

6562

4607

REPORT OF EFFICIENCY RATING

ADMINISTRATIVE-UNOFFICIAL ()
OFFICIAL: REGULAR (✓) SPECIAL ()
PROBATIONAL ()

As of March 31, 1947 based on performance during period from 3-31-46 to 3-31-47

WEISBERG, Harold
(Name of employee)

Research Analyst - P-5 130
(Title of position, service, and grade)

OIR-DRA River Plate - Brazil Branch
(Organization—Indicate Bureau, division, section, unit, field station)

ON LINES BELOW MARK EMPLOYEE ✓ if adequate - if weak + if outstanding	1. Study the instructions in the Rating Official's Guide, C. S. C. Form No. 3823A. 2. Underline the elements which are especially important in the position. 3. Rate only on elements pertinent to the position. a. Do not rate on elements in <i>italics</i> except for employees in administrative, supervisory, or planning positions. b. Rate administrative, supervisory, and planning functions on elements in <i>italics</i> .	CHECK ONE: Administrative, supervisory, or planning <input type="checkbox"/> All others <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---

- | | |
|--|---|
| (1) Maintenance of equipment, tools, instruments.
✓ (2) Mechanical skill.
✓ (3) Skill in the application of techniques and procedures.
(4) Presentability of work (appropriateness of arrangement and appearance of work).
✓ (5) Attention to broad phases of assignments.
✓ (6) Attention to pertinent detail.
✓ (7) Accuracy of operations.
✓ (8) Accuracy of final results.
✓ (9) Accuracy of judgments or decisions.
✓ (10) Effectiveness in presenting ideas or facts.
(11) Industry.
(12) Rate of progress on or completion of assignments.
(13) Amount of acceptable work produced. (Is mark based on production records? (Yes or no))
✓ (14) Ability to organize his work.
+ (15) Effectiveness in meeting and dealing with others.
(16) Cooperativeness.
(17) Initiative.
(18) Resourcefulness.
(19) Dependability.
(20) Physical fitness for the work. | (21) Effectiveness in planning broad programs.
(22) Effectiveness in adapting the work program to broader or related programs.
(23) Effectiveness in devising procedures.
(24) Effectiveness in laying out work and establishing standards of performance for subordinates.
(25) Effectiveness in directing, reviewing, and checking the work of subordinates.
(26) Effectiveness in instructing, training, and developing subordinates in the work.
(27) Effectiveness in promoting high working morale.
(28) Effectiveness in determining space, personnel, and equipment needs.
(29) Effectiveness in setting and obtaining adherence to time limits and deadlines.
(30) Ability to make decisions.
(31) Effectiveness in delegating clearly defined authority to act. |
|--|---|

STATE ANY OTHER ELEMENTS CONSIDERED

- (A) _____
 (B) _____
 (C) _____

STANDARD

Deviations must be explained on reverse side of this form

Plus marks on all underlined elements, and check marks or better on all other elements rated.	Adjective Rating Excellent	Rating official <u>Good</u>
Check marks or better on all elements rated, and plus marks on at least half of the underlined elements.	Very Good	Reviewing official <u>Good</u>
Check marks or better on a majority of underlined elements, and all weak performance overcompensated by outstanding performance.	Good	
Check marks or better on a majority of underlined elements, and all weak performance not overcompensated by outstanding performance.	Fair	
Minus marks on at least half of the underlined elements.	Unsatisfactory	

Rated by Joseph M. Boyer Acting Assistant Chief March 21, 1947
(Signature of rating official) (Title) (Date)

Reviewed by Arthur H. ... Acting Chief DRA 3/21/47
(Signature of reviewing official) (Title) (Date)

Rating approved by efficiency rating committee MAY 8 1947 Report to employee GOOD
(Date) (Adjective rating)

Richard J. ...

REPORT OF
EFFICIENCY RATING

The 1946 Element Pattern Chart was used in the
preparation of this rating.

Richard O. Kiker
Administrative Officer
DRA

Aw

DRA - Mr. Hussey

April 25, 1947

DRA - Mr. Dozer

Efficiency Rating of Harold Weisberg

Following up an earlier conversation with Mr. Weisberg on the subject of his efficiency rating I explained to him today that I have handed in an efficiency rating of "Good" for him. I said that I have discussed his situation with the Executive Officer of OIR, Mr. Opsata, who told me that if we give Mr. Weisberg an efficiency rating of "Good" he cannot put pressure upon DP to transfer him out of DRA. Mr. Opsata told me that a "Good" efficiency rating means that we regard Mr. Weisberg as doing adequate work for a P-5 and that with such a rating Mr. Weisberg cannot be transferred to another line of work or downgraded in his field, which course would be mandatory if he is given an "Unsatisfactory" rating.

I told Mr. Weisberg that, since during the period covered by the efficiency rating his work had consisted almost entirely of the one draft report on "Activities of Franco Agents in the Other American Republics, I, Argentina", his efficiency rating was based largely upon that report and that I regarded it simply as a "good" paper not worthy of a P-5. I said further that he ought to reckon with the possibility that when the jobs in DRA are set up he may not be able to qualify for a P-5 position, on the basis of his background and performance. Since he had already indicated a willingness to be transferred out of DRA I told him that he himself would have to take the initiative with DP. He said that he would do so.

Mr. Weisberg insisted that there are extenuating circumstances which excuse his lack of productiveness and the merely "good" quality of his work in DRA. He informed me that when he receives his efficiency rating he intends to appeal it.

cc: Mr. Opsata
Mr. Kibler
Mr. Weisberg ✓

never considered this

INFORMATION

(1) INTERPRETATION OF EFFICIENCY RATING

Excellent (E) means that performance in every important phase of the work was outstanding and there was no weakness in performance in any respect.

Very Good (VG) means that performance in at least half of the important phases of the work was outstanding and there was no weakness in performance in any respect.

Good (G) means that performance met requirements from an over-all point of view.

Fair (F) means that performance did not quite measure up to requirements from an over-all point of view.

Unsatisfactory (U) means that performance in a majority of important phases of the work did not meet job requirements.

(2) SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFICIENCY RATINGS

An efficiency rating of "Good", "Very Good", or "Excellent" is necessary in order to receive a periodic within-grade salary advancement. Such rating will permit periodic salary advancement by successive steps up to and including the top of the grade.

An efficiency rating "Fair" requires a one-step salary reduction if an employee's pay rate is above the middle rate for his grade (the fourth step in six-rate grades). If the rate of compensation is equal to or below such middle salary rate, it is not subject to reduction on that account.

An employee whose efficiency rating is "Unsatisfactory" is not permitted to remain in his position. He must be assigned to a position more nearly commensurate with his ability, either (1) in the same line of work, in which case the position must be in a lower classification grade and his rate of compensation must not be in excess of the middle rate for such grade, or (2) in some other line of work for which he is qualified, in which case he is considered as having received a new appointment to the extent that his rate of compensation must be at the minimum rate for such grade and he must begin a new probationary period; or if no suitable vacancy is available he must be separated from the service for inefficiency. A probationary employee, assigned to a position of lower classification grade, begins a new probationary period in the new position.

(3) INSPECTION AND APPEALS

If you have any questions regarding your efficiency rating, the appeals procedure, or the inspection of the adjective ratings of other employees, it is suggested that you discuss the matter with your immediate supervisor, or the Division of Departmental Personnel (DP), extension 2432. Although specific information should be secured from your supervisor or DP, the following general points may be helpful:

- a. You are entitled to see the final adjective ratings (not the rating forms) of all Departmental employees; these ratings will be available for inspection in DP, Room 114, Walker-Johnson Building on official work days.
- b. If you believe your rating is wrong, an appeal may be filed with the Department's Efficiency Rating Committee. Such an appeal must be sub-