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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction to Study

Job evaluation is concerned with comparing jobs by applying formal and systematic procedures to determine the relative worth (value) to the organization. It considers the responsibilities, skills, efforts, and the working conditions of the job rather than abilities of an individual, which is employee evaluation.

The purpose of job evaluation is to decide which jobs should be paid more than others (Elizur, 1980). Job evaluation methods generally provide indexes of relative job values within an organization; these indexes are usually based on the judgments of individuals - members of a job evaluation committee - about the jobs or certain job characteristics. These indexes are then used as the basis for determining wage rates for the jobs covered by the system (McCormick, 1979).

The literature on job evaluation identifies four conventional methods: ranking, classification (grading), weighted point, and factor comparison methods. However, many organizations have worked out variations and combinations of the conventional methods to improve upon the accuracy of the rating methods.

One of the combination methods was developed by Lee Anderson Associates, a prominent human resources management consulting firm, which has evaluated a number of school districts. The method developed by Anderson Associates is referred to by the firm as the
This method is a combination of the weighted point and factor comparison methods. The point-factor method includes seven job factors which are grouped into four categories:

1. **Skill**
   - Knowledge
   - Interpersonal

2. **Responsibility**
   - Complexity
   - Decision-making impact
   - Supervisory

3. **Effort**
   - Physical
   - Visual

4. **Working Conditions**

These factors are divided into several levels, or degrees, each having assigned points. The sum of the assigned points becomes the job evaluation. (Anderson, 1988).

Five major components in the point-factor method job evaluation process will be the subject for this research study. These five components are: (a) the position questionnaire; (b) the training and practice sessions; (c) the interviews; (d) the role of the consultant; and (e) the group work evaluation scoring.

**Background of Study**

In 1988, a new superintendent, Dr. Gary Wegenke, was appointed to the Des Moines Public School District. This appointment resulted in the implementation of the superintendent's mission and philosophy of
"Teaching and Learning." This became the commitment and focus for all the district's planning efforts.

Strategic planning as a management tool was then introduced to the board of education and administration to implement the teaching and learning mission. Strategic planning, according to Dr. Wegenke, is "a process and a discipline for facilitating the application of limited resources to competing educational needs in the context of a complex changing school district environment." General sessions were conducted on strategic planning and a series of occasional papers were developed by the new superintendent for action to be taken by the district.

One of the papers, Focus on Central Office Reorganization was the sixth in a series of occasional papers related to strategic planning. It was the superintendent's goal to realign central office administrative positions organizationally (vertically and horizontally) to support teaching and learning issues (Appendix A).

To implement this reorganization plan and to meet one of the 1989-90 goals, which states, "Modify the administrative classification and compensation structure," a study committee consisting of approximately 45 members of the Des Moines Administrators Association (DMAA) was selected by the Des Moines Public School District. The committee was formed to define the objectives and parameters of the central office reorganization study and the methodology to be utilized (Appendix B). Provision was made by the Des Moines Public School District for identifying and hiring a compensation consultant to provide technical expertise and assistance
for the job evaluation study. In order to afford a more manageable sized "working committee" during the job evaluation process, a subcommittee of five from the larger DMAA committee was appointed to work with the consultant. In addition, this researcher was also appointed as a working committee member, making a total of six. The working committee shall henceforth be referred to as the job evaluation committee.

The objectives set by the larger DMAA committee for the central office reorganization were:

1. Review and possibly realign administrative staff to address the district focus of teaching and learning.
2. Assess and evaluate levels of responsibility and identify job titles commensurate with those responsibilities.
3. Consider the establishment of new titles/classifications.
4. Consider the establishment of specialist/technician positions and appropriate classification definition.
5. Eliminate or redesign the salary range category.
6. Conduct study to assess job titles and classification in similar sized districts and appropriate private business.
7. Make salary comparisons to other similar size districts and appropriate private businesses.
8. Identify a consultant who will provide expertise in the job evaluation study.
9. Survey similar size districts in Iowa and make a comparability study.
10. Communicate with school districts that have made similar recent studies.

11. Develop a yardstick to measure levels of responsibilities.

Commensurate with the above objective (#8) "identifying a job evaluation consultant," a consultant was hired by the Des Moines Public School District to conduct the job evaluation study. A committee of six individuals were selected to be trained in the point-factor job evaluation method. (Five were selected from the larger DMAA committee and the sixth was this researcher.)

In 1990, the job evaluation study of administrators in the Des Moines Public School District began. The process of the point-factor job evaluation method included the following components:

1. Submitting the position questionnaire to the administrators to determine their responsibilities, knowledge, work conditions, etc;
2. Training the six members (the job evaluation committee) and conducting practice sessions by the job evaluation consultant;
3. Interviewing the administrators by the job evaluation committee;
4. Identifying the role of the consultant in the process.
5. Conducting the group work evaluation scorings.

The point-factor job evaluation model (Figure 1) used for the Des Moines Public School District's administrative job evaluations, provides the flow of activities for the point factor job evaluation process. The description of the five major components in the model and their relationship to one another follows.
Figure 1: Model of the Job Evaluation Process
Using the Point-Factor Method
Discussion of Model (Figure 1)

The model that depicts the job evaluation process was developed by the researcher to identify the flow of activities and responsibilities of the point-factor job evaluation process used in this study.

The process for the implementation of a job evaluation plan begins at the upper administrative level of an organization. At this level, a need to evaluate part or all of the organization has been determined. The upper administrative level of the organization delegates responsibility to members at the middle management level for the job evaluations to be performed.

The middle management level forms a large committee to determine the specific objectives for the job evaluation study. These objectives may address several issues. Some of these issues include: (a) the specific management level jobs to be evaluated; (b) the consideration of new titles and classifications; (c) the elimination or redesign of the salary range categories; and (d) the consideration to make a comparability study of similar positions in other businesses and organizations.

Two of the objectives the larger committee would determine are instrumental in the point-factor job evaluation model:

1. The selection of independent job evaluation consulting firm (i.e. job evaluation consultant); and
2. The selection of a smaller "working committee" from within the organization's management group (to be referred to as the job
evaluation committee or JEC). Six members are selected for the job evaluation committee and are trained and guided by the job evaluation consultant to perform the actual job evaluation scorings for the management level of the organization.

The job evaluation consultant, selected by the department of human resources, is responsible for developing the position questionnaire to be administered to each person whose job is to be evaluated. The position questionnaire is a job evaluation form from which job identification data, title, job description, department, knowledge, responsibilities, working conditions, etc. is defined (Appendix C). The position questionnaire is sent from the department of human resources to all persons in an administrative or management level position, whose jobs are to be evaluated. The responsibility of the department of human resources is to communicate the importance of completing the position questionnaire in an accurate and timely manner and to explain the outcome of completing the questionnaire (Appendix D).

Once completed by the management level personnel (i.e. administrators), the position questionnaire is returned to the department of human resources and then to the consultant. The consultant assigns the position questionnaires (according to jobs to be evaluated) to the job evaluation committee (Appendix E). The job evaluation committee uses the position questionnaires to conduct individual interviews with the people whose jobs will be evaluated to clarify the responses given in the questionnaire.
The job evaluation consultant is responsible for training the job evaluation committee in the job evaluation process using the point-factor method. The training takes place over a two-week period in which the overall process of the job evaluation is addressed. During this period, the job evaluation consultant accomplishes the following:

1. Instructs the job evaluation committee on (a) the definition of each job factor, and (b) scoring each level and degree using the weighted points (Appendix F).

2. Conducts practice sessions for the job evaluation committee with jobs from similar organizations to familiarize the committee with: (a) reading the job descriptions; (b) applying the correct factors to the job; and (c) scoring the points assigned to the factors (Appendix G).

3. Reviews the interviewing guidelines with the job evaluation committee. Written instructions are given to each job evaluation member with "Position Information Interviewing General Guidelines" (Appendix H).

The interviews are performed on a randomly selected group of people with job-alikes (such as elementary principals) and with each of the individuals whose job is unique. Interview questions are developed independently by each job evaluation committee member for his or her assigned interviewee. The purpose of the interview questions is to clarify and probe further information, as needed, from the position questionnaires. The position questionnaires and the responses from the
interviews will be the basis from which the jobs will be scored by the job evaluation committee during the group work evaluation scoring.

Next, the job evaluation consultant is responsible for selecting the benchmark positions. Benchmark positions are those in the organization that are "stable, well-known positions, and are ranked. They are chosen to represent each major level of duties, responsibilities, and skills encompassed within the range of jobs to be rated" (Elizur, 1987). From the benchmark positions all the other positions to be evaluated can be compared (Appendix I).

After the job evaluation committee has completed their training in the point-factor method, the consultant assigns job positions among the job evaluation committee members (Appendix E). The consultant then distributes to the job evaluation committee members the position questionnaires corresponding to the positions assigned. The position questionnaires are used in the interviewing process to probe and clarify the responses to better understand the nature of the job to be evaluated. Each job evaluation committee member schedules one-on-one interviews with the selected people whose jobs will be evaluated. The interviews are held in their office or work place.

When the interviews are completed, the job evaluation committee members come together again as a group under the direction of the consultant for the purpose of group scoring (referred to in this research as group work evaluation scoring). Each member orally presents to the other committee members the job duties and responsibilities of the job interviewed. After the job evaluation committee members question and
discuss the skill, responsibilities, knowledge, effort and working conditions for the job, each job evaluation committee member individually assigns points for the factors on a worksheet (Appendix J) based on the oral presentation of the position questionnaires and the interview information.

After all six members of the job evaluation committee have completed their individual scoring for the administrative position, the consultant asks each member to give his or her score for each factor on the job position being evaluated. The consultant writes the points from each member's score on a chalkboard grid for the group to review and discuss. The consultant's responsibility is to coordinate the discussion of points assigned by each job evaluation committee member and act as a resource person for the committee. The consultant requests each member to defend his or her position on scoring, especially if one member is much higher or lower than the others, or if the consultant determines the group is unrealistic in their overall decisions. Group discussion of the assigned points continues, under the guidance of the consultant, until a consensus of points on each factor for each job evaluated has been reached. All jobs are evaluated using this process.

Next, the total score for each job is ranked in order of points by the consultant. The consultant submits the scores and their respective rankings of each job evaluated to the department of human resources for review and final approval (Appendix K). The final scores and rankings are then submitted to the upper administrative level.
Finally, the consultant and the department of human resources work together to establish the base wage rate and range for all the scored and ranked jobs.

Statement of the Problem

Job evaluations are being conducted in school organizations throughout the United States. The problem for this research is to determine if the process of the point-factor job evaluation method used by the Des Moines Public School District is effective. Very little has been done to examine the process of the point-factor job evaluation method (which is a combination of the weighted point and factor methods).

There is a need to determine if the point-factor job evaluation process used for the administrative job evaluation in the Des Moines, Iowa Public Schools is an effective process and the extent to which each of the five components contribute to the process and how they can be strengthened.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the point-factor model and the selected components used in the process of the point-factor job evaluation method and to make recommendations, if needed, to strengthen the five components used in the model. These components
of the point-factor job evaluation method shall be referred to in this study as the point-factor components. The determination of the relative worth or compensation assigned to the ranked administrative positions, the sixth major component, will not be studied in this research.

The five major point-factor components to be examined are:

1. **The position questionnaire**, the form which was submitted to the administrators whose jobs were being evaluated to define their job description, responsibilities, work load, knowledge, etc. (Appendix C).

2. **The training and practice sessions**, which were conducted by the consultant for the six job evaluation committee members who will be scoring the jobs using the point-factor job evaluation method.

3. **The interviews**, which were conducted by the six job evaluation committee members. The interviews clarified the responses from the position questionnaire completed by the administrators whose jobs were to be evaluated.

4. **The role of the consultant**, the effect he had on decisions made by the job evaluation committee members who were conducting the evaluations.

5. **The group work evaluation scoring**, the effect of the interaction of the job evaluation committee members during the scoring of the job evaluations.
Delimitations of Study

This study is an effort to examine the point-factor job evaluation model used in the Des Moines Public School District. The study was delimited to one school district and one consultant and his version of the implementation of the point-factor method. This study was also delimited to certificated and non-certificated administrators in the school district.

Definition of Terms

**benchmark positions** - jobs about which consensus is presumed to exist regarding relative worth and the relative importance of the various factors determining worth. Other jobs in the organization can be compared against them to ascertain if the job is more than or less than the benchmark job on any factor (Bartley, 1981).

**classification method (also referred to as grading method)** - A type of job evaluation where the rater is provided with a scale to use in measuring differences among jobs. The scale consists of a series of grades or classes which have been defined in terms of the range of jobs to be rated (Bartley, 1981).

**complexity (factor)** - one of the factors in the point-factor method of job evaluation defined as "the responsibility for the use of judgment and for decision-making considering the degree of
procedural structure present and the scope of the position."  
(Anderson, 1988).

decision-making impact (factor) - one of the factors in the point-factor method of job evaluation defined as "the scope of decision-making authority vested in the position and its impact on the organization's operations."  (Anderson, 1988).

effort (factor) - one of the factors in the point-factor method of job evaluation defined as "the physical and/or visual factors in a job that produce fatigue. Both the amount of effort and the continuity of the effort are considered."  (Anderson, 1988).

employee evaluation - individuals assessed based on their skills, qualification and performance (Elizur, 1987).

factor - The job characteristic or feature of the job that is important to the success of the job (Elizur 1984); the basic part of the job evaluation for which all jobs are compared, such as job knowledge, complexity, responsibility, work conditions, and effort.

factor comparison method - one method of job evaluation whereby all jobs in the program are ranked in importance on a particular factor. Once ranked, each job is assigned a monetary value for that factor. A summation of the values of each factor designates the total value of the job (McCormick, 1979).

inter-personal (factor) - one of the factors in the point-factor method of job evaluation defined as "the requirement for skill in effectively meeting, dealing with, and influencing others both inside and outside the organization."  (Anderson, 1988).
job analysis (job questionnaire) - a systematic collection of all information about a job to determine its requirements (McCormick, 1979).

job consultant - a person who has expertise in the area of job evaluation and coordinates a job evaluation program for an organization.

job description - a written description of the job requirements.

job evaluation - a systematic method of appraising the value of each job in relation to all other jobs in an organization (Elizur, 1987).

job evaluation committee (JEC) - individuals selected by and from within the organization to perform the job evaluations.

knowledge (factor) - one of the factors in the point-factor method defined as "the knowledge and skill required for normal job performance. It may be acquired through formal education, outside study, or training on the job." (Anderson, 1988).

point-factor (method) - a combination job evaluation method (a combination of the weighted point and factor comparison method) developed by Lee Anderson Associates Consultants utilizing seven job factors which are grouped into four categories. Each factor is a divided sum of the assigned points which becomes the (relative) job value or job evaluation (Anderson, 1988).

point-factor components - the five major components selected from the point-factor method of job evaluation to be examined in this research. The five major components are: the position
questionnaire, the training, the interviews, the consultant and the
group work evaluations.

point-factor components survey (PFC survey) - the survey
questionnaire developed by this researcher and completed by the
five working committee members who were involved in the
point-factor job evaluation process. This survey questionnaire
was developed to determine the strengths, weaknesses and
recommendations of the five major point-factor components in
the job evaluation process.

position questionnaire (also see "job analysis.") - a form completed
by the employees whose jobs will be evaluated to determine the
skills, knowledge, responsibilities, physical an visual effort and
working conditions required of their job.

supervisory (factor) - one of the factors in the point-factor job
evaluation defined as "the responsibility for supervision
considering the total number of employees supervised, either
directly or through subordinates, and the level and complexity of
the work directly supervised. " (Anderson, 1988).

weighted-point method - a type of job evaluation method that
breaks down the job into several compensable factors, giving each
job a numerical score on each of the factors, some with more
weight than others. The sum of the scores determines the value
of the job (Bartley, 1981).
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose for the review of the literature is to describe a brief history of job evaluation and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of current job evaluation methods and their processes currently used for professional and managerial jobs.

A review of the literature on the historical background of job evaluation found that job evaluation techniques have been in practice in organizations for about half a century. The first attempts at the evaluation of jobs were made more than a hundred years ago when, in 1871, the United States Civil Service Commission applied job evaluation for the purpose of achieving pay equity. Surveys indicate that job evaluation techniques have become widely used in the United States since the Second World War (Paterson, 1974, p. 5).

Job evaluation is a method of comparing jobs by applying formal and systematic procedures in order to determine their relative worth (value) to the organization. It considers tasks, duties and responsibilities rather than background, qualifications and abilities. The job is analyzed, not the employee performing the work. Employee evaluation includes assessment of employee's skills and qualifications or, alternatively, assessment of performance (Elizur, 1987, p. 5). Job evaluation reduces any bias that might occur if the evaluation were based on how the individual performed the job (Bartley, 1981, p. 11).

Job evaluation provides a systematic framework which may serve as the basis for wage determination but does not entirely solve the
problem. *Internal equity* is a term that describes the relationship of compensation rewards provided by the organization to its various employees. Although base pay may be the most critical component used when analyzing the relationship for internal equity, it is not the sole criterion for making internal equity investigations (Henderson, 1988, p. 92).

In the last decade, problems with pay equity have focused on sex discrimination. In industrialized countries in western Europe, and in the United States, Canada and Australia, women have been paid considerably lower wages than men for performing the same work. For example, the weekly earnings of male school administrators in the USA were 50 percent more than women engaged in the same work. (Rytina, 1982).

From 1945 to 1962 Congress turned down bills requiring "equal pay for comparable work" performed by males and females. In 1962 a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives which would have prohibited employers from sex discrimination in wages "for work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills." The Kennedy administration, in supporting this version, urged that the worth of different jobs could be determined by applying job evaluation system (Williams and McDowell, 1980). In 1963 the bill was amended to provide for equal pay only for equal work when job performance required "equal skill." During the 1970s women's rights groups realized that few substantive changes would be made relative to the treatment of women versus men under the Equal
Pay Act (EPA) of 1963. The EPA requires employers to pay equal wages to men and women for work that is substantially equal. Although the law does not require job evaluation, it incorporates job evaluation concepts in its language. Equal work is defined in the law by four items frequently used in quantitative job evaluation plans: skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions. Pay differences between workers employed in equal work are acceptable to this law when they are based on: differences in seniority; differences in job performance; differences in quality or quantity of production; or differences based on some factor other than sex (Elizur, 1987, p. 8).

Yet during the 1970s, men still earned an average of 60 percent more than women, doing the same job. The concept underlying comparable worth is that one sex should not be paid differently from the other sex when both are doing comparable kinds of work. *Comparable* and *equal* are quite different. Under the EPA, *equal* has been interpreted to mean substantially the same kind of work - work requiring the same skills, same knowledge, same responsibilities under similar conditions. *Comparable* relates very closely to the basic concepts underlying job evaluation as developed in the 1920s. *Comparability* would include jobs that would be rated similar using some kind of evaluation plan - possibly a point-factor job evaluation plan that consists of factors that relate or describe the universal nature of all kinds of jobs. Theoretically, an unbiased job evaluation plan using universal compensable factors should be able to identify comparability at the workplace and match comparable jobs (Henderson, 1988, p. 115).
The literature on job evaluation identifies four conventional methods. These methods are: ranking, classification (grading), factor comparison and point methods. Combinations of these methods are used to meet an organization's needs. All of these methods involve a step-by-step process for initiating and conducting the job evaluations. The process of the job evaluations is examined in this research. However, it is also important to review the literature on the various job evaluation methods - their advantages and disadvantages - to be able to understand the processes for implementing them in the organization.

The ranking and classification (grading) methods of job evaluation are characterized as qualitative methods. Qualitative methods involve ranking jobs using global judgments. The ranking and classification methods compare jobs as a whole without having a definite procedure for applying evaluation items.

**Ranking** refers to the comparison of jobs. Jobs are ranked from lowest to highest in terms of their differences in levels of duties, responsibilities, and requirements. The jobs are not broken down into their component parts but are considered as a whole, and the jobs are compared against each other in order to determine their relative rank. The ranked jobs are then aggregated into categories for the purpose of assigning compensation levels. **Ranking** methods are not held in high repute by experts in job evaluation.

Advantages of the ranking method:
1. It is relatively simple to use.
2. The ranking can be made rapidly.
3. It is relatively inexpensive to install.

Disadvantages of the ranking method:
1. No definite standards exist for determining rank.
2. The ranking may be superficial since no detailed consideration is given to the factors fundamental to the jobs.
3. Confusion is likely to result from similar job titles.
4. It is difficult to find enough raters with sufficient knowledge of all jobs.
5. The system becomes more difficult to use as the number of jobs increases and as the jobs become more complex.
6. Determination of the rank position is likely to be influenced by the existing wage of salary.
7. Raters may be ranking employees on the jobs and not the jobs themselves (Lanham, 1955, p. 42).

Classification is the sorting of jobs into a predetermined order of class specifications on the basis of such factors as the degree of skill and responsibility thought to be required by various jobs. Each job is fit into the structure by comparing its characteristics with the idealized levels describing each category in the classification. The method does not analyze jobs in terms of their component parts. The jobs are considered as a whole without having separate value placed on each part (Elizur, 1987, p. 51).

Advantages of the classification method:
1. It is simple to use.
2. It is easy to understand.
3. It is relatively easy to execute.
4. The results achieved are fairly satisfactory.

Disadvantages of the classification method:
1. Since no detailed analysis is made, blanket judgment of the whole job may produce incorrect classification.
2. No rating sheets are used to indicate the exact values used by the raters to determine the position of the job.
3. Jobs may belong partly to one class and partly to another.
4. The existing salary may affect the placement of a job into its class.
5. No one rater is likely to be familiar with all jobs.
6. The system becomes more difficult to use as the number of jobs increases and as the jobs become more complex.
7. The grade or class descriptions are relatively difficult to write.

(Lanham, 1955, p. 45).

One of the major limitations of the ranking and classification methods is the lack of clearly defined criteria for job comparison. It may be difficult, for instance, to classify administrative positions from class descriptions prepared for computer programmers, and vice versa (Elizur, 1987, p. 57). The ranking method is a highly subjective procedure and depends upon the experience of the people doing the ranking (Paterson, 1974, p. 41). These two methods are generally used if the organization is small. However, they are not very satisfactory
when large numbers of jobs (25 or more different jobs) are involved (Bartley, 1981, p. 9).

The factor comparison and point methods of job evaluation are characterized as quantitative methods. In quantitative methods, distinct judgments are obtained by assigning the job a numerical value, or score, for each evaluation item. These scores are added up to obtain the value of the job or its worth to the organization (Elizur, 1987, p. 50). The only difference between the factor comparison and point methods is that the factor-comparison method compares the job against job and the point method compares the job against a pre-determined job factor and assigns a point value for that characteristic. (Bartley, 1981, p. 58).

Advantages of the factor-comparison method:
1. The job-to-job comparison assures that jobs are compared on comparable points.
2. A scale is constructed for each installation, thereby assuring a plan that is tailor-made for the organization.
3. Once set up, the scale is relatively easy to use in rating other jobs.
4. The scale is expressed in monetary units and requires no conversion.

Disadvantages of the factor-comparison method:
1. If rate inequities exist in the benchmark (or key jobs) used for determining the scale, they will continue to exist, as the scale is set upon a monetary basis.
2. Since rates do not remain constant, the basis for the entire rating scale may be thrown out of balance by fluctuations.
3. A change of duties of a benchmark job may throw the scale out of proper alignment.

4. The construction of the scale is complicate and difficult to explain to employees.

5. The method is time-consuming.

6. Considerable clerical detail is required. (Lanham, 1955, p. 44).

The point method is the most widely used job evaluation method. This method provides the rater with a scale or "yardstick" to use in measuring differences among jobs. The job to be rated is measured, factor by factor, against the scale which has been set up. The degree in the scale which most nearly describes the situation with regard to that factor for the job is selected, and the number of points which that degree has been assigned in the scale is then assigned to the job. When the proper degree has been selected for each factor of the job and the point values corresponding to the degrees have been listed, these values are totaled. The sum represents the final point value of the job in question. Rates of pay are then assigned to numbers of points (McCormick, 1979, p. 315).

Advantages of the point method:

1. A graphic and descriptive type of scale is used which is considered by many authorities to be more reliable and valid than the other methods previously described.
2. The degree of definitions are easy to use, as they are written in terms which are applicable to the types of jobs being rated.
3. The point values of jobs show the relative differences between the jobs in numerical terms.
4. The system makes the placing of jobs into classes quite easy.
5. The system is less easy to manipulate than other systems.
6. The plan increases in accuracy and consistency with use.
7. The plan can be understood by employees and supervisors.

Disadvantages of the point method:
1. A high degree of skill is required in selecting the correct factors and degrees and in writing clear and understandable definitions of the factors and degrees.
2. Allocating the proper numerical weights to the factors and assigning point to the degrees is relatively difficult.
3. The assignment of point values is done somewhat arbitrarily.
4. Installation of the system is time-consuming.
5. Considerable clerical detail is required. (Lanham, 1955, p. 43).

The major limitation of the point method is that it lacks clear principles for the selection of the evaluation factors. Systematic selection of the evaluation factors is a critical step in designing the job evaluation plan, since the factors express and measure job worth. Yet, no clear principles for selecting the evaluation factors are provided in the literature (Elizur, 1987, p. 89).

The writers typically do not take a stand as to which of these methods is preferable. Edward Lawler (1971, p. 260), writes: "My
feeling is that it does not make much difference which of the better known methods is used." Others agree, "no one system has a distinct advantage over another." (Blum and Naylor, 1968, p. 504). In fact, none of the four job evaluation methods receives a highly positive endorsement. Each has many weaknesses. Thus, the use of a combination of methods is widely endorsed. (Levine, Ash and Bennett, 1979, pp. 146-151).

Whichever method is selected, job evaluation is based on judgments. The employee or a committee of employees, the supervisor, a job analyst or someone else acquainted with the job provides judgments as to what extent the job requires initiative, responsibility, independent decision, etc. Judgment may be adversely affected by differences in status between assessors. Elliot (1960) found that the opinions of a senior assessor considerably influenced the judgment of the other assessors. Training can partly overcome these deficiencies. Chesler (1948) reported that raters who had been trained, assessed thirty-five jobs, and achieved high reliability. Similarly, assessors improve with practice (Livy, 1975, p. 122).

Certain authors (Madigan, 1985) contend that job evaluation is inherently subjective. However, it should be noted that the use of judgmental data is not unique to job evaluation. Other areas of social assessment are similarly based: psychological tests and inventories, public opinion polls, market research, attitude surveys, and performance surveys are based on judgments. The experience in these fields has shown that if appropriate methods are applied it is possible to
obtain reliable and valid information from such observations (Elizur, 1987, p. 89).

All four of the job evaluation methods described utilize the following basic *processes* for planning, installing and conducting the job evaluations: The basic steps in all the process are:

1. Planning the job evaluation program.
2. Setting the objectives.
3. Setting policy in the organization to reflect its philosophy.
4. Notifying and communicating to get acceptance of the pending job evaluation program.
5. Installing the job evaluation program.
6. Preparing a job questionnaire for the jobs to be evaluated.
7. Conducting the job evaluations.
8. Assigning monetary values to the positions evaluated.


Additional steps for the quantitative methods (factor-comparison and point) and the combinations of these methods are:

(For the *factor-comparison* method)

1. A job evaluation committee is selected.

There are two main reasons for using an evaluation committee when installing and/or maintaining a job evaluation plan. First, a committee brings the points of view of several people who are familiar with the organization and the jobs in question; second, using a
committee can help to ensure greater acceptance by employees of the results of the job evaluation (Dressler and Duffy, 1984).

How many evaluators are needed to produce 'reliable' ratings? There is not a consensus in the job evaluation literature on the ideal number. Thomason (1968, p. 36) noted that experience on this varies, but the committee is usually quite small - up to about half a dozen. Belcher (1974, p. 95) claims that 'job evaluation committees should be kept small to facilitate decision making - five members may be optimal, ten too many." Yet research by Christal, Madden and Harding (1960) suggests that the reliability of results reaches a maximum when between ten and fifteen raters are employed. A Canadian civil service study done by Quaid (1993, p. 83) describes a combination job evaluation plan that chose to have seven evaluators per committee, using a total of three committees, for the purpose of evaluating 230 jobs held by 350 individuals.

2. Factors for the job evaluations are selected by the committee.

Usually four or five factors are used. If more than seven factors are applied the process become unwieldy (Benge, Burk, and Hay, 1941). The following factors are usually applied in the factor-comparison method:

a. Mental requirements.
b. Skills required.
c. Physical requirements.
d. Responsibility.
e. Working conditions.
3. Benchmark positions are selected.

Usually between 15 and 25 are selected. The selection of the benchmarks are critical, as they form the basis of comparison and they are selected because it is believed that their existing pay is regarded as fair (Paterson, 1972, p. 88).

4. Benchmark positions are ranked on the evaluation items by the evaluation committee.

The committee arrives at agreement by discussion or some other technique. (Elizur, 1980, p. 24).

5. A job comparison table is constructed in which the benchmark jobs are placed in one column and the money amounts with appropriate intervals are placed to slot the evaluated jobs.

6. Additional jobs in the organization are analyzed based on the collected data and compared with the benchmark jobs.

A variety of data collection techniques are employed to analyze jobs. Interviews, questionnaires, observation, work diaries, and technological aids are some of the data that is utilized in job evaluation studies. Since interviewing is an integral part of various method of job evaluation, the individuals who serve on the committee to analyze the jobs need to develop interviewing skills which will enable them to get the most out of each interview. Although normally the interview involves an interviewer or an interviewee, in some instances more persons may be involved in either or both roles. Preparation for an interview should include three basic stages: setting objectives; organizing the approach; and planning the methods to be used. In
planing the methods to be used, the analyst must determine how the information should be recorded: by manual note taking; by tape recorder for later transcription; or by recording the data from memory immediately after the interview (McCormick, 1979, p. 34).

There have been very few systematic studies in which different methods of data collection have been compared. However, in one study, simple recall by the job expert versus actual work observation was compared. The results indicated that the recall group performed as well as the work observation group. (Campion, Greener, and Wernli, 1973, p. 286-288). Another study showed that simple methods of collecting job data were as good as more elaborate approaches. (Hogan and Fleishman, 1979, p.197-204).

The point method is the most extensively used method in the United States and Great Britain and can take the form of a wide number of variations on the original theme (Livy, 1975, p. 72). After the basic steps are installed, the additional steps, similar to the factor-comparison method, are utilized in the point method job evaluation process:

1. A job evaluation committee is selected.
2. A set of evaluation factors are selected and defined.
3. Each of the factors are carefully defined and a sub-division of several ranks for each of the factors is outlined, and a point value is assigned to each of the ranks.
4. Weights are assigned to the factors and sub-factors.
5. Benchmark jobs in the organization are chosen and are evaluated.
6. Each job in the organization is then evaluated based on data collected and according to the factors defined.

7. The committee members must come to a consensus for each job evaluated.

8. The scores on each item are assigned point values, multiplied by the factor weights, and then summed up to obtain the total number of points for that job.

9. Rates of pay are then assigned to the numbers of points. (Elizur 1980, p. 25):

The point method has been recommended by many experts to be superior to the other conventional job evaluation methods in reducing the amount of subjective decisions and in applying a quantitative analytical approach. (Livy: 1975, p. 73).

Out of 322 organizations which reported using a formal job evaluation method, 123 reported using the point method; 75 used the factor comparison method; 66 used a combination method; 55 used the classification method and 3 used the ranking method. The six most frequent reasons given for using their particular choice were: (1) better suited to organization needs; (2) recommended by management consultants; (3) used by other companies in the industry; (4) presented fewer problems of administration; (5) better known to them; and (6) facilitated employee understanding (Lanham; 1955, p. 47).

In many organizations, the members of the group responsible for selecting a job evaluation plan are not familiar with the various job evaluation methods. The best solution is to use a consulting service
which involves both outside assistance and the use of company personnel. The consultants bring with them the prestige of technicians who have specialized in this field. By providing participation by company personnel in the job evaluation (as a evaluation committee) the organization can have the advantages of employee participation and utilize the skill and experience of the consulting firm (Otis & Leukart, 1959, p. 26).

There have been a number of management consultancy firms who have developed their own systems of job evaluation, available to client companies on a fee-paying basis. These methods are usually quantitative in character and are frequently based on variations of the point method (Livy, 1975, p.155).

One combination job evaluation plan developed by a human resources management consulting firm (Lee Anderson Associates) for school organizations is the method used for the Des Moines Public School District's administrative job evaluation study. The plan is one that combines the point and factor-comparison methods (Anderson, 1988). The consulting firm refers to their plan as the point-factor method.

There have been other point-factor methods noted in the literature, but these combinations do not utilize the same factors and processes. The earliest point-factor method was used in 1934 for the National Electrical manufacturers Association and is referred to as the NEMA plan. Another point-factor method was utilized by the Office of Personnel Management (formerly the U.S. Civil Service Commission) developed the Factor Evaluation System (FES) for evaluating and
classifying General Schedule (GS) positions in the federal government. FES uses nine factors that are found in many point-factor plans. It is unique is that the factors and the levels of each factor are defined in occupational terms. Gael (1988: p. 98) referring to the success of any of the point-factor methods states, 'the higher the quality of information available from both job content and context and from job evaluation facts, the greater the likelihood of making accurate and valid inferences.'

The point-factor method used in the Des Moines Public School District utilizes seven job factors. Each factor is divided into several levels or degrees, each having assigned points. The factors are: knowledge; interpersonal skills; responsibility for complex judgements; decision-making authority; supervisory responsibilities; physical and/or visual effort; and working conditions (Anderson, 1988). The process to implement the point-factor method, which has been used for many school organizations and for the Des Moines Public School District's administrative job evaluation study involves several steps, which are grouped into six major components. The steps are:

1. Setting objectives for the job evaluation plan.
2. Selecting a job evaluation consultant.
3. Selecting a job evaluation committee.
4. Determining the benchmark positions.
4. Collecting the data for the job evaluations.
5. Scoring the jobs based on the data collected and assigning points for the factors and sub-factors.
6. Ranking the positions and determining wage rates.

These steps are grouped into the following components. A study of the effectiveness of the first five components, using the job evaluation committee members as subjects, is conducted for this research.

1. The position questionnaire
2. The training and practice sessions.
3. The role of the consultant.
4. The interviews.
5. The group work evaluation scoring.
6. Ranking and wage determination.
CHAPTER III: PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

In January of 1991 a survey questionnaire was developed by the researcher. The questionnaire was submitted to the subjects in this study, the job evaluation committee members, who were involved in the five major components of the administrators' job evaluation study conducted by the Des Moines, Iowa Public School District. The researcher was one of the members of the job evaluation committee and was involved in all aspects of the job evaluation study except the sixth component, the determination of relative worth assigned to the ranked administrative jobs.

The survey questionnaire is referred to in this study as the Point-Factor Component survey or PFC survey to avoid confusing it with the position questionnaire, which was the form submitted to the administrators to define their job description, responsibilities, work load, knowledge, etc., and was one of the major components to be studied in this research.

The PFC survey was sent to five of the six job evaluation committee members (the researcher being the sixth job evaluation committee member) who were involved in the five major components of the job evaluation process. The job evaluation committee members consisted of five certificated and one noncertificated administrator from within the Des Moines Public School District.

The purpose for the PFC survey was to determine the strengths and weaknesses in the five major components of the job evaluation
process using the point-factor method. The PFC survey was also designed to elicit recommendations from the job evaluation committee members (JEC members) in the point-factor job evaluation process. In developing the questions for the PFC survey, anecdotal notes were gathered from the questions and concerns voiced by the job evaluation committee members. The PFC survey consisted of two parts:

1. **Part One** consisted of thirty-seven questions that were subcategorized into five sections, representing the five components of the point-factor job evaluation method:
   a. the position questionnaire
   b. the training and practice Sessions
   c. the interviews
   d. the consultant
   e. the group work evaluation scoring

2. **Part Two** provided the opportunity for the respondents (the job evaluation committee members) to write comments or recommendations expressing their personal concerns or suggestions during the job evaluation process.

   A five point rating scale was developed with a response mode of "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." Next to the response was a "check box" for comments regarding the question (which the respondent could elaborate on in the "Part Two" section of the survey.) After designing the PFC survey, the format was reviewed by the researcher's major professor, Professor James E. Sweeney. It was then submitted to the Director of Human
Resources Department of the Des Moines Public School District for review, recommendations and revision. This process was repeated several times.

After the PFC survey received final approval from the department of human resources, it was mailed January 1, 1991 to each of the five job evaluation committee members (Appendix L) with a cover letter explaining its purpose and request for return mailing by January 15 (Appendix M). Three weeks after the PFC survey was mailed, follow-up telephone calls were made to the job evaluation committee members who did not return the survey. The deadline to complete the surveys was extended to February 1, 1991.

After all the surveys were returned the first week of February, the responses were tabulated. The researcher determined that some questions needed to be probed further:
1. To determine if the "undecided" responses could be moved to a positive or negative response;
2. To clarify comments or suggestions referring to specific questions in the survey.

The researcher then developed questions to probe and clarify the responses that were given in the survey.

In February, 1991, the researcher telephoned each job evaluation committee member to schedule individual interviews to question and record (by tape recorder) some of their responses to the PFC survey. The interview appointments were set up in the privacy of the job evaluation committee member's office or home, where there were no
distractions or interruptions during the session. The interviews were scheduled in March and April. One interview was re-scheduled in May.

At the beginning of each of the individual interviews, the researcher explained the purpose of the taped interview (to probe and clarify some of their responses given on the PFC survey). The researcher also assured each job evaluation committee member anonymity from the transcribed tapes to encourage candid responses.

In June, 1991, after the last of the interviews were completed, the researcher transcribed each tape, eliminating any names or references that would allude to the job evaluation committee member's identity. The names of the job evaluation committee members were replaced with the letters, "A," "B," "C," "D," and "E." (Appendix N).

The results from the analysis of the PFC survey and transcribed tapes will be examined item by item via a worksheet developed by the researcher (Appendix O.) The analysis will examine the strengths and weaknesses in the five major components of the point-factor job evaluation method and categorize the recommendations made by the job evaluation committee members for improving the job evaluation model.

After examining the responses and recommendations of the job evaluation committee members from the PFC surveys and transcribed tapes, the researcher developed a revised model for the job evaluation process using the point-factor method.

Approval by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee was granted for this study.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Analysis of Responses from the
Point Factor Components Survey and Interviews
of the Job Evaluation Committee Members

Below is an analysis of the responses taken from the written comments and response mode on the Point Factor Component survey (PFC survey) and from the interviews of the five job evaluation committee members (JEC members).

The Point Factor Component Survey was an instrument sent to the JEC members to analyze the five components of the job evaluation process. The five components were: the position questionnaire; the training and practice sessions; the interviews; the role of the consultant; and the group work evaluation scoring.

Part I of the Point Factor Component survey consisted of 37 questions with a "strongly disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "somewhat agree" and "strongly agree" response mode for 36 of the 37 statements. The response mode for one of the questions was "none," "few," "several," "many" and "all" (question #3). Part II of the Point Factor Component survey was a section for written comments and suggestions. After the Point Factor Component survey was completed, follow-up interviews were conducted with the five JEC members to clarify their responses to the survey.
A brief description introduces each component of the job evaluation process, followed by the statements in that component of the Point Factor Component survey. Below each statement is the response mode. Below the response mode are "Xs" to indicate the number of respondents who checked that response. Comments and recommendations from the JEC members further clarify and provide direction for improving the job evaluation process. When JEC members "somewhat agreed," they had reservations about that element of the process and were not able to "strongly agree." When the JEC members had reservations, were undecided, or disagreed with a statement, they wrote their comments on Part II of the Point Factor Component survey and/or they explained their concerns and reservations during the follow-up interview. While there were statements on the survey for which some JEC members may have had reservations, were undecided, or disagreed with the statement, the members did not always provide recommendations to improve the job element. It should be noted that the JEC members sometimes provided information or suggestions that were not specifically the solution to the statement presented in the survey, but was related to the statement.

The Position Questionnaire

The position questionnaire, the first component of the job evaluation process, was an eight page questionnaire. It was mailed on April 9, 1990 to all administrators below the directors' level with a return request of May 4, 1990. The purpose of the questionnaire was to
obtain current information regarding the administrators' job (the responsibilities, conditions, educational requirements, etc.) Prefacing the questionnaire was a memo from the personnel office with one page of instructions.

Below are the statements, numbers 1 through 5, related to the position questionnaire component, in the Point Factor Component survey. Five job evaluation committee members (JEC members) participated in this survey. Their responses are indicated by the "Xs" below the response mode.

1. "I feel that the information given to the respondents completing the position questionnaire on the importance of accuracy and timeliness was effectively communicated."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above statement was misinterpreted by some of the JEC members which apparently caused the differences of opinion. Many JEC members interpreted this statement to mean the importance of the position questionnaire itself was not effectively communicated, and others interpreted it to mean the importance of accuracy and timeliness in completing the position questionnaire was not effectively communicated.
The analysis of the comment sheets, the survey, and the interviews, revealed all five of the JEC members indicated the importance of the position questionnaire itself was not effectively communicated. During the interviews, the JEC members made two general recommendations to effectively communicate to the respondents (the administrators) the importance of the position questionnaire itself. These recommendations are:

a. Early explanation and sponsorship. Someone of authority should describe the job evaluation process early in the process, at a meeting and explain the purpose for completing the position questionnaire.

b. A meeting for all administrators. The JEC members suggested one of two processes be used:

1. The administrators should be brought together in a large group meeting, such as a cabinet meeting or the administrators association; or

2. Each group of administrators should be brought together in smaller meetings for "job-alikes," those holding similar roles (such as a principals meeting, a central office administrators meeting, a subject area supervisors meeting, etc.)

At this meeting, the importance of the position questionnaire should be discussed, including completing it accurately and in a timely manner, but primarily discussing the impact, or importance, it will have on their jobs.
2. "I feel that the directions given on the position questionnaire were clear and concise."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JEC member who "somewhat disagreed" recommended the one page directions for the position questionnaire include an oral explanation and an opportunity for the respondents to ask questions of the sponsor at one of the recommended meetings above.

All five JEC members recommended that one of the questions in the position questionnaire be clarified. The question was, "Who do you supervise?" JEC members recommended the terms "supervise" and "evaluate" be clarified further to prevent two or more administrators from counting the same supervisees.

3. "I feel that the respondents completed the position questionnaire in a timely manner."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Many</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One JEC member who responded "many" commented that "only two or three respondents didn't complete the position questionnaires on time, but there were others that weren't "completely completed." This
same member pointed out the timing of the position questionnaire (mailout and return) was not appropriate. It was mailed out after contracts had already been delivered and signed. One JEC member commented, "the school year is over and I've got my contract for next year, so, your survey is just a lot of work for me (as an administrator) to do at the end of the year." He or she recommended sending the position questionnaires out at the beginning of the salary negotiation process.

4. "I feel that the respondents who were late completing the position questionnaire may have had an unfair advantage over the other respondents."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JEC member who was "undecided" indicated he or she had insufficient knowledge to know whether or not the respondents had an unfair advantage over those who completed the position questionnaire on time.

The JEC member who "somewhat agreed" that it was an unfair advantage speculated the respondents may have "heard the word" (meaning the respondents heard how to complete the position questionnaire from another administrator) which may have given them an unequal advantage (meaning they may have learned the value of
information to certain questions, some receiving more points than others.) He or she also speculated that other respondents may have been too busy, on vacation, or just slow completing the position questionnaire.

During the interviews the JEC members reiterated the previous recommendations, the purpose and content of the position questionnaire provide an opportunity to ask questions of a sponsor at a meeting, suggesting the the interviewees wouldn't have an unfair (or unequal) advantage over one another.

5. "I feel that the questions on the position questionnaire provided the information I needed to evaluate the jobs."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two JEC members did not agree that the questions on the position questionnaire provided the information they needed to evaluate the jobs. The member who disagreed indicated he or she did not have completed information from the position questionnaires (the position questionnaires were not completely filled out) from some noncertificated administrators. He or she speculated that either the noncertificated administrators had trouble knowing how to complete it, or did not take it seriously.
The other JEC member who disagreed and two of the members who "somewhat agreed," reported there was not enough information provided from the position questionnaire alone to evaluate the administrators' jobs and it was essential to have the follow-up interview and the position questionnaire to provide enough information to score the job evaluations.

One JEC member who "somewhat agreed" recommended there should have been more information from the respondent's supervisor. (The position questionnaire gave the supervisor a space to comment on "the accuracy and completeness of employees responses, noting any additions or exceptions," and required the supervisor to sign and date the form certifying the answers in the position questionnaire were "accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.")

**The Training and Practice Sessions**

Training for the JEC members was conducted by the job evaluation consultant for a period of two weeks. The training included: explaining the general rules of the job evaluation process; defining the factor and level descriptors; conducting practice sessions using job descriptions from various business and industry, based on the factor and level descriptors and the points assigned to each level; and discussing the interview.

A one-page guideline sheet was distributed to the JEC members on the process of interviewing respondents (the administrators) based on their completed position questionnaires. The guideline sheet was
reviewed by the consultant and the JEC members were given an opportunity for discussion. No other formal training was provided for the interviews by the consultant.

For the next seven statements (#6-12) none of the five JEC members "disagreed," although some "somewhat agreed" the training and practice sessions were effective, the general rules clarified the process sufficiently to do the job evaluations, sufficient time was spent, discussions provided them with sufficient information, and the weighted points were clear to do the job evaluations. Those JEC members who "somewhat agreed," had some reservations or doubts and made recommendations for improvement. There were times when the JEC members who "somewhat agreed" did not have any recommendations.

6. "I feel that the general rules for the 'factor and level descriptions and explanations' clarified the process sufficiently for me to do the job evaluation before beginning the practice sessions."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although four of the JEC members "somewhat agreed," they did not provide any further information to clarify their responses nor did they make any recommendations to improve the general rules for the "factor and level descriptions and explanations."
7. "I feel that the practice sessions were effective for the job evaluations we were to do."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One member who "strongly agreed" the practice sessions were effective recommended they would have been more effective if the sessions had focused more on education instead of business and industry.

One member who "somewhat agreed" the sessions were effective recommended reviewing that which was learned in the practice sessions throughout the actual evaluations to maintain consistency in the job evaluation scorings.

8. "I feel that after the practice sessions, I clearly understood the 'factor and level descriptions and explanations' of the job evaluation process."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JEC members reiterated that it was the practice sessions that made the factor and level descriptions and explanations clear.

One of the JEC members who "strongly agreed" questioned the relevancy of the factor and level descriptors. This member
recommended the descriptors should be tailored toward an educational model instead of an industrial one. For example, the descriptors for work stations were appropriate in industry, but inappropriate for education.

9. "I feel that sufficient time was spent on practice sessions before beginning the actual job evaluations."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While all agreed there was sufficient time spent on the practice sessions, each expressed the concern there was too much time spent practicing. One member referred to the process as being excessively prolonged due to the deliberate (slow) speaking style of the consultant. However, one member who initially indicated frustration with the amount of time spent on the practice sessions, later concluded he or she was glad it took so much time to practice once the job evaluation scorings actually began.

10. "I feel that the discussions during the practice sessions provided me with sufficient information to do the actual job evaluations."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The JEC members who "somewhat agreed" the discussions during the practice sessions provided them with sufficient information to do the actual job evaluations did not provide further comments or recommendations.

11. "I feel that I clearly understood the directions to assign points."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One member who "somewhat agreed" the directions were clear recommended there should have been more flexibility in the assignment of points and recommended the scores should be "in-between whole points," such as 5 1/2 or 3 3/4, instead of limiting it to whole numbers.

12. "I feel that the weighted points assigned in the factor charts (the interpersonal and decision-making impact skills) were clear."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One member who "somewhat agreed" the assignment of the weighted points were clear, recommended the consultant should have been more flexible in modifying some of the descriptors and the point
system. Another member observed the assigning of the weighted points was reached "through a process of concensus and while we were participating in the concensus process we were able to find our mistakes."

One recommendation related to the weighted points is that calculators should have been provided or someone should have audited the scores (to prevent mistakes in the addition of the weighted points.)

13. "I feel that I clearly understood how to conduct the interview (after the training sessions)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the JEC members stated they knew how to conduct the interviews from previous experience. The JEC member who "strongly disagreed" the training sessions provided the skills needed to conduct interviews indicated he or she did not previously possess these skills as did the other JEC members.

All five of the JEC members recommended the need for more formal training in interviewing and questioning techniques during the training sessions. A specific recommendation for the formal interview training was: to practice interview scenarios. Go through a position questionnaire and determine how each JEC member would ask questions during the interviews to gain information for the job
evaluations. Another suggestion related to this recommendation was: develop standardized questions that all JEC members would ask during the interview sessions.

14. "I feel that the location to do the job evaluation was appropriate."

Some of the JEC members misunderstood this question. The question was intended to refer to the location for the actual discussions and scorings of the job evaluations, held in a meeting room at the administrative central office. Some of the JEC members believed this question referred to the location where the interviews of the respondents occurred, at their individual offices or place of work.

Due to the misunderstanding, this question is broken into two components:
14-A. refers to the location of the discussions and scoring for the job evaluations (meeting room at the central office).
14-B refers to the location of the interviewees (their individual offices)

14-A. "I feel that the location for the discussions and job evaluation scoring was appropriate (in a meeting room at the central office)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All four JEC members who "somewhat disagreed" the location was appropriate recommended the location should have been at a neutral place where JEC members would not have been pulled out of the job evaluations or receive phone calls, thus causing absences and possibly affecting the outcome of the scoring of the job evaluations. One JEC member recommended that during the discussions and evaluations at the central office, the door to the room should have been closed.

The one JEC member who "somewhat agreed" the location was appropriate pointed out the attributes of the physical characteristics of the location: centrally located; easily accessible for all the JEC members; air conditioned and comfortable working conditions; and benefit of copy machines and other equipment.

14-B "I feel that the location for interviewing the respondents (administrators) was appropriate (in their individual offices)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although four JEC members agreed the location was appropriate to conduct the interviews, their recommendations were conflicting. One JEC member recommended the interviewees (administrators) should be requested to come to the personnel office for the interviews and was of the opinion "the administrators would have taken it more seriously and it would have given it (the interviews) more importance." Taking an
opposing viewpoint, another JEC member speculated, "it would have been threatening to come downtown for the interview. The administrators would have been more reluctant to 'open-up'."

The JEC member who "somewhat disagreed" about going to the administrators' place of work or office for the interview reported it was an uncomfortable situation (for this JEC member) to be on the administrators' turf when he or she (the JEC member) was suppose to be "in the controlling situation." However another JEC member observed that interviewing in the administrator's place of work (office) was an opportunity to better understand the job since the administrator could pull out information or examples to explain his or her job.

15. "I feel that after participating in this (training) process I was able to effectively evaluate jobs."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The member who "strongly disagreed" expressed frustration, particularly the interviewing part of the training, and stated he or she did not know what to do (for an interview) after the training had been completed. This member recommended the usage of videos and more in-depth training on questioning techniques.
The Interviews

For the interview component of the job evaluation process the six JEC members were each assigned seven to eight interviewees (administrators whose jobs were to be evaluated.) The interviewees included those holding unique job positions (such as supervisor of New Horizons, coordinator of Des Moines Plan, route manager, etc.) and those holding "like" positions (such as elementary principals). Three or more interviewees with "like" positions were interviewed with two or more JEC members each interviewing one of the "like" positions. The interviews were conducted in the interviewee's office. The interviewees were asked questions by the JEC members to clarify the information from their (the interviewees') position questionnaires. The information from the position questionnaire and the interviewed responses together provided the JEC members the information needed to orally present the job before the other JEC members. The purpose of describing the job was to accurately score the job for the job evaluation. After the scoring, consensus had to be reached by all the JEC members. After all the jobs were scored, or evaluated, the jobs were ranked.

Below are the statements, numbers 16 through 23 related to the interview component in the Point Factor Component survey.

16. "I feel that I had acquired the skills to interview the respondents effectively."
The two JEC members who were "undecided" disclosed they already possessed the skills to interview, but it was not due to the job evaluation training.

Four out of five of the JEC members recommended a need for more interview training to elicit specific responses required for the job evaluations. Three JEC members recommended training in specific questioning techniques.

The member who "strongly disagreed" revealed he or she did not possess interview skills prior to the job evaluation training as did the other JEC members and stated, "I did not feel I was on an equal footing with the other JEC members." This member not only recommended specific questioning techniques but also the use of videos to acquire effective interviewing skills.

17. "I feel there were enough positions interviewed (in similar or like positions) by all of the committee members to be able to evaluate the job position fairly."
One member reiterated the recommendation for specific interview questions to be developed, not the number of positions interviewed. Another member stated, "there were too many interviews" (of the same position, such as elementary principals). This member recommended interviewing fewer of the same positions, such as two elementary principals instead of six.

18. "I feel that as I interviewed more respondents, I became better in my interviewing techniques."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The member who was "undecided" observed that interviewing more respondents only improved their interviewing techniques due to the process of learning which specific questions to ask. This member referred to the recommendation for specific questions formulated to evaluate the positions.

19. "I feel that the respondents were given equal time for the interviews I conducted."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The JEC member who "somewhat disagreed," did not believe equal time was an important issue, and responded, "I wasn't watching the clock."

Although one JEC member "somewhat agreed" equal time was important he or she admitted to giving some interviewees more time than others, but did not believe it was an advantage in the job evaluation scorings. This member reported two reasons for spending more time with the interviewees:

a. Clarification - some of the interviewees' position questionnaires were incomplete, therefore it was necessary to ask additional questions to understand the jobs.

b. Interest - sometimes a job was unique and the JEC member became intrigued with the duties and responsibilities of the job, thus asking more questions of the interviewee to better comprehend the job.

20. "I feel that if respondents were given more than 45 minutes of time for the interview, they received an unfair advantage in their job evaluation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the members who answered "undecided," referred to the previous recommendations of asking the "right questions," (specific questions) not spending more than 45 minutes with the respondent.

One member "strongly agreed" it gave respondents an unfair advantage if given more than 45 minutes. This member commented, "I think an hour interview can have a much greater effect than one interviewed for just a half an hour."

A member who "somewhat disagreed," felt that time was not the issue, understanding the job was. Another member who "somewhat disagreed" was unaware there was a 45 minute recommendation to conduct the interviews.

21. "I feel the respondents I interviewed clearly understood the reason for the interview and the impact of the end result of the job evaluation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One JEC member who "somewhat agreed" observed that while the respondents understood the reason for the interview, they did not understand or believe the impact of the end result of the job evaluation. This member recommended that the purpose and explanation of the instrument would help the respondents understand the purpose for the interview.
One of the members who "somewhat disagreed" indicated all respondents needed further clarification for the purpose of the interview, although "not to a large degree." The other member who "somewhat disagreed" reported, "I tried to explain what the purpose was and I think they (the respondents) understood it, but they didn't believe it (the job evaluations) would really happen and they didn't take it seriously." This member further speculated, "This attitude affected their responses on the questionnaire and during the interviews."

22. "I feel that the respondents I interviewed completed their questionnaires thoroughly."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One member who answered, "somewhat agree" noted that there were some (respondents) who didn't complete their questionnaires but speculated it was because "they didn't want to" (not because they didn't understand it).

One of the JEC members who "somewhat disagreed," reported "it varied by jobs." Another JEC member who "somewhat disagreed" noted that approximately half the respondents completed their questionnaires entirely (or thoroughly). The other member who "somewhat disagreed" observed that the people who had the most trouble completing their
questionnaires thoroughly were the noncertificated administrators. This member speculated that this was because "as a whole they (the noncertificated administrators) felt more insecure" (about the job evaluations).

None of the JEC members recommended improvements in the process to ensure that the position questionnaires would be thoroughly completed, other than previous recommendations of informing the respondents to the importance of the questionnaire, and the end result of the job evaluation study and the impact it would have on their job.

23. "I feel that after the interviews I clearly understood each job position well enough to present it before the committee's job evaluation review."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JEC member who "strongly disagreed," believed there was "too much ambiguity involved by some of the interviewees" which prevented this member from understanding some of the jobs well enough to present it to the other JEC members. This member stated, "I could only share with the committee what the interviewees chose to share with me."
One of the JEC members who "somewhat agreed," he or she understood each job position well enough to present it before the committee made the following recommendations to improve this process:

a. All six JEC members should interview (as a whole committee) every respondent so that each member would hear the interviewee's response to each question.

b. Each JEC member should prepare one or two specific questions for the interviewee to ask during the group interview process.

The Role of the Consultant

The Job Evaluation Consultant was hired by the Des Moines Public School District to: develop the position questionnaire; train the six job evaluation committee (JEC members) who were administrators in the Des Moines Public School District; conduct practice sessions with the JEC members; guide and direct the JEC members during the job evaluation scorings; rank the administrative positions based on the final job evaluation scores; and present the scores and rankings to the human resource department.

Below are the statements, numbers 24 thru 29, related to the role of the consultant component of the job evaluation process.

24. "I feel that the training provided by the consultant was very thorough."
One JEC member who "strongly agreed" the training provided by the consultant was very thorough, made the following recommendations to improve the practice session part of the training:

a. Practice sessions should be taken from educational positions, not from business and industrial positions.

b. Practice sessions should be worked off the same position questionnaire (as in the actual job evaluations) instead of using job descriptions.

c. Practice sessions should include interviewing scenarios.

The other JEC members did not feel it necessary to clarify their responses, nor did they have any recommendations at this time for improving the training.

25. "I feel that a sufficient amount of time was provided for the training by the consultant."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While all agreed there was a "sufficient amount of time provided for the training," the consensus of most of the JEC members was that too much time was spent on training.

26. "I feel that the consultant listened objectively to the presentation(s) by the committee members on our district's unique job positions' responsibilities and duties."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One member who "somewhat disagreed" expressed the opinion that the consultant did not listen objectively to the presentations because "he had already made a decision on the direction a job evaluation should go and he chipped away at us until we agreed."

However, one JEC member who "strongly agreed" the consultant listened objectively, was also in agreement with the above member by stating that if the consultant didn't have a clear picture of a certain job after listening to the presentation, he would tend to "suppress where the rest of the JEC members were going with it." This JEC member recommended the JEC members themselves should have been "stronger, more verbal" in explaining the job's responsibilities and duties. This member speculated that if the members had been stronger in their position, it would have influenced the numbers upward in the scoring for the unique positions.
27. "I feel that the consultant influenced our decisions during the evaluations."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JEC members who "strongly agreed" the consultant influenced their decisions were of the opinion there were some manipulations going on. One member observed that instead of acting as a consultant to the JEC members, he was leading or persuading them in a certain direction.

One JEC member believed the consultant was influential by the very nature of being considered "the expert," and *in the interest of time*, "gave up" by finally agreeing with his persuasion for a job evaluation scoring.

One JEC member who "somewhat agreed," reiterated a previous recommendation that the group members themselves should have been more assertive in standing firm for their evaluation scorings on those unique positions when the consultant attempted to influence them. Similar to this recommendation, another member who "somewhat agreed," pointed out that when the consultant attempted to influence the JEC members decisions, each JEC member had the same opportunity to do so, being a process of consensus.
28. "I feel that the consultant presented unbiased information to the committee members during the evaluations."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there appears to be a wide range of discrepancy for the responses to this question, actually four out of five agreed that the consultant presented his own biases during the evaluations.

One JEC member who "strongly disagreed" observed that "all of us came with our biases and blindspots but the consultant failed to acknowledge his own." This member recommended the consultant and each JEC member take turns at the table or the chalkboard (where the evaluations were scored) because "the person holding the chalk retains control and the job evaluations come out flavored with their own biases."

The JEC member who "somewhat disagreed," observed there was a bias from the consultant toward certificated administrative staff positions over noncertificated administrative positions and speculated this bias influenced one or two of the JEC committee members.

While two JEC members "somewhat agreed" the consultant presented unbiased information, they referred to occasions when the consultant was not flexible, when he had strong opinions and "he let us know" or he had strong biases and he "really dug in his heels and said, 'No, you are wrong.'" However, these two members felt overall the
consultant was "open and accepting" and he tried to be as fair as possible.

29. "I feel that the consultant influenced our decision to set the benchmark positions."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one JEC member who "strongly agreed" was of the opinion the committee members themselves should have set the benchmark positions. The other JEC members concurred this was one of the job consultant's responsibilities since he had more expertise and knowledge to make this decision.

The Group Work Evaluation Scoring

The job evaluation committee (JEC) members met together in a central office meeting room to orally present the administrative job positions. Each member orally presented the findings about each job based on the information from the position questionnaire and the responses from the interview. After each presentation, the other JEC members could ask questions of the JEC member who presented, to further clarify the job.

Each job was then assigned points according to the factor and level descriptors. Each JEC member was asked by the consultant for their
scores for each factor. These scores were written on a chalkboard grid. The consultant then requested some JEC members to defend their scores if their scores were higher or lower than the majority of the other JEC members' scores.

When the JEC members reached consensus for the scoring of each factor, the scores were totaled. When all the scores for the administrative positions were totaled, they were ranked. Then the JEC members reviewed the rankings to determine if any positions seemed questionable for re-evaluation.

Below are the statements, numbers 30 thru 37, related to the group work evaluation scoring component of the Point Factor Component survey.

30. "I feel that the committee member(s) exercised influence to convince others of their biases on job evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While most of the JEC members "somewhat agreed," one member expressed concern that certificated JEC members influenced the others on behalf of other certificated administrative positions. He or she indicated reluctance to take a strong stand on behalf of the noncertificated positions because of the repercussions which he or she might experience in the work place after the job evaluations concluded.
This JEC member recommended a balance of both certificated and noncertificated administrators should be selected for the job evaluations. (The job evaluation committee consisted of five certificated administrators and one noncertificated member).

One JEC member commented, "It's all right to influence the others as long as we, the committee members, see ourselves as equals," (which, according to the member above, did not occur).

31. "I feel that compromises were made on the points assigned for a job evaluation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the JEC members who responded to this statement considered compromise to be a natural part of the job evaluation scoring process and the only way to reach consensus. The other members did not feel it required further explanation.

32. "I feel that if committee members made negative observations, comments or jokes based on the personality of the individual whose job as being evaluated, it affected my decision on the job evaluation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The JEC member who "somewhat agreed" it affected his or her decision on the job evaluation recommended the consultant should have cautioned all the members to leave personalities out of it when scoring the job evaluations.

While most of the JEC members did not believe negative comments or jokes affected their decisions on the job evaluation, one member recommended guidelines should be set before the evaluations begin. Another member who did not believe it affected his or her personal decision on the job evaluations, recommended structuring the interview around specific questions to alleviate personalities from interfering with the scoring.

33. "I feel there was advocacy by the committee members during the evaluations."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one member who "strongly disagreed," related "advocacy" with unfairness and partiality, and stated, "there was not and should not have been advocacy in this process because I had to sell this concept to a number of administrators and had convinced them this was an extremely fair process."
However, the other four members agreed there was advocacy—that it was appropriate and it was their responsibility as JEC members to be in the role of advocate (meaning spokesperson or representative) for the person whose job was being evaluated.

34. "I feel that if committee member(s) advocated on behalf of individuals rather than on the function of their job, it affected my decision on the job evaluation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one JEC member who responded "somewhat agree" to the statement disclosed there were some positions they personally advocated for stronger than others. This JEC member explained there were some jobs difficult to advocate for due to the personality or attitude of the person holding that job. He or she recommended personality influence could be alleviated if specific interview questions were asked, and "by asking the right questions you control the outcome."

The other JEC members did not believe their decisions were affected by another member's advocacy on behalf of an individual rather than the job itself. They did not have any further recommendations.
35. "Do you feel member(s) were unwilling to compromise during the job evaluation process?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One JEC member who "strongly agreed" believed everyone compromised, but questioned whether compromise should have occurred or if more time should have been spent debating it. Yet, he or she also observed the JEC members often compromised "to get it over with...it was a matter of fatigue."

The other JEC members did not find it necessary to respond to this statement nor make recommendations.

36. "I feel that if JEC members were unable to attend the job evaluations meetings it affected the outcome of the evaluations."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the JEC members "somewhat agreed" it made a difference and did probably affect the outcome. One JEC member believed it only affected the outcome because of the lost opportunity to hear another perspective, but he or she didn't believe it actually affect the outcome. Yet another JEC member pointed out that it did affect the outcome if a
person in the minority (of the job evaluation scorings) was absent for some of the job evaluations but was present for others.

Another JEC member speculated it was dependent on the number of absenteees, but affirmed it made a difference overall, because the JEC was a small group of six. As one JEC member pointed out, "If one (JEC member) was absent it was approximately 16% of the total outcome."

37. "I feel that the job evaluation process was effective."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JEC member who "strongly disagreed" the process was effective believed there were many negative feelings about the process by the respondents (administrators whose jobs were being evaluated.) He or she speculated this was reflected in the respondents' attitude toward completing the position questionnaire and during the interview sessions. This JEC member also felt that the job evaluation process "zeroed-in" on noncertificated administrative positions.

Three JEC members who "somewhat agreed" the job evaluation process was effective overall, stated the process was "too long" and "too drawn out" and expressed fatigue. One member speculated fatigue caused the JEC members to compromise too readily to "get it over with for the sake of time."
Summary of Findings

The findings from the Point Factor Component Survey and the interviews of the five job evaluation committee members are presented in two parts:

1. **Part one** lists the major and minor changes of each of the five components recommended to strengthen the point-factor job evaluation method.

2. **Part two** illustrates the major changes in the five components with a revised model of the job evaluation process using the point-factor method. The flow of activities for the revised model is discussed.

**Part One**

The five components that were studied for this research in the point-factor job evaluation process were:

1. Position questionnaire;
2. Training and practice sessions;
3. Interviews;
4. Role of the consultant; and,
5. Group work evaluation scoring.

Some of the recommendations for change were minor changes focusing on: more efficient use of time; the locations for training and
practice sessions, interviews, and group evaluation scoring; and use of audio-visual equipment (such as overheads, calculators and videos) which would result in a more effective job evaluation process.

Below is a brief description of each of the five job evaluation components listing the major and minor changes for each component.

**The Position Questionnaire:**

The first component of the job evaluation process was the "position questionnaire." The position questionnaire was mailed (at the end of the school year) from the department of human resources to all persons in an administrative or management level position (below the directors' level). The completed position questionnaires were returned to the department of human resources and then delivered to the job evaluation consultant. The consultant assigned them to the members of the smaller working committee (five certificated administrators and one noncertificated administrator). The working committee members (also referred to as the job evaluation committee members, i.e. JEC members) used the position questionnaires to:

1. Design questions for the follow-up interviews with the administrators whose jobs were to be evaluated.
2. Score the jobs from the information in the position questionnaire and the interviews.
Below are the major changes for the "position questionnaire" component of the job evaluation process:

1. A large group meeting of all administrators (whose jobs will be evaluated) should be held prior to the mailing of the position questionnaire.

2. A sponsor should be present at the administrators' meeting to explain or discuss the following:
   a. the job evaluation process and the end results;
   b. the importance of completing the position questionnaire thoroughly, accurately and in a timely manner; and,
   c. field questions from the administrators regarding the job evaluation process, end results and importance of the position questionnaire.

3. The completed questionnaires should be returned to the department of human resources who gives it to the consultant. The consultant assigns it to two smaller job evaluation committees, (five certificated administrators in one committee and five noncertificated administrators in the other committee:)
   a. The *certificated* administrative position questionnaires should be assigned to the *certificated* job evaluation committee members (JECC members) for the purpose of developing specific interview questions and to use as information for the job evaluation scoring; and,
   b. The *noncertificated* administrative position questionnaires should be assigned to the *noncertificated* job evaluation
committee members (JECN members) for the purpose of developing specific interview questions and to use as information for the job evaluation scoring.

There was one minor change recommended for the position questionnaire component of the job evaluation process: the initial mailing of the position questionnaires should be at the beginning of the school year when the administrators whose jobs are to be evaluated are not at their busiest time of the year, as they are at the end of the year. The initial mailing should also be before negotiations.

The Training and Practice Sessions:

The training for the job evaluation committee members (JEC members) in the point-factor method of job evaluation, and the practice sessions with the JEC members was conducted by the job evaluation consultant and held at the central offices for a period of two weeks.

The training included instruction on the definitions and scoring of the factor and level descriptors of the point-factor job evaluation method. Job descriptions from business and industry and health care were used during the practice sessions to evaluate the jobs on the factor and level descriptors and to score them accordingly. A one page sheet of general guidelines on position information interviewing was introduced during the training. During the training sessions the consultant introduced the benchmark positions he set for the Des Moines Public School District's administrative job evaluation study.
Below are the major changes for the "training and practice session" component of the job evaluation process:

1. The training should include teaching the JEC members to set their own benchmark positions for their respective groups (JECC members setting the benchmarks for the certificated administrators and the JECN members setting the benchmarks for the noncertificated administrators).

2. Specific interview questions should be developed, under the guidance of the consultant, during the training session.

3. Specific interviewing techniques should be discussed.

4. Group interviewing scenarios should be practiced using the specific interview questions and interviewing techniques.

Below are the minor changes for the "training and practice session" component of the job evaluation process:

1. The practice sessions should work from sample position questionnaires instead of job descriptions.

2. The position questionnaires should reflect jobs from education instead of from business and industry.

3. A calculator should be provided during the practice sessions to save time and assure accuracy of scoring.

4. The practice sessions should be held at a location away from the JEC members' offices to prevent interruptions or absences.
The Interviews:

The interviews for the job evaluation process were conducted by each of the six JEC members. Forty-seven administrative positions were assigned to the JEC members, each assigned seven or eight positions. Each administrator whose job was being evaluated was interviewed at his or her office on a one-to-one basis (one JEC member, one administrator). The questions used during the interview were determined by each JEC member and were based on the interviewee's position questionnaire. The purpose of the interviews was to better understand the nature of the job for the discussion during the group work evaluation scoring. Time for the interviews varied. The interviews and the position questionnaires provided the information needed by the job evaluation committee for the individual and group work evaluation scoring.

Below are the major changes for the "interview" component of the job evaluation process:

1. Specific interview questions should be developed during the training session and assigned to each of the JEC members to ask during the group interviews.

2. Group interviews should be conducted, according to the respective administrative committees.
   a. All five JECC members should conduct the group interview for each certificated administrator whose job is being evaluated.
b. All five of the JECN members should conduct the group interview for each noncertificated administrator whose job is being evaluated.

Below are the minor changes for the "interview" component of the job evaluation process:

1. The group interviews should be conducted at the central office.
2. The group interview (for each administrator whose job was evaluated) should be conducted within a specific time frame.
3. Video-taping should be utilized during the group interviews:
   a. Videos could be used during the group work evaluation scorings if there was any ambiguity as to the responsibilities of the administrators' jobs.
   b. Videos could be used in subsequent job evaluation training for interviewing techniques and development of specific interview questions.

The Role of the Consultant:

The job evaluation consulting firm (i.e. job evaluation consultant) was selected by the Des Moines Public School District's Department of Human Resources. The job evaluation consultant was responsible for: developing the position questionnaire; assigning the position questionnaire and jobs to be evaluated to the job evaluation committee members (JEC members); training the JEC members; conducting practice sessions on the point-factor method with the JEC members; selecting the
benchmark positions; coordinating the job evaluation scoring; and ranking the jobs from the results of the group work evaluation scorings.

Below are the major changes for the "role of the consultant" component of the job evaluation process:

1. The consultant should be responsible for training the two job evaluation committees (certificated and noncertificated administrators of five members each who will be trained to evaluate certificated and noncertificated administrative jobs respectively) in the point-factor job evaluation method.

2. The consultant should train the two JEC groups to set the benchmark positions for their respective administrative groups (certificated and noncertificated).

3. The consultant should train the two JEC groups in interviewing and questioning techniques.

4. The consultant should train the two JEC groups to develop specific interview questions for their respective groups.

5. The consultant should coordinate each of the group interviews (for the administrators whose jobs will be evaluated). The consultant should open and close the interview session to assure equal time for each interviewee; act as a resource person; and provide direction as required.

6. The consultant should be responsible for the final rankings from the two job evaluation committee's group work evaluation scores.
7. The consultant should review the scores and rankings from the two job evaluation committees with the department of human resources.

Below are the minor changes for the "role of the consultant" component of the job evaluation process:

1. The consultant (who developed the position questionnaire) should revise one of the questions on the position questionnaire. The question, "Who do you supervise?" should be changed to "Who do you evaluate?" to avoid duplicity when two or more administrators supervise the same person or persons.

2. The consultant should revise the factor and level descriptors for "Effort" and "Working Conditions" to reflect administrative job positions instead of nonadministrative positions.

3. The consultant should use an overhead transparency grid to mark the individual and group job evaluation scores, instead of a chalkboard grid, for efficiency of time.

4. The consultant should advise and/or intervene during the discussions of the administrator's job when or if comments are made about the administrator's personality.

5. The consultant should reschedule the individual and group work evaluation scorings if a member of the job evaluation committee is absent from the scorings.
Group Work Evaluation Scoring:

The "group work evaluation scoring" component of the job evaluation process reflected the interaction of the members of the job evaluation committee (or job evaluation committee members) during the presentations of the administrative jobs and the scoring of the jobs.

The job evaluation committee members (JEC members) met together in a central office meeting room to present the administrative job positions. Each member orally presented each job based on the information from the administrator's position questionnaire and from the administrator's interview. After the presentation, the other JEC members could ask questions of the JEC member presenting the job to clarify the job.

Each administrative job was then assigned points according to the factor and level descriptors of the point-factor job evaluation method. Each JEC member was asked by the consultant for their individual scores for each factor. The scores were written on a chalkboard grid. The consultant requested some JEC members to defend his or her scores if the scores were higher or lower than the other JEC members' scores.

After the JEC members reached a consensus on the scoring of each factor of the job being evaluated, the scores were totaled. When all the scores for the administrative positions were totaled, the consultant ranked them. The JEC members reviewed the rankings against the benchmark positions to determine if any positions seemed questionable for re-evaluation.
Below are the major changes for the "group work evaluation scoring" component of the job evaluation process:

1. Two job evaluation committees (the JECC group and the JECN group) should each set the benchmark positions for their respective administrative jobs (certificated and noncertificated).

2. The two job evaluation committees should perform the group work evaluation scoring for their respective administrative groups (certificated and noncertificated) independently from each other to maintain a sense of autonomy and equality.

3. Each of the two job evaluation committees should rank the administrative job scores for their respective groups (certificated and noncertificated).

4. The two job evaluation committees should submit the scores and rankings of their respective administrative jobs (certificated and noncertificated) to the job evaluation consultant who will combine the rankings of the certificated and noncertificated administrative jobs.

Below are the minor changes for the "group work evaluation scoring component" of the job evaluation process:

1. The group work evaluation scoring should be conducted at a location away from the JEC members' offices to prevent interruptions or absences during the process.
2. The group work evaluation scoring should not be performed if one JEC member is absent, since it could affect the administrative job's final score and ranking.

3. The individual oral presentation of each administrator's job during the group work evaluation scoring should be eliminated since all the members of the working committee would have been present during the administrator's group interview (therefore, all members would have the same information from the position questionnaire and from the interviewed responses).

4. The consultant should be present as a resource person for the group work evaluation scoring, but should not attempt to influence the scorings of the job evaluations.

5. Calculators should be provided to assist in the group work evaluation scoring to assure accuracy and to save time.

6. Guidelines should be established and, if indicated, the consultant should intervene if the administrator's personality is discussed instead of the administrator's job.

Part Two

The revised model of the job evaluation process using the point factor method (Figure 2) addresses the major structural changes from data gathered from the Point Factor Component survey and from the interviews of the five job evaluation committee members (JEC members).
Figure 2: Revised Model of the Job Evaluation Process Using the Point-Factor Method
Discussion of Revised Model (Figure 2)

The major changes (described in part one) in the five components of the job evaluation process are shown in the revised model which was developed by the researcher (Figure 2). Below is a description of the flow of activities:

The revised model begins at the upper administrative level of the organization. At this level, a need to evaluate part or all of the organization has been determined. The upper administrative level of the organization delegates responsibility to the employees of the middle management level for the job evaluations to be performed.

The middle management employees (certificated and noncertificated administrators) select a committee from their peers to determine the specific objectives for the job evaluation study. The objectives may address several issues. Some of these issues might be: the specific management level jobs to be evaluated; the consideration of new titles and classifications; the elimination or redesign of the salary range categories; and the consideration to make a comparability study of similar positions in other businesses and organizations.

The first change in the revised model occurs in the objectives of the larger middle management committee. Instead of the selection of one smaller working committee from the large middle management level committee, the researcher strongly supports the formation of two smaller working committees (referred to as the two job evaluation committees or JEC):
1. One job evaluation committee would be of five *certificated* administrators (henceforth to be referred to as the job evaluation committee of certificated administrators or JECC members) selected from the large middle management committee of administrators.

2. The other job evaluation committee would be of five *noncertificated* administrators (henceforth to be referred to as the job evaluation committee of noncertificated administrators or JECN members) selected from the large middle management committee of administrators.

A second suggestion is to balance the numbers of certificated and noncertificated administrators on the job evaluation committee. This gives equal representation for both the certificated administrators and the non-certificated administrators during the group work evaluation discussions and scoring.

The job evaluation consulting firm (i.e. job evaluation consultant) is selected by the department of human resources and is responsible for developing the "position questionnaire," (a job evaluation form from which job identification data, title, job description, department, knowledge, responsibilities, working conditions, etc. is defined). The position questionnaire is sent from the human resources department to all persons in an administrative or management level position (below the directors' level).
The department of human resources is responsible for scheduling a meeting for all the administrators whose jobs will be evaluated. At this meeting a sponsor (such as the director or assistant superintendent of human resources) presides who will discuss the job evaluation process and the end results; the importance of the position questionnaire in the process and the need to complete it thoroughly, accurately, and in a timely manner; and to field questions from the administrators regarding the job evaluation process. After the meeting with the administrators whose jobs will be evaluated, the position questionnaires are mailed to better assure that all administrators receive them (as opposed to handing them out at the meeting and missing those who were absent).

When the position questionnaires are completed, they are returned to the department of human resources to the job evaluation consultant. The consultant assigns the position questionnaires to the two smaller working committees (the certificated position questionnaires assigned to the JEC members and the noncertificated position questionnaires assigned to the JEC members). The two working committees use the position questionnaires to develop specific interview questions. The information from the position questionnaires and the interviews are also used for the job evaluation scoring.

The job evaluation consultant is responsible for training the two small working committee members together (all ten JEC members). During the training, the job evaluation consultant is responsible for the following:
1. Defining and assisting in the selection of the benchmark positions. After the training, it is the responsibility of the two working committees to select the benchmark positions for their respective groups (certificated and noncertificated);

2. Defining and scoring the job factors for the point-factor job evaluation. During the practice sessions for the factor and level scoring, sample position questionnaires are used from education;

3. Interview training:
   a. Instructing the job evaluation committee members specific interviewing and questioning techniques;
   b. Assisting the job evaluation committee members in learning to develop specific interview questions from the position questionnaires; and,
   c. Practicing interview scenarios to familiarize the two job evaluation committee members to conduct group interviews using the specific interview questions and interviewing techniques.

The job evaluation consultant is responsible for coordinating the group interviews for each of the smaller working committees. The consultant opens and closes the interview to keep the interview within a specified time. The consultant is also present during the interview to act as a resource person. And, the consultant provides direction during the interviews, as required.
The consultant is responsible for coordinating the job evaluation scoring for each of the job evaluation committees. The consultant oversees the JEC members reaching a consensus for each factor and level score and for the final scores of the job evaluated.

The consultant is responsible for combining the two JEC scores and rankings into one complete ranking. The consultant then submits the final scores and ranking to the department of human resources for review.

The two job evaluation committees are responsible for the job evaluations for their respective administrative peers (i.e. certificated or noncertificated). The two job evaluation committees are trained by the job evaluation consultant before they can assume any responsibilities in the job evaluation process.

The first responsibility for each of the two job evaluation committees is to determine the "benchmark positions" for their respective groups (the JECC members select the benchmark positions for the certificated administrative positions and the JECN members set the benchmark positions for the noncertificated administrative positions). The benchmark positions are those positions in the organization that are "stable, well-known positions, and are ranked. They are chosen to represent each major level of duties, responsibilities, and skills encompassed within the range of jobs to be rated." From the benchmark positions all the other positions to be evaluated are compared.
The two job evaluation committees are responsible for developing specific interview questions to be used during the group interviews of their respective administrators (certificated or noncertificated) whose jobs will be evaluated.

Each of the two job evaluation committees conduct group interviews (with all five JEC members present for each interview) for each administrator selected whose job is being evaluated. The job evaluation consultant opens and closes each interview to keep each interview within a specified time. Each JEC member is assigned specific interview questions (developed during the interview training sessions) to ask each administrator interviewed. The researcher strongly recommends the group interviews be scheduled at the administrative central office. This would emphasize the importance of the job evaluation interview and eliminate interruptions that might occur at the administrator's office.

The scoring of each job begins after all the interviews have been completed. The JEC members discuss the job being evaluated, using the information from the position questionnaire and the interview. After the discussion, each JEC member individually scores each factor and level for the job. The job evaluation consultant writes each of the JEC member's scores on an overhead transparency grid. If one JEC member's score is too high or too low, the consultant's responsibility is to request the member to explain his or her reasons for the score. After group discussion, JEC members may change his or her score until all the
members reach consensus on the factor and level scores for the job. The factor and level scores are then totaled.

The group work evaluation scoring results are then submitted by both job evaluation committees for their respective administrative positions (certificated and noncertificated) to the job evaluation consultant for the final ranking. The consultant reviews the rankings against the benchmark positions with the members of each job evaluation committee to determine if the scored and ranked positions appear satisfactory. When all members are satisfied with the scores and ranking of the jobs, the consultant ranks both the certificated and noncertificated administrative positions together. The consultant then submits the final rankings to the department of human resources for review.
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Background of the Study

In 1988 a new superintendent was appointed to the Des Moines Public School District. The new superintendent implemented a reorganization plan as one of his 1989-90 goals, which was, "Modify the administrative classification and compensation structure."

An independent consulting firm (i.e. job evaluation consultant) was hired by the DMPSD to provide technical expertise and assistance to conduct administrative job evaluations in the district to realign the positions.

The DMPSD then selected six administrators (five certificated and one noncertificated) to form the job evaluation committee (JEC) to be trained by the job evaluation consultant in the point-factor method to conduct the job evaluations for certificated and noncertificated administrative jobs.

Statement of the Problem

The problem for this research was to determine if the model for the point-factor job evaluation method, used by the Des Moines Public School District for their administrative job evaluations, was effective.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the selected components of the job evaluation process using the point-factor method to determine the effectiveness of the model for the administrative job evaluations in the Des Moines Public School District. The major components studied were referred to as the point-factor components. The sixth component, "the determination of the relative worth or compensation assigned to the ranked administrative positions" was not studied.

The following five point-factor components were studied:
1. The position questionnaire;
2. The training and practice sessions;
3. The interviews;
4. The role of the consultant;
5. The group work evaluation scoring.

This study addressed the following questions:
1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each of the five major point-factor components?
2. What are the recommendations for strengthening each of the five point-factor components?
3. How can the point-factor job evaluation model be strengthened?
Procedures Used

A point-factor survey (PFC survey) and follow-up interviews with the JEC members were used to determine the effectiveness of the five major point-factor components in the job evaluation model, which were: the position questionnaire; the training and practice sessions; the interviews; the role of the consultant; and the group work evaluation scoring. The PFC survey consisted of 37 questions, subcategorized into five sections (representing the five components) and a section for comments. The follow-up interviews of the JEC members were conducted individually to elicit further information from the PFC survey. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed.

The results from the survey and interviews were analyzed and changes were made for improving the point-factor job evaluation model.

Summary of Findings

The information gathered from the analysis of the PFC survey and the follow-up interviews from the five job evaluation committee members has determined the original point-factor job evaluation model (used in the Des Moines Public School District's administrative job evaluation) was an effective model. While it had its strengths, there were two major structural changes (as well as other changes within each of the five point-factor job evaluation components) that indicated the revised point-factor job evaluation model would be more effective.
The components in the original point-factor job evaluation model that were effective are:

1. The position questionnaire was effectively developed by the job evaluation consulting firm (i.e. job evaluation consultant).
2. The training and practice sessions were effective in teaching the job evaluation committee members how to score the jobs using the factor and level descriptors.
3. The role of the consultant was effective for the following:
   a. Developing the position questionnaire;
   b. Training the job evaluation committee members in the factor and level descriptors and weighted point scoring;
   c. Setting the benchmark positions;
   d. Coordinating the group work job evaluation scoring; and,
   e. Ranking the results from the group work evaluations.

The two major structural changes, recommended to improve the point-factor job evaluation model are:

1. Two job evaluation committees (one committee of five certificated administrators and one committee of five noncertificated administrators) are selected by the large middle management committee for the training in the point-factor job evaluation. Each committee is responsible for:
   a. Selecting the benchmark positions for their administrative groups;
   b. Developing specific interview questions to ask in the group interview;
c. Interviewing as a group, each administrator whose job will be evaluated from their administrative group;
d. Ranking the jobs after the group evaluation scoring for each of the administrative jobs in their administrative group.

2. The job evaluation consultant has the extended responsibility for interview training and practice sessions with the two job evaluation committees. These responsibilities are:
a. Interviewing and questioning techniques for group interviews;
b. Advising and guiding each of the two committees in the process of developing specific interview questions;
c. Practicing interview scenarios with the two job evaluation committee members.

Discussion

The two major structural changes in the revised point-factor job evaluation model (Figure 2) - the selection of two job evaluation committees (one made of certificated administrators and one noncertificated administrators; and the addition of formal interview training for the job evaluation committee members - have significant implications for making the revised model more effective.

Selecting two job evaluation committees was determined by the researcher to be the best recommendation based on the responses from
the noncertificated administrator and two of the certificated administrators on the job evaluation committee. The noncertificated administrator expressed concern about being the "odd man out" during the job evaluation process. One of the certificated administrators on the job evaluation committee referred to the job evaluation process as a fair process *if* they were *equals*. This was the caveat. The noncertificated administrator on the JEC was reluctant to pursue his or her stance on certain key issues during the group work evaluation discussions and scorings, even when he or she was the advocate for the administrative position being discussed. The concern this noncertificated administrator had was, if he or she "stood his or her ground" during the group work evaluation discussion for the job evaluation scorings (especially if the job evaluation was for another noncertificated administrative position) there might be repercussions later on by his or her JEC colleagues. Whether or not this was a real or imagined concern it is a limitation for the noncertificated administrator as a member of the job evaluation committee.

The creation of two separate job evaluation committees is the most logical recommendation because it allows the job evaluations to proceed without a "pecking order." Each job evaluation committee would be independent of the other. Each job evaluation committee would set their respective benchmark positions for their administrative groups (certificated and noncertificated). Each job evaluation committee would also have a better understanding of their respective
administrators' job responsibilities, knowledge, skills, efforts and working conditions.

A second suggestion is to have equal numbers of certificated and noncertificated administrators on one job evaluation committee. This would balance the committee and provide the non-certificated administrators equal representation as the group work discussions and scorings proceed.

The second structural change in the revised point-factor job evaluation model recommended by the researcher is to extend the job evaluation consultant's responsibility to that of conducting formal interview training for the two job evaluation committee members. Some interviewees, according to the JEC members, were defensive, reluctant, humble, or indifferent to the job evaluation interview. To provide JEC members with the skills to elicit information from the interviewees required specific questioning and listening techniques by the interviewer. Also, there were many jobs evaluated in the Des Moines Public School District that were unique positions. This, too, required skillful interview techniques of asking probing questions to discover the unique responsibilities and knowledge involved in the job to assign points to assess its value.

While some JEC members possessed adequate or even a high level of interviewing skill due to their administrative positions, all five JEC members indicated the need for some kind of formal interview training, specifically for job evaluations. Possessing the same interviewing and questioning techniques by each JEC member could determine the
difference for a more effective evaluation score for the job. Therefore, formal training in interviewing techniques and questioning techniques for all the JEC members - to give them all the same knowledge and skills - is an essential component in the point-factor job evaluation process to make it more effective.

Interviewing as a group (all JEC members together interviewing each administrator whose job is to be evaluated) is recommended to give each JEC member equal opportunity to ask questions and listen to the responses of the interviewee. When only one JEC member is responsible for reporting the duties and other information of the administrator's job from the position questionnaire and individual interview, there is a much greater risk of incomplete information obtained and the inclination of advocating on behalf of the administrator whose job is being evaluated. A group interview lessens advocacy and the time needed for discussions during the group work evaluation as all members possess the same information for the job.

Limitations of Study

This research has limitations because the point-factor job evaluation process was studied in only one school district, the Des Moines, Iowa Public School District (30,000 student population).

The point-factor job evaluation method itself was a limitation since other job evaluation methods used for school district job
evaluations were not selected for the Des Moines Public School District's administrative job evaluation study.

The selection of administrative job positions only using the point-factor job evaluation method was a limitation because other jobs (secretarial, clerical, maintenance, teachers, nurses, counselors, etc.) in the Des Moines Public School District were not studied using this job evaluation process.

The job evaluation committee members selected as the subjects for this were in five in number and this was a limitation.

The sixth component of the job evaluation process, "the determination of the relative worth or compensation assigned to the ranked administrative positions" was not one of the components studied in this research to determine if the process was effective. This was a limitation in determining the effectiveness of the point-factor job evaluation process.

The researcher was one of the six members of the job evaluation committee. This was a limitation by bringing into the research certain biases - by being a part of the process - that the researcher herself may not have been aware.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendations for Practice:**

The results from this research may benefit other medium to large-sized school districts that may consider a job evaluation study for
their employees. The selection of a job evaluation consulting firm; the
selection of the job evaluation committee members; the training for the job
evaluation committee members; and other less significant, but
important factors that make a job evaluation effective, are all facets of
the job evaluation process school districts need to consider before
beginning their job study. Much of the information in this research on
the job evaluation process and how to make it more effective will be
applicable for other school districts' job evaluations, if a quantitative job
evaluation method is utilized.

If job evaluations are to be performed for employees such as
secretaries, teachers, maintenance, or other the same process should be
installed to conduct and perform the job evaluations. The major
difference is in one of the two structural changes made in the revised
model - the selection of two job evaluation committees - which is for
administrative job evaluations only. The other major structural change
- interview training for the job evaluation committee remains as a
recommendation for any employee evaluation. Other recommendations
should also be considered for any employee job evaluation: the large
group meeting to explain the job evaluation process and its results;
locations for the employee interviews and group job evaluation scorings;
and, the use of audio visuals during the interviews and group
evaluation scorings.

For job evaluation consulting firms, the revised model for the
point-factor job evaluation process could be adapted to "fit" other
quantitative job evaluation methods for management and administrative jobs, as well as the recommendations mentioned above.

Recommendations for further study

Employee job evaluations will continue to be conducted in other school districts. Further research should be conducted in other school districts using quantitative job evaluation methods or combinations of quantitative methods for the evaluation of administrative jobs.

A model could be developed to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the components of another job evaluation method in another school district (medium to large sized district). A comparison between the revised model in this research and the model developed from another research would provide additional information for job evaluation studies.

Another research study that should be conducted is to apply the revised model from this research to another medium to large sized school district's administrative job evaluation study to determine its effectiveness. If the model would be used for jobs other than administrative or managerial job evaluations, the one structural component - the selection of two job evaluation committees - would not apply.

It might also be useful to interview administrators whose jobs were evaluated to determine their opinions as to the effectiveness of the point-factor job evaluation process as they may provide important insights.


Christal, R.E., Madden, J.M. and Harding, F.D. (1960). Reliability of job evaluation ratings as a function of number of raters and length of job description. USAF Personnel Laboratory. (pp. 1-8). Lackland Air Force Base, TX:
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APPENDIX A
CENTRAL OFFICE REORGANIZATION
MAJOR CENTRAL OFFICE FUNCTIONS

- **TEACHING AND LEARNING**
  - Elementary and Early Childhood Programs
  - Middle and High School Programs
  - Special Programs
  - Intercultural Programs
  - Adult and Continuing Education Programs

- **MANAGEMENT**
  - Information
  - Human Resources
  - Operations
  - Facilities
  - Food Services

- **EXECUTIVE**
  - Teaching and Learning
  - Management Services
  - Business and Finance Services (Includes Board Secretary role)
  - Public and Governmental Relations

DISTRICT'S ORGANIZATIONAL DIRECTION (SUMMARY)

- Restructure central office roles and responsibilities to support school-based management through shared decision making.
- Restructure central office roles and responsibilities to be responsive to districtwide issues identified in the strategic plan.

TIME LINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

- Board reviews plan: October 1989
- Staff reviews plan: October 1989
- Board accepts plan: November 1989
- Staffing of plan: December–May 1990
- Plan completed: August 1990

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on:

- Review of current organizational pattern and functions.
- Development of an organizational pattern designed to support the implementation of the district's strategic plan and mission.
- Development of an organizational pattern with the three central office administrative levels related to (1) Teaching and Learning, (2) Management, and (3) Executive Functions.
- Review of current administrative positions in district budget.
- Acknowledgement of the organizational pattern as dynamic, subject to continual review and probable change.
APPENDIX B
ADMINISTRATIVE STUDY OBJECTIVES
ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY STRUCTURE STUDY

Background: The sixth in a series of papers prepared by Dr. Wegenke addresses the issue of "central office reorganization." Three broad categories of job classifications have emerged as the most effective organization to meet the mission of this district.

Goal 5 of the 1989-90 District Goals states, "Modify the administrative classification and compensation structure."

Members of the Des Moines Administrators Association have expressed concern regarding their compensation relative to comparable positions in the general work force area of other school districts of our comparability group.

The state defines an administrator as "having authority in the interest of the public employer to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward or discipline other public employees, or the responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgement."

Purpose of Study: It will also be the purpose of this committee to evaluate the present administrative salary structure below the director's level to determine internal equity and external comparability.

A third priority of consideration will be the elimination of the proliferation of job titles and the renaming of some existing positions.

1. Scope of the Study:

   Address all administrative positions except associate superintendents (2); Directors of communication (1), business and finance (1), and board secretary (1): teaching and learning executive directors (3); and management directors (3).

   Review and possibly realign administrative staff to address the district focus of teaching and learning.

   Assess and evaluate levels of responsibility and identify job titles commensurate with those responsibilities.

   Consider the establishment of new titles/classifications.

   Consider the establishment of specialist/technical positions and appropriate classification definition.

   Eliminate or redesign the salary schedule range category.

External Comparability:

   Conduct study to assess job titles and classification in similar size districts and appropriate private businesses.

   Make salary comparisons to other similar size districts and appropriate private businesses.
2. Methodology:

Research for the assessment will include:

- Identification of a consultant who will provide "expertise" in the field of compensation to be used when needed.
- Survey similar size districts and comparability schools in Iowa.
- Communication with school districts that have made similar recent studies.
- Development of a yardstick to measure levels of responsibilities.

3. Timeline:

- formulate committee
  - November 1989
- gather research information
  - December 1989
- analyze information
  - December/January 1990
- finalize recommendation
  - January 1990
APPENDIX C
POSITION QUESTIONNAIRE
POSITION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name (Leave blank)  

Official job title  Working title, if different

High School Vice Principal  

Department or school  Work location (site name)

Scheduled work week (No. of hours)  Current work year (No. of months)

7:30 A.M. - 4:00 P.M.  12 Months

Name of immediate supervisor  Supervisor's title

Principal  

Other persons from whom you receive work assignments on a regular basis. Indicate name, title, and department or school.

Principal -  

Director of Secondary Education -  

Part I Description of Position

Briefly state the main purpose of your job:

The main purpose of my job is to assist the principal and to work with the principal, other vice principal, teachers, students, support staff, and parents to maintain a positive learning climate to promote and improve the quality of education at [High School].

List duties you perform regularly. State clearly what you do, how you do it, and why (i.e., end result expected). Indicate amount of time spent (percentage of total time or number of hours) on each. If you have a current job description which accurately reflects your job duties, you may attach it in lieu of completing this section. However, list time spent for each duty in the job description.

Regular Duties/Responsibilities

1. Work with students who have discipline problems, including counseling students, making parent contacts, holding parent conferences or teacher conferences, arranging and/or attending staffings, working with outside agencies, working with school counselors and school nurse.

   Time Spent  45%  

2. Supervise student activities which may include: extra-curricular activities such as evening plays, concerts, dances, mixers, senior class events like Banquet and Prom.

   Outside school day

3. Supervise athletic events such as all football games, basketball games, volleyball games, wrestling meets, swim meets.

   Outside school day 2 or 3 evening per week
4. Enrollment and orientation of new students, orientation of students new to the building, including tours for all 8th grade students, Parents' Night for 8th grade students, and Fall orientation.

5. Acting as an advisor for two grades of students, counseling students regarding academic progress, attendance, and working with students who have educational problems, social problems and personal problems.

6. Supervision of students in the halls and on the school grounds before and after school, over the lunch hour, and during passing periods.

7. Works with the Booster Club in the management of the concession stand.

8. Assumes responsibilities of the Principal in the Principal's absence.

9. Responsible for all senior activities (every other year) Senior Board Elections, meeting with Senior Board every Wednesday morning before school, conducting several fundraisers for the senior class, planning and conducting senior class meetings, writing and sending senior bulletins to members of the senior class, planning the Commencement program and having the program printed, keeping track of all the awards for the Class Day and planning the Class Day Program, working with the Commencement and Prom, ordering all the things necessary for Prom and Banquet, collecting senior dues, selling Banquet and Prom tickets, ordering senior announcements and collecting money for extra announcements.

10. Responsible for all athletics and coaches.

11. Responsible for the Attendance Committee.

12. Member of the Exit Skills Vs. Carnegie Units.

13. Coordinate the In-School Suspension Program: in-service of teachers assigned to the ISS, design, order, fill out forms including student passes, put together appropriate student learning packets, assign students to ISS, read and fill student packets.

14. In-Service of new teachers: familiarize new teachers with the schedule, building and district forms, the process used for taking attendance, the procedures used for referring students to the office.

15. Registration of students in the Fall: recruit staff to work at registration, design the format for registration, in-service of counseling staff and secretarial staff for assignment at registration, locate necessary materials for registration.
16. Enroll new students: instruct the clerical staff in how to fill out forms, determine whether the student should attend, confer with new enrollees and their parents, review school policy and rules, confer with the personnel at other schools and the special education department to determine program and grade placement.

17. Responsible for evaluation of 1/3 of the High Staff, set up and conduct preconferences, set up and attend classroom observations, fill out needed information for post conferences, set up and conduct post conferences, write and turn in written reports, work with teachers to improve instruction or classroom management.

18. Confer with the Principal on important school matters such as school policies, conflicts, the master schedule, to hiring of new personnel, the management of the school building, the building goals, new programs and projects.

19. Work with parents and those responsible for students attending High School. Confer with parents regarding attendance, school policies, concerns related to safety or health, problems at home, in the community and with civil authorities, questions and concerns about teachers dances, mixers, school programs, clubs and organizations, senior activities, academic difficulty, etc.

20. Responsible for students from foreign countries and foreign exchange students, enroll, orientation, tours of the school, communicate with ESL department, counselors, sponsors.

21. Assume responsibility for the school in the absence of the other administrators.

22. Work with Pupil Services Coordinator and Counselors.

23. Assist the staff, especially new teachers, in improving classroom control.

24. Work with substitute teachers.

25. Handle all types of contact with community and business.

% Time Spent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enroll new students: instruct the clerical staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for evaluation of 1/3 of the High Staff</td>
<td>(some of this is done outside the school day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confer with the Principal on important school matters</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with parents and those responsible for students attending High School</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume responsibility for the school in the absence of the other administrators</td>
<td>This goes on while I am doing my own duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Pupil Services Coordinator and Counselors</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the staff, especially new teachers, in improving classroom control</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with substitute teachers</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle all types of contact with community and business</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(some of this is done outside the school day)
### Regular Duties (Continued)

| 26. Observations for 1/3 of the IIIB teachers. | 1% |

(Add additional sheets if necessary)

For what work are you the final authority? Please give examples.

- Commencement, Prom, Senior Banquet
- Teacher Assignments - Hall Duty - I.S.S., etc.
- Student Discipline
- Employee Evaluation
- Coaches and Athletics

For what work do you make recommendations to others before taking action? Please give examples.

- Curriculum
- Building Policies

License or certifications required for your position

- Evaluators License
- Secondary Administrator Certification
Describe below knowledge, skills, and abilities required to do your work.

Knowledge of School Board Policies
Skills in working with staff, students, and parents

List statutes, rules, policies, procedures, etc., with which you must be familiar in order to do your work.

School Board Policies
Attendance Policies
Discipline Policies
Building Policies
Athletic Association Policies

List any machines, equipment, or tools used in your work and the time spent (hours per month) using them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machines, equipment, or tools used</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your work requires typing, please indicate time spent (hours per month) on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typing from:</th>
<th>Using:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Copy</td>
<td>Standard Typewriter (mechanical or electric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Dictation</td>
<td>Word Processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand Dictation</td>
<td>Computer or Data Terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Notes (composition)</td>
<td>Typesetting Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With whom or what organization outside of your department or building does your job require regular contact? Also, indicate the purpose of the contacts and the frequency (times per month). Do not include contact with co-workers in your department or with students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Persons or Organizations</th>
<th>Purpose of Contact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booster Club</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches Association</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principals' Association</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMAA</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II  Supervisory Responsibilities (complete only if you directly supervise others)

List the name and title of all employees you directly supervise. Do not include employees supervised by subordinate supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodians (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Monitor (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-School Liaison (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(If the above includes large numbers in multiple incumbent positions, you need only list job titles and number of incumbents in each.)

Total number of employees supervised directly and through subordinates 98

(If number fluctuates, use average.)

Check as many of the following that apply to your supervision of those reporting directly to you.

- Select employees
- Appraise employee's performance
- Train employees
- Counsel or reprimand employees
- Transfer and reassign employees
- Suspend or terminate (or recommend termination) employees
- Approve vacation, sick leave, other time off

Please provide any other information that you feel is important to the description of your job not covered in the foregoing questions.

Part III  Employee Statement

I certify that the foregoing answers are accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Employee Signature: [Redacted]  Date: May 25, 1990
Indicate the level of student contact required in your job by checking the applicable category(s) below. Also, indicate the frequency (daily, weekly, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Student Contact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practically none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental to work place</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information requesting or furnishing</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring students</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling students</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and/or managing students</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate the physical and/or visual effort required in your job by checking as many of the following that apply. Also, indicate the duration (hours per month).

- Mostly sitting at a desk or table with some standing, walking, bending, stooping or carrying of light objects: 270 hours
- Standing or walking for extended periods of time:
- Repeated bending, crouching, stooping or stretching:
- Climbing ladders, scaffolding or poles:
- Hand shoveling (dirt, sand, snow):

Indicate the working conditions encountered in your job by checking as many of the following that apply. Indicate the duration (hours per month).

- Typical office or classroom setting which is adequately lighted, heated, ventilated, and maintained: 270 hours
- Conditions which are moderately dirty, dusty, or noisy (describe):
- Conditions which are very dirty, dusty or noisy to the extent that protective equipment is required (describe):
- Conditions which cause exposure to heat, cold, rain, or snow:
- Conditions which involve exposure to extremes of heat or cold for long periods:
- Other undesirable conditions (explain):

Other (describe): Walking and standing—halls and grounds Daily
What is the most important outcome or end result you expect from this position?

**Improved school climate for learning.**

What do you consider to be the best measures of how well a person is performing in this position?

**Climate/teacher survey**

Does this position represent the District with other public, private, or community organizations or the media? If yes, please explain.

Represents the school and the district at hundreds of school functions, many committees, and with the media.

What education, training, and experience do you feel a new employee in this position should have?

**Education and/or training**

- Masters Degree

**Experience**

- Five years teaching

Licenses or certificates

- Administrative endorsement

Other

Please comment on the accuracy and completeness of employees responses. Note any additions or exceptions.

I accept the responses with the reservation that no one can predict from day to day the hundreds of chores that arise. The day runs the job regardless of good planning.

I certify that the foregoing answers are accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

[Signature]

Date: 6/1/80

The composite of the foregoing information is an accurate description of this position.

[Signature]

Date:
APPENDIX D
POSITION QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER
April 9, 1990

TO: District Administrators

FROM: Earl Bridgewater, Asst. Supt., Personnel and Adm. Services
      Thomas E. Stokes, Director of Personnel

SUBJECT: ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION QUESTIONNAIRE

Attached is a questionnaire regarding your position in the District. This will be one component of our administrative structure and salary survey that has long been promised.

Individual position holders and several individuals holding the same positions will be interviewed by your fellow administrators that have been trained in the process of job analysis. These interviews will be conducted during the month of May after the receipt of your position questionnaire.

It is anticipated the total study will be completed during the summer months and ready for presentation to the superintendent and DMAA in September 1990.

Please take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it so your position can be given the same consideration as other positions.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR POSITION QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose of the Questionnaire

The position questionnaire is being used to obtain current information about your job for use in the job classification study which was recently described to you. The information you provide should be as complete and accurate as possible so that the study committee will have solid information with which to work.

The information requested is to determine what you do (are responsible for), only. It will not be used in any way to evaluate your job performance.

Instructions for Completing the Position Questionnaire

Answer all of the questions completely and accurately, while keeping them as concise as possible. If a question does not apply to your job, write "N/A" in the space provided.

When describing your regular duties in Part 1, try to list those that you spend the most time on first. This will help you get started and will also be helpful to the reader. Also, try to group together closely related responsibilities (e.g. "Participate in the selection, placement, and orientation of professional staff." or "Supervise all standarized testing programs in the building. Interpret test data to determine areas of strength and weaknesses of students and program; convey results to staff and develop strategies, as indicated."). Incidental tasks do not need to be listed.

The percent of total time spent on an activity need only be a rough estimate. This data is meant to portray the relative time spent on the various tasks/responsibilities of your job.

In the section on page 2 that covers licenses and certifications, please indicate only those that are required for the position, not those that you hold.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOULD BE COMPLETED AND GIVEN TO YOUR SUPERVISOR BY MAY 4, 1990.
APPENDIX E

ASSIGNMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE JOBS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. Principal</th>
<th>H.S. Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreman, Operations</td>
<td>Elem. Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supv. Transportation</td>
<td>M.S. Vice-Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. Ed. Supv.</td>
<td>H.S. Vice-Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. Area Supv.</td>
<td>Asst. Supv., Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>Supv. New Horizons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg. Manager</td>
<td>Fleet Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord., Data Process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. Principal</th>
<th>M.S. Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Principal</td>
<td>M.S. Vice-Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Principal</td>
<td>H.S. Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Supv. Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Subj. Area Supv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Manager</td>
<td>Purchasing Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Dir. Elem/Sec.</td>
<td>Supv. Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supv. Payroll</td>
<td>Bldg. Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elem. Principal</th>
<th>Elem. Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Vice-Principal</td>
<td>M.S. Vice-Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Principal</td>
<td>H.S. Vice-Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Manager</td>
<td>Supv. Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Specialist</td>
<td>Coord. Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start Coord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

JOB FACTOR DESCRIPTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS
CHECKING EVALUATIONS

It is unlikely that a properly evaluated job will have a higher complexity level than the knowledge level required.

It is unlikely that a properly evaluated job would decrease more than one job level (10-12%) if the supervisory points were deleted from the evaluation.

Standard or "benchmark" evaluations are established to provide anchors for the evaluation process. Benchmark jobs are selected from a cross section of the District's jobs and are characterized by their stability, visibility, and representativeness. These jobs are evaluated with care and deliberation in order to ensure solid reference points for the evaluation process. Subsequent evaluations are to be checked against the benchmark evaluations for reasonableness. If the relationship appears wrong, the benchmark evaluation should be considered the "right" one.

When comparing evaluations against a benchmark evaluation, each factor should be compared as well as the total points.
JOB EVALUATION

General Rules

- The Factor and level descriptions should be interpreted literally but also with reference to those of the next higher and lower levels. In other words, the description which fits best should be used.

- If a description closely describes the factor in the job being evaluated, the points indicated in Column "A" should be used. If the factor description is the closest one to the factor in the job but does not describe it fully, so that you feel pushed toward the next higher level, use the points in column "B."

- The normal or average duties, work flow, and conditions should be considered and not the extremes.
FACTOR EXPLANATIONS

I. SKILL

A. KNOWLEDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>These jobs are quite simple and require very little skill. The job skills can normally be learned within a week on the job. An elementary education is usually sufficient skill preparation for these jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>These jobs involve routinized tasks which often require the knowledge and use of simple machines or equipment such as a typewriter, adding machine, keypunch or data entry, snow blower, duplicating machine, fork lift, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>These jobs involve the use of more complicated procedures, skills, and/or equipment. Skills such as advanced shorthand, basic bookkeeping, etc. Equipment such as video camera, computer terminal, lathe, etc. Normally requires integrating tasks into the overall department operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A specialized vocational activity refers to skilled craft (electrician), advanced office skills, a vocational level knowledge of a professional field (advanced bookkeeping, paralegal, personnel interviewing, etc.). Also included is supervision of lower skill levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>These jobs normally require a college level education in a professional or technical field or advanced vocational skills broadened by extensive experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>These jobs normally require a college level education in a professional or technical field broadened by considerable related work experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>These jobs require professional, technical, or managerial expertise developed through extensive experience and training to the point of being an authority in the organization. Also included are positions which require expertise in several fields.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. INTER-PERSONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>These jobs require the normal courtesy and respect for others expected of any employee. Contact is primarily with co-workers and supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>These jobs require the normal courtesy and respect for others expected of any employee plus a moderate degree of tact. Contact is with employees, students, and the public on primarily routine requests or inquiries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>These jobs require more than normal courtesy and respect for others. They require sufficient tact and diplomacy to effectively handle regular contact outside the organization (i.e., with parents, community groups, etc.) on difficult and/or sensitive matters. Also included are jobs which require extensive supervision of students (i.e., classroom teacher).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>These jobs require, in addition to tact and diplomacy, the ability to persuade and motivate others, both inside and outside of the organization, to take desired action. These jobs are characterized by regular interaction with the Board of Education and the public on complex and highly sensitive matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. RESPONSIBILITY

A. COMPLEXITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rules are simple and instructions are fairly specific. Very little discretion is allowed or required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tasks are carried out following general work routines and instructions. Some discretion allowed within these parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tasks are varied and discretion must be used to accomplish them utilizing established procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The tasks and conditions are diverse and considerable discretion is allowed and required to accomplish them utilizing a variety of procedures within a framework of general instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The work objective and the fundamental principles of the discipline (teaching, accounting, social work, personnel, etc.) are the framework within which decisions are made and tasks are accomplished. The focus is on the objective rather than the procedures used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goals, policies, and Board directives are fairly specific but the incumbent must use considerable judgment in determining how to get the work done or solve the problem. The jobs are characterized by rapidly changing issues, problems, and requirements dealing with matters of significant importance to the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Within the framework of general board policy and long range goals, these positions must &quot;point the way&quot; by establishing more specific goals and objectives. Responsible for initiating changes in Board policy, district priorities, etc. in response to a variety of input from both inside and outside the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. DECISION-MAKING IMPACT

GENERAL

- The effect of the regular, day to day, decisions of the position is considered—not the extremes.
- The effect of decisions that are made are being measured—not the effect of decisions that should have been made that were not made (i.e. negligence).
- A work unit, for these purposes, is a subdivision of a non-school building department whose members are engaged in closely related work. A school building department should be considered a work unit for these purposes.
- A department, for these purposes, is a grouping of related work units, usually headed by a Director or a similar level administrator who reports to an Asst. or Assoc. Superintendent. The educational function and the support function in a school building should each be considered a department for these purposes.
- A major department, for these purposes, is a grouping of generally related but separate non-school building departments, usually headed by an Asst. or Assoc. Superintendent. A total school building should be considered a major department for these purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decisions made in these positions usually directly affect the quality or quantity of work produced by the incumbent or the work unit. The majority of decisions relate to how the work should be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decisions made in these positions usually directly affect the quality, quantity, and timeliness of the work of others in different work units. The majority of decisions are related to work execution with some work planning decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decisions made in these positions usually directly affect the success of a major department or school in meeting its objectives. Decisions are roughly balanced between planning and execution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decisions made in these positions usually directly affect the success of the District in meeting its objectives and mission. The majority of decisions are related to program and resource planning, allocation, and adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decisions made in these positions regularly affect the short- and long-term success of the District. Decisions are balanced roughly between those related to strategic plans and program and resource planning and allocation. Effects of decisions are characterized by a high visibility inside and outside the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. SUPERVISION

GENERAL

• Supervision means the responsibility for directing, training, controlling, and coordinating the efforts of subordinate employees. It also includes the responsibility for evaluating the work of such employees and counseling them, including the responsibility for disciplinary action. Work leadership, without the above responsibilities, should not be considered supervisory for these purposes.

• Direction of only one or two people is not considered supervisory for these purposes.

• Total number of employees are those in a direct reporting line (i.e., directly or through subordinates). Persons reporting functionally only are not counted for these purposes.

• Level of work directly supervised is governed by that performed by the majority of these employees reporting directly to the supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Directly supervises employees in positions which have a Level 1 knowledge requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Directly supervises employees in positions which have a Level 2 or 3 knowledge requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Directly supervises employees in positions which have a Level 4 knowledge requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Directly supervises employees in positions which have a Level 5 or 6 knowledge requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Directly supervises employees in positions which have a Level 6 or 7 knowledge requirement plus responsibility for large and complex departments and/or facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. EFFORT

GENERAL

- Effort relates to physical and visual fatigue producing activity but does not include "mental fatigue" that may be associated with complex jobs. This element has been considered as part of the complexity factor.

- Normal work flow or conditions should be considered--not the extremes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most professional, administrative, and many clerical positions will fall in this category. These positions are characterized by light physical requirements and the work pace is generally under the control of the employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jobs requiring light to moderate physical activity (intermittent or light lifting, operating light machines, etc.) or requiring moderate visual attention for long periods of time (i.e., label or form letter typing) or intermittent close visual attention, would fall in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Many craft, maintenance, stores positions requiring moderate but regular physical effort would fall in this category. Office jobs involving fairly continuous word processing, data entry, or drafting would fall in this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Positions doing essentially heavy labor (laborers, bricklayer tender, etc.) and office positions requiring protracted and very close visual attention would fall in this category.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACTOR CHARTS

#### I. SKILL

**A. Knowledge** - The basic knowledge and skill required for normal job performance. May be acquired through formal education, outside study, or training on jobs of lesser degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncomplicated and standardized work routines and/or simple skills acquired on the job. May require basic reading, writing, and arithmetic.</td>
<td>30/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Procedural and systematic proficiency involving skill in the use of methods, procedures, and/or simple equipment and machines.</td>
<td>40/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interpretive and/or mechanical skills in one or more basic areas plus a firm comprehension of departmental procedures. May require business, vocational school, or apprenticeship training.</td>
<td>55/65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Comprehensive skill in at least one involved specialized vocational activity plus a good understanding of the purpose of this work in the organization.</td>
<td>75/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Knowledge and skill in a specialized or technical activity plus a good grasp of how these activities affect both internal and external operations of the organization. Ability to apply principles and precedents in the field.</td>
<td>100/115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Broad knowledge of an advanced or technically specialized field including ability to apply knowledge to related fields. Usually characterized by postgraduate training and/or extensive experience.</td>
<td>130/150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outstanding competence or mastery of a specialized technical or managerial field gained through broad experience or extensive training.</td>
<td>175/200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. **Inter-Personal** - The requirement for skill in effectively meeting, dealing with, and influencing others inside and/or outside the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>% of Knowledge Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Normal courtesy and cooperation with other employees. Little or no contact with students or the public and normal contact with other employees.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Normal courtesy, cooperation, and tact in dealing with other employees, students, or the public. Frequent contact outside the immediate department and/or regular contact with the public on matters which are mainly routine.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Above average tact and diplomacy in dealing with other employees, students, and/or the public. Frequent requests for information from employees outside the immediate department and/or regular contact with the public on difficult or sensitive matters or extensive student supervision.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A high degree of tact, diplomacy, and persuasion in dealing with employees, students, and/or the public to secure desired action on matters which are regularly complex and highly sensitive.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. RESPONSIBILITY

A. **Complexity** - The responsibility for the use of judgment and for decision making considering the amount of procedural structure and the scope of the position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Routine or repetitive work involving the straightforward application of readily understood rules and/or instructions.</td>
<td>A 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work generally standardized but involving choice of action within limits defined by standard practice and instructions.</td>
<td>A 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally diversified work requiring judgment in the general application of established rules and procedures to problems not falling clearly or concisely within accepted standards or precedents.</td>
<td>A 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work involves the application of broad instructions and/or various procedures in the context of varying conditions and problems.</td>
<td>A 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work regularly requires judgment to apply factual background and fundamental principles in developing approaches and techniques for the solution of problems and/or meeting objectives.</td>
<td>A 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Actions governed primarily by established District goals or policies and Board directives. Considerable adaptability and judgment required to meet rapidly changing operational and/or functional requirements.</td>
<td>A 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Actions governed primarily by broad Board policy and principles, long-range objectives, and the public interest.</td>
<td>A 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Decision-Making Impact - The scope of decision making authority vested in the job and its impact on district operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The scope of decision making authority and organizational impact is limited. Effects appear mainly at work unit level.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The scope of decision-making authority and organizational impact is of a moderate level. Effects appear mainly at departmental level.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The scope of decision-making authority and organizational impact is important. Effects appear mainly at major department or total school building level.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The scope of decision-making authority and organizational impact is substantial. Effects appear mainly at total district level.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The scope of decision-making authority and organizational impact is of critical importance to the achievement of district objectives. Has broad and lasting effect on major goals and long range objectives.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Supervisory - The responsibility for supervision considering the total number of employees supervised, either directly or through subordinates, and the level and complexity of the work directly supervised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Number of Employees Supplied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employees perform uncomplicated and related work in several job areas, or perform uncomplicated but unrelated duties in same job area. Normal training period is 0-6 months.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employees perform uncomplicated but unrelated work in several job areas, or semi-skilled, or specialized clerical operations. Normal training period is 6-12 months.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employees perform vocational level duties in a variety of work situations.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employees perform specialized, professional or technical work, either highly complex or highly demanding.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Employees are responsible for large and complex functional areas, departments and/or facilities.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. EFFORT

A. Physical or Visual - The physical and/or visual factors in a job that produce fatigue. Both the amount of effort and the continuity of the effort are considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Continuity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical or visual effort is non-strenuous in nature and of light fatigue producing quality.</td>
<td>Work pace is generally under the control of the employee. Regular stops are possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work requires sufficient physical and visual effort so that moderate fatigue develops under normal work situations.</td>
<td>Work pace is not generally under the control of the employee but governed by a continuous process or machine. Stops are infrequent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work requires prolonged standing, walking, or repetitive movements, generally with close visual attention or appreciable physical effort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Requires physical work of a strenuous nature or extremely close, protracted visual attention on an exacting task of heavy fatigue producing quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. WORKING CONDITIONS

A. Physical - The surroundings or physical conditions under which the work is performed which tend to affect its desirability and the frequency of exposure to undesirable factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work place and surroundings are clean and pleasant. Normal office or classroom conditions.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some discomfort caused by such factors as dust, dirt, heat, cold, illumination, and noise.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significant discomfort caused by such factors as dust, dirt, heat, cold, illumination, and noise.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

PRACTICE JOB EVALUATION WORKSHEETS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Inter.-Pers.</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>D/H Impact</th>
<th>Supervisory</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Work Cond.</th>
<th>Total Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLERK-TYPIST I</td>
<td>2A 40</td>
<td>1B 4</td>
<td>2A 30</td>
<td>1B 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERK-TYPIST II</td>
<td>2B 45</td>
<td>2A 7</td>
<td>2A 30</td>
<td>1B 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL BUS DRIVER</td>
<td>2A 40</td>
<td>2A 6</td>
<td>2A 30</td>
<td>1B 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERK STENO. II</td>
<td>2A 55</td>
<td>2A 11</td>
<td>2A 40</td>
<td>2A 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMBER</td>
<td>3A 65</td>
<td>1B 7</td>
<td>2B 35</td>
<td>1B 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3A 14</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPN</td>
<td>3A 65</td>
<td>2B 13</td>
<td>2B 35</td>
<td>2A 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT. CLERK SUPER.</td>
<td>4A 75</td>
<td>2B 15</td>
<td>3A 45</td>
<td>2A 9</td>
<td>2A 10</td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTANT</td>
<td>5A 100</td>
<td>2B 20</td>
<td>4A 60</td>
<td>2B 15</td>
<td>2A 18</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELOR, SR. HIG</td>
<td>5B 115</td>
<td>3A 29</td>
<td>5A 70</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER (SCH. SCIENCES)</td>
<td>5B 115</td>
<td>3A 29</td>
<td>5A 70</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
POSITION INTERVIEWING GUIDELINES
POSITION INFORMATION INTERVIEWING

GENERAL GUIDELINES

Purpose

To clearly understand the position in order to be able to represent it to the Study Committee for evaluation.

Process

. Read position questionnaire

. Develop specific interview questions to clarify vague or ambiguous statements (i.e. ask them to describe, expand upon, or give examples)

. Review position questionnaire categories in order to clearly define:

  - reporting relationship, work week/year, location, etc. (also, length of time in current position)

  - which tasks are the most important (vs. time-consuming)

  - scope of authority, limits of authority

  - knowledge requirements - degrees, certificates, licenses, disciplines, procedures (also, how acquired)

  - laws, regulations, rules - need to know, controlled by

  - machines and/or equipment used - what, why, duration

  - inter-personal contacts - who, why, frequency

  - physical/visual effort - what, why, how long, how strenuous

  - working conditions, if not normal office or classroom - specific cause of discomfort and duration

  - supervision - number of subordinates, extent of supervision (i.e. administrative responsibility vs. work leadership), level of work directly supervised

  - significant changes in position within last year

  - "Anything else I need to know about your position in order to understand it better?"
APPENDIX I
BENCHMARK POSITIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Inter.-Pers.</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>D/M Impact</th>
<th>Supervisory</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Work Cond.</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*H.S. Principal</td>
<td>6B 150</td>
<td>3B 95</td>
<td>5B 80</td>
<td>3B 28</td>
<td>4E 29</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Elem. Principal</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>3B 39</td>
<td>5B 80</td>
<td>3A 24</td>
<td>4D 24</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Subj. Area Supv.</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>2B 26</td>
<td>5A 70</td>
<td>3A 21</td>
<td>4A 14</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Purch. Agent</td>
<td>5A 100</td>
<td>2B 20</td>
<td>4B 60</td>
<td>3A 18</td>
<td>2C 14</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bldg. Mgr.</td>
<td>3B 105</td>
<td>2B 13</td>
<td>3A 40</td>
<td>2A 8</td>
<td>2C 14</td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Accountant</td>
<td>4A 15</td>
<td>2A 11</td>
<td>2B 35</td>
<td>2A 7</td>
<td>2A 10</td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

JOB EVALUATION WORKSHEETS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Inter.-Pers.</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>O/H Impact</th>
<th>Supervisory</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Work Cond.</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Clem. Principal</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5B 80</td>
<td>3A 24</td>
<td>4B 24</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*N.S. Principal</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5B 80</td>
<td>3B 28</td>
<td>4E 29</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bldg. Mgr.</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3A 40</td>
<td>2A 8</td>
<td>2C 14</td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Dir. Food Service</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>3A 25</td>
<td>3B 45 2B 11</td>
<td>2D 17</td>
<td>1A 8 1B 8</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Accountant</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2B 35</td>
<td>3A 40 2A 8</td>
<td>2A 10</td>
<td>2A 12 1B 8</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Purchasing Agent</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3A 25</td>
<td>5A 10 3A 21</td>
<td>3C 14 1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>20 1B 8 299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Store Purchasing</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2A 8</td>
<td>2B 35 2A 7</td>
<td>1B 10 2A 12 2B 12</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Middle School Principal</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3B 39</td>
<td>5B 80 3B 26</td>
<td>4D 24 1A 8 1B 8</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. of Operations &amp; Security</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2B 17</td>
<td>3B 45 3A 14</td>
<td>2F 24 1A 8 1B 8</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Foreman</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2B 13</td>
<td>3B 45 2B 11</td>
<td>2E 24 1A 8 1B 8</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Inter.-Pers.</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>D/H Impact</td>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Work Cond.</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Plan Super.</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B 2B</td>
<td>5A 10</td>
<td>3A 25</td>
<td>4C 20</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Plan Coord.</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2B 23</td>
<td>4B 60</td>
<td>2B 15</td>
<td>4A 14</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Manager</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2A 11</td>
<td>3A 40</td>
<td>2A 8</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Manager</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2A 8</td>
<td>3A 40</td>
<td>2A 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans Sup.</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2B 17</td>
<td>3B 45</td>
<td>3A 14</td>
<td>2D 17</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start Sup.</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2B 23</td>
<td>5A 70</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td>4C 20</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordin. Sup. Early Child</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2B 23</td>
<td>5A 70</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td>4E 29</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Supervisor</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2B 15</td>
<td>2B 35</td>
<td>2A 7</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Dir. Elem. Early Ch.</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3B 45</td>
<td>5B 80</td>
<td>3B 28</td>
<td>5F 42</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. of Soc. Services</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3A 23</td>
<td>4B 60</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td>4C 20</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Inter.-Pers.</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>D/M Impact</td>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Work Cond.</td>
<td>Total Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. Area Supv.*</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>2B 2W 5A 70</td>
<td>3A 21</td>
<td>4A 14</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. Ed. Supv.</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>2B 2W 5A 70</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td>4B 17</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord. of Testing</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>2A 20 4B 60</td>
<td>2B 21</td>
<td>4A 14</td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord. of Research</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>2B 2W 5A 70</td>
<td>3B 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Mgr.</td>
<td>2A 55</td>
<td>2B 1W 3A 40</td>
<td>2A 18</td>
<td>2D 17</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supv. of Health Serv.</td>
<td>5B 115</td>
<td>3A 29 5A 70</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td>4D 24</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Vice Principal</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>3B 39 4B 60</td>
<td>3A 24</td>
<td>4D 24</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Vice Principal</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>3B 39 4B 60</td>
<td>2B 15</td>
<td>4C 10</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. of Staff Dev.</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>2W 2W 5A 70</td>
<td>3A 21</td>
<td>4A 14</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. New Horizons</td>
<td>5B 115</td>
<td>2B 23 5A 70</td>
<td>2B 18</td>
<td>4D 20</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 13</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Job Evaluation Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Inter.-Pers.</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>D/H Impact</th>
<th>Supervisory</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Work Cond.</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Transport</td>
<td>4B 85</td>
<td>2B 17</td>
<td>3B 45</td>
<td>2A 14</td>
<td>2D 17</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Purchasing Agent</td>
<td>4B 16</td>
<td>2B 17</td>
<td>2B 35</td>
<td>2A 7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Eval.</td>
<td>5B 115</td>
<td>2A 17</td>
<td>3B 45</td>
<td>2A 11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2A 12</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating/Adult Ed.</td>
<td>5A 100</td>
<td>2B 20</td>
<td>2B 35</td>
<td>2B 9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Supervision, Guidance, Maintenance</td>
<td>4B 85</td>
<td>2B 17</td>
<td>4A 50</td>
<td>3A 15</td>
<td>3D 20</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>2A 10</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Spec.</td>
<td>5A 100</td>
<td>3A 25</td>
<td>4A 50</td>
<td>3A 15</td>
<td>2B 12</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Speech/Lang.</td>
<td>4A 130</td>
<td>2A 24</td>
<td>5A 70</td>
<td>2A 18</td>
<td>4D 24</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Ed. Early Chld Spec.</td>
<td>6A 130</td>
<td>3A 33</td>
<td>4B 60</td>
<td>3A 18</td>
<td>4A 14</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>1B 8</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table contains evaluations for different job titles, with scores for Knowledge, Inter.-Pers., Complexity, D/H Impact, Supervisory, Effort, and Work Cond. columns.
APPENDIX K

FINAL JOB EVALUATION TOTAL SCORES AND RANKINGS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>INTERFERS</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>D/H</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>SUPERVisory EFFORT</th>
<th>D/h COMP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASST DIR ELEH/SEC EDUC</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR HIGH PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE SCH PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR HIGH VICE PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENT TECHNICAL</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENT PLANT &amp; MAINT</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEC EDUC</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DIR FOOD SERVICE</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST DIR TECHNICAL MATERIALS</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY EDUC COORD</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM EVALUATOR</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTANT</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING MANAGER</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVING MANAGER</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST PURCHASING AGENT</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUTE MANAGER</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Benchmark Positions

75% for Joint Supervision
50% for Shared Supervision
APPENDIX L

POINT FACTOR COMPONENT (PFC) SURVEY
Point-Factor Component Survey

PART I:

Please read the SURVEY STATEMENTS 1 through 37 on pages 2-10 and determine how much you disagree or agree with each statement. Indicate how much you disagree or agree by circling the number that corresponds to the statement.

The box to the right of your response is for you to check if you would like to make additional comments in Part II (see page 11).

Example:

I feel that...

1. ... I received adequate training to begin the job evaluation process.
SURVEY STATEMENTS

Your Name

A. The Position Questionnaire

I feel that...

1. ...the information given to the respondents completing the Position Questionnaire on the importance of accuracy and timeliness was effectively communicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

2. ...the directions given on the Position Questionnaire were clear and concise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

3. ...the respondents completed the Position Questionnaire in a timely manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>Several</th>
<th>Many</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments
4. ...the respondents who were late completing the Position Questionnaire may have had an unfair advantage over the other respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

5. ...the questions on the Position Questionnaire provided the information I needed to evaluate the jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

B. The Training

I feel that...

6. ...the general rules of the "factor and level descriptions and explanations" clarified the process sufficiently for me to do the job evaluation before beginning the practice sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

7. ...the practice sessions were effective for the job evaluations we were to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments
8. ...after the practice sessions, I clearly understood the "factor and level descriptions and explanations" of the job evaluation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. ...sufficient time was spent on practice sessions before beginning the actual job evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. ...the discussions during the practice sessions provided me with sufficient information to do the actual job evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. ...I clearly understood the evaluations to assign points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. ...the weighted points assigned in the factor charts (interpersonal and decision-making impact skills) were clear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. ...I clearly understood how to conduct the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. ...the location to do the job evaluations was appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. ...after participating in this process I was able to effectively evaluate jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. The Interviews

I feel that...

16. ...I had acquired the skills to interview the respondents effectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. ...there were enough positions interviewed (in similar or like positions) by all of the committee members to be able to evaluate the job position fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. ...as I interviewed more respondents, I became better in my interviewing techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

19. ...respondents were given equal time for the interviews I conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

20. ...if respondents were given more than the 45 minutes of time for the interview they received an unfair advantage in their job evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

21. ...the respondents I interviewed clearly understood the reason for the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

22. ...the respondents I interviewed completed their questionnaires thoroughly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments
23. ...after the interviews I clearly understood each job position well enough to present it for the committee's job evaluation review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. The Role of the Consultant

I feel that...

24. ...the training provided by the consultant was very thorough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. ...a sufficient amount of time was provided for the training by the consultant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. ...the consultant listened objectively to the presentation(s) by the committee members on our district's unique job positions' responsibilities and duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. ...the consultant influenced our decisions during the evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

28. ...the consultant presented unbiased information to the committee members during the evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

29. ...the consultant influenced our decision to select the benchmark positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments

E. Group Work Evaluation Scoring

I feel that...

30. ...committee member(s) exercised influence to convince others of their opinion on job evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments
31. ...compromises were made on the points assigned for a job evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. ...if committee member(s) made negative observations, comments or jokes based on the personality of the individual whose job was being evaluated, it affected my decision on the job evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. ...there was advocacy by the committee member(s) during the evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. ...if committee member(s) advocated on behalf of individuals rather than on the function of their job, it affected my decision on the job evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. ...member(s) were unwilling to compromise during the job evaluation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. ...if member(s) were unable to attend the job evaluation meetings it biased the outcome of the evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. ...the job evaluation process was effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check for comments
APPENDIX M

PFC SURVEY COVER LETTER
Dear Administrative Job Evaluation Colleague:

During the summer of 1990 we, as a committee of six, participated in an administrative job evaluation process under the guidance of Lee Anderson, job evaluation consultant. As one of the members of this committee, I will be describing this job evaluation process in detail and will make recommendations for improvement, based on your input and suggestions.

To begin, I would like you to take a few minutes to complete this survey. Please put your name on the survey and return it to me before January 15. I will then contact each of you for an interview, based on the survey you completed, to ask you questions about your responses for further clarification.

All of your answers and statements will remain confidential. It is the overall group assessment that will be reported. This study has met with the approval of Mr. Tom Stokes and the Human Resources Department.

Please return the completed survey in the enclosed envelope before January 15. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Sharon Orlins
APPENDIX N
TRANSCRIBED TAPES FROM INTERVIEWS
Transcribed Tapes from Interviews

To assure confidentiality and candid response, the five job evaluation committee members interviewed were each assured of anonymity. Therefore, each has been designated a letter, "A," "B," "C," "D," and "E." Any reference to another person's name in the interviews will be deleted or referred to as Jane or John Doe.

Interview with Working Committee Member "A"

S: We'll start with the first one and that was on the Position Questionnaire. You said you somewhat agreed on the question (#1) that the information given to the respondents completing the Position Questionnaire on the importance of accuracy and timeliness was effectively communicated. When you say you "somewhat agree" what do you think could have been done to have made it seem more important to the respondents? There were so many who didn't get it in on time, so many who didn't fill it out completely or feel it was important. What do you think could have been done to have insured that sort of thing from happening?

A: I don't know how many ideas I have on that. It probably would have had a greater impact if the person's supervisor would have given them the questionnaire and had explained to them the impact it could have regarding their placement on the salary schedule and that kind of thing. Part of the problem is that most of us are inundated with paperwork that it's just one more thing. I know for me, personally, and I'm sure it's true for a lot of other people, you end up doing the things first that have the highest priorities. If it's something that, months on down the road, might have some effect on you then...I didn't do my questionnaire in a timely fashion and I knew what it was about.
I think if it had been discussed it at the principal's meeting, got an explanation from the secondary or elementary director, or a committee member or the job consultant to have explained what it was all about, I think it would have had a little better impact.

Also, if it had been discussed at the cabinet meeting, that this was going to be coming out, and directors had been given it to distribute to their staff, I think it would have had a greater impact. I think it would also have had a greater impact if it had to be given back to their supervisors.

S: Okay. Those are suggestions that could have been done that would have made everyone take it more seriously, and maybe everyone would have filled out their questionnaire better.

You "strongly agreed" that the directions on the position questionnaires were clear and concise. Did you ever feel on your interviews that you needed to explain a little bit more to any of the respondents as to some of the things that maybe they didn't understand real well? I don't want to make any leading questions here.

A: I understand what you're saying. I think that most of the people I talked to had a pretty good understanding at what we were getting at. I guess the only questions I asked were for me to get at or to sort out in my mind what they were telling me.....trying to fit what they were telling me in with what I already knew about their jobs and make sure I didn't have any misconceptions about the job and also that they were not giving me some information that was not...for instance in "responsibility" and you say you do it all, that kind of thing...you didn't want to get into that situation either. So therefore, it was more me asking questions more for my own clarification more than explaining to them exactly what I was talking about.

S: Did you feel that when you went in there you had to explain to them why you were there for the interview?
A: Yeah, I think so because they weren't real sure why and it's not that it wasn't communicated necessarily, but if people were really busy and this wasn't a high priority for them. So I did have to give them a recap as to why we were doing this at all.

S: Did any of them feel threatened?

A: No, I don't think so. I think most people really enjoyed talking about their jobs. That was one of the positive things about the process, because most people welcomed the opportunity to tell somebody what they do because unfortunately, we as a school district, we seem to have a tendency to think "Well, I work hard, but nobody else does." It allowed people to, especially people in jobs that were unique, because most people pretty well know what a principal does because it's a well-known kind of job...but when you go out and talk to an administrator in charge of food service, that's a little different, because they don't get the attention necessarily and most of the things that they do are things the rest of us take for granted. It just happens. We don't think, "somebody had to do that" so they kind of enjoyed having the opportunity to be listened to about their jobs.

S: Regarding the people who handed in their questionnaires late, (#4) "they may have had an unfair advantage over the other respondents," and you said "undecided". Did you want to add anything to that?

A: I guess it's because I'm not sure. Part of what I'm working under is that I wasn't there for some of the sessions that occurred that summer so it would be hard for me to say that those people necessarily had an advantage. I'm not working from enough knowledge to know whether or not they do.

S: Now, you "somewhat agreed" that "the questions on the position questionnaire provided the information I needed to evaluate the jobs,"
(#5). I realize that the interview picked up a lot, but what I would like to know is, could there have been additional information on the position questionnaire itself that would have helped you more in your evaluation of the job? Can you think of anything that you might have liked to have seen elaborated on? Maybe not the position questionnaire, but some other vehicle, such as shadowing? Or somebody like a supervisor or someone doing something to show how much actual time was spent?

A: When you said supervisor... I don't think the supervisors paid much attention to this process either because some supervisors had specific people they really felt needed to be moved up and they would make an effort to try to support the position questionnaire in terms of having them considered for higher salary or higher ranking. But others, we really didn't get anything from them. But how you would have gotten that information, I think that could have been real helpful... to have had more information from their supervisor.

S: Maybe if they (the supervisors) felt it was more important...or maybe if the directors had spoken to the supervisors or someone from central office speaking to all of these people, emphasizing the importance of it? Could there have been more details on any of the position questionnaires? I know we came across one, "Who do you supervise?" Did you feel that was clear?

A: We didn't give a definition as to what we meant by "supervisor" and that could have helped on that one. I know we did run into some confusion on that one. People were counting people as people who were being supervised by them when they were actually supervised by someone else. In particular, people who are labelled as a "subject area supervisor", such as English, were counting all the English teachers in the district, when they were not their supervisors, their principal was. There was some real confusion there, as who supervises the teachers?
S: I remember that. Now, on practice sessions, you "strongly agreed" that they were effective on the job evaluation we were to do (#7). Did you feel that maybe some members of the committee could have benefited from more time or maybe individual time? Let's say you understand what to do (on the job evaluations) and committee member "B" understands what to do, but maybe committee member "C" still doesn't understand or there may have been someone on the committee who simply needed more time before we embarked on this task. Do you think there could have been that situation and if so, what would you recommend?

A: I guess I'm not sure if there was anybody that really felt that more time would have been of value to them. I guess one thing that I believe about practice, and I know we did a lot of practices, and the consultant would probably disagree with me on this, but I think it's more effective to be practicing in the arena in which you will be working than practice things that are just sort of "out there" some place for you. I think it's more meaningful for one thing and people take the practice more seriously. And, always remember, "Practice doesn't make perfect, perfect practice makes perfect." Practicing on jobs that are in the industrial or business area or whatever is just exercise to me. I think it's more meaningful and is taken more seriously when we're looking at positions - and maybe it could have been positions that were not necessarily ones we were going to rate later - but at least positions that are in the arena.

S: Like a teacher?

A: Right, like a teacher or a consultant or that type of thing or chief of operations in a middle school, some of the ones we weren't going to do, but at least were jobs that had relationships with some of the jobs we were going to do. I think, rather than more time, we could have spent less time on "getting ready" because I felt we moved so slowly and your mind begins to go off just because you don't have to keep up
with it. It was too slow and that made it hard to stick with it just because it was moving so slowly.

S: I'm backing up one here, "The general rules of the 'factor and level descriptions and explanations' clarified the process sufficiently for me to do the job evaluation before beginning the practice session" (#6) Before you began the practice sessions, did you understand what that was all about or did you need to have it entwined with the practice sessions before it had clarity for you?

A: I generally understood it. I do think I was better after practice, certainly.

S: So that part was basically okay for you?

A: Yes.

S: "The discussions during the practice sessions provided me with sufficient information to do the actual job evaluations" (#10). You "somewhat agreed" and I'm asking you, how could it have been better? How could you have obtained better information during the discussions? Would it have been better if we had each interviewed the same person? Or had two people interview the same person, whereas you might have picked up something the other person might not have picked up on?

A: Yes, that probably would have been helpful, but I don't know if time allowed something like that. I do think one thing that I would suggest that would have helped in the interviewing and I don't know if it relates to this question or not. It would have been better to bring people into the central administrative office to do the interviews, because what happened was 1) it would be convenient for them and 2) they were trying to do their work while they were doing this. That also contributed to them not taking it seriously. If they had been called into
the personnel office for their job interview, they would have looked at it a little differently, than if somebody just dropped by my office to talk to me for a few minutes.

S: You recommend the interviews be conducted in the personnel department to have given it more importance, sort of a "power play", so to speak. Now, I did have something about location as one of the questions, but the location I was referring to was the location where the training and evaluations were conducted. Do you feel it should have been located elsewhere, or was the location all right? (#14).

A: I agree, it would have been better had we gone out to another site because any time there is a meeting here (central administrative office) people are subject to being pulled out, whereas when you leave somehow people (your staff and others) figure out how to do it without you. If you want to do something, you have to be inaccessible.

S: Question #11 you didn't answer...."I clearly understood the directions given to assign points." It's back to the factor explanations given to the committee members.

A: I guess I would have to agree to that.

S: Would that be "somewhat" or "strongly agree?"

A: Strongly agree.

S: Do you have any comments or suggestions about the weighted points or the assignment of points? Do you feel that it was fair or equitable, the way it was done?

A: Yes, there were some things that I questioned at the time, for instance, the physical environment thing. I think if we had been evaluating jobs in an industrial setting where people have to work
under really grubby areas of work, that would have been a more pertinent factor to consider, but when we're looking at administrative positions, when 99.9% of us are sitting in an office someplace, for most of our day, I'm not sure how relevant that really is. I know the consultant has said he has used this for school districts and used it for companies, but I'm not so sure how tailored it was to a school district. I think it was more tailored to an industrial model.

S: Do you think that if another school district did a job evaluation that members of their committee should be people who would not have any vested interest? In other words, not be one of the people whose job is being evaluated?

A: Yes I do. It makes it really difficult. Whether you have people come in from other school districts (to be on the evaluation committee) or a combination from people in business and a school district, or whatever. There are people with human resource expertise in the city that could have done it, if they were willing to give that kind of time to it. It's kind of a lot to ask or expect you to volunteer to lower your own salary, if that would be the end result. That's kind of a tall order.

S: But it's my understanding that they aren't going to lower anyone's salary, but they are just going to "up" some people's salary.

A: Yes, I understand that, but there are some people whose jobs are being down-graded. And, salary not withstanding, it's difficult to stand out there and be objective and at the same time deal with that. Anything I say.... I know that I can't be 100% objective. That's a tall order.

S: Everyone on that committee, their position was being evaluated?

A: Right. You were the only one who was totally uneffected by all of this. Neither was the consultant.
S: Let me go on here. You probably understood how to conduct an interview as did others on the committee, due to the nature of their position, but what I want to say is, that while you clearly, "strongly agreed" that you knew how to conduct an interview, the concern I have is, what do you think about some of the other members of the committee? Do you feel there was enough preparation in the training for all members to equally go out there and begin interviewing? Do you think there should have been some special training for those who felt they needed it?

A: I don't think it's a matter of skill or non-skill. There is some difference whether you've done a lot of interviewing or you haven't done a lot of interviewing. The difference I see is that inexperienced interviewers tend to be high raters. Now, whether they (the committee members) needed more training or not, I don't know. They would have to determine that. Each person would have to say, "I feel comfortable with this," or "I'm not." or "I know what I'm doing or I don't. I'd like a little more information."

S: Do you feel the rules and guidelines were adequate (about interviewing) enough to go out there and begin to do some kind of interview?

A: I think it might have been helpful, and this again is true for most interviewers who are inexperienced, to have specific questions you begin with. Then, I think, as you get into the interview, other avenues open up that you see you had better explore and ask more questions. I think if we had had some standard questions that we all started with and then branched off, I think that would have been real helpful. As I said before, even for people who do a lot of interviewing, it's real helpful if you start at least with your standard kinds of questions and then go from there.
Okay. Now, let's hit #18. "As I interviewed more respondents, I became better in my interviewing techniques," you "somewhat agreed." Were there things as you went along that you found were some of the similar, or same things, you had to ask the next person you interviewed, based on the first person you interviewed? Did you become better?

Well, I think it's easier to interview for jobs you know a little bit about. But maybe that's not exactly true. Maybe they're harder because you're working off of a set of assumptions that may or may not be totally true, so maybe you're not as open to new information. When you interview a principal you have a pretty good feeling of what they do and probably you do. But there may be some things that might surprise you so maybe you're not as thorough with that job as you should have been. Whereas, a job you are totally unfamiliar with, you're a little more careful because you know if you're asked certain questions by the committee members you're going to have the answers for it from that person. I'd say there is probably more difference between knowing the job and not knowing the job than getting better at interviewing or not getting better. That would make me get better or worse, rather than the chronology of it.

Okay, (#19) "Respondents were given equal time for the interviews I conducted," you "strongly agreed." Do you feel that that was important that every candidate received the same amount of time for the interview?

Yes I do, but I don't think that happened. I think some of the interviews were longer than others and whether that's the interviewer's fault or the candidate...in some case it's the candidate's fault. A longer interview, I think, does have an effect.

Did it tend to sway you?
A. Yes. I think that that is why when we interview for jobs, when we make judgments for ten people, that they all be given the same amount of time to impress you with how good they were or whatever. I think an hour interview can have a much greater effect than one you interviewed for a half an hour.

S: Moving right along (#22) "The respondents I interviewed completed their questionnaires thoroughly." What I want to ask you are were there any similarities between those who hadn't finished it thoroughly, other than the supervisor question. Were there any other areas you can think of that needed improvement?

A: No, they just hadn't done it (filled out the questionnaire thoroughly).

S: I was just wondering if there had been a pattern?

A: No, it was just a matter of people not wanting to do it.

S: This is sort of a general question, "After the interviews I clearly understood each job position well enough to present it for the committee's job evaluation review." (#21). You "somewhat agreed" on that. My question to you is, what could have been done in this process to have made a person's job better understood by you and the members of the committee?

A: That supervisor thing would have been helpful. That was one thing, I think. I think about one person's job and I thought I pretty much understood what she did - that I had the right perception of what she did based on what she told me in the interview. But there was something that wasn't understood and the consultant especially questioned it and I had to go back to her and ask her again. I did, and that was okay. That's the only incident I can think of that there was some question about the information.
S: Now, did you learn about various job functions that you were previously unaware of before that surprised you or enlightened you about their job responsibilities?

A: Yes, I think this person's job I referred to would have qualified on that. I kind of had a vague notion of her job responsibilities. I didn't realize the structure of who did what. One of those director type things, taken things for granted. That was something that "yes, that gets done," but it never occurred to me that somebody is doing that.

S: Now, on the role of the consultant(#24). "The training provided by the consultant was very thorough." You "strongly agree" and you felt there was sufficient time (#25). I already asked you this, what about other members of the committee? You felt comfortable with the training and the amount of time given to it, but what I'd like to ask you, is, if this was to be done all over again, what would you have changed about the whole training, other than not so much time spent on it. Is there anything about the training itself? And you also talked about having it within the arena, the practice being within the arena (of education).

A: Yes, the focus of the practice being in the arena, related to those we were going to be doing.

S: Is there anything you can think of that you would like to have seen done differently?

A: Well, the only other thing I can think of, and it just occurred to me, when we rated jobs, in practice, we were not working off that same position questionnaire. We rated jobs off job descriptions when we actually did it. It would have made sense to me to have had that same position questionnaire on "John Doe," some other position and then worked off that questionnaire and maybe a simulated interviewer information and then the practice would have been a little more true to
what we were actually going to have to do. But when we practiced, we relied on what he (the consultant) told us and then a job description, which was not quite the same thing as the position questionnaire.

S: Okay. Now, (#26) "The consultant listened objectively to the presentation by the committee members on our district's unique job positions' responsibilities and duties" and you "somewhat disagreed." So, I'd like you to tell me more about that one, as to how you felt about his input regarding our unique job positions. You stated you didn't feel he listened objectively or at least you "somewhat disagreed" that he did.

A: I got the feeling on several occasions that he had already decided in his mind on which way that job would go and he just had to chip away at us until we agreed. He could say, "Well, another district so and so and so and so..." Well, that may be true, but we're not other districts and I guess sometimes I had a little better knowledge of the job. I guess I had some concern over the fact that he would decide in his head it was just like some other job in Podunk, Iowa or wherever and it was going to be rated on the same basis as it was rated elsewhere. Not that there shouldn't be some consistency. If the two jobs are the same, I would say, "Yes, they should be rated similarly." But one thing I've found about school districts,..there are very few jobs that you take out of one district and plug into another district and say they are exactly the same job, because we realign responsibilities differently from district to district. So you can't make those kinds of transfers. I got the feeling that there were some areas of responsibility in administration that he didn't see as being very important.

There was some manipulations going on, that was obvious. Sometimes you felt like you were taking a test and we were suppose to guess the right answer and if you didn't guess it, he (the consultant) would just keep wearing you down until you would give up, basically.

S: Okay. "The consultant influenced our decision during the evaluation" (#27). You "strongly agreed" about that. Do you have any
recommendations as to how an outside consultant should have handled things?

A: I'm not sure what a better way would have been. I just don't think he should have had any more weight than anybody else. The one thing he failed to consider is that all of us came with our biases and blindspots and he failed to acknowledge his own. My biases and blindspots could be ameliorated by the other committee members. They could point out, "Hey, you're way off base on that" or "Let's look at it this way," but when you've got the chalk (referring to the consultant) and your statement is wrong,... well, you're the teacher and your biases and blind fall through. They're not averaged in.

S: So that would be your recommendation, that he (the consultant) should have set those (his biases and blindspots) aside and let us...

A: Either that or kept quiet. Or if you want to have some influence, you (referring to the consultant) sit down at the table with the rest of us and we take turns up there (at the chalkboard). For instance, today is my turn and I'll write down the score. I'll say what I think. Tomorrow is another member's day. He'll write down the scores and he'll say what he thinks.

S: So, the person who's holding the chalk is holding the power?

A: When you retain control of it, then it comes out flavored with your biases. When you have the chalk you can edit, or reword it just a little bit.

S: What about the benchmark positions(#29)? How do you feel about those? ("The consultant influenced our decision to select the benchmark positions.") How do you feel about the positions that were selected by him?
A: I guess I don't disagree with the selection of those particular positions, I don't have a problem with that. Of course, I don't think we were far enough along to say, "We want to select the benchmark positions."

S: So you feel his expertise came in handy then, because we hadn't been trained well enough by then?

A: Yes, I didn't have any trouble with that one.

S: Now, about advocates among the committee members themselves. (#30) "Committee members exercised influence to convince others of their opinion on job evaluations." You "strongly agreed." What I want to ask you is, "Do you feel is was okay to advocate for someone else?"

A: Oh yes. I think that's okay, as long at the committee sees themselves as equals and that there is not a committee member who is constantly changing other people's votes. If you have as much influence over my vote as I do over yours, I think that's fine.

S: Okay, we're almost done. (#31) "Compromises were made on the points assigned for a job evaluation." Do you think it was equally done or justifiable with the compromises? Do you feel comfortable with that?

A: I think compromises have to be a part of it, otherwise we would still be sitting in there fighting about it.

S: What if there weren't compromises and they had just averaged the scores? Would you have been comfortable with that? You stick with your guns and I'll stick with mine?

A: No, I think there's a synergistic outcome when you compromise. Compromise doesn't necessarily mean I'm giving up my position. Compromise means there were things I failed to consider and you
pointed them out to me and I've moved closer to where you are because of the information you've given me.

S: Do you feel that during these compromises the consultant exercised undue influence? Or did the committee members compromise because of this influence?

A: I guess I think that he did exercise some influence. I'm trying to remember at what point he put down what the "right answer" was. Yes, I do think he exercised undue influence, although I can't remember exactly how that happened.

S: What about the "outlander" type of person, the person who was way out there (in scores) compared to the majority of the committee, who were pretty tight, and he (the consultant) would point out "Okay, John, explain why you scored it this way?" He would point to this person to have them justify their position. How do you feel about this?

A: Probably 75% of the time that was okay, but 25% of the time that person may be the one that was right. Just because more people are voting one way doesn't mean that they're necessarily right. Just because you're the only one, doesn't mean that they are wrong. That's not a good idea, to think that. A lot of people could be wrong at the same time.

S: Okay, so you think it was a good strategy to have him (the consultant) make you justify your position if you were the odd man out?

A: It puts that person on the spot. We're still in the teacher-classroom mentality, of "Everybody had the right answer but you, John. Now what's wrong with you?" So, no, I don't necessarily think that's a good strategy, because it really puts you on the spot and even if it's just in the interest of time, you're likely to fold your tent, because you don't
want to be the one holding it up. Most of the time that's probably okay, but some of the time what you're doing is discouraging any kind of diverse opinion. And yes you could beat us all until we're in a tight little...but is that real or because we were coerced into being there? I don't know?

S: Okay, (#32) "If committee members made negative observations, comments or jokes based on the personality of the individual whose job was being evaluated, it affected my decision on the job evaluation." You strongly disagreed. My question is, do you think there should have been some ground rules made or do you think the consultant should have stepped in when we were getting a little tired and....

A: Well, I think maybe ground rules probably would have been good, but as far as stepping in, I don't think that was his role. I think any one of us could have said, "Hey, guys, let's get back on it..." Because he wasn't our dad.

S: While you didn't feel it influenced your decision, do you think it could have influenced some of the other committee members on their decisions?
A: I don't know. I would certainly hope not. I guess that's all I can say.

S: Okay, (#34) "If a committee member advocated on behalf of individuals rather than on the function of their job, it affected my decision on the job evaluation." You "somewhat disagreed."

A: I guess the reason I said "somewhat" was because sometimes it was hard to tell whether they (the committee members) were advocating for the person or the job. If they could couch their terminology so it appeared to be advocating for the job instead of the person, yes it could have been influenced.
S: Do you feel personalities got in the way of the job evaluations?

A: No, I don’t really think so.

S: Okay. If that did happen, and you said you don’t want the consultant to act like dad, should he have stepped in if it did happen - if personalities got in the way of the job evaluations?

A: Again, I think I would have to say the same thing, yes he would have that responsibility, but I don’t think his responsibility would be any greater than any one elses.

S: Okay. (#35) "Members were unwilling to compromise during the job evaluation process." You stated you "strongly disagreed."

A: Everyone did (make compromises.) Should they have? We should have more time, but it was a matter of fatigue by the committee members to "get it over with." I think this was a factor.

S: You responded "undecided" to question #36 "If members were unable to attend the job evaluation meetings it biased the outcome of the evaluations."

A: I didn’t know how to respond to that question because I was one of the committee members who had to be pulled away from the evaluations. It was is the busiest time for me. Wrong time of the year. I guess I would have to say that pulling people away didn’t help the evaluations.

S: Last question, "Did you feel the job evaluation process was effective?" (#37.) You stated that you "somewhat agreed."
A: Yes, but it was just two committee sessions too long. Cutting down on the number of jobs to evaluate would have helped. We were all tired. We just wanted to finish.

Interview with Working Committee Member "B"

S: I'm going to start with the section on the position questionnaire. How could it have been more easily understood by the respondents?. So, the first question (#1) "The information given to the respondents completing the Position Questionnaire on the importance of accuracy and timeliness was effectively communicated." You "somewhat disagreed" that it was not effectively communicated on the importance of it. What I want to ask you is, one of the things you commented on was, "Clear information of the end results of the study would have been helpful to the respondents." My question to you is, did you find that you spent a large part of the time explaining to your interviewees what the job evaluation was all about?

B: I did, as a matter of course. It was almost my opening statement because I wanted to make sure they knew where I was going and why I was there.

S: How do you think it should have been better explained?

B: I think the whole process...the purpose should have been explained in the right settings. For example, all of the elementary principals should have been told, "You're going to be getting this and it may seem redundant, but it is extremely important you do this the best way you know how. And all 40 of them are going to be different, and I don't want them the same. I want you to be together to think...because, here's what we're going to do with them, we're going to look at them, we're going to interview, we're going to put all of these job
classifications in order and it might possibly affect the salary structure. Because it was very clearly stated, there were three or four objectives that the Board had. Even the building managers and especially the ones out of range... they tended to, well, it affected the way they did their jobs.

S: So you're saying each group should be taken individually. Okay. Question #4, "The respondents who were late completing the position questionnaire may have had an unfair advantage over the other respondents." You "somewhat disagreed." You felt it didn't make any difference?

B: I don't think it made much difference. Also, they didn't know what it was going to be used for. So maybe that's an advantage - of not letting them know what this was for.

S: You "somewhat agreed" that (#5) "The questions on the position questionnaire provided the information I needed to evaluate the jobs." Can you think of anything besides using the position questionnaire that may have provided you more information to evaluate the jobs?

B: You mean after it was written? Nothing comes to mind. Because I wouldn't know what area to suggest for them to write about because the follow-up interview clarified that which needed clarifying anyway. You're never going to write it perfect. If you try to be more specific in one area you're going to miss something, or area, with the next person's job.

S: "Do you feel the position questionnaire... do you feel the definitions were clearly stated?"

B: Some of it seemed one and the same, as I recall.
S: I was thinking of something like, "Who do you supervise?" for example. Did you think that was clearly stated or defined. It seems like a supervisor, of let's say, math or science...I supervise all the math teachers or science teachers...

B: I think a clarification could have been made in terms of "supervisor." I think we need to make a distinction "who do you give the assistance to, who do you evaluate or how many?" I think separating out supervision and evaluation is tough to do, but that's what we're looking for. Who are you actually in charge of, in other words, looking at negative side who would you be able to fire? She may be a part of that, but somebody in line administration would actually be responsible for this. She could put down, "Well, I'm in charge of all 40 elementary math teachers" but when you ask, "Who do you evaluate?" Well, that clears it up.

S: Okay. (#11) "I clearly understood the evaluation to assign points." You said you "somewhat agreed." You commented you had a better understanding after doing some real jobs. Do you think the practice sessions could have been better designed so that you would have more thoroughly understood the assignment of points?

B: No, I don't think so. Again, it's just like an athlete practicing and practicing. Getting into the ball game is where it's at and we just had to go through that. I was frustrated with the length of time, at first, how long this was taking for the training, but I soon discovered how necessary it was and I was glad we took that much time to do it. But I think getting into it, actually do some real ones (job evaluations,) real numbers on real people started to work and that was the necessary part.

S: Do you think it would have been helpful if we had practiced on jobs that were more similar to the jobs we had to evaluate....let us say, for
example, practicing on evaluating teachers instead of evaluating jobs in businesses or those that were outside of the educational field?

B: That didn't cross my mind at all as being a detriment. Because I was looking at in terms of learning what we were looking for in terms of "knowledge," what was important in terms of "decision-making" impact. So I guess it didn't matter who we practiced on for my concern.

S: Okay. On the interviews, (#16) "I feel that I had acquired the skills to interview the respondents effectively." You "strongly agreed." My question is this, "You have done a lot of interviewing, so you didn't feel you needed a lot of training, but did you think that the consultant assumed that all the members of the committee came with that same ability?

B: Yes., because as I recall, the most helpful thing he gave me, in terms of interviewing - because there wasn't one thing - is to ask, "how." I don't know what day it was, but I recall somebody bringing that up. He simply stated you would have to read what they wrote and here is what we need to know. You needed the interview to make up the gap. And that was all I needed. But I think you're right, because I've had experience interviewing, but yet when I think back on it, that was a component, in general, that was slighted...."how to interview" or "how to get to..." There are certain questions to ask to get the information you want. There could have been some general things, how to write them down, for example: "If you need this information, you should ask this question..." And he might have done this a couple of times, a couple of things - how to ask, nothing formal, more incidental.

S: Let us say that half of the members came into the committee with the same interviewing information that you did, they had all of that experience.... what would you recommend, let us say, if XYZ district, if they should like to do this, or if Des Moines would do it again?
B: Okay, I would use the people in the group to help the others out. Maybe have a brainstorm session, if that's the right term, in terms of just going into some (interviewing) scenarios. Have people who aren't comfortable with it (the interviewing process) go through a job description and know - I am black inking this and this and this. - how would you three go about getting the answers to these questions? I think that would be helpful. I think it would also give us some more standardizations. Plus if the consultant would give us some more formal training, I think it would be a nice break in the types of training we had.

S: Okay. Next (#19) "The respondents were given equal time for the interviews I conducted." You said you "somewhat agreed." My question is, what, if any effect did it have on your presentation on the administrator's job. Would it have just been a matter of clarifying that job, giving them more time or given them a better edge for you to advocate for them?

B: I'm trying to stay away from advocacy. Those that I took longer with were for two reasons: 1) One of them was clarity because their questionnaire was fairly sketchy so it took longer for me to ask questions to understand what it was that I had to know; 2) The second reason that I took so long with some of mine was pure interest, in that the job entailed much more than what they wrote. And that started to come out in the interviewing, so I had to get clarification. I was unaware of some of the things and it didn't come out early, so I guess it was how they wrote it, but I got to it a different way. I think with some I was just interested as a colleague, but regarding advantage, time taken, no, I felt we were controlled fairly well by the questionnaire they wrote, which everyone had a copy of, and the notes we took during the interviewing process.
S: I'm glad you mentioned that, about how everyone on the committee received a copy of the person's position questionnaire and the notes we took during the interview.

Now, question #21, "The respondents I interviewed clearly understood the reason for the interview." What I want to ask you is, what recommendations would you make, by verbal explanation or the instructions on the questionnaire?

B: I want to go back and tie that one in (with the first question) with explaining the purpose and explaining the instrument. We have these people together and put the two together and explain, "We want to know everything you come up with." If people had a thorough understanding of what percentage of time, I think that could have been explained very thoroughly and easily and we would have gotten more results on that section. Again, if they had all been pulled together and if we had introduced the process as deduction, deductive reasoning. "So, do you spend 80% of your time on it?" (And they respond,) "Well, I don't know?" Well, the thing is they do know! Do you spend 80%?" And they'll say, "Well, no, that's ridiculous." Well, you see, you do know. You really can come within a range and not just say, who knows? So with that, given that explanation, plus the scope of it, plus the instructions, it would help.

S: Okay, (#26) "The consultant listened objectively to the presentation(s) by the committee members on our district's unique job positions and responsibilities and duties." You "strongly agreed" and commented that you felt he brought much of his experience and expertise with him. And this kind of ties in with question #27, "The consultant influenced our decisions during the evaluations." You responded again, that there was some input but it was not an unfair situation. Do you think there were some decisions that he may have used from other school districts that were maybe more uniquely ours? What I'm trying to get at is, do you think he tried to lean us toward
some things that he was just comparing from his experience that may not have been comparable to those in our system?

B: Yeah! I think his lack of knowledge of certain positions was a factor and I think he was up front about it, telling us he didn't have much experience to guide us in certain positions. He would make a statement like, "Well, I've looked at those in four or five districts and they're all different so I really can't tell you anything." I think that the group (the job evaluation committee members) should have been stronger, more verbal in explaining, "Now, here's how we see it here." And then my guess is that it would have influenced the numbers upward in the job evaluations on those unique job positions. His experience tended to temper or make it more conservative even though the group was conservative as a whole. I think some of those - he lacked a lot of experience, he didn't have a clear picture of the job - that he would tend to kind of suppress where we going with it.

S: Okay. We're almost done. (#29) "The consultant influenced our decision to select the benchmark positions." You said, "He did select the benchmark positions!" My question is, 'Do you feel we should have had more input on selecting the benchmark positions, or do you feel it's the way it should have been?"

B: No, I think it was done properly. I think it was done the best way. I think that we could have had six different opinions on what a benchmark was and here's where I think - this is why we paid the guy - it was for the experience. And I didn't disagree with his decisions. He adjusted them. But I would not have wanted to have had anything to do in selecting the benchmarks. Not that I see that they are any more important than any of the others, but that's the pivot around which everything else revolves. And I think he had a more global picture of that than maybe one of us or collectively, any of the six of us could have had.
S: Last question, (#36) "If members were unable to attend the job evaluation meetings, it effected the outcome of the evaluations." You answered that you were undecided. Do you want to add anything to that? Do you have any recommendations as to how we might be able, if we were to do this again, insure maybe better attendance among the committee members for the job evaluations. Now, I'm thinking of location. My concern is that there were three people there that were central office staff and we were located at the central office. People knew where they were and could pull them out of our meeting.

B: Yes, I noticed that. It was very convenient to do that. During the summer if we had been a neutral site we could have everyone bring in their lunch and we could get the job done. Again, when you talk about six people and you take one away, it takes away a big percentage. I know we had a lot of inter-rater reliability after our practice sessions, and we were fairly even in our compromises, I felt. But we're losing a lot when there was a person missing.

S: Going back to #36, you were undecided...Do you think it probably did (effect the outcome of the evaluations?

B: I think my response in terms of percentage, and I don't know my math very well, about 16% if one person was absent....that's almost one/fifth. That's a big chunk. But it's 1/6 of the total outcome and that's significant. I always put it in terms of money and it's 16% of the total ? (couldn't get this word). And I always perceive committee assignments as ....one of the four or five committees I'm on was... the charge for the committee was a little fuzzy, the membership of the committee was vast, and our direction isn't real clear and our checkpoint time wasn't real clear, consequently, not much is getting done. And so, it's dragging on and it's not fun and a lot of people are not showing up. But most of the committees I'm on, except that one, we have a pretty clear direction. Well, we want to begin. We didn't have any specific job, we had what, a hundred, or how many, 40 or 50
positions we had to get done? And we had to rank them. Now here's what had to be done, that set the seriousness and purpose, so if it's serious enough to want to get it done, then be there!

S: Getting back to the importance of this whole thing, obviously, these people that are being interviewed, do you think if it had been requested, "You need to come into the personnel office at 2:00 Friday or 1:00 Thursday," - give them some choices, you know, according to their schedules - you know, when you come into personnel for an interview, it says, "This is important", whereas, when I come into your office.....

B: I didn't feel that it was a determent to me and to the people I interviewed, especially when I did a building manager. I think it was a lot more comfortable to sit there in this office. Plus a couple of times he went to his notebooks - because I said, "What is this?" And he would say, "Here it is." "Ah, okay, I got it, I understand." If he was downtown he would have had a harder time. That's for some of them, not for all of them. I also felt that since we were asking for their time and compromised that by saying, well, we'll come to your place and give them the responsibility for setting up the time.

However, maybe we should have all had a canned opening statement and on our yellow pads or whatever, had it taped, for the interviews, da,da,da,da,da, and we would have all said the same thing so that there was no question as to misinterpretation....I don't know. It comes off cold sometimes, but I think if it was worded right, and if it had been stated properly, I think it would have been very powerful.

S: All right. Now, I just want to go through this quickly. You "strongly disagreed" that "Committee members made negative observations, comments, or jokes based on the personality of the individual whose job was being evaluated, it affected by decision on the job evaluation" (#32.) You "strongly disagreed" that there was advocacy by the committee members during the evaluations (#33.) By advocacy, I'm going to clear that up. I mean, that we were that person's
representative, and in a way, it was up to us to let the committee members know - not that we were promoting that person over anyone else - just that we their spokesperson. That's what I really meant by "advocacy." Do you think there should have been advocacy?

B: No, because this was an extremely fair process and I believe that. When we talked about the humor part of it, we had fun with it and made jokes about it, but we understood exactly where we were coming from. Because there were little jabs here and little innuendos about this or that and we laughed at each other and we laughed at each other's positions. I don't think it made a bit of difference. I also think there was a very subtle and clear understanding that when somebody was presenting something, and they seemed to go on, just try to draw them back. And I think that we understood that. I felt that way.

S: A couple more general thoughts I'm having that I have asked others, "Do you feel that people (referring to committee members) who didn't understand the process or parts of the training - maybe the points, maybe the factor and level descriptions - and let's say half of the committee members did understand it or let's say most of them did, maybe even five out of the six understood it, and one didn't quite get it yet, or didn't quite feel comfortable doing it (the job evaluations,) even though they had practiced and practiced.... do you think the consultant, or someone, do you think anything could have been done to have given that person more training so that they would feel comfortable doing this process?

B: No. The very nature of the process doesn't lend itself to that. What we're looking for is a group consensus. For one person to do a one-on-one (more training just for one person) doesn't "fit". There might be some specific interpretations or meanings that could be taken care of on a one-on-one, such as "So, explain to me what this "effort" thing is, I misinterpreted it." Or the scores may be way off on the "Knowledge" aspect. Say, "So, explain to me where are you coming from on that?"
But as far as the elements of the rating, I think it has to be a practice with the group. I think I can use the analogy that we view this as a classroom here, teaching a class math and it's a chapter test. You've got 77 or so kids who understand it. The rest of you come back until we get it mastered. I think that by just being in the process, you'll get better. Yet, I think the safety net for that is the "sore-thumbing" position. In our very last session, he (the consultant) called it the "sore-thumbing" position, where, if anybody has got a sore thumb, if there is a problem with somebody's placement - and it's my guess, we went back and changed a couple of the early positions because, "Oh, I had some rethinking about that one" - I know we changed some.

S: Thank you. I think we've covered it all. You made it very clear what your suggestions were on part II of the survey, so I didn't have all that much to ask you. I think that's it.

Interview with Working Committee Member "C"

S: The first part of the Point-Factor Component Survey is on the position questionnaire. Question #1 is "The information given to the respondents completing Position Questionnaire on the importance of accuracy and timeliness was effectively communicated."

C: I think the whole group or the group as a whole did not take the Questionnaire seriously as it turns out that it is but I don't know how you change things either.

S: Do you think it could have been communicated better, maybe by their supervisor or somebody?

C: There again you are getting into the area where it's a free input type of thing and I don't know that getting the superintendent or the
supervisors involved would make any difference, I just don't know the answer.

S: Do you want to say you are undecided then?

C: I know what I want to say but I don't know the answer. I know the question but I don't know the solution.

S: You don't have to have the solution. I just wondered if they had enough information?

C: I think they had enough information for accuracy but I just don't think people knew how important it was.

S: Do you think that if they knew it was going to affect their salary, do you think that would have made a difference?

C: I think it would have but then I think people would have been very defensive. I think it was a two-sided sword. I know what the problem is but I don't know the answers.

S: Do you think that if it had been communicated that nothing was going to be taken away from them but that it was going to upgrade some people's salaries and no one was going to be receiving less than they were, do you think that would have been less threatening?

C: Well, I think they should have been right up front with them because to me that is the best policy.

S: (#5.) "The questions on Position Questionnaire provided the information positions rather than providing good information to explain their jobs."
C: I think what they tried to do is give me "I am so important stuff" about their job and I guess that is OK. It was hard to try to separate that from, "What's the milk and what's the cream?" I am not an expert and I think I had a hard time with that was to make a judgmental call because I don't know. I don't think any of us know really, to that I guess. It was just really hard to make that judgment call as to what was really important and and what wasn't.

Also, a lot of the people did pretty much what I thought they did. I had a preconceived notion of their job before I went in to interview. Some of them did not help me at all. They had a patronizing attitude. Especially a certain person. "What do you want to hear? You want to hear this? OK, then I will tell you that."

S: Again, that goes back to the importance of this job evaluation study.

C: Yes, and that kind of bothers me. It sets my mind set as to how I was going to judge it. I was probably somewhat harder on those people than on others.

S: Did it bias your input to the committee?

C: Sure but then that is just human nature and I don't know how you will get rid of that.

S: Did you think that your feelings influenced your advocacy? Such as discovering all their job responsibilities and feeling you have to get that across to the committee?

C: That's one of the things that bothered me with the consultant. There is a point where you fight for something then there is a point when you are making a stand or a statement. Well, that to me was not necessary. Because if you feel that strongly about it, sure, you are going to make a stand. And if you really feel that strongly about this position, I think you are entitled to make a stand. You are their advocate. But he is
saying "You can be their advocate but don't go this far." Well you can't have it "either" "or." I thought that's what we were there for. And that is one of things with him that I had a disagreement with.

S: With that same question is there anyway we could have approached it in a different way where they (the administrators being interviewed) would not have felt defensive?

C: I think it all goes back to the importance (of the study.) The ones who really put the time and effort in it, they were good interviews and good outlines basically. Now the ones that were skimpy were indifferent or condescending. And when you look at their outline, it was very sketchy.

S: Do you think it might have been that some of the administrators didn't know how to fill it out?

C: Well, that might have been. I think part of it was the people that had the most trouble with it were "noncertificated people." I think as a whole they felt more insecure.

S: I want to get into that area of the certificated vs the noncertificated personnel, later. I want to ask you more about that one. Let us say that everyone on the committee understood and grasped the concepts to do the job evaluation study except for one person who was having difficulty with it. What do you think should have been done in this case when most are ready to go on one person isn't?

C: I think sometimes as we went along I think maybe we needed to go back and review.

S: Do you mean on the actual job evaluations?
C: Yes for two reasons: 1) because you get a kind of mindset. You go for days and grade real hard and then there are days when we graded real easy. I think it showed in some of our grading scale. I think if we had gone back and said, "OK folks lets go back again and look at the criteria we're using and try to get more consistent" that would help us. I think there were some days when my brain sort of went "click." I will admit it. Then there were other days when I would set my jaw and come "hell and high water" I was not going to change. So I think if we went back and reviewed and said "Lets just see where we are at," it would have helped. I definitely don't think we need to - I had a problem in going back and regrading people because I think we had real problems when we did that. I think once it's graded, it is graded and that's it.

S: I am not in the right order on this question, but it has to do with what you are saying. (#27) Do you think the consultant used undo influence with us?

C: I definitely think he was. I feel like we, the committee members, were being led. He is supposed to help when we asked, but I felt he was leading us.

S: So, this could have effected your decision-making?

C: It could have but it didn't. I was asked to be on this committee and I am going to state my opinion.

There is one thing I would like to say and that is that I wish some of the committee members had kept the (old) salary schedule in their pocket. One member pulled that salary schedule out and I said, "Put that salary schedule away!" I don't think we should look at people's salaries because I don't think that was right. We are suppose to evaluate these positions on their own merits and not what has been done prior to this and where people "fit" based on prior salaries.
S: Do you think using committee members who had a personal take in this made any difference? For example, if another school district decided to use this job evaluation study, should they use committee members who are administrators in their own school district or should they use someone from another school district or people in a business area who would look at this objectively with...

C: I don't think business would be good at all, they would not have any understanding of school business.

S: What about similar school districts?

C: I could to some extent, but then again how do you tell somebody who says, "If they don't have noncertificated people"... how do you tell? Everybody knows what a principal does. Let's take John Doe for example... when he came in, he was a warehouseman. But he knows where everything is and what goes out. It may not be in an educational sense, but he sure keeps things going.

S: And he supervises people.

C: We would have the same trouble if we went into another school district. I am sure they have their "unique" positions that we would not understand and yet to them they are essential positions. So, I think, it is better to keep it "in-house." I am a firm believer of "in-house" things anyway.

S: Do you feel there were enough people representing noncertificated people on the committee? Do you think that should have been better balanced?

C: I think we had a lot of people that were certificated ....And I felt sometimes like the "token" noncertificated person. I can relate to most, and they even admitted it..."I really don't know what this person does."
But if you look at their grading, it was notoriously low, because they had a bias. Probably I had a bias the other way. I would like to think I was more even-handed but it is hard to convince four other people. Sometimes when I spoke out, or advocated for someone, I felt I was the only one sticking up for that person and I felt like I was on a soap box at time and I had no support from any of the others. It would have been nice to have had someone else on the committee who understood the noncertificated positions as well as I do. How do we present noncertificated positions when we say, "we are in the business for the kids, their education.". We have to be realistic, we are a business.

S: Where would we be without the transportation, the maintenance and the central stores?

C: I know that somebody who has four to six years of college, you are going to say "I have this type of education, so why is somebody who has three years or none making the same amount of money that I am? I will be the first one to admit it, we are rewarded on what we know. But don't penalize the person because they don't have as much formal education.

S: Question #15, "After participating in this process, I was able to effectively evaluate jobs." You said you "strongly disagreed" with this statement.

C: I still don't think I knew what to do.

S: Is there anything you can think of in the (job evaluation) process to make it better?

C: More training, it goes back to the interviewing. I guess I was peeved a little bit on the interviewing more than evaluating jobs.

S: So you feel interviewing is very important?
C: That's the part I had trouble with. I think if I could have just felt better about that. When we were done, I still couldn't tell you really what, let us say John Doe - I still couldn't tell you what he does. I could tell you what he says he does, but I couldn't tell you what he does.

S: In some evaluations they do shadowing, where somebody watches what they do periodically, kind of spot shadow for an hour or two. Another process is writing down a log on everything they do. Would any of those techniques be helpful to this process?

C: I think it would be a good idea to do something with a video because then we could see....

S: Are you talking about the interview?

C: Yes. Then, if I felt comfortable about the interview, I can help evaluate jobs.

S: Just by knowing what questions to ask?

C: Yes, then I can feel better about what questions to ask, getting the feedback and getting at the truth. I think I asked a lot of shallow questions.

S: And the probing questions are the ones that are...

C: .....are offensive. They can be offensive. You get a little background and you say, "Tell me what you do." Then, I will basically go back and regurgitate this and see if I come up with anything. You can kind of tell when somebody is giving you a snow job. Basically, if you are even-handed about it. You can tell - there are not that many hidden jobs in this district.
S: Okay, let's get on to #23: "After the interviews I clearly understood each job position well enough to present it for the committee's job evaluation review." We already talked about that.

C: I had a problem with the consultant's approach and I take part of the blame myself, and I blame us. We allowed ourselves to be manipulated. Then I, more than most people, became a little resentful, because he crossed over from neutral to....

S: You believed he changed the rules and that's the thing that bothered you?

C: If he had stayed neutral or stayed biased but don't switch in midstream because ...."set the ground rules" and play by these rules, don't change them on me.

S: We've covered # 27, 28 and 29 because that's exactly what we are talking about this bias and how he influenced the decisions during the evaluations and you feel he presented biased information to the committee.

C: Yes, And I felt when I started talking about the lower certificated and noncertificated jobs - I felt like he would let you go so far and then he would cut you off. He would say "Yes, that's true but I have found in Podunk Center that they did this and it was like this and this is the way it's going to be. And I think we had one person, and maybe two on this committee who were very, very influenced by him. I won't mention names, but I think that happened. It really happened.

S: Do you think he influenced benchmark positions? (Question #29.) Should he have?
C: NO, I think if we wanted to put someone up there making $2 less than the superintendent, then that was our perrogative, because that is what we were there for.

S: Irregardless of his expertise?

C: Right, it goes right back to what I said before, when he leaves he is done, we have to live with it. We can defend it and we can take the criticism and if we have to we can go back and do it again. But they are our decisions. They are not his. He definitely had certain ideas on where things were going to be, and I feel we were manipulated.

S: Okay. We are almost done. I want to ask about the group dynamics (#30). "Do you feel committee members exercised influence to convince others of their opinion on job evaluations." You commented on the back, "Because the majority of participants were certified administrative staff they were defensive of others in the same position like principal or whatever." My question to you is, did these committee members actually influence your decision on these job evaluations?

C: They influenced it as far as the committee as a whole. If I was going to argue or disagree about the positions, I will make my opinion but I am not going to hammer it home.

S: You felt you were low key in trying to make a point because you felt "I do have to live with this, I do have to deal with these people later," so that caused you to back off?

C: Yes, and I think that is a valid concern. You have to deal with these people in the work place and you don't want to make an enemy. You can call it politics or whatever you want, but it's a reality.

S: How do you think the job evaluations would have proceeded differently if a majority of certified administrators were on the
committee? You once mentioned "it would have been nice if you could have had some kind of backup and it wouldn't have been just me against the world."

C: I don't think it would have changed that much, maybe some of the noncertificated administrators might have been... I think some of them might have been upgraded slightly, but then some of them might have been downgraded slightly, as well as some of the lower certificated positions.

S: If more of the noncertificated people had been put on the committee? Lets see, there were two principals, although at the time one was a vice-principal, but is now a principal. And two supervisors, and the researcher, who was neutral but was also certificated.

C: One (the vice-principal) knew he was hired as a principal at the time he was on this committee.

S: So we had two principals and two supervisors - kind of a 5 to 1 ratio. Lets say we had six again (committee members.) What would you have recommended it be?

C: I would have one principal ....at least one of each area.

S: Give me an example.

C: One jr. high principal, one elementary principal (there's the problem, we have 2 people in the same area) Then one supervisor and, I don't know whether it would be instructional or non-instructional. I would have one noncertificated person there, one instructional and I guess ...

S: If we had a 2 - 2 - 2 ratio, what would it be?
C: I guess we would have had it the way it was, but we would have just boosted the non-instructional administrator. I think it would have been better if we would have had an eight member committee and a facilitator who would break ties or something like that. Then we would have had two principals and two people from instructional and maybe two people from the other, and then you could have had two noncertificated administrators. You would have just had two more people. It also gives you that psychological freedom and I think that helps because you feel less intimidated.

S: Question #33 and 34. "Do you feel there was advocacy by the committee members during the evaluations?" and if there was, did it affect your decisions about the job?"

C: This goes back to, did we advocate for those people we interviewed? I will say this, there was some I pushed harder than for others. There were some people it was hard to state their job responsibilities because of their personalities, whereas for some of the others I really dug my heels in.

S: On that advocacy bit, if somebody advocated on behalf of somebody like you said, for instance, someone everybody liked, do you feel people did advocate on the basis of a personality rather than the job?

C: I don't know how you get away from that, but what do you do? How do you separate it? There again, I think if you knew the right questions to ask on the interview, you are asking the questions and you are controlling the outcome. A lot of stuff can be interview related. As a whole I think we did a pretty good job and I am not criticizing the instrument but I am criticizing the intent. It was just that it was an impossible task to ask people to do.

S: Did you feel responsible for their income?
C: Yes, you can go and sluff it off.

S: Do you feel like the Position Questionnaire itself was a good instrument and/or were there things about it that could have been improved?

C: I think it would have been a lot better if we could have got it across to people that this is important. We should have gotten people together to explain the instrument, but not to answer any questions, because that would have given some an unfair advantage over others, but just to let them know how important filling out this questionnaire was.

S: Just as an example, the question, "Who do you supervise?" was very confusing to a lot of people. Some thought it meant all the people in their subject matter area and yet they didn't do any evaluations on these people, so therefore, they didn't really supervise them.

C: In my case, I do 15 to 20 evaluations but the person above me is ultimately responsible for these people so he gets credit for supervising them. But I don't think we built that in to the instrument. We have a lot of dual supervisions in the school district and sometimes triple supervisions. For instance you teach at ABC School and XYZ School and you have 2 principals, so who supervises you, who does your evaluation?

S: One gets me for 2/5ths time and one gets me for 3/5ths time and then I have a subject area supervisor and yet he doesn't evaluate me.

C: Yet he is your program supervisor and you can bet if you do something wrong he would be involved, even though he doesn't evaluate you.

S: Just one more question, (#37) "The job evaluation process was effective." You stated there were too many negative feelings by the
respondents, and that the process zeroed in more on certificated positions, is that correct?

C: I really feel that way (End of tape).

Interview with Working Committee Member "D"

S: On question #1, "The information given to the respondents completing the position questionnaire on the importance of accuracy and timeliness was effectively communicated." You said you "strongly agreed." Do you feel that anything could have been done differently in letting people know the importance of it, because it seems like when we went on the interviews....

D: Yes, I think the questionnaire was well written and I hope to believe that most people responded accurately on it, but I don't think they understood the importance of it, or how it was really going to affect them. I don't. I really don't.

S: Did you feel you had to explain its importance during your interviews with the administrators?

D: Yes. It comes in the mail (referring to the position questionnaire survey). It's just another survey to fill out and it's not a simple survey. There's a lot of depth and involvement in the questions. I don't know. Maybe someone should have come and visited with them. The administrative group or all the administrators pulled into one building and really hammered it home - the importance of it - what they were trying to accomplish. I don't even think all of them were completed, were they?

S: No.
D: So there's your answer right there... that people didn't take it as seriously as we might have liked them to.

S: Did you feel the directions on the questionnaire were clear and concise? Did you feel that there were any that might have been explained better on that position questionnaire? The job description explains what it was and then it states certain things like "What things do you do and do you do any lifting?" and that kind of thing. The one thing I'm trying to probe a little bit is "Who do you supervise?" It seems like a supervisor of reading, for instance, and I'm just pulling that one out of a hat, thought that they supervise all the reading teachers.

D: Supervising and evaluating are two different things. That could have been pointed out a little more.

S: Such as "supervising" meaning, "Who do you evaluate?"

D: Yes. The importance of points scoring in regards to the difference in evaluating and supervising. I can supervise all kinds of people, but if I'm not responsible for your evaluation and performance rating, you get more "points" for that than you do just "supervising."

S: Did you feel there was a question of overlapping in supervisory duties, such as two principals who share the same teacher?

D: Things like that can be pointed out but this (problem) has to be alleviated so we can assign points.

S: Okay, (question #3) "The respondents completed the Position Questionnaire in a timely manner." You said "many of them did."

D: I really don't know the outcome of that... how many of them filled them out.
S: I think most of them did. I can only think of two or three of them that didn't. That's not too bad. But there were others that weren't completely completed.

Okay. I had asked you, (question #4) "The respondents who were late in competing the position questionnaire may have had an unfair advantage over the other respondents" and you said you "somewhat disagreed"

D: I just thought they were just being slow n filling it out. They hadn't heard the "word" about the position questionnaire.

S: So you don't think it gave them an opportunity to have an advantage over somebody who didn't fill it out earlier?

D: I don't think so. Everybody answered the same questions.

S: (Question #5) "The questions on the position questionnaire provided the information I needed to evaluate the jobs." You said you "somewhat agree," Do you think there could have been any more in-depth questioning for us to get to that which we needed to have?

D: No, I thought that was part of the interviewing to do that..."to pull it together."

S: Okay, now on the training segment of the job evaluation process. (Question #6) "The general rule of the 'factor and level descriptions and explanations' clarified the process sufficiently for me to do the job evaluation before beginning the practice sessions." You said you "somewhat agreed." Do you think it was enough explanation to know...

D: Before we began practicing?

S: Do you think it was enough explanation to help us know what to do?
D: In retrospect, I think it all came into place together. Your explanation to begin with and then you practice...I think it all comes together. You don't actually know something well until you're doing it.

S: Once you knew what you were doing, do you feel it was consistent?

D: Yes. Like our practice sessions, I think we did it enough.

S: I'm going to skip a couple of questions because mainly they're redundant. But I think you've made it clear that you felt we had enough practice before we started doing them. Now, you said (on question #9) "sufficient time was spent on practice sessions before beginning actual practice job evaluations." Do you feel that the practice sessions we had were - the practice sessions - were like teaching positions or nursing positions or clerical positions and things like that, not administrative.. Do you think that it would have been helpful if you had practiced on some administrative positions that weren't going to be evaluated, such as, maybe a director or some other administrative positions?

D: Well, I don't know. The process was all the same. In doing it, I don't really think so. We set our benchmarks and went from there and the benchmarks were kind of a guide. I don't think so. It was more or less what we were suppose to be looking for. That was what was important.

S: Once you had the benchmarks...

D: Once we had the benchmarks and the criteria and the college degree, amount of evaluations, things like that.

S: Well, on question #10, "The discussions during the practice sessions provided me with sufficient information to do the actual job evaluations." You said you somewhat agree. Was there anything lacking in the practice sessions that....
D: I don't think so. I can't think of anything. With more practice I
didn't do any better. I think maybe we just needed to "hone in" more
on the criteria, like the knowledge requirements for the job, manual
labor requirements for the job and stuff like that...just to "hone in" on it
more. That's important. If you understand that, then if we have a clear
description of their job, then...

S: Do you think that should have been gone over in the interviews
then? Maybe gotten into that then?

D: You know, that might not have been a bad idea.

S: Okay, then during the interviews...

D: If we had been told, and we might have been for all I know, before
we did the interviews, "These are the criteria that we're going to do
that's going to be very important." We, as interviewers, should be
honing in on those kind of questions, as we interview the people. "How
much knowledge is required for your job?" "How much manual labor is
required of your job?" "How dirty is your job?" "What is the
educational level that you must have, that is required of your job?"
Now, I didn't ask those questions specifically during the interview, I
just asked questions as to how they responded to it (the position
questionnaire). Maybe if we would have asked them more direct
questions in regards to that we would have gotten a better perspective
of it.

S: OK, that leads me into another question, another area. I'm going to
bounce around here a little bit, and that was that whole interviewing
process. Do you feel that there should have been more training to do
the interviews?

D: Yes, I kind of think so. I was a little awkward with the interviews. I
don't know how the other people felt (referring to the other committee
members). We needed some specific questions that we could all asked in the interview about the job description. And those specific questions should relate to the point system that we used. We should have all been asking similar type questions, I think.

S: Even though you did have to probe versus what they didn't tell you on the position questionnaire. But as you said, you think the committee members needed to "zero in" on specific things and they all should have asked some specific things.

D: I think so.

S: Okay. Now, like I said, I'm skipping around a little bit. This point system thing and the weighted points and factor charts (question #12), do you feel that was clearly explained? Was it clear enough to you to assign points? And do you feel in this point system - the consultant was the one up there writing the points down that we gave him. 1) Do you feel he should have been the one putting the points on the board, and 2) Do you feel that there should have been anyone else there to be double checking the scoring?

D: I don't really know. Whether it's a consensus type system anyway - when we were working it, I think we found our mistakes while we were doing it. It was a process of consensus, so whether we should have had someone who was auditing it, I don't know.

S: It has been said that "the person who has the pencil in their hand or the chalk in their hand is the person who's in control." Do you feel that the consultant had that "power" or that he manipulated the scoring by being the scorer?

D: No, he was only up there putting down the points we gave him. I don't see how he could control. We gave him what we wanted up there.
S: What about when we'd go over it and he'd say, "You're the real high scorer or the real low scorer and he'd ask us to "explain yourself."

D: I think that's all right though. We were trying to reach a consensus and how else do you reach a consensus but by doing that?

Sharon: Kind of like the juror... the only one holding out?

D: Yes, but I didn't feel uncomfortable with that. I don't know how the consensus process goes, but that's how I visualize it. We put our scores up and if we were high or low compared to others then we'd have to explain why. Everybody had the right to change though.

S: And, as I observed, one person sometimes got other people to change sometimes too. Sometimes they made a point that made the rest of the committee say, "Hey, good point!"

D: Yeah, I didn't feel uncomfortable with it.

S: Okay, that's fine. Now I have a question here that seems to have been misunderstood by several people., it's "Is the location to do the job evaluation appropriate?" (question #14). So, I'm going to break that into two locations. Some people thought I meant if I went to interview someone, like a principal, some people took it to mean that was inappropriate to come to his or her office. Other people took this question to mean the location where the job evaluation group scorings (downtown) were taking place - two different questions here. So first, I'm going to ask you, do you feel that it was all right to go to the people you interviewed, to their home base, or office, to do the interviews? Did that lessen their feeling in this interview that it was really important - you going to them? Would they have thought it was more important if you had told them to meet at 2:00, Thursday, in a conference room, downtown and go over their job? Do you think it would have made it
"seem" more important - having them come to you, at a downtown central location, rather than to have gone to their place?

D: I know what you're asking, but I don't really know. I'd have to respond, "I don't think so."

S: You "don't think so" ...what?

D: That it would make any difference. If I had asked a person to come downtown, it's just a meeting place. I'd have to respond this way, you came to my house today to do this interview. If you had asked me to come downtown to do it, I don't think it would have made any difference, at least to me personally. I don't know to another individual if it makes any difference or not - whether they're intimidated to have to come downtown or something like that, or their own place of employment (their own office). I don't know. I just think it would be better to "hone in" in the beginning of the interviews of the importance and the filling out of the questionnaire to all people involved, like we previously mentioned. If the superintendent had spoken to us or someone like that, I think it was just stressing the importance of filling out the questionnaire rather than the place or location. I would try to answer just as honestly here as I would downtown and I might feel more comfortable doing it here, in my own office, than I would downtown. I might give you a more open response! (ha,ha)

S: Okay, in their own territory where they feel more comfortable.

D: I never felt with any of the people I visited with that they felt uncomfortable.

S: That's because you went to their place?

D: Yes.
S: So probably that made it better?

D: They seemed to be willing to talk to me.

S: Okay.

D: It made them feel more important if you went to their place. If you bring them downtown it would make them feel lesser. I also think the importance is in stressing the importance of the questionnaire.

S: Do you think one who is not a certificated administrator, like a route manager, might have been threatened (referring to coming downtown for the interview)?

D: Yes, you don't want to be threatening, but it might make them uncomfortable. In an interviewing session they may be more reluctant to be open. Also, you know it came out at the end of the school year and I don't think the timing was very good either. And I think we (the administrators) were rushing to get it done. We (the committee members) had to start writing on it at the beginning of the summer.

S: That's right.

D: I'm not so sure that was a good time to do it either. Contracts had already been delivered and signed, I believe. It might have been a good thing to do at the beginning of the salary negotiation process. It would have really stressed the importance of it. The school year is over and I've got my contract for next year, so... well, your survey is just a lot of work for me (as an administrator) at the end of the year.

S: Okay. No one else had brought that out. Now, I want to go back to the location of the job evaluation. Was it appropriate? When I originally asked that question I had in mind where you were actually doing the job evaluations, as a committee, at 1800 Grand, because it was
noted that some of the committee members, because their offices were also there, got called out of the evaluation process meeting frequently since their staff knew where they could be reached. What I was thinking, if XYZ School District or Des Moines wanted to do this sort of thing (a job evaluation study) what would your recommendation have been?

D: A neutral place would have been better. A place where no one would be pulled out or get phone calls.

S: Okay, now on the interviews, (question #16) "I feel I had acquired the skills to interview the respondents effectively," you said you were "undecided". By the "skills" I meant "questioning techniques," for example.

D: Well, I think I'll just go back to what I said before. I think we could have been trained a little better in specific questioning. You know, so much of it came out "this is the way they responded to it" now you ask them "why" they responded to it. I'm not so sure that's the way it should be. Why did you answer such and such a way? Maybe we should have had more specific questions in regards to how we... such as, "Who do you supervise?" and "Who do you evaluate?" and "Do you share that evaluation with anyone else?" Or, "How much time do you spend doing this?" "How much time do you spend doing that?" I think our questioning should have been in regards to that, more so, rather than try to interpret what they put down. We needed specific questions then we'd know that other stuff.

S: Okay, that's all I needed to know on that. "Do you feel there were enough positions interviewed on the positions, such as enough elementary principals interviewed, enough supervisors, for us to evaluate those positions fairly?" (Question #17).
D: We had all the questionnaires from all of them to refer to. We could overdo that, I think.

S: Okay.

D: There again, I go back to the interviewing questions could have been more specific.

S: Now, (question #18) "As I interviewed more respondents, I became better in my interviewing techniques." Do you feel there should have been practice interviewing?

D: It's a matter of human relations. I don't think that (interview practice) so much as what questions to ask.

S: It goes back to the questions.

D: It goes back to the questions to ask. The questions should relate to how we evaluate.

S: If you were going to be trained in interviewing do you think things like films would have helped? Just like you'd be trained in anything - there are a lot of good films out there on questioning techniques, probing, listening, that kind of thing. Do you think any of that would have helped in a training situation?

D: Yes.

S: Were your respondents given equal time for the interviews you conducted? (Question #19) Do you think that's important?

D: I think they were, yes. Yes, I think it's important.
S: What if it's a job... we all know what a principal does, what if it's a job like early childhood education, where you don't know tiddlewink about what that person does, do you feel a person like that, that you would need more time to understand their job?

D: It goes back to the questions (asking the right ones).

S: Okay, now, (question #21) "The respondents I interviewed clearly understood the reason for the interview" that goes back to the beginning. Do you feel the ones you interviewed had a clear understanding of what was being done?

D: From all indications, yes. But sometimes I don't know if they gained the credence they should have - whether they actually believed it was going to happen or not (referring to the importance of the job evaluation and impact on their jobs).

S: Did your respondents complete the questionnaires thoroughly? (Question #22).

D: I think so.

S: Okay. You wrote here on the question #23, "I wonder if it might not have been a better interviewing process if the committee could have interviewed (the respondents) rather than as individuals." (The question stated, "After the interviews I clearly understood each job position well enough to present it for the committee's job evaluation review.")

D: I guess I'm just saying that if more than one person sat in on the interview...like we tried to reach a consensus as a committee on how to evaluate the job positions. If a committee of maybe two or three would have interviewed the respondent together, at the same time, they
would have asked the appropriate questions or have reached a better understanding of the position.

S: I see, one would ask something the other might not have picked up on. Okay.

D: I'd just like to go back, instead of us individually interviewing, having our committee sitting in there and have the interviewing prospect come in and the whole committee might interview them. Just like you're interviewed for a job. That would stress the importance of this whole thing. I wonder if it would have been better if we had interviewed as a committee, like you interview a real person for a position? And each member of the committee have one or two questions prepared beforehand in regards to specific things that we need to know. He comes in and I say to him, "What educational requirements are needed for your position." If you interviewed two or three people in that same category, and the committee would do that and hear it all and I think we would get a pretty clear picture of that job position. I almost think that would have been better, rather than each of us individually going out and interviewing somebody on the job.

S: And did you notice sometimes too when the committee members asked you a question about something you missed, something you forgot to ask on your interview and you just go, "Oh, I didn't catch that" or "I forgot to ask that."

D: If we had specific questions and as a committee sit there and here the responses of the position, I think we would have gotten a better and clearer picture. If I were to do it over, I think that's what I would recommend.

S: Okay, kind of going back to the committee themselves, we had five certificated administrators, and we had one noncertificated
administrator committee member. Do you feel that was evenly balanced?

D: Oh, to be fairly represented, we could have had some other people on this committee who were noncertificated. That kind of put one person in a disadvantage.

S: Okay, now I'm going to get on the role of the consultant. "The training provided by the consultant was very thorough" (Question #24). You said you somewhat agree.

D: Well, I'm just going back to the things I pointed out before.

S: Okay. (Question #25) "Sufficient amount of time was provided for the training by the consultant." You said you "somewhat agreed."

D: Oh, I think there was enough time. I got kind of bored with all the training sessions. We did the same thing over and over and he spoke very slowly. I think we should have "zeroed in" on specific questions to ask and that sort of thing...

S: Okay. (Question #26) "The consultant listened objectively to the presentations by the committee members on our district's unique job positions' responsibilities and duties." You said, you somewhat agreed.

D: He had his opinions as opposed to ours about every one and he let us know.

S: Do you feel he was consulting, or do you feel he was trying to influence our decisions?

D: He tried to influence us once in a while. But we all had that same opportunity, as a member of the committee. It was still a process of concensus.
S: Do you feel that he, being the "outside expert" had more influence on us?

D: Yes, I would probably defer to him moreso, probably, than anybody else. He changed a couple of things...he came back with that report. (referring to changes made after our committee made the decisions and rankings). He came back and had already changed two of them, if I remember correct. He informed us, but it was after the fact. But, he talked it over with the director of human resources. After objections by people involved. And you know that's been changed a time or two since.

S: Has it?

D: Why, I think it has.

S: You see, I haven't been up on what has happened after we met as a committee. I knew they had made a couple (of changes).

D: The cabinet probably made some changes, but that's their perrogative.

S: The committee did their job.

D: We did our job, right.

S: Okay, so you do feel the consultant influenced our decisions during the evaluations?

D: Somewhat, but it was a concensus process, so I don't think he over did it. But other people on the committee did it too.

S: You mean when we were advocating for positions?
D: Yes.

S: Okay, do you feel he presented unbiased information to the committee members during the evaluations? (Question #28)

D: Well, we had to defer to him a little bit, because he had done this in other school districts before and so forth.

S: Now, he had a business background, whereas, you're in education. Do you feel that made any difference? For him to understand what DMPSD is all about?

D: It's really kind of hard to say. For me to speak about someone else's area, it would be hard for me to do a true evaluation either. What was your question again?

S: If he presented unbiased information to the you (and the committee members)?

D: I think so, pretty much. I think he was trying to be as fair as possible. That was part of his job as a consultant.

S: Okay. (Question #29) "Do you feel the consultant influenced the committee members decision to select the benchmark positions?" Do you think it should have been more your decisions?

D: We might have come up with the same things. We might have been consulted on it, yes.

S: Okay, now on the "Committee Members" .....we're almost done now. (Question #30) "The committee members exercised influence to convince others of their opinion on job evaluations."
D: Sure, that's what we were suppose to do. We are suppose to be advocates if we have knowledge or strong opinions on something. It's still a matter of concensus. It probably would have been a better process, if we had interviewed as a group. I think we would have better understood the positions with more specific questions and with all of us having a shot at it and hearing the respondent as the interviewee.

S: Okay. (Question #31) "Compromises were made on the points assigned for a job evaluation." You said "somewhat agree."

D: Oh, we all compromised to a certain extent. It's a matter of concensus. It's a process. You can't reach a concensus otherwise.

S: (Question #32) "If committee members made negative observations, comments or jokes based on the personality of the individual whose job was being evaluated, it affected my decision on the job evaluation." You said you somewhat disagreed. Sometimes individuals' personalities got in the way of their job evaluations, for better or worse, whatever the case may be. Do you think it affected your decision on the job evaluation?...Or could it have? In other words, should there have been rules made by the consultant saying to all of the committee members, "Now we are going to be discussing certain individuals who you may all know...."

D: Are you talking about the personality affecting our decision?

S: Yes, and I'm wondering if there should have been rules. Or, he stops you and says "Let's not be joking about this person, let's get back on track." Or that sort of thing. Should there have been any kind of rules or guidelines made?

D: You could down-play a position because of the person's personality.
S: So you think we should have had some guidelines where the personality of the individual didn't become an issue and we stayed on track as to the job itself.

D: It goes back to the outline of the questions, had specific questions to ask...

S: ...then none of that would have happened?

D: That's right.

S: Okay. (Question #33) "There was advocacy by the committee members during the evaluations." You said, "undecided," yet earlier you said that's what we were there for.

D: Yeah, I think so. I'll change that answer. We all did some advocacy for the positions.

S: Now, (question #34) "If committee members advocated on behalf of individuals rather than on the function of their job, it affected my decision on the job evaluation." Were you able to see through that, if the advocacy was for the person and not their job?

D: Well, I hope so. I tried to be as objective as possible.

S: (Question #35) do you feel there were any members who were unwilling to compromise?

D: No

S: Okay, (Question #36) "If members were unable to attend the job evaluation meetings it affected the outcome of the evaluations." Even though you all had to reach a consensus, do you feel it could have shifted the weight (of the evaluations)?
D: It depends on how many would be absent. It might have, yes, somewhat.

S: (Question #37) "Do you feel the job evaluation as a whole, was effective?"

D: Yes.

S: Did you want to add anything, any suggestions or comments that we haven't covered?

D: I think your point that everyone needed to be there during the job evaluations was well taken. That would have made a difference overall. We needed that person's input in our discussions and I do think it made a difference that this person was absent so much, especially when we were a small group to begin with and that particular individual would have contributed a great deal to the process.

Interview with Working Committee Member "E"

S: (Referring to question #1) "I feel that the information given to the respondents completing the position questionnaire on the importance of accuracy and timeliness was effectively communicated." You said you "somewhat agree." Do you think it could have been improved, either by the personnel office to the administrators or a preface as to the importance of the questionnaire and getting it completed on time?

E: Yes (it could have been improved). I think that the explanation that went along with the questionnaire, just a one-page memo from Tom, now this isn't in the interests of efficiency and effectiveness for
anything else, but for that, probably getting everyone together would have been a good idea.

S: I wasn't aware that they hadn't gotten everyone together ahead of time.

E: We did have a meeting at North about a month or month and a half ago....

S: ...Oh, after it was over with..

E: Yes, where the Welfare Committee invited anybody who wanted to attend could get an explanation of what had happened. You know that the director of human resources switched some of the rankings of positions. One of them that I remember was the purchasing agent. In any other business in town, he would have gotten a high salary. This was done in his presence.

It would have been better to get everyone (the administrators or respondents to the position questionnaire) together before the questionnaire was sent out and explain what we're doing and explain the importance of filling this questionnaire out and then had time for questions. For instance, we understood questions such as "how much to you lift" but the people filling out the questionnaire didn't understand the reason for such questions.

S: Did you feel you had to clarify that with the administrators you interviewed?

E: Whether I did or didn't, I felt I did need to clarify the questions on the questionnaire.

S: Were there any other recommendations on the questionnaire that you would make? Were there enough directions on the questionnaire...
itself? Would you have had it more than one page? Was one page adequate?

E: I think one page with an oral explanation and a chance for people to ask questions would have been best. Some people didn't take it seriously and if they had known that it might affect their salary it would have been different.

S: (Question #5) "I feel the questions on the position questionnaire provided the information I need to evaluate the jobs." Could the position questionnaire have been written more concisely and/or thoroughly that would have given you all the information you needed without the oral interview?

E: No, I didn't. Because as I was interviewing people, subconsciously I was mentally ranking the people I interviewed. So, I asked the first one and because of the response, that that person gave me, then I knew to ask a similar question or knew that should come out of the interview. So, I thought that the oral interview was a must.

S: That answered the second part of my question. Now, on the training, you felt everything was pretty well explained but you stated that you felt the practice sessions were "somewhat sufficient." What do you think could have been improved upon overall, that the consultant gave during training. What part of it could have been improved upon and how would you have improved upon it? You commented about too much "down time" to the speaking style?

E: It seems to me that that he was kind of arbitrary in his classifications and I remember thinking at one point that it would be nice if we had something in between these two things and if it would work to have more flexibility of the instrument so that the people who are doing it would say "it really needs to be a five and a half or a three and three quarters (points) or something."
S: Something in-between? You are talking about the factor charts and the weighted points for question #12. On how to conduct the interview, obviously being an administrator you are doing interviews all the time, but to do these interviews (administrators whose jobs will be evaluated) do you feel like there should have been more training or practice sessions or something to that effect?

E: I didn't think any of the interviews I had were awkward because when I really try I can be tactful. I can be pretty tackless too, if I think about it and think it is going to be a situation that needs delicacy, and I think it needed delicacy, because it is their job and their salary and they feel very threatened by it, so I tried to anticipate the concern they would have and address those ahead of time. I think there should have been some general interview training like when you interview you should do much less talking than the interviewee and that is something we pick up with personnel interviews.

S: Like I said, you have had this kind of people skills ability, do you feel like like if this was going to be done in XYZ school district or if it was done in Des Moines again and they brought together five or six people to do the job evaluation, would make any recommendations that there should be some kind of training or do you think people should have had that kind of training (previously), like yourself? Would it have been beneficial to have had some kind of specialized training for this?

E: For people who have not had that kind of experience, I think the problem would be if you were mixing veterans with nonveterans and I have not thought of a good pretest for that sort of thing so that you can tell who needed the training. I guess maybe you could just ask, "How many of you feel comfortable?" and not require the training of people who felt comfortable.
S: You were talking about being tactful, do you think that could have been something that could have been brought before the committee, to make them aware of?

E: But didn't he (the consultant) already do that? It seems to me he gave us a sheet on "Do's and Don't's" and that was helpful.

S: So, you think he should just sort of ask "Who needs more training" for the interview, and give more individual help to those people who need it. One of the things I asked about "Was the location to do the job evaluations was appropriate?" (question #14.) There was a misunderstanding about that question. Some people understood the questions to mean when you went on the interviews to interview the people, and other people understood it to mean the conference room where the actual job evaluations by the group were taking place. What I did mean was the conference room where the evaluations were scored by the group. Was it an appropriate place to have done the evaluations? My thinking was, did that, perhaps, cause some distractions for those members of the committee whose offices were located nearby?

E: It certainly caused some absences.

S: Do you think it might have been better to have been at a more neutral place?

E: I remember thinking we really should close the door when we were doing some of those job evaluations. I was so frustrated with the "down time" that if we had done that in another site - where I couldn't have gotten something productive done at the same time. I am not sure I would have shown up and that's probably why another member didn't show up. That person probably got so frustrated with all of this (waste of time).

S: Are you referring to the training or the actual job evaluations?
E: I am referring to the actual job evaluations. I remember saying, "Is everybody ready?"

S: I also want to ask, you didn't give me an answer for #9 "Sufficient time was spent on practice sessions before beginning the actual job evaluations" but you did say there was too much down time, so none of these probably pertained to it. Almost everything else you answered, "somewhat agree." You never strongly agreed with anything. Is it that you just felt it was as good as it was going to get? Was there anything that could have been done that would have put you over here in this slot, where you feel you would strongly agree? Can you recommend anything that would have made it better for you?

E: Maybe adapting the instrument a little bit more to the circumstances. If he (the consultant) would have been flexible about giving a little on some of the descriptors and on the point system that would have improved my overall opinion.

S: Okay, now on the interview, there is some overlap here with some of the other questions. You said you were undecided on acquiring skills to interview the respondents effectively (#16.) Can you tell me more about that? Why were you undecided?

E: I think it was the fact that I didn't know as much about everybody's job ahead of time as I thought I did and I don't know what can be done about that. There is probably nobody that knows everybody's job as well as needs to be done for this ranking.

S: Basically, you didn't know as much as you thought you did so you had to grasp all of that during the interviews and looking over their sheets (position questionnaires)?
E: And also on several of my interviews the people hadn't done them ahead of time, they hadn't thought through everything they needed to think through to be able to give precise answers and then again, if this had been explained orally in a large group situation, where they had a chance to ask questions, maybe that would have made a difference.

S: Maybe they would have taken it more seriously and given it more thought. Okay, next, you were undecided on the question (#20) "If respondents were given more than 45 minutes of time for the interview, they would receive an unfair advantage for the job evaluation." I want to tell you where I am coming from with that question. Giving them more than 45 minutes, because you do not understand this person's job, do you think that that would weigh more or effect your presentation on that job, if you had more time with that person to explain their job to the rest of the committee?

E: I didn't realize we had to limit it to 45 minutes.

S: I don't think he did, he (the consultant) just said about 45 minutes. He said to keep it within that range. That was just one of his "Do's and Don't's." Sort of a recommendation about how long to spend with people.

E: I wasn't watching the clock, we were just finished when we were finished. Some people were promoting themselves when they were answering the questions and you could pick up on that and some people would just answer the questions.

S: Again we are coming right back to further clarification about why they are being interviewed, and that would go right back to an explanation in the beginning. Would there have been anything you could have done to had better understood the respondents job position to present it before the committee's evaluation, such as being on the job site, shadowing. That's what I was wondering, could there have been
some other things that could have done to have given the job evaluation a fair shake? How much time to do this, one hour, one day, one afternoon?

E: No, I wouldn't think so because everybody I talked to said their job goes in "spurts," there are peaks and valleys and some days you are going bananas and some days you can get caught up on your filing, things like that.

S: Should it be a quarter of the school year and you spot check them for an hour, do you think that would help?

E: Probably ideal would be to have people on sabbatical and following people around for a week each quarter to really see what they are doing.

S: What about their supervisor? A supervisor putting forth this input, for that part of shadowing because they would better understand what it involves and entails.

E: I think some supervisors really understand and I don't think some others do.

S: That would be like the principal not knowing what all his/or her teachers are doing. He can't possibly know each one of them and how they are teaching.

E: I think the only way they know how the teacher is doing is based upon how many students are sent to the office.

S: Whether the teacher is in control or not. OK, I am just trying to get some kind of recommendation as to how to better understand a persons job position. Shadowing is great but who is going to do it and
how and when? Obviously committee members like yourselves would not have access to do that during the school year.

E: Perhaps if you would ask the people who you are going to interview to keep a log of their activities ....

S: That has been done before in job evaluations.

E: It would have to be at different times of the year because like payroll, it comes in spurts, Phase III payroll they are really going crazy. That was taken care of in the summer or early fall. Then after they get all the checks figures out it is a little bit more routine. Tell them to pick their busiest week and log that and then pick a typical week and log that and then one where they have time to do their filing.

S: Let's go on with the questions: You "strongly agreed" that the consultant influenced your decisions during the evaluations (#27.) How do you think he influenced your decisions during the evaluations? In what way did he influence your decisions, specifically?

E: Well, obviously he is the expert and if he said "that's wrong, it should be this," it had an influence. But also at least for me, who was frustrated with his pace, I said "Okay, I will give up on this in the interest of time."

S: You gave in to his recommendations in the interest of time. Okay. Do you also feel that being an expert and his knowledge of other school districts and having done these evaluations, do you feel it was relevant to the same positions that we were interviewing the unique positions, let's take someone in another school district that does the same things as someone in this district, but yet this person's scope is a wider range. However, he (the consultant) perceives it as a more narrow one - basically all he really is is a "coordinator of" as opposed to a "supervisor" in the job being evaluated.
E: I think there is no way anybody can leave behind their biases but I think he was open to what we were telling him about the positions except in some cases where he really had strong biases. And then he kind of dug in his heels and said "No, you are wrong." From my recollections of his comments during one of the job evaluations was he didn't understand that this had done so many things. Was he flexible on that one?

S: Again this goes back to "did the consultant present unbiased information to the committee members during the evaluations?" (#28) then you commented, "For the most part he was open and accepting but there were just a few cases where he was not flexible. Also, you "strongly agreed" that he influenced our decision to select the benchmark positions (#29). Do you feel that should have been done by him since he was the expert or do you think the committee members or someone else should have had more input on that?

E: I didn't have a problem with the benchmark positions he selected, so even though he influenced us it was no concern, so that was fine. His choices, I thought, were logical.

S: The group dynamics of the committee members (#31) "Compromises were made that were on points assigned for a job evaluation," you "strongly agreed."

E: His procedure of having the people who were out on the limb explain why they felt as they did and in some cases that person is the one that ended up with the good explanation and we all switched to that, I thought that procedure was uncomfortable at the time, but probably necessary.

S: Is there anything you can suggest to improve that process?
E: I think that everyone should have brought a calculator. Also, he could have had transparency of his grid. He was erasing each little cell and if he had a transparency, it would have saved a lot of time.

S: Okay. (Question #32) "If committee members made negative observations or comments or jokes based on the personality of the person whose job was being evaluated, did this influence the committee's decision?" You "somewhat agreed." What should be done about this particular problem?

E: I don't remember him doing too much cautioning to us to leave the personality out, he probably should have. Then if we made comments he could have cautioned us to leave the personalities out of it.

S: Okay, next, "There was advocacy by the committee members during the evaluations" (#33). You "strongly agreed." Did you see this taking place with a like or similar position or did they do it for a friend? How do you feel that advocacy happened?

E: I thought that you were the best advocate, but you were an impartial advocate. I didn't feel you had any biases of personalities or anything to gain. Whereas, the personalities that I know influenced my advocacy.

S: Do you think anything should be done about advocacy, should it be a caveat that the consultant warns you - to just present the facts and not get emotionally involved?

E: I think he structured it so that we were supposed to be advocates with the people that we interviewed. I mean, he said you need to make sure that everyone understands the job as well as you do and it has to be that way.
S: Is there anything else that you can think of off the top of your head that if you were making recommendations on how to improve the job evaluation process?

E: I think we've about covered it. I can't think of anything else.
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