

4. Members present their factor ratings supported by their interpretations of the rating scales and comparisons with Bench-marks.
5. The committee arrives at a consensus for each factor and determines the most appropriate bench-mark positions to be used for substantiation of findings.
6. The chairman records the consensus and the bench-marks selected on a rating report, which is signed by each member of the committee and this determines the classification of the position.

Pitfalls in Rating

1. Instant Evaluation – preconceiving the group and level before studying the job description and the standards.
2. Blinkered Evaluation – allowing the status or existing classification of the job to influence your judgement.
3. Bench-mark Paralysis – insufficient reference to bench-marks throughout the rating process.
4. Job Matching – attempting to evaluate the whole job by matching with another job or a bench-mark – matching must be made on a factor by factor basis.
5. Occupational Prejudice – tendency to overrate or underrate a job because of your experience of or feelings towards a particular occupation, i.e., physical science vs social science, white collar vs blue collar, feelings about lawyers, doctors, engineers, technicians.
6. Tendency to Leniency – consistent tendency to rate high.
7. Tendency to Rate Low – failure to give recognition to the difficulties of the duties.
8. Person-Orientation – tendency to consider personal qualities of incumbent when rating the job, or to be unduly influenced by his qualifications.
9. Factor Confusion – tendency to award points under the wrong factor, e.g., continuing study and education and experience are entirely separate concepts, but are often confused.
10. Sleeping Partner Approach – accepting judgements of other members of the Committee before you are actually convinced and have stated your own case, for the sake of saving time or being agreeable. Equally undesirable is the opposite factor – inflexibility.
11. Filibuster Approach – trying to bulldoze the committee by volume of opinion rather than quality of opinion; make your points as clearly and succinctly as possible and weigh contrary opinion carefully.
12. Halo Effect – tendency to rate all factors high because one factor is high or all low because one factor is low, e.g., high on education, therefore high on complexity, consequence of error, and contacts.
13. Central Tendency – tendency to automatically assign an average or middle of the level rating to the job to avoid controversy.
14. "Sucker for Words" – tendency to be impressed by words used in the description, e.g., "negotiate", "statistics", "liaison", "directs", "co-ordinates", "confidential", "complex", without taking the trouble to find out what the words are intended to convey or to assess their accuracy and credibility.
15. Hierarchy Approach – placing excessive emphasis on organizational considerations, i.e., to the number of positions above or below in the organizational structure and their classifications in allocating degree ratings.