

actual behavior in work situations and that the reactions of others to him in these situations are the best manner of measuring them.

#### The Oregon Service Rating

In view of the newness of the program and the unfamiliarity of most employees and department supervisors with the operation of a merit system, those who devised the Oregon service rating plan believed that the prime and immediate objective should be simplicity and ease of administration.

It is customary when first going on the rifle range to practice trigger-pull for many hours before actually firing. A ship always makes a "dry run" before starting out on the maiden voyage. The Oregon rating plan was designed so that it could go into operation on June 1 with a minimum of friction and confusion; and still embody as many of the desirable features of a good rating system as possible. Yet it would be difficult to deny that a certain amount of reliability and validity has been sacrificed to attain this.

Each employee is to be rated on an overall basis in one of five categories: "Outstanding," "Above Average," "Average," "Below Average," and "Unsatisfactory." The form lists a variety of factors which would ordinarily designate each of these factors; and in addition the instructions indicate that all factors reflecting the value of the employee's service shall be considered. Actually, the Oregon form is as much a summary rating form as a complete service rating. But to supplement this brief form, departments have the option of selecting their own, more detailed scales to be used on the back of the regular form; although the final rating has to be indicated in the terms of the front. Kenneth Riley, Personnel Officer at Oregon State College, has developed an excellent supplemental rating form of the graphic, non-numerical type to be used this June. Another interesting supplemental form is to be used by the Department of Agriculture in which the employees rate themselves before

being rated by a supervisor. J. J. Elliott of the Liquor Control Commission is designing a system patterned somewhat after the Probst system as an aid to maximum objectivity in rating.

Ratings will be made every six months, and must be reviewed and signed by each department head in addition to the supervisor; though the rating may be reviewed by as many as three supervisors. The employee receives a copy of his rating, and one copy goes to the Civil Service Commission. Employees may appeal their rating to the Commission if evidence of unfair or capricious action is evident.

In spite of the many weaknesses inherent in any service rating system, it remains one of the most valuable tools of public administration; and is of particular benefit to the employee. As Mosher and Kingsley, in their text on personnel administration, have stated so well: "... a proper scheme of rating gives the individual a chance to come into his own. He realizes that his merits are recognized, that good service is appreciated and he may further become aware of traits and habits that deter progress in his career. The much berated efficiency ratings may thus serve as a ferment that will promote interest and effort on the part of all concerned."

#### PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT NEWS

(Continued from page 13)

purchased by his contributions made to time of disability. Covers only employees who have been employed over five years, who for the next ten years are totally disabled in line of duty, or who after fifteen years employment are totally disabled for any cause at any time or place; except self-inflicted cause.

10. Less than five-year lapse in employment does not break "continuous service." Thus, many employees over 54 could retire now and still receive some pension starting July 1, 1951, for those then 60, or at attained age of 65 if at a prior date.