread attention and extensive research in its construction and application is now being conducted. 36 Efforts are being made to develop methods of preparing information from forced-choice ratings which can be communicated to an employee, and considerable progress appears to have been made on this point. 37 Increasing attention is also being given to the basic problem of planning for proper application of merit-rating in achieving the objectives of the organization. 38 The most promising method of performance evaluation appears to be the forced-choice method. This method however will not mitigate the requirements for proper planning and application of other sound management practices.

34 Jucius, op. cit., p. 239. 35 Bittner, op. cit., p. 22.
36 Ibid., p. 41-42. 37 Covner, op. cit., p. 91.
CHAPTER III
SURVEY OF EXISTING MERIT-RATING SYSTEMS IN GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Purpose of Survey:

A survey of procedures and principles used in the development and administration of existing merit-rating systems was considered by the author to be essential. If the most successful practices of merit-rating in government were to be used and those which had failed avoided, those practices and policies must obviously be known prior to the development of a system. Such information could be taken from practical experience only. It was expected that a study and comparison of practices in government and business would provide valuable information for guidance in the development and administration of a merit-rating system for the State of Ohio.

Definition of Terms:

The term "central personnel agency" refers to the staff agency charged with the performance of personnel management functions in the governmental organization indicated. It may be a commission, board, or a single administrator.

The term "full merit system" refers to a set of rules and procedures whereby employees are employed and rewarded according to merit, utilizing some system which attempts to measure that merit.

---
1 The material in this chapter is from the files of the Ohio State Civil Service Commission, the files of the New York State Department of Civil Service, and from statements made in speeches and interviews by officials of the State of Ohio and other state and municipal governments.
The term "grant-in-aid only" indicates that the organization employs a complete merit system only in those departments which must do so in order to receive grants from the federal government. They include those agencies engaged in certain public welfare activities.

The term "not full merit system" includes those units of government which employ only some phases of a merit system, or which employ rating only for special purposes such as promotion.

"Individual agencies" refer to replies received from single departments of a state government, but not from a central personnel agency of that state.

"Local Jurisdiction" refers to city and county governments.

**Study of Ohio State Civil Service Commission Files:**

The files of the Ohio State Civil Service Commission indicate that there has been an interest in merit-rating for at least twenty years. Since 1934 there have been numerous inquiries of other state and municipal civil service commissions concerning merit-rating systems in use in those organizations. As a result of these inquiries the commission has received a large number of rating forms and manuals. There appears to have been no attempt to conduct a systematic survey of rating systems, nor were questions as to planning of programs and principles followed in their development asked. As a result the replies were very general statements as to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction with existing systems. In most cases a copy of the
rating form and the manual of instructions were included with the reply. The comments made in these replies almost invariably expressed dissatisfaction with the existing merit-rating system or stated that it was being revised.

While dissatisfaction and distrust of existing merit-rating systems was almost unanimously expressed, very few instances could be found in which basic procedures were changed. The majority of the rating forms were of the graphic scale type, a few were of the checklist type, and three used a system of plus, minus, and check-mark for indicating the level of performance on each performance trait. One form provided a space for the rater to check the employee’s over-all performance at one of three levels, and asked the rater to explain in writing the reasons for his rating. The majority of the forms left the determination of the over-all rating to the discretion of the rater as a matter of practical judgment. Five of them provided a formula for determining the over-all rating, and two left the analysis of the ratings and the assignment of final ratings to be done in the central personnel office. Most of the forms assigned weights to the performance traits. Some of them assigned specific weights to each trait and others left the weighting to the department and others to the supervisor.

Departmental Rating Systems in Ohio:

A check of the various departments of the State of Ohio revealed that several departmental rating systems had been installed during
the past several years. These were subjective rating systems which had been developed by personnel officers in the departments. All except one had utilized five levels of performance for the rating, and except for one of these the ratings were expressed as an adjective. This one was expressed in numbers, one through five. The other plan utilized a system of plus, minus and check-mark to indicate one of three levels of performance on each trait. These systems showed indications of considerable work, but for the most part were lacking in well planned objectives set forth by top management.

The system in use by the Ohio State Highway Patrol called "Personnel Evaluation and Development," represented many years of study and experience by top management of that unit. The program had been developed within the department with full knowledge of all employees and all members of the department had been encouraged to make contributions to the plan. The program was developed for a specific use - the development and maintenance of an efficient police force in Ohio - and indications were that it was achieving its objectives well. The objectives of the program had been well defined by the chief executive of the department and their achievement watched closely by him during the development and maintenance of the system.

Interest in merit-rating was evidenced in several other departments of the government but the attitude was to delay work on a system until the Civil Service Commission should take action on the mandate of the law. The law required that the commission should define reasonable standards of efficiency and that each employee should
achieve such standards in order to be eligible for the annual salary increment on July 1, 1953. The representatives of all these departments expressed eagerness to cooperate and assist in developing a uniform system of merit-rating which would be adopted by the Civil Service Commission for the entire state service.

Inquiries Made of Other State and Municipal Personnel Agencies:

During August and September of 1952 further inquiries were made of other civil service commissions and of the Civil Service Assembly in Chicago. The replies to these inquiries revealed that numerous surveys had been attempted by other civil service commissions. When efforts were made to get a canvass of methods and procedures in such organizations for the state of Ohio, vigorous opposition was displayed by some officials. The reason given for opposition to the survey was that there was not sufficient time for the State of Ohio to benefit from the study before a system of merit-rating would be required by law to be in operation. A stack of approximately 100 unanswered questionnaires of a similar nature was found in the files of the commission. The dates on these questionnaires ranged from the mid 1930's to very recent. No reason for failure to answer them was discovered.

Inquiries disclosed that the State of New York had recently completed such a survey, conducted by James S. Quigley and Roy T. Haskell, Personnel Technicians for the State of New York. The results of this survey were furnished to the Ohio State Civil Service
Commission by the New York Department of Civil Service. The survey was made during the Summer of 1951 and thirty-two questions (Appendix I) were asked of forty-one state and twenty-two city and county jurisdictions. Replies were received from thirty-six state and twenty-one local jurisdictions, of which the following had in operation some form of rating system applicable to all or part of the employees of that organization.

**STATE JURISDICTIONS**

**Full Merit System**

Alabama State Personnel Department  
California State Personnel Board  
Colorado State Civil Service Commission  
Connecticut Personnel Department  
Illinois Civil Service Commission  
Kansas Department of Civil Service  
Maine Department of Personnel  
Maryland Department of State Employment and Registration  
Michigan State Civil Service Commission  
Minnesota Civil Service Department  
New Jersey Department of Civil Service  
Oregon Civil Service Commission  
Rhode Island Division of Personnel  
Wisconsin Bureau of Personnel

**Grant-in-aid only**

Louisiana Merit System Council  
Virginia Division of Personnel

**Not Full Merit System**

Arizona Merit System Council  
Florida Merit System  
Georgia State Merit System (of Personnel Administration)  
Indiana State Personnel Bureau  
Missouri Personnel Division  
Nebraska Joint Merit System  
Tennessee Department of Personnel  
Washington State Personnel Board
Individual Agencies

Kentucky State Department of Economic Security  
New Mexico Department of Public Welfare  
Pennsylvania (1) Department of Labor and Industry  
Pennsylvania (2) Department of Public Assistance  
Texas Employment Commission  
Vermont Unemployment Compensation Commission

LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

Baltimore, City Civil Service Commission  
Chicago, Civil Service Commission  
Cincinnati, Department of Personnel and Civil Service Commission  
Flint (Michigan) Civil Service Commission  
Hartford (Connecticut) Personnel Board  
Los Angeles County Civil Service Commission  
Milwaukee County Civil Service Commission  
Minneapolis Civil Service Commission  
New Haven Civil Service Commission  
New York Municipal Civil Service Commission  
Philadelphia Civil Service Commission  
Portland (Oregon) Municipal Civil Service Board  
San Francisco Civil Service Commission  
St. Louis (Missouri) Department of Personnel  
St. Paul (Minnesota) Civil Service Bureau  
Wayne County (Michigan) Civil Service Commission  
Westchester County (New York) Personnel Office

Of this group thirty-six reported that complete formal merit-rating programs were in operation. Twenty-two of the fifty-eight respondents reported no formal rating program (Table I) but eleven of those twenty-two indicated that merit-ratings were used for one or more of the following purposes: promotion examinations, probationary appointments, salary increment determinations, lay-off and reinstatement lists. The civil service commissions of Pennsylvania, Wayne County, Michigan and Cleveland, Ohio, who reported no formal rating programs, stated that studies were under way to put formal rating
programs into effect in order to comply with statutory mandates. Failure to obtain a satisfactory rating system was reported to be the chief reason for lack of formal rating programs.

TABLE 1

"Do you have a formal program for periodically rating the work performance of your employees?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reply</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;YES&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;NO&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The basis for the use of rating systems in the majority of the reporting jurisdictions is a legal requirement, either constitutional or statutory, or both (Table 2). New Haven and New York City reported that the rating procedure in use is detailed in the legal basis of the rating program.

Twenty-seven of the agencies responding to this questionnaire indicated that credit is given on promotional examinations for merit ratings. The weight given to ratings varied from one per cent to fifty per cent with most jurisdictions having a range such as ten per cent to thirty per cent. Six jurisdictions reported giving credit for rating scores but had no set formula for determining the weight to be given such scores (Table 11).
Approximately one-half of the reporting jurisdictions indicated that written performance standards are not used for guidance of raters. Also approximately one-half of the agencies use different forms and procedures for rating supervisory and non-supervisory employees. The jurisdictions in which uniform procedures were not used are for the most part those in which the ratings required of grant-in-aid departments are the major rating programs in the organization. In these cases the merit-rating procedures and the use of results are left to the discretion of the various departments (Table 11).

**TABLE 2**

Legal Bases of Rating Programs Employed in Forty-Six State and Local Jurisdictions in 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL BASIS OF RATING PROGRAM IN USE</th>
<th>Formal Program</th>
<th>No Formal Program</th>
<th>Total Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Provision</td>
<td>1 State 1 Local</td>
<td>1 State</td>
<td>3 Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Provision</td>
<td>13 State 2 Local</td>
<td>1 State 3 Local</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and regulations of central personnel agency</td>
<td>4 State -</td>
<td>1 State 1 Local</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution and Statute</td>
<td>- State - Local</td>
<td>- State -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution and rules and regulations</td>
<td>1 State 2 Local</td>
<td>- State -</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statute and rules and regulations</td>
<td>6 State 4 Local</td>
<td>- State 1 Local</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of above</td>
<td>1 State - Local</td>
<td>- State -</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Basis not reported</td>
<td>- State - Local</td>
<td>2 State 1 Local</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>26 State 9 Local</td>
<td>4 State 7 Local</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

Control Exercised Over Employee Rating Programs by Central Personnel Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Control</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No control</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Extent of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Review</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4

Administrative Uses of Ratings in Thirty State and Fifteen Local Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Improving Employee Performance: 1 87% 3 60%
- Salary Increment Determination: 2 77% 5 40%
- Initiation Discharge Proceedings: 3 73% 2 73%
- Determining Demotions: 4 70% 4 47%
- Promotion Examinations: 5 63% 1 93%
- Determining Additional Training Needs: 6 57% 7.5 20%
- Determining Transfer to Other Duties: 7 53% 6 27%
- Lay-off and Reinstatement Lists: 8 43% 7.5 20%
- Determining Provisional Promotion: 9 40% 9 13%
In more than one-half of the reporting organizations employees were notified of their ratings by interview with the supervisor and given an explanation of the appeal procedures. Only seven jurisdictions notified the employee of his rating with no explanation. Three agencies made the rating public. Thirty-five agencies permitted an appeal of a satisfactory rating while only twenty-eight permitted an appeal of an unsatisfactory rating. The usual procedure for appeal was to departmental review officials and thence to the central personnel agency, although ten jurisdictions permitted direct appeal of a rating to the central personnel agency (Table 11).

The central personnel agency appears to exercise some control over the rating system in slightly less than one-half of the cases. The usual control is that of administrative review (Table 3). The administrative uses of ratings appears to be weighted slightly in favor of the positive uses which may be made of such information. Improving employee performance ranked first among state organizations while its use in promotional examinations ranked first in local jurisdictions. Its use in initiating discharge proceedings however ranked second in local agencies and third in state agencies. State jurisdictions appear to have made a much wider use of the administrative possibilities of merit rating than have local organizations (Tables 4 and 10).

Governmental organizations having uniform rating programs generally include all employees in the rating program except officials such
as department heads (Table 5). Probationary employees are generally rated only once at or near the end of the probationary period (Table 6).

Training programs for raters are conspicuous by their absence. The method most frequently used was conferences and manuals but this was reported to be in use by only thirteen jurisdictions. Only twenty-one state and seven local jurisdictions reported any training program at all (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Status of Employees Rated in Reporting Jurisdictions in 1951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive employees rated?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than competitive?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are all those employees rated?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary employees rated?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent employees only?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and Provisional?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of rating most often assigned to employees was an adjective, with a combination of adjective and numerical score a close second (Table 9). The reason for the large number of combination adjective and numerical ratings appears to be the number of jurisdictions using the ratings in promotion examinations (Table 4).
### TABLE 6

Number of Times an Employee is Rated While Serving Probationary Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Number of Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7

Supervisory Level Originating the Rating in Forty-five Jurisdictions in 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Level</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Supervisor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Level Supervisor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Level Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate and Second Level Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate and Higher Level Supervisor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review by a Higher Level of Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40
TABLE 8
Rater Training Procedures Employed in Twenty-eight Reporting Jurisdictions in 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Procedure Employed</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Session</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference of Raters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Manuals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes and Conferences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes and Manuals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences and Manuals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Above Procedures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
Type of Rating Assigned Employees in Forty-two Reporting Jurisdictions in 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Rating Assigned</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Satisfactory&quot; or &quot;Unsatisfactory&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rating forms used in all these organizations are of the same general type - subjective ratings. Three of the local jurisdictions use the Probst System while most of the others, both state and local,

\[2\] The Probst system consists of a series of check-list rating forms developed for different levels of positions and for different
use a system which was designed for the specific organization. The chief variations in the forms are in the method of determining the final rating and in the number of performance traits on the rating form (Table 11).

**TABLE 10**

Penalties Imposed for Unsatisfactory Ratings as Reported by Twenty-eight State and Twelve Local Jurisdictions in 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty Imposed</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>State Percentage</th>
<th>Local Rank</th>
<th>Local Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of Salary Increment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Pending Re-Rating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Promotion Rights</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Fixed Penalty</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Tenure Credits</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Decrease</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimand</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common procedure was to have ratings made by the immediate supervisor and reviewed by one or more higher levels of supervisors. Only one agency reported a joint rating by immediate and higher level supervisors (Table 7).

The answers to questions six and seven of the questionnaire (See Appendix I) appear to shed considerable light on the attitudes and opinions of public administrators toward merit-rating procedures. The answers were almost entirely qualified and responding administrators commented freely on the questions. In reply to question six: "In your opinion, does your present rating system satisfactorily accomplish its objectives?" twenty-two answered "Yes," but most of these were qualified, nineteen answered "No," and two answered "Yes and No." The "No" replies were not entirely negative. The qualification of answers here appeared to be as prevalent as it was with the "Yes" answers. Practically none of the administrators appear to find the rating system completely without value nor were any quite satisfied with the results obtained. There appeared to be more satisfaction with ratings in cases where the positive uses of results were emphasized, and there appeared to be most dissatisfaction where the least possible use was made of the ratings and their results. The attitude of administrators appeared to range fairly evenly from complete distrust of any merit-rating system to a mild degree of satisfaction with the present system in that organization.

In response to the question; "Do you believe that your employees are satisfied with your present rating system?" twenty-two answered
"Yes," thirteen answered "No," and seven replied "Yes and No," but again the answers were qualified. The statements were admittedly opinions based on incomplete information. Typical of the statements is, "... We have had less complaints about the present system than about those previously used. This is probably due to the simplicity, as well as to the fact that it invites explanations of ratings." Most of the answers were qualified, indicating a belief that employees attitudes varied widely. The responses indicated that employees were less satisfied with systems in which numerical ratings were used and where ratings were not discussed with the employees. There was an exception to this in that a few systems appear to be simply a formal procedure of which employees are hardly aware. In these cases, administrators reported that employees appeared to have no special like or dislike for the program, being little cognizant of its existence.

The attitudes of administrators as expressed in all this study indicates that they believe in general that the following rules should be followed in developing and maintaining a merit-rating system.

1. Convince employees of the fairness and sincerity of the raters.

2. Remove all secrecy from the development of the plan. Encourage employee participation.

3. Discard arithmetical computation. Use adjective type ratings.

4. Emphasize the positive uses of the rating program.

5. Provide for informal interviews between employees and raters.
The chief criticisms listed by administrators against existing systems of rating were:

1. Inadequate training for rating supervisors.
2. Failure to analyze results of ratings.
3. Failure to initiate corrective action where organizational weaknesses were brought to light.
4. Inadequate staffing of agencies responsible for the rating program.
5. Lack of well established objectives for the program.
6. Failure of objectivity in ratings.
7. Raters are too often relying on judgments which are not pertinent to job performance.
8. Ratings are often too high because raters are not willing to accept the responsibility of discussing the employee's shortcomings with him.
9. Too little emphasis is placed on the positive uses of ratings.

This represents the consensus of responses by the majority of administrators with respect to merit-rating systems in operation in state and local governmental organizations. From comments made by department heads in Ohio and civil service administrators in other organizations it appears that in their opinion one of the greatest difficulties in merit-rating is the failure of the immediate supervisor to fully understand his duties and to accept his responsibility to the employee. The logical conclusion from this information would appear to be that adequate training of managerial personnel is a necessary prerequisite to a program of employee evaluation.
The percentage return on the survey conducted by the State of New York seems to indicate a very high degree of interest in the problems of employee performance evaluation. The repeated attempts of agencies to establish successful employee performance evaluation systems in spite of repeated failures seems to indicate that administrators consider such a program essential to good management in spite of the difficulties of accomplishment.

One recent development in a state government indicates that at least some officials are reaching the conclusion that specific personnel programs can be successful only in a well planned and well balanced program of management. The State of Connecticut has started a program to develop a job evaluation system and from this to place personnel programs in proper perspective with other management functions.3

| TABLE II |
| Questions Used in Survey Conducted by New York State Department of Civil Service in 1951 |
| Questions | Responses |
| Are numerical ratings averaged into final grade of promotion examinations? | Yes | 27 | No | 8 |
| Are written performance standards used for guidance of raters? | Yes | 21 | No | 21 |
| Are uniform procedures required for all departments? | Yes | 29 | No | 15 |
| Do forms differ: By department? | Yes | 12 | No | 0 |
| By duties? | Yes | 8 | No | 0 |

3 "Taking a Cue From Business," Business Week, No. 1254, September 12, 1953, p. 139.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are special forms used in reporting employees as unsatisfactory?</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is additional information required for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Unsatisfactory ratings?</td>
<td>Yes: 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ratings at maximum of rating scale?</td>
<td>Yes: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is tardiness considered and reported apart from overall rating?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, are special forms used?</td>
<td>Yes: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is employee notified of rating?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. In all cases?</td>
<td>Yes: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Only if unsatisfactory?</td>
<td>Yes: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. In no instance?</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is employee notified by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Letter?</td>
<td>Yes: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interview?</td>
<td>Yes: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If by interview, are ratings discussed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. In all cases?</td>
<td>Yes: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Only if unsatisfactory?</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are ratings made public?</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews take place:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. After original rating?</td>
<td>Yes: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. After review?</td>
<td>Yes: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. During rating process?</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is employee told reason for rating?</td>
<td>Yes: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Merely notified?</td>
<td>Yes: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Notified of appeal procedure?</td>
<td>Yes: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Varies.</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May an employee appeal a &quot;satisfactory&quot; rating?</td>
<td>Yes: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. To departmental review officials?</td>
<td>Yes: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. To department, thence to central personnel agency?</td>
<td>Yes: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. To central personnel agency directly?</td>
<td>Yes: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a formal appeal procedure for employees receiving &quot;unsatisfactory&quot; ratings?</td>
<td>Yes: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, to whom?</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

B. To department, thence to central personnel agency?
C. To central personnel agency directly?

Does a rating of "unsatisfactory" debar an employee from promotion examinations?
Employee is debarred until rated "satisfactory."

Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:

None of the systems checked in any of these studies offered any unique methods or procedures for evaluation of the performance of an employee. They were simply variations of the same general type of subjective rating system. The information set forth in this chapter seems to indicate that administrators are aware of the shortcomings of existing merit-rating systems. The reasons why many of the difficulties listed by them have not been corrected is not apparent. A large percentage of the administrators appear to understand and appreciate the most generally accepted principles of merit-rating.  

There were no obvious reasons why these principles were not applied in practice. One of the difficulties in the state service may be the practice of legislative bodies in charging a staff agency - the central personnel agency - with the duty of enforcing an employee performance evaluation system on line officials. It appears that in many cases this procedure violates one of the basic principles of merit-rating, that of having objectives established prior to the development of a system.

---

The practice of enforcing a uniform rating system on a large number of varied units of the organization may explain the difficulties in part (See Table 11). This practice complicates any efforts to have minor executives participate in the development of a system because of the large number of persons involved. This may be partially the cause of the reported lack of training and understanding of rating systems among raters.
CHAPTER IV
BACKGROUND OF THE OHIO MERIT-RATING SYSTEM

Personnel management in any unit of government may be considered as a result of the interrelationships of four sectors of government organization. These sectors are the legislature, the chief executive, central staff or service agencies, and the operating agencies of the unit. The Constitution of a state sometimes as in the state of Ohio sets forth broad rules governing personnel practices. The legislature enacts laws which constitute the legal structure and broad framework under which agencies operate. The chief executive makes recommendations to the legislature and to some extent determines personnel policy in his own right. The central staff personnel agency of a unit of government is responsible for administration of specific functions of personnel management. The authority delegated to central personnel agencies varies significantly. A central personnel agency may not always engage in all authorized functions because of lack of funds or inertia of key personnel. A trend toward service relationships between the central personnel agency and the operating agencies has been accelerated since 1940. The function of "policing" in general is becoming relatively less important. "Under the 'policing' relationship, initially characteristic of central staff personnel

2 The Constitution of the State of Ohio, Section 10.
3 Torpey, op. cit., pp. 2-5.
agencies, officials of these agencies regarded themselves as virtually the sole defenders of honesty and 'good government'." Believers in this approach seemed to consider their main objective is to "keep the rascals out." Line officials often were considered as persons to be distrusted.\(^4\)

Ohio was one of the earlier states to adopt the "merit system." The first civil service system was adopted by the state of New York in 1883, and only an occasional state followed before 1937.\(^5\) The Ohio civil service system was established by statute in 1913 subsequent to a constitutional amendment passed in 1912 requiring such a law.\(^6\) The constitutional provision reads as follows: "Appointments and promotions in the civil service of the state, the several counties, and cities, shall be made according to merit and fitness, to be ascertained, as far as practicable, by competitive examinations. Laws shall be passed providing for the enforcement of this provision."\(^7\)

The central personnel agency of Ohio is a two member commission appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of four years each. At the time of appointment both commissioners shall not be adherents of the same political party. No

---

\(^4\) Torpey, op. cit. p. 5  
\(^5\) Ibid. pp. 31-33.  
\(^7\) The Constitution of the State of Ohio, Section 10.
commissioner shall hold any other office of profit or trust under the
government of the United States, the state of Ohio, or any political
subdivision thereof. The Governor shall designate one of the mem-
bers of the commission as chairman.

The Ohio State Civil Service Commission is charged with the
following powers and duties.

1. Prescribe, amend and enforce administrative rules for the
purpose of carrying out and making effectual the provisions
of this act (Ohio Revised Code, Section 143.01 to 143.99).

2. Keep minutes of its own proceedings and records of its exam-
inations and other official actions. All such records except
recommendations of former employees, shall be open to public
inspection under reasonable regulations.

3. The commission shall prepare, continue and keep in its office,
a complete roster of all persons in the classified service.
This roster shall be open to public inspection at all reason-
able hours.

4. Make investigations, either sitting in banc or through a
single commissioner or the chief examiner, concerning all
matters touching the enforcement and effect of the provisions
of this act and the administrative rules of the commission
prescribed thereunder.

5. Have power to subpoena and require the attendance and testi-
mony of witnesses and the production thereby of books, papers,
public records and other documentary evidence pertinent to
the investigations, inquiries, or hearings on appeal from the
action or decision of an appointing officer as is herein
authorized.

6. Hear appeals from the decisions of appointing officers of
persons in the classified service, who have been reduced in
pay or position, laid off, suspended, discharged or discrimi-
nated against by such appointing authority.

---

8 The Laws of Ohio, Revised Code, Section 143.02.
9 The Laws of Ohio, Revised Code, Section 143.04.
7. Make a report to the governor annually, on or before the first day of January of each year, showing its own actions, the rules and all exceptions thereto in force, and any recommendations for the more effectual accomplishment of the purposes of this act. The commission shall also furnish any special reports to the governor whenever the same are requested by him. Such reports shall be printed for public distribution under the same regulations as are the reports of other state officers, boards or commissions.  

A formal classification program was first adopted by the state of Ohio in 1917. By the end of World War II the classification system was extremely complex and outmoded. There were approximately 1,400 separate classifications. The General Assembly in 1947 appointed a salary study commission for the purpose of simplifying and bringing up to date the old system. The act created an eighteen member commission and appropriated $50,000 to carry out the purposes of the act. This commission was directed to employ an experienced organization to make a salary study, a personnel administration study and a job classification and pay analysis of all positions in the state service. An additional $20,000 was subsequently appropriated by the General Assembly during the same session for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act.

Following the recommendations of the salary study commission the General Assembly on July 15, 1949 approved the classification plan now in use and the salary schedule (Appendix II). This bill restated

10 The Laws of Ohio, Revised Code, Section 143.07.


12 Ibid. House Bill No. 382.
the requirement that the Civil Service Commission require by its rules that the various departments keep records of efficiency and performance on the part of all state employees. Annual salary increments on and after July 1, 1953 were made contingent upon the achievement of reasonable standards of efficiency to be fixed by the commission.\textsuperscript{13} The Civil Service Commission was directed to prepare specifications descriptive of each of the classifications and to allocate each position paid in whole or in part by the state of Ohio to one of the classes in conformity with the report of the Public Administration Service.\textsuperscript{14}

The classification system and the job surveys were done by the Public Administration Service, a non-profit consulting organization of Chicago, Illinois. Job information was obtained by means of questionnaires, completed by the employee, checked by supervisors and approved by department heads. Information obtained from this source was the basis for allocating jobs to classes. At the time of completion the system contained approximately 900 classifications, and by the time preparation for the merit-rating system began in July 1952, there were approximately 1000 classifications. A number of the classifications were established specifically for only one job of which

\textsuperscript{13} State of Ohio, 98th General Assembly, Amended Substitute House Bill No. 382, 1949.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
there was only one position in the state service. The classification system covered approximately 34,000 employees ranging from house parent trainee, pay range No. 7 to Superintendent of Ohio Tuberculosis Hospital in pay range No. 51 (See Appendix II).

Following the passage of House Bill No. 382 in 1949 executives of the Civil Service Commission displayed an increased interest in merit-rating systems. A number of inquiries were sent to central personnel agencies in other state governments. The replies to these inquiries consisted largely of rating forms and instruction manuals. Several of the responding agencies reported that existing systems were being revised. In July 1952 the Ohio Civil Service Commission employed the author as a management consultant for the purpose of establishing a system of employee performance evaluation to meet the requirements of the law.

One of the first efforts made by the author in preparation for a performance evaluation system was to acquire a clear concept of the organizational structure in which the system was to be used. This proved to be extremely difficult because lines of authority were often vague. Discussions with several officials and executives indicated little understanding of the need for clear definition of the organizational structure. The fact that lines of authority and responsibility could not be determined in several cases seemed a matter of little concern to them.

One of the most complex situations was a large department into which a number of previously independent agencies had been combined.
The heads of what had been independent units in this department were classed as appointing authorities for certain purposes but the extent of their authority was often not clear. The department appeared to be in the process of transition from decentralization to centralized administration. The transition was apparently being effected gradually and some small units which were incorporated into the new department seemed to have been little noticed by the central office. Dealing with these units proved difficult because the proper line of communication frequently was not clear.

**Limiting Factors:**

Information from all available sources indicated that the success of an employee performance evaluation system in an organization such as the state of Ohio would require cooperation of all officials and major executives. It appeared that such cooperation would require considerable time to achieve and little time was available. The law required that employees' pay increases on July 1, 1953 be contingent upon the last performance report. This date left eleven months in which to develop a system, place it in operation, and have reports made to the Civil Service Commission by all departments, after which, the Civil Service Commission would be required to determine eligibility of each employee for the pay increase on July 1, 1953.

Further complicating the problem was the inadequacy of job information provided by the classification system. The questionnaires
used by the Public Administration Service were of little use. Information provided on these questionnaires was frequently more descriptive of the incumbent than of the job. Few adequate job descriptions were available and few jobs provided any means of measuring performance by quantity or quality of work.

No training facilities for raters were available. It therefore appeared that training of raters would have to be left to the devices of the various departments regardless of the type of rating system which might be adopted. This did not appear satisfactory because few persons in the state service were adequately prepared to conduct a training program.

A study was made to determine whether budget control systems might offer a means of determining performance standards for organizational units or for functions. Budget systems in most departments, however, were far too general and vague for this purpose. Office production controls were almost completely lacking. All production standards used seemed to be purely rule-of-thumb based on experience of the individual executive.

The personnel of the governmental organization is composed of three groups: those elected officials who head the organization, those offices filled by elected officials through appointment, and the career public service worker. The latter group, which constitutes the bulk of state employees, is covered by civil service rules and therefore subject to the rating system. The management and direction of the system must, however, emanate from elected and appointed officials.
A large number of state employees are members of the major labor unions but the most conspicuous employee group is the Ohio Civil Service Employees' Association, a local organization. The membership of this organization ranges from laborers to some of the higher executives in the classified service. This places operative employees and several levels of management in the same employees' organization. The activities of the association are largely directed toward securing passage of favorable legislation with respect to wages, working conditions, and other employee benefits. The only recognition accorded to any employee organization is that which the official or executive deems expedient at the time of any particular situation or dispute.

The power of the association is derived from its ability to influence the electorate. The most of its efforts appeared to be devoted to preparation of legislation, salary studies, and public relations. The representative of the association attempted to convince legislators of the necessity for desirable changes. His conduct during this period indicated that he was well aware of the general framework of the organization. His efforts were simply directed toward achieving his objectives within that framework.

Opposition to change in established status and procedure was expressed by a number of employees during the classification program. An effort was made to standardize the duties of jobs in certain areas so that the allocation of jobs would result in equal pay for equal work. Employees objected to any changes even when their duties were
reduced with no reduction in pay. This objection to change was obvious throughout the development of the program. Furthermore, in spite of the fact that all employees had been provided with a copy of the provisions of House Bill 382, few of them seemed to be aware of its provisions. Numerous complaints were received by the Civil Service Commission when it became generally known that a merit-rating system was planned. The employees' association led an effort to have the provision removed from the law (Appendix IV).

The fear that a merit-rating system would permit a return to extensive political patronage was repeatedly expressed by executives in the service and by some officials. A lack of faith in the ability and integrity of lower level supervisors to make such ratings with fairness and accuracy was expressed by operatives and executives alike. One appointing authority insisted that he personally could rate with accuracy the approximately 375 employees in his department, but that his subordinates could not. In spite of the divergence of opinions among officials and executives their cooperation in the program was considered essential. Plans were therefore made to have the program developed by a committee of department representatives.

Summary:

The fear of any change on the part of employees caused extensive difficulties from the beginning. This along with the pressure of time and the lack of an adequate general management development program necessitated many compromises with what appeared to be proper
procedures. Memory of occurrences of the 1930's and a fear of their recurrence appeared to cause many employees of long standing to oppose any change.

Indications were that the General Assembly had not appreciated fully the time required and the necessary prerequisites for a successful merit-rating system. The fact that the Civil Service Commission, a staff agency, was charged with the development and enforcement of a merit-rating system gave additional power and prestige to that body. This in itself seemed to cause resentment from some line officials. This situation also precluded the adequate development of plans for objectives of the merit-rating system. The procedure of asking the line officials to cooperate in developing the system did not overcome this weakness in most cases. The system appeared to be only another requirement of law to be complied with in the opinion of many officials and executives.
CHAPTER V
PLANNING OF THE OHIO SYSTEM

In July 1952 the following eight steps were recommended by the author to the Ohio State Civil Service Commission as a plan for establishing an employee performance evaluation system.

1. Clearly and concisely define the purposes of the system and the uses which may be made of results. Such definitions to be published for the information of all state employees.

2. Conduct a study of all available information concerning employee performance evaluation systems in similar circumstances in an effort to determine what difficulties have been encountered with various systems.

3. Development of extensive performance evaluation procedures which will be scientifically tested in limited application to determine which available procedure provides the most satisfactory results.

4. Pilot studies of the procedures to determine validity and reliability of the various forms. Selection of the most desirable procedure and the most desirable forms on the basis of information so obtained.

5. The installation of the program for general use to be accompanied by a program of training for raters. Such program to be as extensive and detailed as possible under the circumstances.

6. The operation of the system to be accompanied by a program of assistance to all departments in developing and administering training programs for rating supervisors. This program to be directed toward achieving coordination of efforts among all the departments in order to achieve the uniformity required by law.

7. To conduct a continuous study of the system in operation in order to discover weaknesses when they arise.

8. To establish a research unit for the purpose of conducting a long range study of the system in operation. This unit to be charged with a continued search for more adequate means of performance evaluation and with assisting in the administration of supervisory training programs.
During July and August of 1952 a study of existing merit-rating systems and the literature on the subject was conducted along with a study of the organization of the state of Ohio. Following this study the following procedure was suggested as desirable for achieving the purposes set forth in Section 143.10(I), Ohio Revised Code.

1. Seek the cooperation of the executive branch of the government in clearly defining the organizational structure of all the units of the government.

2. Have all jobs studied and complete descriptions written by competent job analysts. Standardize jobs in so far as possible so that the classification system can be simplified.

3. Install in all departments a system of budget control which would provide standards of performance for each unit of the department. Install systems of office production control and set standards of performance for office employees.

4. Provide, as a temporary measure, a simple system of merit-rating, which can be checked by comparison of average ratings with the achievements of the unit.

5. Provide for research to install an objective system of employee performance evaluation.

6. Provide adequate training for rating supervisors in the constructive uses of merit-rating systems.

Suggested as possible merit-rating procedures were: graphic scale type, check-list type, forced-choice type, and the man-to-man type or a variation thereof. (See Appendix III for a brief description of principle types of rating systems.) A modification of the ranking system was developed in lieu of a man-to-man system because of objections which had been expressed by several executives. These systems and their operation were explained to several department heads and personnel officers, some of whom were familiar with the
traditional types of merit-rating systems. The forced-choice system
attracted interest from some department heads at first but when they
learned that raters could not know how they were rating an employee
they quickly and completely rejected the system.

After discussions with a number of individual department heads
and executives, most of whom felt that this program would be far too
extensive, several compromises were made. The commission decided that
the more practical approach to the problem would be to utilize a sub­
jective rating form. The immediate objective was largely to develop
a system of employee performance evaluation which would comply with
the requirements of the law. The more long range objectives were
established as follows:

1. To improve the quality of supervision by providing training
   and assistance for supervisors in the practice of sound
   management principles.

2. To aid in improving the quality of performance of state
   employees and reduce the cost of state government by:
   A. Pointing up weaknesses and need for training.
   B. Attracting the best possible employees to the state
      service.

3. To induce definition of and improvements in the organiza­
tional structure of the governmental units.

4. To promote cooperation among employees of various departments
   of the state service, and an interchange of ideas between the
   various levels of management.

Those purposes were proposed by the member and approved by the
chairman of the Civil Service Commission. The committee method for
developing a rating plan was decided upon in spite of its disadvan­
tages. All appointing authorities were to be asked to make suggestions
and comments. After sufficient time had elapsed for officials to consider the problems, they were to meet for a group discussion of the problems. In so far as possible the plan to be adopted by the commission was to be that desired by the persons who would administer and apply the system.

During this time an effort was being made to find some criteria by which to check the validity and reliability of the plan once it had been developed. An effort was made to have an attitude survey conducted for this purpose. The proposal was ruled out because such a survey had reportedly been conducted improperly and the results improperly used a few years earlier. Opposition was so severe that efforts to have the survey conducted were short lived. There was great difficulty in establishing any criteria for validation of a rating system.

Explanations and illustrations of four types of rating systems (Appendix III) were prepared for distribution to appointing authorities along with a statement of policy and intention by the Civil Service Commission (Appendix V).

All appointing officers and their personnel officers were asked to meet in Columbus on September 29, 1952 for discussion of the proposed merit-rating system. Two hundred seventy-five (275) officials and executives attended this meeting. Each person attending was furnished a copy of the four sample rating forms, an explanation of the forced-choice performance reporting system, (Appendix III) and the statement of policy and aims by the commission (Appendix V).
The purpose of the meeting and the policies and aims of the Civil Service Commission were explained to the group by General Macklin, Member of the commission. Appointing officers were requested to advise their subordinates of the plan for developing a performance evaluation system and to provide all employees with an opportunity to present their suggestions. The plan to utilize a committee of department representatives in developing the system was explained by the author and department heads were asked to volunteer for service on the committee either personally or by representative. Nineteen officials volunteered and the author was designated as chairman of the committee by the Civil Service Commission.

The sample rating forms were explained to the entire group by the author. The forced-choice system was again explained in the hope that some interest in developing an objective system might be found among the departments. Very little interest was expressed, however, and that quickly subsided. The officials were then told that a plan would be developed on the basis of suggestions made by the personnel in the departments. They were requested to make suggestions through representatives on the merit-rating committee or directly to the Civil Service Commission. After this explanation, department officials were given an opportunity to direct questions to the author. Most of the questions asked dealt with requirements of the law and plans and attitudes of the commission for developing a system of employee performance evaluation. The questions asked concerning the law indicated very little familiarity with the requirements of the law even on the part of officials.
After approximately three hours of discussion the majority of the group expressed approval of the commission's plan for developing a system of merit-rating. Practically all officials expressed willingness to cooperate and a number of them appeared eager to assist in developing a system which would aid in improving management.

The first meeting of the merit-rating committee was set for October 6, 1952 to provide time for committee members to study the proposed plans and receive suggestions from personnel in their departments. Department heads and committee members were urged to exert their best efforts to see that all state employees were informed on the proceedings as much as possible. Department heads were also requested to set up a procedure whereby all employees would be given an opportunity to present suggestions or complaints with respect to the rating system. Both department heads and committee members were asked to forward suggestions to the Civil Service Commission as soon as they were available so that as many suggestions as possible could be considered by the committee at its first meeting on October 6, 1952. Committee members were asked to examine the sample forms and be prepared to discuss the type of form considered most satisfactory for the State of Ohio.

During the time between September 29 and October 6 the commission received a number of letters from department officials expressing their preference for various types of forms and procedures for ratings. Several included copies of forms which had been used for departmental ratings.
An agenda for committee discussion was prepared in an effort to see that one problem would be discussed at a time. The time limitation required that the committee proceed as rapidly as possible with consideration of the problems.

On October 6, 1952 the following topics were presented to the committee as requiring agreement.

1. The type of evaluation form to be used.
2. The number of forms to be used.
3. The number of degrees of performance to be used.
4. The method to be used in collecting empirical data from within the organization.
5. Who shall do the actual rating?
6. Methods and procedures to be provided for review and appeal of ratings.
7. Whether employees shall have the right to see their ratings.
9. Whether raters shall be required to discuss ratings with employees.
11. Safeguards of employees' right to appeal.
12. Whether ratings shall be made annually or semiannually.
13. Differentiation between operative and supervisory and executive employees.

The committee members agreed to take up these topics one at a time and to make decisions on each before proceeding to the next, with the stipulation that all decisions so reached would be tentative. The members considered that in view of the need for haste in making decisions, all such decisions should be held tentative as long as possible. Several of the members considered that later decisions might alter their views on other questions. There appeared to be a general feeling among personnel officers that one preliminary rating of all employees should be made prior to the rating which would determine eligibility for the salary increment on July 1, 1953. The
committee members were therefore anxious to reach agreement on a system as soon as possible.

At the first meeting of the merit rating committee on October 6, 1952 one member suggested that one of the sample forms which had been developed as a basis for study should be adopted and immediately placed in operation. There was brief support for this proposal but suggestions for revisions and disagreement over which of the three subjective types should be used soon brought an end to the matter. The questions on the agenda were then taken up by the committee. The proposal that the rating system be kept as simple as possible was made repeatedly by members of the committee as discussions proceeded. After a brief discussion the committee agreed on the general type of rating form to be used. Most of the members favored the graphic scale type and as there was no serious opposition this type of rating form was quickly approved. The number of performance levels to be represented on the scale, however, brought out extensive disagreement. The question was postponed until agreement should be reached on the number of forms to be used.

Several members of the committee felt that a single form for such a large organization could not be successfully developed. A number of others insisted that the intent of the law would not be served unless a single form should be adopted for all employees. After brief discussion the members agreed to attempt to develop a single form with the stipulation that if a pilot study showed extensive difficulties in such a procedure, separate forms would be developed for different levels of employment.
The committee again disagreed on the number of levels of performance to be used on the rating scale. A number of the members had expressed a desire to use five levels of performance from "unsatisfactory" to "outstanding" as used on the sample forms. This group was determined to have at least four levels of performance while the other group was equally as determined to have only two levels. The discussion on this point brought out a basic difference of opinion on the part of members. One group felt that an employee had a right to know as accurately as possible just how well he had performed the duties of his job. The other group believed that an employee should not be told how well he was performing unless disciplinary action should be necessary. The latter group wanted the ratings to be simply "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory," and this information kept confidential in the personnel office. Their contention was that telling an employee that he had done a good job would give him a feeling of "superiority" and cause friction in the organization. After extended debate a compromise was proposed and tentative agreement was reached on three levels of performance; "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory" and "outstanding." Several members who had insisted on only two levels of performance gave notice that the question would be raised later in the discussions. A few of the members, it developed at this point, were basically opposed to any form of merit-rating and their only aim in serving on the committee was to keep the rating form as simple as possible.
The problem of determining validity and reliability of the rating form attracted little attention from most of the committee. A pilot study conducted with a selected group of state employees was suggested by the author but drew support from only four members. These four expressed willingness to select a pilot group from their departments for the purpose of testing forms and procedures. Approximately one-half of the members believed that a suitable rating form could be developed by a group of "experts" without any testing in the specific organization. The remainder of the committee agreed to the use of a pilot study to be conducted in the four departments.

The members were asked to give consideration to the following questions before the meeting to be held the succeeding week.

1. Who shall do the rating?
2. What procedures, if any, shall be provided for review and for appeals of ratings?
3. Shall employees have the right to see their ratings?

When the committee met on October 13, 1952, the chairman recommended that the immediate supervisor should initiate the rating and that the second level of supervision be responsible for review, with the ratings being forwarded through channels to the appointing authority who would provide for final appeal by dissatisfied employees. One appointing officer immediately stated that such a procedure would be impossible as in many cases the immediate supervisor was not known. It was further suggested that the lower levels of supervision could not be relied upon to perform the rating function. This question
provoked radical disagreement among the committee members and oc-
cupied most of the time allotted to the meeting. A small majority of
the committee favored the procedure proposed by the chairman but the
minority was determined in its effort to have a higher level of man-
agement do the actual rating. One appointing officer insisted that
he could rate all his employees accurately. After lengthy discussions
a member of the committee moved that a vote be taken on the chairman's
recommendation. The motion carried by a small margin and all members
appeared willing to abide by the wishes of the majority.

The question of having ratings explained to employees provoked
another period of disagreement. One member pointed out that unless
an employee had already attained step five in his grade he would dis-
cover whether his rating had been satisfactory when he received his
July pay. If the employee had attained step five his rating would be
of little importance to him. From this he concluded that no mention
of the rating to the employee would be necessary. Several members
contested this view at length while others supported it. A compromise
proposal brought about a vote of approval but did not result in agree-
ment. The committee approved a proposal to have unsatisfactory em-
ployees notified immediately and leave the notification of satisfac-
tory employees to the discretion of the appointing authority.

Due to the pressure of time the committee agreed to meet twice
each week until sufficient agreement could be reached to begin a
pilot study. Members were asked to be prepared to consider the
performance factors to be included on the rating form at the next
meeting. The procedure to be followed was for the committee to select all items which appeared to be necessary for appraising an employee's performance. Then from the information obtained through pilot studies, to eliminate as many of the duplicating items as possible.

At the next meeting the following resume of tentative agreements to this point was read to the committee.

1. To rely on a subjective system of merit rating.

2. To use three levels of performance on a graphic scale for the rating form, "unsatisfactory," "satisfactory," and "outstanding."

3. To have the immediate supervisor complete the performance report, the second level of supervision review, and the appointing authority have final action.

4. To attempt to develop a single form which would be used for all employees in the state service.

5. To require notification of employees who are rated "unsatisfactory" and to leave notification of others to the discretion of appointing authorities.

6. To conduct pilot studies in an effort to secure empirical data upon which to base judgment as to the content of rating forms.

Several members who had not been present at the preceding meetings raised objections to these points and the entire period was spent in the discussion of these items. A number of the objections and disagreements appeared to be a result of problems in semantics. Some of the extended discussions therefore resulted in clarification of misunderstandings. The process was time consuming but appeared to be very profitable in achieving understanding and cooperation among representatives of various departments.
The following several meetings were devoted to continued discussion of various questions which had already been covered, and to selection of the performance factors which should be included on the rating form. The method to be used in arriving at an overall rating came in for discussion several times during this period. One group contended for the use of a formula to arrive at an average of the factor ratings as the final rating. This group was divided on the type of formula to be used and some were not sure of the type of formula desired. The remainder of the committee favored leaving the determination of the overall rating to the rater as a matter of judgment. The proposals of the latter group were adopted by the committee after several hours of discussion.

At the meeting on October 28 a group of committee members made a determined effort to have the rating scale charged to contain only two levels of performance. The meeting was devoted almost entirely to this question. After extensive discussions a compromise was again proposed. It was suggested that a rating scale providing two adjective descriptions with four levels of performance be substituted for the three levels which had been previously adopted. The proposed scale appeared as follows:

```
  c  b  a
...---------...
Unsatisfactory
             Satisfactory
factory
```

The subdivisions of the satisfactory side of the scale were to be defined as: "a" Outstanding, "b" Good, and "c" Satisfactory.
Although this was not satisfactory to several of the members they all gave indication of being willing to accept it. This compromise was proposed by the author in an effort to achieve agreement in the committee without permitting the scale to be reduced to two levels of performance. The proposal was made with full knowledge that it would not be entirely satisfactory to either group. Those who opposed the larger scale intended to use this as a two level scale and those who had insisted on a more extensive scale wanted the adjectives to appear on the scale.

Little time was devoted to discussion of the content of the rating form during this meeting. The October 30 meeting was devoted to the selection of performance factors to be included in the form. After lengthy discussions the members agreed that each one would submit a list of the performance factors which he considered should be included on the form. The factors were to be submitted to the Civil Service Commission so that duplicates could be eliminated and a list compiled for consideration of the committee at its next meeting. The lists were promptly submitted and elimination of duplications left twenty-three factors. Definitions given by the members were combined to form the single definition for each factor. These were submitted to the committee at the next meeting and members approved the list with little discussion.

At this meeting seven members expressed willingness to cooperate in conducting the pilot study. The major part of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the procedures for conducting the pilot study.
During all this period the major part of the work had been done by from seven to ten members of the committee who attended most of the meetings. Other members attended occasionally but appeared to attend more to keep in touch with developments than to contribute to the development of a program. The members who did most of the work appeared to feel that cooperation among the various departments was essential. The group therefore continued to function in spite of difficulties and divergence of opinion which was sometimes basic. At this point the group agreed to proceed with preparation for the pilot study. Only the members who were participating in the pilot study planned to attend meetings until the pilot study should be completed.

Summary:

This system of employee performance evaluation was developed and installed under extreme pressure of time and in spite of opposition by some influential officials. These officials had delayed development of a system until at the time work began, there was less than a year in which to develop and install the system. This opposition hampered development of a system after work began and thus further reduced the effectiveness of the system.

The process of establishing objectives for the system, developing a rating system, installing and policing the system was assigned to the Civil Service Commission by the General Assembly. This resulted in a situation in which a staff agency had the responsibility of
determining objectives for line officials and executives.\textsuperscript{1} Although some line officials made plans for the use of the merit-rating system and established objectives for its use in their departments, a large number of executives and officials opposed any use of the system.

As a result of these conditions the system was developed to serve a minimum number of purposes. Efforts were made to get line officials to cooperate in developing the system with the commission acting in an advisory capacity only. This procedure frequently resulted in the adoption of practices of which the author did not approve. In spite of this, the practice seemed more advisable than that of developing a system without the cooperation of line officials. The latter procedure would, however, have met with the approval of approximately one-half of the executives and officials in the state service.

\textsuperscript{1} For an effective approach to such organizational problems see Ralph C. Davis, \textit{The Fundamentals of Top Management}, New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1951, pp. 323-541.
CHAPTER VI
THE PILOT STUDY

During October 1952, two departments conducted a limited pilot study for the purpose of checking form design. The four sample forms shown in Appendix III were used for the study. One of the first problems encountered was that of determining which employees should be rated on the form provided for supervisors. The distinction between operative, supervisory and executive employees proved to be a difficult one in several cases. The differentiation shown here was adopted because the type of distinction recommended by the author; Operative employees, Operative executives, Administrative executives, and professional employees, could not be agreed upon by committee members. Many of the executives considered "administrative duties" as being the process of carrying out orders and plans. Their concept would attribute administrative duties to all employees. Because of the different meanings attributed to the terms involved by executives in the service the three levels of employment listed above were adopted.

The appointing authorities appeared sincere in their efforts in this study but seemed to fear the results of requiring cooperation of minor executives. Much of the difficulty could probably have been avoided if time had permitted adequate discussion with the raters. The raters who participated in this study were asked for their comments on the forms. Their preference was almost invariably for the graphic scale, but they all objected to having the scale varied as it
was on the sample form. The obvious errors in rating on this scale were so numerous that any attempt to vary the scale was discarded.

The raters all objected to the ranking and check-list forms because of the apparent complexity. Objections were based on the contention that all the forms took too long to complete. A brief study of the results of these ratings indicated that raters in this organization would not be willing to use any form which required the rater to do more than make a few check marks. The lack of confidence in lower level executives, expressed by appointing authorities and employees, appeared to cause much of the difficulty. This lack of confidence along with the lack of training deprived supervisors of the authority and the techniques for doing sound merit-rating.

The chief decision which came out of this study was to make the rating scale uniform for each performance factor as it appears on the adopted rating form (Appendix VII). The study emphasized the need for simplicity in the rating form and procedures. Numerous errors were made by raters in spite of written instructions and oral discussions in training periods. The rating committee concluded from this study that only the most obvious procedures would be followed by a large percentage of the raters. The committee also took cognizance of the great need for rater training in the use of any program of merit-rating.

During the first three weeks of November 1952, forms were designed and procedures developed for the pilot study. This work was done on the basis of discussions in committee meetings and in consultation with the individual members. Plans were made to have the
immediate supervisor rank employees in order of performance, from best to poorest, using Form 1, Appendix VI, and after a period of two weeks to rate the same employees on the pilot rating form (Form 2, Appendix VI). It was also planned that where qualified raters could be found, more than one person would do the ranking and rating. Discussions with supervisors on the subject however revealed a reluctance to attempt such a procedure. The supervisors with whom the plan was discussed stated that they were not sufficiently familiar with any other group to be qualified for such ratings. One appointing authority reported that a number of supervisors in his department were familiar with employees' performance in two or more supervisory units and could rate two or three groups. The supervisors reported that employee turnover had altered this situation. They indicated that a few employees in other units could be rated by them but not enough to provide any accurate check of results. After discussion with a number of participating supervisors the plan to have more than one rating was dropped.

One of the major difficulties in conducting the pilot study was the fact that the majority of the executives and officials involved did not appear to appreciate the necessity of conducting such research in a scientific manner. The usual attitude appeared to be that if the form or procedure appeared suitable to them no further test should be necessary. This attitude appeared to hamper all efforts to conduct a valid pilot study.
Plans were made to collect as much information as possible on all employees included in the pilot study in the hope that some means of checking validity of the rating form could be found. An information sheet (Form 3, Appendix VI) was designed for this purpose. Members of the committee who were participating in the pilot study expressed their approval of the idea and purpose in gathering this information but most of them indicated that approval would have to come from higher officials in the departments.

The committee met on November 24, 1952 for the purpose of making final preparation for the pilot study. The forms and instructions shown in Appendix VI were approved with the provision that completion of the information sheet, Form 3, would be left to the discretion of the appointing authority in each case. This qualification was accepted in the hope that appointing authorities could be persuaded later to permit the names to appear. This was a usual situation because executives serving on the committee were almost invariably unwilling to make commitments for the department.

The procedures to be used in conducting the pilot study were discussed in detail. Participating members were furnished with a supply of all the forms and instructions for the study. Instructions to raters were discussed at length in an effort to coordinate the thinking of the members. The need for uniformity of instructions was emphasized. Two of the participating members requested and received technical assistance from the Civil Service Commission in conducting the pilot study. The others carried out the study with only occasional consultation with the commission representative.
An effort was made to have the pilot group represent as many
levels of employment as possible. A wide range, in the types of work
involved, was also sought. Groups were selected in units where a
number of persons worked under the same supervisor. The groups se­
lected were to contain not less than five nor more than twenty-five
persons. This was observed in most of the cases but a few of the
groups contained only three or four employees. The majority of the
rating units contained from six to ten employees.

Raters were given a list of the performance factors to be in­
cluded on the pilot rating form and asked to use these as a guide in
ranking the performance of employees. Discussion groups were ar­
ranged for raters to discuss the process of ranking. Instructions
were explained to all groups in as nearly the same language as possi­
ble in an effort to achieve as much uniformity as possible among the
groups. These training sessions were conducted in part by the author
and in part by personnel officers in the department involved. After
the rankings were completed all this information was turned over to
the Civil Service Commission and raters were instructed to forget the
rankings as much as possible.

Two weeks after the rankings were completed the raters were
given similar instructions in the use of the pilot rating form. The
author directed two of these sessions and the others were directed by
the personnel officers of the departments. Common rater tendencies
were discussed with the raters and they were asked to exercise their
best efforts in overcoming these tendencies. The factors on the rat­
ing form were explained as being only a means of aiding them in their
analysis of the employee's performance. The overall rating was ex-
plained as being simply a matter of judgment. The raters were asked
to consider it as such and exercise their best efforts to arrive at
sound decisions. They were again asked to consider only the employ-
ee's performance of the job to which he is assigned so as to omit
other considerations or characteristics which would not be pertinent
to job performance. This training was conducted in class sessions
in which raters were given an opportunity to ask questions of other
raters and the personnel office representatives. They were encouraged
to express their own opinions. The raters were then asked to rate
the same employees who had been ranked earlier but to disregard the
rankings as much as possible. All the raters contacted in this
study indicated a desire to perform the ratings as objectively as
possible.

The ratings were completed and forwarded to the Civil Service
Commission with little delay. The information sheets, giving personal
data about the ratees, were not completed in many cases. It appeared
at first that a sufficient number had been completed to serve the
purpose. A check of the completed sheets, however, showed the em-
ployees in each of the groups had been employed over such an extended
period of time and under such varying circumstances that little could
be gained from this source of information. In most cases formal edu-
cation was so nearly uniform as to be of little value for comparison.
Employment examinations had been administered at different times by the Civil Service Commission and by local boards so that no comparison of examination grades to rates was practical. The examinations, administered at different times and by different groups were not comparable. Also many of the employees were serving on provisional appointments in which case no examination had been given. The only check of the ratings which appeared effective was a check of reliability by comparison of the ratings with the rankings which had been completed two weeks earlier. This situation further reduced the possibility of accurately validating the rating system. The problems encountered in the pilot study indicated a need for extensive training in several departments. Training in this instance would consist largely of selling all levels of management on the value of merit-rating.

Examination of the information obtained in the pilot study resulted in a decision to avoid any complex statistical procedures in any analysis. The more complex types of correlation were omitted for a simple scatter plot with a trend line showing relationships. It was considered that this representation of relationships could be most easily explained to all personnel involved. Indications were that more complex procedures would result in distrust of conclusions by several personnel executives and by some officials.

The results of the pilot ranking and ratings were tabulated by rater and by department. Percentage agreement of rankings with ratings were calculated and scatter plots constructed (Appendix VIII).
The deviations of individual factors from overall ratings were also tabulated.

The percentage agreement of rankings with ratings were prepared in tabular form for presentation to the committee. No correlation other than the scatter plot with a trend line was made. The rankings and ratings of each rater were plotted on a graph with the four rating levels on the vertical axis and the rankings on the horizontal axis. The horizontal scale was adjusted in each case so that the graph would form a square (Appendix VIII). The ratings and rankings thus plotted would all fall on a trend line forming a forty-five degree angle from the horizontal scale, when a perfect relationship between rankings and ratings existed.

The tabulation of trait ratings and overall ratings showed very close agreement between the overall rating and the ratings on all twenty-three items on the form. A comparison of the ratings obtained on these forms with those on the previous pilot study showed, as nearly as could be determined, no deviation in ratings of individuals on the various forms. The previous ratings however were so incomplete that little if any inference may be drawn from this fact.

Discussions with individual members of the rating committee and with officials of the government indicated that many of the items on the pilot rating form were considered by them to be essential. These discussions indicated that several of those people would not agree to eliminate some of the items regardless of what statistical analysis might be presented. The agreement of overall ratings with rankings
of all factors was so great as to indicate that any such eliminations would have little if any effect on the final rating. In view of these attitudes, however, only the items showing less than one percent deviation from the overall rating were considered for elimination. Even these were left when extensive prejudice in their favor had been shown. Following this study and the discussions, items two and three, Industry and Initiative, which had been marked identically, were combined into one item. They were retained because of insistence by several officials and executives. Item seven, Cooperation, was eliminated and item eight, Punctuality and Attendance, was changed to read only, Attendance. The latter change was made because of numerous complaints by supervisors. Item thirteen, Ability to Learn, Item sixteen, Skill, and Item twenty-one, Effectiveness in promoting a high working morale, were eliminated. The ratings on these items had agreed with the overall ratings in more than ninety-nine percent of the cases. In those cases which did not agree there was not more than one degree of deviation.

The results of the pilot study indicated that the form would serve the purpose equally well if other items were eliminated. The cooperation of individuals who opposed further shortening however was considered to be more important than the advantages to be gained from further reduction of the length of the form.

Item twenty-four, which asked the rater what his action would be if he were in a position to hire this employee, appeared to show some inconsistencies in ratings. For this reason and because several of
the committee members favored retaining the item it was kept on the form.

The remaining seventeen items were placed on the rating form which was designed according to the desires of the majority of the committee. The form was to be printed on a sheet eleven by seventeen inches which would be folded to eight and one-half by eleven inches. The design of the form was checked with individual members of the committee as it was being developed. The participating members in the pilot study had been asked to forward the suggestions and criticisms of raters to the Civil Service Commission as soon as possible during the pilot study. Minor changes were made in the form design and in the wording of instructions on the basis of these suggestions. Further statistical analysis of the pilot study was not attempted because of skepticism on the part of some of the officials. Some of these officials expressed lack of understanding and distrust of any statistical analysis.

Summary:

The first pilot study attempted in October 1952 did not bring satisfactory results. Raters appeared willing to cooperate but did not appear to understand the principles of rating. It became obvious after a short period of time that they had not grasped the instructions. The results indicated a need for extensive training of raters in employee evaluation. The need for understanding of merit-rating and its possible values appeared to extend from officials through the lowest level of executives.
The pilot study conducted later proved to be more successful but still left much to be desired. More time was available for training of raters and they appeared to acquire a better understanding of the instructions. The reluctance of some officials to provide information, needed to complete the study, indicated a fear of such procedures and a lack of confidence in the researcher. This lack of confidence was frequently apparent and was eliminated only in cases in which the author was able to make extensive personal contacts with the officials. In both these studies the supervisors generally appeared willing to cooperate but seemed apprehensive of the results of the ratings.
CHAPTER VII
INSTALLATION OF RATING SYSTEM

On December 18, 1952 the merit rating committee met for the purpose of considering the report on the pilot study and to complete plans for the installation of the rating program. Members were provided with copies of the proposed rating form (Appendix VII) and instructions which were to appear in the instruction manual (Appendix IX).

Only one proposal for change in the rating form was made. It was suggested by one member that some of the items on the rating form were more important than others and should be given more weight than the others. It was pointed out that the final rating was to be left to the rater as a matter of judgment and that as ratings on items were not to be averaged in any way, weighting was not necessary. A number of the members however felt that some form of weighting was necessary. After a brief discussion the group agreed to designate items 1, 2, 5, 12, and 14 through 17 as critical items. These items were to appear on the form in heavy type and be explained as critical items in the manual. The final rating for an employee was not to be higher than the lowest rating on any of the applicable critical items.

With this agreement the committee voted to recommend the rating form (Appendix VII) to the Civil Service Commission for adoption. The group also voted to recommend that the commission conduct a
central training program in Columbus, Ohio. In this program representatives of the various departments would receive instructions in the use of the rating forms and in procedures for the conduct of training programs for raters in their departments. Members of the committee also requested that the commission make available to the departments, technical assistance for the conduct of supervisory training programs.

The procedure approved earlier by the committee provided that the original ratings should be retained in the personnel office of the various departments. The report to the Civil Service Commission was to consist of a certification to the effect that employees either had, or had not, achieved reasonable standards of efficiency upon rating by the immediate supervisor on C.S. Form No. 61 and approval of the appointing authority, in compliance with instructions in C.S. Form No. 62. The commission requested that a carbon copy of the first rating be forwarded to the commission for statistical analysis. This request brought objections from some members, but was approved when the provision was made that employees' names might be omitted from the carbon copy if the department head so desired. Opposition to submitting the actual ratings to the commission reportedly arose out of employees' fears of a return to political patronage.

When the provision for semianual ratings was mentioned several of the members expressed doubt that two ratings could reasonably be completed and reported to the commission by July 1, 1953. They based their opinions on experience in conducting the pilot study. These
persons insisted that completion of two ratings before July 1, 1953 would require immediate action in conducting training programs. This would not permit time for printing and distribution of the rating forms and manuals. As a result of these suggestions the committee voted to change the procedure to have one rating each year on March 31. Employees who received unsatisfactory ratings on that date would have the rating discussed with them immediately and be advised that another rating would be made on June 1 of the same year. The June 1 rating would be the only one reported to the Civil Service Commission for determining eligibility for pay increases.

The committee then voted to recommend these procedures to the Civil Service Commission for adoption along with the instructions used in the pilot study. The commission which was present at this meeting accepted the recommendations of the committee and approved the recommended form and procedures.

Preparation began immediately for printing the forms and manuals, and for the development of training programs. The final wording of the manual, the type sizes and design of the rating form were left to the discretion of the author.

Numerous occurrences during this study had indicated that employees, whether operative, supervisory or executive would not read extensive instructions. An extended effort was therefore made to keep the instruction manual as brief as possible. All the necessary instructions were worded carefully and tested on employees for clarity until the information was set forth as briefly as appeared possible.
without sacrificing clarity. The manual, as finally worded, contained seven pages typed double space.

The training program which was to be held in Columbus was designed to instruct department representatives in procedures for conducting the rater training programs in their departments. It was also necessary that most of the representatives be familiarized with the rating procedures. For this reason plans were made to illustrate step by step the process of rating for this group. The training of this group was planned as a one day program of lecture and discussion with both morning and afternoon sessions.

Each appointing authority was asked to make general plans for conducting a rater training program, and to notify the commission of the number of persons he planned to send to the training program in Columbus. They were also asked to designate the most convenient dates for their representatives to attend such a program. By January 26, 1953 all appointing authorities had responded and the program was set for February 5, 1953.

Copies of the completed rating form and the instruction manual were sent to all members of the merit rating committee as soon as they were available. Members were asked to acquaint department officials with the procedures and the form prior to the training session to be held in Columbus on February 5, 1953.

The training program began with a lecture by the author in which the method used in developing the rating program and the procedures adopted were explained. The rating form, the manual, and the general
principles upon which they were based were explained to the group. All trainees were provided with a copy of the rating form and manual. During the lecture the following points were especially stressed:

1. Make raters aware of common rater tendencies; especially "halo" - the tendency to give an overall high rating if the employee is very good in one respect; and "central tendency" - the tendency to assign an average rating when accurate rating is difficult or uncertain. Also the tendency of many raters to assign high ratings for fear of complaints by employees.

2. Hold discussion periods for raters in order to discover misunderstandings of instructions.

3. Stress constructive uses of ratings.

This group was urged to exert their best efforts to make raters aware of their responsibilities in making the ratings. The rating is simply a recording of the judgment of the rater and should be treated as such. The overall rating is not necessarily an average of the factor ratings, but the factor ratings are made for the purpose of analyzing the employee's performance as an aid to judgment in making the overall rating. No formula was used to obscure the fact that the rating is a matter of judgment. Efforts to use the average of traits as an overall rating should therefore be discouraged.

Discussion periods held during training should indicate to the instructor the points in his instruction which have not been clearly understood by trainees. The need for uniformity can best be served by making certain that all raters receive and understand the same instructions for making the ratings. Experience in completing sample ratings by trainees will also serve to facilitate the learning process and improve retention of instruction procedures on the part of the trainees.
The constructive uses of merit-rating should be given the major emphasis in training raters. The values to be gained from evaluation of subordinates' performance should be kept in mind constantly. Uses which may be made of rating results in encouraging and instructing employees should receive major emphasis rather than any negative uses which may be made of the results. Raters should be trained to discuss ratings objectively and constructively with their subordinates. While the rules of the commission do not require that satisfactory employees have their ratings discussed with them, the rating program and the results of ratings should be made known to employees as much as is possible. Employees will tend to distrust things with which they are not familiar. The rating program will have much better chances of success if employees are informed of all the procedure of ratings, appeals, and hearings.

Following the explanation of the background and operation of the system a demonstration of the rating procedure was given to the group. The rating form was projected onto a screen and a fictitious person rated while the demonstrator gave explanations of each step in the rating procedure. The procedure was demonstrated twice, making one rating for a satisfactory employee and one for an unsatisfactory employee. The meaning of critical items on the form was explained as the ratings were made and the method of arriving at the overall rating was again explained.

Following this explanation specific questions, which had been written in to the commission, were answered. After this, persons were
encouraged to make comments and ask questions from the floor. The entire afternoon session was devoted to questions and comments from the floor. The department representatives appeared cooperative and anxious to achieve uniformity in the ratings. Members of the group asked for further explanation of a number of points covered in the lecture period, particularly the rules and procedures required by the Civil Service Commission. A number of department representatives requested technical assistance in conducting training programs for the rating supervisors.

Following this meeting the rating forms and manuals were distributed to the departments as rapidly as the necessary information could be obtained. Several days were required to determine the number of raters and the number of employees in each department.

For several days following the February 5 training session the Civil Service Commission received numerous complaints from state employees, chiefly executives, concerning the procedures for the merit-rating system. The most common complaint was in reference to the requirement that the rating should be made by the immediate supervisor. There were frequent statements to the effect that immediate supervisors were not known either to the employees or to the appointing authority. There were also a number of complaints from operative employees during this period. The chief objection made by operative employees was that a rating should be made. Distrust of the ability of lower level supervisors to make a rating of employees' performance was expressed repeatedly by persons who telephoned, or came to the offices
of the Civil Service Commission in person. Numerous letters were also received from various departments, chiefly requesting additional information. A number of these questions were answered by simply quoting from the instruction manual which had been furnished to all executives and supervisors. Replies indicated that these answers were quite satisfactory. The commission continued to receive letters asking questions which were specifically answered in the manual until the rating program was completed in June 1953.

One of the chief difficulties in conducting the ratings was the lack of adequate organizational structure. Where an organizational structure had been developed the lower level executives often were not familiar with it. The rating program was being used in an effort to compel the development of a sound organizational structure which should have been a prerequisite to the rating program. A lack of confidence in lower levels of executives, as expressed by appointing officials and operative employees alike, also contributed to the problem.

Frequent inquiries and complaints from executives were received by the Civil Service Commission from the time the forms were distributed until the ratings were made on March 31, 1953. After that date letters, telephone calls and personal calls at the offices of the commission were substantially increased. During the first two weeks of April of 1953 there were almost constant telephone calls from employees who indicated that they had just discovered that the salary increment for July 1, 1953 would be contingent upon satisfactory
performance of the job. A number of employees complained before the ratings were completed. These persons indicated that a rating of "satisfactory" was expected and they therefore objected to the use of the system.

In spite of all the objections most officials and executives showed indications of a sincere effort to have the rating plan effectively carried out. A frequently expressed attitude was that judgment of the system should be withheld until after it had been given a fair trial in operation. Some officials and executives however were opposed to any form of merit-rating and objected to the plan at every opportunity. The majority of the executives and officials seemed to be willing to exert their best efforts to comply with the intent as well as the letter of the law.

The report of ratings to the Civil Service Commission was designed as a single form on which the departments simply listed the names of employees. The form used indicated whether employees were satisfactory and whether they were in step five of the pay range for their job or classification. Four forms were provided; one for employees who were below step five and satisfactory, one for those below step five and unsatisfactory, one for those in step five and satisfactory and one for those in step five and unsatisfactory. Appointing authorities were asked to certify satisfactory employees to the commission as soon as possible after the March 31 rating, and to report at that time the number only of unsatisfactory ratings given.
A carbon copy of the ratings was to be furnished to the commission for the first rating only. These were received from some departments by April 1, 1953 and from most departments by June 1, 1953. The ratings were tabulated by section and by department as they arrived at the offices of the commission. The overall ratings were recorded for all employees, (See Appendix X) and all ratings were examined for statements by raters and employees. Some of the smaller departments were slow in sending in returns and as a result the analysis presented here is based on the first 29,518 ratings received. A check of the distribution of the overall ratings for the first 24,000 ratings, and addition of the remaining 5,518 as they arrived, showed that this additional group resulted in changes in total ratings in any level of not more than one-tenth of one percent. As a result it was considered that the remaining ratings would not cause a significant percentage change in the results. For this reason the analysis was made on the basis of these ratings to avoid further delay. Some of the reports were not received until after July 1, 1953. In fact, ratings of employees in the Civil Service Commission were made on July 1, 1953. All reports were in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, however, in time for the employees to receive the salary increment on July 1, 1953.

The distribution of overall ratings in the state service (See Appendix XI) indicates that either a large number of state employees are outstanding or that raters did not accept the definitions of levels of performance as presented to them. The latter was very
obviously the case in some small units in which all employees were rated at the maximum on all traits. The ratings for all employees however indicate that most raters attempted to follow instructions and to make accurate ratings. The fear of penalizing subordinates because other raters would give high ratings was expressed by a number of raters. This may account largely for the fact that ratings clustered in the two highest levels on the scale. Conclusions drawn from this were that there was a great need for rater training. Such training would consist not only of instruction and communication between all levels of executives but would include communication between raters on the same level.

**Summary:**

The merit-rating system in Ohio was installed without adequate time for training raters. Procedures for training and for dealing with communication problems had to be developed along with the rating system. Efforts to achieve cooperation by executives and officials frequently resulted in compromise on what was considered to be sound procedures. The line organization which should have assumed leadership with technical assistance from the staff agency complied with the requirements of the law only after insistence by the staff agency.

The chief difficulties were objections from line officials, partial apathy from the staff agency, lack of time for completion of preliminary study, inadequate training facilities and insufficient time for training of raters.
CHAPTER VIII

RESULTS OF FIRST RATING

An attempt was made to compare the first general ratings with those made on the pilot study. Omitted names from the carbon copies, transfers and employee turnover however made such a comparison of little value. Ratings for less than one-half of the persons included in the pilot study could be accounted for. Numerous suggestions and complaints were received from employees in the various departments but none of them added appreciably to what had been received during the pilot study.

The overall ratings for the entire service were tabulated and a random sample was taken for analysis of individual items. The random sample was taken by placing the 29,518 ratings in stacks and taking each fiftieth rating beginning with the seventh from the top. Following this, each one-hundredth rating was taken beginning with the twentieth from the top. Addition of the second group to the sample showed no significant change in the percentage distribution of overall ratings and it was assumed that this would constitute a representative sample. In addition, all the ratings for employees in pay grade thirty-four and above (Salaries for this group ranged from $6,000 to approximately $10,000) were recorded for comparison with the total and with employees in other classes of jobs.

1 The first fifty ratings were numbered and a number between one and fifty selected by lot. The number drawn was seven.

2 The beginning number for this group was selected by lot as in the first case.
Reports to the Civil Service Commission indicated that 264 employees were rated as "unsatisfactory" as of March 31, 1953. As the names of the employees who received unsatisfactory ratings were withheld by some of the departments, a complete check was not possible. The majority of the departments did, however, make reports on this group for the purpose of study. (See Appendix X.) Of this group only seventy-seven were reported to have made statements in the space provided on the form. Fifty-one refused to sign the report to indicate that they had seen it. Fifty of these were in one unit and the report on the group indicated previous difficulty. The group appeared to have received indications that their ratings would not be satisfactory and each one refused to recognize the rating. All were advised of the rating to be made as of June 1, 1953, and told that if performance had improved sufficiently by that time the rating reported to the Civil Service Commission would be satisfactory. A report from the department about three weeks after ratings were discussed with employees indicated that production by the group had increased by an estimated twenty-five percent. All reports received on this point indicated that approximately twenty percent of the employees who received "unsatisfactory" ratings promised improvement. The reports indicated that the chief difficulty with this group was that the supervisors simply had not advised the employees of their shortcomings.

In one case an employee had been considered a "trouble maker" by his supervisors. One supervisor had initiated, but dropped, removal procedures against him. After the ratings his performance was
discussed with him and he expressed willingness to cooperate with the
supervisor in improving his work habits. Two months later the super­
visor reported that this employee had essentially corrected the con­
ditions which had caused his low rating. This supervisor expressed
surprise that the simple procedure of talking with the person should
accomplish so much. In the departments in which there was an active
interest in the program, follow-up studies and rater conferences were
held. These were designed to assist raters in achieving uniformity of
rating and in improving the constructive uses of ratings by an
interchange of ideas.

The reports, from departments from April 1, 1953 through July
1953, indicated that discussion of ratings with unsatisfactory employ­
ees had been followed by improvements in employee performance in more
than fifty percent of the cases. By June 1, 1953 resignations, trans­
fers, and improvements in performance left only seventy-nine employees
reported as "unsatisfactory." (Appendix X). Of this group eleven
were older employees who reportedly were retained on the payroll sim­
ply because of long service. As of June 1, 1953 only .83 percent of
all state employees were rated as "unsatisfactory," 10.25 percent were
rated as "satisfactory" "a". Examination of the ratings showed that
very small departments had given higher average ratings as a rule.
Some of the smallest departments rated all employees in the two
highest performance levels. The ratings taken in total showed a
distribution over the entire range of the scale. Although ratings
did not approximate a normal curve on the scale, examination of the
results from the entire state service indicate a sincere effort, on
the part of most agencies, to make fair and accurate ratings. The obviously slanted ratings were in very small units. This may be explained partially by the close contact of employee and supervisor in such cases but with this allowance some units were very high. In one small unit, in which the appointing authority was opposed to merit-rating, all employees were given the highest possible rating on every item on the rating form. This, however, was the exception, and while ratings of "a" or outstanding seemed too numerous, considering the state service as a whole the distribution appears sufficient to indicate a sincere effort to objectivity on the part of most of the department officials and executives.

Examination of the ratings by rater indicated a need for rater training in a number of cases, and this information was passed along to the department involved. Department heads were urged to recognize that rating is a continuous process and requires extensive training and follow-up by management if it is to be successful. A number of department heads expressed interest in continued operation of the program and requested advice and assistance from the commission in administration of the program. Some assistance was provided by the author but there was no adequate provision by the commission for such assistance. The only other assistance of this nature was that which could be provided by the member of the commission. One appointing authority who had opposed any form of merit-rating and had stated that the organizational structure of his unit was not known to himself or to his employees expressed vital interest in the results of the ratings.
He requested that he be advised of the results of any statistical analysis of the ratings in his department and a comparison of the department with other departments. He also asked advice on continued operation of the program, and indicated that he planned to have a semianual rating of all his employees and that ratings were to be discussed with all the employees.

In view of the expressed prejudices of many state officials toward statistical analysis few such procedures were employed in the analysis of ratings. Only the most simple and obvious procedures were used in explaining results. No explanation of procedures requiring the use of complex formulae was attempted. The reasons for this prejudice were often not clear. In some cases it seemed to be simply a fear of something which the person did not understand.

The total ratings for all departments were tabulated showing the total number of employees and the percentage rated in each of the four levels of performance for the entire state service and for each department. The random sample of ratings was studied in total for indications of rater tendencies. The statements as to whether the rater would be willing to take the employee if he were organizing a new unit were also checked. In some cases, after assigning a high rating, the rater indicated that he would not hire the employee. This was taken as inconsistent although the age of the employee was given as the reason for being unwilling to hire him in several cases. In more than ninety-five percent of the cases this statement appeared to be consistent with ratings assigned.
The results of the first rating considered along with the expressed attitudes of officials and executives offered little reason to attempt any extensive revision of the system at the time. The more advisable procedure at this point was, in the opinion of the author, that of education which would assist executives in discovering for themselves the value of practices which the Civil Service Commission was attempting to install. The distribution of ratings by department and for the entire state service was prepared in tabular form for the members of the merit rating committee (Appendix XI). Groups in which excessive discrepancies in ratings appeared to exist were also listed for each of the committee members for his department only.

The random sample of ratings was divided into groups according to pay range for the purpose of making comparison of ratings assigned to various levels of employees. An array of the number of employees in each pay range indicated a cluster at four points on the pay scale. On the basis of these clusters the scale was divided into four parts and the 885 ratings in the random sample tabulated in those classes (Table 13).

This comparison shows somewhat higher ratings for employees in higher pay ranges but probably no greater differences than would be expected. The employees in Group I of Table 13 are often in large groups with little contact with the rating supervisor. There is also a large turnover of employees in this group. Those in pay range thirty-four and above are executives and professional employees who in most cases would be in close contact with the appointing authority.
It may also be assumed that persons who acquire such positions have demonstrated the ability to achieve approval of their superiors.

**TABLE 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Pay range one to twelve</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Pay range thirteen to eighteen</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Pay range nineteen to thirty-three</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Pay range thirty-four to fifty-two</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All state employees in pay range thirty-four and above</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings for all state employees showed agreement of critical items with overall ratings with negligible exceptions. The random sample showed a correlation of overall with individual item ratings of .789. The like correlation of ratings for employees in pay range thirty-four and above was .734.\(^3\) This difference may perhaps be explained by the greater degree of contact between rater and ratee at the higher levels of employment.

The enactment of Substitute House Bill No. 484 by the one-hundredth General Assembly in 1953 necessitated a few changes in the

---

reporting procedures. Extensive efforts had been made by various 
groups to have the merit-rating provision removed from the law. 
Failing in this, a provision was inserted giving employees the right 
of direct appeal to the Civil Service Commission on unsatisfactory 
ratings. This provision was approved by the General Assembly. The 
reason for seeking this provision probably arose from the belief by 
a number of persons that the chief function of the Civil Service 
Commission should be that of protecting employees against capricious 
action by line officials. The form and instructions were changed 
to give effect to this provision and other minor revisions were made 
in the rating form (See Appendix XII).

A meeting of the merit rating committee was called for July 21, 
1953 for the purpose of considering changes in forms and procedures 
pursuant to the changes in the law and for consideration of recom­
 mendations based on experience gained from the first ratings. The 
changes made by the author to give effect to the new provisions of 
the law were approved after brief discussion and the committee turned 
its attention to the experience of the first ratings.

Although a number of changes in the rating form and procedures 
were suggested by committee members during the meeting, most of them 
had been thoroughly discussed earlier. The majority of the members 
favored retaining the items and definitions as they were. An atti­
tude expressed by several members was that more time should be

4 Cf. Torpey, op. cit., p. 2.
allowed for raters to become familiar with the system before any changes were made. As the results of the first rating showed little use of the space provided for comment it was suggested that such space be reduced to a minimum. The suggestion which met with approval of most of the members was that the form should be redesigned to place definitions in the manual and eliminate surplus space for comments. The object of these suggestions was to so reduce the form that it could be printed on a single sheet eight and one-half by eleven inches. The committee voted to recommend the form thus redesigned and the revised rating manual (Appendix XII) to the Civil Service Commission for approval.

The majority of the committee expressed satisfaction with the results of the first ratings. All members agreed that more time should be given to rater training. The one point, which the first rating appeared to prove to the committee members, was that a very extensive training program for raters would be imperative to the success of the rating system. In spite of this opinion few suggestions were presented for improving training procedures or facilities.

The following twelve steps were recommended to the Civil Service Commission by the author as being desirable if not necessary for the successful operation of the employee rating system.

1. Follow-up study and continued efforts to improve the employee performance evaluation system.

2. Development of administrative work measurement procedures.

3. Development of standards of production and standardization of all jobs.
4. Development of office procedures control.

5. Installation of training program for supervisors.

6. Simplification of the classification system.

7. Improved organizational structure and better distribution of information regarding the organizational structure.

8. Improved lines of communication both vertical and horizontal.

9. Development of a promotion procedure to hold good employees in the state service.

10. Publication of information concerning improved procedures to attract better employees to the state service.

11. Development of a program for providing pertinent information to all state employees.

12. Beginning of a program of test validation for future use in improvement of testing procedures.

The rating system at this time was represented to the commission as being only a beginning and requiring extensive follow-up study, training and improvement. Improvement of the general quality of management was urged as a necessary requisite to any system of employee performance evaluation.

Although the Civil Service Commission is, by law, given line authority with respect to the rating program, this authority likely can not be utilized successfully for accomplishment of the program set forth above. The logical solution would be that of providing assistance and advice to line officials in the hope that the value of such a program can eventually be demonstrated to their satisfaction. Members of the General Assembly appear to place too much reliance on the commission for leadership in line functions. The only explanation
available for this situation is that the Assembly members wish to insist on the use of certain management practices and lack adequate direct authority over the executive branch of the government.

In 1954 ten state employees appealed unsatisfactory ratings to the Civil Service Commission under provisions of Section 143.10(1) of the Ohio Revised Code as amended in 1953. All these appeals were pending with the commission in August, 1954. The reduced number of unsatisfactory ratings in 1954 over 1953 may indicate an improvement in employee performance, or it may bear out an opinion expressed by several administrators in 1951. In the opinion of these persons raters tend to make ratings more lenient each time the ratings are made under a system. An accurate conclusion on the question would require an objective measurement of employees' contributions in relation to the ratings during both years.

**Summary:**

The study of the first ratings of employees in the Ohio State service indicated that a reasonable beginning on a rating program had been made. Some executives expressed changes of attitude toward the program and indicated a willingness to continue work in an effort to improve the system. Many of the attitudes appeared little changed however and the fear of such a program remained in the minds of many state employees. The program remained in the position of having no

---

5 Survey conducted by the New York State Department of Civil Service in 1951.
objectives for the program established by line officials as a basis for development and use of a rating system. Many officials and executives continued to be fearful of new procedures.

Fear of change seemed to cause many officials to refuse to cooperate in the development of a well balanced management program. The logical procedure for the Civil Service Commission to follow would probably be the adoption of a long range program designed to educate both management and operative employees to the advantages of a well planned management program.
CHAPTER IX

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EMPLOYEE MERIT-RATING IN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS AND IN SELECTED INDUSTRIES

The differences in governmental organizations and business organizations make comparison somewhat difficult. Also the nature of procedures and results of merit-rating systems make a comparison of any system with another quite difficult except for some details of mechanical procedure. The variations in the degree of success of various systems however indicates that a study of differences and similarities of various systems should be of value. As some of the phases of planning and administration of rating system appear to be of greatest importance to their success these will be given major consideration in this chapter. Further complicating such comparison in this instance is the fact that the information available for governmental organizations is from an original survey while the information for business organizations is taken from published reports of surveys. The fact that inquiries were sent to all state governments and the available surveys of business organizations are of necessity selective introduces another possible inaccuracy to such comparison.

The most comprehensive recent study of employee merit-rating in business organizations was completed by Randolph Benjamin in 1952. The study covered 130 merit-rating systems in seventy-five plants. ¹

Comparisons will be made in so far as possible between this and the survey reported in Chapter III.

These studies indicate no significant difference in the manner of determining the overall rating or in weighting of traits as between the two groups of organizations. The use of adjectival and numerical rating scores also appears to be approximately equal in the two groups. Some business organizations omit the final rating, requiring only that the rater evaluate employees' performance on a list of performance traits or characteristics. This procedure is designed to require the supervisor to analyze the performance of his subordinates rather than simply appraise the individual.\(^2\) This practice was not observed in any of the governmental organizations included in this study.

The graphic scale is the most widely used type of rating in both business and governmental organizations. The check-list type of rating is reported in use in a small number of both types of organization. Two responding business organizations reported using the forced-choice type of rating\(^3\) while none of the responding governmental organizations reported using this type of rating. From these studies it appears that business organizations are somewhat more willing to utilize new developments in procedures such as the forced-choice system of performance reporting than are governmental organizations. This may be partially explained by the nature of government organizations and the difficulties involved in changing procedures once


\(^3\) Benjamin, *op. cit.* p. 293.
they are established. In a few cases the procedure is prescribed by law and could not be changed without amendment of the law.

The number of traits and the number of degrees of performance used on the rating scale show no noticeable difference between governmental and business organizations. The traits used also seem to be identical except that some difference of arrangement is used in governmental organizations due to the wide range of employee levels covered by a single procedure and form. Most of the systems used in governmental organizations utilized one form with additional traits added for executive employees.

Administrators in both government and business appear to agree generally that a rating plan should be developed for the specific organization in which it is to be used. The most noticeable difference in the attitudes of executives in state and local government, and those in business, is that dealing with employee participation in developing rating procedures. The business executives usually appear to favor having supervisors cooperate in the development of the rating plan. Such cooperation provides minor executives with practical experience in the operation and principles of the system. This should provide a more adequate means of training raters than a program designed to instruct raters in an existing plan of rating.4 A large percentage of government officials on the contrary seem to feel that the plan should be developed by experts in personnel management. The

---

4 Benjamin, op. cit. p. 293. Also Survey of Employee Rating Systems conducted by New York State Department of Civil Service in 1951.
latter course would appear to place an extensive burden for training of raters on management. This may partially explain the large number of complaints of inadequate staffing and poor training on the part of government administrators.

The uses made of rating results appear from these studies to be more of a positive nature in business than in governmental organizations. Business organizations offer more rewards to the employee who receives a high rating than do governmental organizations. (See Tables 4, 10, and 12). Available information also indicates that government agencies impose more penalties for low ratings. When rewards are linked with merit-rating in the state service the usual practice seems to be that of denying an "automatic" salary increment to the employee who does not receive a rating of stipulated level. Indications are that this procedure implies a penalty rather than a reward to the employees.

Statements made by government administrators generally listed training of rating supervisors as being of major importance to successful merit-rating with use of results and follow-up study given as next most important. Comments made by business executives indicated that they considered planning and definition of objectives as a prime requisite of any rating system. The study conducted by Benjamin indicates that business organizations usually employ merit-rating as a device to deal with specific problems. In state and local governmental agencies the usual procedure has been that administrative

\[5\text{ Ibid.}\]
agencies establish rating systems under compulsion of legal requirements, either statutory or constitutional (See Table 2). Business executives indicated that they consider that rating procedures should be worked out step by step with rating supervisors. The procedure thus would provide for planning and establishment of end objectives by top level management to be followed by planning for use of the program and its results at each level of management. Thus the rating system would serve specific purposes for each level of management and would facilitate accomplishment of employees' objectives. While these differences in attitude are obviously not universal the percentage of replies to these two surveys indicating such opinions in each case indicates some general difference in attitude between government and business executives. Although these differences in attitude are small, this slight difference may be of vital importance to the success of a rating program. The indicated difference is that a majority of government executives would use the rating system as an aid to development of a management program rather than as an aid in carrying out a plan. The business executive would use merit-rating to facilitate the achievement of objectives established by the overall plan.  


The majority of governmental organizations use a uniform rating form and procedures for all levels of employment whereas two or more forms seem to be the rule in business. Business firms included in this study as a rule used different forms for operative employees and for professional and executive employees. There were also many cases in which different forms were used for office employees. Where different forms were used for ratings in governmental organizations the usual demarcation was between departments rather than between various levels of employment. The only explanation found for the use of a single form in government agencies was the attitude found in the Ohio service. In this case the contention was that the uniformity of treatment required by law would not otherwise be served.

The percentage of governmental organizations which have raters discuss ratings with employees appears to be slightly greater than that for business. The number of business firms which failed to answer this question however makes this inference inconclusive.

Business organizations tend to complete ratings at more frequent intervals than do government agencies. Periods of time covered by ratings in business ranged from three months to six months and for government from three months to one year.

Other more extensive studies of specific rating systems in business organizations appear to bear out the conclusion that

---

8 Benjamin, op. cit. p. 294. Also survey conducted by the New York State Department of Civil Service in 1951.

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid.
cooperation among the various levels of management is essential to the success of a subjective rating system.  

TABLE 13
Uses Made of Merit-Ratings in Seventy-Five Selected Business Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Rating Results</th>
<th>Companies Reporting This Use</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To grant merit increases</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To tell employees where they stand</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine training needs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine promotibility</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To evaluate employees</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine eligibility for transfers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish layoff and recall lists</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As basis for demotions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve efficiency of departments</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As basis for disciplinary action</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation at end of probationary period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To locate special talents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To validate psychological tests</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine placement of employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


12 Benjamin, op. cit., p. 292.
Two considerations in particular appear necessary for the success of an employee rating program: adequate planning and support by top management, and clear understanding of objectives and cooperation by all levels of executives.¹³ These considerations will probably be necessary to any type of employee performance evaluation system¹⁴ as the usually stated objectives¹⁵ could not well be served without such understanding and cooperation.

Summary:

The chief difference in employee merit-rating systems in business as compared with governmental organizations seems to be that of planning and origination of the program. The rating programs studied in business organizations were most often adopted as a device for aiding in the solution to specific problems. In government the plan was most often adopted by executives as a result of a mandate by a legislative body. The types of rating forms used and the general mechanics of rating in both types of organizations studied are the same with negligible exceptions. A few business organizations showed some indications of being more willing than were governmental organizations to experiment with new procedures.

No practices were discovered in governmental organizations except those which had been used in business organizations. One of


¹⁴ Ahern, op. cit., p. 165.

¹⁵ Jucius, op. cit., p. 239.
the chief problems in both types of organization seem to be that of translating theory into the working situation.
Conclusions:

Available information indicates that state and local governmental organizations have in general lagged somewhat behind industry in the development and application of employee performance evaluation techniques. Although some states introduced merit rating early, comparatively little work appears to have been done in developing new or objective procedures. Many systems have been installed to meet legislative requirements and many of them have been discarded to be later readopted in only slightly revised form. The most recent available information indicates that many states continue to rely on political patronage for employee placement except where operations of the federal government require merit rating systems.

The nature and objectives of government organizations and the attitudes of persons involved do not appear to lend themselves well to the development of incentives for efficient operation. The service nature of governmental units tends to make the establishment of objective measurements of efficiency difficult in many cases. The degree of success of a government official is too often measured by the amount of money expended or by the number of employees under his direction. The incentive therefore can too easily be for inefficiency rather than for efficient operation. This absence of incentive to efficiency in government offices seems to result in a lack of interest...
in any procedure designed to reduce cost of operations. The author observed several cases in which officials and executives were apprehensive of changes in work procedures for fear of losing votes by reducing employment. The only adequate and lasting remedy for this situation, in the opinion of the author, would be a change in the nature of government organization to fix objectives and provide rewards for efficient operation.

Although improved techniques for employee performance evaluation would obviously be of value, the greatest need at present appears to be for adequate application of available techniques and their results. Unless the values available from present procedures can be utilized at least to some extent, more accurate or more scientific techniques would appear to be of little use. As unused rating results would be of little value regardless of accuracy, the scientific application of existing techniques would appear to offer the most rewarding field for improvements in governmental organizations. Lack of understanding and interest on the part of government officials appears to be the greatest deterrent to adequate utilization of available techniques and procedures for employee performance evaluation.

The staff function of installing sound employee performance evaluation theories and procedures in a governmental organization is a lengthy and difficult task. Its success will probably require education of management, labor, and to some extent the general public. Theories can be of little value unless they are accepted and their application in the work situation can be seen by persons who must
use them. One of the major problems at present seems to be that of presenting the theories to such executives and officials in such a manner that they will be understood. Achievement of such understanding will likely require increased interest in the program by line officials. Indications from this study are that extensive efforts by executives are necessary to such understanding and to the success of a rating program. In the absence of some rewards for efficiency the necessary efforts will likely not be exerted.

Indications from this study are that unity of purpose among all levels of management is essential to the success of any program of employee performance evaluation. Dissatisfaction or inertia on the part of any large group of management will probably result in failure of the system to achieve its purposes. Resistance may be active, passive, intentional or unintentional with essentially the same resultant effect on the program. Lack of understanding may destroy a system as quickly as deliberate sabotage.\(^1\) For these reasons the author recommended to the departments that ratings be made more frequently than annually, also that a periodic audit be made by the Civil Service Commission and that provision for rater training be made.

Opinions and attitudes of officials and executives, as expressed during the development and installation of the Ohio merit-rating system indicated that extensive follow-up would be necessary to the success of the system. These attitudes further indicated that without increased interest on the part of some officials the system would

\(^{1}\) Cf. Driver, op. cit. p. 99.
likely become ineffective after a year or two. Without increased interest in the program by line officials, it appears likely that efforts of the employees' association to disassociate pay increments with the ratings may be successful in 1955. Such a development would likely cause the system to fall quickly into disuse in most of the departments. The fact that no ratings were ever provided for under Section 143.24 of the Ohio Revised Code bears further evidence to this effect.

The chief benefits derived from the program in Ohio may well be the understandings gained from exchange of ideas by representatives of various departments in developing the rating program. A number of improvements in management procedures appear to have been made as a result of the program. Information and understanding gained from exchanges of ideas in this program will likely benefit many units of the government by improving general management. The process employed in planning the program should prove beneficial in pointing up some of the advantages of exchanges of ideas among executives, officials and operative employees. Some administrators appeared to discover the value of a well planned management program during their participation in the work of the merit rating committee. Several of these officials indicated interest in developing more adequate organizational structure and defining such structure for subordinates.

These persons had approached the problem with skepticism but with reserved judgment pending some experimentation. When procedures could be shown by experience to be of value, they were willing to
accept them. Some officials and executives however assumed the
attitude expressed by a speaker at the Civil Service Assembly con­
ference in Cincinnati, Ohio; "Merit-rating is one of the imponder­
able impossibilities." Those who held this opinion exerted their
best efforts to see that no system was developed, and after it was
developed, to see that it was not used.

Lack of understanding by top officials of the broad phases of
personnel problems seems to be one of the major problems in dealing
with employee evaluation. The length of time allowed by the General
Assembly for development of the classification system, and for
preparation of specifications and allocation of positions, indicates
that the members of that body may not fully appreciate the
problems involved in developing such a program. The time allowed
for developing the rating system, however, should have been adequate
if comprehensive planning had preceded the development of the classi­
fication system.

The classification appears to be unnecessarily extensive, com­
plex, and sometimes vague in its meaning. The haste with which the
system was developed and installed appears to have resulted in brief
and hastily written class descriptions in many cases. Furthermore

---

2 Statement made by Donald J. Sublet, Secretary, Civil Service
Commission, Detroit, Michigan, in Panel Discussion at the Civil Ser­
vice Assembly Conference, Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio,
May 13, 1953.


4 Laws of Ohio, Revised Code, Section 143.09.
the number of classifications, already extensive, began to be increased soon after the installation of the system. It was increased from approximately nine hundred classes to well over one thousand classes in less than two years after its original installation. The desire for one position classifications on the part of some executives seems to be unsurpressable.

One of the purposes of the employee performance evaluation system in Ohio, as established by the Civil Service Commission, was to induce improvements in organizational structure and in personnel practices. The results in some departments were gratifying, while in other cases little if any improvement was accomplished. In some cases executives had fixed attitudes toward personnel management in all its phases and were not willing to change these attitudes or their practices. In these cases it appears that no amount of statistical evidence or scientifically valid and reliable procedures would be accepted. The only apparent solution to this situation would be a change in the system of compensation to provide incentives for efficiency of operation on the part of executives and officials.

**Suggestions - Specific:**

Indications are that the most successful procedure for solving the employee evaluation problems in the state service of Ohio would be a general program of management development. Although a system for providing incentives for officials and executives would be highly desirable and perhaps necessary to permanent solution of the problems, extensive improvements could be made under the existing system. A
program of management improvement would not necessarily require legislative action. Plans could be made and carried out by the executive branch of the government. The only requirement would be a clear understanding of the fundamental principles of management on the part of the chief executive and his immediate subordinates.\(^5\)

A sound plan of procedure would be to place each function of management in proper perspective to the entire organization and its objectives. Such a plan would establish major objectives for the entire organization and specific objectives for each unit.\(^6\) Likewise each management device and each program, such as the merit rating system, would have a specific purpose to serve. These purposes would be so designed and so related as to contribute directly to the major objectives of the entire organization. The function of which the organization appears to be in greatest need is that of long range planning in regard to personnel problems with an understanding of the entire organization and its objectives. Again, such plans would likely achieve little unless some means can be found to motivate the officials and executives to efficiency. One of the complicating factors in establishing incentives for state employees is the Civil Service law which, while designed to promote efficiency and prevent the use of political patronage, tends to protect employees in their positions. This does not provide the sort of situation in


which officials and executives can well be motivated to achieve efficient performance.

The personnel program and policies should be integrated but sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of a greatly varied organization. Departments having 10,000 employees will doubtless face very different problems from those of the departments having fifty or less employees. The classification system and all other devices used for personnel management should be as simple as practicable, and should be designed to facilitate administration.\(^7\) Once simplicity has been achieved constant care will likely be required to avoid having the system grow gradually back into its original complex state.

Although some efforts have been made to acquaint employees with the classification system these efforts should be continued. More extensive efforts should be devoted to employee communication. This should include both vertical and horizontal communication in the organizational structure and should be well planned to provide employees with pertinent information. In addition to improving attitudes and performance of employees, such a program would provide management with a better understanding of the organizational structure and of employee attitudes.

The open door policy appears to be working effectively in a few cases. Getting employees to bring problems and suggestions to

\(^7\) For a complete discussion of this problem see: Reign Bittner, "Developing an Employee Merit Rating Procedure," Rating Employee and Supervisory Performance, New York, American Management Association, 1951, pp. 20-34.
executives, however, requires confidence in the intentions and the good judgment of the executives on the part of employees. The fear of unfavorable reactions by fellow employees and supervisors also must be overcome in many cases. The number of supposed differences of opinion resolved by the members of the merit rating committee during this program seems to indicate that continuation of such discussions would improve understanding among the various departments. The exchanges of ideas during these meetings appeared to cause a number of persons to develop respect for the opinions of others in the service. The simple process of discussion often resolved misunderstandings with the conclusion that no real disagreement had ever existed. Provisions for such discussions would likely promote needed cooperation among various departments in developing improved personnel practices.

The twelve point program outlined in Chapter VIII was presented to the Civil Service Commission as a program which might eventually be "sold" to officials and thereby result in improvements in general management. In any event, gradual changes through training would probably be more advisable than radical changes. The habits and customs of long time employees can not be changed quickly. A large number of persons must be dealt with in this organization and their prestige and ambitions must be handled with care. The informal organizations and informal positions have been shown repeatedly to be of vital importance. This opposition can best be overcome by demonstrating the advantages of changes. This may be carried out by the Civil
Service Commission, as a staff function, but will require the cooperation of line officials, and perhaps of the General Assembly, in providing incentives to employees.

The greatest problem appears to be not a lack of techniques and procedures but inadequate application of known devices, probably resulting from lack of incentives. This includes not only theories of personnel management but also procedures provided by law and by administrative rules. Many complaints were received from appointing authorities to the effect that discipline could not be adequately enforced because of civil service rules, which protected inefficient employees. The statement, "We can not dismiss an employee," was made repeatedly by officials. Here again part of the problem appears to be inadequate attention to the duties and responsibilities of management. Although this complaint seemed to be partially justified, a check of laws and of civil service rules showed that removal procedures were fairly well defined and that an employee could be removed for cause. As a reversal of an appointing authority's action in such cases requires unanimous approval by the Civil Service Commission, it would seem that a reasonably well prepared case would stand in case of appeal. There is a possibility of a police attitude on the part of commissioners. If reasonable cause exists, however, it would appear that one commissioner would uphold the appointing officer's action.

---

9 Cf. Torpy, op. cit. p.2.
These problems likely can not be solved by legislation alone. Their solution would require changes of attitude on the part of numerous persons from members of the General Assembly through many operative employees. Of vital importance is the nature of the organization which gives all employees the right to cast a vote each biennium for or against the officials of the organization. Indications are that some officials attach an importance to this vote out of all proportion to its relative importance in elections.

The present process of writing legislation might well be examined by the General Assembly. Although members of the General Assembly obviously must have extensive assistance in preparation of legislation it would seem that the top management group in the governmental organization should exercise leadership in management functions. Legislation dealing with classification and pay ranges might well be developed by an impartial person or group. The process of having legislation drafted by employee organizations in cooperation with a group of employees could lead to undesirable practices. If the initiative for developing adequate legislation regarding salaries is left to employee groups, those who take the initiative in introducing bills in the legislature could benefit to the exclusion of other employees. Such inequities might result in the loss of employee efficiency, the cost of which would exceed the cost of writing adequate legislation. This situation might be remedied by the executive branch of the government by defining lines of communication and requiring that such recommendations be forwarded to the General Assembly through channels.
Suggestions - General:

It appears from this study that in any case a system of employee performance evaluation should be subsequent to and coordinated with a well developed job evaluation and classification system. This system in turn would be only a part of a well planned program of management development. The functions and performance of management should be adequately developed before employees are expected to perform according to standards. Also, performance standards should be adequately developed and clearly defined before employees are expected to meet them. The organizational structure should be clearly defined and all management and employees acquainted with lines of authority and responsibility. Although devices such as merit-rating procedures may be used to induce improvements in management structure, the more advisable procedure is that of developing plans and procedures in the order stated above.

Good lines of communication are necessary to avoiding misunderstandings and dissension among employees and management. An open door policy will aid in developing and maintaining such lines of communication but its success requires extensive positive action by the executive. He must create confidence in himself on the part of his subordinates. Such confidence requires time to develop but can be destroyed easily and quickly. This study seems to indicate that the need for adequate lines of communication can not be over stressed. The complaints and problems which were resolved by the process of discussion during the study indicates that perhaps a majority of the
complaints could be either reduced or eliminated by proper communication procedures.

The results of this study indicate that in many cases private businesses have progressed much farther than state governments in the installation of employee relations practices. If governmental organizations are to compete with private business for competent employees, some effort must be made to keep pace with developments in these organizations.\textsuperscript{10}

State and local governmental organizations studied in this investigation offer little of value on the problems of employee performance evaluation except what has already been applied in private business. The quest for security rather than opportunity seems to dominate the thinking of many government employees. This, along with fixed relationships resulting from traditions of long standing, appears to limit the use of incentives for efficient operation.

The most satisfactory method of dealing with existing conditions in state government appear from this inquiry to be for the chief executive to assume leadership in development of a program for management improvement. Such a program might be developed in the following steps.

1. Planning

   A. Establish objectives for the organization and for each unit.

   B. Establish and clearly define the organizational structure.

\textsuperscript{10} Bittner, \textit{op. cit.} p. 20.
2. Selling of plan to legislative body, officials and executives.

3. Development of a comprehensive job evaluation system.


5. Development of a budget control system.
   A. Establishment of procedures control systems.
   B. Establishment of standards of performance where possible.


   A. Establishment of objectives for performance evaluation system in relation to existing problems.
   B. Explain objectives to officials and executives. Show objectives for entire organization and how to develop specific objectives for each unit.
   C. Ask cooperation of all state employees in developing plan.
   D. Conduct extensive study to determine best system for the specific organization.
   E. Give employees a part in development of the program.
   F. Use all available methods for validation of system.
   G. Treat installation of program as only a beginning.
   H. Conduct continuing campaign to keep employees informed.

Plans for increasing efficiency should be put into operation gradually so as to reduce the number of employees by failing to replace employees who are separated from the service for any reason. This would preclude the necessity of layoffs and thus avoid discontent among employees who might otherwise be fearful of losing their jobs.
One of the chief conclusions drawn from this investigation is that adequate planning of objectives by top management must precede the use of a merit-rating program if success is to be expected. Merit-rating should be of extensive value in a proper setting but simply thrown into a situation to correct difficulties without clear definition of objectives, its value will probably be negligible. An adequate plan of over-all management is likely essential to the success of any merit-rating program. Such plans must be developed by and supported by top management.\footnote{For complete explanation of planning for merit-rating see Michael J. Jucius, \textit{Personnel Management}, Chicago, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1951, Chapters I and IV.}

Developments in the forced-choice type of employee performance evaluation along with studies in leadership and other personnel problems appear to offer hope for extensive improvements in the means of employee performance evaluation for the future. The most pressing need in state government at present, however, appears to be for a change in attitude toward the use of such procedures. If full utilization of the procedures mentioned above is to be realized when they are adequately developed, sound planning and utilization of other management devices must precede their installation.
APPENDIX I

Questions Used In Survey By New York State Department of Civil Service In 1951

The following questions were asked of forty-one state and twenty-two of the larger county and municipal jurisdictions.

1. Do you have a formal program for periodically rating the work performance of your employees? Yes . No

2. What is the legal basis of the rating program in use?
   A. Constitutional provision?
   B. Statute?
   C. Rules and regulations of central personnel agency?
   D. Constitutional Provision and statute?
   E. Constitutional provision and rules and regulations?
   F. Statute and rules and regulations?
   G. All of above?

3. Is rating procedure detailed in legal basis? Yes . No
   If no, is procedure:
   A. Prescribed by central personnel agency?
   B. Determined by individual operating agency?

4. Are all competitive employees rated? Yes . No
   Groups excluded?

5. Are employees not required to take examinations before appointment rated? Yes . No

6. In your opinion, does your present rating system satisfactorily accomplish its objectives?

7. Do you believe that your employees are satisfied with your present rating system?
8. Does your rating program apply:
   A. Only to permanent employees? Yes__ No__
   B. To both permanent and provisional employees? Yes__ No__
   Groups excluded?

9. What is the minimum length of service before an employee is rated?
   Does minimum apply to all groups?

10. Do you have a probationary period? Yes__ No__
    If yes, are employees rated during this period?
    Yes__ No__
    If yes, how often?

    Do rating procedures differ from that used for rating of permanent employees? Yes__ No__
    How?

11. Are actual ratings originated by:
    A. Immediate supervisor?___
    B. Second level supervisor?___
    C. Higher level supervisor?___
    D. Immediate and second level supervisor?___
    E. Immediate and higher level supervisor?___
    F. All levels?___
    Is rating reviewed by higher than rating level?___

12. What type of rating is assigned to the employee?
    A. Adjective_. Number of rating levels___________.
    B. Numerical_. Range___________________________.
    C. Both_.

13. Is employee notified of rating?
    A. In all cases__. 
    B. Only if unsatisfactory__
    C. In no instance__
    Is employee notified by:
    A. Letter?__
    B. Interview?__
    If by interview, are ratings discussed?
    A. In all cases__
    B. Only if unsatisfactory__
14. Do interviews take place:
   A. After original rating? ___.
   B. After review? ___.
   C. During rating process? ___.

15. Is employee told reason for the rating? Yes ___. No ___.
   A. Merely notified? ___.
   B. Notified of appeal procedure? ___.

16. Are ratings made public? Yes ___. No ___.

17. May an employee appeal a "satisfactory" rating? Yes ___. No ___.
   If yes, to whom?
   A. To departmental review officials ___.
   B. To department, thence to central personnel agency ___.
   C. To central personnel agency directly ___.

18. Do you have formal appeal procedures for employees receiving "unsatisfactory" ratings? Yes ___. No ___.
   If yes, to whom?
   A. To departmental review officials ___.
   B. To department, thence to central personnel agency ___.
   C. To central personnel agency directly ___.

19. Does central personnel agency exercise any control over department's ratings? Yes ___. No ___.

20. Is a uniform procedure required for all departments? Yes ___. No ___.

21. Do forms differ:
   A. By departments? ___.
   B. By duties? ___.

22. Do forms differentiate between supervisory and non-supervisory employees? Yes ___. No ___. How?
   A. By additional traits for supervisory employees ___.
   B. By varied weightings ___.

23. Are special forms used in reporting employees as "unsatisfactory?" Yes ___. No ___.

24. Is additional information required for:
   A. Unsatisfactory ratings? Yes ___. No ___.
   B. Ratings at maximum of rating scale? Yes ___. No ___.

25. Is tardiness considered and reported apart from overall ratings? Yes ___. No ___.
   If yes, are special forms used? Yes ___. No ___.
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26. What penalties are imposed for unsatisfactory ratings?
   A. Dismissal___
   B. Denial of salary increment___
   C. Probation pending re-rating___
   D. Demotion___
   E. Loss of promotion rights___
   F. Transfer___
   G. No fixed penalty___
   H. Suspension___
   I. Loss of tenure credits___
   J. Salary decrease___
   K. Reprimand___

27. Does a rating of "unsatisfactory" debar an employee from promotion examinations? Yes___ No___
   Employee is debarred until rated "satisfactory."___

28. If ratings are used in promotion examinations, does examination section require:
   A. A numerical rating?___
   B. A statement of satisfactory performance?___

29. Are numerical ratings averaged into final grade of promotion examination? Yes___ No___
   If yes, what is usual weight given them?______________________

30. What administrative purposes are served by your rating program?
   A. Salary increment determination___
   B. Promotion examinations___
   C. Determining additional training needs___
   D. Determining provisional promotions___
   E. Improving employee performance___
   F. Determining transfer to other duties___
   G. Determining demotions___
   H. Initiating discharge proceedings___
   I. (Other) Lay-off, re-employment lists, etc.

31. Do you have a training program for raters? Yes___ No___
   If yes, what methods are used?
   A. Classroom sessions___
   B. Conference of raters___
   C. Written materials, manuals, etc.__________________________

32. Are written performance standards used for guidance of raters? Yes___ No___
APPENDIX II

Pay Grades For Ohio State Employees

Ohio Revised Code Section 143.10

(A) All employees working for the state or any of the several departments, commissions, bureaus, boards, or councils of the state, except those excluded in section 143.09 of the Revised Code, shall be paid a salary or wage in accordance with one of the following pay ranges, set up in monthly amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Range Number</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Range Number</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Step 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F) New employees shall be employed at the minimum rates in each pay range except that the commission may authorize the employment of new employees at a beginning salary or wage equal to the second step within the pay range of the particular classification, if employment conditions existing at a particular time require it, . . .

(I) . . . Beginning July 1 following his employment, each employee who has completed at least ninety days of service in any position, office or employment and who is below the maximum salary step in the pay range to which his position, office or employment is assigned, shall receive an automatic salary adjustment to the next
higher step within the pay range for his class or grade. On July 1 of each year thereafter, until the highest step in the pay range is reached, each employee shall receive an automatic salary adjustment equivalent to the next higher step within the pay range for his class or grade. Provided that on and after July 1, 1954, such adjustments shall be automatic for each employee when his service rating, as shown by the current or last performance report is equal to or higher than reasonable standards of efficiency to be fixed by the commission ...

Section 143.11 (A) The *** positions, offices, and employments established in section 143.09 of the Revised Code are hereby assigned to the pay ranges established in section 143.10 of the Revised Code, in accordance with the following schedule:

PAY RANGE NO. 7 — ($132-$138-$145-$152-$160 per month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class No.</th>
<th>Class Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5440</td>
<td>House Parent Trainee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAY RANGE NO. 8 — ($138-$145-$152-$160-$168 per month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class No.</th>
<th>Class Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0005</td>
<td>Elevator Operator I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAY RANGE NO. 51 — ($980-$1020-$1060-$1100-$1150 per month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class No.</th>
<th>Class Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4530</td>
<td>Superintendent, Ohio Tuberculosis Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4455</td>
<td>Chief, Division of Mental Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
The following forms for employee performance evaluation are presented only for the purpose of illustrating the general types of rating systems which are available. Except for the forced-choice type of ratings, they are of the traditional subjective type. The forced-choice type of ratings utilize a statistical technique which has proved to be highly effective in at least one large industrial organization. Its results are far more objective than any of the other types of rating systems. The other forms of necessity rely on the good judgment of the rater. The listing of performance traits on the rating forms is for the purpose of aiding the rater to analyze the employee's performance. Final ratings are left to the judgment of the rater and are not necessarily an average of the ratings on the individual traits. The traits listed on these forms are for purposes of illustration only and a form to be used in the state of Ohio may well include more or fewer traits.

These forms are not recommended as suitable for any particular organization. Regardless of the type of form or forms which may be selected for use in this organization the forms should be developed to suit the purposes and functions to be served here. A rating system adopted in any other way will likely prove unsatisfactory and fail to achieve its objectives.
The Forced-Choice System of Employee Performance Reporting

Studies show that supervisors, in describing an employee's performance frequently use statements which are equally applicable to both good and poor employees. The result is that descriptions of good and poor employees both contain a number of what appear to be favorable and unfavorable statements. Experimental studies made with people in the organization can show that two statements may appear equally attractive, but one of them will indicate a good performance and the other will not. This characteristic of human behavior is the basis for the forced-choice system of performance reporting.

The forced-choice system is developed by having a number of persons from within the organization describe the work performance of the best and the poorest employees they know. From these descriptions large numbers of descriptive statements are taken. By comparing these statements with the overall appraisal of the employee it is possible to determine which statements the people in this organization would use in describing the pertinent characteristics of the best employees and which they would use to describe the poorest employees. Other statements, favorable and unfavorable, will be found to apply equally to both good and poor performance but will not be indicative of either a good or poor performance. It can also be determined experimentally whether the statements appear equally favorable to raters. Thus from these performance descriptions a large number of descriptive statements is developed. The statements are arranged in blocks of four as in the attached illustration. Each block contains two pairs of state-
ments, one favorable and the other unfavorable. These pairs are so
arranged that each statement in a pair will appear equally favorable or
unfavorable, but one will distinguish between a good and poor perform-
ance. The rater is required to select one of two equally attractive
statements which most nearly describes the performance of the employee.
The rater can not know which of the statements will result in a high
rating for the employee. The rater is required to list the employee's
strong and weak points. These are scored in the central office on the
basis of a carefully worked out and validated procedure. Such scoring
is proved experimentally to be accurate within very narrow limits.
ILLUSTRATION OF FORCED-CHOICE SYSTEM

Read each block of statements carefully. Decide which statement most nearly describes the person as he does his job. Then in the column headed MOST, place an X over the letter which goes with that statement. Next decide which statement least describes the person as he does his job. Under the column headed LEAST place an X over the letter which goes with that statement. Mark only one answer under MOST and one under LEAST in each block of statements.

1

MOST          LEAST
A  A  Familiar with all phases of the business.
B  B  Capable of doing more important work.
C  C  Needs close supervision.
D  D  Inclined to make hasty decisions.

2

MOST          LEAST
A  A  Should be more business-like.
B  B  Has outstanding ability.
C  C  Some question about his health.
D  D  Uses written reports skillfully.

3

MOST          LEAST
A  A  Has mechanical sense.
B  B  Very serious-minded.
C  C  Has capacity for better work.
D  D  Looks like a "comer."

Illustration

MOST          LEAST
A  A
X  B
C  X
D  D
INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING

Read carefully the definition of the first factor, then read carefully all the statements under that factor in the rating form, place a check mark (✓) in the blank to the left of the statement which most nearly applies to this employee. If more than one statement applies, check more than one, but indicate, by placing the figure (l) to the left of the blank, which statement most nearly fits the ratee.

Rate all employees on the first factor, then follow the same process for the second factor, and then for the third and so forth, until all forms are completed.

I. Attention to Details: This factor relates to the extent to which the person understands the need for completing the necessary minor phases of the duties of his job, and the extent to which he is willing and able to complete those phases of his work without undue delay. It applies only to directing and seeing that work is done and not necessarily actual performance of work.

II. Attention to Major Objectives of the Service: The extent to which the person understands the over-all objectives of the organization of which he is a part, and his ability and willingness to direct his efforts toward economical achievement of those aims.

III. Initiative: The extent to which the ratee understands the objectives of his organization, and directs his efforts toward achieving those objectives without constant direction.

IV. Leadership: The ability of the individual to so influence other persons that they will willingly follow his suggestions, and cooperate with him in achieving the objectives of the organization. The ability to direct the efforts of others in such a manner that their efforts to follow his suggestions as requests are willingly and thoroughly given.

V. Relations With Others: The manner in which the person treats other people in the work situation, whether subordinates, superiors, or fellow workers. The extent to which others either like or dislike to work with the person.
SUPERVISORY

Name____________________________________ Date of appointment to present position___________

I. Attention to details:
   _Carefully directs completion of all details.
   _Is aware of necessity of completing details, but does not always see them through to completion.
   _Neglects details.

II. Attention to major objectives of the service:
   _Is not aware of the major objectives of the service.
   _Directs efforts toward achievement of major objectives of the service with skill and understanding.
   _Places advancement of the service above immediate personal gain.
   _Cooperates well with others, for the benefit of the service.
   _Works for benefit of the service when he can see a personal advantage in such.
   _Interested only in immediate personal gain.
   _Works hard, but does not understand the major objectives of the service.

III. Initiative:
   _Constantly works to expand his knowledge and skill.
   _Performs only the necessary duties of his job.
   _Plans and carries out work efficiently and with minimum of friction with others.
   _Works hard, but planning is poor.
   _Plans his work well, but is slow in completing details.
   _Learns new procedures slowly.
   _Has no desire to learn new methods.
   _Learns new procedures quickly.
   _Has no desire to learn or accept new responsibilities.

IV. Leadership:
   _Relies on authority of position for control.
   _Successfully exercises personal leadership, and secures willing cooperation of subordinates.
   _Reprimands employees before others.
   _Tends to drive subordinates.
   _Works constantly to earn the respect of his subordinates.
   _Is paternalistic toward subordinates.
V. Relations with others:
   __ Is resentful toward superiors.
   __ Is cooperative with other supervisors, and well liked by them.
   __ Considers his job the only one of importance.
   __ Generally disliked by subordinates.
   __ Earns the respect of superiors.
   __ Groveling toward superiors.
   __ Brusque with the public.
   __ Fair and considerate, but firm with subordinates.
   __ Courteous and tactful with the public.
   __ Holds subordinates back.
   __ Trains and encourages subordinates to seek promotion.

VI. If you were organizing a new department, would you:
   __ Be willing to take this man?
   __ Be unwilling to take this man?
   __ Try very hard to get him?
   __ Be glad to get him?
   __ Take a chance on him?

______________________________
Rater's Signature
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INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING

Before marking this form read carefully the job specifications for the job to which the ratee is assigned. Have clearly in mind the requirements of the specific job before starting. Do not rate employees on any trait or factor which is not required for the satisfactory performance of the duties of this specific job. Consider only one factor at a time, and avoid the following tendencies:

1. The tendency to rate a person high on all factors because he rates high on one factor.

2. The tendency to place those of whom you are not certain into the middle or average group.

Consider employees' performance of the duties of this job only. Do not consider other duties required of a job to which ratee may have been assigned temporarily. This rating is intended only to reflect the ratee's proficiency in duties to which he is regularly assigned. The satisfactory performance of his job depends upon the satisfactory performance of the duties required of his job only, and not on general ability or education. Avoid comparing ratee to other persons on the same or similar jobs who may be either exceptionally outstanding or very poor in relation to the requirements of this job. Compare ratee's performance to the requirements of the job.

Following each statement on the form place an adjective in the blank to act as a guide in determining your final rating. It should be recognized that the presence or absence of any of these traits is not absolute, but that all traits probably exist in varying degrees in any person's performance. The intent here is to determine the extent of their presence, and not whether they are present or absent. Use a word which describes as nearly as possible, your appraisal of the employee's performance.

After filling in all the blanks under the factor, consider the employee's performance on this one factor only, and place a check mark on the scale below the factor at a point which indicates your appraisal of the employee on this factor. Rate all employees on the first factor, then rate all of them on the second factor, and so on until all employees are rated on all factors.
PERFORMANCE REPORT

Name

Pay Number

Date of original appointment

Date of appointment to present position

I. Duties of the job:
   a. Scope of work.
   b. Knowledge of position.
   c. Mistakes.
   d. Condition of work.
   e. Care of equipment and material.
   f. Planning and organizing work.
   g. Handling of new or unusual situations.

II. Attendance:
   a. Tardiness.
   b. Leaves before time.
   c. Clock watcher.
   d. Loafs on job.
   e. Always on time.

III. Conduct:
   a. Trouble maker.
   b. Talks too much.
   c. Personal appearance.
   d. Resents correction and instruction.
   e. Always dependable.

IV. Performance:
   a. Initiative.
   b. Physical condition.
   c. General appraisal of performance.
   d. Quality of work.
   e. Quantity of work.

V. Relations with others:
   a. Not generally liked.
   b. Cooperative with others.
   c. Tactful and courteous to public.
   d. Well liked by fellow workers.
   e. Is looked to for leadership by fellow workers.
VI. Supervisory duties:
a. Leadership.
b. Training and developing subordinates.
c. Attitude toward subordinates.
d. Attitude toward superiors.
e. Handling of infractions of rules and shortcomings of subordinates.
f. Directing of efforts toward major objectives of the department.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

Total _______________________
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INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING

Read carefully the definition of the first factor, then read carefully all the statements under the factor in the rating form. Place a check mark (✓) in the blank to the left of the statement which most nearly applies to this employee. If more than one statement applies, check more than one, but indicate, by placing a figure one (1) to the left of the check mark which statement most nearly fits the employee.

Rate all employees on the first factor, then follow the same procedure for the second factor, and then for the third and so forth until all the forms are completed.

I. Skill: The acquired ability to perform the tasks required on the job, including manual dexterity and vocal ability, where required on the job. The ease and confidence with which the employee performs his duties.

II. Accuracy of Work: The extent to which the employee's work is free from error or deviation from the standards required on the job. The extent to which employee's work results in completion of a usable product.

III. Attention to Details: The extent to which employee completes, without delay, the necessary minor phases of his work.

IV. Attention to Major Objectives of the Service: The extent to which employee is aware of the relation between his work and that of others, and the degree to which he directs his efforts toward achieving the goals of the organization.

V. Quantity of Work: The relationship between the requirements of the job and the volume of work completed by the employee.

VI. Initiative: The degree to which the employee seeks to devote his best efforts toward making the greatest possible contribution to achieving the objectives of his department. This includes not only the willingness to work, but searching for means to improve the speed and accuracy with which work is achieved.

VII. Relations With Others: This factor attempts to measure the extent to which the employee cooperates with others in the work situation, and the degree to which his actions promote or detract from the harmonious relations among members of the group. It also includes the courtesy and tact with which the person deals with the public.
OPERATIVE

I. Skill:
   - Highly skilled in duties of the job. Little supervision required.
   - Adequately skilled. Performs all the tasks of the job with only general instructions.
   - Close supervision and frequent check of his work is necessary.
   - Constant and dependable production of satisfactory quality.
   - Satisfactory production with occasional exceptions.
   - Has inadequate skill for job.
   - Consistently uses best methods in his work.
   - Does not know good methods of work.
   - Knows but does not apply good methods of work.
   - Gives little attention to methods of work.

II. Accuracy of Work:
   - Performs all the duties of the job with more than required accuracy.
   - Accuracy of work meets requirements with rare exceptions.
   - Work is frequently below standards.
   - Has occasional material wastage resulting from inaccuracy.
   - Has frequent material wastage resulting from inaccuracy.
   - Has no material wastage resulting from inaccuracy.

III. Attention to Details:
   - Carefully completes all details.
   - Is aware of necessity of completing details, but only attends to minimum requirements.
   - Neglects details.
   - Keeps work place in excellent condition.
   - Does not allow work place to become unduly cluttered.
   - Work place usually untidy.

IV. Attention to Major Objectives of the Service:
   - Directs efforts toward achieving the major objectives of the service with skill and understanding.
   - Places advancement of the service above immediate personal gain.
   - Cooperates well with others for benefit of the service.
   - Works for benefit of the service when he can see a personal advantage in such.
   - Interested only in immediate personal gain.
   - Is not aware of the major objectives of the service.
V. Quantity of Work:
- Consistently exceeds the standard requirements of the job.
- Consistently meets the standard requirements of the job.
- Does not meet the standard requirements of the job.
- Meets schedules at personal sacrifice without being urged.
- Always attempts to meet schedules.
- Usually meets schedules.
- Often fails to meet schedules.
- Must be urged to meet schedules.

VI. Initiative:
- Is always busy. When one job is completed, finds something constructive to do.
- Performs assigned work well and assists others when possible.
- Performs only assigned duties but performs them well.
- Does only what is necessary.
- Does not loaf on the job.
- Plans and carries out work smoothly and rapidly.
- Works hard but planning is poor.
- Plans work well but is slow in carrying out details.
- Learns new tasks slowly.
- Learns new tasks rapidly.
- Is anxious to learn new tasks.
- Has no desire to learn new tasks.

VII. Relations With Others:
- Cooperative and well liked by fellow employees.
- Courteous and maintains good relations with the public.
- Liked generally by fellow employees but not a leader.
- Courteous but cool to public.
- Personal appearance is always proper for job.
- Always careful to appear as clean and well-dressed as job permits.
- Neglects personal appearance.
- Is looked to for leadership by fellow workers.
- Is not tactful in dealing with public.
- Is antagonistic toward the public.
- Often has disputes with fellow employees.
- Has no unnecessary contact with others but is not generally disliked.

VIII. If you were organizing a new department, would you:
- Be willing to take this man?
- Be unwilling to take this man?
- Try very hard to get him?
- Be glad to get him?
- Take a chance on him?
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PROCEDURE FOR RATING

Read carefully the definitions of the factor and consider the employee's performance in relation to the one factor only.

Count the number of employees under your supervision and draw a line across the form just below that number on the form. Then begin with the first factor, Quantity of Production, and considering only this factor, select the employee whose quantity of production is highest. Place this name in the blank opposite the numeral (1). Next, select the person whose work is poorest under this factor, and place his name opposite the highest number. Next, select the second best and place his name opposite the numeral (2), select the second poorest and place his name next to the bottom. Follow this procedure until all your employees are ranked in order of performance under this factor. Next, read carefully the definitions of the degrees of performance, from unsatisfactory to outstanding and again, considering only the one factor, place a check mark (✓) opposite the name of the employee at a point which indicates your best judgment of the employee's performance on this factor. Repeat this process for each of the other two factors. Now, using the last page of the form, combine your judgment of the three factors in the form. Assign an overall rating to each of the employees by entering each name on the blank and placing a check mark (✓) in the appropriate space on the form.
DEFINITIONS OF PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Unsatisfactory: Does not perform the duties of the job to which he is assigned in a manner which would ordinarily be expected of a person who would normally be assigned to this type of a job.

Satisfactory: Performance such as would normally be expected from a satisfactory employee on this job. Performs the duties of the job in a satisfactory manner with the usual amount of supervision and instruction. Work may be occasionally unsatisfactory and occasionally superior.

Good: Performs duties in a better manner than would be expected of the ordinary person on this job. Always dependable and requires less than average supervision and instruction. Displays ability to learn duties of jobs in next higher classification. Capable of performing duties of other jobs in this classification.

Exceptional: Unusually good performance of all the duties of this job. Has ample ability to perform duties of higher classification and willingly accepts extra responsibility. Places improvement of the service above immediate personal interests, Capable of performing jobs on a higher level.

Outstanding: Performs with ease all the duties of the job in an outstanding manner and seeks additional duties and responsibilities. An ambitious leader, capable of assuming duties and responsibilities of a much more exacting nature than those of his present job. Eagerly seeks the best interest of the service without regard for immediate personal interests. Always alert for methods of improving performance of his job and anxiously aids fellow employees in the performance of their duties.
PERFORMANCE REPORT

QUANTITY OF PRODUCTION:

Considering the nature of the work, accuracy required, the cost of errors resulting from hasty action and whether any delays resulted from negligence of the employee. The performance of the specific ratee should be compared to that normally expected of a person on this specific job. Speed of performance must not be at the expense of necessary accuracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Exceptional Standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QUALITY OF PRODUCTION:

Base rating on consideration of the quality of ratee's work in relation to the standards of quality established as satisfactory for the specific work, and the performance of the usual person on this specific type of work. Unnecessary accuracy at the expense of speed of production should not be considered as favorable, but should not penalize employee on this factor. Satisfactory performance on this factor should be considered as meeting the required standards of accuracy, giving due consideration to other factors on the specific job which is being considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS:

Consider the requirements of the job with respect to the following traits: Personal appearance, cooperation with others, relations with the public, tact, courtesy, use of time, habits of work, whether consistent or erratic, housekeeping and the general impression created by the ratee. Include any other traits of value to job. Care must be taken to consider these traits only as they relate to the specific job involved. That is to avoid rating the employee on traits which are not of value to the specific job, whether rating is favorable or unfavorable on the trait.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Out-regular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV


STATE INAUGURATES MERIT RATING SYSTEM

The State Civil Service Commission has announced the adoption of a merit rating system covering all state employees. Departments have been advised that all employees must be rated by March 31, 1953, and a copy of such ratings are to be filed with the Commission. Second ratings are to be made by May 31, 1953, but none but the initial ratings must be reported to the Commission.

For the time being, it was announced, ratings are to be used for the purpose of determining the eligibility of employees for annual increments, starting with the one due on July 1, 1953. It has been implied that later on such ratings may be used in promotion procedures and possibly used as evidence in removal order cases before the Commission.

To keep the records straight, it must be pointed out that for forty years, civil service law in Ohio has required the Civil Service Commission to "provide in its rules for keeping a record of efficiency for each employee in the classified civil service" (Sec. 436-15). Contrary to the belief of many employees, this power of the Commission to require merit ratings is not new, but is simply a case of the Commission beginning to employ a power it has always had.

Prior to January 1, 1950, Ohio law had never provided for annual increments for its employees. Ever since this became a mandatory obligation of the state, attention has been focused on the degree of efficiency among state employees, and agitation for a method of measuring employee efficiency has been growing.

Many members of the General Assembly have objected strenuously to "automatic" salary increments for employees on the ground that such a policy rewards the unworthy along with the worthy. They have insisted that salary increases be conditioned on performance and not on tenure alone.

We believe in normal times, a good merit rating system may have some value. But, when economic conditions are such that the state finds it extremely difficult to retain and recruit qualified personnel in the face of the much higher salaries being paid in private
industry, it seems foolish to even attempt to put such a thing into operation. We would be opposed to the kind of plan the Civil Service Commission has developed at any time since, among other things, there is substantial disagreement even among personnel people, with respect to using a rating system for the purpose of establishing eligibility for salary increases. In addition, this plan was conceived by supervisors only and non-supervisory personnel had no voice in its preparation. Umpires do not ordinarily write the rules they will later interpret. Moreover, it makes no safeguards against such influences as personalities, politics, religion, etc., and is admitted to be a rank experiment.

For these, and many other reasons too numerous to discuss here, the Association will delete the merit rating provision from the bill it is preparing and will seek to disassociate ratings from salary increases all together. You can give us a great deal of help by contacting your members of the General Assembly and expressing your opposition to a merit rating system being used in connection with salary increases at this time.
APPENDIX V

RECOMMENDATION AND POLICY

The following recommendation was made by the author to the Ohio State Civil Service Commission on September 4, 1952.

It is requested that the Commission make a formal statement of its attitude and policies with respect to the following questions. The purpose in requesting this statement is to present clearly and concisely to department heads, the problems and objectives of the employee performance evaluation system.

1. What purposes shall the program attempt to serve?

2. Shall all departments be required to use the same rating form, or will a rating pattern in which departments may vary the exact form be satisfactory?

3. Shall training of raters be undertaken by the commission, or left entirely to the various departments? If it is to be left to the departments, what procedures shall be adopted for achieving uniformity among departments?

4. How often shall performance reports be made? By whom shall ratings be made, immediate supervisor, etc.?

5. Is a policy of informing employees of their ratings to be established by the commission, or is that to be left to the departments?

6. Is an appeal procedure to be provided for?

7. Shall ratings be numerical or adjective or both?

It is also requested that the commission now give consideration to a policy regarding the maintenance of the program after its installation.

The following statement was made by the member of the Ohio State Civil Service Commission to all appointing authorities.
The proposed plan for establishing a performance evaluation system is to combine the information available from experience in other locations with suggestions and experimental data from within the organization.

The objective is to arrive at an agreement on the number of degrees of performance, from best to poorest, which will be required to achieve the necessary evaluation of employees' performance. Then to reach agreement on a clear definition of each of these degrees of performance. These definitions to be so developed that rating supervisors in all departments will be able to compare employees with those definitions and place each employee into one of the degrees with uniformity, accuracy, and confidence in the justice of the rating.

For the purpose of screening such information, it is suggested that a working committee of department representatives be selected to work with the Civil Service Commission and its representative. This committee would also give consideration to the problem of training raters, and make recommendations for departmental policies concerning procedures for training raters and other policies necessary to implement the program. It is expected that the final system will be a combination of the best judgment of all the qualified officials of the State Government, who are in a position to devote time and effort to its planning. The procedures described above are intended to provide
as much information as possible upon which to base that judgment.

This procedure is based on the assumption that performance evaluation is at present very largely an art and very little a science. Any statistical procedure used, will therefore be used as a supplement and aid to judgment rather than as a substitute for judgment.

The Commission seeks for this program:

a. A rating form which is as brief as practical to achieve the desired results.

b. A program which is developed and presented in such a clear and concise manner that all employees will readily understand the system and its operation.

c. A rating form which contains as few factors of performance as possible to achieve accuracy of rating.

d. A rating score which is simple and easy to determine.

e. A program which will serve as an aid to supervision rather than merely an additional task for the supervisor to perform.

f. A minimum number of forms considering the extent and complexity of jobs in the State Service.

Ratings are to be made semiannually, March 31 and September 30 of each year, but only the March 31 rating is to be reported to the Civil Service Commission. However, a report of the results of the first ratings completed in 1952 should be made for the purpose of checking on and correcting difficulties which may arise in connection with the operation of the system.

The rating of employees shall be made by the immediate supervisor and reviewed by one or more higher levels of supervision.
APPENDIX VI

PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCTING A PILOT STUDY

In order that a pilot study may provide the necessary information upon which to base judgment of a performance evaluation program, it is necessary to select organizational units in which several persons of the same classification are doing essentially the same type of work under the same supervisor. The selection should be so made that each of these units will consist of five or more employees. Twenty-five will be ample in each case. These employees will be ranked by their supervisors in order of quality of performance. Then the supervisor will rate the same employees on the "pilot" rating form. A comparison of the results of the ratings and rankings will be used to determine which factors on the "pilot" form should be used in the final rating form.

Procedure for Selection of Pilot Group: In order to get a wide sample of skills, there must be several of the above units ranging from low pay-ranges to high pay-ranges in each department.

Each unit should be checked to eliminate those who have been in the present position less than three months. Large units may be reduced by selecting a group of between five and twenty-five who are considered by the supervisor to represent a range from poorest to best in the unit. After selecting the units in this manner the employees in each unit will be ranked in order of the quality of performance in the manner described below.
Procedure for Ranking: List the names of employees in the unit on the lines at the left of Form I, then place the same list on the oblique lines at the top of the form, as in illustration, Table I. Now compare the first employee on the vertical list with all those on the horizontal list. Obviously the man will not be compared with himself. As in the illustration, compare Brown with Gay. If Brown is better than Gay, place a check mark in the square below Gay's name, and opposite Brown's name. If Brown is not better than Gay, leave the space blank. Now compare Brown with English. If Brown is better than English, place a check mark in the square below English's name and opposite Brown's name. If Brown is not better than English, leave the square blank. Follow this procedure across the sheet for Brown, then go to Gay, and follow the same procedure across the sheet. Continue this process until every person on the horizontal list has been compared with every person on the vertical list. Now count the blank squares opposite each name in the vertical list. This gives the rank position of the individual in the unit.

For the purpose of this study only those units should be selected in which the supervisor is well qualified by experience and contacts to make such ratings.

Rankings should be made and turned in to the Civil Service Commission as soon as possible in order to avoid any confusion or carry-over to ratings.

Who Shall do Rating? The ratings shall be made by the immediate
supervisor. "Immediate Supervisor" in this case means the person who has personal direction of the employee's work. The person who assigns tasks, gives instructions, appraises performance of assigned tasks, and who is recognized by the employee as being the supervisor.
MERIT RATING PROCEDURE

The chief purpose of this program is to provide a uniform system whereby all departments of the state government will maintain records of each employee's performance. These records will serve as a basis for granting annual pay increases to those employees not in step five for the classification.

This experimental rating of a limited group of state employees is being conducted to aid in determining the best procedure and the best forms to adopt for the system. The ratings made here will be considered as confidential and will not effect in any way, either the employee's status in the service, or his rate of pay. It is hoped that the information and suggestions obtained through this study will provide the basis for establishing a permanent system which will be satisfactory to all departments.

The objectives of the program are entirely constructive. The system is not intended as a device to penalize anyone, but rather to aid in improving the state service. The aim is to reward achievement, and to aid in improving performance, not merely to penalize failure.

Suggestions to Raters:

This report is only a recording of the appraisal which you have made of the employee's performance during the time he has been under your supervision. Consider the performance over the entire period of time covered by this rating. Do not allow recent events to influence
the rating unduly. Make the rating a complete appraisal of the employee's performance over the past six months.

Avoid rating an employee high, or low, on all factors just because he rates high, or low, on one factor. Good performance on one factor does not necessarily indicate good performance on other factors. Also, avoid over-rating old employees, or under-rating new employees. The rating should be an evaluation of the employee's achievement in relation to all conditions under which he works. Consider only the employee's performance of those duties which have been assigned to him as part of his job. Do not rate employee on duties which he has not been instructed to perform. Do not rate one employee against another employee, but against the requirements of the job.

Procedure for Rating:

Read carefully the definitions of factors on the rating form, and all other information provided before starting to rate employees. Have the headings filled in on a form for each employee before completing the remainder of any of the forms. Have clearly in mind the requirements of the job and rate employees only on these requirements. Now read carefully the definition of the first factor, "Reliability and Responsibility." Considering the requirements of the job, rate each employee on this factor alone. Place a check mark on the scale below the factor at a point which indicates your appraisal of his
performance, considering this factor alone. Use the definitions given below in arriving at your appraisal. These definitions of performance levels are intended as relationships between the performance of the employee and the duties of the job upon which the classification which determines the pay range for the job is based. They are intended to measure the extent to which the employee meets the minimum requirements of the specific job to which he is assigned.

**Unsatisfactory:** A level of performance which would not meet the minimum requirements of the job on this factor. Failure to meet the standard of performance upon which the classification for the job is based. An overall rating of unsatisfactory indicates that the employee fails in one or more important respects to meet the minimum requirements of the job.

**Satisfactory:** This level of performance covers the range from that which barely meets the minimum requirements of the job, through the very outstanding performance which exceeds in all respects the requirements of the job. A check mark in the "c" space on the scale indicates that the employee meets the minimum requirements of the job, but is not quite up to the performance of the usual good employee on this type of work. A check mark in the "b" space indicates a good performance typical of the average good worker on this job. A check mark in the "a" space indicates that the employee's performance on this factor is better than that of the average good worker. This is the performance of the unusually good worker. An overall rating in
the "a" space indicates that the employee exceeds the performance of
the average worker in all important aspects of his work. A "b" rating
indicates that the employee is an average worker, perhaps above
average in some respects, but below average in other respects. An
overall rating of "c" indicates that the employee is somewhat below
average in some important respects.

After assigning a rating to each employee on the first factor
read carefully the second factor, "Initiative." In so far as possible
disregard any consideration of the other factors or how you have rated
employees on them. Assign a rating to each employee on this factor.

Follow this procedure for all other factors in the rating form.
Consider only one factor at a time, and consider only the require­
ments of the job in relation to the employee's performance.

After rating employees on all applicable factors up to No. 23,
consider the overall performance of the employee for factors No. 23
and No. 24. Make the rating on these two factors an appraisal of the
entire performance of the employee for the past six months. This
should be a composite rating of the employee's contribution to the
objectives of the department for which he works.

Do not allow personal feelings to enter into your rating. The
employee's relations with others will be rated separately by you. It
is therefore necessary that you attempt to appraise the employee just
as you would a machine. In performing this function attempt to act as
a machine yourself. It is recognized that no human can ever achieve
such objectivity in his thinking, but considerable effort is necessary to rule out as much of the personal element as possible, if accurate ratings are to be had.

After completing the ratings for all employees under your supervision, submit the ratings to your supervisor, who will review the ratings. The reviewer will review the ratings, and indicate in red where he does not agree with the rater.

Ratings shall be made by the immediate supervisor and reviewed by the next higher level of supervision. "Immediate supervisor" in this instance is the person who has personal direction of the employee's work. The person who assigns tasks, gives instructions, appraises performance of assigned tasks, and who is recognized by the employee as being the supervisor. The "next higher level of supervision" in this case means the immediate supervisor of the rater.
Form 2

PERFORMANCE REPORT

Name________________________________________ Date__________________

Rating for period ending_______ 19_________ Annua 1 ____________________

Probationary_________ Work

Classification title:_________ Title______________________________

Years in State Service_______ Years in present position__________

RATE ALL EMPLOYEES ON THESE FACTORS:

1. RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY: The success with which assignments are completed in unusual and difficult circumstances as well as in ordinary working conditions. c b a

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

2. INDUSTRY: The extent to which the employee occupies his time profitably in carrying out assigned duties. c b a

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

3. INITIATIVE: The extent to which the employee devotes his time and efforts to achieving the objectives of the organization, with understanding, a desire to improve procedure, and the desire and ability to proceed with work without specific instructions. c b a

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

4. KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS: Awareness of relationship of his job to other jobs in the office and department, knowledge of related jobs, knowledge of specific and general objectives of the agency functions. c b a

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

5. ADAPTABILITY: Ability to learn new duties, to retain new knowledge, grasp explanations, to adjust readily to changes in work or in working conditions. c b a

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory
6. WORK ATTITUDE: Consider enthusiasm displayed for job duties and responsibilities, loyalty to agency objectives, response to discipline.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

7. COOPERATION: Ability to work harmoniously with co-workers and supervisors, tendency to be helpful, courteous and tactful, pleasant disposition.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

8. PUNCTUALITY AND ATTENDANCE: Time and energy devoted to productive work as well as frequency and duration of tardiness and absence, note validity of excuses for absence or tardiness.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

9. PUBLIC RELATIONS: Effectiveness of relations with persons outside the organization. The ability to influence public opinion favorably, to gain acceptance of programs, or the courtesy and tact with which minor contacts with the public are handled.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

10. PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK: Considering the type of work to be done, the extent to which employee accomplishes the duties of the job without undue fatigue.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

11. PERSONAL APPEARANCE: The extent to which the employee's dress, etc., is equal to what is expected for the type of work to which he is assigned.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

12. ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS: The accuracy and speed with which the employee carries out the necessary details of his job.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory
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13. ABILITY TO LEARN: The extent to which employee acquires knowledge of new techniques and procedures without undue delay.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

RATE ONLY OPERATIVE EMPLOYEES ON THESE FACTORS

14. QUANTITY OF WORK: Consider volume of work produced, promptness in completion of tasks, mental alertness, and manual dexterity where applicable.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

15. QUALITY OF WORK: Effectiveness and ability to achieve results, accuracy, neatness, orderliness, proper use of skills and abilities in performing mental, manual or personality requirements of the position.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

16. SKILL: The extent to which the employee has acquired the necessary manual dexterity, and the ability to apply satisfactory techniques and procedures.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

17. MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS, AND INSTRUMENTS: The extent to which the employee uses the necessary tools and equipment without undue damage or wear.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

RATE ONLY SUPERVISORY AND EXECUTIVE EMPLOYEES ON THESE FACTORS

18. PRACTICAL JUDGMENT: Ability to think intelligently, make logical decisions, and discriminate.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

19. SUPERVISORY ABILITY: Degree and ways in which subordinates are encouraged and developed, do subordinates have confidence and respect, is discipline and morale maintained with impartiality.

Unsatisfactory Satisfactory
20. EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS: The extent to which employee is able to convey his thinking to others, with a minimum of misunderstanding.

  c b a

  Un satisfactory  Satisfactory

21. EFFECTIVENESS IN PROMOTING HIGH WORKING MORALE: The extent to which the employee is able to identify the objectives of the organization with those of his subordinates, in the minds of subordinates, and to achieve their willing cooperation.

  c b a

  Un satisfactory  Satisfactory

22. EXECUTIVE ABILITY: The extent to which the employee has the ability to make intelligent and valid decisions, to analyze, organize and plan effectively, to delegate responsibility and instruct clearly. Resourcefulness in handling new and unusual situations.

  c b a

  Un satisfactory  Satisfactory

RATE ALL EMPLOYEES ON THESE FACTORS:

23. If you were organizing a new department, would you: 1. Be willing to take this employee? 2. Be unwilling to take him? 3. Try very hard to get him?

24. OVERALL RATING: Consider total ability, performance on the job, and overall value to the department.

  c b a

  Un satisfactory  Satisfactory

RATER'S CERTIFICATION

The foregoing is a true and accurate appraisal of employee's performance based on my personal observation or knowledge. I have brought to the attention of the employee, his strong points as well as his weaknesses prior to this rating.

[Signature]
Title
Date
REVIEWER'S CERTIFICATION

I have reviewed the foregoing rating and in view of all available information I am of the opinion that the rating should be:

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{c} & \text{b} & \text{a} \\
\hline
\text{Unsatisfactory} & \text{Satisfactory}
\end{array} \]

(Remarks if any)

Reviewer's Signature  Title  Date

IF RATING IS ESTABLISHED AS UNSATISFACTORY AFTER REVIEW, THE RATER SHALL EXPLAIN THE RATING TO THE EMPLOYEE, AND ASK HIM TO SIGN IN THE SPACE BELOW. THE EMPLOYEE SHALL BE GIVEN UNTIL THE END OF THE FOLLOWING WORK DAY IN WHICH TO MAKE ANY STATEMENT HE MAY WISH.

The foregoing rating has been explained to me. I do, do not, wish to make a statement. (If employee wishes to make a statement, use reverse side of this sheet.)

Employee's Signature  Date

APPOINTING AUTHORITY

In view of all the evidence presented, the rating for this employee is established as:

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{c} & \text{b} & \text{a} \\
\hline
\text{Unsatisfactory} & \text{Satisfactory}
\end{array} \]

Appointing Authority

By: ____________________________
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EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE REPORT
APPROVED BY THE OHIO STATE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Name ........................................................................................................ Date........................................

1. RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY: The success with which assignments are completed in unusual and difficult circumstances, as well as in ordinary working conditions.

2. INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE: The extent to which the employee occupies his time profitably in carrying out assigned duties, and achieving the objectives of the organization, a desire to improve procedure, and the desire and ability to proceed with work without specific instructions.

3. KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS: Awareness of relationships of his job to other jobs in the office and department. Knowledge of related jobs, knowledge of specific and general objectives of the agency functions.

4. ADAPTABILITY: The ability to learn new duties, to retain new knowledge, grasp explanations, to adjust readily to changes in working conditions or work. The extent to which employee acquires knowledge of new techniques and procedures without undue delay.

5. WORK ATTITUDE: Consider enthusiasm displayed for job duties and responsibilities, loyalty to agency objectives, response to discipline. Ability to work harmoniously with co-workers and supervisors, tendency to be helpful, courteous, and tactful, pleasant disposition.

6. PUBLIC RELATIONS: Effectiveness of relations with persons outside the organization. The ability to influence public opinion favorably, to gain acceptance of programs, or the courtesy and tact with which minor contacts with the public are handled.

7. PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK: Considering the type of work to be done, the extent to which the employee accomplishes the duties of the job without undue fatigue.

8. PERSONAL APPEARANCE: The extent to which the employee’s dress, etc., is equal to that which would be expected of a person assigned to this type of work.

9. ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS: The accuracy and speed with which the employee carries out the necessary minor phases of his job.

10. ATTENDANCE: Time and energy devoted to productive work as well as frequency and duration of tardiness and absence, note validity of excuses for absence or tardiness.

11. QUANTITY OF WORK: Consider volume of work produced, promptness in completion of tasks, mental alertness, and manual dexterity where applicable.

12. QUALITY OF WORK: Effectiveness and ability to achieve results, accuracy, neatness, orderliness, proper use of skills and abilities in performing mental, manual or personality requirements of the position.

13. MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS: The extent to which the employee uses the necessary tools and equipment without undue damage or wear.

14. PRACTICAL JUDGMENT: The ability to think intelligently, make logical decisions, and discriminate.

15. EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS: The extent to which the employee is able to convey his thinking to others, with a minimum of misunderstanding.

16. SUPERVISORY ABILITY: The degree and ways in which subordinates are encouraged and developed, confidence and respect displayed by subordinates, the extent to which discipline and morale are maintained impartially. The extent to which employee is able to identify the objectives of the organization with those of his subordinates, in the minds of the subordinates, and to achieve their willing cooperation.

17. EXECUTIVE ABILITY: The extent to which the employee has the ability to make intelligent and valid decisions, to analyze, organize and plan effectively, to delegate responsibility, and authority, as well as to instruct clearly. Resourcefulness in handling new and unusual situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>SATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ADAPTABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WORK ATTITUDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PUBLIC RELATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PERSONAL APPEARANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ATTENDANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATE ONLY OPERATIVE EMPLOYEES ON FACTORS 11 THROUGH 13.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>SATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. QUANTITY OF WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. QUALITY OF WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATE ONLY SUPERVISORY AND EXECUTIVE EMPLOYEES ON FACTORS 14 THROUGH 17.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>SATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. PRACTICAL JUDGMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SUPERVISORY ABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. EXECUTIVE ABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATE ALL EMPLOYEES ON ITEMS 18 AND 19.**

18. If you were organizing a new department, would you: 1. Be willing to take this employee; 2. Be unwilling to take him; 3. Try very hard to get him.

19. OVERALL RATING: Considering total ability, performance on the job, and overall value to the department.

**RATER'S CERTIFICATION**

The foregoing is a true and accurate appraisal of this employee's performance, based on my personal observation or knowledge. I have brought to the attention of the employee, his strong points as well as his weaknesses, prior to this rating.

**REVIEWER'S CERTIFICATION**

I have reviewed the foregoing rating, and in view of all available information, I am of the opinion that the rating should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reasons if any)

**APPOINTING AUTHORITY'S APPROVAL**

In view of all the evidence presented, the rating for this employee is established as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Reasons if any)
APPENDIX VIII

Scatter diagrams showing the relationship of rankings to ratings on the pilot study of 228 employees in seven departments. The graphs are so adjusted that a perfect relationship between ratings and rankings would cause the trend line, shown in red, to form a forty-five degree angle from the horizontal axis. A complete lack of relationship would result in a parallel line.
This system of employees' efficiency and performance rating is established primarily for the purpose of providing all the State Departments with records of performance for each employee. These records will serve as a basis for granting annual step increases in pay for those employees not in step five for their classification.

The greatest value of the program will be realized, if it is used as a day-to-day means of improving the State Service. The objectives of the program are entirely constructive. The system is not intended as a device to penalize anyone, but rather to aid in improving the State Service. The aim is to reward achievement and to aid in improving performance, not merely to penalize failure.
EMPLOYEE RATING PROCEDURE

Who Will be Rated:

Each employee who was employed before January 1, shall be given a rating by his immediate supervisor, as of March 31 the same year. Employees who are on loan to other supervisors shall be rated by the supervisor to whom they are regularly assigned. Advice for this purpose may be asked of the borrowing supervisor on recent performance. Those employees who have been transferred from one supervisor to another within one calendar month of the rating date shall be rated by the original supervisor, and those who have been transferred more than one calendar month, but less than three calendar months prior to the rating date (March 31) shall be rated by the present supervisor on the advice of the original supervisor, and that fact shall be noted on the rating form.

Upon resignation of a supervisor, the resigning supervisor shall complete a Performance Report for each employee under his supervision. Such report shall be made as of the date of separation and shall be available to his successor.

The annual rating shall be made as of March 31 in accordance with instructions given below. This rating shall be completed by employee's immediate supervisor and delivered to his supervisor on or before April 5. The reviewing supervisor shall review the ratings and submit them to the Appointing Authority by April 15. The results of these
ratings shall be reported to the Civil Service Commission by May 1. Employees who receive an unsatisfactory rating on the annual report shall be given a special rating as of June 1 of the same year. This rating shall be completed, reviewed, and submitted to the Appointing Authority by June 5. The report of such special ratings shall be made to the Civil Service Commission by June 10.

The same form may also be used as a special rating for those employees who are separated from the service for any reason. It may also be used as a probationary rating, to be completed for new employees at the end of ninety days of service.

Suggestions to Raters:

This report is only a recording of the appraisal which you have made of the employee's performance during the time he has been under your supervision. Consider the performance over the entire period of time covered by the rating. Do not allow recent events to influence the rating unduly.

Avoid rating an employee high, or low, on all factors just because he rates high, or low, on one factor. Also avoid overrating old employees, or underrating new employees. The rating should be an evaluation of the employee's achievement in relation to all conditions under which he works. Consider only the employee's performance of those duties which have been assigned to him as part of his job. Do not rate one employee against another employee, but against the
Procedure for Making Rating Reports:

Read carefully the definitions of factors in the rating form, and all other information provided, before starting to rate employees. Have the headings filled in on a form for each employee before completing the remainder of any of the forms. Have clearly in mind the requirements of the job, and rate employees only on these requirements. Now read carefully the definition of the first factor, "Reliability and Responsibility." Considering the requirements of the job, rate each employee on this factor alone. Place a check mark on the scale following the factor at a point which indicates your appraisal of his performance on this factor. Use the definitions given below in arriving at your appraisal. These definitions of performance levels are intended as a relationship between the performance of the employee and the duties of the job upon which the classification which determines the pay range for the job is based.

Unsatisfactory: This is the first space on the scale, and represents a level of performance which does not meet the minimum requirements of the job on this factor, and is a failure to meet the standards of performance upon which the classification for the job is based. An overall rating (Item No. 19) of unsatisfactory indicates that the employee fails on one or more critical factors to meet the minimum requirements of the job.
Satisfactory: This level of performance covers the range from that which barely meets the minimum requirements of the job, through the outstanding performance which exceeds the requirements of the job in all important respects. A check mark in the space marked "c" on the scale indicates that the employee meets the minimum requirements of the job, but is not up to the performance expected of the usual good employee on this type of work. A check mark in the space marked "b" indicates a good performance, typical of the good worker on this job. A check mark in the space marked "a" indicates that the employee's performance on this factor is better than that of the good worker. This is the performance of the unusually good worker. An overall rating (Item 19) in the "a" space indicates that the employee exceeds the performance of the good worker in all important aspects of the work. An overall rating of "b" indicates that the employee is a good worker, perhaps below average in some respects, but above average in others. An overall rating of "c" indicates that the employee is satisfactory, perhaps below average in some respects but is sufficiently good in all critical respects to meet minimum standards for the job.

After assigning a rating to each employee on the first factor, read carefully the second factor, "Industry and Initiative." In so far as possible, disregard any consideration of the other factors or how you have rated employees on them. Assign a rating to each employee on this factor.
Follow this procedure for all other factors in the rating form. Rate all employees on factors one through ten inclusive. Rate only those employees whose duties consist of performing tasks under supervision on factors eleven through thirteen. Rate only those employees whose duties consist of supervising the work of others on factors 14, 15, and 16. Whether an employee shall be rated on factor 17 shall be at the discretion of the Appointing Authority. All employees shall be rated on items 18 and 19.

Items 1, 2, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are critical factors. If an employee receives an unsatisfactory rating on one of these factors which is applicable to his job, this constitutes an unsatisfactory rating on item No. 19.

After rating employees on all applicable factors up to No. 18, consider overall performance of the employee for items No. 18 and 19. Make the rating on these two items an appraisal of the entire performance of the employee for the entire rating period. This should be a composite rating of the employee's contribution to the objectives of the department for which he works.

Do not allow personal feelings to enter into your rating. It is necessary that you appraise the employee's performance on each factor without consideration of any other factor, or personal feelings.

Ratings shall be by the immediate supervisor, and reviewed by the next higher level of supervision. The "immediate supervisor" has personal direction of the employee's work: The person who assigns
tasks, gives instructions, appraises performance of assigned tasks, and who is recognized by the employee as being his supervisor. The next higher level of supervision means the immediate supervisor of the rater.

After completing the ratings for all employees under your supervision, submit the ratings to your supervisor, who will review them. The reviewer will indicate by a red check mark, each point at which he does not agree with the rater. The rating made by the immediate supervisor shall remain on the form, and any disagreement by the reviewer shall be in addition to the original rating. If there is substantial disagreement between the rater and the reviewer, the matter shall be brought to the attention of the Appointing Authority immediately.

If the rater and reviewer agree that the rating should be unsatisfactory, the rating shall be discussed with the employee, in private, and in a constructive manner. The employee shall then be asked to sign the form in the space provided, and indicate whether he desires to make a statement. If the employee desires to make a statement, he shall be given until the end of the third succeeding work day in which to make such statement. Ample opportunity shall be provided the employee to make such statement. After the employee is given an opportunity to make a statement, the matter shall be brought to the attention of the Appointing Authority immediately.

The discussion of the rating with the employee should be only
one of numerous discussions concerning the efficiency of the employee. This statement is based on the assumption that the employee has the right to know as nearly as possible, exactly what the supervisor expects of him, and the extent to which he meets these expectations. The supervisor should discuss with each employee, the employee's performance of the duties of his job at frequent intervals. These discussions should be in private, and so designed as to aid the employee in achieving the performance expected of him by the supervisor. The supervisor should take care not to make such discussions appear as criticisms only. Just as much care should be exercised in commending good performance as in criticising poor performance, and the criticism should be coupled with advice for correcting weaknesses.

The rater should ask himself the following questions as he rates each employee.

1. **RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**: Can the person be depended upon to do his job? Does he loaf when he can?

2. **INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE**: Is the employee busy during working hours? Does he like to talk to others when he should be working? Does he suggest ways to do the job better?

3. **KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS**: Does the employee attempt to understand the purpose of his organization? Does he try to improve his performance and assist fellow workers to improve their performance?

4. **ADAPTABILITY**: Does the employee adjust himself to changes in conditions of work or duties of his job?

5. **WORK ATTITUDE**: Is employee willing to cooperate with others to improve the department? Does he seek personal gain regardless of the results to others or to the organization? Does he spend excessive time in rest periods, lunch, etc.? Does he go immediately to work after reporting? Does he take pride in his work?
6. PUBLIC RELATIONS: When the employee deals with the public, is he courteous, or is he snappy or sarcastic? Does he try to give the public a good impression of his department? Does he try to be helpful?

7. PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK: Is the employee strong enough to do the labor the job requires, or does he complain of "a weak back," etc.? Does he require assistance for things he should do himself?

8. PERSONAL APPEARANCE: Does the employee dress and appear as well as he should for this type of job? Is he careless of his appearance?

9. ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS: Does he avoid minor tasks of his job? Does he see that all necessary work is done as promptly as possible?

10. ATTENDANCE: Does he report to work on time from breaks? Is he habitually late?

11. QUANTITY OF WORK: Does the employee get out the amount of work that would reasonably be expected on the job?

12. QUALITY OF WORK: Is work completed with care to meet the standards of perfection required for the job? Does employee keep work well within specifications?

13. MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS: Is the employee careless with tools and equipment? Does he use material, instruments, etc., with care to avoid unnecessary waste or damage?

14. PRACTICAL JUDGMENT: Does employee handle difficult situations with promptness and accuracy: Is he hesitant to make decisions? Are his decisions sound?

15. EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS: Can he present his ideas to others so that they understand what he means? Does he take too much time in expressing ideas? Does he make clear and concise statements?

16. SUPERVISORY ABILITY: Does he achieve willing cooperation from subordinates? Does he encourage subordinates to improve their knowledge and skill? Does he aid capable subordinates in securing advancements? Does he lead rather than drive subordinates? Is he considerate of subordinates? Does he make sure that subordinates know exactly what is expected of them?
17. **EXECUTIVE ABILITY**: Does the employee delegate clearly, both responsibility and authority? Does he maintain a balance of responsibility and authority? Does he clearly define lines of authority and responsibility? Is he "rambling" in expressing his ideas? Does he prevent any overlapping or confusion of duties in delegating work to his subordinates?
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE REPORT
APPROVED BY THE OHIO STATE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Name: Jane Doe
Date: March 31, 1953

1. RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY: The success with which assignments are completed in unusual and difficult circumstances, as well as in ordinary working conditions.

2. INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE: The extent to which the employee occupies his time profitably in carrying out assigned duties, and achieving the objectives of the organization, a desire to improve procedure, and the desire and ability to proceed with work without specific instructions.

3. KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS: Awareness of relationships of his job to other jobs in the office and department. Knowledge of related jobs, knowledge of specific and general objectives of the agency functions.

4. ADAPTABILITY: The ability to learn new duties, to retain new knowledge, grasp explanations, to adjust readily to changes in working conditions or work. The extent to which employee acquires knowledge of new techniques and procedures without undue delay.

5. WORK ATTITUDE: Consider enthusiasm displayed for job duties and responsibilities, loyalty to agency objectives, response to discipline. Ability to work harmoniously with co-workers and supervisors, tendency to be helpful, courteous, and tactful, pleasant disposition.

6. PUBLIC RELATIONS: Effectiveness of relations with persons outside the organization. The ability to influence public opinion favorably, to gain acceptance of programs, or the courtesy and tact with which minor contacts with the public are handled.

7. PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK: Considering the type of work to be done, the extent to which the employee accomplishes the duties of the job without undue fatigue.

8. PERSONAL APPEARANCE: The extent to which the employee’s dress, etc., is equal to that which would be expected of a person assigned to this type of work.

9. ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS: The accuracy and speed with which the employee carries out the necessary minor phases of his job.

10. ATTENDANCE: Time and energy devoted to productive work as well as frequency and duration of tardiness and absence, note validity of excuses for absence or tardiness.

11. QUANTITY OF WORK: Consider volume of work produced, promptness in completion of tasks, mental alertness, and manual dexterity where applicable.

12. QUALITY OF WORK: Effectiveness and ability to achieve results, accuracy, neatness, orderliness, proper use of skills and abilities in performing mental, manual or personality requirements of the position.

13. MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS: The extent to which the employee uses the necessary tools and equipment without undue damage or wear.

14. PRACTICAL JUDGMENT: The ability to think intelligently, make logical decisions, and discriminate.

15. EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS: The extent to which the employee is able to convey his thinking to others, with a minimum of misunderstanding.

16. SUPERVISORY ABILITY: The degree and ways in which subordinates are encouraged and developed, confidence and respect displayed by subordinates, the extent to which discipline and morale are maintained impartially. The extent to which employee is able to identify the objectives of the organization with those of his subordinates, in the minds of the subordinates, and to achieve their willing cooperation.

17. EXECUTIVE ABILITY: The extent to which the employee has the ability to make intelligent and valid decisions, to analyze, organize and plan effectively, to delegate responsibility, and authority, as well as to instruct clearly. Resourcefulness in handling new and unusual situations.
RATE ALL EMPLOYEES ON FACTORS 1 THROUGH 10.

1. RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY: ..............................................................
2. INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE: ........................................................................
3. KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS: ..................................................
4. ADAPTABILITY: ............................................................................................
5. WORK ATTITUDE: ..........................................................................................
6. PUBLIC RELATIONS: ....................................................................................
7. PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK: ..............................................................
8. PERSONAL APPEARANCE: .........................................................................
9. ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS: ..................................................
10. ATTENDANCE: ............................................................................................

RATE ONLY OPERATIVE EMPLOYEES ON FACTORS 11 THROUGH 13.

11. QUANTITY OF WORK: ................................................................................
12. QUALITY OF WORK: .................................................................................
13. MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS:..............

RATE ONLY SUPERVISORY AND EXECUTIVE EMPLOYEES ON FACTORS 14 THROUGH 17.

14. PRACTICAL JUDGMENT: ............................................................................
15. EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS: ...........................
16. SUPERVISORY ABILITY: ............................................................................
17. EXECUTIVE ABILITY: ............................................................................... 

RATE ALL EMPLOYEES ON ITEMS 18 AND 19.

18. If you were organizing a new department, would you: 1. Be willing to take this employee...........; 2. Be unwilling to take him..........; 3. Try very hard to get him.........
19. OVERALL RATING: Considering total ability, performance on the job, and overall value to the department.

RATER'S CERTIFICATION

The foregoing is a true and accurate appraisal of this employee's performance, based on my personal observation or knowledge. I have brought to the attention of the employee, his strong points as well as his weaknesses, prior to this rating.
REVIEWER'S CERTIFICATION

I have reviewed the foregoing rating, and in view of all available information, I am of the opinion that the rating should be:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Remarks if any)

IF RATING IS ESTABLISHED AS UNSATISFACTORY AFTER REVIEW, THE RATER SHALL EXPLAIN THE RATING TO THE EMPLOYEE, AND ASK HIM TO SIGN IN THE SPACE BELOW. THE EMPLOYEE WILL BE GIVEN UNTIL THE END OF THE THIRD SUCCEEDING WORK DAY IN WHICH TO MAKE ANY STATEMENT HE MAY WISH.

The foregoing rating has been explained to me. I do........, do not........ wish to make a statement. (If employee wishes to make a statement, use reverse side of this sheet.)

Employee's Signature  Date

APPOINTING AUTHORITY'S APPROVAL

In view of all the evidence presented, the rating for this employee is established as:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appointing Authority
APPENDIX X

UNSATISFACTORY RATINGS BY DEPARTMENT IN 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees Rated Unsatisfactory March 31, 1953.</th>
<th>Operative</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Made</th>
<th>Did not Make</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid for the Aged</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens State Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys' Industrial School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge State Hospital</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Receiving Hospital</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton State Hospital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Highways</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>*76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsatisfactory June 1, 1953.

*Included in this total were sixteen persons who resigned prior to discussion of ratings with employees.

198
Number of Employees Rated Unsatisfactory March 31, 1953.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Operative</th>
<th>Super-Visory</th>
<th>Made</th>
<th>Did not Make Statement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory on June 1, 1953.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Liquor Control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3 under removal order)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls' Industrial School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthornden State Hospital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Commission</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima State Hospital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Prison Farm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Penitentiary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphans' Home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo State Hospital</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX XI

### Employee Performance Reports for 1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjutant General</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor of State</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Board</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green University</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Unemployment Compensation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State College</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State School</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Finance</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Highways</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Industrial Relations</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Liquor Control</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>16.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Taxation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Welfare</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls' Industrial School</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Commission</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>13.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Prison Farm</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Penitentiary</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>14.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Soldiers' and Sailors' Home</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Reformatory</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatory for Women</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquicentennial Commission</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphans' Home</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Boards</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total State Service</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XII

MANUAL FOR EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND EFFICIENCY REPORTING

OHIO STATE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Form No. 62 (Rev.)
EMPLOYEE RATING PROCEDURE

Who Will be Rated:

Each employee who was employed before January 1, shall be given a rating by his immediate supervisor, as of March 31, the same year. Each employee who was employed on or after January 1, but before April 2, or who was assigned to a new position, office or employment during that time, shall be given a rating as of June 30, of each year. Such rating shall be reported to the Civil Service Commission by July 10, of that year. Employees who are on loan to other supervisors shall be rated by the supervisor to whom they are regularly assigned. Advice for this purpose may be asked of the borrowing supervisor on recent performance. Those employees who have been transferred from one supervisor to another within one calendar month of the rating date shall be rated by the original supervisor, and those who have been transferred more than one calendar month, but less than three calendar months prior to the rating date (March 31) shall be rated by the present supervisor on the advice of the original supervisor, and that fact shall be noted on the rating form.

Upon resignation of a supervisor, the resigning supervisor shall complete a Performance Report for each employee under his supervision. Such report shall be made as of date of separation, and shall be available to his successor.

The annual rating shall be made as of March 31, in accordance
with instructions given below. This rating shall be completed by the employee's immediate supervisor and delivered to his supervisor on or before April 5. The reviewing supervisor shall review the ratings and submit them to the Appointing Authority by April 15. The results of these ratings shall be reported to the Civil Service Commission by May 1. Employees who receive an unsatisfactory rating on the annual report shall be given a special rating as of June 1, of the same year. This rating shall be completed, reviewed, and submitted to the Appointing Authority by June 5. If rating is "unsatisfactory" on June 1, the Appointing Authority shall immediately notify the employee on C. S. Form No. 68. The report of such special ratings shall be made to the Civil Service Commission by June 10.

The same form may also be used for special ratings, such as probationary, separation, or other special purposes.

Suggestions to Raters:

This report is only a recording of the appraisal which you have made of the employee's performance during the time he has been under your supervision. Consider the performance over the entire period of time covered by the rating. Do not allow recent events to influence the rating unduly.

Avoid rating an employee high, or low, on all factors just because he rates high, or low, on one factor. Also avoid overrating old employees, or underrating new employees. The rating should be an
evaluation of the employee's achievement in relation to all conditions under which he works. Consider only the employee's performance of those duties which have been assigned to him as part of his job. Do not rate one employee against another employee, but against the requirements of the job.

Procedure for Making Rating Report:

Read carefully the definitions of factors in the rating form, and all other information provided, before starting to rate employees. Have the headings filled in on a form for each employee before completing the remainder of any of the forms. Have clearly in mind the requirements of the job, and rate employees only on these requirements. Now read carefully the definition of the first factor, "Reliability and Responsibility." Considering the requirements of the job, rate each employee on this factor alone. Place a check mark on the scale following the factor at a point which indicates your appraisal of his performance on this factor. Use the definitions given below in arriving at your appraisal. These definitions of performance levels are intended as a relationship between the performance of the employee and the duties of the job upon which the classification which determines the pay range for the job is based.

Unsatisfactory: This is the first space on the scale, and represents a level of performance which does not meet the minimum requirements of the job on this factor. It is a failure to meet the
standards of performance upon which the classification for the job is based. An overall rating (Item No. 19) of unsatisfactory indicates that the employee fails on one or more critical factors to meet the minimum requirements of the job.

**Satisfactory:** This level of performance covers the range from that which barely meets the minimum requirements of the job, through the outstanding performance which far exceeds the requirements of the job in all important respects. A check mark in the space marked "c" on the scale indicates that the employee meets the minimum requirements of the job. This includes fair, or barely satisfactory, up to barely below average performance. A check mark in the space marked "b" indicates a good performance, typical of the good worker on this job. This ranges from barely average to a very good performance. A check mark in the space marked "a" indicates that the employee's performance on this factor is outstanding, and far exceeds the minimum requirements of the job. An overall rating (Item No. 19) in the "a" space indicates that the employee far exceeds the requirements of the job in all important respects. An overall rating of "b" indicates that the employee is a good worker, perhaps below average in some respects, but above average in others. An overall rating of "c" indicates that the employee is satisfactory, perhaps poor in some respects, but is sufficiently good in others to make him a satisfactory employee.

After assigning a rating to each employee on the first factor,
read carefully the second factor, "Industry and Initiative." In so far as possible, disregard any consideration of the other factors or how you have rated employees on them. Assign a rating to each employee on this factor.

Follow this procedure for all other factors in the rating form. Rate all employees on factors one through ten inclusive. Rate only those employees whose duties consist of performing tasks under supervision, on factors eleven through thirteen. Rate only those employees whose duties consist of supervising the work of others on factors 14, 15, and 16. Whether an employee shall be rated on factor 17 shall be at the discretion of the Appointing Authority. All employees shall be rated on items 18 and 19.

Items 1, 2, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are critical factors. If an employee receives an unsatisfactory rating on one of these factors which is applicable to his job, this constitutes an unsatisfactory rating on item No. 19.

After rating employees on all applicable factors up to No. 18, consider the overall performance of the employee for items No. 18 and No. 19. Make the rating on these two items an appraisal of the entire performance of the employee for the entire rating period. This should be a composite rating of the employee's contribution to the objectives of the department for which he works.

Do not allow personal feelings to enter into your rating. It is necessary that you appraise the employee's performance on each factor.
without consideration of any other factor, or personal feelings.

Ratings shall be made by the immediate supervisor, and reviewed by the next higher level of supervision. The "Immediate supervisor" has personal direction of the employee's work: is the person who assigns tasks, gives instructions, appraises performance of assigned tasks, and who is recognized by the employee as being his supervisor. The next higher level of supervision means the immediate supervisor of the rater.

After completing the ratings for all employees under your supervision, submit the ratings to your supervisor, who will review them. The reviewer will indicate by red check mark, each point at which he does not agree with the rater. The rating made by the immediate supervisor shall remain on the form, and any disagreement by the reviewer shall be in addition to the original rating. If there is substantial disagreement between the rater and the reviewer, the matter shall be brought to the attention of the Appointing Authority immediately.

If the rater and reviewer agree that the rating should be unsatisfactory, the rating shall be discussed with the employee, in private, and in a constructive manner. The rater shall explain to the employee that another rating will be made on June 1. The employee shall then be asked to sign the form in the space provided, and indicate whether he desires to make a statement. If the employee desires to make a statement, he shall be given until the end of the third succeeding work day.
in which to make such statement. Ample opportunity shall be provided the employee to make such statement. After the employee is given an opportunity to make a statement, the matter shall be brought to the attention of the Appointing Authority immediately. When rating is established, the Appointing Authority shall notify the employee on C. S. Form No. 67.

The discussion of the rating with the employee should be only one of numerous discussions concerning the efficiency of the employee. This statement is based on the assumption that the employee has the right to know as nearly as possible, exactly what the supervisor expects of him, and the extent to which he meets these expectations. The supervisor should discuss with each employee, the employee's performance of the duties of his job at frequent intervals. These discussions should be in private, and so designed as to aid the employee in achieving the performance expected of him by the supervisor. The supervisor should take care not to make such discussions appear as criticisms only. Just as much care should be exercised in commending good performance as in criticising poor performance, and the criticism should be coupled with advice for correcting weaknesses.

In assigning ratings ask yourself the following questions.

1. **RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**: The success with which assignments are completed in unusual and difficult circumstances, as well as in ordinary working conditions. — Can the person be depended upon to do his job? Does he loaf when he can?
2. **INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE**: The extent to which the employee occupies his time profitably in carrying out assigned duties, and achieving the objectives of the organization, a desire to improve procedure, and the desire and ability to proceed with work without specific instructions. — Is the employee busy during working hours? Does he like to talk to others when he should be working? Does he suggest ways to do the job better?

3. **KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS**: Awareness of relationships of his job to other jobs in the office and department. Knowledge of related jobs, knowledge of specific and general objectives of the agency functions. — Does the employee attempt to understand the purpose of his organization? Does he try to improve his performance and assist fellow workers to improve their performance?

4. **ADAPTABILITY**: The ability to learn new duties, to retain new knowledge, grasp explanations, to adjust readily to changes in working conditions or work. The extent to which employee acquires knowledge of new techniques and procedures without undue delay. — Does the employee adjust himself quickly to changes in conditions of work or duties of his job?

5. **WORK ATTITUDE**: Consider enthusiasm displayed for job duties and responsibilities, loyalty to agency objectives, response to discipline. Ability to work harmoniously with co-workers and supervisors, tendency to be helpful, courteous, and tactful, pleasant disposition. — Is employee willing to cooperate with others to improve the department? Does he seek personal gain regardless of the results to others or to the organization? Does he spend excessive time in rest periods, lunch, etc.? Does he go immediately to work after reporting? Does he take pride in his work?

6. **PUBLIC RELATIONS**: Effectiveness of relations with persons outside the organization. The ability to influence public opinion favorably, to gain acceptance of programs, or the courtesy and tact with which minor contacts with the public are handled. — When the employee deals with the public, is he courteous, or is he snappy or sarcastic? Does he try to give the public a good impression of his department? Does he try to be helpful?

7. **PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK**: Considering the type of work to be done, the extent to which the employee accomplishes the duties of the job without undue fatigue. — Is the employee strong enough to do the labor the job requires, or does he complain of "a weak back," etc.? Does he require assistance for things he should do himself?
8. **PERSONAL APPEARANCE:** The extent to which the employee's dress, etc., is equal to that which would be expected of a person assigned to this type of work. —Does the employee dress and appear as well as he should for this type of job? Is he careless of his appearance?

9. **ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS:** The accuracy and speed with which the employee carries out the necessary minor phases of his job. —Does he avoid minor tasks of his job? Does he see that all necessary work is done promptly as possible?

10. **ATTENDANCE:** Time and energy devoted to productive work as well as frequency and duration of tardiness and absence, note validity of excuses for absence or tardiness. —Does he report to work on time from breaks? Is he habitually late?

11. **QUANTITY OF WORK:** Consider volume of work produced, promptness in completion of tasks, mental alertness, and manual dexterity where applicable. —Does the employee get out the amount of work that would reasonably be expected on the job?

12. **QUALITY OF WORK:** Effectiveness and ability to achieve results, accuracy, neatness, orderliness, proper use of skills and abilities in performing mental, manual or personality requirements of the position. —Is work completed with care to meet the standards of perfection required for the job? Does the employee keep work well within specifications?

13. **MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS:** The extent to which the employee uses the necessary tools and equipment without undue damage or wear. —Is the employee careless with tools and equipment? Does he use material, instruments, etc., with care to avoid unnecessary waste or damage?

14. **PRACTICAL JUDGMENT:** The ability to think intelligently, make logical decisions, and discriminate. —Does employee handle difficult situations with promptness and accuracy? Is he hesitant to make decisions? Are his decisions sound?

15. **EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS:** The extent to which the employee is able to convey his thinking to others, with a minimum of misunderstanding. —Can he present his ideas to others so that they understand what he means? Does he take too much time in expressing ideas? Does he make clear and concise statements?
16. **SUPERVISORY ABILITY**: The degree and ways in which subordinates are encouraged and developed, confidence and respect displayed by subordinates, the extent to which discipline and morale are maintained impartially. The extent to which employee is able to identify the objectives of the organization with those of his subordinates, in the minds of the subordinates, and to achieve their willing cooperation. — Does he achieve willing cooperation from subordinates? Does he encourage subordinates to improve their knowledge and skill? Does he aid capable subordinates in securing advancements? Does he lead rather than drive subordinates? Is he considerate of subordinates? Does he make sure that subordinates know exactly what is expected of them?

17. **EXECUTIVE ABILITY**: The extent to which the employee has the ability to make intelligent and valid decisions, to analyze, organize and plan effectively, to delegate responsibility, and authority, as well as to instruct clearly. Resourcefulness in handling new and unusual situations. — Does the employee delegate clearly, both responsibility and authority? Does he maintain a balance of responsibility and authority? Does he clearly define lines of authority and responsibility? Is he "rambling" in expressing his ideas? Does he prevent any overlapping or confusion of duties in delegating work to his subordinates?
EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE REPORT
APPROVED BY THE OHIO STATE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

NAME: James Doe
CLASSIFICATION: Clerk, Typist II
TITLE: Office Machine Operator
RATING PERIOD ENDING: March 31, 1963

ITEMS IN BOLD FACE TYPE ARE CRITICAL. AN UNSATISFACTORY RATING ON ONE BOLD FACE ITEM HENDERS THE ENTIRE REPORT UNSATISFACTORY.

RATE ALL EMPLOYEES ON FACTORS 1 THROUGH 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Un satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RELIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. KNOWLEDGE OF AGENCY FUNCTIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ADAPTABILITY:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WORK ATTITUDE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PUBLIC RELATIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PHYSICAL FITNESS FOR WORK:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PERSONAL APPEARANCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ATTENTION TO PERTINENT DETAILS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ATTENDANCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATE ONLY NON-SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES ON ITEMS 11 THROUGH 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. QUANTITY OF WORK:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. QUALITY OF WORK:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT, TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATE ONLY SUPERVISORY AND EXECUTIVE EMPLOYEES ON FACTORS 14 THROUGH 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. PRACTICAL JUDGMENT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. EFFECTIVENESS IN PRESENTING IDEAS OR FACTS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SUPERVISORY ABILITY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. EXECUTIVE ABILITY:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATE ALL EMPLOYEES ON ITEMS 18 AND 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. If you were organizing a new department, would you: 1. Be willing to take this employee...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. OVERALL RATING: Considering total ability, performance on the job, and overall value to the department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATER'S CERTIFICATION

The foregoing is a true and accurate appraisal of this employee's performance, based on my personal observation or knowledge. I have brought to the attention of the employee, his strong points as well as his weaknesses, prior to this rating.

Frequently tardy. "Watched clock" at quitting time. Promised to do better in the future.

Lucille Weaver
Office Manager
Date: 11-1-63
REVIEVER’S CERTIFICATION

I have reviewed the foregoing rating, and in view of all available information, I am of the opinion that the rating should be:

[Rating Options: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory]

No Comment

[Signature]

Reviewer’s Signature

[Title]

[Date]

[Reviewer’s Name]

[Assistant Chief]

[Date]

[Appointing Authority’s Name]

[Title]

[Date]

[Appointing Authority’s Name]

[Date]

IF RATING IS ESTABLISHED AS UNSATISFACTORY AFTER REVIEW, THE RATER SHALL EXPLAIN THE RATING TO THE EMPLOYEE, AND ASK HIM TO SIGN IN THE SPACE BELOW. THE EMPLOYEE WILL BE GIVEN UNIL THE END OF THE THIRD SUCCEEDING WORK DAY IN WHICH TO MAKE A STATEMENT.

The foregoing rating has been explained to me. I do, do not wish to make a statement. (If employee wishes to make a statement, use the space below, and add another sheet if necessary)

[Signature]

Employee’s Signature

[Date]

APPOINTING AUTHORITY’S ACTION

After careful review of above statements, Employee’s rating is:

[Rating Options: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory]

[Signature]

Appointing Authority
APPENDIX XIII
RECOMMENDED RULE FOR EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

Each appointing authority shall provide the necessary organization and personnel for implementing the employee performance evaluation system in compliance with Section 143.10 (I), Ohio Revised Code. Ratings are to be made on C. S. Form No. 61 (Rev.), in accordance with instructions in the manual, C. S. Form No. 62 (Rev.). The appointing authority shall provide for instruction of supervisory personnel in the use of rating forms. For this purpose he may request technical assistance from the Civil Service Commission in planning and conducting training programs.

Ratings shall be completed by the immediate supervisor as of March 31, for each employee who was employed on or before December 31, of the preceding year. By June 30 of each year, each employee who was employed, reinstated, promoted or reclassified, on or after January 1, but prior to April 2, of that year shall be given a rating.

Each employee who receives an unsatisfactory rating on March 31, shall have the rating explained to him by his immediate supervisor before April 15, of that year. On June 1, each employee who received an unsatisfactory rating on March 31, shall be given another rating. If this rating is unsatisfactory the employee shall be given a hearing within the department. An appeal procedure for such hearing shall be established by the appointing authority. When final determination of
an unsatisfactory rating is established by the appointing authority, he shall immediately notify the employee on C. S. Form No. 68, and send a copy of such notice to the Civil Service Commission. Employees who were employed, transferred, or promoted on or after January 1, but before April 2, shall receive such notice when the rating is unsatisfactory.

The appointing authority shall report to the Civil Service Commission, on forms to be furnished by the Civil Service Commission, the names of all employees who have achieved reasonable standards of efficiency, and those who have not achieved reasonable standards of efficiency for the jobs to which they are assigned. All such reports shall be completed and in the hands of the Civil Service Commission prior to the date on which the payroll for July 15 of that year is submitted for approval.
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I, William English Green, was born at Brooksmith, Texas, June 19, 1914. I received my secondary school education in the public schools of Motley County, Texas. My undergraduate training was obtained at Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas, from which I received the degree Bachelor of Business Administration in 1947. At the University of Oklahoma, I completed one year of graduate study in the Department of Business Administration in 1948. In January, 1949 I received an appointment as Instructor in the College of Business Administration at Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas. I held this position for three semesters. In September, 1950 I entered The Ohio State University, completing residence requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy. Following completion of the residence requirements I served one year as management consultant to the Ohio State Civil Service Commission, which work served as the basis for this dissertation. In July of 1953 I accepted a position as Assistant Professor of Business Administration at the University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska, which position I hold at present.