YEAR ONE, YEAR TWO, YEAR THREE, YEAR FOUR, YEAR FIVE, AND YEAR SIX
OBJECTIVE DATA RESULTS

Range of Percent Salary Increases for Demonstration Group Employees

Year One—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Demonstration Group Employees

Year Two—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Demonstration Group Employees

1 This appendix is a compendium of data tables from previous reports and is provided for the ease of the reader in making comparisons with the Year Six data. Note that some analyses were not performed in all years.
Year Three—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Demonstration Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Salary Increase</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Std. Dev. = 2.08</th>
<th>Mean = 2.29</th>
<th>N = 2249</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.9</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.9</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.9</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.9</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 - 4.9</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 5.9</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 - 6.9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 - 7.9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 - 8.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 - 9.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 10.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 - 11.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year Four—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Demonstration Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Salary Increase</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Std. Dev. = 2.0</th>
<th>Mean = 2.6</th>
<th>N = 2099</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.9</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.9</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.9</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.9</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 - 4.9</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 5.9</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 - 6.9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 - 7.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 - 8.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 - 9.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 10.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 - 11.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This analysis is based on 2,099 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom salary data were available.
Year Five—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Demonstration Group Participants

Note: This analysis is based on the 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom salary data were available.

Year Six—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Demonstration Group Participants

Note: This analysis is based on 2,734 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants who had eligible performance ratings and for whom salary data were available.
Range of Percent Salary Increases for Comparison Group Employees

**Year One—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Comparison Group Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Salary Increase</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 - 0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1337.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.9</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.9</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 - 4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 5.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 - 6.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 - 7.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 - 8.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 - 9.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 10.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 - 11.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 and above</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year Two—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Comparison Group Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Salary Increase</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 - 0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 - 1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.9</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.9</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 - 4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 - 5.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 - 6.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 - 7.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 - 8.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 - 9.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 - 10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0 - 11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0 and above</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year Three—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Comparison Group Participants

![Bar chart showing the distribution of percent salary increases for comparison group participants in Year Three. The chart includes the number of employees, the range of percent increases, and the statistics for std. dev. and mean.]

Note: The Year Three bar for zero percent salary increases was revised in Year Four to reflect a correction. The corrected data point did not change the previously stated mean and standard deviation.

Year Four—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Comparison Group Participants

![Bar chart showing the distribution of percent salary increases for comparison group participants in Year Four. The chart includes the number of employees, the range of percent increases, and the statistics for std. dev. and mean.]

Note: This analysis is based on 1,619 of the 1,821 Comparison Group participants for whom salary data were available.
Year Five—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Comparison Group Participants

Mean = 1.52
Std. Dev. = 1.74
N = 1,556

Note: This analysis is based on the 1,556 of the 1,811 Comparison Group participants for whom salary data were available.

Year Six—Range of Percent Salary Increases for Comparison Group Participants

Mean = 2.64
Std. Dev. = 3.92
N = 1,865

Note: This analysis is based on 1,865 of the 2,134 Comparison Group participants who had eligible performance ratings and for whom salary data were available.
Range of Bonus Percentages for Demonstration Group Employees

Year One—Range of Bonus Percentages for Demonstration Group Employees

Year Two—Range of Bonus Percentages for Demonstration Group Employees
Year Three—Range of Bonus Percentages for Demonstration Group Participants

![Bar Chart for Year Three]

- Std. Dev. = 1.29
- Mean = 1.50
- N = 2675

Year Four—Range of Bonus Percentages for Demonstration Group Participants

![Bar Chart for Year Four]

- Std. Dev. = 1.2
- Mean = 1.7
- N = 2,099

Notes:
1. This analysis is based on the 2,099 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom bonus data were available.
2. Average bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 2001, as reported in the Year Four data file provided by DoC.
Year Five—Range of Bonus Percentages for Demonstration Group Participants

Notes:
1. Average bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 2002, as reported in the Year Five data file provided by DoC.
2. This analysis is based on the 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom salary data were available.
3. In Year Five, the analysis of bonus/award data was addressed in two separate ways for the Demonstration Group. The original analysis was based solely on performance-based bonuses, consistent with previous years. The expanded analysis was based on all bonuses/awards received by Demonstration Group participants and allows inclusion of “Special Act” awards and Other Awards, given that these were accounted for in the Comparison Group calculation.
Year Six—Range of Bonus Percentages for Demonstration Group Participants

Original Analysis:
Mean = 1.76
Std. Dev. = 1.24
N = 2,743

Expanded Analysis:
Mean = 2.16
Std. Dev. = 1.81
N = 2,747

Notes:
1. This analysis is based on the 2,747 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom bonus data were available.
2. Average bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 2003, as reported in the Year Six data file provided by DoC.
3. In Years Five and Six, the analysis of bonus/award data was addressed in two separate ways for the Demonstration Group. The original analysis was based solely on performance-based bonuses, consistent with previous years. The expanded analysis was based on all bonuses/awards received by Demonstration Group participants and allows inclusion of “Special Act” awards and Other Awards, given that these were accounted for in the Comparison Group calculation.
Range of Award Percentages for Comparison Group Employees

Year One—Range of Award Percentages for Comparison Group Employees

Year Two—Range of Award Percentages for Comparison Group Employees

Year Three—Range of Award Percentages for Comparison Group Participants
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Year Four—Range of Award Percentages for Comparison Group Participants

Note: This analysis is based on the 1,619 of the 1,821 Comparison Group participants for whom salary data were available.

Year Five—Range of Award Percentages for Comparison Group Participants

Note: This analysis is based on the 1,556 of the 1,811 Comparison Group participants for whom salary data were available.
Year Six—Range of Award Percentages for Comparison Group Participants

![Bar Chart]

Mean = 1.59  
Std. Dev. = 1.73  
N = 1873

Note: This analysis is based on 1,873 of the 2,134 Comparison Group participants who had eligible performance ratings and for whom award data were available.

Capped Employees by Race/National Origin

(This analysis was first performed in Year Six.)

Year Six—Capped Employees by Race/National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/NATIONAL ORIGIN</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION AMONG CAPPED EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION AMONG NEARLY CAPPED EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>OVERALL REPRESENTATION IN THE DEMONSTRATION GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This analysis is based on the 150 (and 375) Demonstration Group participants who had eligible performance ratings and for whom salary data were available had salaries at the maximums (near the maximums) for their pay bands.
### Average Performance-Based Pay Increase by Career Path

(This analysis was not performed on Year One or Year Two data.)

#### Year Three—Average Performance-Based Pay Increase by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Average pay increase by career path were computed for Demonstration Project participants for whom pay band data were available.
2. Overall average pay increase is a non-weighted average given that it is intended to represent the Demonstration Project as a single entity.

#### Year Four—Average Performance-Based Pay Increase by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Average pay increase by career path were computed for 2,099 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and salary data were available.

#### Year Five—Average Performance-Based Pay Increase by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Average pay increase by career path were computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and salary data were available. Average overall pay increase was computed by generating a weighted average to account for the different number of employees in each band.
Year Six—Average Performance-Based Pay Increase by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Average pay increase by career path were computed for 2,734 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom career path and salary data were available.
2. Average overall pay increase represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.

Average Bonus by Career Path

(This analysis was not performed on Year One or Year Two data.)

Year Three—Average Bonus by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>AVERAGE BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Average bonus by career path was computed for Demonstration Project participants for whom pay band data were available.
2. Overall bonus is a non-weighted average given that it is intended to represent the Demonstration Project as a single entity.

Year Four—Average Bonus by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average bonus by career path was computed for 2,099 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and salary data were available.
Year Five—Average Bonus by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average bonus by career path was computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and salary data were available. Average overall bonus was computed by generating a weighted average to account for the different number of employees in each band.

Year Six—Average Bonus by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average bonus by career path was computed for 2,743 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom career path and bonus data were available. Average overall bonus represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.

Average Performance Score by Career Path

(This analysis was not performed on Year One or Year Two data.)

Year Three—Average Performance Score by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>85.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>83.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>85.8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>81.9 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>84.3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Average scores by career path were computed for Demonstration Project participants for whom pay band data were available.
2. Average overall performance score represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.
### Year Four—Average Performance Score by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>85.9 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>87.3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>83.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>85.7 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Average performance scores by career path were computed for 2,101 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and performance score data were available.
2. Average overall performance score represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.

### Year Five—Average Year Five Performance Score by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>86.4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>84.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>88.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>84.8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>86.5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Average performance scores by career path were computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and performance score data were available.
2. Average overall performance score represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.

### Year Six—Average Year Six Performance Score by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>87.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>85.3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>88.5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>84.8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>86.9 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Average performance scores by career path were computed for 2,743 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and performance score data were available.
2. Average overall performance score was computed for 2,752 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom performance score data were available and represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.
### Performance Category and Performance-Based Pay Increases

#### Year Two—Performance Category and Performance-Based Pay Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PAY INCREASE PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year Two—Performance Category and Demonstration Group Participants Receiving No Performance-Based Pay Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES WITH NO SALARY INCREASE</th>
<th>PERCENT RECEIVING NO SALARY INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Beginning in Year Three, the two tables above were combined into the table below.)

#### Year Three—Performance Score Category and Performance-Based Pay Increases Among Demonstration Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES RECEIVING PAY INCREASES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some, if not all, of the 10.7 percent of employees in the highest performance score category, but with no pay increases, may be employees at or near the top of their paybands. Employees who were promoted or received a pay adjustment within 120 days of the end of the rating cycle are eligible to receive a score but are not eligible for a pay increase.*
### Year Four—Performance Score Category and Performance-Based Pay Increases Among Demonstration Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES RECEIVING PAY INCREASES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some, if not all, of the 9 percent of employees in the highest performance score category, but with no pay increases, may be employees at or near the top of their paybands. Employees who were promoted or received a pay adjustment within 120 days of the end of the rating cycle are eligible to receive a score but are not eligible for a pay increase.

### Year Five—Performance Score Category and Performance-Based Pay Increases Among Demonstration Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES RECEIVING PAY INCREASES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The total number of employees in this analysis is based on the 2,723 employees for whom valid Year Five performance scores were available.
2. Some, if not all, of the 13 percent of employees in the highest performance score category, but with no pay increases, may be employees at or near the top of their paybands. Employees who were promoted or received a pay adjustment within 120 days of the end of the rating cycle are eligible to receive a score but are not eligible for a pay increase.
Year Six—Performance Score Category and Performance-Based Pay Increases Among Demonstration Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES RECEIVING PAY INCREASES</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAY INCREASE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>1144 (41.8%)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>1292 (47.3%)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>239 (8.7%)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>45 (1.6%)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9 (0.3%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5 (0.2%)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1. This analysis is based on the 2,734 employees for whom valid Year Five performance scores and salary data were available.

Correlation Between Performance Scores and Bonuses by Career Path

(This analysis was not performed on Year One or Year Two data.)

Year Three—Correlation Between Performance Scores and Bonuses by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>CORRELATION BETWEEN PERFORMANCE SCORE AND BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All results are significant at the $p \leq .001$ level.
2. Correlation by career path were computed for Demonstration Project participants for whom pay band data were available.
3. Overall correlation represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.
### Year Four—Correlation Between Performance Scores and Bonuses by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>CORRELATION BETWEEN PERFORMANCE SCORE AND BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All results are significant at the p≤0.01 level.
2. Correlation by career path was computed for 2,099 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band data were available.
3. Overall correlation represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.

### Year Five—Correlation Between Performance Scores and Bonuses by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>CORRELATION BETWEEN PERFORMANCE SCORE AND BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All results are significant at the p≤0.01 level.
2. Correlation by career path was computed for 2,502 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band data were available.
3. Overall correlation represents a non-weighted average across the Demonstration Group.

### Year Six—Correlation Between Performance Scores and Bonuses by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>CORRELATION BETWEEN PERFORMANCE SCORE AND BONUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All results are significant at the p≤0.01 level.
2. Correlation by career path was computed for 2,743 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom performance score, bonus data, and career path data were available.
Range of Pay Increases Upon Promotion

(This analysis was not performed on Year One or Year Two data.)

Year Three—Range of Pay Increases Upon Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion by Band (or equivalent)</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band after promotion Employees</td>
<td>Size of Range of Increase Upon Promotion Employees</td>
<td>Size of Range of Increase Upon Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2  18</td>
<td>$8,997 6</td>
<td>$7,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3  60</td>
<td>$10,206 26</td>
<td>$9,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4  57</td>
<td>$14,173 11</td>
<td>$6,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5  21</td>
<td>$17,537 4</td>
<td>$1,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Range</td>
<td>$12,503</td>
<td>$7,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Band (equivalent) and salary information was not available for two participants in the Comparison Group who were promoted. Promotions are reported for those cases in which employees were promoted across bands (or the equivalent in the Comparison Group).
2. Size of range was computed by subtracting the smallest promotion amount from the largest promotion amount.
3. Average range was computed by generating a weighted average to account for the different number of employees in each band.

Year Four—Range of Pay Increases Upon Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion by Band (or equivalent)</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band after promotion Employees</td>
<td>Size of Range of Increase Upon Promotion Employees</td>
<td>Size of Range of Increase Upon Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2  2</td>
<td>$2,116 3</td>
<td>$714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3  43</td>
<td>$10,270 27</td>
<td>$5,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4  55</td>
<td>$17,522 38</td>
<td>$9,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5  24</td>
<td>$13,885 8</td>
<td>$5,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Range</td>
<td>$14,055</td>
<td>$7,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Promotions are reported for those cases in which employees were promoted across bands (or the equivalent in the Comparison Group).
2. Size of range was computed by subtracting the smallest promotion amount from the largest promotion amount.
3. Average range was computed by generating a weighted average to account for the different number of employees in each band.
Year Five—Range of Pay Increases Upon Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion by Band (or equivalent)</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band after promotion</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Size of Range of Increase Upon Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$10,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$12,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$15,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$24,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Promotions are reported for those cases in which employees were promoted across bands (or the equivalent in the Comparison Group).
2. Size of range was computed by subtracting the smallest promotion amount from the largest promotion amount.
3. Average range was computed by generating a weighted average to account for the different number of employees in each band.

Year Six—Range of Pay Increases Upon Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion by Band (or equivalent)</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band after promotion</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Size of Range of Increase Upon Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$4,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$17,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$12,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$26,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Promotions are reported for those cases in which employees were promoted across bands (or the equivalent in the Comparison Group).
2. Size of range was computed by subtracting the smallest promotion amount from the largest promotion amount.
Supervisory Performance Pay and Average Performance Scores

(This analysis was first conducted in Year Six.)

Year Six—Supervisory Performance Pay and Average Performance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Supervisors</th>
<th>Eligible for Supervisory Performance Pay</th>
<th>Not Eligible for Supervisory Performance Pay</th>
<th>Average Performance Score Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Average Performance Score</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Average Performance Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Two</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Three</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Four</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Five</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Six</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Year One data were not available for this analysis.
2. This analysis is based on the 276 of the 524 supervisors for whom supervisory performance pay data and performance score data were available.

Supervisory Performance Pay and Distribution of Performance Scores

(This analysis was first conducted in Year Six.)

Year Six—Supervisory Performance Pay and Distribution of Performance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Eligible for Supervisory Performance Pay</th>
<th>Not Eligible for Supervisory Performance Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This analysis is based on the 276 of the 524 supervisors for whom supervisory performance pay data and performance score data were available.


### Distribution Across Each Performance Score Category

(This analysis was first conducted in Year Six.)

#### Year Six—Distribution Across Each Performance Score Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Eligible for Supervisory Performance Pay</th>
<th>Not Eligible for Supervisory Performance Pay</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This analysis is based on the 276 of the 524 supervisors for whom supervisory performance pay data and performance score data were available.

### Employees on Three-Year Probation

(This analysis was first conducted in Year Six.)

#### Year Six—Employees on Three-Year Probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Probation Began</th>
<th>Number on Probation in Year Six</th>
<th>Number Made Permanent in Year Six</th>
<th>Number Remaining on Probation at End of Year Six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demo Project Year Three</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Project Year Four</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Project Year Five</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Project Year Six</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparisons of Starting Salary Ranges Among New Hires in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

#### Year Two—Comparisons of Starting Salary Ranges Among New Hires in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Hires*</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
<td>Number of New Hires</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$16,492</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$18,171</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$16,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,754</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$7,372</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$20,059</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$12,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$25,927</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$22,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$31,657</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$35,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$21,505</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$6,513</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$5,106</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$23,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$10,656</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$11,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$10,585</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$6,278</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$8,814</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$6,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$7,526</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$9,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8,063</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$9,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The number of cases used in this analysis is based on the number of new hires for whom starting salary, career path, and pay band data were available (i.e., 192 out of 313 new hires).
2. Size of range of was computed as by subtracting the smallest starting salary from the largest starting salary.
3. For each comparison between the Demonstration Group and the Comparison Group, the wider range in starting salaries appears in bold.
## Year Three—Comparison of Starting Salary Ranges Among New Hires in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Hires*</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
<td>Number of New Hires</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$16,134</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$15,502</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$27,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$29,819</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$25,390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$8,438</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$6,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$21,003</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$23,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$19,040</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$28,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$31,815</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$31,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4,763</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9,502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$11,411</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$11,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$9,803</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$10,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$8,889</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$12,980</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$9,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$12,690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The number of cases used in this analysis is based on the number of new hires for whom starting salary, career path, and pay band data were available (i.e., 187 out of 280 new hires in the Demonstration Group and 118 out of 161 new hires in the Comparison Group).
2. Size of range of was computed as by subtracting the smallest starting salary from the largest starting salary.
3. For each comparison between the Demonstration Group and the Comparison Group, the wider range in starting salaries appears in bold.
Year Four—Comparison of Starting Salary Ranges Among New Hires in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Hires</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
<td>Number of New Hires</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$14,549</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$22,515</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$13,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$28,048</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$16,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$42,333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$22,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$24,333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,104</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$26,969</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$22,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$28,047</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$43,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$32,343</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$31,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$25,783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$8,591</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$9,180</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,880</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$11,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$16,955</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$10,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$8,902</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$6,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$10,740</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$11,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8,838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The number of cases used in this analysis is based on the number of new hires for whom starting salary, career path, and pay band data were available (i.e., 310 out of 344 new hires in the Demonstration Group and 214 out of 215 new hires in the Comparison Group).
2. Size of range of was computed as by subtracting the smallest starting salary from the largest starting salary.
3. For each comparison between the Demonstration Group and the Comparison Group, the wider range in starting salaries appears in bold.
### Year Five—Comparison of Starting Salary Ranges Among New Hires in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Hires</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$24,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$27,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$28,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$29,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$14,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$13,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$12,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The number of cases used in this analysis is based on the number of new hires for whom starting salary, career path, and pay band data were available (i.e., 131 out of 223 new hires in the Demonstration Group and 132 out of 160 new hires in the Comparison Group).
2. Size of range of was computed as by subtracting the smallest starting salary from the largest starting salary.
3. For each comparison between the Demonstration Group and the Comparison Group, the wider range in starting salaries appears in bold.
Year Six—Comparison of Starting Salary Ranges Among New Hires in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of New Hires</td>
<td>Size of Range of Starting Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$20,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$22,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$24,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$11,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$22,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$28,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$27,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$19,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$11,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$11,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$17,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The number of cases used in this analysis is based on the number of new hires for whom starting salary, career path, and pay band data were available (i.e., 143 out of 330 new hires in the Demonstration Group) and all 102 new hires in the Comparison Group.
2. Size of range of was computed as by subtracting the smallest starting salary from the largest starting salary.
### Agency Data Request Results – Recruitment Methods

#### Year Three—Agency Data Request Results – Recruitment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION GROUP</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency based staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made*</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Merit assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION GROUP</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of calendar days required to fill a position (from initial posting of vacancy to selection)</td>
<td>69 days</td>
<td>68 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total number of offers made may appear lower than typical given the Presidential hiring freeze.*

#### Year Four—Agency Data Request Results – Recruitment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION GROUP</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency based staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Merit assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION GROUP</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of calendar days required to fill a position (from initial posting of vacancy to selection)</td>
<td>58 days</td>
<td>56 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Year Five—Agency Data Request Results – Recruitment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION GROUP</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency based staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit assignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of calendar days required to fill a position (from initial posting of vacancy to selection)</td>
<td>48 days</td>
<td>42 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Year Six—Agency Data Request Results – Recruitment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION GROUP</th>
<th>COMPARISON GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Based Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit Assignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers made</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers accepted</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offers re-negotiated (per candidate)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance rate (offers accepted/offer made)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to Fill Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of calendar days required to fill a position (from initial posting of vacancy to selection)</td>
<td>40 days</td>
<td>58 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demonstration Group Turnover Rates by Level of Performance

#### Year Two—Demonstration Group Turnover Rates by Level of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>TURNOVER RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Scores</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*
1. This analysis is based on Demonstration Group participants who had valid performance ratings in Year Two.

#### Year Three—Demonstration Group Turnover Rates by Level of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SEPARATED EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>TURNOVER RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Scores</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>339*</td>
<td>15%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
1. Overall, 436 employees separated during Year Three. Valid Year Three performance scores were available for 148 of the 436 who separated in Year Three. For an additional 191 of the 436 who separated in Year Three, valid Year Two performance scores were available (presumably these employees separated prior to receiving a Year Two score). This analysis is therefore based upon these 339 employees. This analysis does not include 97 employees who separated in Year Three but for whom neither Year Two nor Year Three performance scores were available.
2. 15 percent is the turnover rate among Demonstration Group participants for whom performance scores were available. The turnover rate presented elsewhere, 16 percent, is the rate for all Demonstration Group participants.
### Year Four—Demonstration Group Turnover Rates by Level of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SEPARATED EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>TURNOVER RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Overall, 403 employees separated during Year Four. The total number of separated employees in this analysis is based on 197 of the 403 employees who separated in Year Four for whom valid Year Four performance scores were available.
2. The total number of employees in this analysis is based on the 2,101 employees for whom valid Year Four performance scores were available.
3. In Year Four, this analysis was performed as it was in Year Two.

### Year Five—Demonstration Group Turnover Rates by Level of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SEPARATED EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>TURNOVER RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The total number of employees in this analysis is based on the 2,723 employees for whom valid Year Five performance scores were available.
2. Overall, 158 employees separated during Year Five. The total number of separated employees in this analysis is based on 61 of the 158 employees who separated in Year Five for whom valid Year Five performance scores were available.
3. The overall turnover rate for the Demonstration Group is 5 percent, which differs from a weighted average of the rates presented in this table. The reason for this difference is that the overall turnover rate is based on the number of employees who separated during Year Five and the total number of employees in the Demonstration Group, regardless of whether performance scores were available.
### Year Six—Demonstration Group Turnover Rates by Level of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE SCORE CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SEPARATED EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>TURNOVER RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The total number of employees in this analysis is based on the 2,752 employees for whom valid Year Six performance scores were available.
2. Overall, 242 employees separated during Year Six. The total number of separated employees in this analysis is based on 69 of the 242 employees who separated in Year Six for whom valid Year Six performance scores were available.
3. The overall turnover rate for the Demonstration Group is 5.4 percent, which differs from a weighted average of the rates presented in this table. The reason for this difference is that the overall turnover rate is based on the number of employees who separated during Year Six and the total number of employees in the Demonstration Group, regardless of whether performance scores were available.

### Average Turnover Rate by Career Path

(This analysis was not performed on Year One or Year Two data.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>AVERAGE TURNOVER RATE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>85.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>83.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>85.8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>81.9 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84.3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Rates by career path were computed for Demonstration Project participants for whom pay band data were available.
2. Overall turnover rate is a non-weighted average given that it is intended to represent the Demonstration Project as a single entity.
3. The overall turnover rate for the Demonstration Group is 16 percent, which may differ from a weighted average of the rates presented in this table. The reason for this difference is that the overall turnover rate is based on the number of employees who separated during Year Five and the total number of employees in the Demonstration Group, regardless of whether career path data were available.
### Year Four—Average Turnover Rate by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE TURNOVER RATE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85.9 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>83.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>87.3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>83.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85.7 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Turnover rates by career path were computed for Demonstration Project participants for whom pay band data were available.
2. Average performance scores by career path were computed for 2,101 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and performance score data were available; these averages are not limited to the subset of individuals who turned over in Year Four.
3. The overall turnover rate for the Demonstration Group is 15 percent, which may differ from a weighted average of the rates presented in this table. The reason for this difference is that the overall turnover rate is based on the number of employees who separated during Year Five and the total number of employees in the Demonstration Group, regardless of whether career path data were available.

### Year Five—Average Turnover Rate by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>AVERAGE TURNOVER RATE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>86.4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>84.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>88.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>84.8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>86.5 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Turnover rates by career path were computed for Demonstration Project participants for whom pay band data were available.
2. Average performance scores by career path were computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom pay band and performance score data were available; these averages are not limited to the subset of individuals who turned over in Year Five.
3. The overall turnover rate for the Demonstration Group is 5 percent, which may differ from a weighted average of the rates presented in this table. The reason for this difference is that the overall turnover rate is based on the number of employees who separated during Year Five and the total number of employees in the Demonstration Group, regardless of whether career path data were available.
### Year Six—Average Turnover Rate by Career Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER PATH</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES WHO TURNED OVER</th>
<th>AVERAGE TURNOVER RATE</th>
<th>OVERALL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>87.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZT</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>85.3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>88.5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>84.8 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Average turnover rates were computed based on the 2,743 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom career path, performance score, and turnover data were available.
2. Average performance appraisal scores by career path were computed based on the 2,743 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom career path and performance score data were available; these averages are not restricted to the subset of individuals who turned over in Year Six nor to those for whom turnover data were available.

### Average Increases, Bonuses, and Total Awards as a Percent of Salary

**Year Two—Average Increases, Bonuses, and Total Awards as a Percent of Salary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (as a % of salary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The difference between performance-based pay increases was statistically significant at the p≤.05 level. The difference between bonuses and the difference between total awards was not statistically significant at the p≤.01 level.*
### Year Three—Stayers Versus Leavers: Percent Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (as a Percentage of Salary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Based Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: None of these differences was found to be statistically significant at the $p \leq .05$ level.

### Year Four—Stayers Versus Leavers: Percent Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (as a Percentage of Salary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Based Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: None of these differences was found to be statistically significant at the $p \leq .05$ level.

### Year Five—Stayers Versus Leavers: Percent Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (as a Percentage of Salary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Based Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards (Performance-Based Pay Increase Plus Bonus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The difference between performance-based pay increases was not statistically significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. The difference between bonuses and the difference between total awards was statistically significant at the $p \leq .01$ level.
### Year Six—Stayers Versus Leavers: Percent Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (as a Percentage of Salary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance-Based Pay Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Awards (Performance-Based Pay Increase Plus Bonus)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Average awards were computed for the Demonstration Group participants for whom turnover, salary, and bonus data were available (2,734 for the performance-based pay increase and total awards analysis and 2,748 for the bonus analysis).
2. The difference between performance-based pay increases was statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.01$ level. The difference between bonuses was statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level. The difference between total awards was statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.01$ level.

### Average Increases and Bonuses (in Dollars)

#### Year Two—Average Increases and Bonuses (in Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The difference between performance-based pay increases was statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level. The difference between bonuses was not statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level.

#### Year Three—Stayers Versus Leavers: Average Performance-Based Pay Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (in Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance-Based Pay Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$1,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Neither of these differences was found to be statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level.
### Year Four—Stayers Versus Leavers: Average Performance-Based Pay Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (in Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Based Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The difference between performance-based pay increases was not statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level. The difference between bonuses was statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level.

### Year Five—Stayers Versus Leavers: Average Performance-Based Pay Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (in Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Based Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The difference between performance-based pay increases was not statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level. The difference between bonuses was statistically significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level.

### Year Six—Stayers Versus Leavers: Average Performance-Based Pay Increases and Bonuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Average Award (in Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Based Pay Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>$1,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>$997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Turnover Among Supervisors

## Year Two—Turnover Among Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>2740</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Receiving Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Only</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The turnover rate was calculated as the number of individuals who separated divided by the total number of individuals.*

## Year Three—Turnover Among Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Number Who Separated</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Not Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The turnover rate was calculated as the number of individuals who separated divided by the total number of individuals.*

## Year Four—Turnover Among Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Number Who Separated</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees*</td>
<td>2641</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Not Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*

1. Turnover rate was calculated as the number of individuals who separated divided by the total number of individuals.
2. “All Employees” includes supervisory and non-supervisory employees.
### Year Five—Turnover Among Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Number Who Separated</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees*</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Not Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Turnover rate was calculated as the number of individuals who separated divided by the total number of individuals.
2. “All Employees” includes supervisory and non-supervisory employees.

### Year Six —Turnover Among Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Number Who Separated</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees*</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Not Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors Who Did Receive Supervisory Performance Pay</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Supervisors</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Turnover rate was calculated as the number of individuals who separated divided by the total number of individuals.
2. “All Employees” includes supervisory and non-supervisory employees.
3. This analysis is based on the 500 of the 524 supervisors for whom supervisory performance pay data were available.
### Diversity of New Hires Compared to the Overall Demonstration Group

#### Year Two—Diversity of New Hires Compared to the Overall Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Hires (N=313)</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group Employees (N=2,740)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. May not add to 100% due to rounding.
2. The number of new hires reported here is the number of new hires reported in the objective datafile.

#### Year Three—Diversity of New Hires Compared to the Overall Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Hires (N=280)*</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group Employees (N=2,781)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of new hires reported here is the number of new hires reported in the objective datafile.
### Year Four—Diversity of New Hires Compared to the Overall Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Hires (N=344)</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group Employees (N=2,641)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of new hires reported here is the number of new hires reported in the objective datafile.

### Year Five—Diversity of New Hires Compared to the Overall Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Hires (N=223)</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group participants (N=2,723)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of new hires reported here is the number of new hires reported in the objective datafile.
Year Six—Diversity of New Hires Compared to the Overall Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Hires (N=330)</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group participants (N=4,465) in Year Six</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group participants (N=2,697) in Year One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/National Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of new hires reported here is the number of new hires reported in the objective datafile.

Average Performance Appraisal Scores (Raw), Pay Increase Percentages (Raw and Adjusted), and Bonus Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) for the Demonstration Group

Year One—Average Performance Appraisal Scores (Raw), Pay Increase Percentages (Raw and Adjusted), and Bonus Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) for the Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>80.34 points</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>82.33 points</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82.64 points</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81.53 points</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>79.38 points</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>82.22 points</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>81.95 points</strong></td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The average performance appraisal score for each Demonstration Group subgroup is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 1998, and as reported in the January 1999 data file provided by DoC. Average increase and bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 1998, as reported in the January 1999 data file provided by DoC.
2. The minority group includes all non-White personnel.
3. Adjusted averages were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.
Year Two—Average Performance Appraisal Scores (Raw), Pay Increase Percentages (Raw and Adjusted), and Bonus Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) for the Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>82.7 points</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>83.6 points</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83.9 points</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83.1 points</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>81.8 points</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>83.6 points</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.4 points</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The average performance appraisal score for each Demonstration Group subgroup is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 1999, and as reported in the Year Two data file provided by DoC. Average increase and bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 1998, as reported in the Year Two data file provided by DoC.
2. The minority group includes all non-White personnel, specifically Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians.
3. Adjusted averages were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.

Year Three—Average Performance Appraisal Scores, Pay Increase Percentages (Raw and Adjusted), and Bonus Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) for the Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Performance-Based Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>83.5 points</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>84.9 points</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84.7 points</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.5 points</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>83.2 points</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>84.8 points</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>84.3 points</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The average performance appraisal score for each Demonstration Group subgroup is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 2000, and as reported in the Year Three data file provided by DoC. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 1999, as reported in the Year Three data file provided by DoC.
2. The minority group includes all non-White personnel, specifically Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians.
3. Adjusted averages were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.
### Year Four—Average Performance Appraisal Scores, Pay Increase Percentages (Raw and Adjusted), and Bonus Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) for the Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Performance-Based Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>85.3 points</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>85.8 points</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85.9 points</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85.7 points</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>83.6 points</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>86.1 points</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The average performance appraisal score for each Demonstration Group subgroup is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 2001, and as reported in the Year Four data file provided by DoC. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 2001, as reported in the Year Four data file provided by DoC.
2. The minority group includes all non-White personnel, specifically Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians.
3. Adjusted averages were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.
4. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages were computed for 2,099 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom salary data were available. Average performance scores were computed for 2,101 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom performance score data were available.

### Year Five—Average Performance Appraisal Scores, Pay Increase Percentages (Raw and Adjusted), and Bonus Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) for the Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Performance-Based Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>85.9 points</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>86.6 points</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86.8 points</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.2 points</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>84.9 points</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>86.7 points</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The average performance appraisal score for each Demonstration Group subgroup is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 2002, and as reported in the Year Five data file provided by DoC. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages are based on actions effective in November 2002, as reported in the Year Five data file provided by DoC.
2. The minority group includes all non-White personnel, specifically Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians.
3. Adjusted averages were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.
4. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages were computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom salary data were available. Average performance scores were computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom performance score data were available.
(Beginning in Year Six, the preceding table was divided into the two tables below.)

### Year Six—Average Performance Scores by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average Performance score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>87.0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>86.7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>85.9 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>87.7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>84.5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87.3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>85.6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>87.1 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year Six—Average Pay Increase Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) and Bonus Percentages (Raw and Adjusted) for the Demonstration Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average Performance-Based Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:
1. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages are based on appraisals conducted in September 2004 and actions effective in November 2004, as reported in the Year Six data file provided by DoC.
2. Adjusted averages were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path length of service, and organization.
3. Average performance-based pay increase percentages were computed for 2,734 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom data were available on pay increases, performance score, career path (or equivalent), length of service, and organization.
4. Average bonus percentages were computed for 2,743 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom data were available on bonuses/awards, performance score, career path (or equivalent), length of service, and organization.
5. Average performance scores were computed for 2,752 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants for whom performance score data were available.
6. The sample sizes for this analysis ranged from 81 to 2,187.
## Comparison of Performance Appraisal Scores (Raw), Average Pay Increases (Adjusted), and Average Bonuses/Awards (Adjusted)

### Year One—Comparison of Performance Appraisal Scores (Raw), Average Pay Increases (Adjusted), and Average Bonuses/Awards (Adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus/Award Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>80.34 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>82.33 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82.64 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81.53 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>79.38 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>82.22 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The average performance appraisal score presented for each Demonstration Group subgroup is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. The numbers presented for the Comparison Group subgroups are the percentages of employees who received “Pass” or “Fail” under the 2-level system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 1998, and as reported in the January 1999 data file provided by DoC. Performance data for Comparison Group employees are based on appraisals occurring between March 28, 1998 and January 31, 1999 and as reported in the January 1999 data file provided by DoC.

2. Average pay increase and bonus/award percentages are based on actions occurring between March 28, 1998 and January 31, 1999 as reported in the January 1999 data files provided by DoC.
### Year Two—Comparison of Performance Appraisal Scores (Raw), Average Pay Increases (Adjusted), and Average Bonuses/Awards (Adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus/Award Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>82.7 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>83.6 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83.9 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>83.1 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>81.8 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>83.6 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The performance appraisal score presented for the Demonstration Group is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. The numbers presented for the Comparison Group are the percentages of employees who received “Pass” or “Fail” under the 2-level system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 1999, and as reported in the Year Two data file provided by DoC. Performance data for Comparison Group employees are based on appraisals occurring between April 1, 1999 and March 31, 2000 and as reported in the Year Two data file provided by DoC.

2. Average pay increase and bonus/award percentages are based on actions occurring during the 1999 performance evaluation cycle that ended 9/30/99 and as reported in the Year Two data file provided by DoC.
### Year Three—Comparison of Performance Appraisal Scores, Average Performance-Based Pay Increases, and Average Bonuses/Awards Across Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus/Award Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>83.5 points 100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.5% 0.3%</td>
<td>1.5% 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>84.9 points 100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.7% 1.2%</td>
<td>1.7% 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84.7 points 100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.7% 1.3%</td>
<td>1.8% 1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.5 points 100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.6% 0.9%</td>
<td>1.6% 1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>83.2 points 100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.4% 2.4%</td>
<td>1.5% 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>84.8 points 100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.7% 0.9%</td>
<td>1.7% 1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. The performance appraisal score presented for the Demonstration Group is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. The numbers presented for the Comparison Group are the percentages of employees who received “Pass” or “Fail” under the 2-level system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 2000, and as reported in the Year Three data file provided by DoC. Performance data for Comparison Group employees are based on appraisals occurring between April 1, 2000 and March 31, 2001 and as reported in the Year Three data file provided by DoC.
2. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus/award percentages are based on actions occurring during the performance evaluation cycle that ended 9/30/00 and as reported in the Year Three data file provided by DoC.
3. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages for the Demonstration Group are based on adjusted averages that were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.
## Year Four—Comparison of Performance Appraisal Scores, Average Performance-Based Pay Increases, and Average Bonuses/Awards Across Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus/Award Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>85.3 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>85.8 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85.9 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85.7 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>83.6 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>86.1 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The performance appraisal scores presented for the Demonstration Group is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. The numbers presented for the Comparison Group are the percentages of employees who received “Pass” or “Fail” under the 2-level system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 2001, and as reported in the Year Four data file provided by DoC. Performance data for Comparison Group employees are based on appraisals occurring between April 1, 2001 and March 31, 2002 and as reported in the Year Four data file provided by DoC.
2. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus/award percentages are based on actions occurring during the performance evaluation cycle that ended September 30, 2001 and as reported in the Year Four data file provided by DoC.
3. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages for the Demonstration Group are based on adjusted averages that were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.
4. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages were computed for 2,099 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom salary and demographic data were available. Average performance scores were computed for 2,101 of the 2,641 Demonstration Group participants for whom performance score and demographic data were available.
5. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages were computed for 1,434 of the 1,821 Comparison Group participants for whom data were available on pay increases, bonuses, performance score, career path, and length of service.
### Year Five—Comparison of Performance Appraisal Scores, Average Performance-Based Pay Increases, and Average Bonuses/Awards Across Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance Appraisal Scores</th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus/Award Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>Demonstration Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>85.9 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>86.6 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86.8 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.6 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>84.9 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>86.7 points</td>
<td>100% Pass; 0% Fail</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The performance appraisal scores presented for the Demonstration Group is the average number of points received under the 100-point system. The numbers presented for the Comparison Group are the percentages of employees who received “Pass” or “Fail” under the 2-level system. Performance data for Demonstration Group employees are based on appraisals conducted in September 2002, and as reported in the Year Five data file provided by DoC. Performance data for Comparison Group employees are based on appraisals occurring between April 1, 2002 and March 31, 2003 and as reported in the Year Five data file provided by DoC.

2. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus/award percentages are based on actions occurring during the performance evaluation cycle that ended September 30, 2002 and as reported in the Year Five data file provided by DoC.

3. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages for the Demonstration Group are based on averages that were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, and length of service.

4. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages were computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom salary and demographic data were available. Average performance scores were computed for 2,723 of the 3,072 Demonstration Group participants for whom performance score and demographic data were available.

5. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages were computed for 1,555 of the 1,811 Comparison Group participants for whom data were available on pay increases, bonuses, performance score, career path, and length of service.
### Year Six—Comparison of Average Pay Increases and Average Bonuses/Awards Between Demonstration Group and Comparison Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Pay Increase Percentage</th>
<th>Average Bonus/Award Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demo Group</td>
<td>Comp Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Veteran</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Demonstration Group average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages are based on appraisals conducted in September 2004 and actions effective in November 2004, as reported in the Year Six data file provided by DoC.
2. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus/award percentages are based on actions occurring during the performance evaluation cycle that ended September 30, 2004 and as reported in the Year Six data file provided by DoC.
3. Average performance-based pay increase and bonus percentages for the Demonstration Group are based on averages that were computed by statistically controlling for performance score, career path, length of service, organization.
4. Average performance-based pay increase percentages were computed for 2,327 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants, and the 1,842 of the 2,134 Comparison Group, for whom data were available on pay increases, performance rating, career path (or equivalent), length of service, and organization.
5. Average bonus percentages were computed for 2,504 of the 4,465 Demonstration Group participants, and the 1,850 of the 2,134 of the Comparison Group, for whom data were available on bonuses/awards, performance score, career path (or equivalent), length of service, and organization.
6. The sample sizes for this analysis ranged from 81 to 2187 for the Demonstration Group and 30 to 1567 for the Comparison Group.
## Turnover in the Demonstration Group, All Participants and High Performers

### Year Two—Turnover in the Demonstration Group, All Participants and High Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group Participants</th>
<th>Demonstration Group High Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “High performers” is defined as performance scores of 90–100.

### Year Three—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration Group Between All Participants and High Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>All Demonstration Group Participants</th>
<th>Demonstration Group High Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “High performers” is defined as performance scores of 90–100.

### Year Four—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration Group Between All Participants and High Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>High Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “High performers” is defined as performance scores of 90–100.

### Year Five—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration Group Between All Participants and High Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>High Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “High performers” is defined as performance scores of 90–100.
### Year Six—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration Group Between All Participants and High Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th>High Performers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Participants</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
<td>Percent Separated</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
<td>Percent Separated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “High performers” is defined as performance scores of 90–100.

### Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

#### Year Two—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
<td>Percent Separated</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
<td>Percent Separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year Three—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year Four—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year Five—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group All Participants</th>
<th>Comparison Group All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Minority</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year Six—Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Demonstration and Comparison Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Demonstration Group All Participants</th>
<th>Comparison Group All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>