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**Metrics Module Tools: Editable Scorecards**

This document includes the Metrics Scorecards that are presented in the Metrics module (Module 2) of the integrated Guidebook: *Building a Sustainable Workforce in the Public Transportation Industry—A Systems Approach.* The Scorecards in this document allow for input of metrics ratings as well as editing of the anchors to better match the needs or specific situation of the organization utilizing the scorecards, as described in the Guidebook.

This document includes scorecards for four organizational processes: Recruitment, Retention, Training & Development, and Professional Capacity Building. There are two metrics scorecards for each of the organizational processes; one for management, advisory, administrative, and technical positions and one for frontline positions.

### How to Use the Metrics Scorecards

The metrics scorecards presented in this document should be used to evaluate existing workforce programs or practices that are under consideration for implementation. The purpose of these scorecards is not to compare one organization to another or create an evaluation of an organization that will be shared publically. Rather, these scorecards can be used internally to compare various practices to determine the most effective way to utilize resources. Further, while many of these metrics require data collection at an individual employee level, the scorecards are not designed to be used as a performance evaluation for any one employee. Instead, by aggregating data across employees and across metrics, the public transportation organization can evaluate or estimate the impact of particular initiatives.

All ten of the metrics (global and specific) provided in the appropriate scorecard should be used together to evaluate a single workforce practice such that the total score on the scorecard is for a single practice and then a new scorecard can be completed for a second practice if comparison is desired. To do this evaluation, ratings for each metric should be selected based on the anchors provided in the scorecard. To further explain how to use the metrics scorecards, consider the example metric in Exhibit 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exhibit 1**  **Example of Training and Development Metric and Anchors** | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Rating Scales** | | | |
| 0-25 | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 |
| 1. Percent of trainees satisfied with training | Less than 50% satisfied | 50% up to 75% satisfied | 76% up to 90% satisfied | Greater than 90% satisfied |

For example, if post-training surveys for a specific training and development program show that 77% of trainees are satisfied with the training program, this program may be given a rating of 52 based on the anchors in the above exhibit. If post-training surveys for another program show that 85% of trainees are satisfied with the program, this second program may be given a rating of 65. The choice in the absolute score given on each metric is not as important as consistency is to the functioning of the scorecard. For example, if a transit leader gave the second program described above a 67 instead of 65, this would be acceptable as long the same logic used to generate that score is applied when comparing another training program of interest along the same metric.

Once ratings are assigned for each of the metrics contained in a scorecard, a total score should be computed by summing each of the individual metric ratings. This number can help provide an overall picture of a practice that can then be compared internally to other practices. When using these metrics to evaluate workforce practices, performance on one metric should not be the sole determinant of whether a practice is effective. While metrics related to each of the organizational processes were identified, there could be other external factors or processes that impact the performance on that metric. Therefore, performance on multiple metrics should be considered when evaluating workforce practices.

### Adjusting or Creating Metrics Scorecard Anchors

While the anchors included in the scorecards were developed to be applicable to a wide range of public transportation organizations, individual organizations may find that the anchors do not meet their specific needs. In this case, the anchors can be adjusted slightly so that they are specific to and helpful for the individual public transportation organization utilizing the scorecards. An example of how the anchors can be adjusted is presented below; notice the same metric is used in Exhibits 2 and 3 while the anchors (i.e., descriptors under the scale points) have been changed in Exhibit 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exhibit 2**  **Example of Recruitment Metric and Anchors** | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Rating Scales** | | | |
| 0-25 | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 |
| 1. Time to fill position | Over 4 months | Greater than 2 up to 4 months | Greater than 1 up to 2 months | Less than 1 month |

When trying to evaluate recruitment programs using this metric and its associated anchors, a public transportation organization may find that all of their bus driver positions are filled in less than two months. In this case, it would be necessary to adjust the anchors to better differentiate between various recruitment programs that target bus drivers. When revising any of the anchors, it is important to make sure that the revised anchors follow these guidelines:

* The anchors should form a continuous scale (i.e., there is not break between categories so all possible values are covered);
* Each anchor should be mutually exclusive (i.e., there should be no overlap in scale points); and
* The same anchors should be used when evaluating programs for comparison with one another.

Using these guidelines, the anchors could be revised as shown in Exhibit 3 to better meet the needs of the public transportation organization just described.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exhibit 3**  **Example of Recruitment Metric and Revised Anchors** | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Rating Scales** | | | |
| 0-25 | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 |
| 1. Time to fill position | Over 2 months | Greater than 1 up to 2 months | Greater than 2 weeks up to 1 month | Less than 2 weeks |

The remainder of this document presents the scorecards for each organizational process (i.e., Recruitment, Retention, Training and Development, and Professional Capacity Building).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recruitment Practices Scorecard – Management/Advisory/Administrative/Technical Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Recruitment-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Time to fill position | * Over 8 months | * Greater than 5 up to 8 months | | * Greater than 2 up to 5 months | | * Less than 2 months | |  |
| 1. New hire turnover within the first year | * More than 40% of new hires turnover | * Over 20% up to 40% of new hires turnover | | * 10-20% of new hires turnover | | * Less than 10% of new hires turnover | |  |
| 1. New hire performance rating | * Bottom 25% of employees | * Slightly lower than average employees | | * Slightly higher than average employees | | * Top 25% of employees | |  |
| 1. Recruiting cost ratio | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Offer to acceptance ratio | * Less than 40% of offers accepted | * More than 40% up to 60% of offers accepted | | * More than 60% up to 80% of offers accepted | | * More than 80% of offers accepted | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recruitment Practices Scorecard – Frontline Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Recruitment-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Time to fill position | * Over 4 months | * Greater than 2 up to 4 months | | * Greater than 1 up to 2 months | | * Less than 1 month | |  |
| 1. New hire turnover within the first year | * More than 40% of new hires turnover | * Over 20% up to 40% of new hires turnover | | * 10-20% of new hires turnover | | * Less than 10% of new hires turnover | |  |
| 1. New hire turnover during initial training | * More than 30% of new hires turnover | * Over 20% up to 30% of new hires turnover | | * 10-20% of new hires turnover | | * Less than 10% of new hires turnover | |  |
| 1. New hire performance rating | * Performance deemed unacceptable | * Significant coaching required | | * Some coaching required | | * No coaching required | |  |
| 1. Recruiting cost ratio | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Retention Practices Scorecard – Management/Advisory/Administrative/Technical Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Retention-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Employee voluntary turnover rate | * Greater than 20% turnover | * Greater than 10% up to 20% turnover | | * Greater than 5% up to 10% turnover | | * Less than 5% turnover | |  |
| 1. Cost to fill open positions | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Diversity turnover | * More than 50% minority employees turnover in 1st year of hire | * Turnover of minorities significantly greater than non-minorities within 1st year of hire | | * Turnover of minorities slightly greater than non-minorities within 1st year of hire | | * Turnover of minorities equal to non-minorities within 1st year of hire | |  |
| 1. Employee engagement | * Less than 25% of employees indicate high engagement | * 25% up to 50% of employees indicate high engagement | | * Greater than 50% up to 75% of employees indicate high engagement | | * Greater than 75% of employees indicate high engagement | |  |
| 1. Impact of turnover on employee knowledge | * Greater than 50% decline in employee knowledge over 5 years | * Greater than 25% up to 50% decline in employee knowledge over 5 years | | * Greater than 0% up to 25% decline in employee knowledge over 5 years | | * No negative impact on employee knowledge | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Retention Practices Scorecard – Frontline Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Retention-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Employee voluntary turnover rate | * Greater than 10% turnover | * Greater than 5% up to 10% turnover | | * Greater than 2% up to 5% turnover | | * Less than 2% turnover | |  |
| 1. Cost to fill open positions | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Diversity turnover | * More than 50% minority employees turnover in 1st year of hire | * Turnover of minorities significantly greater than non-minorities within 1st year of hire | | * Turnover of minorities slightly greater than non-minorities within 1st year of hire | | * Turnover of minorities equal to non-minorities within 1st year of hire | |  |
| 1. Employee engagement | * Less than 25% of employees indicate high engagement | * 25% up to 50% of employees indicate high engagement | | * Greater than 50% up to 75% of employees indicate high engagement | | * Greater than 75% of employees indicate high engagement | |  |
| 1. Impact of turnover on employee knowledge | * Major impact on employee knowledge and related outcomes | * Significant impact on employee knowledge and related outcomes | | * Limited impact on employee knowledge and related outcomes | | * No negative impact on employee knowledge and related outcomes | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Training and Development Practices Scorecard – Management/Advisory/Administrative/Technical Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Training and Development-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Post-training knowledge/skill testing | * Testing indicates less than 60% post-training effectiveness | * Testing indicates 60% up to 79% post-training effectiveness | | * Testing indicates 80% up to 89% post-training effectiveness | | * Testing indicates 90% or greater post-training effectiveness | |  |
| 1. Employee performance post-training | * Performance decreases post-training | * Performance remains the same post-training | | * Performance improved somewhat post-training | | * Performance is greatly improved post-training | |  |
| 1. Percent of employees rating training as job relevant | * Less than 50% rate as job relevant | * 50% up to 75% rate as job relevant | | * 76% up to 90% rate as job relevant | | * Greater than 90% rate as job relevant | |  |
| 1. Percent of trainees satisfied with training | * Less than 50% satisfied | * 50% up to 75% satisfied | | * 76% up to 90% satisfied | | * Greater than 90% satisfied | |  |
| 1. Recency of training materials | * Greater than 10 years old | * Greater than 5 years up to 10 years old | | * 1 year up to 5 years old | | * Less than 1 year old | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Training and Development Practices Scorecard – Frontline Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Training and Development-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Post-training knowledge/skill testing | * Testing indicates less than 60% post-training effectiveness | * Testing indicates 60% up to 79% post-training effectiveness | | * Testing indicates 80% up to 89% post-training effectiveness | | * Testing indicates 90% or greater post-training effectiveness | |  |
| 1. Employee performance post-training | * Performance decreases post-training | * Performance remains the same post-training | | * Performance improved somewhat post-training | | * Performance is greatly improved post-training | |  |
| 1. Impact of training on system operations, safety, and customer service | * Negative impact on operational safety and effectiveness | * No impact on operational safety and effectiveness | | * Some positive impact on operational safety and effectiveness | | * Significantly positive impact on operational safety and effectiveness | |  |
| 1. Percent of trainees satisfied with training | * Less than 50% satisfied | * 50% up to 75% satisfied | | * 76% up to 90% satisfied | | * Greater than 90% satisfied | |  |
| 1. Recency of training materials - | * Greater than 10 years old | * Greater than 5 years up to 10 years old | | * 1 year up to 5 years old | | * Less than 1 year old | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Professional Capacity Building Practices Scorecard – Management/Advisory/Administrative/Technical Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Professional Capacity Building-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Timeliness of task completion | * Less than 50% of tasks completed on time | * Greater than 50% up to 75% of tasks completed on time | | * Greater than 75% up to 90% of tasks completed on time | | * Over 90% of tasks completed on time | |  |
| 1. ‘Percentage of employees who participate in employee development opportunities. | * 20% or less of employees; system does not have opportunities | * Greater than 20% up to 40% of employees | | * Greater than 40% up to 60% of employees | | * Over 60% of employees | |  |
| 1. Percentage of jobs filled internally | * 25% or less of jobs filled with internal candidates | * Over 25% up to 50% of jobs filled with internal candidates | | * Over 50% up to 75% of jobs filled with internal candidates | | * Over 75% of jobs filled with internal candidates | |  |
| 1. Employee involvement in organization’s decision-making | * Employees involved 10% or less of time | * Employees involved more than 10% up to 30% of time | | * Employees involved more than 30% up to 50% of time | | * Employees involved over 50% of time | |  |
| 1. Percentage of jobs with an up-to-date Job Description | * Less than 25% of jobs | * More than 25% up to 50% of jobs | | * More than 50% up to 75% of jobs | | * More than 75% of jobs | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Professional Capacity Building Practices Scorecard – Frontline Positions** | | | | | | | | |
| **Title of Practice:** | *(Enter here)* | | | | | | | |
| **Metrics** | **Professional Capacity Building-Specific Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Timeliness of scheduled activities | * Less than 70% of activities completed on time | * Greater than 70% up to 80% of activities completed on time | | * Greater than 80% up to 90% of activities completed on time | | * Over 90% of activities completed on time | |  |
| 1. Percentage of employees who participate in employee development opportunities. | * 20% or less of employees; system does not have opportunities | * Greater than 20% up to 40% of employees | | * Greater than 40% up to 60% of employees | | * Over 60% of employees | |  |
| 1. Percentage of operational supervisory positions filled by frontline personnel | * Less than 25% of supervisory positions filled | * Over 25% up to 50% of supervisory positions filled | | * Over 50% up to 75% of supervisory positions filled | | * Over 75% of supervisory positions filled | |  |
| 1. Employee involvement in organization’s decision-making | * Employees involved 10% or less of time | * Employees involved more than 10% up to 30% of time | | * Employees involved more than 30% up to 50% of time | | * Employees involved over 50% of time | |  |
| 1. Percentage of jobs with an up-to-date Job Description | * Less than 25% of jobs | * More than 25% up to 50% of jobs | | * More than 50% up to 75% of jobs | | * More than 75% of jobs | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Metrics** | **Global Rating Scales**  **(Based on experience or projections)** | | | | | | | **Score** |
| **0-25** | **26-50** | | **51-75** | | **76-100** | |
| 1. Stakeholder Buy-In | * Stakeholders unaware of program | * Stakeholders know of program but have a lot of questions | | * Stakeholders understand program and only have few questions | | * Stakeholders already onboard | |  |
| 1. Time to implement | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Cost to implement | * More than budget target | * Right at budget target | | * Slightly under budget target | | * Significantly under budget target | |  |
| 1. Full Return on investment | * Over 1 year | * Over 6 months up to 1 year | | * 3 up to 6 months | | * Less than 3 months | |  |
| 1. Sustainability | * One-time program | * Program information must be continually updated to remain current | | * Program can be updated annually and reused | | * Program can be continually used with minimal maintenance | |  |
| Subscore: | | | | | | | |  |
| **Notes:** | | | | | | | | |
| ***Likelihood of Success Going Fwd***  **Total Metrics Score** | ***Success Very Unlikely***  **0-250** | | ***Success Unlikely***  **251-500** | | ***Success Likely***  **501-750** | | ***Success Very Likely***  **751-1000** | |