



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations

Graduate College

6-1989

Industrial Applicability of the Joint Committee's Personnel Evaluation Standards

Michael Jay Orris
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons

Recommended Citation

Orris, Michael Jay, "Industrial Applicability of the Joint Committee's Personnel Evaluation Standards" (1989). *Dissertations*. 2154.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2154>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE'S
PERSONNEL EVALUATION STANDARDS

by

Michael Jay Orris

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
June 1989

INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE'S
PERSONNEL EVALUATION STANDARDS

Michael Jay Orris, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1989

The purpose of the study was to determine the degree to which The Personnel Evaluation Standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) were applicable and could be applied in a specific industrial setting. Strengths and weaknesses of a specific corporate evaluation process were examined by using the Standards and guidelines within the Standards as a benchmark. The Standards were also used to recommend possible improvements in the design and development of the system.

The method used to apply the standards was patterned from the five steps outlined in "A General Approach to Applying the Standards" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 125). Five judges used a consensus method to apply the standards to the specific corporate evaluation process.

Research questions that were addressed included:

1. Are the Standards applicable in an industrial setting and to a specific corporate evaluation system?
2. To what degree are the Standards addressed in an industrial personnel evaluation system?
3. Are there industrial standards and guidelines that did not correspond to any of the Joint Committee's Standards?

4. Is it feasible to use the Standards for critiquing a specific corporate evaluation process and making recommendations for improvement?

Three conclusions were drawn from this study. First, the Standards are generalizable and feasible for use in settings other than education. Second, some (9%) of the Standards' guidelines are not universally applicable in settings other than education. Third, all Standard guidelines could be written to be universally applicable.

Three major recommendations were made: (a) Consideration should be given to rewriting the Standards to make them applicable in all settings; (b) care should be exercised when using the Standards outside of education to be certain that the guidelines are appropriate for the type of setting; and (c) this study is but one check of the Standards applicability outside of education and further studies should be made.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 8921869

**Industrial applicability of the joint committee's "Personnel
Evaluation Standards"**

Orris, Michael Jay, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Orris, Michael Jay. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright by
Michael Jay Orris
1989

DEDICATION

To my mother, Shirley, I will be eternally grateful for instilling in me the importance of family, hard work, dedication, and the value of education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my appreciation to others for their contribution toward the completion of this dissertation and their support throughout the doctoral program. I am grateful for the support that each of my committee members (Chairman Dr. Edgar Kelley, Dr. James Sanders, and Dr. Dale Brethower) has given. I would particularly like to acknowledge Dr. Edgar Kelley for the important time and guidance he has contributed in support of this dissertation.

I would also like to acknowledge all of the individuals from the studied site who freely gave their time and support: Greg Jones, John Marra, and the five jury members.

Lastly, this paper would not have been possible without the assistance, support, and sacrifice that each member of my family has made toward the completion of this degree; I thank my wife, Kathy, and my children: Kristin, Kelly, and Matthew.

Michael Jay Orris

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Context of the Problem	1
Research Problem	4
Operational Definitions	5
Research Questions	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Conceptual Framework	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Introduction	12
Personnel Evaluation in Business and Industry	13
The Specific Corporation Evaluation Process	14
1982 SCEP	15
1988 SCEP	17
Literature Related to the Standards	24
Utility Standards	24
Feasibility Standards	27
Propriety Standards	30
Accuracy Standards	35
III. METHODOLOGY	43
Introduction	43

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER		
	Research Design	44
	Instrumentation	53
	Evaluator Selection and Training	54
	Data Analysis	56
	Decision Rule	56
	Analysis	57
IV.	FINDINGS	58
	Introduction	58
	Findings	59
	Research Question 1	59
	Research Question 2	61
	Research Question 3	61
	Research Question 4	62
	Research Question 5	62
	Research Question 6	63
	Research Question 7	64
	Research Question 8	64
	Findings From Interviews	65
	Interview Question 1	66
	Interview Question 2	66
	Interview Question 3	67
	Interview Question 4	67
	Interview Question 5	67

Table of Contents--Continued

CHAPTER		
	Interview Question 6	67
	Interview Question 7	68
	Interview Question 8	68
	Summary	68
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
	Summary	69
	Purpose	69
	Research Questions	69
	Research Design	70
	Evaluator Selection and Training	71
	Major Findings	72
	Finding 1	72
	Finding 2	72
	Finding 3	72
	Finding 4	72
	Finding 5	73
	Finding 6	73
	Conclusions	73
	Conclusion 1	73
	Conclusion 2	74
	Conclusion 3	74
	Recommendations	74
	Major Recommendations	74

Table of Contents--Continued

Additional Recommendations	75
APPENDICES	76
A. Joint Committee	77
B. Evaluation Forms	83
C. Performance Improvement Plan	87
D. Prestudy Package Table of Contents	89
E. Instrument	92
F. Standard Guideline Applicability and Compliance	99
G. Recommendations	101
H. Interview Summary	135
I. Summary of the Number of Improvements Recommended	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	143

LIST OF TABLES

1. Roles of Managers, Supervisors, and Employees in Performance Appraisal	37
2. Compiled Ratings for Each Standard and Category	60
3. Standard Guideline Applicability in an Industrial Setting	63
4. Summary of the Number of Recommendations Made to Improve the Joint Committee's Standard Guidelines and the SCEP	66

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

In business and industry, personnel evaluation has long been a tool used, or misused, to accomplish a multitude of objectives. The purposes of personnel evaluations may be many, or few, depending on the organization, but generally they are used for: (a) providing honest feedback to employees so they can improve their own capabilities on the job, (b) providing an objective basis for salary and other personnel decisions, (c) encouraging employees to achieve higher levels of performance in addition to maintaining acceptable performance levels (Woods & Dillon, 1985), (d) organizational and manpower planning, and (e) validation of a selection technique (Zippo & Miller, 1984).

With these constructive and purposeful objectives in mind, why has personnel evaluation long been an area of confusion, criticism, controversy, and litigation? In reviewing literature on evaluation, one immediately encounters a variety of conflicting reviews. An American Management Association (AMA) survey on evaluation (Zippo & Miller, 1984) found that personnel evaluations do have a positive effect. More specifically, performance appraisals have a moderate or greater effect on leadership, productivity, and efficiency, while its effect on morale, organizational stability, profits, and company

growth are also rated positive but less powerful. There have been conflicting reviews, as well, "despite the logical appeal of performance appraisal . . . evidence has been popping up to suggest that most performance appraisal systems are more noteworthy for the angst they create than the results they achieve" (Zemke, 1985, p. 24). Another is Deming's (1984) description of personnel evaluation systems as one of the "seven deadly diseases that afflict practically all big American companies" (p. 17). Deming further stated, "evaluation should be titled management by fear" (p. 19).

The reason for the constant criticism of personnel evaluation techniques are many. A list of nine of these criticisms are:

1. Evaluations nourish short-term performance, annihilate long-term planning, build fear, demolish teamwork, and fuel rivalry and politics (Deming, 1984).
2. Evaluations promote bitterness, despondence, dejection, and depression, leaving some unfit for work weeks after receipt of ratings, unable to comprehend why they are inferior (Deming, 1984).
3. Evaluation is unfair, as it ascribes to the people in a group differences that may be caused totally by the system in which they work (Deming, 1984).
4. Evaluation allows unqualified persons to assume important professional roles (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988).
5. Personnel evaluations do not aid in ridding incompetent or unproductive personnel from the organization (Joint Committee, 1988).

6. Evaluations do not always recognize and help to reward outstanding service (Joint Committee, 1988).

7. There is no recourse for the evaluatee in an unfair or inaccurate evaluation, as the individual most likely to give the evaluation is the only one close enough to the employee to perform the evaluation (Olson, 1984).

8. Resources and evaluation tools are not properly or fairly allocated to the evaluation process (Reed & Kroll, 1985).

9. Supervisors and managers dislike giving performance appraisals as they are not properly trained, believe the process is either too objective or subjective, and they "don't like playing god" (McGregor, 1960, p. 86; Reed & Kroll, 1985; Rice, 1985).

Criticisms of evaluation systems illustrate the need for improvement and reform of evaluation processes in industry. In response to similar criticisms in the area of educational personnel evaluation and the need for better and more consistent evaluation systems, the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation began work on personnel evaluation standards. (See Appendix A for a detailed overview of the make-up of the Joint Committee.) The committee believed that the crux of the problem was that professions of education and evaluation had not reached agreement on what standards should be used to judge personnel evaluation systems. While these professions had collaborated in developing standards for judging program evaluations, they had previously explicitly excluded the area of personnel evaluation (Joint Committee, 1981). Perhaps the only common denominator for evaluations have been commonly used financial

criteria (Wilde & Vancil, 1982). With this understanding, the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) developed 21 standards for evaluation of educational personnel. These standards are to be used for assessing or developing systems for evaluating educational personnel. The standards require that evaluations be proper, useful, feasible, and accurate.

In reviewing literature on personnel evaluation in business and industry, there is the same lack of existing standards for personnel evaluation. There also exists the same need for personnel evaluation standards in business and industry. This is evident in the widespread dissatisfaction with practices, it is inherent in efforts to develop better systems for developing personnel, and the need is highlighted by the fact that published standards for evaluations so far have excluded the area of personnel evaluation (Gallegos, Sanders, & Stufflebeam, 1986; Joint Committee, 1981). This lack of standards in business and industry is the basis for the objectives of this study.

Research Problem

The problem addressed in this study was: To what degree were the personnel evaluation guidelines developed in a major corporation consistent with the standards developed for personnel evaluation systems in education?

Operational Definitions

Personnel evaluation is the act of evaluating employees on their job performance. This evaluation may be used for a variety of purposes by the employer. Included in this list of purposes (but not excluded by this list), may be: performance feedback, monetary merit awards, encouraging higher performance levels, organizational and manpower planning, recruitment and selection, certification and licensing, and dismissal. Participants in the evaluation process include: the group or individual conducting the personnel evaluation work, the person being evaluated, the implementor of the evaluation, and the prime decision-making audiences for the evaluation report (Joint Committee, 1988).

Specific Corporation Evaluation Process (SCEP) is the specific evaluation process that will be critiqued in the process of applying the educational evaluation standards to an industrial or business setting. The SCEP is an evaluation process employed by 1 of Americas 10 largest corporations which is in the business of manufacturing and assembling durable goods. Data were collected from a single division of that corporation using the standard corporate evaluation process. The process in this study was a newly developed SCEP that at the outset of this work was less than 1 year old and was used for salaried employees only.

A standard is "a principle commonly agreed to by people engaged in the professional practice of evaluation for the measurement of the value or quality of an evaluation" (Joint Committee, 1981, p. 12).

The Joint Committee (1988) developed 21 Personnel Evaluation Standards which are guiding principles. They "represent the best thinking of many knowledgeable, experienced people about sound general principles for personnel evaluation" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 150).

A standard guideline is an instructional or directional statement for carrying out the standards and making them operational.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study were:

1. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to any personnel evaluation systems in an industrial setting?
2. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to a specific corporate evaluation process?
3. To what degree are the Joint Committee's Standards addressed in an industrial personnel evaluation system?
4. Are the guidelines, developed for each of the 21 standards for application in educational settings, also appropriate for application in industrial settings?
5. Are there industrial standards that did not correspond to any of the Joint Committee's Standards (suggesting possible need for additional standards)?
6. Are there guidelines for use in industrial settings that did not correspond to any Joint Committee's Standards' guidelines (suggesting possible need for additional standard guidelines)?
7. Is it feasible to use the Joint Committee's Standards and guidelines within the Standards for critiquing a specific corporate

evaluation process?

8. Can recommendations be made for improvement of the host setting's personnel evaluation system and the Joint Committee Standards and guidelines for the Standards?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to use The Personnel Evaluation Standards, as developed by the Joint Committee (1988), and to determine the degree to which the standards were present, applicable, complete, and could be applied in a specific industrial work setting to make recommendations for improvement. Strengths and weaknesses of the SCEP were examined and compared by using the standards and guidelines as a benchmark. The standards and guidelines were also used to recommend possible improvements in the design and development of the system, by adapting the Joint Committee's Personnel Evaluation Standards for application in industry. When speaking of adaptation of the standards and guidelines, only minor word substitutions that were specific to education were made to consider the industrial arena (see Appendix G). No substantive changes were made.

Although the standards were written to present "widely shared views of general principles for developing and assessing sound, acceptable personnel evaluation procedures" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 7), the standards are directed at educational personnel. The Joint Committee focused their research, written format, and validation work toward the educational community. The standards are intended to apply to all institutions or parts of institutions that

have a primary responsibility to educate. Both private and public institutions are included. Among them are schools; universities; and departments in the military, business, or industry that are focused on education (Joint Committee, 1988).

Conceptual Framework

In spite of the problems with personnel evaluation systems that have been discussed, evaluations are necessary in business and industry. First, personnel evaluation systems provide important feedback (Zemke, 1985). Second, they add another dimension: expectations. If done correctly, personnel evaluation is a mechanism for making sure people know what is expected of them and how they will be measured (Zemke, 1985). Third, a central reason for personnel evaluation systems is the law. An organization without a sound, standardized performance evaluation system can experience severe legal problems. The courts have been specific. If an employee challenges a dismissal or missed promotion or disciplinary action, an organization should have a defensible appraisal system in place. The courts further require that a defensible system uses standardized forms and procedures, is based on a clear and relevant job analysis, and is covered by training for the people doing the rating (Pinto, cited in Zemke, 1985). Personnel evaluations are important to the productivity of an organization. Latham and Wexley (1982) discussed productivity as being a function of how well at least three variables are managed, namely: technology, capital, and human resources. Many organizations strive to maximize productivity through improved

technology and capital investment. Quite a few of these same organizations have failed to take full advantage of their human resources. Organizations have established traditional accounting standards to measure increases in performance due to investments from capital or technologies (e.g., profits and costs, as measured by standard ratios and formulas). Performance improvements by people and their influence on organizational improvement are not so easily measured. Employee practices such as coming to work late, stopping work early, and inefficient work practices are costing companies millions of dollars. Latham and Wexley (1982) estimated the costs of these factors at a client company as \$80,000,000, compounding at 7% annually. These examples illustrate the need to evaluate personnel performance.

Personnel evaluation systems have been deficient, inconsistent, and controversial since their inception in the business and industrial setting. The SCEP which this study is addressing is no exception and has been introduced as a replacement for an older system. The old SCEP had drawn both controversy and criticism and was considered obsolete. The new SCEP was designed to address the perceived or actual shortcomings of its predecessor.

A set of universal evaluation standards could provide general rules and guidelines by which the inadequate and confusing field of personnel evaluation could be studied and improved. Before anything or anyone is evaluated, standards for the evaluation should be established (Harris, McIntyre, Littleton, & Long, 1985).

The Joint Committee (1988) listed 25 uses of the standards that could benefit the four main groups involved in personnel evaluation;

they are:

Group 1: Prime users of the evaluation might include administrators, committees, members of policy boards, and others. The uses are: (a) to provide the primary reference document for developing and applying board policy on personnel evaluation; (b) to foster due process in evaluation practices, thereby providing fair treatment and reducing legal vulnerability in personnel evaluation cases; (c) to assess and improve institutional evaluation systems used in certification, selection, assignment, reassignment, promotion, tenure, and other types of recognition and decisions; (d) to strengthen the role of personnel evaluation in ensuring high standards; (e) to help assure that new policy initiatives--e.g., incentive pay, career ladders, and mentoring programs--can accomplish their objectives; (f) to help clarify the rights and responsibilities of professionals in the institution; (g) to help assure that personnel evaluations hold individuals accountable for delivery of high quality services; (h) to promote evaluation practices that help the institution attract, develop, and retain qualified people; (i) to promote evaluations that reinforce positive behaviors, as well as identify areas for improvement; and (j) to obtain evaluations that provide a just and defensible basis for terminating individuals who persist in providing unacceptable services.

Group 2: The personnel evaluator uses are: (a) to train those who are to serve in the role of the personnel evaluator, (b) to examine alternative evaluation practices, (c) to plan particular evaluations and overall evaluation systems, (d) to guide and monitor

particular evaluations, (e) to assess particular evaluations, (f) to help avoid or settle disputes in the evaluation of personnel, and (g) to provide direction for addressing specific issues in given evaluations.

Group 3: The uses for evaluatees are: (a) to improve their understanding of and skills in personnel evaluation; (b) to promote or demand evaluations that lead to increased professional development for themselves and others; (c) to identify and resolve possible due process issues before mistakes occur in an evaluation; and (d) to investigate whether given personnel evaluations are fair, valid, practical, and educationally useful.

Group 4: The uses for those involved in research, development, and teaching are: (a) as a textbook for courses on personnel evaluation or personnel administration, (b) as criteria against which to evaluate alternative models for personnel evaluation, (c) as a framework for use in developing evaluation systems, and (d) as a logical structure for deriving and investigating questions and hypotheses about personnel evaluation.

Capitalizing on the large investment that went into developing educational standards and applying them to business and industry, the opportunity exists for improving evaluation practices in other fields. This study, although small in magnitude compared with the work by the Joint Committee on standards for personnel evaluation, could be the basis for future work to expand these standards universally in all areas of personnel evaluation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to use The Personnel Evaluation Standards, as developed by the Joint Committee (1988), and to determine the degree to which the standards were present, applicable, complete, and could be applied in a specific industrial work setting to make recommendations for improvement. Strengths and weaknesses of the SCEP were examined and compared by using the standards and guidelines as a benchmark. The standards and guidelines were also used to recommend possible improvements in the design and development of the system by adapting the Joint Committee's (1988) Personnel Evaluation Standards for application in industry.

The literature review employed a computer assisted search using 52 descriptors on personnel evaluation and a review of Western Michigan University's Evaluation Center's resources. While at the Evaluation Center, the Joint Committee's literature searches and other pertinent materials located at the center were reviewed and gathered (e.g., Literature Related to Educational Personnel Evaluations: The Need for Standards [Gallegos et al., 1986], A Selected Annotated Bibliography on Personnel Evaluation [Joint Committee, 1986]). This literature review also included an examination of the on-site information and documentation for the SCEP used in the study

and developmental sources (e.g., writings from Deming, 1982, 1984) that have influenced the studied company. All on-site information and documentation are treated confidentially with citations preceded by SCEP.

The literature review is organized in three sections: (a) Personnel Evaluation in Business and Industry; (b) the Specific Corporate Evaluation Process (SCEP); and (c) Literature Related to the Standards: Utility, Feasibility, Propriety, and Accuracy.

Personnel Evaluation in Business and Industry

The need for standards in judging personnel evaluation systems stems from the vital role in which they play in appraising employee performance. This need is evident in the widespread dissatisfaction with current practices; it is inherent in efforts to develop better systems for developing personnel; and the need is highlighted by the fact that published standards for evaluations so far have excluded the area of personnel evaluation (Gallegos et al., 1986; Joint Committee, 1981). Organizations owe accountability in human resources management and development to the stockholders and owners who have invested heavily in the companies' employees. These same organizations also owe fair and equitable personnel evaluation processes to their employees who depend on the organization for financial support to them and their families.

Nearly all businesses and industrial organizations have some method in place to evaluate the performance of their personnel: categorically in the areas of feedback, merit pay, human resource

management, improving performance, recognition, selection, and certification (Cascio, 1982a; Heneman, Schwab, Jassum, & Dyer, 1983; Levine, 1986; Woods & Dillon, 1985; Zippo & Miller, 1984). In an effort to determine the uses of performance appraisals, the American Management Association (AMA) conducted a survey of 588 organizations (424 responded). This survey found that 91% of the companies conducted management-level performance appraisals. The appraisals were used for compensation (85.6%), counseling (65.1%), training and development (64.3%), promotion (45.3%), manpower planning (43.1%), retention and discharge (30.3%), and validation of a selection technique (17.2%). Further, in defining the role of evaluations in business, the study showed that in 97.8% of the companies the employee's supervisor takes a major role in the appraisal, and in 92% the supervisor's supervisor also takes part (Eichel & Bender, cited in Zippo & Miller, 1984).

The Specific Corporation Evaluation Process

The Specific Corporation Evaluation Process (SCEP) is a system that was put into effect in 1976, revised in 1982 to include a 6-point rating scale, and modified again in 1988. The 1988 SCEP is still in the implementation phase. The SCEP applies only to salaried employees. Due to the evolutionary development of the evaluation process, the system as revised in 1982 will be described and the system as modified in 1988 will be reviewed. Throughout the overview of the 1982 system, items modified in the 1988 system will be followed by an asterisk.

1982 SCEP

Purpose

The 1982 SCEP is a multipurposed instrument used to perform many tasks: Among them are the following administrative tasks: (a) job description, (b) performance planning, (c) evaluations,* (d) merit increases,* (e) promotion, (f) transfers, (g) terminations, (h) recruiting and (i) self-nomination. Developmental tasks include: (a) orientation, (b) training, (c) job rotation, (d) career growth, (e) competency development, and (f) increasing potential. The strategic task is the alignment of job assignment with business unit goals and objectives.

The formally stated purpose of the SCEP is as follows:

Appraisal involves the evaluation of each salaried employee's job performance, potential, and readiness for other positions. The purpose is to establish communication with employees, improve their job performance, and develop their capacity for advancement. Also management is provided with information on the department and quality of the salaried work force and facilities, compensation, selection, and personnel planning decisions. (SCEP Training Handbook, 1985)

Appraisal Procedure

The appraisal process consists of a four-phase appraisal cycle: Phase 1, performance planning; Phase 2, ongoing performance review; Phase 3, completing appraisal forms; and Phase 4, completing appraisal discussion.

Phase 1, performance planning, consists of writing key elements and standards of excellence and determining when performance planning

should occur. Key elements are a major responsibility or output required as part of any job. Key elements are concise, objective, and action oriented. Standards of excellence are critical, observable actions performed in achieving key elements. They are stated as critically effective actions or critically ineffective actions. Key elements describe "what" the employee is to do, while standards of excellence describe "how" the employee is to accomplish the key elements. Together the key elements and performance standards of excellence make up a performance plan.

Phase 2, the continuing performance review, occurs separate from the formal appraisal during the appraisal year. The ongoing appraisal review is any informal review of job performance conducted during Phase 2 of the performance cycle. This should include reference to the performance plan and how actual performance is comparing to the key elements and standards. Phase 2 also consists of observing behaviors and offering constructive feedback.

Phase 3, completing appraisal forms, involves the actual completion of the formal appraisal forms. The formal appraisal forms are three standardized and numbered forms.

Phase 4, appraisal discussion, entails the appraisal discussion that occurs between the evaluator and the evaluatee. This should focus on the employee performance as compared to the key elements and performance standards. The action plan for the next cycle should also be discussed at this time.

1988 SCEPIntroduction

Under the 1982 SCEP all personnel evaluation was performed using a single instrument or process, the appraisal instrument. In the 1988 SCEP, the "overall" rating was deleted from the appraisal instrument and it is no longer used for compensation administration. An assessment of performance for use in compensation will continue but not as part of the appraisal instrument. The new SCEP is no longer a single instrument, rather it contains two distinct elements for personnel evaluation: (a) Performance Development Process (PDP) is a revision of the 1982 SCEP appraisal instrument without a numerical rating and containing many major changes. Developmental issues are reviewed in the instrument but it is no longer used for compensation. (b) Relative contribution is an assessment process used to evaluate performance for purposes of compensation and other personnel decisions (SCEP Modifications, 1988).

In determining relative contribution employee performance is assessed by evaluating an individual's contributions to the company relative to that of other employees of their unit who are at the same or similar levels and who have similar job responsibilities. Relative contribution is determined by comparing over a sustained period: (a) how well individuals have met their responsibilities and achieved their performance objectives, (b) improvements made to quality and cost, (c) demonstrated leadership ability, and (d) commitment to teamwork (SCEP Modifications, 1988).

Background

The 1982 SCEP was developed to establish uniformity and consistency in documentation and appraisal policy across all units. While the company believed these goals were met, a number of concerns developed with the system. Some concerns were: (a) The 1982 SCEP did not adequately distinguish performance (e.g., 70% of the top level classified employees were rated in the upper 30%). (b) the system was viewed as being cumbersome and paper intensive. (c) Employees and supervisors tended to focus upon the "overall" rating rather than the developmental aspects of the appraisal. (d) Many internal units were interested in using an appraisal system which better assisted them in accomplishing their business objectives and supported their philosophy and culture (SCEP Supplement B, 1988).

Performance Development Process

The purpose of the Performance Development Process is:

to facilitate more effective communications and feedback of performance expectations. The new process also improves the linkage between business planning and performance planning for individuals. Emphasis is placed on development by making performance expectations clearer and by providing feedback on an employee's progress in meeting those expectations. (SCEP Supplement B, 1988, p. 1)

Under the 1988 modifications to the appraisal process the corporation no longer requires individual divisions to use the old appraisal form. The division in this study has chosen to develop new evaluation forms for its process (see Appendix B for new evaluation forms). While use of the corporate appraisal process is division

optional, groupings of employees based on relative contribution is required (SCEP Supplement B, 1988).

Any locally developed (unit or division) Performance Development Plan must include the following corporate standards (SCEP Supplement B, 1988):

1. The Performance Development Plan is a tool for the supervisor and employee which focuses on job performance and development of skills for greater responsibility.
2. A Performance Development discussion must be conducted with each employee at least once every 12 months.
3. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring that Performance Development discussions are conducted. Units are responsible for adopting appropriate controls to monitor the Performance Development Plan.
4. Although no summary rating is required, a determination must be made regarding whether the performance of the employee is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
5. The 1982 SCEP's Performance Improvement Plan must be used for employee's with unsatisfactory performance.
6. The Performance Development Plan must provide for employee input.
7. The Performance Development Plan must include the following items: leadership, teamwork, cost improvement, quality improvement, Equal Employment Opportunity responsibilities, and unit business objectives.

8. The supervisor's discussion of performance should include information from other appropriate individuals (peers, subordinates, and other supervisors).

9. Review of the Performance Development Plan by the second level supervisor is required.

10. Immediate "readiness" for a change in position must be discussed during the performance development plan and entered into the appropriate employee information system.

11. Units must develop an employee appeal procedure.

12. Units must use one system for all their regular, salaried employees.

13. Unit-specific plans must meet policy and legal requirements and receive staff approval.

The Performance Development Plan is a 5-step process that operates on a 12-month continuous cycle with ongoing communications and coaching year round (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988). The starting mechanism for the beginning of each cycle is the evaluatee's employment month, which is the month in which the employee began work at the company.

Step 1 is to establish the employee's job responsibilities and performance expectations. In Step 1 the supervisor and employee meet to: (a) review the business plans and employee's role in achieving them, (b) identify key job responsibilities and performance expectations, (c) develop employee action plans for further development and improvement, (d) develop management action plans to help the employee develop, (e) identify any necessary training to be scheduled, and

(f) identify and agree on tentative multiple input sources for the upcoming year (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

Step 2 is the employee input meeting. In Step 2 the evaluatee completes the employee input form and then the supervisor and the employee meet to discuss the following: (a) short-term and long-term career goals and interests; (b) contributions and strengths relative to job responsibilities and the Personal Operating Principles (these are a set of operating principles which are developed on what are considered correct, or good, operating principles); (c) progress made against the developed action plan, special projects, or training; (d) identification of any roadblocks preventing maximum contributions; (e) proposed action plan to further develop and improve; and (f) the final selection is agreed to for the multiple input source team members (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

Step 3 is obtaining multiple input on the evaluatee. Multiple input forms are completed by the multiple input sources who then meet with the supervisor to: (a) review and discuss the employee's key job responsibilities and expectations for the past year, (b) review the employee's career goals and expectations, (c) identify the employee's strengths and contributions, (d) identify opportunities for the employee's further development and improvement, and (e) develop a proposed action plan that both the employee and management could take to further develop and improve (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

Step 4 involves the supervisor completing the Personal Development Plan form. During Step 4, the supervisor: (a) reviews and compiles all information from the Personal Development Plan forms,

(b) completes the feedback sections of the Personal Development Plan form, (c) assigns position readiness code, (d) determines if the employee is a candidate for a Performance Improvement Plan (discussed in a later paragraph), and (e) completes the remaining sections of the form except the comments section (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

Step 5 is the employee review of the Personal Development Plan form. In this step the supervisor and the employee meet to:

(a) discuss the completed sections of the form; (b) clarify any information; (c) listen to the employees views, ideas, and suggestions; (d) establish key job responsibilities for the coming year; and (e) sign the form and complete the comments section (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

A key element of the Performance Development Plan is that it requires ongoing coaching and communication throughout the evaluation cycle. The process requires a minimum of four quarterly reviews throughout the year (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

For employees whose performance is substandard and have not responded to coaching they may be subject to a Performance Improvement Plan (see Appendix C for forms). A Performance Improvement Plan is a formal process to address unsatisfactory performance of individuals who have not responded to normal coaching. The purpose of the Performance Improvement Plan is to assure that employees who are experiencing performance difficulties are provided prompt, sensitive, and timely assistance to return them to satisfactory levels of performance (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988). If performance has not

improved to desired levels within the time period specified, determination is made on whether the employee should be reassigned, reclassified, or terminated (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988). The Performance Improvement Plan process is one of the elements that remains in effect from the 1982 evaluation system.

Relative Contribution

Employees are "grouped" or "ranked" according to their contribution relative to employees with similar responsibilities (SCEP Supplement A, 1988). Corporate policy requires that the grouping of employees into designated categories of the following proportion will be sufficient, although units may elect to rank order their employees (studied SCEP has opted to group rather than rank):

Relative contribution grouping	Salary potential
Top 10%	High premium
Next 25%	Premium
Middle 55%	Competitive
Lower 10%	No base increase

Corporate policy dictates that all procedures for determining relative contribution must comprehend the following standards (SCEP Supplement B, 1988):

1. Group by level or very similar levels of responsibility.
2. Group in the largest numbers practical, but such that employees understand their comparative groups.

3. Grouping categories should consider the following factors demonstrated over a sustained period (up to 3 years): (a) achievement of unit's business objectives, (b) demonstrated leadership ability, (c) teamwork, and (d) improvements in quality and cost.

4. Information from appropriate management sources should be used in determining an employee's relative contribution.

5. Personnel involved in the grouping decision should have direct knowledge of employees' performance during the period under review.

6. Employees should be informed of their relative contribution upon request.

7. A unit should develop an employee appeal procedure for the grouping process.

Literature Related to the Standards

Utility Standards

"The Utility Standards are intended to guide evaluations so that they will be informative, timely, and influential" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 45). The standards are: (a) constructive orientation, (b) defined uses, (c) evaluator credibility, (d) functional reporting, and (e) follow-up and impact (Joint Committee, 1988).

Most authors agree one of the primary criticisms of evaluation processes has been their destructive, rather than constructive, orientation. Evaluations should be constructive and credible and, with proper feedback, may have a positive impact (Darling-Hammond, Wise, &

Pease, 1983; Dipboye & Pontbraid, 1981; Kaye, 1984; Woods & Dillon, 1985; Zemke, 1985). Conversely, many authorities are quick to point out that if administered improperly, personnel evaluations may not only be destructive but also have devastating results (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Deming, 1984; Joint Committee, 1988; Olson, 1984; Reed & Kroll, 1985; Zemke, 1985). Concerning evaluator credibility, an evaluation should be managed and executed by individuals who are qualified, skilled, and trained in personnel evaluation (Joint Committee, 1988). The ultimate success or failure of a system or individual evaluation may rest on the training effort that supports it (Stroul, 1987). Training should also cover the specific uses of the evaluation process; it may not be enough to train in general on how to apply a personnel evaluation system. An example of this might be an evaluation process that includes career development. If evaluators are expected to offer career advice they must be trained to offer meaningful feedback (Jacobson & Kaye, 1986).

Evaluator credibility may be lacking for many reasons; some of those reasons are that evaluators: (a) are improperly trained (Jacobson & Kaye, 1986; Rice, 1985; Stroul, 1987); (b) may be biased (Rice, 1985); (c) might be subjective (Reed & Kroll, 1985; Rice, 1985); (d) sometimes operate under conflicting or miscommunicated rules, goals, or standards than the evaluatee (Stroul, 1987); (e) are often opposed to the role they are playing in the evaluation process (McGregor, 1960; Stroul, 1987; Zemke, 1985); (f) may not have, or allocate, enough time or resources to the process (Reed & Kroll, 1985); (g) often do not possess the knowledge of the evaluatee's job

performance, job content, or work environment (Deming, 1984; Reed & Kroll, 1985); and (h) may have cognitive and perceptual differences that affect ratings within the system (Rice, 1985).

In personnel evaluations the supervisor is usually involved, but dependent on the particular system, not necessarily the exclusive evaluator. In the Eichel and Bender (cited in Zippo & Miller, 1984) survey, it was found that 98% of the time the supervisor takes the major role; and in 92% of personnel evaluations, the supervisor's supervisor also is included. Peer review has also been used in some instances to perform the evaluation (Latham & Wexley, 1982; Olson, 1984; Strauss & Sayles, 1980).

If evaluations are to be effective they must be followed up so that clients and evaluatees understand the results and take appropriate action. A Honeywell study found that only 4% of supervisors, 2% of managers, and 1% of executives said performance appraisals had a positive impact on their careers. Appraisals were near the bottom of the list of 24 impact items listed by managers in the study (Campbell, 1985). This might imply that processes or evaluators do not follow up evaluations properly so as to achieve a positive impact from the instrument. "Feedback and training must be specific if they are to bring about a relatively permanent change in an employee's behavior" (Latham & Wexley, 1982, p. 38). A resounding theme found throughout the literature on personnel evaluation is the importance of feedback before, during, and as a follow-up to the process (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983; Dipboye & Pontbraid, 1981; Kaye, 1984; Woods & Dillon, 1985; Zemke, 1985).

Intended uses of the evaluation should be identified (Joint Committee, 1988). The first step of an evaluation should be deciding what is to be evaluated (Schneier, Beatty, & Baird, 1986). In general, an individual should develop clear objectives for the proposed assessment procedures and design the validation effort to determine how they have been achieved (American Psychological Association, 1980). There is a number of uses for evaluations: merit, recognition, promotion, discharge, development, performance feedback, certification, selection, training, and other personnel practices (Cascio, 1982a; Heneman et al., 1983; Levine, 1986; Woods & Dillon, 1985; Zippo & Miller, 1984).

Evaluation reports should also be clear, timely, accurate, and germane to be of value (Joint Committee, 1988). Managerial positions often operate at a very high pace; nonetheless, it is imperative that time is taken to insure evaluations are timely and accurate (Reed & Kroll, 1985).

Feasibility Standards

"The Feasibility Standards call for evaluation systems that are as easy to implement as possible, efficient in their use of time and resources, adequately funded, and viable from a number of other standpoints" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 71). These standards are: (a) practical procedures, (b) political viability, and (c) fiscal viability (Joint Committee, 1988).

Personnel evaluations should be planned and implemented so as to maximize impact while minimizing cost and disruption. Davis (cited

in Zemke, 1985) advocated the "Keep It Short and Simple" (KISS) principle be adhered to in the evaluation process. There is no excuse, or reason, to have numerous pages of performance appraisal forms (Zemke, 1985). Systems that have burdensome, time consuming instruments may find that procedures are not adhered to by evaluators. Managers required to complete the ratings often see performance appraisals as another time consuming personnel paperwork requirement, having little utility in solving "real" managerial problems (Schneier et al., 1986).

Personnel evaluation systems should be developed collaboratively, so that all parties are constructively involved (Joint Committee, 1988). As was reviewed above, it is essential to a good evaluation system that the evaluator (credible evaluator) and the evaluatee be thoroughly involved in the process. There should be continuous feedback, follow-up, and defined uses for the system. One area not reviewed, however, is the importance of all concerned parties being involved in the system.

Over and above the involvement of the evaluator and the evaluatee, involvement of senior management is necessary. Senior executives must be willing to participate in the process along with every other manager (Davis, cited in Zemke, 1985). Senior management must be committed to the system to ensure compliance, allocate sufficient resources, and emphasize the importance of the instrument's role. They must also support the system to insure that there is a high level of commitment by middle management. One of the primary reasons for failure of evaluation systems is lack of middle management

support after the system has been implemented (Latham & Wexley, 1982).

The success of any personnel evaluation system depends as much on the attitude of the users of the system as it does on the technical soundness and design of the system. User participation and joint collaboration in developing an appraisal system are undeniable; unless those affected regard the system as valid and fair they will undermine the system (Cascio & Awad, 1981). Cook (1984) reviewed such an appraisal system in her work, Human Resource Director's Handbook. The system was developed by a small company (473 employees) that used a task force from all levels of the company to develop their appraisal system. By meeting 1 night a week for 12 weeks, they not only developed a system but also achieved several other benefits: orientation to the program, user support and commitment, mutual goal setting, and training in personnel evaluation.

Time and resources can be problematic to the personnel evaluation process. Organizational structures that have large numbers of individuals (evaluatees) reporting to a supervisor (evaluator) in a system that uses the supervisor as the evaluator can make time and resources scarce (Reed & Kroll, 1985). An organization in which managers, or evaluators, are mobile may also pose time constraints problems, where the manager does not have time to assess performance (Levinson, 1976). Evaluation processes themselves may also impose logistical constraints on the manager if the instrumentation is too burdensome. Many formal appraisal systems contain too much paperwork and ritual (Rieder, 1973).

Personnel evaluation systems can be costly to have and operate; however, it may be more costly not to have them or to operate programs poorly. Cost-benefit analysis of personnel evaluation systems and uses are important factors to consider. Cascio (1982b), in his book Costing Human Resources, outlined methods for considering these costs.

When the evaluation is used for merit pay or compensation, financial allocation of resources may be an important consideration as well. If evaluators are given inappropriate merit funds, they may be tempted to give inaccurate ratings in order to manipulate monies. This is true for systems using forced distributions (Reed & Kroll, 1985; Rodman, 1984). Resources are an important consideration because of time constraints on managers and because it is estimated that the largest single use of personnel evaluations is for compensation (85.6%) (Zippo & Miller, 1984).

Propriety Standards

"The Propriety Standards require that evaluations be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of the persons being evaluated, as well as their clients" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 21). The standards are: (a) service orientation, (b) formal evaluation guidelines, (c) conflict of interest, (d) access to personnel evaluation reports, and (e) interactions with evaluatees (Joint Committee, 1988).

Violations of federal laws in regard to performance appraisals can cost an organization millions of dollars in legal fees, court

costs, damages, and back pay, not to mention the opportunity costs of the company's time and personnel resources (Latham & Wexley, 1982). Due to the depth, breadth, and complexity of materials available on the legal aspects of personnel evaluation, this review has been limited to a discussion of the primary governing bodies associated with enforcement and precedent setting case law.

One primary governing body is the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) which administers Title VII. In 1972, the EEOC was authorized to bring suit against nongovernmental agencies. In 1964, the EEOC assumed responsibility of the Department of Labor for enforcing the Equal Pay Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination Employment Act of 1979.

Another primary governing body is the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP), which was established in 1965 and then merged with the Department of Labor in 1975. The OFCCP was originally intended to enforce discriminatory practice laws by federal contractors and subcontractors, but the powers have expanded far beyond this into other sectors.

Case Law

1. The Civil Reform Act of 1978 is important because it specifically addresses performance appraisals of federal employees; effects, however, go beyond federal employees.

2. EEOC guideline changes in 1978: (a) Any and all personnel decisions affecting an employee's status in an organization are defined as tests, and tests that adversely affect people in a protected

class must be valid (measure what they purport to measure). (b) If a selection rate for any sex, race, or ethnic group is less than 80% of the selection rate for the group with the highest rate of selection, a test is considered to have an adverse impact on the former group (bottom-line strategy).

3. United States v. South Carolina (1978): As to the extent that the EEOC Guidelines conflict with well-grounded expert opinion and accepted professional standards, the guidelines need not be controlling.

4. Griggs v. Duke Power (1971) made the EEOC Guidelines the law of the land: (a) Any and all employment criteria must be shown to be job related, and (b) validation of employment practices that may affect a protected class is required.

5. Brito v. Zia Company (1973) further enforced the need for a valid, measurable instrument.

6. As stated in the Federal Register ("Regulatory Requirements of Office of Personnel Management," 1979), "An appraisal system must not include any controls, such as a requirement for a bell shaped curve, that prevent fair appraisal of performance in relation to standards" (p. 3448).

7. The following court rulings have clarified the fact that an employer must have a sound, valid, and reliable instrument for evaluating employees, and that those administering the process must be trained: (a) Wade v. Mississippi Cooperative Extension Services (1974), (b) Albemarle Paper Company v. Moody (1975), (c) United Steelworkers v. Weber (1979), (d) Domingo v. New England Fish Company

(1977), and (e) Rowe v. General Motors (1972).

Evaluation of personnel should promote sound business principles, fulfillment of institutional missions, and effective performance of job responsibilities, so that the needs of the employee, community, and society are met (Joint Committee, 1988). Evaluation should be supportive of the organizational goals and objectives and should be linked to effective job performance (Latham & Wexley, 1982; Levine, 1986; Zippo & Miller, 1984). The evaluation should be developmental in its feedback addressing the needs of the evaluatee (Cascio & Awad, 1981; Dipboye & Pontbraid, 1981; Kaye, 1984; Woods & Dillon, 1985; Zemke, 1985).

Guidelines for personnel evaluations should be recorded in statements of policy, negotiated agreements, and personnel evaluation manuals so that evaluations are consistent, equitable, and in accordance with pertinent laws and ethical codes (Joint Committee, 1988). Guidelines promote consistency, equitability, and legality; and by adhering to guidelines of behavior between evaluator and evaluatee before, during, and after the appraisal, stress between the parties involved can be reduced. This can promote a constructive, professional approach to the process (Cascio & Awad, 1981).

Conflicts of interest should be identified and addressed openly and honestly so that they do not compromise the evaluation results (Joint Committee, 1988). Conflicts of interest can lead to rater error and bias.

Access to reports of personnel evaluation should be limited to individuals with a legitimate need to review and use the reports so

that appropriate use of the information is assured (Joint Committee, 1988). The researcher or other user is responsible for maintaining security. All reasonable precautions should be taken to safeguard materials, and decision makers should beware of making decisions on scores obtained from insecure procedures (American Psychological Association, 1980).

Perhaps one of the most important aspects of personnel evaluation in terms of user acceptance of the evaluation is the interaction that occurs with evaluatees. In 1960, McGregor wrote:

Performance appraisal . . . the implicit logic of which is that in order to get people to direct their efforts toward organizational objectives, management must tell them what to do, judge how well they have done, and reward or punish them accordingly. (p. 77)

With an ever changing work environment, this is an oversimplification of the process and could lead to a poorly supported system. A unilateral system damages self-esteem, motivation, and attitudes toward personnel evaluation. Interactions with the evaluatee should be professional, courteous, and considerate and should promote self-esteem, performance, and motivation (Joint Committee, 1988). Cascio and Awad (1981) listed several activities evaluators should engage in before, after, and during appraisal interviews; they are: (a) frequent communication, (b) appraisal training, (c) judge your own performance first, (d) encourage subordinate preparation, (e) encourage participation, (f) judge only performance, (g) be specific, (h) be an active listener, (i) set mutual goals, (j) communicate and assess progress, and (k) reward performance.

With the emphasis in this section being mostly technical (validation, reliability, and legality), it is important to consider fairness. The underlying premise of these technical considerations is that they promote fairness or equality in employment practices. A fundamental assumption of the principles of good practice is that those who follow them will also further the principle of fair employment (American Psychological Association, 1980).

Accuracy Standards

"The Accuracy Standards require that the obtained information be technically accurate and that conclusions be linked logically to the data" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 83). The standards are: (a) defined role, (b) work environment, (c) documentation of procedures, (d) valid measurement, (e) reliable measurement, (f) systematic data control, (g) bias control, and (h) monitoring evaluation systems (Joint Committee, 1988).

For the evaluator to determine valid assessment criteria, it is necessary to define the role, responsibilities, performance objectives, and needed qualifications of the evaluatee (Joint Committee, 1988). The evaluator should develop distinct objectives for the proposed assessment procedures and design the validation effort to determine how well they have been met. Objectives should be consistent with professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities (American Psychological Association, 1980). The goal of evaluation should be to improve, not prove (Stufflebeam, cited in Isaac & Michael, 1981). For this reason, establishing performance objectives is important to

personnel evaluation. When speaking of evaluation, Isaac and Michael (1981) described three general steps. They are: (a) setting objectives, (b) designing a means to achieve these objectives, and (c) providing feedback to determine progress toward, and achievement of, these objectives.

In a study of 588 organizations, 72% stated that they included clear and concise goals and objectives in their evaluation systems (Zippo & Miller, 1984). In another study, 18 of the 30 respondents to the survey, said they used Management by Objectives (MBO) objectives for exempt employees in their evaluation system (Levine, 1986). Management by Objectives, sometimes called results-oriented appraisals, has been adopted by many organizations to reduce subjectivity in personnel evaluation. This system also contains many limitations inherent with numerical goals and is losing some of its initial popularity (Strauss & Sayles, 1980).

Kaye (1984) included a table in one of her articles as an example of the roles managers and employees play in a performance appraisal (see Table 1).

Along with defining the role, the evaluator should define the work environment in which the evaluatee works, so that influences and constraints can be considered (Joint Committee, 1988). Evaluation is inaccurate, as it ascribes to people in a group differences that may be caused totally by the system in which they work (Deming, 1984). "Performance appraisal systems . . . cannot be successful if they are not consistent with the realities of managerial work and organizational environments" (Schneier et al., 1986, p. 42).

Table 1
Roles of Managers, Supervisors, and Employees
in Performance Appraisal

Roles in Performance Appraisal	
Managers	Employees
Learn about and understand process.	Learn about and understand process.
Gather data/documents.	Brush up on skills in listening and feedback.
Clarify expectations.	Review past appraisals.
Brush up on listening and feedback skills.	Review job description.
Determine exactly what is wanted of employee "shoulds."	
Determine consequences (rewards and penalties) for achievement or non-achievement.	
Collect back-up examples.	
Arrange for and conduct interview.	

Note. From "Performance Appraisal and Career Development: A Shotgun Marriage" by B. L. Kaye, 1984, Personnel, 61(2), p. 64.

Work environmental effects can be particularly difficult as an influencing factor in systems using numerical goals. In reviewing the level of attainment of a numerical objective or goal, it is often difficult to determine the degree to which environmental factors contributed to the achievement, or lack of achievement, of the established objective (Deming, 1982; Strauss & Sayles, 1980). Even when such measures can be obtained, they are usually applicable only for

the work group as a whole, because no individual worker has substantial control over the output measured. Employee performance is often affected by the performance of others (Latham & Wexley, 1982).

Procedures should be documented so that actual evaluation practices can be measured in relation to intended procedures (Joint Committee, 1988). As stated previously, there exist many reasons that may influence compliance to procedures (e.g., time, resources, training, and commitment). Only through documenting procedures and measuring actual to intend procedures, can these weaknesses be identified and corrected.

The measurement procedures should be chosen or developed and implemented on the basis of the described role and intended uses, so that inferences are valid and accurate (Joint Committee, 1988). Measurement procedures should also assure reliability, so that the information obtained will provide consistent indications of the performance of the evaluatee (Joint Committee, 1988).

The most frequently referenced source found in this review on the subject of validation and reliability was the Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures (2nd ed., American Psychological Association, 1980). Because of the source's importance, it is appropriate to outline the work in its entirety:

- I. Definition of validity

- A. Validity is the degree to which inferences from scores on tests or assessments are justified or supported by evidence. (Note: The 1970 EEOC Uniform Guidelines defined "tests" to include any paper-and-pencil test

or performance measure used as a basis for an employment decision. The 1978 EEOC Uniform Guidelines redefined test to also include unstandardized, informal, and unscored appraisal procedures) (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1970, 1978).

- B. The primary question to be answered in validation is the degree to which these inferences are appropriate.
- II. Application of principles: Three axioms underlie the applications of all of these principles:
 - A. Individuals differ in many ways.
 - B. Individual differences in personal characteristics and backgrounds are related to differences in behavior on the job.
 - C. In the best interest of organizations and individuals, information about these differences should be developed and used in assigning people to jobs.
- III. Job analysis: A systematic examination of the job and the context in which it will be performed will provide an enhanced understanding.
- IV. Criterion-related strategy: In general, the use of any personnel selection procedure is to predict future performance as measured by some job relevant criterion. Evidence for criterion-related validity typically consists of a demonstration of a statistically significant relationship between the selection procedure (predictor) and one or more measures of job relevant performance (criterion).

- V. Content-oriented strategies: Content-oriented predictor development or choice, if properly conducted, provides evidence that a selection procedure samples job requirements.
- VI. Implementation: Validation is the investigatory phase in the development or choice of selection procedures. Whatever the outcome of such research, the researcher should prepare a report of the findings. The importance of documentation in the form of such a report is especially great if the assessment procedure is to be adopted for operational use. Many valid programs fail at the point of implementation.

Reliability effects validity in that a performance measure that is unreliable cannot be valid (Latham & Wexley, 1982). A valid measure should yield consistent (reliable) data about what it is concerned with regardless of the time frame in which it is taken or who takes the measurement (Cascio & Awad, 1981; Latham & Wexley, 1982).

The evaluation should safeguard against bias, so that the evaluatee's qualifications or performance are assessed fairly (Joint Committee, 1988). The possibility of bias or other contamination should be considered. Although a simple group difference on the criterion does not establish bias, such bias would occur if a definable subgroup were rated consistently high or low as compared to other groups (American Psychological Association, 1980).

In addition to biases found in personnel evaluation systems, many other sources for rating errors were found in this literature review. Some of the more common mentioned were:

1. Contrast effects: the tendency for a rater to evaluate a person relative to other individuals rather than on the requirements of the job (Latham & Wexley, 1982).
2. Biases: they may be sexual, racial, similar-to-me, physical appearance, or age (Cascio & Awad, 1981; Latham & Wexley, 1982; Rice, 1985; Schneier et al, 1986; Zemke, 1985).
3. Halo effects: paying too much attention to one factor, allowing a high or low rating in one area to influence the rating in other areas (Cascio & Awad, 1981; Isaac & Michael, 1981; Latham & Wexley, 1982; Zemke, 1985).
4. Central tendency: raters may assign all ratings around the center of the scale avoiding ratings that appear too high or low (Cascio & Awad, 1981; Isaac & Michael, 1981; Latham & Wexley, 1982; Zemke, 1985).
5. Negative and positive leniency: raters may rate all employees either too severe or too easy (Cascio & Awad, 1981; Isaac & Michael, 1981; Latham & Wexley, 1982; Zemke, 1985).

Objectivity and subjectivity was a topic discussed repeatedly by authors when speaking of personnel evaluation. Some authors stated that in the attempt to maintain objectivity, evaluation systems were often weak and ineffective (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983). Most, however, maintained that one of the primary faults with personnel evaluations was their inability to keep biases and subjectivity out

of the process (Levine, 1986; Levinson, 1976; Soar, Medley, & Coker, 1983; Zemke, 1985). Effective designs can minimize subjectivity; but as long as evaluators are human, subjectivity may evolve (Levine, 1986; Levinson, 1976).

The information used in the evaluation should be kept secure and be carefully processed and maintained, so as to ensure that the data analyzed are the same as the data collected (Joint Committee, 1988). Data should be free from clerical error. Key punching, coding, and computational work should be checked carefully and thoroughly (American Psychological Association, 1980).

The evaluation system should be reviewed periodically and systematically, so that appropriate revisions can be made (Joint Committee, 1988). Information should not be available for use in personnel decisions when it may no longer be valid. Personnel files should be purged of data rendered potentially invalid by new experience, aging maturation, or other personal changes (or by changes in jobs or organizations) so that inferences will not be based on such scores (American Psychological Association, 1980). "Any performance review program, once implemented, needs periodic enrichment" (Rodman, 1984, p. 77).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to use The Personnel Evaluation Standards, as developed by the Joint Committee (1988), and to determine the degree to which the standards were present, applicable, complete, and could be applied in a specific industrial work setting to make recommendations for improvement. Strengths and weaknesses of the SCEP were examined and compared by using the standards and guidelines as a benchmark.

The study investigated eight research questions, which were:

1. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to any personnel evaluation systems in an industrial setting?
2. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to a specific corporate evaluation process?
3. To what degree are the Joint Committee's Standards addressed in an industrial personnel evaluation system?
4. Are the guidelines, developed for each of the 21 standards for application in educational settings, also appropriate for application in industrial settings?
5. Are there industrial standards that did not correspond to any of the Joint Committee's Standards (suggesting possible need for additional standards)?

6. Are there guidelines for use in industrial settings that did not correspond to any Joint Committee's Standards' guidelines (suggesting possible need for additional standard guidelines)?

7. Is it feasible to use the Joint Committee's Standards and guidelines within the Standards for critiquing a specific corporate evaluation process?

8. Can recommendations be made for improvement of the host setting's personnel evaluation system and the Joint Committee Standards and guidelines for the Standards?

In this chapter the methodology used for the study to address the above mentioned research topics is reviewed. The chapter is divided into the following sections: Research Design, Instrumentation, Evaluator Selection and Training, and Data Analysis.

Research Design

The research design of this study was a descriptive analysis of a Specific Corporate Evaluation Process (SCEP). The 1988 SCEP described in the literature review was the process used for the study. Of the two-part evaluation system, only the Performance Development Plan was studied as time did not permit a review of the Relative Contribution evaluation. The SCEP in this study is employed by a division of a large American corporation that manufactures and assembles durable goods. The durable goods are technical, expensive products, mass produced for sale both domestically and internationally. The division is headquartered in the north central part of the United States and employs approximately 11,000 people. The division has

four primary assembly plants that are supported by numerous component plants, as well as engineering and administrative facilities. This study was done at one site location of the division which employees approximately 4,500 people, has one assembly plant, one component plant, and an administrative and engineering facility.

The study used the Joint Committee's Standards for the evaluation of the SCEP. The steps in A General Approach to Applying the Standards that are described in The Personnel Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee, 1988) were closely paralleled. The steps used were as follows:

Step 1 was to become acquainted with the Standards. The method used to accomplish Step 1 was: (a) a complete review of the Joint Committee's (1988) Personnel Evaluation Standards, (b) inclusion of Standards in literature review, and (c) inclusion of Standards in the research instrument.

Step 2 was to clarify the purpose of the evaluation system. The method used to accomplish Step 2 was to answer the questions outlined by the Joint Committee (1988) in their second step. The answers to these questions were found by reviewing corporate policies and guidelines pertaining to the SCEP, reviewing divisional policies and guidelines pertaining to the SCEP, a review of the questions in Step 2 with personnel administrators responsible for the SCEP, and a review of the questions with the judges who participated in the SCEP training and applied the standards.

1. Whose work is to be evaluated? All classified salaried employees are reviewed under the SCEP (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

2. Why should the evaluation be done? There are three primary purposes for the Performance Development Plan: (a) to link employee job objectives with the broader objectives of their unit and the goals of the corporation, (b) to ensure that individuals understand the results and job skills expected of them, and (c) to encourage dialogue between supervisors and subordinates in regard to performance so that subordinates can build on achievements and identify areas for improvement and development (SCEP Modifications, 1988). Other uses of the SCEP identified through documentation and by personnel administrators of the SCEP were: (a) addressing unsatisfactory performance through improvement or dismissal via a Performance Development Plan, (b) improved communication, (c) self-nomination, (d) promotion, (e) training, (f) transfers, (g) career growth (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988; SCEP Supplement B, 1988; SCEP Modifications, 1988), (h) improve quality of work life, (i) solicit ideas, (j) establish goals and commitments, and (k) remove performance barriers (Jones, 1988; SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

3. Who will use the findings? The Performance Development Plan is used for a variety of purposes; therefore, it has a variety of users. The findings may be used by several supervisors, managers, human resource management committees, trainers, and the evaluatee (Jones, 1988).

4. What decisions will be determined or affected and/or what types of actions are evaluatees and managers expected to take in response to evaluation reports? Decisions and actions taken in response to the Performance Development Plan would include employee

development, separation, career planning, transfer, promotion, demotion, and training (Jones, 1988; SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

5. Should the evaluation(s) focus on qualifications, performance, and effectiveness, or some combination of the three? The Performance Development Plan should focus on some combination of the three (Jones, 1988).

6. What impact is the evaluation system intended to have? The Performance Development plan is intended to have the following impact: (a) link employees' objectives to the broader objectives and goals of the unit and the company; (b) ensure that individuals understand the results and job skills expected of them; (c) improve evaluator-evaluated dialogue regarding performance, enabling subordinates to build on achievements and identify areas for improvement and development (SCEP Modifications, 1988); (d) promote quality and continuous improvement; (e) emphasize positive leadership; (f) stress subordinate empowerment and motivate them toward doing a better job (Jones, 1988; SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

Step 3 was to describe the system. The method used to accomplish Step 3 was to answer the questions outlined by the Joint Committee in their third step. The same sources were used to answer the questions in Step 3 as Step 2.

1. How are evaluations staffed and what are the qualifications of the evaluators? In the Performance Development Plan process the supervisor of the evaluatee is always the prime evaluator, although others are asked to provide multiple input. Each evaluator is required to attend a 2-day training program that explains how the

evaluation process works and teaches some basic evaluation skills. All evaluatees receive a shortened version of this training session. Evaluators and evaluatees also receive documentation of the process in the form of a manual and periodic updates as the process is modified (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

The actual evaluation is the primary responsibility of the supervisor. The administrative tasks are the responsibility of the personnel department. These administrative tasks would include such things as notification, storage, filing, monitoring of the process, and the appeal process. Personnel administrators are often given additional training and workshops in the evaluation process and germane personnel policies and procedures (Jones, 1988).

2. What are the relevant policies? Relevant personnel policies include: (a) incorporation of the business plan into the evaluation process, (b) evaluations must be completed in ink or typed and signed in ink, (c) evaluation training is required for all users of the evaluation system, and (d) personnel employees who handle evaluations are required 2 weeks of additional training. (Answer developed through review of the judges.)

3. What questions are addressed? Questions asked on the Employee Input form include: (a) describe your career goals and interests; (b) identify your contributions and strengths in relationship to your specific job responsibilities, the Personal Operating Principles, progress on previously developed action plans, and training, as well as any additional assignments you may have had during the previous year; (c) identify any organizational roadblocks which

prevent you from maximizing your contributions; and (d) propose any action plans that you or management could take, including any necessary training, to further develop and improve (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

Questions asked on the Multiple Input form include: (a) employee's job responsibilities; (b) identify employee's contributions and strengths; (c) identify opportunities for employee's further development and improvement; and (d) propose any action plans that the employee or management could take, including any necessary training, to further develop and improve (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

Questions asked and items reviewed on the Personal Development Plan include: (a) job responsibilities, (b) employee action plans for improvement and development, (c) management action plans, (d) training to be scheduled, (e) feedback contributions and strengths, (f) opportunities for development with suggested action plans, (g) readiness for other positions, (h) employee comments, (i) multiple input sources, (j) does the employee's performance necessitate the use of a Performance Development Plan, and (k) supervisor comments (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

4. What data are collected? Data collected are outlined in the above and below mentioned questions.

5. How are data collected, analyzed, interpreted, and reported? Steps in the Performance Development Plan are as follows: (a) Twelve months prior to the evaluatee's employment date the evaluatee and the evaluator establish responsibilities and expectations. (b) Three months prior to the evaluatee's employment date the employee

completes the Employee Input form which is reviewed by the employee and the supervisor. (c) One month prior to the evaluatee's employment date the Multiple Input forms are completed by the multiple input sources and reviewed with the supervisor. (d) One week prior to the employee's employment date the supervisor completes the Personal Development Plan form. (e) On or about the evaluatee's employment date the supervisor and employee review the Personal Development Plan and begin the first step again (SCEP PDP Training Manual, 1988).

6. How is the evaluation system organized, scheduled, managed, and monitored? The Performance Development Plan is completed annually for each salaried employee and is scheduled by the employment date of the evaluatee. A computer database generates a name sticker to be placed on a set of forms at the appropriate time intervals required by the system. This computer generated sticker is the signal to start the process. The timing of the process is monitored by the personnel department (Jones, 1988).

7. What follow-up activities occur? The evaluatees and the evaluators are expected to follow up on issues addressed in the Performance Development Plan through ongoing coaching and communications. These coaching and communications sessions are expected to occur at least quarterly. The personnel department follows up only on reports that require special handling, exceptions or discrepancies found in an audit, or Open Door issue. The Open Door is a formal appeal process that allows an employee to appeal an issue through the formal chain of command in the company (Jones, 1988).

Step 4 was applying the Standards. The method used for applying the standards in this study was to use a jury of five judges that scored the SCEP on a Standard by Standard basis. The judges rated the SCEP for compliance with each of the Joint Committee's (1988) Standards and corresponding guidelines. In addition to the numerical rating, judges were asked to include descriptive comments of their findings.

Prior to the study, each of the judges were given a prestudy package (see Appendix D for the prestudy package table of contents) to orient themselves with: (a) an overview of the dissertation study; (b) the instrument they would be using which also contained the Joint Committee's Standards; (c) an overview of the SCEP; (d) a preliminary draft of the preceding Steps 2 and 3; (e) corporate and unit policy statements pertaining to the SCEP; and (f) a study agenda showing the times, schedule, and meeting rooms. The prestudy package also included each of the judge's standards and associated guidelines that they would be asked to apply independently before reaching consensus opinion on the ratings. All judges were assigned four standards with the exception of one who was given five.

Four days were scheduled for the jury to be trained in the SCEP and to apply the standards. The first day of training began with a short introduction which included: a review of the agenda, an explanation of the research objectives, a discussion on the prestudy package, a reading of the Joint Committee's (1988) section on applying the standards, and a question and answer period. Following the introduction began the formal SCEP training package that was

delivered by an on-site training instructor. The jury was able to complete the training by the end of the first day.

The second day of the study began with a second introduction to the jury. The introductory remarks included: (a) a review of the Joint Committee, its background, and the standards developmental process to make the jury comfortable with the material; (b) a review of the agenda; (c) a review in use of the instrument; (d) the joint establishment of the process for reaching consensus; and (e) a group review of Steps 2 and 3. Following this brief introduction, the judges began their individual work on their assigned standards. After approximately 3 hours the judges had all completed the instruments for their individually assigned standards and were ready to begin a consensus review. Prior to beginning work on the consensus review, there was a discussion to determine the exact format for their presentations on the consensus work. The jury agreed that they would first review their individual findings as recorded on their instruments, review detailed guideline-by-guideline information, give their rationale for their summary ratings, and finally, they would open the floor for discussion and rebuttals until consensus opinion was reached. In actuality this format was discarded after the first two standards were reviewed, as the jury found it easier to discuss each guideline after the standard owner gave his position and then recap the findings of the instrument. The jury was able to complete five standards by the end of the first day.

On the third day of the study the jury immediately began consensus work on the standards. The jury was able to complete all work on

the standards by the end of the third day. During this third day, one of the judges had to leave and missed the last 2 hours of the consensus work. Since the judge had completed his assigned standards, it is thought that this had little impact, if any, on the outcome of the study.

The fourth day was used to conduct individual interviews with each of the judges. These interviews were held at separate locations with only the interviewer and one judge present.

A fifth step is listed by the Joint Committee (1988), which is deciding what to do about the results. The Joint Committee's fifth step was not recorded as a part of this study as any decisions regarding the results of this study will occur after completion of the study.

Instrumentation

The jury used a rating instrument that was developed for this study (see Appendix E for the instrument). The instrument was completed by the jury to:

1. Indicate applicability of the Standards in relation to general industrial application.
2. Indicate applicability of the Standards in relation to this SCEP (industrial application).
3. Rate the SCEP for compliance to the Standards.
4. Provide descriptive comments in line with the descriptive design of this study. Descriptive comments were used to elaborate on the reasons that the Standard and guidelines did or did not apply,

and to point out specific areas of compliance and noncompliance. These comments were used to address Research Objectives 4, 5, 6, and 7 (suggesting possible need for additional standards and guidelines, assessing applicability of guidelines, and developing recommendations for improvement).

Outside of the formal instrument and upon completion of the instrument, judges were interviewed to determine the ease with which they were able to apply the standards and to identify study strengths and weaknesses. This was to determine the feasibility of using the standards to critique an SCEP, determine if any Standards were missing, not mentioned during the study, and offer suggestions for such a process. Questions were simply and openly constructed to encourage descriptive feedback: (a) Did you find the standards easy to use in critiquing the SCEP? (b) Is it feasible to use the Joint Committee's Standards in reviewing an SCEP? (c) Was this a practical and useful exercise you would recommend for reviewing an SCEP? (d) Were there any SCEP procedures that did not have standards that addressed them? (e) Do you have suggestions to improve the process for applying the standards? (f) Did the prestudy package help you? (g) How much time did you spend outside of the class on this project? (h) Do you have anything that you would like to comment on or add?

Evaluator Selection and Training

Evaluators or judges were selected that had varied roles in and knowledge of the SCEP. The judges selected were a mixture of users and experts that also represented all levels of SCEP users.

Judge 1: Judge 1 was an outside expert who had no knowledge or ties to the SCEP. This individual worked on the Joint Committee's Standards as part of the validation panel. In addition to experience with the Joint Committee's Standards and a working knowledge of test validity and reliability, Judge 1 also had developed a personnel evaluation system for the United States Government.

Judge 2: Judge 2 was the Director of Personnel at the studied location. This individual was an unclassified employee who does not participate in the SCEP but is a policy maker and user of the system. Judge 2 possessed extensive knowledge in all aspects of personnel policy and procedures. As Director of Personnel, this judge sat on early review panels of the SCEP, is a member of the unit Human Resources Management Committee, and is in charge of all personnel activities at the host setting, which includes training and the administration of the SCEP.

Judge 3: Judge 3 was a seventh level classified employee which is a second level manager in the organization. This is a level in which the judge would be both a giver and receiver of a personnel evaluation. Judge 3 is presently in charge of the training and communications departments. Judge 3 has wide experience in all aspects of the business having been a production supervisor and manufacturing general supervisor for almost 20 years.

Judge 4: Judge 4 was a sixth level classified employee which is a first level production supervisor in the organization. Judge 4 was a minority employee who is presently assigned to coordinate hourly training on the assembly line. As a first line supervisor this

judge's relationship with the SCEP is strictly that of an evaluatee.

Judge 5: Judge 5 was an eighth level employee which is typically a department head in the organization. Presently working on a special assignment to coordinate a joint union-management program, Judge 5 has had a wide variety of experience in the organization which included work on the personnel compensation evaluation task force, a member of the salary recruitment team, a master mechanic, superintendent of maintenance, senior industrial engineer, manufacturing superintendent, and process engineer.

For training purposes all judges were given a detailed description of the SCEP (developed partially through Step 2 and Step 3 described above), a 1-day training course in the SCEP, a copy of the Standards complete with the explanation and guidelines contained in the Joint Committee's (1988) work, and the rating instrument with an explanation of how it is to be used.

Data Analysis

Scores and comments were compiled and a description of the strengths and weaknesses of the SCEP corresponding to each of the Standards and Guidelines was developed.

Decision Rule

A decision rule was originally developed for rating the SCEP in the event that the judges were unable to reach consensus opinion on a final standard rating. In all cases, however, the judges were able

to reach a consensus opinion so that it was unnecessary to use a decision rule for establishing a standard rating.

Analysis

All consensus ratings taken from the judges' instruments were compiled for each standard on a summary rating table (see Table 2 in Chapter IV). This table included: (a) a yes or no decision for industrial applicability, (b) a yes or no decision for applicability to the SCEP, and (c) a numerical rating of compliance by the SCEP for standards that were determined to apply to the SCEP. The numerical rating of compliance by the SCEP was also tabulated to give a mean rating by standard grouping. The numerical rating values were as follows: 1 = addressed and met standard, 2 = addressed and partially met standard, 3 = standard addressed and not met, and 4 = standard not addressed.

Guidelines for each standard were also rated for compliance by the SCEP in the same manner except that numerical values were not recorded. The reason for this was that each guideline had a different weighting of importance to the jury, and they did not use a straight forward numerical extrapolation to determine the overall rating of the standard. These guideline ratings were compiled for each standard (see Appendices F and G).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which The Personnel Evaluation Standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) were applicable and could be applied in a specific work setting. Strengths and weaknesses of the SCEP were examined by using the Standards. The Standards were also used to recommend possible improvements in the design and development of the system, by adapting the Joint Committee's Personnel Evaluation Standards for application in industry.

The research questions addressed in this study were:

1. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to any personal evaluation systems in an industrial setting?
2. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to a specific corporate evaluation process?
3. To what degree are the Joint Committee's Standards addressed in an industrial personnel evaluation system?
4. Are the guidelines, developed for each of the 21 standards for application in educational settings, also appropriate for application in industrial settings?
5. Are there industrial standards that did not correspond to any of the Joint Committee's Standards (suggesting possible need for

additional standards)?

6. Are there guidelines for use in industrial settings that did not correspond to any Joint Committee's Standards' guidelines (suggesting possible need for additional standard guidelines)?

7. Is it feasible to use the Joint Committee's Standards and guidelines within the Standards for critiquing a specific corporate evaluation process?

8. Can recommendations be made for improvement of the host setting's personnel evaluation system and the Joint Committee Standards and guidelines for the Standards?

A summary of findings related to the eight research questions is presented in this chapter. Additional findings resulting from individual interviews also are reported in this chapter.

Findings

In this section each of the eight research questions is addressed. Findings are reported as they specifically relate to each question.

Research Question 1

The first research question was: Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to any personnel evaluation systems in an industrial setting? Data tabulated from the jury's instrument are reported in Table 2. The jury ruled that all 21 Standards are applicable to personnel evaluation systems in an industrial setting.

Table 2
Compiled Ratings for Each Standard and Category

Standard symbols	Applicable to any industrial SCEP	Applicable to this SCEP	Addressed and met	Addressed and met partially	Addressed and not met	Not addressed
P1	Yes	Yes		2		
P2	Yes	Yes	1			
P3	Yes	Yes		2		
P4	Yes	Yes		2		
P5	Yes	Yes	1			
Mean P	Yes	Yes		1.6		
F1	Yes	Yes	1			
F2	Yes	Yes	1			
F3	Yes	Yes		2		
Mean F	Yes	Yes	1.3			
A1	Yes	Yes	1			
A2	Yes	Yes	1			
A3	Yes	Yes		2		
A4	Yes	Yes		2		
A5	Yes	Yes		2		
A6	Yes	Yes	1			
A7	Yes	Yes		2		
A8	Yes	Yes		2		
Mean A	Yes	Yes		1.6		
U1	Yes	Yes	1			
U2	Yes	Yes		2		
U3	Yes	Yes		2		
U4	Yes	Yes	1			
U5	Yes	Yes	1			
Mean U	Yes	Yes	1.4			

Research Question 2

The second research question was: Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to a specific corporate evaluation process?

Data tabulated from the jury's instrument are reported in Table 2. All 21 Standards were judged to be applicable to the Specific Corporate Evaluation Process.

Research Question 3

The third research question was: To what degree are the Joint Committee's Standards addressed in an industrial personnel evaluation system? Data compiled addressing Question 3 are shown in Table 2. The SCEP addressed and partially met the Propriety Standards with a mean rating of 1.6 (on a scale with 1 being the highest and 4 the lowest). Standards P1 (Service Orientation), P3 (Conflict of Interest), and P4 (Access to Personnel Evaluation Reports) were given overall ratings of addressed and partially met Standard. Standards P2 (Formal Evaluation Guidelines) and P5 (Interactions With Evaluatees) were rated as addressed and met Standard.

The SCEP addressed and met the Utility Standards with a mean rating of 1.4. Three of the Standards were addressed and met by the SCEP: U1 Constructive Orientation, U4 Functional Reporting, and U5 Follow-up and Impact. Two of the Utility Standards were addressed and partially met by the SCEP: U2 Defined Uses and U3 Evaluator Credibility.

Feasibility Standards were addressed and met with a mean rating of 1.3. Two of the Feasibility Standards were addressed and met by the SCEP: F1 Practical Procedures and F2 Political Viability. The third Feasibility Standard, F3 Fiscal Viability, was addressed and partially met by the SCEP.

The Accuracy Standards were addressed and partially met by the SCEP. Three of the Accuracy Standards were rated as addressed and met by the SCEP: A1 Defined Role, A2 Work Environment, and A6 Systematic Data Control. The remaining five Accuracy Standards were addressed and partially met by the SCEP: A3 Documentation of Procedures, A4 Valid Measurement, A5 Reliable Measurement, A7 Bias Control, and A8 Monitoring Evaluation Systems.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question was: Are the guidelines, developed for each of the 21 standards for application in educational settings, also appropriate for application in industrial settings? Summary data are reported in Table 3; detailed data may be found in Appendix F and Appendix G. Of the 199 Standard Guidelines, 177 (88.4%) were found to be applicable in an industrial setting, 18 (9.6%) were not applicable in an industrial setting, and 4 (2%) were not rated.

Research Question 5

The fifth research question was: Are there industrial standards that did not correspond to any of the Joint Committee's Standards? This question was addressed during a poststudy interview (see

Table 3
Standard Guideline Applicability in an Industrial Setting

Standards	A	NA	NR
Propriety Standards	54	6	1
Feasibility Standards	23	0	0
Accuracy Standards	57	5	0
Utility Standards	43	7	3
Totals	177	18	4

Note. A = number of Standard Guidelines applicable; NA = number of Standard Guidelines not applicable; and NR = number of Standard Guidelines not rated.

Appendix H). All five of the judges stated that they could identify no standards that were unique to an industrial setting which should be added to the Educational Standards.

Research Question 6

The sixth research question was: Are there guidelines for use in industrial settings that did not correspond to any Joint Committee's Standards' guidelines? Information addressing this question was collected from the comments section of the instrument and from group discussions during the consensus process. Though there were several recommendations to alter or delete guidelines for industrial application, there were only two guidelines that the jury suggested adding for industrial applications. For Standard F3 (Fiscal

Viability), the jury suggested adding a guideline identifying management support as a necessary committed resource for the success of an industrial personnel evaluation system. A second recommended guideline addition was for Standard A1 (Defined Role). The jury suggested adding a guideline requiring a competitive review of like jobs (with competing companies) when defining job responsibilities, duties, tasks, and performance objectives. Such a competitive review, could enhance employees competitiveness and effectiveness.

Research Question 7

Research Question 7 was: Is it feasible to use the Joint Committee's Standards and guidelines within the Standards for critiquing a specific corporate evaluation process? This question was addressed through a poststudy interview with the judges. Interview findings can be found in Appendix H. All judges independently concluded that the answer to this question was yes.

Research Question 8

Research Question 8 was: Can recommendations be made for improvement of the host setting's personnel evaluation system and the Joint Committee's Standards and guidelines for the Standards? The findings of this study concluded that recommendations could be made using this process. There were only two recommendations for changes in the actual standards themselves for industrial applicability. Standard P1 (Service Orientation) specifically refers to "educators," "students," and "education"; these words need to be generalized for

industrial applicability. Standard U1 ends with the words "excellent service"; as all employees in an industrial setting are not service employees, the words "excellent performance" should be substituted or added.

Recommendations made for improving the Standard Guidelines and the SCEP are summarized in Table 4 and Appendix I and detailed in Appendix G. Regarding recommendations to the Joint Committee, 10 (5%) of the guidelines should be dropped or indexed as not applicable to an industrial personnel evaluation system. There were also 20 changes recommended to the guidelines for use in an industrial setting. (These did not include nonsubstantive wording changes made to the guidelines prior to the study for use in industry.) Six of the 20 changes were in Standard P4 and these 6 could have been reduced to 2 general recommendations. Many of the 20 recommendations were not substantive changes but suggested further clarification or operational definitions for important terms.

There were 45 recommendations made to improve the SCEP. Two notations should be made regarding the 45 SCEP recommendations: many of the recommendations overlapped and a single corrective action, if enacted, could address several recommendations; no weightings were assigned to the recommendations but the importance and magnitude of the recommendations were varied.

Findings From Interviews

The findings from the individual interviews with each judge are reviewed in this section. The section is organized by first listing

Table 4

Summary of the Number of Recommendations Made to Improve
the Joint Committee's Standard Guidelines and the SCEP

Standard category	Joint Committee		SCEP changes
	Guidelines dropped	Guideline changes	
Propriety	2	3	13
Feasibility	0	0	6
Accuracy	3	7	19
Utility	5	5	7
Totals	10	20	45

an interview question, and then giving a brief overview of the judges' responses. (A summary of the interviews can be found in Appendix H.)

Interview Question 1

Question 1 was: Did you find the standards easy to use in critiquing the SCEP? All judges answered yes. All judges also elaborated on their answers with general statements (e.g., "Some operational definitions would have been helpful").

Interview Question 2

Question 2 was: Is it feasible to use the standards in reviewing an SCEP? All judges answered yes. All judges also elaborated on

their answers with general statements (e.g., "Yes, I found it could be made more feasible by eliminating some of the overlapping guidelines that were redundant").

Interview Question 3

Question 3 was: Was this a practical and useful exercise you would recommend for reviewing an SCEP? All judges answered yes with positive elaborative remarks.

Interview Question 4

Question 4 was: Were there any SCEP procedures that do not have standards or guidelines that address them? All judges answered no, noting that a few minor exceptions were addressed in the consensus review.

Interview Question 5

Question 5 was: Do you have any suggestions to improve the process (e.g., number of judges, representation of judges, or process used)? All judges stated that the number and mix of judges were good. All judges also offered suggestions for improving the process that may be found in Appendix G.

Interview Question 6

Question 6 was: Did the prestudy package help? All judges answered yes.

Interview Question 7

Question 7 was: How much time did you spend outside of the group work session on this project? Four of the five judges spent between 5 and 6 hours outside of class working on the prestudy package. Four of the five judges spent an additional 1.5 to 5 hours outside of the class working on their assigned Standards. This adds to an average time spent outside of the class of 8.2 hours for four of the judges.

Interview Question 8

Question 8 was: Do you have anything at all you would like to comment on or add? All judges had additional comments to add. The most common remark was that this was a useful exercise.

Summary

In this chapter study findings were presented that addressed all eight of the original research objectives as well as interview findings. Chapter V includes a summary of the study, a discussion of the findings, recommendations, and conclusions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree to which The Personnel Evaluation Standards, as developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988), were applicable and could be applied in a specific industrial setting. Strengths and weaknesses of the SCEP were examined by using the Standards and guidelines within the Standards as a benchmark. The Standards and guidelines for the Standards were also used to recommend possible improvements in the design and development of the system, by adapting the Joint Committee's Personnel Evaluation Standards for application in business and industry.

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study were:

1. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to any personal evaluation systems in an industrial setting?
2. Are the Joint Committee's Standards applicable to a specific corporate evaluation process?

3. To what degree are the Joint Committee's Standards addressed in an industrial personnel evaluation system?

4. Are the guidelines, developed for each of the 21 standards for application in educational settings, also appropriate for application in industrial settings?

5. Are there industrial standards that did not correspond to any of the Joint Committee's Standards (suggesting possible need for additional standards)?

6. Are there guidelines for use in industrial settings that did not correspond to any Joint Committee's Standards' guidelines (suggesting possible need for additional standard guidelines)?

7. Is it feasible to use the Joint Committee's Standards and guidelines within the Standards for critiquing a specific corporate evaluation process?

8. Can recommendations be made for improvement of the host setting's personnel evaluation system and the Joint Committee Standards and guidelines for the Standards?

Research Design

The research design paralleled "A General Approach to Applying the Standards" (Joint Committee, 1988, p. 125) that the Joint Committee recommended for use with the standards. The design was a 5-step process consisting of:

Step 1 was to become acquainted with the standards which was accomplished by: (a) a complete review of the standards, (b) inclusion of standards in literature review, and (c) inclusion of

standards in the research instrument.

Step 2 was to clarify the purpose of the evaluation system, which was accomplished by answering the questions outlined for this step by the Joint Committee.

Step 3 was describing the system, which was accomplished by answering the Joint Committee's Step 3 questions.

Step 4 was actually applying the standards, which was accomplished by using five judges to score the SCEP on a standard by standard basis.

The fifth step, deciding what to do with the results, was not included in the study. Elements of this step will be pursued after completion of the study.

Evaluator Selection and Training

The evaluator selection and training and the data analysis are reviewed in this chapter. There were five judges of varied background and experience used in this study. Judges used were: (a) an outside expert familiar with the Joint Committee's (1988) Standards; (b) the unclassified site personnel director; (c) a second level supervisor from the training and communications department; (d) a first level supervisor in manufacturing; and (e) an individual of superintendent level who has been a department head in engineering, maintenance, manufacturing, and special assignments working with the union. All judges were given a prestudy package to review before the study week and were given one full day of training in the SCEP. The data generated by the judges were summarized and tallied.

Major Findings

Six major findings are listed in this section resulting from this study.

Finding 1

All judges concurred that the Joint Committee's (1988) Personnel Evaluation Standards are applicable in industrial settings in general. (This finding is subject to the limitations as specified in this study.)

Finding 2

All Standards were applicable in the specific industrial setting used as a case study, and no additional Standards were identified as necessary for use in industrial settings.

Finding 3

In the case study 10 of the 21 Standards were addressed and met by the SCEP, and 11 Standards were addressed and partially met.

Finding 4

Of the 199 guidelines for the Standards, 177 were appropriate for use in industrial and educational settings, 18 were not applicable for use in industry, and 4 were not rated. Two guidelines were identified as possible additions for industrial settings.

Finding 5

The jury found it feasible to use the Standards for critiquing an SCEP and made 45 recommendations to improve the SCEP, 2 recommendations to improve the Joint Committee's Standards, 20 recommendations to improve the Joint Committee's guidelines for the Standards, and recommended that 10 guidelines be dropped or indexed as not for use in industrial settings.

Finding 6

The jury required 24 working hours to review the Joint Committee's first three steps in applying the Standards and to complete Step 4. This did not include training time in the evaluation system or the time needed for an individual to coordinate and administer the completion of the Joint Committee's first three steps in applying the Standards. Additional time would also be needed for completion of Step 5 which was not addressed in this study.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study three conclusions were drawn.

Conclusion 1

The Joint Committee's (1988) Personnel Evaluation Standards are generalizable and feasible for use in settings other than education.

Conclusion 2

Eighty-eight percent of the guidelines within The Personnel Evaluation Standards are generalizable in settings other than education (9% of the Standard's guidelines were not).

Conclusion 3

Guidelines within The Personnel Evaluation Standards could be written to be generalizable, or situation specific guidelines categorized as such, or a combination of the two.

Recommendations

This study will conclude with three major recommendations and three additional recommendations.

Major Recommendations

1. Consideration should be given to a rewrite of the Joint Committee's Standards to make them applicable in all settings. This could be accomplished by a careful review and development of guidelines within the Standards which are universal, as the Standards themselves already are. All guidelines could be made generalizable, or situation specific guidelines could be categorized, or a balance of the two could be used.

2. When using the Standards outside of education, care needs to be exercised in the application of the Standards to be certain that guidelines are appropriate for each setting or type of setting.

3. This study represents a single check of the application of the Joint Committee's educational Standards for use in an industrial setting. Additional studies in settings other than education and industry should be conducted to provide further validation of the universality, applicability, and feasibility of these Standards.

Additional Recommendations

1. The Joint Committee should review the specific recommendations made as a result of the jury's use of the Standards in critiquing the SCEP. Consideration by the Joint Committee should also be given to further editing of the guidelines within the Standards to avoid unnecessary duplication and redundancy.

2. Consideration should be given by the Joint Committee to include some discussion of the time required by an organization to apply the Standards in future revisions of the Standards.

3. The host site of the study should give careful consideration to the review by the jury of experts and attention should be focused where omissions to procedures or guidelines were identified in practices being used by the organization.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Joint Committee

The Joint Committee

Chair

Daniel L. Stufflebeam

Committee Members

James Adams

Carol Norman

Ralph Alexander

Diana Pullin

Marvin C. Alkin

Marilyn Rauth

Beverly Anderson

James Sanders

Esther Diamond

Sheila Simmons-Merrick

A. Keith Esch

Scott D. Thomson

Ronald K. Hambleton

JoAnn Wimmer

Philip L. Hosford

Linda Winfield

William Mays, Jr.

Project Officers

William C. Bonifield

Donald H. Hubbs

H. Dean Evans

C. R. Reitz

Ellen Friedman

Robert Steiner

Russell Gabier

Project Staff

Dale Brethower

Jean Heald

Mary Anne Bunda

Theresa Hollowell

Sharon Dodson

Sandra Ryan

Dennis Dressler

James Sanders

Linda Frisbie

Daniel Stufflebeam

Michael Gagnon

Sally Veeder

Panel of Writers

Jane Bangert

Bernard McKenna

Marilyn Bittle

Robert McNergney

Dale Brethower

Donald Medley

Esther Diamond

Jason Millman

Maurice Eash

Bernard Oliver

Laura Edwards

Sheila Pfafflin

Mary Galloway

Sharon Rallis

Richard Gazzola

Joan Regan

Thomas Graham

Frances Robinson

Ethel Hines

William Sedlacek

Jeremy Hughes

Robert Soar

Ruben Ingram

June Spooner

Edward Iwanicki

Daniel Stufflebeam

Rich Jacobs

Ross Traub

Fran Jeffries

William Tullar

Edgar Kelley

Laura Wagner

General Consultants

Dale Brethower

Carol Norman

Edgar Kelley

International Review Panel

David Andrich	Les McLean
Simon Clyne	Gilies G. Nodeau
Robert Conry	Neville Postlethwaite
Janet G. Donald	G. A. Randell
Vincent Greaney	Marie Sainz-Funaro
David Hamilton	Michael Scriven
Carol Heffernan	Pinchas Tamir
James Killeen	Ron Tickfer
Ron Lane	D. Watkins
Ernest Lehmann	Ingemar Wedman
Tom Maguire	C. H. Whitney
Bob McGurrin	Jac Zaal

National Review Panel

Nelson Ashline	Mildred E. Katzel
Sue Bentz	A. S. Kramer
Leonard Bickman	Nat LaCour
James Blank	Donald Langlois
Gwyneth Boodoo	Dal Lawrence
David Brauhn	David Lepard
John Cole	Dick Manatt
John Coleman	Donald McCarty
Donna Cox	William Monahan
Cory Cummings	Margaret Mueller
Raymond E. Curry	Tony Nitko

Gay Nelle Estes	John Ory
Gerry Firth	Maureen Peters
Antoine Garibaldi	Stuart Rankin
Gladys Graves	Frank Rapley
LaBarbara Gregg	Wayne Robbins
Ann Gregory	Carol Robinson
Gene Hall	Carroll R. Sawin
Bob Hanes	Signa Segrist
Alice Harden	Calla Smorodin
Ben Harris	Louise Sundin
Walter E. Hathaway	Carol Tittle
Ernest House	Millie Wallace
Kenneth R. Howe	Richard Wallace
Lloyd G. Humphries	Reg Weaver
Mack Irving	Hilda Wing
M. Claradine Johnson	Linus Wright

Validation Panel

Chair

Robert Linn

Members

Margret Buchmann	Dal Lawrence
Bruce Gould	Phil Robinson
Thomas Kellaghan	Perry Zirkel

Field Test Participants

Dale Brethower

Richard A. Gorton

Joseph V. Grebb

David Holdzkom

Ann V. Kraetzer

James S. Long

Kathleen B. Lynch

C. Benjamin Meleca

C. Rebecca Montoya

Carol Norman

James A. Pearsol

William Quinn

A. M. Srikanta Rao

Robert A. Reineke

David L. Sanger

Carroll Sawin

Lowell K. Scott

Don Soderberg

Dennis C. Stacey

Thomas Truitt

Charles E. Warfield

Marjorie J. Willeke

Editors

Philip S. Denenfeld

Daniel L. Stufflebeam

Appendix B

Evaluation Forms

Personal Development Plan (Employee Input Form)

Employee Name: _____ Classification / Title: _____

SSN: _____ Ckco: _____

Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Personal Operating Principles

▸ Leadership

▸ Competitive Assessment

▸ Drive for Quality

▸ Disciplined Planning & Execution

Describe your career goals and interests (both short and long term, specific interests, and any suggestions you may have for career development).

Field of interest codes:

Primary _____ **S/N ()** **Secondary** _____ **S/N ()**

Identify your contributions and strengths in relationship to your specific Job Responsibilities, the Personal Operating Principles, progress on previously developed action plans and training, and any additional assignments you may have had during the previous year.

Personal Development Plan (Multiple Input Form)

Employee Name: _____ Classification / Title: _____

SSN: _____ Cisco: _____

Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Personal Operating Principles

► Leadership

► Competitive Assessment

► Drive for Quality

► Disciplined Planning & Execution

Employee's Job Responsibilities.

Identify employee's contributions and strengths.

Identify opportunities for employee's further development/improvement.

Propose any action plans that the employee and/or management could take, including any necessary training, to further develop and improve.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Classification / Title: _____

Personal Development Plan

Employee Name: _____ Classification / Title: _____

SSN: _____ Cisco: _____

Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Personal Operating Principles

▷ Leadership

▷ Competitive Assessment

▷ Drive for Quality

▷ Disciplined Planning & Execution

Job Responsibilities

Employee Action Plans for Development/Improvement

Management Action Plans

Training to be Scheduled

_____ (Over)
 employee _____ date _____
 supervisor _____ date _____

Appendix C
Performance Improvement Plan

"Performance Improvement Plan"

Name: _____

Date: _____

1. Performance Difficulties	2. Behavior or Results Desired by Management	3. Action Management Will Take to Help Employee Correct Deficiencies	4. Action Employee Will Take to Correct Deficiencies	Completion Date
<p>(ACTIONS, METHODS, OR RESULTS THAT DO NOT MEET SATISFACTORY EXPECTATIONS.)</p>	<p>(SPECIFIC BEHAVIOR OR RESULTS EXPECTED FOR EACH DEFICIENCY)</p>	<p>(SPECIFIC ACTIONS YOU WILL TAKE TO PROVIDE SUPPORT.)</p> <p>ORGANIZATIONAL BARRIERS SHOULD ALSO BE IDENTIFIED AS WELL AS ANY APPROPRIATE ACTIONS TO REMOVE THEM.</p>	<p>LIST OF ACTIONS EMPLOYEE SHOULD TAKE TO CORRECT OR IMPROVE DEFICIENCIES</p> <p>(SUGGESTIONS FROM THE EMPLOYEE MAY BE INCLUDED.)</p>	<p>TARGET DATE FOR EACH IMPROVEMENT</p>

Signatures:

Supervisor _____

Appraiser _____

2nd. Level _____

Appraiser's Supv. _____

Other _____

Date _____

Date _____

Date _____

Employee _____

Personnel _____

Other _____

Date _____

Date _____

Date _____

Appendix D

Prestudy Package Table of Contents

Section 5

Steps 2 and 3 all

(This section contains relevant information and answers to questions that are necessary to complete the instrument. This information is a combination of information pulled from corporate documentation and through interviews with site personnel. It is important that this section is reviewed in its entirety.)

Section 6

Presentation multiple documents

(This section contains three documents used in a presentation to salaried employees to introduce Compensation, Policy and Benefit Modifications to all Salaried Employees. Important pages are:

Script

PDP 1-4

Relative Contribution 5-15

Transparencies [skim only] not numbered

Questions and Answers

PDP 12

Relative Contribution 4-6

Related Information 7,10,11)

Appendix E

Instrument

The following is an example of the instrument used by the judges. This is the instrument for Standard P1. All 21 Standards were presented in the same manner but were not included in this Appendix because of their size. A copy of the complete instrument is available upon request.

Standards Checklist of SCEP

P1

The Propriety Standards require that evaluations be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of the persons being evaluated, as well as their clients.

P1 = Service Orientation

Standard = Evaluations of personnel should promote sound business principles, fulfillment of institutional missions, and effective performance of job responsibilities, so that the needs of the company, community, and society are met.

Explanation = Evaluations should help assure that the institution's goals are understood and pursued, employee's responsibilities specified, customers' needs addressed, promised services delivered, professional capabilities advanced, and incompetent or harmful personnel removed.

Rationale = Business systems exist to meet the needs of the customer and the shareholder so that all elements of those systems, including personnel evaluation, should be directed toward achieving that purpose.

Guidelines

A. Advocate rights of customer and shareholder that should be protected by personnel evaluation, such as the rights to quality products and responsible management.

B. Pursue a unified, collaborative effort by the board, administration, and management to promote excellence and eliminate

incompetence in leadership; if there is an evaluatees union, provide concrete opportunities for them to participate in the collaborative pursuit of excellence.

C. Inform the institution's staff and constituents that personnel evaluation will be directed to recognize and encourage excellent service, motivate and assist all personnel to improve, and a just cause for dismissing those who remain incompetent or ineffective.

D. Target evaluation resources to those areas most likely to promote the institution's goals: first line supervision, administration, and technical support.

E. Implement a thorough screening process at the time of hiring, followed by 1 to 3 years of thorough evaluation to assure sound decisions on retention of personnel.

F. Subject all supervisors in the institution to a consistent and procedurally fair process of evaluation that can withstand legal scrutiny and, when justified, lead to advancements or successful terminations. (See P2)

G. Include steps in the evaluation process that promote the best interests of the customers and company. (See P2 and A3)

H. Develop criteria for personnel evaluation that reflect the needs of the customers and company and the duties of supervisors. (See P2 and A1)

I. Include in personnel policies, definitions of the types of evaluation findings likely to lead to termination. (See P2)

J. Issue official intermediate warnings citing deficiencies that must be remedied if employment is to continue. (See P2)

K. Enforce prescribed standards consistently in the personnel evaluation process; e.g., do not relax the standards of the departmental supervision because a supervisor is outstanding in some other role, such as computer systems, community politics, or social organizing.

L. Periodically inform the stockholder about how personnel evaluation is promoting the best interests of the customer and the business. (See A8)

Questions

1. Answer yes or no to the following question. Is this standard generally applicable to an industrial evaluation process?

yes _____ no _____

If yes, proceed to Question 2. If no, proceed to descriptive comments.

2. Answer yes or no to the following question. Is this standard applicable to this SCEP?

yes _____ no _____

If yes, proceed to Standard rating. If no, proceed to descriptive comments.

Standard Rating

Please select the rating that most describes how the SCEP applies to this Standard. Select only one answer.

1. _____ The SCEP addressed and met this Standard.
2. _____ The SCEP addressed and partially met this Standard.
3. _____ The SCEP addressed and did not meet this Standard.
4. _____ The SCEP did not address this standard.

Enter any descriptive comments for this Standard below.

Appendix F

Standard Guideline Applicability and Compliance

Standard Guideline Applicability to and Compliance by the SCEP

Standard symbol	Standard guidelines applicable	Guidelines not applicable	Guidelines not rated	Guidelines met by SCEP	Guidelines not met by SCEP	Guidelines not rated
P1	11	1	1	8	3	2
P2	17	0	0	13	1	3
P3	9	0	0	5	4	0
P4	10	5	0	7	3	5
P5	7	0	0	6	1	0
Subtotal	54	6	1	39	12	10
F1	10	0	0	6	3	1
F2	7	0	0	6	1	0
F3	6	0	0	3	3	0
Subtotal	23	0	0	15	7	1
A1	7	0	0	6	1	0
A2	2	0	0	2	0	0
A3	3	0	0	1	2	0
A4	8	2	0	1	6	3
A5	7	0	0	3	3	1
A6	15	0	0	14	1	0
A7	7	2	0	3	4	2
A8	8	1	0	2	2	5
Subtotal	57	5	0	32	19	11
U1	11	0	0	10	1	0
U2	6	0	0	2	1	3
U3	11	2	0	6	5	2
U4	3	5	0	3	0	5
U5	12	0	3	11	1	3
Subtotal	43	7	3	32	8	13
Totals	177	18	4	118	46	35

Appendix G

Recommendations

Jury Comments and Study Recommendations As They Apply to the Joint Committee
Standards and the SCEP for Each Guideline

STANDARD P1: SERVICE ORIENTATION--Evaluations of personnel should promote sound business principles, fulfillment of institutional missions, and effective performance of job responsibilities, so that the needs of the company, community, and society are met.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Advocate rights of <u>customer</u> and <u>shareholder</u> that should be protected by personnel evaluation, such as the rights to <u>quality products</u> and <u>responsible management</u> .	A	M		
B. Pursue a unified, collaborative effort by the board, administration, and management to promote excellence and eliminate incompetence in <u>leadership</u> ; if there is an <u>evaluatee's</u> union, provide concrete opportunities for them to participate in the collaborative pursuit of excellence.	A	M		
C. Inform the institution's staff and constituents that personnel evaluation will be directed to recognize and encourage excellent service, motivate and assist all personnel to improve, and a just cause for dismissing those who remain incompetent or ineffective.	A	M		
D. Target evaluation resources to those areas most likely to promote the institution's goals: <u>first line supervision</u> , administration, and <u>technical support</u> .	A	M		

E. Implement a thorough screening process at the time of hiring, followed evaluation to assure sound decisions on retention of personnel.	A	NM	No screening in hiring process or thorough evaluation for retention of newly hired employees.	Include provisions in the SCEP for a thorough screening process for hiring and retention of new employees.
F. Set and maintain high standards for granting tenure, making sure that the standards are responsive to the needs of students, community, and society.	NR	NR		
G. Subject all <u>supervisors</u> in the institution to a consistent and procedurally fair process of evaluation that can withstand legal scrutiny and, when justified, lead to advancements or successful terminations. (See P2)	A	M		
H. Include steps in the evaluation process that promote the best interests of the <u>customers</u> and <u>company</u> .	A	M		
I. Develop criteria for personnel evaluation that reflect the needs of the customers and company and the duties of <u>supervisors</u> .	A	M		
J. Include in personnel policies, definitions of the types of evaluation findings likely to lead to termination.	A	NM	SCEP does not define the types of evaluation findings that would lead to termination or placement on a Performance Improvement Plan.	Evaluation findings that can lead to termination or placement on a Performance Improvement Plan should be clearly defined.
K. Issue official intermediate warnings citing deficiencies that must be remedied if employment is to continue. (See P2)	A	M		

L. Enforce prescribed standards consistently in the personnel evaluation process; e.g., do not relax the standards of the <u>departmental supervision</u> because a <u>supervisor</u> is outstanding in some other role, such as <u>computer systems</u> , <u>community politics</u> , <u>social organizing</u> .	A	NM	SCEP has no specified process to assure like jobs will have like job responsibilities and expectations.	A review process should be established by the SCEP to assure like jobs will be evaluated with like job responsibilities and expectations.
M. Periodically inform the <u>stockholder</u> about how personnel evaluation is promoting the best interests of the <u>customer</u> and the <u>business</u> . (See A8)	NA	NR	Guideline was considered non-applicable to the SCEP and industry in general or of little consequence.	Guideline should not be used for industrial application.

STANDARD P2: FORMAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES--Guidelines for personnel evaluations should be recorded and provided to employees in statements of policy, negotiated agreements, and/or personnel evaluation manuals, so that evaluations are consistent, equitable, and in accordance with pertinent laws and ethical codes.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Require in institutional policies that all employees be subject to systematic evaluations.	A	M		
B. Develop clearly written guidelines for implementing personnel evaluation policies.	A	M		
C. Ensure that guidelines address all of the elements for acceptable evaluations set forth in these standards.	A	M		
D. Concentrate the guidelines on important job-related issues, and avoid listing rules for trivial aspects of the job or matters unrelated to the requirements for successful job performance.	A	M		

E. Make the guidelines sufficiently specific to guarantee shared understandings of the purposes, procedures, and substance of evaluations.	A	M		
F. Identify in the guidelines the performance reasonably expected of the evaluatees in order to be competent and successful on the job.	A	M		
G. Require that appropriate weights be assigned to each evaluation criterion explicitly and in advance of evaluation.	A	M		
H. Involve the board and staff in development and periodic review of the policies and guidelines.	A	NR	Uncertain if there is a periodic review process.	SCEP should establish a periodic review process if one does not exist.
I. Ensure that the guidelines meet all local, state, and federal legal requirements concerning employment decisions, . . . such as a city's nondiscrimination ordinance.	A	NR	Judges not qualified to address legal requirements.	
J. Explain the plan of personnel evaluation to all employees at least annually and when changes in evaluation are to be implemented.	A	M		
K. Assure consistent enforcement of the written evaluation guidelines.	A	M		
L. Provide a plan of progressive discipline, such as an oral warning, a written warning, disciplinary layoff, and discharge.	A	M	The judges noted that corporate policy does not allow for salary disciplinary layoffs.	
M. Define types of evaluation findings likely to lead to termination.	A	NM	The judges noted that this was addressed in guideline P1-J.	The J.C. should review this guideline and determine if this redundancy is necessary.

N. Apply the guidelines with a concern for the human dignity and worth of the persons involved. (See P5)	A	M		
O. Establish in the guidelines viable review or reevaluation, problem-solving, and appeals procedures to protect all involved in the evaluation.	A	M		
P. Establish a process for periodic review and revision of evaluation procedures and guidelines. (See A8)	A	NR	Uncertain if there is a periodic review process.	SCEP should establish a periodic review process if one does not exist.
Q. Change evaluation guidelines when evaluation practices are changed, when the guidelines are found to be in conflict with applicable law, or when role definitions change.	A	M		

STANDARD P3: CONFLICTS OF INTEREST--Conflicts of interest should be identified and dealt with openly and honestly, so that they do not compromise the evaluation process and results.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Encourage the cooperative development of evaluation designs that reduce the possibility of conflicts of interests.	A	M	The guideline was ambiguous, allowing for multiple interpretations by the judges.	A suggested clarification for this guideline might read: "A cooperative design team should be used during the developmental process of an evaluation system to minimize the impact that a person could have in furthering an individual, or group of individuals, best interest."

B. Specify common sources of conflict program guidelines, and provide appeal procedures wherein alleged conflict of interest can be investigated and addressed. (See P2)	A	NM	The SCEP does not specify common sources for conflict of interest, nor does it specify an appeal procedure in the program guidelines.	The SCEP should specify common sources for conflict of interest and an appeal procedure.
C. Make every effort to rule out conflict of interest and the appearance of it in order to ensure confidence in fairness, objectivity, and equity in the process and the outcome.	A	NM	The jury noted that the evaluator's supervisor does not review the evaluation prior to issuance of the evaluation report.	The evaluator's supervisor should review the evaluation prior to issuance of the evaluation report.
D. Exercise control of conflict of interest at every level of examination and judgment, including: -Selection of personnel to conduct the process. -Use of clear criteria and objective evidence. -Involvement of the evaluatee and the client in the review process prior to finalizing the report. -Review of findings upon appeal. -Defining the range of evidence admitted into the review.	A	M		
E. Employ evaluation procedures requiring comparisons of multiple sources of information to discover any tainted evidence.	A	M		
F. Discuss in the evaluation report how the use in judging the performance of individuals is related to the evaluation's purpose and criteria. (See U4)	A	M		
G. Give first priority to using another evaluator if an unresolvable conflict of interest exists.	A	NM	There is no provision in the SCEP to use another evaluator if a conflict exists.	The SCEP should contain provisions for the use of another evaluator when the need arises.

H. Mutually define, in writing, the conditions of the evaluation to include role-specific behavior assessed under defined conditions if an unresolvable conflict of interest exists, and it is impossible to appoint another evaluator.	A	NM	There is no provision in the SCEP to resolve a conflict of interest in the event another evaluator cannot be appointed.	The SCEP should contain provisions for resolving conflict of interest when another evaluator cannot be appointed.
I. Invite the evaluatee to append a reaction to the evaluation report.	A	M		

STANDARD P4: ACCESS TO PERSONNEL EVALUATION REPORTS--Access to reports of personnel evaluation should be limited to individuals with legitimate need to review and use the reports, so that appropriate use of the information is assured.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Reference the data and the other information used as the basis of an evaluation in the written evaluation report or its appendix.	A	NM	Data used for the written evaluation report and appendices may not be referenced.	SCEP multiple input forms should be retained for regular review and for reference in an appeal.
B. Write CONFIDENTIAL at the top of an evaluation report and make no more copies than necessary.	A	NM	Evaluation reports are not marked "confidential."	SCEP evaluation reports should be labeled as "confidential."
C. Sign and date the original copy of the evaluation report.	A	M		
D. Provide the evaluatee with a copy of the signed evaluation report, including any appendices.	A	NM	Multiple input forms are destroyed and never given to the evaluatee.	SCEP multiple input forms should be retained for regular review and for reference in an appeal.
E. If multiple copies of evaluation reports are maintained, ensure that they are identical.	A	M		
F. Establish an official personnel file for each employee.	NA	NR	Establishment of a personnel file was considered by the jury to be part of personnel policy not the SCEP.	J.C. should review this guideline for applicability to the evaluation process.

G. Discuss derogatory material with an employee before placing it in the official personnel file.	A	M	The jury noted that this guideline as well as guidelines G, H, I, L, N, and O did not specifically reference the evaluation system.	J.C. should review this guideline and the others referenced to determine if they could be enhanced by clearer wording that specifically referred to the personnel evaluation process.
H. Notify an evaluatee in writing when the institution has added to her or his file sensitive or possibly controversial information or documents, except as otherwise provided for by laws or agreements.	A	M	See Guideline G.	See Guideline G.
I. Provide each evaluatee continuing opportunity to review the employee's personnel file; to append, within appropriate time restraints, written comments; and to request a copy of any item contained in the file, except as otherwise provided for by laws or agreements.	A	M	See Guideline G.	See Guideline G.
J. Specify in writing that, subject to statutory limitations, access, retrieval, and release of evaluation reports should be limited to persons with a legitimate need to know; e.g.: -The evaluatee. -The evaluator. -The immediate supervisor. -Those who must make or defend decisions based on the results. -Prospective employers, higher <u>officials</u> , awards committees, or other such groups authorized by the evaluatee to receive the information. -Support personnel officially assigned and trained to produce, control, and retrieve personnel records.	A	M		

K.	Make arrangements for secure storage of evaluation reports and other evaluation records. (See A6)	A	M		
L.	Specify, for any electronic storage of personnel records, procedures, rights, and safeguards which parallel the manual procedures for accessing and handling written personnel records.	NA	NR	See Guideline G.	See Guideline G.
M.	Provide written instructions and internal training to persons charged with implementing the evaluation system regarding access, retrieval, and release of evaluation records, and regarding the circumstances under which the reports may be destroyed.	NA	NR	Establishment of a personnel policy was considered by the jury to be part of personnel system rather than the SCEP.	Recommend that the guideline be left as is.
N.	Certify in writing the support staff assigned to help produce, control, and retrieve personnel records; provide them with clear instructions regarding confidentiality and the control of records; restrict unauthorized personnel from seeing or reproducing the records.	NA	NR	See Guideline G.	See Guideline G.
O.	Maintain records of report access, retrieval, or release, including the names of persons receiving records and the purposes for each release, and maintain a list of personnel authorized to have access to the file.	NA	NR	See Guideline G.	See Guideline G.

STANDARD P5: INTERACTIONS WITH EVALUATEES--The evaluation should address evaluatees in a professional, considerate, and courteous manner so that their self-esteem, motivation, professional reputations, performance, and attitude towards personnel evaluation are enhanced or, at least, not needlessly damaged.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Provide adequate time before formal assessment for early interaction among all participants in an evaluation, to develop mutual trust and understanding.	A	M		
B. Require evaluators and evaluatees to seek mutually acceptable goals and time lines, and encourage them to establish a productive, cooperative relationship.	A	M		
C. Provide periodic training to evaluators in human relations procedures.				
D. Monitor the effectiveness of the evaluation system regularly through systematic collection of process feedback from evaluatees. (See A8)	A	NM	There is no systematic collection of feedback on the SCEP from the evaluatee.	The SCEP should develop a systematic process for collecting feedback on its process.
E. Schedule evaluation activities well in advance and stick to the schedule.	A	M		
F. Conduct evaluation feedback sessions in private settings.	A	M		
G. Use encouragement as a leadership tool.	A	M		

STANDARD F1: PRACTICAL PROCEDURES--Personnel evaluations should be conducted and planned, so that they produce the needed information while minimizing disruption and cost.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Identify information needs, available resources, and policy requirements before designing data-collection procedures.	A	M		
B. Select procedures that provide necessary information with minimal disruption.	A	M		
C. Avoid duplicating information that already exists.	A	M		
D. Define in familiar language all concepts or key terms of the evaluation system.	A	NM	Training used many undefined acronyms.	SCEP should limit the use of acronyms in training to those that are clearly defined.
E. Define the roles of evaluators and evaluatees.	A	M		
F. Help <u>individuals</u> understand the evaluation system and its procedures through periodic orientation sessions.	A	NM	No periodic orientation for evaluatees in the SCEP.	SCEP should provide periodic orientation for evaluatees in the SCEP.
G. Delineate the procedures by which evaluatees can exercise their rights to review data about their performance.	A	M		
H. Identify and assess published evaluation procedures as a step toward selecting or improving local procedures.	A	NR	Applicable to industry but not the SCEP as local procedures are standardized to promote consistency.	

- | | | | | |
|--|---|----|--|---|
| I. Review procedures periodically to assess how they could be strengthened. | A | NM | No process to assess SCEP procedures to strengthen the system. | SCEP should adopt a process to assess the system. |
| J. Encourage <u>users</u> to suggest ways by which evaluation procedures can be made more effective. | A | M | | |

STANDARD F2: POLITICAL VIABILITY--The personnel evaluation system should be developed and monitored collaboratively, so that all concerned parties are constructively involved in making the system work.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Designate the policy board as the final authority in determining evaluation policies.	A	M		
B. Involve instructors, department chairpersons, supervisors, administrators, evaluation specialists, policy board members, and pertinent external groups in developing personnel evaluation policies and procedures.	A	M		
C. Provide sufficient time and opportunity for concerned individuals and groups to help develop, review, and revise personnel evaluation policy.	A	M		
D. Institute definite procedures for obtaining regular feedback from evaluatees, evaluators, and users of the evaluations. (See P2)	A	NM	No formal procedures for obtaining regular feedback from users on the SCEP.	A formal process for obtaining feedback on the SCEP by users should be developed.
E. Review personnel evaluation policies periodically. (See P2)	A	M		

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| F. Direct special attention during the policy review process to the perspectives of evaluatees and others with legitimate interests in evaluation outcomes. | A | M |
| G. Rectify problems in the personnel evaluation system promptly and effectively. | A | M |

STANDARD F3: FISCAL VIABILITY--Adequate time and resources should be provided for personnel evaluation activities, so that evaluation plans can be effectively and efficiently implemented.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Define the purposes of the evaluation, how it is to be used and by whom; then make sure the resources allocated are sufficient to achieve the purposes.	A	NM	Peripheral uses of the SCEP are not clearly defined and allocation of sufficient resources for these uses are questionable.	All purposes of the SCEP should be clearly identified and sufficient resources allocated to achieve these purposes.
B. Expend no more resources and time than necessary to obtain the needed information.	A	M		
C. Estimate the personnel time required to conduct each type of personnel evaluation, and use the estimates to decide on the frequency of evaluations and to allocate staff time accordingly.	A	NM	This was not met by the SCEP, but the jury determined that this was unimportant to the SCEP as they used past experience with other evaluation systems to make this determination.	
D. Calculate the funds needed to conduct the evaluation and compare this with the amount of money available for that purpose; then, if sufficient time and resources cannot be committed, modify the objectives and procedures.	A	M		

E. Ensure that resources are used effectively and efficiently in the execution of the evaluation plan.	A	M		
F. Maintain a search for new ideas that will help the personnel evaluation system achieve and maintain the best possible return.	A	NM	No system established to maintain a search for new ideas to maximize return on investment.	A regular search for new ideas should be conducted to maximize return on investment. This search should be tied to the feedback process.

STANDARD A1: DEFINED ROLE--The role, responsibilities, performance objectives, and needed qualifications of the evaluatee should be clearly defined, so that the evaluator can determine valid assessment criteria.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Develop job descriptions based on systematic job analysis.	A	M		
B. Obtain position description information from as many knowledgeable sources as possible, including: -Persons currently holding the position. -Supervisors and other decision makers. -Applicable contracts and labor agreements. -Position descriptions. -Letters of appointment.	A	M		
C. Define duties that reflect the needs of <u>employees</u> , the product, and the employing institution. -Demonstrate up-to-date knowledge of <u>technical skills</u> . -Examine and respond to the individual and collective needs of the <u>customer</u> .	A	M		

- Plan and deliver effective and efficient instruction . . .
- Maintain supervisor control and good rapport with subordinates.
- . . .
- Be accessible to help subordinates solve problems.
- Regularly evaluate subordinates' progress and provide specific feedback, including reinforcement of successes and concrete steps for improvement.
- Maintain clear and complete records on employee participation and progress.
- Maintain clear, up-to-date instructional plans to be followed by substitute . . .
- Periodically evaluate . . . procedures.
- Maintain position working relationships with staff and customers.

D. Specify in detail significant role behaviors, tasks, duties, responsibilities, and performance objectives.	A	M		
E. Make clear the relative importance and performance level of each standard used to define success in the position.	A	NM	SCEP was weak in describing standards for success, for peripheral uses of the SCEP.	The SCEP should establish standards defining successful performance levels for peripheral uses.
F. Investigate and resolve any discrepancies in the position description.	A	M		
G. Make clear the relationship between performance indicators and the standard with which each indicator is associated.	A	M		

STANDARD A2: WORK ENVIRONMENT--The context in which the evaluatee works should be identified, described, and recorded, so that environmental influences and constraints on performance can be considered in the evaluation.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Identify and record contextual variables that might affect the work environment.	A	M	Though the guideline was applicable, the jury stated that employee interests and family background should not be considered in an industrial evaluation.	The J.C. Standards should not consider family background and employee interests in an industrial personnel evaluation.
B. Consider available resources, working conditions, community expectations, and other context variables that might have affected performance.	A	M		

STANDARD A3: DOCUMENTATION OF PROCEDURES--The evaluation procedures actually followed should be documented, so that the evaluatees and other users can assess the actual, in relation to intended, procedures.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Monitor evaluations and maintain appropriate records of their timing and steps, making special note of any deviation from the institution's approved evaluation system.	A	M		
B. Provide all evaluatees and other users with feedback forms on which to criticize or suggest improvements in the evaluations system.	A	NM	There is no evaluatee and user feedback form to criticize or suggest improvements.	The SCEP should provide an evaluation feedback form for evaluatees and users.
C. Periodically provide all employees with orientation and training in the evaluation process. (See P2)	A	NM	SCEP has no system to provide for periodic orientation and training.	The SCEP should include provisions for periodic orientation and training.

STANDARD A4: VALID MEASUREMENT--The measurement procedures should be chosen or developed and implemented on the basis of described role and the intended uses, so that the inferences concerning the evaluatee are valid and accurate.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Establish criteria for selecting and developing measurement procedures based on the proposed use of the evaluation and the involved role. (See U2, P2, and A3.) Such criteria include: -Collecting multiple assessments of instruction to ensure that the data obtained are of sufficient depth and breadth. -Assessing accomplishments (output) against a careful description of what the job is to accomplish.	A	NM	Guideline was met for core uses of the SCEP but for placement into the Performance Improvement Plan and for establishment of a readiness code the SCEP was deficient relative to this guideline.	For peripheral uses of the SCEP there should be clear documentation demonstrating how the instrument was developed, designed, and validated. The relationship between the SCEP, pertaining to these uses, and the organizational and job goals must also be demonstrated and trained.
B. Ensure that plans for full implementation of the measurement procedures are based on a careful review of the intended uses.	A	NM	Guideline was met for the core purpose, as the SCEP's procedures are based on a careful review of the intended uses; for other uses this guideline is not met.	Measurement procedures for peripheral uses should be based on a careful review of the SCEP's intended uses.
C. Involve those who are to be affected by the system in determining its purposes, processes, assessment criteria, and instruments, and in assessing its validity.	A	M		
D. Conduct unscheduled observations as a check on data obtained from scheduled observations.	NA	NR	The SCEP uses continuous supervisory observation for evaluation data gathering as does most industrial evaluation systems.	This guideline should be deleted for industrial use of the standards.

E. In observing <u>performance</u> , use structured, objectively recorded observation schedules as a check on techniques that allow recording only summary judgments based on what was perceived.	NA	NR	The SCEP uses continuous supervisory observation for evaluation data gathering as does most industrial evaluation systems.	This guideline should be deleted for industrial use of the standards.
F. Field test the measurement procedures using appropriate validation techniques.	A	NM	Field testing was done but the extent and whether appropriate validation techniques were used was unknown and untrained.	Documentation on the validation process (including field testing) should be developed and included in the training.
G. Ensure the validity of any measurement procedures that disproportionately affect members of any identifiable subgroup. (See A7)	A	NM	Data are collected but there is no process identified to ensure the validity of measurement procedures that might disproportionately affect members of an identifiable subgroup.	A process for collecting data to demonstrate criterion related validity should be established, particularly for the readiness rating and a check should be included to analyze whether there is any evidence of bias.
H. Make the results of the validation process public and describe the results in terms that are understandable and meaningful to evaluatees and other interested individuals and groups.	A	NM	Results of the validation process are not made public and the results are not published.	Documentation should be developed on the SCEP's validation process: How was it developed; who was involved; and what the considerations and trade-off options were.
I. Report validity results openly and completely and include descriptions of what inferences are supported by validity evidence and what precautions must be taken in using them for decision making. (See A8)	A	NM	Validity results are not reported.	Documentation should be developed on the SCEP's validation process: How was it developed who was involved; and what the considerations and trade-off options were.
J. Encourage sufficient flexibility in negotiated contracts, legislation, and board policy so that evaluation instrumentation and measurement procedures can be improved to enhance validity over time.	A	NR	Information was not sufficient to answer this guideline.	

STANDARD A5: RELIABLE MEASUREMENT--Measurement procedures should be chosen or developed and implemented to assure reliability, so that the information obtained will provide consistent indications of the performance of the evaluatee.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Acquire evidence for all types of reliability that are relevant to the intended uses of the instrument before using it in personnel evaluation.	A	NM	Guideline was met for the primary use of the SCEP but for the peripheral uses of the SCEP reliability evidence is not collected.	Empirical evidence should be acquired of reliability particularly concerning recommendations for readiness and placement into the Performance Improvement Plan. This should include test results using another multiple input committee and rater on an evaluatee, and a content analysis for consistency between multiple input.
B. Check for inconsistency in interpretations of measurement results.	A	NM	There were no checks for inconsistency in interpretations of measurement results.	A check should be conducted for inconsistencies in interpretations of measurement results.
C. Estimate and report reliability of instruments for the particular situation.	A	NM	Did not report estimates of reliability of instruments for particular situations.	SCEP should estimate and report reliability of instruments for the particular situation or application.
D. Train observers to apply the rating criteria consistently and objectively.	A	M		
E. Train the evaluators to use procedures and instruments correctly.	A	M		
F. In developing instruments, take into account research that has identified internally consistent dimensions of pertinent behavior.	A	NR	Insufficient information.	

- G. Employ multiple measures, multiple observers, and multiple occasions for data collection as appropriate to minimize inconsistency and discern consistent patterns and trends.

A M

STANDARD A6: SYSTEMATIC DATA CONTROL--The information used in the evaluation should be kept secure, and should be carefully processed and maintained, so as to ensure that the data maintained and analyzed are the same as the data collected.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Establish policies and procedures to control who has access to information collected for personnel evaluation. (See P2 and P4)	A	M		
B. Select those who type or handle personnel evaluation materials, require that they maintain strict confidentiality, and train them to do so. (See P4)	A	M		
C. Ensure that people included in processing the information have the necessary training and background to perform their tasks accurately.	A	M		
D. Ensure that the people involved in the actual coding of the data are familiar with and understand the criteria, context, and other components of the evaluation.	A	M		
E. Spot check by recording and comparing the results.	A	M	Guideline was unclear and the jury had different interpretations. All interpretations were met by the SCEP so they used the guideline.	The J.C. should review this guideline for multiple interpretations.

F. Identify files or entries by individual and group characteristics, so there will be no doubt about what information is associated with whom. This is especially important for supporting documents.	A	NM	Guideline was met with the exception of the multiple input forms which are destroyed.	As recommended in other guidelines the multiple input forms should maintained by the SCEP.
G. Write a date and reason for data collection on each entry, so that files may be easily updated or used for longitudinal data analysis, and not used for unintended or inappropriate purposes.	A	M		
H. Provide employees an opportunity to enter explanations, clarifications, or objections to particular evaluation findings when they are entered into their personnel files. (See P4)	A	M	The jury noted that employees should be given an opportunity to respond to evaluation information "before" they are entered into their personnel files rather than "when" as stated in the J.C. guideline.	The J.C. should consider substituting the word "before" for the word "when" in this guideline.
I. Require employees to sign each evaluation report placed in their file, indicating that they have seen the report and had an opportunity to discuss it. (See P4)	A	M		
J. Prepare duplicate data sets and keep a back-up set in a secure location. This is especially important when there is a chance that fire, theft, computer malfunctions, data processing error, or staff neglect can cause vital information to be lost.	A	M		

K. Label evaluation documents as ORIGINAL or COPY.	A	M	Though the SCEP did not label evaluation documents as "original" or "copy" they were clearly identified by the color of the form and ink signatures.	The J.C. should consider less restrictive wording for this guideline, such as: "Evaluation documents should be identifiable as originals or copies."
L. Develop a filing system for information, so that it can be easily and accurately retrieved when needed.	A	M		
M. Maintain complete and well-documented records on all evaluation follow up. (See P1 and P2)	A	M		
N. Maintain files for a reasonable amount of time.	A	M		
O. Assure the integrity of information removed from the office or storage location.	A	M		

STANDARD A7: BIAS CONTROL--The evaluation process should provide safeguards against bias, so that the evaluatee's qualifications or performance are assessed fairly.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Involve evaluatees and other pertinent personnel in designing the evaluation process. (See U1 and F2)	A	M		
B. Train evaluators, evaluatees, and others in the use of the evaluation system. (See U3)	A	M		

C. Provide ample, timely opportunities for criticizing the evaluation system.	A	NM	No formal process for critiquing the evaluation process.	As discussed in other guideline recommendations, the SCEP should include a formal process for critiquing the evaluation system.
D. Exclude factors from the process disadvantage some evaluatees despite their actual performance level; e.g., a prerequisite period of experience or seniority that rules out candidates who otherwise are highly qualified.	NA	NR	The jury could not reach a consensus on the meaning of this guideline.	The J.C. should review this guideline for multiple interpretation.
E. Obtain data and judgments from multiple sources and preserve the independent review. (See A4 and A8)	A	NM	Multiple input data are not preserved for independent view.	The SCEP should preserve multiple input data for independent review.
F. Allow evaluatees and other relevant personnel ample opportunity to review data and participate in interpreting it. (See U4 and U5)	A	M		
G. Compare the results of unscheduled observations with those from scheduled observations. (See A4 and A5)	NA	NR	Guideline applied to scheduled and unscheduled observation systems typically used in a classroom environment.	The J.C. should drop this guideline for industrial application.
H. Be particularly alert to the potential for bias in those parts of the evaluation system that are more subjective than objective.	A	NM	No provisions in the SCEP to alert users to potential bias in the process.	SCEP training should alert individuals to the potential for bias in the evaluation process.
I. Provide for prompt, third party reviews of appeals.	A	NM	There is no appeal process specified in the SCEP documentation or training.	As stated in other guideline recommendations, there should be a formal appeal process for the SCEP.

STANDARD A8: MONITORING EVALUATION SYSTEMS--The personnel evaluation system should be reviewed periodically and systematically, so that appropriate revisions can be made.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Investigate whether the evaluation system is having a positive effect on the quantity and quality of . . . outputs.	A	NM	There is no investigation of the SCEP's positive effect on the quantity and quality of outputs.	A process should be established to investigate the effects of the SCEP on the quantity and quality of outputs.
B. Budget sufficient resources and personnel time to review the evaluation process regularly. (See F3)	A	M		
C. Identify the parts of the evaluation system that require more frequent review or close monitoring.	A	NR	The jury thought it too early in the SCEP's history to rate this guideline.	
D. Compare actual specific evaluation tasks with the evaluation plan.	NA	NR	Guideline was unclear to the jury.	J.C. should review guideline for clarity.
E. Periodically survey the staff to obtain their criticisms and recommendations.	A	M		
F. Engage a representative group to review and revise at least annually personnel evaluation policies and procedures.	A	NR	The jury thought the requirement of an "annual" review to be too restrictive for a large industrial evaluation system.	The J.C. should consider substituting the word "annual" with the word "periodically" for use in industry.
G. Review the evaluation policies and plans against the standards in this document and other relevant sources.	A	NR	The jury thought this guideline was applicable in industry but not to the SCEP as they have not commissioned the J.C. standards as their monitoring device.	

H. Train evaluatees, evaluators, and others in using these standards to evaluate the evaluation system.	A	NR	The jury thought this guideline was applicable in industry but not to the SCEP as they have not commissioned the J.C. standards as their monitoring device.	
I. Check that validity and reliability information is current and adequate.	A	NM	No identified process to check that validity and reliability data are current and adequate.	The SCEP should adopt a process that would check validity and reliability data.

STANDARD U1: CONSTRUCTIVE ORIENTATION--Evaluations should be constructive, so that they help institutions to develop human resources and encourage and assist those evaluated to provide excellent service.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Involve a representative group of evaluation participants in designing and developing the personnel evaluation system, including the definition of standards and the roles to be played by interested parties. (See P2 and F2)	A	M	The judges noted that the SCEP training should have presented a better explanation of this process in the training package.	
B. Secure the governing board's support for the personnel evaluation system.	A	M		
C. Communicate to all interested parties the intended positive, constructive uses of evaluation results; conceptualize personnel evaluations as an important part of professional development and achievement of organizational goals.	A	M	The jury noted that the word "professional" may not be appropriate in industry.	

D. Create a shared understanding among interested parties of the purpose and procedures of the personnel evaluation system. (See U2 and F2)	A	M		
E. Define and clarify performance standards for all professional positions.	A	M	Guideline was considered applicable but the jury was unclear of the intent of "all professional positions."	The J.C. should review guideline for clarity.
F. Provide timely evaluation feedback.	A	M		
G. Begin evaluation conferences on a positive note, avoiding an adversarial posture and emphasizing support for the evaluatee as a professional and promotion of professional growth and improvement.	A	NM	SCEP conference is not structured to always begin on a positive note. The jury also noted that the use of the word "professional" may not be appropriate in industry.	The SCEP should consider formatting the evaluation conference so that it begins rather than ends with a review of strengths. The J.C. should question the appropriateness of the word "professional" in industrial applications.
H. Identify performance areas for reinforcement and improvement.	A	M		
I. Provide specific constructive ways to overcome deficiencies.	A	M		
J. Use evaluations to allocate resources for improving performance, and provide resources and support for that purpose.	A	M		
K. Encourage, train, and assist <u>managers</u> to assess and improve their own performance.	A	M		

STANDARD U2: DEFINED USES--The users and the intended uses of the evaluation should be identified, so that the evaluation can address appropriate questions.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Identify and consult potential audiences, especially primary users, to clarify their needs for personnel evaluation information.	A	NR	Insufficient information to rate.	
B. Invite the evaluatees to help determine evaluation goals, uses, forms, methods, and audiences. (See F2)	A	NR	Insufficient information to rate.	
C. Construct evaluation questions that are relevant to information needs and proposed uses.	A	M		
D. Reach formal agreements with all parties involved to assure that they understand and are committed to the intended use of the evaluation information. (See P2)	A	NR	Insufficient information to rate.	
E. Formally determine which users are authorized to see what information and enforce the restrictions.	A	M		
F. Monitor the evaluation process to ensure tight connections between the collected information, intended uses, and actual users. (See A8)	A	NM	No identified procedure to monitor for a tight connection between the collected information and intended uses.	A procedure should be adopted that monitors the SCEP to ensure a tight connection exists between collected information and intended uses.

STANDARD U3: EVALUATOR CREDIBILITY--The evaluation system should be managed and executed by persons with the necessary qualifications, skills, sensitivity, and authority, and evaluators should conduct themselves professionally, so that evaluation reports are respected and used.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Assign evaluation roles to <u>individuals</u> with appropriate professional training and skills, professionalism and sensitivity, and who understand the evaluation tasks and the roles of the personnel to be evaluated.	A	M		
B. Ensure that evaluators of classroom practice understand effective teaching techniques and principles of learning psychology.	NA	NR	Guideline not applicable to industrial application. Applies to classroom environment.	Guideline should be discarded for industrial application.
C. Train administrators, board members, managers, and evaluation specialists to be effective in their role in the institution's evaluation system.	A	M		
D. Train those who will serve as evaluators in principles of sound personnel evaluation, performance appraisal techniques, methods for motivating employees, conflict management, and the law as it applies to personnel evaluation.	A	NM	The SCEP met this guideline except for legal training.	The SCEP should consider adding a section to the training package that addresses evaluation legal issues.
E. Establish the authority and responsibilities of the evaluators.	A	NM	Authority and responsibility were not clearly established for the evaluator or the second level supervisor.	The authority and responsibilities of the evaluator and the second level supervisor should be clearly explained in the training.

F.	When feasible, engage an evaluation team rather than a single administrator, to enhance credibility and validity.	A	M		
G.	Provide evaluators with support personnel or services to assist in collecting and analyzing needed information when those tasks exceed their professional training and expertise.	A	M		
H.	Require that evaluators be responsible for their evaluation assignments from start to finish; substitutes in mid-stream are vulnerable and not well received.	A	NM	There is no policy in the SCEP to address this guideline.	No recommendations are made addressing the jurors' comments as this guideline may not always be practical.
I.	Prepare and use a relevant agenda for evaluation feedback sessions, if they are held. Such an agenda might include: -Review the job description, prior objectives, accomplishments, and strengths and weaknesses. -Develop an action plan, including institutional support. -Schedule a follow-up evaluation. -Ask the evaluatee to summarize the feedback, discussion, targets for improvement, and next steps. -Promise and deliver a written summary.	A	M		
J.	Exercise professionalism in reporting on and discussing the performance of a staff member, e.g.: -Discuss the evaluation only in a professional setting. -Present facts. -Be open to gathering additional information if it is needed. -Avoid discussing personalities.	A	M		

K. Stress and demonstrate commitment to educational improvement. (See U1)	NA	NR	Jury had multiple interpretations of this guideline.	The J.C. should review this guideline for clarity.
L. Promptly reinforce improvement by an individual involved in remediation.	A	NM	No established policy to promptly reinforce improvement by individuals involved in remediation.	The SCEP training should encourage prompt reinforcement of improvement for those in remediation.
M. Evaluate the work of each evaluator periodically. (See A8)	A	NM	The SCEP has no provisions to periodically evaluate the work of each evaluator.	The SCEP should periodically evaluate the work of each evaluator.

STANDARD U4: FUNCTIONAL REPORTING--Reports should be clear, timely, accurate, and germane, so that they are of practical value to the evaluatee and other appropriate audiences.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Begin evaluations early to allow time for interim reporting.	A	M		
B. Address only identified professional responsibilities in the evaluation report.	A	M		
C. Write the report immediately following the observation, interview, or other data-gathering process, while the activity is still fresh in mind.	A	M		
D. Write the report soon enough following an observation so that it can be provided to the evaluatee in advance of a post-observation conference.	NA	NR	Guideline relates to an observation evaluation or special incident reporting.	Guideline should not be used for industrial application.

E. Write the report to bear directly on the behavior or other indicators of status that reflect agreed-upon objectives and criteria.	NA	NR	Guideline relates to an observation evaluation or special incident reporting.	Contrary to the jury opinion, the guideline is relevant and should be included.
F. Check the accuracy of data and the clarity and defensibility of the draft report. Consider involving the evaluatee or other appropriate users in review process prior to finalizing the report.	NA	NR	Guideline relates to an observation evaluation or special incident reporting.	Guideline should not be used for industrial application.
G. Conduct feedback sessions to encourage evaluatee acceptance and use of the findings to improve performance.	NA	NR	Guideline relates to an observation evaluation or special incident reporting.	Guideline should not be used for industrial application.
H. Issue formal notices as intermediate and fair warnings that cited deficiencies must be remedied.	NA	NR	Guideline relates to an observation evaluation or special incident reporting.	Guideline should not be used for industrial application.

STANDARD U5: FOLLOW-UP AND IMPACT--Evaluations should be followed up, so that users and evaluatees are aided to understand the results and take appropriate actions.

Joint Committee Guidelines	J.C.	SCEP	Jury comments	Recommendations
A. Review with the evaluatee specific areas of strengths and weaknesses.	A	M		
B. Give recognition to outstanding performance.	A	M	The jury had difficulty agreeing on a definition of recognition. They agreed supervisory recognition was acceptable to meet this guideline.	The J.C. should consider providing an operational definition of "recognition."
C. Include ways to improve identified weaknesses.	A	M		

D. Solicit the evaluatee's suggestions for improving performance.	A	M		
E. Develop, with the appropriate support personnel, a flexible professional growth plan to take advantage of assessed strengths or to overcome identified weaknesses.	A	M		
F. Arrange follow-up conferences between the evaluatee and appropriate support personnel.	A	M	The jury had difficulty agreeing on a definition of "support personnel." They agreed that the supervisor was support personnel.	The J.C. should consider providing clarification to the term "support personnel."
G. Assist the evaluatee with released time, and/or other practical actions that may enable the professional growth plan to succeed.	A	M		
H. Advise the evaluatee of the implications of success or failure in completing the professional growth plan.	A	M		
I. Schedule the next evaluation.	A	M		
J. Keep a record of instances in which the evaluatee did or did not act upon recommendations from evaluations.	NR	NR	Omitted from instrument.	
K. Give any necessary notices of possible non-reemployment by the appropriate date.	NR	NR	Omitted from instrument.	
L. Keep written records of the total process.	A	NM	Met guideline with the exception of the multiple input form destruction.	Multiple input forms should be retained by the SCEP.

M.	Use information in the manner prescribed in the adopted formal guidelines (See P2) for making personnel decisions, such as selection and merit pay.	A	M		
N.	Work with users to be sure that they understand and make appropriate use of the evaluation information.	A	M		
O.	Determine necessary modifications in the evaluation procedure to increase evaluation use and impact on practice and outcomes. (See A8)	NR	NR	Guideline was unclear to the jury.	The J.C. should review the guideline for clarity.

Note. J.C. = Joint Committee. SCEP = Specific Corporate Evaluation Process. A = Applicable. M = Met guideline. NM = Guideline not met. NA = Guideline not applicable. NR = Guideline not rated. Underlined = word change from original Standards and Standard guidelines. . . . = indicates omission of word from original Standards and Standard guidelines.

Appendix H

Interview Summary

Summary of Responses to Interview Questions

Question 1: Did you find the standards easy to use in critiquing the SCEP?

Judge 1: Yes, very easy with the exception of the fact that some of the standards needed clarification with operational definitions. The orientation given and the modification of the standards for industrial use made them very easy to apply.

Judge 2: Yes, but it would have been helpful to have had some clearer direction in the format for consensus review.

Judge 3: Yes, very easy.

Judge 4: Yes, relatively easy with the exception of some wording revisions that should be made.

Judge 5: Yes, in some cases; no, in others where operational definitions were missing. There were a lot of personnel functions "lumped in" with the evaluative process which added difficulty.

Question 2: Is it feasible to use the standards in reviewing an SCEP?

Judge 1: Not only was it feasible, but I was surprised at how few of the guidelines were not applicable. I found it could be made more feasible by eliminating some of the overlapping guidelines that were redundant.

Judge 2: Yes, absolutely.

Judge 3: Yes, though there were some slight problems with wording, the basic theme was "right on."

Judge 4: Yes, it provided proven methods and tools.

Judge 5: Yes.

Question 3: Was this a practical and useful exercise you would recommend for reviewing an SCEP?

Judge 1: Yes, it was useful in that it provided feedback to the developers of the SCEP. The process was also useful for the in-depth learning it provided on the SCEP.

Judge 2: Yes, I wish this would have been done earlier in the developmental process of the SCEP.

Judge 3: Yes, it provided me with a thorough understanding of the SCEP. I consider this a necessary process in the development of a new system.

Judge 4: Yes, it was practical and useful, especially with the group process that was used.

Judge 5: Yes, absolutely, we used a similar process that was valuable in the development of the compensation system.

Question 4: Were there any SCEP procedures that do not have standards or guidelines that address them?

Judge 1: Only the minor ones that were pointed out in the consensus review.

Judge 2: No, if anything the reverse was true as the standards overlapped.

Judge 3: No, it was a very thorough process. If all the recommended changes were made on the SCEP that were identified, we would have a great system.

Judge 4: No.

Judge 5: No, if anything the reverse was true.

Question 5: Do you have any suggestions to improve the process (e.g., number of judges, representation of judges, process used)?

Judge 1: The group process for consensus and the assigned standards approach was important and better than other approaches we could have taken. The validity and reliability standards assumed advanced knowledge and special skill which in other circumstances would have required an expert or supplemental training.

The mix of judges was outstanding and five was a good number, though we could have gotten similar results with fewer judges.

Judge 2: A more structured approach could have been helpful when sharing information for consensus review. The variety of the judges was appropriate, though another outsider may have been better. Five judges was a good number, probably ideal. If time was not a problem, I would have required all judges to answer all standards, though I would have still assigned standards to individuals to lead the discussion.

Judge 3: I would recommend time be set aside to study the standards and guidelines in class. Five judges was a good number and the variety of judges was good. I might have added some judges, particularly someone from the design team. The method of having assigned standards was a good one as it provided ownership and someone to lead the consensus discussion.

Judge 4: No, the process for applying the standards was a very good one. I might have used a few more judges and I would recommend that a woman be used as a judge in future studies like this.

Judge 5: I think that the option of stating that a guideline is addressed in some system other than the SCEP should be made clearer. I believe we may have rated the SCEP down at times when a guideline was met through another process. The process could have been improved by reading all the standards and guidelines together in class. The number of judges in the study was good. The fact that one of the judges worked for another of the judges was probably not a good idea.

Question 6: Did the prestudy package help?

Judge 1: The prestudy package was essential, especially for me as an outsider to the organization. The preliminary work done on Steps 2 and 3 was a big help and really saved time. For the judges to have developed the answers to the questions in Steps 2 and 3 would have been too tedious.

Judge 2: Very much so. However, there was some repeated information in the package that could have been avoided.

Judge 3: The prestudy package was a big help. Everything in the package was appropriate.

Judge 4: The prestudy package was a big help. Everything in the package was appropriate.

Judge 5. The prestudy package did help.

Question 7: How much time did you spend outside of the class on this project?

Judge 1: Five hours on the prestudy package; 1.5 hours on the assigned standards.

Judge 2: Four to 5 hours on the prestudy package; 1.5 hours on the assigned standards.

Judge 3: Six hours on the prestudy package; 3 hours on the assigned standards.

Judge 4: Six hours on the prestudy package; 5 hours on the assigned standards.

Judge 5: One hour on the prestudy package as I speed read.

Question 8: Do you have anything at all you would like to comment on or add?

Judge 1: This was a great exercise; I learned a lot about the evaluation system.

Judge 2: This was a very good exercise; I learned a lot about the SCEP and what evaluation systems should contain.

Judge 3: I wished I would have done something like this sooner; it was a great learning process.

Judge 4: I enjoyed the process and learned a great deal about the standards and the SCEP.

Judge 5: The SCEP study team is very interested in seeing our work.

Appendix I

Summary of the Number of Improvements Recommended

Number of Recommendations Made for Improvements of Standard
and Guideline Industrial Applicability and Improvements
to the Host Setting's SCEP, by Standard

Standard symbol	Recommendations to add standard guidelines	Recommendations to drop standard guidelines	Recommendations to change standard guidelines	Recommended changes to the Host's SCEP
P1	0	1	0	3
P2	0	0	1	2
P3	0	0	1	4
P4	0	1	6	3
P5	0	0	0	1
Subtotal	0	2	8	13
F1	0	0	0	3
F2	0	0	0	1
F3	1	0	0	2
Subtotal	1	0	0	6
A1	1	0	0	1
A2	0	0	1	0
A3	0	0	0	2
A4	0	2	0	6
A5	0	0	0	3
A6	0	0	3	1
A7	0	1	1	4
A8	0	0	2	2
Subtotal	1	3	7	19
U1	0	0	1	1
U2	0	0	0	1
U3	0	1	1	4
U4	0	4	0	0
U5	0	0	3	1
Subtotal	0	5	5	7
Total	2	10	20	45

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albemarle Paper Co. v. Moody. 422 U.S. 405, 10 FEP 1181 (1975).
- American Psychological Association, Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology. (1980). Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: Author.
- Brito v. Zia Co., 478 F.2d. 1200 (1973).
- Campbell, S. (1985). The Honeywell studies: How managers learn to manage. Training, 22(8), 22-30.
- Cascio, W. F. (1982a). Applied psychology in personnel management (2nd ed.). Reston, VA: Reston.
- Cascio, W. F. (1982b). Costing human resources: The financial impact of behaviors in organizations. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Cascio, W. F., & Awad, E. M. (1981). Human resources management: An information systems approach. Reston, VA: Reston.
- Cook, M. F. (1984). Human resource director's handbook. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53, 285-328.
- Deming, W. E. (1982). Quality, productivity, and competitive position. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Deming, W. E. (1984). Extra notes for seminars to accompany use of the book: Quality, productivity, and competitive position. Copyrighted unpublished manuscript.
- Dipboye, R. L., & Pontbraid, R. D. (1981). Correlates of employee reactions to performance appraisals and appraisal systems. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66, 248-251.
- Domingo v. New England Fish Company, 445 F. Supp. 421 (W.D. Wash., 1977).
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1970). Guidelines on employee selection procedures. Federal Register, 35, 12333-12336.

- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1978). Uniform guidelines on employee selection. Federal Register, 43, 38290-38309.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1979). Adoption of questions and answers to clarify and provide a common interpretation of the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures. Federal Register, 44, 11996-12009.
- Gallegos, A. M., Sanders, J. R., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1986). Filling a void: The development of standards for evaluations of educational personnel. A presentation to the 1986 annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Griggs v. Duke Power Company, 401 U.S. 424, 3 EDP 8137 (1971).
- Harris, B. M., McIntyre, K. E., Littleton, V. L., & Long, D. F. (1985). Personnel administration in education. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Heneman, H. G., Schwab, D. P., Jassum, J. A., & Dyer, L. D. (1983). Personnel/human resources management. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego: EdITS.
- Jacobson, B., & Kaye, B. L. (1986). Career development and performance appraisal: It takes two to tango. Personnel, 63(1), 26-32.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1981). Standards for evaluation of educational programs, projects and materials. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1986). A selected annotated bibliography on personnel evaluation. Unpublished manuscript.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1988). The personnel evaluation standards. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jones, G. (1988, October 14). Personal communication.
- Kaye, B. L. (1984). Performance appraisal and career development: A shotgun marriage. Personnel, 61(2), 57-66.
- Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1982). Increasing productivity through performance appraisal. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Levine, H. Z. (1986). Performance appraisals at work. Personnel, 63(6), 63-71.

- Levinson, H. (1976, July-August). Appraisal of what performance? Harvard Business Review, pp. 74-80.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Olson, F. C. (1984, November-December). How peer review works at control data. Harvard Business Review, pp. 58-68.
- Reed, P. R., & Kroll, M. J. (1985). A two-perspective approach to performance appraisal. Personnel, 62(10), 51-57.
- Regulatory requirements of Office of Personnel Management. (1979). Federal Register, 44, 3448.
- Rice, B. (1985, September). Performance review: The job nobody likes. Psychology Today, pp. 30-36.
- Rieder, G. A. (1973, July-August). Performance review a mixed bag. Harvard Business Review, pp. 61-66.
- Rodman, T. A. (1984). Make the praise equal the raise. Personnel Journal, 63(11), 73-78.
- Rowe v. General Motors, 4 FEP 445 (1972).
- SCEP modifications. (1988). Confidential internal publication of host company.
- SCEP PDP training manual. (1988). Confidential internal publication of host company.
- SCEP supplement A. (1988). Confidential internal publication of host company.
- SCEP supplement B. (1988). Confidential internal publication of host company.
- SCEP training handbook. (1985). Confidential internal publication of host company.
- Schneier, C. E., Beatty, R. W., & Baird, L. S. (1986). How to construct a successful performance appraisal system. Training and Development Journal, 40(4), 38-42.
- Soar, R. S., Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1983). Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used models. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(4), 239-246.
- Strauss, G., & Sayles, L. R. (1980). Personnel: The human problems of management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Stroul, N. A. (1987). Whither performance appraisal. Training and Development Journal, 41(11), 70-74.
- United States v. South Carolina, 434 U.S. 1026, 16 FEP 501 (1978).
- United Steelworkers v. Weber, U.S. F (1979).
- Wade v. Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service, 372 F Supp. 126, 7 EPD 9186 (1974).
- Wilde, F. B., & Vancil, R. F. (1982, November-December). Performance audits by outside directors. Harvard Business Review, pp. 92-96.
- Woods, J. G., & Dillon, T. (1985). The performance review approach to improving productivity. Personnel, 62(3), 20-27.
- Zemke, R. (1985). Is performance appraisal a paper tiger. Training, 22(12), 24-32.
- Zippo, M., & Miller, M. (1984). Performance appraisal: Current practices and techniques. Personnel, 61(3), 57-59.