

Table of appendix:

1. Appendix 1 – Table 1	50
2. Appendix 2 – Table 2	50
3. Appendix 3 – Table 3	51
4. Appendix 4 – Table 4	52
5. Appendix 5 – Attachment 5	53
6. Appendix 6 – Attachment 6	53
7. Appendix 7 – Attachment 7	54
8. Appendix 8 – Table 8	58
9. Appendix 9 – Table 9	60
10. Appendix 10 – Attachment 10	61
11. Appendix 11 – Table 11	62
12. Appendix 12 – Table 12	63
13. Appendix 13 – Table 13	64
14. Appendix 14 – Table 14	65
15. Appendix 15 – Table 15	66
16. Appendix 16 – Attachment 16	67
17. Appendix 17 – Attachment 17	67
18. Appendix 18 – Attachment 18	68

Table 1⁴⁸

	1995	2000	2005	% change, 1995–2005	% change, 1995–2005 (inflation adjusted)
All nonprofits	1.1 million	1.3 million	1.4 million	27.3	-
Reporting nonprofits	431,567	428,154	530,376	22.9	-
Revenues (\$)	802 billion	1.1 trillion	1.6 trillion	96.9	54.6
Expenses (\$)	729 billion	984 billion	1.4 trillion	96.4	54.2
Assets (\$)	1.5 trillion	2.4 trillion	3.4 trillion	125.6	77.1
Public charities, 501(c)(3)	572,660	690,326	876,164	53	-
Reporting public charities	187,038	245,749	310,683	66.1	-
Revenues (\$)	573 billion	811 billion	1.1 trillion	99.5	56.6
Expenses (\$)	530 billion	731 billion	1.1 trillion	98.7	56
Assets (\$)	843 billion	1.432 trillion	1.98 trillion	134.3	83.9

Table 2.⁴⁹

Type of Charity	% of charitable contribution
Religion-related	32.8
Education	13.9
Health	6.9
Human Services	10
Arts, culture and humanities	4.2
Political and societal benefit	7.3
Environment and animals	2.2
International and foreign affairs	3.8
Gifts to foundation	10
Unallocated	8.8

⁴⁸Kennard T.Wing, Katie L.Roeger, Thomas H.Pollak , “The non-profit sector in brief”, Public Charities, Giving and Volunteering ,2009

⁴⁹Kennard T.Wing, Katie L.Roeger, Thomas H.Pollak , “The non-profit sector in brief”, Public Charities, Giving and Volunteering ,2009

Table 3.⁵⁰

**Employment in the Independent Sector and Its Subsectors
1977-2001**

	1977		1987		1997		2001	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total for the independent sector (thousands)	5,520	100.0	7,390	100.0	10,619	100.0	11,721	100.0
By subsector and components								
<u>Health services</u>	<u>2,459</u>	<u>44.5</u>	<u>3,367</u>	<u>45.6</u>	<u>4,618</u>	<u>43.5</u>	<u>4,911</u>	<u>41.9</u>
Nursing and personal care facilities	206	3.7	348	4.7	571	5.4	601	5.1
Hospitals	2,121	38.4	2,665	36.1	3,304	31.1	3,483	29.7
Other health services	131	2.4	354	4.8	546	5.1	612	5.2
Clinics of doctors of medicine and dentists	---	---	---	---	196	1.8	215	1.8
Clinics of M.D.s, dentists, other health services	---	---	354	4.8	743	7.0	827	7.1
<u>Education/research</u>	<u>1,280</u>	<u>23.2</u>	<u>1,666</u>	<u>22.5</u>	<u>2,295</u>	<u>21.6</u>	<u>2,570</u>	<u>21.9</u>
Private colleges and universities	703	12.7	908	12.3	1,226	11.5	1,351	11.5
Private elementary and secondary schools	428	7.7	566	7.7	828	7.8	946	8.1
Selected educational services	49	0.9	68	0.9	82	0.8	108	0.9
Noncommercial, research	100	1.8	125	1.7	160	1.5	165	1.4
<u>Social and legal services</u>	<u>715</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>1,196</u>	<u>16.2</u>	<u>1,825</u>	<u>17.2</u>	<u>2,140</u>	<u>18.3</u>
Legal services	12	0.2	15	0.2	22	0.2	25	0.2
Social services	<u>703</u>	<u>12.7</u>	<u>1,182</u>	<u>16.0</u>	<u>1,803</u>	<u>17.0</u>	<u>2,115</u>	<u>18.0</u>
Individual and family services,								
social services	290	5.3	514	7.0	788	7.4	985	8.4
Job training and related services	130	2.3	213	2.9	353	3.3	353	3.0
Child daycare services	141	2.6	201	2.7	239	2.2	274	2.3
Residential care	142	2.6	254	3.4	424	4.0	504	4.3
<u>Religious organizations</u>	<u>679</u>	<u>12.3</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>1,207</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>1,379</u>	<u>11.8</u>
<u>Civic, social, and fraternal organizations</u>	<u>305</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>366</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>443</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>463</u>	<u>3.9</u>
<u>Arts and culture</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>223</u>	<u>1.9</u>
Radio and TV broadcasting	10	0.2	19	0.3	20	0.2	21	0.2
Producers, orchestras, entertainers	27	0.5	54	0.7	94	0.9	100	0.8
Museums, botanical and zoological gardens	29	0.5	48	0.7	85	0.8	103	0.9
<u>Foundations</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>0.3</u>

⁵⁰ "Employment in the Non-profit Sector", Independent Sector, The New Non-profit Almanac, 2008

Table 4.⁵¹

-Advocate to advocate – Each One Reach One	Using newspapers
- Civic groups	- “What’s happening” columns
- Newspaper articles	- Editorials
- Utilize AmeriCorps/VISTA volunteers as recruiters	- Utilize “community” newspapers
- Hold frequent orientations	- Letters to editors: respond to articles with strategies to address problems, including CASA (as a strategy, not a problem!)
- Vary orientation location – neighborhoods, coffee houses	Feature stories
- Vary training location – get corporations to “sponsor” a training class	- call with a specific story idea, and give them a volunteer’s name and phone number
- Newspaper advertising insert – sell ads to underwrite the cost	- Use national events (such as national volunteer or child abuse prevention month) and make it local for them
- Radio and TV PSAs	- Paid advertising in newspapers
- Talk radio	-Send press releases for awards won
- Jury pool room	- Consider including a media person on your board
- Universities and colleges (students (21+) and faculty)	- Know your beat reporter (the person who usually covers human services stories) and be a good source for them
- Realtors (can partner with real estate associations)	- Send press releases often
- Retired and active teachers	- Put the newspaper on your newsletter mailing list
- Community bulletins/calendars	
- Referrals from other agencies	
- Flyer in utility bills	
- Spouses of volunteers	
- Volunteer fairs and local fairs/festivals	

⁵¹Joan E.Pynes. “Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit organizations”. Jossey-Bass. 2004

Attachment 5.⁵²

- 1) Interview (incumbent, supervisor, SME – subject matter expert).
- 2) Questionnaire (open-ended questions for SME, incumbent, supervisor).
- 3) Structured checklist (other type of questionnaire).
- 4) Observation (not well for intellectual and cognitive practice's)
- 5) Diary (employees asked to keep a diary)
- 6) Combination of all methods.

Attachment 6.⁵³

1. In-basket – written tests designed to simulate administrative tasks.
2. Leaderless group discussion – oral communication.
3. Assessment centers – special selection programs that rely in performance tests.
4. Bio data – biographical information.
5. Drug-testing.
6. Lie-detector exams (could be prohibited by law).
7. Honesty and integrity tests.
8. Physical ability test.

⁵²Pynes, J.E., “Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations”, Jossey-bass, 2004

⁵³Pynes, J.E., “Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations”, Jossey-bass, 2004

Attachment 7.⁵⁴

Participants and Procedures

An anonymous survey was distributed to 991 employees of a nonprofit youth and recreation services organization with sixteen geographically dispersed locations. Executives at each branch facilitated the distribution and collection of surveys, which an independent research center analyzed. To retain anonymity employees could drop surveys in a collection box at each branch or mail them directly to the organization's main office. Branch size ranged considerably, from as few as fourteen employees to as many as 130. A total of 304 completed surveys were returned (31.6 percent response rate). Fifty-four percent of the respondents ($n = 165$) classified themselves as part time; 112 respondents (37 percent) indicated that they were full-time employees; and 9 percent ($n = 27$) did not specify. Almost 70 percent (67.4 percent) of the respondents were female; 28.9 percent were male. Eleven individuals (3.6 percent) did not specify.

Measures

Several demographic variables were measured to control for the effect on expressed intentions to stay with the organizations (Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner, 2000). Age was assessed using categorical age brackets. Thirty-three percent of the respondents indicated they were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five; 27.6 percent indicated they were twenty-six to thirty-five, accounting for over 60 percent of the respondents. Position was measured as full-time (scored as one) and part-time (scored as zero). Time with the organization (that is, tenure) was measured in months. Part-time employees had been with the organization for an average of 23.75 ($SD = 30.16$) months, whereas full-time employees had been with the organization for slightly over forty-six months ($SD = 48.64$). The organization's proprietary survey instrument was used to assess employee attitudes. Respondents answered all questions on a four-point scale, on which lower scores indicated higher levels of agreement. All variables identified as reflecting a construct were factor analyzed to verify that they were associated with a single component. When more than one factor was present, items were dropped or separate factors were developed.

Two components of satisfaction were investigated: overall satisfaction (four questions) and satisfaction with compensation (four questions). Employees on average expressed satisfaction with their work ($r = .77$; $M = 1.98$, $SD = .58$) and dissatisfaction with pay ($r = .83$; $M = 2.64$, $SD = .71$). Mission attachment was assessed through four statements by which employees could gauge their awareness and contribution to the organization's mission ($r = .76$; $M = 1.77$, $SD = .56$) Specific statements used to assess mission attachment were the following:

Component Statement

Awareness I am well aware of the direction and mission of [Organization name].

Awareness the programs and staff at my branch support the mission of [organization name].

Agreement I like to work for [organization name] because I believe in its mission and values.

⁵⁴William A. Brown, Carlton F. Yoshioka, "Mission attachment and satisfaction as factors in employee retention", *Nonprofit management and Leadership*, 2003

Alignment My work contributes to carrying out the mission of [organization name].

Career intentions were assessed through a single item that asked employees about their intentions to stay with the organization for the length of a career. In addition, respondents were asked to explain why they would or would not stay with the organization for a career. These qualitative responses were analyzed to further explain their responses.

HYPOTHESIS 1a. Full-time and part-time employees will express similar levels of satisfaction and mission attachment.

HYPOTHESIS 1b. Compared to part-time employees, full-time employees will express stronger intentions to stay with the organization.

HYPOTHESIS 2. There will be a positive association between mission attachment, employee satisfaction, and expressed intentions to stay.

HYPOTHESIS 3. Mission attachment will explain employees' intentions to stay, above and beyond aspects of satisfaction and demographic variables.

Results

Hypothesis 1A states that full-time and part-time employees will express similar levels of satisfaction and mission attachment, and Hypothesis 1B states that full-time employees will express stronger intentions to stay with the organization when compared to part-time employees. A comparison of mean scores across measures of satisfaction and mission attachment revealed no significant difference between full-time and part-time employees. Conversely, part-time employees were significantly less likely to indicate an intention to stay with the organization ($M = 2.60, SD = .83$), whereas full-time staff were more likely to indicate that they intended to make a career with the organization ($M = 2.05, SD = .86; t = 5.19, df = 259, p < .001$). Forty-three percent of the part-time employees indicated they probably or definitely would stay, whereas 70 percent of the full-time employees indicated that they would stay. The analysis supports

Hypotheses 1A and 1B (see Table 1).

A correlation analysis was conducted to explore the association between mission attachment, employee satisfaction, and expressed intentions to stay (see Table 2). All facets of satisfaction were positively correlated with each other, mission attachment, and intentions to stay, which supports Hypothesis 2.

To test Hypothesis 3, a stepwise regression analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which control variables (tenure and age), facets of satisfaction, and mission attachment accounted for variance in intentions to stay with the organization. Based upon different levels of attachment to the organization, separate analysis was conducted for full-time and part-time employees (see Table 3).

Table 1. Mean Scores and Comparison of Full- and Part-Time Employee Attitudes by Time Status

Variable	All Respondents N = 304		t	df	Full Time N = 112		Part Time N = 165	
	Mean	SD			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Mission attachment	1.77	.56	0.13	273	1.76	.56	1.77	.56
Satisfaction overall	1.98	.58	-1.06	275	2.01	.62	1.93	.55
Satisfaction with pay	2.64	.71	0.14	272	2.64	.73	2.65	.71
Intention to stay	2.37	.90	5.19*	259	2.05	.86	2.60	.83

* $p < .001$.

Table 2. Correlation of Variables in Analysis

	1	2	3	4
1. Mission attachment	(.76)			
2. Satisfaction	.63*	(.77)		
3. Pay satisfaction	.35*	.52*	(.83)	
4. Intention to stay	.43*	.49*	.45*	N/A
N	301	304	299	285

Notes: Values in parentheses are alpha coefficients for measurement scales. Total possible N = 304.

* $p < .001$.

Table 3. Regression on Intentions to Stay Before Each Step

Step	Variable	Full Time				Part Time			
		β^a	T	ΔR^2	ΔF	β^a	T	ΔR^2	ΔF
1	Control			.007	.36			.14	12.20**
	Age	-.04	-0.40			-.37	-4.87**		
	Tenure	-.08	-0.76			.001	0.02		
2	Satisfaction								
	Overall	.63	7.77**	.39	60.40**	.47	7.10**	.22	50.35**
	Pay	.20	2.11*	.03	4.45*	.26	3.30**	.04	10.86**
3	Mission attachment	.12	1.15			.21	2.38*	.02	5.69*
		$R^2 = .42, F(4,94) = 17.06, p = .000$				$R^2 = .42, F(5,147) = 21.59, p = .000$			

^aStandardized β before each step.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 8.a ⁵⁵

**2010 DC NONPROFIT SALARY RANGES
(IN ALL SECTORS)**

Operating Budget:	Under \$2M	\$2.1-5M	\$5.1-10M	\$10.1-20M	\$20.1-50M	\$50M +
MANAGEMENT & ADMINISTRATION						
CEO/President	NA	120-140K	140-180K	160-200K	200-240K	240-300K
Executive Director	80-110K	100-120K	120-140K	130-160K	150-190K	190-250K
Chief Operating Officer	NA	90-110K	100-130K	120-150K	140-160K	160-180K
VP/Dir of Human Resources	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-110K	100-120K	110-130K
Office Manager	NA	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K	70-80K
Executive Assistant	NA	40-50K	40-50K	50-60K	50-60K	60-70K
Administrative Assistant	35-45K	40-45K	40-45K	45-50K	50-60K	50-60K
FINANCE						
CFO/VP of Finance	NA	90-100K	100-130K	120-140K	140-160K	160-180K
Dir of Finance	NA	70-90K	80-100K	100-120K	110-130K	120-140K
Controller	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-120K	110-130K
Staff Accountant	NA	50-60K	60-70K	70-80K	80-90K	80-90K
Bookkeeper	NA	40-50K	40-50K	50-60K	50-60K	50-60K
FUNDRAISING						
VP/Chief Development Officer	NA	90-110K	100-120K	110-140K	120-150K	130-160K
Dir of Development	70-80K	80-90K	90-110K	100-120K	110-130K	120-140K
Dir of Major Gifts	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-120K	110-120K
Dir of Special Events	NA	60-70K	70-80K	80-90K	80-90K	90-100K
Grants Writer	NA	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K	70-80K
Development Associate	40-45K	45-50K	50-60K	50-60K	50-60K	50-60K
Development Assistant	30-35K	30-35K	35-40K	35-40K	40-50K	40-50K
PUBLIC RELATIONS & MARKETING						
VP of PR/Marketing	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-110K	110-120K
Dir of PR/Marketing	NA	60-70K	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-110K
PR/Marketing Associate	40-45K	45-50K	50-60K	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K
PROGRAMS & EDUCATION						
VP of Programs/Education	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-110K	110-120K
Dir of Programs/Education	50-55K	55-65K	65-75K	75-80K	80-90K	90-100K
Program/Education Associate	40-45K	40-50K	50-60K	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K
IT & DATABASE MANAGEMENT						
VP/Dir of IT	NA	NA	70-90K	80-100K	90-110K	100-120K
Network Administrator	NA	NA	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K
Database Manager	NA	NA	50-60K	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K

⁵⁵ DC SALARY SURVEY 2010
Annual Salary Survey of DC Metro Nonprofits ISSUE FIVE

Table 8.b⁵⁶

2010 NY NONPROFIT SALARY RANGES
(IN ALL SECTORS)

Operating Budget:	Under \$2M	\$2.1-5M	\$5.1-10M	\$10.1-20M	\$20.1-50M	\$50M +
MANAGEMENT & ADMINISTRATION						
CEO/President	NA	140-160K	160-220K	180-260K	250-300K	280-350K+
Executive Director	80-110K	100-140K	130-170K	160-200K	200-250K	260-300K
Chief Operating Officer	NA	90-130K	120-150K	140-170K	160-180K	180-240K
VP/Dir of Human Resources	NA	80-90K	90-100K	100-120K	120-140K	120-160K
Office Manager	NA	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K	70-80K
Executive Assistant	NA	50-60K	50-60K	60-70K	70-80K	70-80K
Administrative Assistant	35-45K	40-50K	40-50K	40-50K	50-60K	50-60K
FINANCE						
CFO/VP of Finance	NA	80-120K	120-140K	140-160K	160-200K	180-200K
Dir of Finance	NA	80-90K	90-100K	100-120K	120-140K	140-160K
Controller	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-130K	120-140K
Staff Accountant	NA	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K	70-80K	80-90K
Bookkeeper	NA	40-50K	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	60-70K
FUNDRAISING						
VP/Chief Development Officer	NA	100-120K	120-140K	140-160K	160-180K	180-220K
Dir of Development	70-80K	80-100K	100-130K	120-140K	140-160K	160-180K
Dir of Major Gifts	NA	80-90K	80-110K	100-120K	120-140K	140-160K
Dir of Fdn/Corp Giving	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-120K	120-140K
Development Officer	NA	60-70K	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-110K
Dir of Special Events	NA	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-110K	110-120K
Grants Writer	NA	50-60K	60-70K	70-80K	80-90K	80-90K
Development Associate	40-50K	40-50K	50-60K	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K
Development Assistant	35-40K	35-45K	40-50K	40-50K	50-60K	50-60K
PUBLIC RELATIONS & MARKETING						
VP of PR/Marketing	NA	70-90K	80-110K	110-130K	120-150K	140-160K
Dir of PR/Marketing	NA	60-70K	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-120K
PR/Marketing Associate	40-50K	40-50K	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K
PROGRAMS & EDUCATION						
VP of Programs/Education	NA	70-90K	80-110K	100-130K	120-140K	130-160K
Dir of Programs/Education	50-60K	60-70K	70-80K	80-90K	90-100K	100-120K
Program/Education Associate	40-45K	40-50K	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K
IT & DATABASE MANAGEMENT						
VP/Dir of IT	NA	70-80K	80-100K	90-110K	100-130K	120-140K
Network Administrator	NA	NA	60-70K	70-80K	70-80K	80-100K
Database Manager	NA	NA	50-60K	60-70K	60-70K	70-80K

⁵⁶ NY SALARY SURVEY 2010
Annual Salary Survey of New York City Nonprofits ISSUE TWELVE

Table 9.⁵⁷

Compensable Factor	Definition	Relative Weight	Total Points	Minimum Point Value	Levels within Factor
Education	This factor measures the minimum level of formal education, specialized training, and professional licensing and certification required to perform the work.	16%	200	20	7
Work Experience	This factor measures the minimum amount of job-related experience, whether gained inside or outside the University, in order to be hired or promoted into the position.	16%	200	0	6
Leadership /Supervisory Responsibilities	This factor measures the degree of responsibility for other employees and direct control over the quantity and quality of others' work.	13%	175	0	9
Personal /Organizational Contacts	This factor measures the scope, frequency, and purpose of relationships with others, internal and external.	10%	125	25	5
Customer Service Relationships	This factor measures the required skill level and frequency of customer service relationships.	10%	125	25	4
Work Complexity/ Budget Authority	This factor measures the variety, difficulty, and magnitude of tasks and responsibilities	16%	200	50	5

⁵⁷ Available at www.pvamu.edu

Compensable Factor	Definition	Relative Weight	Total Points	Minimum Point Value	Levels within Factor
	necessary to complete the work.				
Independent Judgment/ Decision Making/ Problem Solving	This factor measures the extent of independent authority for making decisions and recommendations that affect policies, procedures, and practices.	16%	200	50	5
Working/ Environmental Conditions	This factor measures the unavoidable physical demands, environmental elements and safety/hazardous conditions under which the work is performed.	3%	50	10	4
Total		100%	1275		

Attachment 10.⁵⁸

1. Broad banding – movement away from system of many pay grades. Salary grades were collapsed into broader bands.

2. Skill-based pay – pay is determined by amount of knowledge employee masters. Organization should be aware, that wages will increase, as employee learns new skills.

3. Pay for performance – individual should be paid according to their contributions. To be successful, pay for performance should be limited to the strategic mission of the organization; and upper level management must support the plan.

4. Gain-sharing – team bonus program. Organization need to offer competitive wages or other heavy benefits to stay in a competitive market.

⁵⁸Pynes, J.E., “Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations”, Jossey-bass, 2004

Table 11. ⁵⁹

Exhibit 9.1. Common Rating Errors.

Halo Effect

Rating an employee excellent in one quality, which in turn influences the rater to give that employee a similar rating or a higher-than-deserved rating on other qualities. A subset of the halo effect is the “logic error.” In this situation, a rater confuses one performance dimension with another and then incorrectly rates the dimension because of the misunderstanding. For example, an employee demonstrates a high degree of dependability (is never absent or late), and from this behavior, a comparable high degree of integrity is inferred (such as “would never use organization property for personal use”).

Central Tendency

Providing a rating of average or around the midpoint for all qualities. This is the most common and most serious kind of error. Since many employees do perform somewhere around the average, it is an easily rationalized escape from making a valid appraisal.

Strict Rating

Rating consistently lower than the normal or average; being overly harsh in rating performance qualities.

Lenient Rating

Rating consistently higher than the expected norm or average; being overly loose in rating performance qualities.

Latest Behavior

Rating influenced by the most recent behavior; failing to recognize the most commonly demonstrated behaviors during the entire appraisal period.

Initial Impression

Rating based on first impressions; failing to recognize most consistently demonstrated behaviors during the entire appraisal period.

Spillover Effect

Allowing past performance appraisal ratings to unjustly influence current ratings. Past performance ratings, good or bad, result in a similar rating for the current period, even though demonstrated behavior does not deserve the rating, good or bad.

⁵⁹Pynes, J.E., “Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations”, Jossey-bass, 2004

Exhibit 9.1. Common Rating Errors, Cont'd.

Same as Me

Giving the ratee a rating higher than deserved because the person has qualities or characteristics similar to those of the rater (or similar to those held in high esteem).

Different from Me

Giving the ratee a rating lower than deserved because the person has qualities or characteristics dissimilar to the rater (or similar to those held in low esteem).

Table 12⁶⁰

Exhibit 9.2. Trait-Rating Scale.

Name _____ Section _____ Unit _____

Use the following scale to rate each trait:

Outstanding = 1 Very good = 2 Average = 3 Improvement needed = 4
Unsatisfactory = 5

Judgment _____

Cooperation _____

Dependability _____

Knowledge of work _____

Work initiative _____

Public contacts _____

Quality of work _____

Supervisory ability _____

Appearance _____

Overall job performance _____

⁶⁰Pynes, J.E., "Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations", Jossey-bass, 2004

Table 13.⁶¹

Exhibit 9.3. Behavioral-Anchored Rating Scale.

Job: Lieutenant Investigator

Dimension: Assign and review cases to investigators

Check the rating that describes this person's job performance most accurately.

- ___ *Superior:* Reviews all cases sent to investigations from records section on a daily basis. Assigns cases to investigators on a daily basis, giving clear verbal instructions about what is expected of them by the supervisor in reference to a particular case. Attaches case assignment log sheet with handwritten scheduled time once a week. Keeps a case management log of all cases assigned.
- ___ *Very Good:* Reviews all cases sent to investigations. Assigns cases to investigators. Attaches a case assignment log sheet with written instructions. Reviews cases with investigators when necessary.
- ___ *Good:* Reviews all cases refereed to investigations from patrol division and records division. Assigns cases to investigators.
- ___ *Needs improvement:* Takes several days before cases are reviewed. Rarely reviews investigators' work. Assignment of cases to investigators takes several days to a week.
- ___ *Unsatisfactory:* Allows investigators to review all reports given to investigations by records section and to pick their own assignments. Does not review investigators' work.

Comments:

Rater's signature: _____

⁶¹ Pynes, J.E., "Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations", Jossey-bass, 2004

Table 14⁶²

Exhibit 9.5. Critical Incidents Report.

Positive:

- (Date) Employee volunteered for four extra assignments.
- (Date) Phone call received from professional X commending the assistance given by employee A.
- (Date) Employee submitted progress report B two weeks ahead of deadline. The report was complete and accurate. Employee exercised independent judgment.

Negative:

- (Date) Employee failed to submit accurate and complete verification reports. Auditors found deficiencies that warranted a payback.
 - (Date) Employee refused to return phone calls to client, resulting in loss of client.
 - (Date) Employee missed the deadline for a grant proposal submission. This resulted in the agency not receiving X amount of funds. Program X had to be eliminated.
-

⁶²Pynes, J.E., "Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations", Jossey-bass, 2004

Table 15. ⁶³

Exhibit 9.4. Management by Objectives Rating Scale.

Position evaluated: Lieutenant Investigator

Dimension: Maintaining and updating standard operating procedures (SOP) manual for the investigations section

Objective: Create a documented review procedure for investigations personnel to review SOP manual

Type of measure: Timeliness

Present level: Manual is reviewed with investigations personnel on a yearly basis but with no formal documented procedure

Desired level: Manual to be reviewed with investigations personnel once a year, on a scheduled date, with captain present. A review form is signed and initialed by each individual investigator, the supervising lieutenant, and the captain. Review forms are kept on file with the SOP manual.

Time frame: One month

Method used to achieve objective:

1. Create SOP review form and submit it to the captain for approval.
2. Check with captain and establish a yearly review date in the month of January.
3. Update manual to include file for review forms.
4. Immediately file completed review forms.

Employee signature: _____

Supervisor signature: _____

Date completed: _____ Date of review: _____

⁶³Pynes, J.E., "Human Resource Management for Public and Nonprofit Organizations", Jossey-bass, 2004

Attachment 16.⁶⁴

- 1.Lecture (trainee is a passive participant)
- 2.Experiential exercises (simulators)
- 3.Role Playing (practicing interpersonal and communicative skills)
- 4.Case Studies (participants analyze situation, identifies problem, offer a solution)
- 5.Audio-visual methods
- 6.Programmed instructions and PC-based training (self-teaching method)
- 7.Equipment simulations (bring realism to training)
- 8.Videoconferencing (useful for training in distance)
- 9.Community resources (community training, which could be performed at nominal cost or even free of charge).

Attachment 17.⁶⁵

- 1.Termination - also referred to as being fired or let go, with no particular implication as to the reason for the termination.
- 2.Dismissal - implies that the employee's performance or conduct was unsatisfactory.
- 3.Retirement - implies that the employee has voluntarily decided to cease being gainfully employed.
- 4.Lay-off - implies that employees are being put on unpaid leave status, but as soon as work is available they may be rehired.
- 5.Reduction in force - implies that more than one staff member is being terminated, but no particular implication as to the reason for the terminations; generally, not appropriate to use when an employee's performance was unsatisfactory.
- 6.Reorganizing - implies that positions are being eliminated and that reporting relationships are being restructured.
- 7.Elimination of a position - describes a situation where a particular position is being eliminated; no implication as to the reason, although generally not appropriate when the reason is poor performance.
- 8.Right-sizing - implies that the organization was overstaffed to begin with.
- 9.Delay ring - implies that managers are being fired.

⁶⁴ Available at www.managementhelp.org

⁶⁵ Available at www.nonprofitrisk.org

Attachment 18⁶⁶

Mission Statement: The mission of the Human Resource Management Office is to support and influence the strategic direction of Buffalo State College by providing managers and employees with innovative solutions to organizational and human resource issues. The department exists to provide services which help the college to attract, retain, and reward competent and dedicated faculty and staff who share a commitment to the values of excellence and innovation in teaching, research, and service to students and the community.

Vision Statement: We aspire to build partnerships with management at all levels of the organization to create a campus culture that values all employees. This culture encourages and rewards exceptional performance and continuous improvement, fosters teamwork, and supports balanced attention to work and personal life issues. We provide services of the highest quality in a cost-effective manner while creating a healthy professional environment that fosters respect for both diverse perspectives and a service orientation.

⁶⁶ Berman, Evan M.. Productivity in Public and Nonprofit Organizations, Armonk, NY, USA: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 2005. p 72.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/cuni/Doc?id=10178066&ppg=84>