

**The Merit Pay Evaluation Criteria was primarily developed by faculty in my department. If No, comment:**

Since the dean last fall came from a system that used points our department decided to use a point system with some similarity to (other state). The criteria for getting points were a combination of compromises among faculty in terms of how to get to the level 4 and 5 with a division between the categories.
Our department head worked in a very collaborative way with faculty in the department to develop our criteria. One reason I believe we had absolutely no problems was the extent to which faculty were involved in developing the criteria by which they would be evaluated.
It was primarily imposed from above. The incompetence of this questionnaire is evidenced by its poor design (for example "next" button should be at bottom of page not at top) and by the ignorance of its writing. The word "criteria" is plural not singular.
The criteria were developed by our departmental faculty but the concept of merit was imposed upon us.
We borrowed on previous merit evaluations including Grant and Faculty Award criteria.
My understanding is that the plan was developed at the college level.
It was developed primarily by upper level administration. The dept. then did what it could to clarify for our departmental criteria.
Criteria were discussed then had to be conformed to college criteria
Our Personnel Committee was instrumental in guiding all aspects of this process
The department head developed own idea of exactly what the criteria would be and pretty much ignored faculty input.

**All faculty in our department had an opportunity to participate in the development of our departmental evaluation plan. If NO, please comment:**

The 2006-07 advisory committee along with members from the current evaluation committee developed the evaluation plan. This composite group may now be called the personnel committee.
We had one faculty member who was on sabbatical who only had the opportunity to participate in initial development but not the actual criteria.
in a very limited way
Subcommittees were developed that decided the plan for each area: teaching service research.
The bulk of the work was done by the tenured faculty working in the personnel committee. It was then sent to the faculty and the head for initial feedback before being finalized.
See Answer 15
We had the opportunity to read what the dept. committee had put together.
Not all faculty could attend meetings.
Only Associate and Full Professors
There was an ad hoc Compensation Committee in my department. I do not believe that it did its job competently or consistently. There was no meaningful attempt to solicit the ideas or input of all faculty.
The college dominated.
I attempted to provide feedback but the committee either disagreed with or ignored my feedback. There was no faculty-wide discussion on issues I raised in emails with the committee.
By committee with input
The Compensation Committee (EDIT – information removed) ... drafted the guidelines and presented them to faculty but I don't think we were allowed to alter them. We had input that could or could not be used at the discretion of the committee.
Only brief discussions were held with the entire faculty and many suggestions were ignored. There was a sense that we have to just get this done. This feeling filtered down from our acting head.
The (department head) appointed a (EDIT – information removed) committee...the entire process was selective/secretive/flawed
While there was a plan presented for acceptance the DH ignored the plans set forth therein.

**My performance weights for teaching, research, and service were negotiated with my Department Head. If NO, please comment:**

He simply asked for them. I do not know if he used what I asked for. We never saw our ratings from the committee nor from him. All we received was the composite from the college.
Each faculty member was told to turn in a suggested performance weight to the chairman but there was no personal discussion or negotiation with the chairman
The weights were negotiated within some parameters but do not relate to our actual teaching/research/service loads. We have no negotiation re: workload in our dept. We teach 12 equated hours (18 contact hours) per week which is an overload and no opportunity for release time.
We choose our own weight for each of the 3 areas
Negotiated would not be the term. We simply sent in the weights and the department head used them.
I don't think it was entirely clear how when or if faculty might determine or negotiate their merit ratings.
Not done individually; handled by dept.
No initially we were told they would be negotiated within a range but ultimately it sounded like they were dictated by the provost's office.
in a very limited way
The performance weights were discussed at the department level. Based on faculty input we were offered two choices: An 80/20 split between teaching and research/service and a 90/10 split between teaching and research/service.
He set a standard for the dept for this year and left next year until next.
It was not a negotiated process. As a lecturer/instructor we were told what percentages and what areas we could claim. At one point we were told we might not be able to claim anything for research even though some instructors have publications and research endeavors. After all the materials were due we were given a chance to reweight some items because of a complaint someone had made (senior faculty)
Due to the shortened decision making period this year everyone choose their weighting as they submitted their application. I don't see why this couldn't be a standard policy however since sometimes the natural dynamics of weighting will change during the course of a year.
We were told that we do not REALLY have a choice because of the 18 contact hours per week that we teach. We had to go with a high end in teaching . . . basically even if we are stellar at research it was not a better strategy to elect a higher weight.
For this academic year not for last calendar year.
only to the extent possible within the inflexible parameters dictated by the administration
Well they were negotiated between my dh and myself but that negotiation was not honored. When we met in December we agreed on percentages and then when the dh evaluated my application he used different percentages. This is completely unethical and should
I sent a formal letter to the acting department head stating that I had philosophical issues about this plan and had chosen not to participate in this first experimental round. Surprisingly I received a summary of my evaluation. I was informed by the ac
A form was sent to us there were no meetings to determine performance weights
I was asked to specify the weights - there was no discussion.
No opportunity for discussion.
We each got to chose distribution within parameters

**I was satisfied with my final negotiated performance weights for next year. If no, please comment:**

No with regard to merit but with regard to equity. As a full professor (EDIT – information removed) ... I will never get equity. Equity will primarily be given to those individuals entering the rank to the detriment of those who have served long and well. I would characterize this as a distinct disincentive to remain in the institution.
Due to a strong negative bias towards me from this chairman I cannot expect a fair performance rating.
Without research support there is no negotiation and no discussion of weights for the coming year.
I find it disturbing that we are to be judged on how well we can speculate about what we will accomplish rather than being judged on what we actually accomplished that year. For example in my field it is quite possible to have four articles in press during a given year but not have any of them published until two or three years later -- we never know. THE ONLY FAIR WAY TO APPLY MERIT WEIGHTS IS TO SET THEM AT THE END OF THE YEAR WE'RE BEING JUDGED UPON--TO SET THEM ACCORDING TO WHAT WAS ACTUALLY ACCOMPLISHED RATHER THAN WHAT WE *THINK* WE MAY ACCOMPLISH AT THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR. Another issue is that there is no real room for negotiation in these performance weights when professors teach courses that are in high demand and we need more ranked faculty to cover them; we cannot negotiate release time for research if we are always required to cover certain classes. Further if we are expected to do research and service the idea that four classes a semester is a "normal load" is ridiculous as is the idea that those of us who teach three classes a semester are getting "one class per semester of 'release time' ". The normal load without release time at institutions where professors are expected to do research is a THREE-TWO load.
I have had no negotiations with my head about weights for next year.
Evaluation committee and department head made unjustified accusation and I was denied opportunity that my compensation report is evaluated on fair bases.
We have not had meetings with the department head about next year's weights.
There is no room to go further on Service. Who is going to do the several Service functions that are needed on this campus. Since I am a Professor there are Committees that only tenured full professors serve on. In other cases I take up service responsibilities because others "are busy working on tenure" and cannot carry out being student committee advisors chairs or members of this committee or that committee etc. In some cases the untenured people I have protected then go off to another college/university to teach and the process begins again.
I wished that weights for service could be somewhat higher than %20.
See 18 above.
There was little time to consider the performance weights and I had just had a MAJOR shift in work details. I am sure this will be addressed before/during the next year but the speed and newness of the process in conjunction with these changes left me feeling unsure and dissatisfied.
I was hired to teach a full load of 4 classes with no expectation in faculty handbook of research or service.
I felt my department head did all he could under the constraints he was given.
the whole system is cumbersome divisive and counter-productive
My only qualm with this split is that it wasn't possible to know beforehand however which choice would provide the greater benefit. In essence we placed a bet about which split would be most advantageous without knowing where our scores would rank us. I chose the default split of 80/20 going into the process because I felt my teaching and service were both strong but after seeking how my rankings compare with the departmental highs I wish I would have chosen the 90/10 split.

Next year's performance weights have not been discussed.
We have not yet discussed next year which is problematic since we are almost half way there and I don't know what plan of action to take.
If you mean next year as in the time period for this next process of evaluation we have not discussed that at all. If you mean next year as in the weights used to calculate my salary after the raise in August then yes.
The university does not allow sufficient leeway in negotiating weights. Service is not seen as important.
I believe that the weighting system imposed from the Provost's level seriously undervalues the importance of service to the community and the university. With a maximum of 20% and a min. of 10% the signal being sent to the faculty is that service doesn't matter very much. So where is the incentive for senior faculty to do more service (a model that is more likely with advancement in rank and years of service and one that allows junior faculty to focus more on teaching and research necessary to achieve tenure and promotion)? This cap needs to be rethought.
Yes somewhat! But since I pick my fights carefully I choose not to taken on this one!
Not done yet.
Research is too risky. I can send a paper for publication but the journal might not accept it. I am more in control of teaching and service. Research depends on many people outside people.
The evaluation is currently under appeal. If necessary I plan to take the appeal all the way to the provost office
I don't believe performance weights for next year have yet been negotiated.
The negotiation with (my) department head was arbitrary at best. He did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the measurements nor did he seem to have a context of what was being done across the college.
This type of competition is best left to sports not higher education.
There were limits as to how high certain things could be. I felt like I did an inordinate amount of service this year that took up the bulk of my time and yet I wasn't allowed to go over 20% in that category.
Please see explanation in box 18. In addition there seems to be many discrepancies across departments and within departments concerning the evaluation tools and the implementation of these tools. Concerning the ratings themselves my rating for teaching seemed low to me (given solid student evaluations my work with service learning the fact that teaching is a major focus of my work etc.)
Because we had no discussion concerning this process I now feel I did not select my weights accurately...for instance next year I will be doing a great deal in the creative/research area and upon reflection I probably should have weighted that area heavier.
No discussion about next year's weights has taken place.
I don't/didn't know that those percentages were already determined for next year.

**The Department Head's composite score differed from the recommendation of the Personnel committee. If you answered "B" or "C" above, did you receive written justification for the discrepancy between the committee's and the Department Head's ratings?**

I do not know because we have seen no information from either the committee nor the head.
I received a written justification from the chairman AFTER I submitted an appeal to my initial rating.
We were notified only of the dean's score which I assume was in line with the dept. head and committee....??
The Head rubber-stamped the recommendations of the Personnel Committee (and he told us that he would be doing this).
Did not receive any info regarding to dept head's rating and personnel's so can't make comparison. Question 21 should have option D. - N/A. Just to complete this questionnaire I will choose A for Q 21.
The discrepancy was between the Dean and my Department Head's ratings. My Department Head approved teaching-5 research-5 and service-4 (10%). The Dean gave me a composite score of 4+ which is lower my Department Head's ratings.
Received no notice of Personnel committee's recommendation. So for item #21 above my actual response is "don't know" but this form didn't allow for that option.
However it is clear from the numbers why I was bumped up.
He made an addition error in calculating my raw score points. So there were 10 points lower than the committee recommendation. I've asked twice via email if those 10 points affected my overall ranking and he hasn't applied.
I have no idea what ranking my department head gave me. I have not seen the committee rankings nor my department head's - only my Dean's which is a satisfactory rating.
I received a short written commentary but it did not explain the lowering of my overall score.
Only slight discrepancy and verbal explanation was sufficient
Our committee doesn't seem to see any need to justify its decisions.
I technically received written notification of the lower rating yet I would not -- by any estimation -- agree that what I received in writing was a justification. What I received was an attempt at covering up the lower rating and offering a token explanation for blatant dishonesty.
There was a written statement that articulated that the department head's opinion (based on no known system of measurement) differed from that of the department's personnel committee which did base its evaluation and composite score on a system of measurement. I do not call this a document that provides "justification."
There was a brief description of rationale for the rating but no explanation of discrepancy.
The personnel committee did not give a composite score. only 3 members of the personnel committee were on the merit committee. some senior faculty refused to participate in this exercise for philosophical reasons (and previous - very negative - experience with the merit pay scheme at MSU).
It was not indicated how the head affected my rating

**I understood the University Pay for Performance Evaluation System process including the criteria to be used, how my portfolio was to be put together, and how I was to be evaluated before to process was initiated in our department. If NO, please comment:**

<p>These things became clearer after I have submitted my portfolio. I had missed a few things. Moreover there was no standard from to follow and things were not asked for clearly. I relied on my judgment on what to include and what not to include.</p>
<p>We were given so many announcements about this process all seemingly at the same time. It was confusing. I didn't realize the impact these weights would have on the final outcome. Service could only have 10% which was unfortunate for me.</p>
<p>I understood the criteria used how to put together my portfolio and the criteria on which I would be evaluated but I did not (and still do not) understand how the rankings are made or why people have the ratings they received.</p>
<p>I actually thought that I would be evaluated on efforts over last two years but was informed (much later in the process) that I would only be evaluated on efforts of past year.</p>
<p>There were many misunderstandings in my department about many specific details of evaluation process.</p>
<p>I understood the process but there were elements that didn't make sense and I did the best guessing I could about reporting my activities. If I had known at the BEGINNING of the process what I now know from the END of the process I would have made sure to report and assign my best guess for points for every little thing I did over the course of last year because I could have raised my merit point score easily by one full point in all areas.</p>
<p>I find the entire system extremely complex. The "Matrix" makes it almost impossible for the average faculty member to have any idea of what a rating actually means once it leaves the department.</p>
<p>The process really didn't become clear until it was underway.</p>
<p>I don't understand anything that comes out of the University administration (Provost office)-- the language used is so far beyond my understanding that I simply never understand anything. Period. I understood what my department required and how my department committee would look at my materials and my Head. I did not understand what the Dean or the Provost's Office would DO with any of it.</p>
<p>General departmental and college confusion over what to include and how the material would be valued.</p>
<p>The process we developed in my department was a good START but once we were in the middle of evaluations we found that we should have provided more information about portfolio development and explanations for what the committee wanted to see. We'll develop a better set of instructions for 2007's evaluation.</p>
<p>The entire process and the criteria involved at every level (University College and Department) were at best confusing and ambiguous (and changing from week to week).</p>
<p>We did not discuss how portfolios were to be developed.</p>
<p>There weren't any directions specific directions for how to put the portfolio together. I think each of us put it together differently.</p>
<p>See 27 below</p>
<p>The full information was not distributed as the process had not yet been completely decided on at higher levels. Terminology and process were only described more after ratings came out were misunderstood and clarification was requested by many in the college.</p>
<p>No there was absolutely no guidance about portfolios. In our dept they ranged from simply returning the form to one or more page summaries to full dossiers.</p>
<p>Faculty in our department received only minimal instructions on the contents of the portfolio. In</p>

addition a serious problem emerged with faculty who inflated their own work.
I paid as little attention as possible to this ridiculous system.
Seeing the evaluation form was a surprise. For example the time sheet on which we were supposed to log hours for service performed was asinine. We didn't know that we were supposed to keep these sorts of records so it's unfair to expect us to recall dates and times. I ended up spending hours combing through all the records (calendars e-mail messages and so forth) I could locate to piece together an accurate assessment of my hours. Moreover while I knew that the criteria would include both a merit and an equity component I didn't realize that my current salary would put me in the worst equity quartile meaning that even though I have a high merit score my performance raise this year will be lower than someone's who received a lower merit score but makes less money. That doesn't seem right.
The guidelines seemed to change daily.
Explanation unclear.
It took 3 phone calls and 2 emails and still the process seemed murky. We need something with a clear understanding and concise writing skills to write up a one page explanation. (If I did that how many merit points would I get??)
I was unclear on the format of the portfolio.
No the university procedures were unclear and kept changing.
More or less.
Structurally the plan was understandable. But the criterion for evaluation at all levels especially beyond the department was nonexistent or vague. Especially when equity was entered into the mix without any clear indication how equity decisions would be made or what percentage of the total compensation package equity would play. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I would truly like to see equity and merit evaluations remain separate as they cloud each other and can lead to some real discontent by those deserving equity adjustments and those performing at a very meritorious level. It's a bit disheartening to perform well in terms of merit and then see other faculty receive higher pay raises because of an equity issue. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Also since each department has a different method of assessing merit there is a real perception that the whole process is somehow out of kilter. Some departments being harder on faculty other's easier in their assessments. And no one understanding how the administration will be able to fairly and accurately asses the individual department recommendations when the criterion is different for each department and each college. Won't this lead to the old model of cronyism and good old boyism. Those in favor get favored more?
It was not explained to me. When I asked the head of my departmental personnel committee s/he was unable to provide an explanation.
The process appeared to be in flux this year across the University. I did my best to understand the process and my department head did his/her best to inform us about the process. The deadlines changed; the format of the information to be provided changed; the performance rating numbers were changed at the college level.
I don't believe any of us UNDERSTOOD these details since they have constantly changed throughout the porcess and to date have not been firmed up clarified etc.
Not really. The process as described kept changing.
I was told to have a simple portfolio
I don't believe this system was even understood by the upper administration when it was implemented. In a panel discussion I witnessed the administrators were disagreeing about elements of the system. Our Personnel Committee which was in charge of implementing this system had numerous questions they could not answer and no one else seemed to be able to answer.
Again the PC did little to guide us. Thank goodness for the Department Head.
There was no guidance in (our) department about portfolio. In fact there was general disagreement within (our) department about how the time frame for evaluation whether it would be for 1 year or 2 years. The (EDIT – information deleted) faculty were of an understanding that we would meet with

the department head to discuss outcomes and this did not take place.
I thought I understood the criteria to be used for Performance Evaluation but the scores I received indicate that I did not.
I was under the impression that I did. Our criteria indicated that a two page report was to be submitted which I understood to be a two page narrative. After the department committee completed their work I was informed that a simple bulleted list would have been preferred.
The process has been rushed. Many changes have been made during this rushed process.
The rules changed daily. Everyone was basing their thoughts on different documents and there was no official word as to which controlling document was in effect at which time.
I did not adequately understand the matrix until after the process was initiated in our department.
There were no clear guidelines for portfolio presentation or how performance would be evaluated with particular regard to scholarly creative activities.
I had no idea that there would be a "quartile" element - and still do not understand how it was decided into which quartile to place me.
Everything was done at the last minute so there was no chance to make sure everyone understood how the process would work.
It is all a bit messy to be frank especially in a department with as many varied fields as ours.
Sufficient time was not given to explanation of the process. We were given lots of charts and sheets. But I am someone who needs to hear and discuss processes and procedures not just be given reams of paper that begin to make no sense.
Very unclear changing and ranking did not coincide with guidelines.
There was not discussion to clarify any of this...just a date to turn it in.
There was little to no description of how the portfolio should have been developed. There was little to no guidance fro the departmental committee when making the recommendations.
(EDIT – information removed) The criteria and manner in which faculty submitted their respective materials was disparate indicating vague understandings of the requirements.
There were numerous variations in exactly how the plan was implemented

**Before the merit evaluation process was initiated in my department, I understood the role of the Department Personnel Committee, Department Head and College Dean, including the nature of the feedback that I was to receive about my performance rating.**

I thought I did but I was wrong
I did not fully understand how this three-part merit evaluation process would impact my final performance rating and ultimately my future chances for promotion. Our department will possibly use these yearly merit/performance ratings (starting this year) for committee evaluations for promotion; making these separate processes one and the same thinking it will save time.
For the most part there was understanding of various roles. However some tidying up of the process needs to happen. I believe the committee members and Head will resolve these concerns and will bring it to our departmental faculty for discussion and resolution.
not really
There appears to be some discrepancy across departments as to how the system works.
the "quartile" issue is still very unclear
I thought I understood but my understanding of what would happen and what actually happened were different especially as it relates to the department heads participation in the process.
Feedback was an ongoing discussion about when ratings would be distributed. This was a particular problem at the dean's level.
I assumed that the head and dean would tweak the process to ensure fairness and I don't believe that occurred.
It really wasn't until the process was underway that each party's role became clearer.
As stated above I understood all department level roles but nothing above that.
The entire evaluation system was too complex to be easily understood at least by me. I did not realize that the ranking would go through subcommittee Personnel committee head and Dean.
See 25 above.
I wasn't really sure how this merit pay thing worked. I knew that we evaluated ourselves and then the department was broken up into groups which evaluated our self-evaluation but I didn't know what happened next. In their defense the process seemed so overwhelming. It's my first year so I didn't spend extra time trying to figure out the process. I just did what I was told.
The portfolio was a long list of research teaching and service activities with points claimed where appropriate. I understood that much. However it wasn't clear to me what reviewers would be doing with those totals. (EDIT – information deleted) This process overlapped with my annual review as a non-tenured faculty member and I was never sure what feedback was coming from which direction.
Only understood in the most general terms at the level of the dean.
NO never clear and constantly changing.
See previous.
Many changes were made during and after the process.
I still don't understand it. There has been zero feedback
Explanations unclear from higher administration.
All of this was an evolving mystery.
It all just sort of happened or at least that's how it seemed to me.
The appeal process was never clearly articulated to faculty.
No the university kept changing the procedure.
There was some question about the appeals process. This was not really worked out until well after

the merit process had been undertaken.
I thought I understood the role and assumed what the feedback would be - I assumed there would be a letter from the committee and the department head but none have appeared.
Our departmental Personnel Committee role changed in the midst of the process. It was not carried out the way the Merit Pay Comm. had originally planned.
It was not clear what the college dean would look at.
Knew nothing about the Deans position of Merit Pay.
It was all very confused. No one really understood what the relationship between these entities was - still don't.
I thought I understood but what I expected and what i received were not the same.
It was not clear to me what the differences in roles were between any of these three evaluators.
(Our department) personnel committee was neither objective nor reasonable in many cases: from my discussions with colleagues the PC used the process in an attempt to punish colleagues they don't like. Some of their comments were embarrassing.
(EDIT – information deleted) there were significant differences in the interpretation of guidelines concerning the evaluation ratings required narratives report to the department head and department head responsibilities for communication to the PC and the release of PC numeric ratings and narratives to each faculty member. While there is a need for transparency the issue of anonymity was of great concern throughout this peer evaluation.
I thought I did...
Only part of the departmental personnel committee participated in evaluation. Information from the Dean was sketchy and unclear.
The process was very unclear.

**Please write any additional comments that you have about the implementation of the Pay for Performance System in your Department and College?**

<p>We have a head who is leaving (and who doesn't like conflict so avoids it) and a Dean who is incompetent. Obviously not a set up to get good feedback.</p>
<p>Our department used standard performance criteria that did not reflect the true performance. The committee had no unbiased representation for my area of employment or expertise. Just a handful of faculty who are unfamiliar with my scholarly work and a biased chairman determined the value of my performance for the year. I have never had a normal yearly performance discussion with this chair so I do not expect any support from him. He did write a response to my appeal letting me know that there would be no hope for a higher rating due to ratings needing to fit the college matrix system. He said it could be higher on the college level due variations among departments but never higher than a 3.5.</p>
<p>The weights system is the only problematic part which cannot be easily resolved. This is a complicated issue that needs to be more thoroughly investigated.</p>
<p>I cannot answer most of the questions in your review because our colleagues' ratings were not shared with us AT ALL and neither the committee nor our head nor the dean explained our own scores to us AT ALL. I received a number and a quartile and (much later) TENTATIVE compensation percentages and that is ALL. (IF the tentative compensation percentages given to us are correct then I think that the pay raise that I will get is a good step in the right direction.) This was supposed to be a transparent process but it is about as opaque as it can possibly be. WHILE I AM VERY PLEASED WITH MY MERIT SCORE and I believe it is well-deserved I have absolutely no clue about how it was determined I have no way to evaluate this process and I am very frustrated by this. This is NOT a transparent process for us in our department but a completely opaque one; the information on the whole of the faculty is likely being withheld from us because the committee is afraid of the wrath of the low-achievers which I can at least partly understand. However there is NO good reason for withholding the justification for our own scores from us nor is there a good reason to withhold information on what constitutes a 5 a 4+ etc. I strongly believe that this information is being withheld in an effort to make sure that the under-achievers in our department try harder so they get a higher merit score next year but also to make sure that the over-achievers don't slow down and demand a more fair and equitable workload...! (It is my understanding that the dean and the head simply rubber-stamped what our departmental committee determined.)</p>
<p>I feel there is a bit of a dis-connect between the more "casual" nature of the Pay for Performance process and how we go about re-appointing faculty for example. Re-appointment (and tenure promotion etc) requires a dossier of substance while this process requires checking off a list and providing little if any documentation. I am not asking for dossiers mind you since we get enough of that but it just seems to be a casual process for an issue that is important to all and that can be divisive as well.</p>
<p>There still seems to be lots of confusions about how system works---for instance most tenured faculty in my Department thought that they would be evaluated for past two years of work but only very late in process were told that evaluations would consider efforts of past one year only. I never had a meeting with my head to discuss my evaluation for this year and to discuss merit ratings for next year. I have little real knowledge about how system will work next year.</p>
<p>No comments</p>
<p>Amount time frame distribution of raises for merit and/or equity is still unclear</p>
<p>The system is de-motivating. The assumption was that a department would identify every possible activity that would receive points but that turned out to be untrue. In every case when an activity was not listed a faculty member in my department had to argue for that activity to be included. Chairing departmental committees such as the Personnel Committee was not included in the list. People received points for doing lots of small daily activities rather than for doing activities that were truly meritorious. A person could get a 5 in teaching and not be a good or excellent teacher. A person could get a 5 in research and have no publications. The idea that a faculty member could negotiate weights that would allow someone to emphasize her/his interest or strength did not occur. The dean set the weight ranges which created no need to do service because the choices (10%-20%) makes those activities a waste of one's time. Likewise the ranges for teaching and research were also limited (30%-60%) which again meant that there was very little room to negotiate. This system turned out to be worse than the former merit system of years ago. If a faculty member under the present system is satisfied with being competent he/she needs to do very little. After learning what others in my department and in other</p>

departments in my college received my reaction is "why bother to do much."
I think more credit should be given for service.
Unfortunately the effect that this merit system is having on the people I've spoken to is to demoralize folks rather than motivating them. What the system is doing is telling most people they are average do no matter how you spin it a "3" is average. Most faculty here work very hard on behalf of their students and in service to the university; the merit system is telling them that no matter what they aren't doing enough or doing "it" well enough. The overall message: you aren't doing enough. It's a very demoralizing system that's not making me (as well as other people I've talked to) want to work any harder to help the university. I may work differently--for example less service--but I don't think it will ultimately help the university.
Until salaries in college are equitable with college and or other Missouri institutions of higher education merit has little meaning. When salaries are below equity by figures ranging from 5 to 10 thousand dollars annually merit has little meaning. Although much compensation were made in areas of service and research instructors had fewer opportunities to score above 3 than tenure track faculty.
I believe the process was handled very well in our department. Overall I do not believe this is an effective system and the conflict it has caused will far outweigh potential benefits.
I have been a member of the faculty at this institution for (many years). At no time have I ever questioned whether or not this is a place where I wanted to work. For the first time in (many years) this is a place where I do not want to stay. I have started the process of look for a faculty position elsewhere. This isn't simply a reaction to the Pay for Performance System but to the new administration. I have no confidence in the leadership of the Provost or President.
The thing that was most de-motivating for me was the fact that I received a 5 rating for 70% of my performance and a 4 rating for the remaining 30% but my overall rating at the college level ended up being a 4. Rationally I understand that the reason for this was to have equity across departments but what it felt like to me was that no matter how clear our departmental criteria were it didn't matter because factors outside of my or the department's control (and not having anything to do with my performance) were ultimately going to affect my rating.
Overall I feel the first year of this process went well in my department. I do think there was some confusion about how much certain activities that we had not specifically listed should be worth. These had to be placed in an "other" category and many of us were unsure of how many points to claim. I feel my rating was fair though I do have some concern about the non-tenure track instructors' ability to earn 5's in the system we have created. I appreciated having some flexibility in where I could count certain activities (i.e. teaching or service).
The reason I waited so long to complete this evaluation is that we haven't had time to meet with the Head to DISCUSS anything. I do not yet know how much money is involved in my merit pay raises. I know nothing so far other than a number ranking. This evaluation is therefore PREMATURE and will not tell you much of anything. ASK US FOR EVALUATIONS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FALL SEMESTER WHEN WE ACTUALLY KNOW SOMETHING!!!! This is SOOO FRUSTRATING to be asked to evaluate this system when I as yet don't know the outcome!!!! I also have no idea whether others in my department or college received "equitable" treatment (as per the questions in the previous sets of evaluations)-- how can you ask me that at this point in time??? All I have is a slip of paper in my hand! ARrggghhhhh!!!!
Faculty members essentially competing against each other for merit awards does not foster collegiality. At least in (instructors in my discipline) by nature of their position have limited opportunities for meritorious activity. In general I found the system frustrating and demoralizing but I suspect my main criticism is of the underlying philosophy rather than its implementation which is understandably cumbersome.
The process was in no way as transparent as intended. In fact much of the work was done totally in secret by a very few people (mostly administrators).
Advising should not be considered under teaching. This is appropriately identified with service to students dept college and university and it should be awarded as such. Faculty who do little to enhance their classrooms still came in points ahead of those who do merely by logging numerous advising hours. Classroom enhancement such as writing grants and service learning course development counted less than advising time.
On the last ten questions I'm not really sure. Do we know that merit pay will improve performance? I just can't say. I sat through hours and hours of meetings. (EDIT – information deleted)
It is a good start toward a good system that will probably need to be continually evaluated and adjusted year by year to work in the most efficient way.
So I could have done nothing and gotten 1 percent more raise. As it was many faculty spent 10 to 15% of their time (which they could have spent being MORE PRODUCTIVE) going through this exercise which has already damaged faculty morale. "They" always want us to "do more with less" then they give use ridiculously time

<p>consuming meetings and processes to go through to get cheated. Furthermore our department asked non-ranked and non-tenured faculty to sit in judgments of tenured ranks.</p>
<p>I believe this system will work but the problem of faculty inflating / overvaluing their own performance is a serious one.</p>
<p>Very last-minute and rushed. I think my department did as well as possible given these problems. I would have preferred that the program be announced before it began rather than having to do the first year's rankings retrospectively.</p>
<p>Throw out the whole mess. It causes bad feeling does not reward valuable behaviors and demeans the professionalism of the faculty. Our department did the best he could with a horrible system. This questionnaire in its clumsy design sometimes incorrectly worded questions and overall mental density is a suitable way to measure a stupid system. The questionnaire and the merit pay system fit together well in their complete ignorance and persistent pressure against achievement.</p>
<p>Major discrepancies in the way that faculty reported performance. Appeal process was futile. The appeals committee was told by the dean that none of the appeals could even be granted because the matrix had already been sent to the Provost.</p>
<p>Focus on cost of living raises. The Pay for Performance System is divisive.</p>
<p>I truly believe that merit (or pay for performance -- could we agree on one term please) needs to be entirely separate from equity. I am so far behind in equity (gosh cost of living hasn't even been a factor for 5 years) that I'm frustrated. Merit is merit cost of living is cost of living and they should be different. Explain why I should put myself out when I cannot keep up? There are days I wonder if taking another job to keep up with cost of living wouldn't be more productive than worrying about the university which for so long as made it clear that faculty are not important. I hope this new admin will clear up this moral issue and pay faculty a living wage.</p>
<p>We need to do a better job in (our department) of capturing actual measurements of "quality" in teaching. We captured time spent but whether any of it was worthwhile is not addressed in our system.</p>
<p>It took a HUGE amount of work for everyone to prepare the portfolios then a huge amount of work for subcommittees to scour through those portfolios before the poor personnel committee had to spend hours wading through it all and making hard decisions. Then the main office was almost shut down for two weeks while the head and secretary crunched numbers. Finally the verdict came out and many people were hurt of upset--some not so much because of their own scores but because of their scores in comparison to those of others. For the most part I think the system worked. I fared well. Of course I think that was appropriate ;-) and for the most part I believe those at the bottom probably belong at the bottom. But I'm not convinced that it was worth the hours it took to sort all this out and I believe the system ultimately causes horrible ill will among colleagues. It seems as if the central administration is using a "divide and conquer" approach to get us fighting among ourselves for a little pot of money.</p>
<p>Although I received a very high rating I am not receiving any merit pay so I found the entire procedure a waste of time that distracted from my work as a lecturer.</p>
<p>I didn't -- and still don't -- know how much money is in the raise pool so I can't honestly say if it was enough to motivate me.</p>
<p>The inconsistencies among departments in my college were astounding. In one department faculty weren't given their merit ratings from the department personnel committee or head until April 11 the deadline for appealing. In another department a head told a faculty member she could not appeal.</p>
<p>The plan send down to us was too inflexible (limited as to what percent was allowed for service) and kept changing -- or at least it kept being clarified.</p>
<p>The system is still so young that it is impossible to say if it can be made to work effectively. I have serious reservations about the stipulated % allowed in each area. I do not think that you create a fair or transparent merit system when you include equity in the mix. I do not see how faculty across the campus can feel the whole system is fair when each college and each department within each college are applying different criterion in the assessment process.</p>
<p>There is no way to assess the equitable distribution of Merit Pay monies or the implementation of the system itself since we know NOTHING about either the monies to be distributed nor about the evaluations of any other faculty either in the dept. or in the college let alone the university as a whole.</p>
<p>I am pleased with my final merit evaluation and with the amount of my raise for next year. I am less pleased by the news that certain asshats who do no research whatsoever and whine like babies about having to be on campus more than three days a week are receiving "fours." Absent enough of a merit pay pool to make the pay differentials suitably substantial it would help to know said asshats were receiving the kick in the pants they so</p>

richly deserve.
I believe that requiring a "portfolio" is ridiculous. A simple list of accomplishments in each area should suffice. We do enough portfolios as it is (annual reappointment pre-tenure review etc. etc... We're going a bit crazy with the notion of documentation.
This system pits faculty against each other. It is one of the most destructive ideas that have ever been witnessed in our department. Faculty who normally get along are forced to evaluate each other and this causes terrible situations and hard feelings.
I was not happy that the departmental committee allowed a wide range of ratings among it's members to go forward to the Head. This allows individuals on the committee to use the system for retribution against faculty against whom they have a grudge. In my case I was given a 5 in teaching by every person on the committee except one who gave me a 3. My final rating from the committee however was a 4. In this case one person was allowed to make a one-level difference.
In short I can only say that the current Pay for Performance System seems to me to be predicated on rewarding obedient citizens those who always agree with the department head and dean. The system is the very model of dishonesty and provides absolutely no incentive for faculty to improve their performance in the traditional areas of teaching research and service. The current system should be abandoned forthwith. It is doomed to failure.
Although clear criteria were developed at the departmental level some of the Personnel Committee ignored those criteria and substituted their own. In some areas this helped my ratings and in others it hurt my ratings.
I am thankful for the opportunity to share my views via this survey. (My department) under its present leadership operates under a veil of deception and distrust. We are told that there is transparency to this and other processes but then find that outcomes are tainted with lies.
Too much weight given to Department Personnel Committee ratings.
The Personnel Committee in my department did not evaluate faculty based on the Evaluation Criteria that was set up for that purpose. The department head did not seem to be aware of that criteria either.
How comparisons are made within and across departments appear to be rather confusing. While committee documentation appears to be clear different interpretations of the criteria seem to surface at many levels. Comparisons of probationary faculty with tenured faculty also seem to introduce confusion into the process. Attempting to incorporate merit cost of living and equity in the same process creates additional frustration and may inadvertently result in further inequity.
There was no performance review with department head; he provided written rating with no interview granted. There was no way to see how my rating compared to the ratings of others in my department or college making it difficult to make an appeal I know my final rating and equity quartile but currently have no idea what kind of raise that will translate to. The equity is mysterious to me. I would like to know how we can address equity when everybody in the college (almost) is paid about 15 percent less than national norms give or take a few percent.
Merit pay no matter what the title has not worked in the past and will not work in the future. The time and energy spent doing the required work is never repaid in salary. A few with more time than others find ways to beat the system and that becomes their main activity rather than teaching service and research.
The pay for performance system will work to the extent that objective measures for performance exist and evaluators objectively apply these measures. In the case of the (our department) faculty developed criteria designed to reflect and reward themselves and the Personnel Committee used their position as evaluators to punish certain colleagues. The exercise devolved into an unfortunately obvious subjective popularity contest with PC members (who rewarded themselves) acting as judges. I find it difficult to believe that most of the present PC membership could make legitimate assessment of any colleague's performance in teaching research or service: most of the committee take far too little part in the life of the department to offer any factual judgment. I'm afraid that in the case of (our department) such stagnation and animosity exists that colleague to colleague evaluation will never provide legitimate assessment: the results will only reflect the already too well-known factional nature of the department. At present the system rewards those passing judgment and inspires faculty to find ways to maximize the system rather than inspiring legitimate self-improvement for the sake of improving the educational experience.
One of the Personnel Committee members rated me a 2 in Teaching and Research when the other four members rated me at level 4 or 5. After re-reading the criteria were given I believe that this individual was not following the guidelines properly. I have heard of at least two other faculty members who received similar treatment (presumably from the same person). I did not appeal the rating by the deadline- it was only after my composite rating which was over a 4 was further lowered by the dean that I realized how much this one rating hurt me. All

<p>this happened after I had one of my best years in a long time with several accomplishments at the regional and national levels. It is very discouraging to receive a "3+" after working so hard during the last year.</p>
<p>There are no clear departmental guidelines for performance evaluation. Evaluation of research scholarly and creative activities and what constitutes a 5 4 or 3 rating is far too subjective. Faculty with release time or on sabbatical to pursue research and creative activities certainly has an advantage in annual performance review. How does anyone fairly evaluate faculty when the playing field is not level. This ambiguity empowers a system of favoritism at the peer and department head levels. How does one evaluate teaching effectiveness? Student success? Student evaluation? This has been a serious topic of discussion with my colleagues and we have no answers. Objectivity is certainly not guaranteed and perhaps not possible. The service component is the only area of review that seemingly appears to be clear. Our university has experienced a number of years of low compensation increases. This combined with salary compression has created an unfair disadvantage for faculty with longevity in service. The matrix includes no component to reward years of service. Fair and equitable... I think not! The old merit system at MSU was abandoned over a decade ago due in part to the inequity of the evaluation and of course the lack of budget to fund any merit increases. The 'new and improved' pay for performance system seems neither new or improved. The entire process has created animosity between faculty ranks and between faculty and the department head.</p>
<p>The departmental guidelines were not followed - I questioned my "teaching" rating and why student evaluations were the ONLY criterion used (and only one semester out of the full year) when there are several other criteria and was told it was impossible to quantify the other criteria (then why did we the faculty include them?). Questions arise regarding policy about junior faculty service (whether service is expected particularly of first-year faculty: if so how much; if one does more than expected should that not be rated higher than "3"?). Some tenured faculty members are philosophically opposed to this entire system and refused to participate leaving the tenure-track faculty in a quandary and without full representation on the committee in terms of the different areas in this department.</p>
<p>Having received no feedback it is difficult to know what any of this really means in terms of my own performance. My 4- score (which doesn't appear in question #34) seems low given the work i have done this year (serving on committees). Although we were told the entire calendar year would be taken into account only one semester was looked at by my department. The merit guidelines the department approved were not followed by the committee nor by the Head. i did not file a written appeal: that seemed like a time-consuming task for such a small difference (ie not "cost-efficient"). If ALL faculty do not participate how can this system be equitable? Junior faculty need to be represented by tenured faculty who support them not just judged by those who either do not understand the work or who are actively antagonistic to the particular instructor. I have no idea what my rating indicates since i do not know what anyone else's rating is.</p>
<p>This system feels like the horse and carrot. I understand the idea but the rational and implementation is weak. To be fair the University does not know what I do and has no basis of comparison for what I do. My College has a better idea but still is mostly in the dark. My department is full of varied disciplines and strengths so developing a guideline for all of us is absurd. Also for me to do "research" requires me to be out of town a minimum of two weeks. For me to do enough research to meet the criteria of this silly system I would have to be out of town the entire semester. I have chosen to teach and it is what I want to do. My students however are getting the crap end of the stick because for me to keep my job I must be away from it.</p>
<p>The implementation of such a new and controversial plan could have been done in a more reasoned way. For example a year could have been taken to talk with faculty get input develop several possible plans get feed-back from faculty on those various plans and then find a consensus about a plan that best suits this particular institution.</p>
<p>In theory I support the concept of rewarding "harder" working faculty more than those who do not work as hard. The process however is tainted when peers with personal agendas sit in judgment over others. This is especially true when they disregard question and make negative decisions without benefit of verifying facts and/or speaking with the source person.</p>
<p>There are 7 departments in our college none handled this process in the same way. I do not feel it was handled on an equal basis for the faculty.</p>
<p>Too many changes were made to the plan to allow for adequate and equitable awards.</p>
<p>There needs to be some differentiation between teaching evaluations for "required" and "specialized" classes where the student population is interested and engaged. There exist many classes for which 80% of the population believes that there is no useful information for their future and will never be "supportive" of in or out of class room activities.</p>

## Please suggest ways to improve the Pay for Performance System in your Department and College

I think it will be taken care of next year with new individuals as both Head and Dean
Faculty should be aware of their departmental evaluation immediately after the evaluations have been determined. They should be able to discuss the personnel committee's decision with the chairman and/or the committee chair. I knew absolutely nothing about my departmental rating outcome until I received the college rating which was almost after the fact. There was hardly any time to prepare a strong appeal.
Teaching is a very difficult area to evaluate and although we have designed a very good system it is never really clear how to properly demonstrate this outside the classroom.
We NEED to have the reasoning behind our scores revealed to us. PLEASE MAKE THIS *REQUIRED*!!! We also DESERVE to know WHAT CONSTITUTES a 5 a 4+ a 4 etc. We also need to know what an average load and an average level of achievement is so we know what is reasonable and fair to accept as a load. And we need to know what the actual pool of money and the actual raise percentages will be. Without this information I have no way of evaluating this system. Other more general issues to be remedied include the fact that I was placed into a higher equity quartile than I expected; the reason I am in this quartile I assume is because of the hard-won equity pay and hard-earned merit pay that I received under the previous system. However I can understand that this is probably because currently the strongest concern is for equity rather than merit. I hope that the system will be adjusted once more equity is achieved to focus more on rewarding meritorious work...? The other problem in the system is that all faculty within a certain rank are considered to be equals. I can understand this at the instructor rank since that is not progressive and at the assistant professor rank since that is considered to be short-term and probationary; I can even understand it somewhat at the associate professor rank-- although there should be at least be a difference between a first-year associate professor and a fifth-year associate professor. The big problem however is that there is currently no distinction made between a first-year full professor and a fifteen-year full professor; that must be remedied. (Perhaps considering five-year increments of time served?)
A little more "proof" of one's effective teaching research/creative activities and service.
As long as some faculty on campus have no flexibility in negotiating their work loads each year the system is terribly flawed. The whole system seems posited on this power to negotiate.
No suggestions
Make clear definition between merit increase and equity increase requests
My suggestion is really university-wide since I have not heard one positive comment about the system from anyone in any college. Stop the process and take time to develop a system that will work fairly for all. This was rushed into existence. My department had 5 weeks to discuss the system and develop criteria. People were afraid to speak their minds because there was always the end of September deadline. We worked hours and yet the system did not work well. Other departments did the same. Rushing the system into place caused inequities within a department between departments in the same college and between colleges. The appeal process also was not managed well in my college. I asked on numerous occasions how to go about it but the college committee had not developed a procedure. I suggest that the appeal process if this system is kept be similar to the reappointment process. If a person received a rating that she/he disagrees with from the departmental committee that person should have the ability to appeal before the department head makes a decision. If a person disagrees with the head's rating then the person should be able to appeal to the dean. One department in my college didn't get their merit ratings from the department committee and department head until after April 11th. Question 34 asks for my final merit evaluation. My rating is not listed. I received a 4-. So my opinion of this system is not so much reflected by my own rating but by what I saw and heard happen too many people.
What was wrong with the former system where you could apply for a teaching research or service award in a particular category? That seemed to work reasonably well.
Instructors are hired to teach four classes. Not to do research and 4-5 level service to the department. Adjustments should be made for the instructor rank
I think we can add more specific activities such as service in our Center for Dispute Resolution for example to our itemized list. I think we can continue to add even more flexibility about where points can be counted. I had more points than necessary in some categories and it would be nice to move those as needed. I would suggest

<p>adding more activities that can be realistically accomplished by instructors to the "4-5 level" list in service. Thank you for your time and consideration!</p>
<p>Honestly the thing I am most troubled about in terms of performance evaluation is this growing trend to evaluate Teaching Performance in terms of grants and administrative activities outside the classroom or contact with students. Under many of the current criteria a person could be a terrible classroom teacher who humiliates students and even drives students out of his/her classroom but could still bring in administrative big dollars and thereby outrank a true and dedicated teacher (me) who has devoted her life to making the classroom content and contact a meaningful life experience for her students. I am deeply alarmed at the devaluation of traditional GOOD TEACHING in this current academic climate.</p>
<p>I would prefer across the board college increases and a voluntary merit adjustment system where individual faculty could apply to department via personnel committee or head or both for merit increases. Equity should be a first priority.</p>
<p>(Our department) must be required to inform each faculty member of the Personnel Committee and Head recommendations BEFORE those are sent on to the college level. There was way too much "dealing" and re-ranking done behind closed doors.</p>
<p>A better-defined explanation of the portfolio for the personnel committee would have helped me to develop evidence of my work.</p>
<p>Examples of high merit criteria should be given to faculty so that we know how to aim higher for our work.</p>
<p>I am not sure how this system provides incentive for faculty. I was near the bottom of my department but I already work more than 50 hours a week not counting 8 hours of commuting time each week. I question whether the small salary increase is a realistic tradeoff for the many additional hours of work that would apparently be necessary for me to move into a higher category.</p>
<p>Hopefully a new dean will be a good first step. Probably start over. This department had a chance to improve the system but chose to totally ignore recommendations of one of the personnel sub-committees thus delaying universally agreed upon improvements a full year.</p>
<p>I ignored the whole mess as much as possible. I spent the minimum time filling out the stupid forms. I would have abstained completely but was informed that I did not have that option. "Pay for Performance" is a bloated misleading and ugly phrase that perfectly captures the wrong-headedness of the concept and its execution.</p>
<p>The current system turns faculty into bean-counters which isn't healthy for the university. Having to log everything a faculty member does during the day takes away time that the faculty member could spend teaching researching or performing service. Also such records can't possibly consider the intangibles that faculty bring. Further faculty members who would rather work than count beans will inevitably forget to log time spent and thus will miss out on points which aren't fair. If I have to choose between one or the other I would always spend time performing my duties instead of keeping elaborate records about the time spent doing my duties. The existing system actually makes us less productive and is going to cause conflicts. Perhaps points should be earned not for hours spent but on the basis of committee assignments departmental and college responsibilities and so forth. Further the teaching evaluation system put a cap on the number of points earned for the number of preps taught. That's silly since more preps equal more work. This aspect should be overturned. Faculty should also to some degree be able to renegotiate their split among teaching service and research once the numbers come out. Otherwise picking a split will to some extent always be a crap-shoot. Any previous increases for merit or other adjustments should be excluded from a faculty member's baseline salary in considering equity adjustments. If that doesn't occur then the equity adjustments won't be fair and will negate or minimize previous merit increases which are wrong. Finally the equity quartile for instructors needs to be seriously reconsidered. A slight difference in salaries results in a big difference in quartile ranks which ends up sticking it to long-time instructors and those who have made meritorious advances. This issue too will erode faculty morale and could result in losing top-notch talented faculty members which is exactly not the purpose of a merit-pay system.</p>
<p>Have a REAL appeal process. Have department heads meet published deadlines.</p>
<p>Focus on cost of living raises. The Pay for Performance System is divisive takes too long and ends up offering the equivalent of a cost of living raise.</p>
<p>Tie equity to merit and marketability or it defeats merit gains from the past and present. And disciplines should be considered not just departments.</p>
<p>Actually pay someone a bonus when they score well on their merit survey.</p>
<p>So away with it. If I told my students that only 15 percent would get an A regardless of how well they did they would have a fit. But we faculty are being treated this way. I am personally offended at having to compete against my colleagues for the meager amount of money that's available when faculty in one college is hideously</p>

underpaid compared to other colleges means.
Changes need to be made at a higher level. The present system does not fairly reward faculty in all areas. Service is grossly underrated. Why were the questions aimed at the college and department when the problems were at a higher level?
There needs to be flexibility in assessing merit of course since we do not all do the same things in the same way. But there does need to be some set of similar assessment standards applied to all faculty so that the perception can be that we are all be judged in a similar equitable manner. □□You might revisit the old University Awards model that we discontinued to create this new system. Here a group of faculty from across the university (& thus less likely to be biased at a personal level) applied a set of universal criteria to judge merit (and determine university awards in teaching service and research).□□Whatever happens you need to separate merit from equity or the whole notion of pay for merit gets degraded. Equity is a separate issue both at the individual professor level and as an entire university where almost all of us are underpaid in comparison to similar institutions.
POST. TENURE. REVIEW.
Do away with the idea that there has to be a forced distribution. It is not fair that someone's departmental or Head rating is significantly lowered to smooth things out across the college or to ensure that a predetermined university-wide distribution is fulfilled. A five should be a five. A four should be a four regardless. Why am I going to work harder if my rating will eventually be lowered anyway? I think this issue needs to be better addressed. Isn't the goal to get to a point where we all get high ratings?
Drop it!
The departmental committee should be required to meet and discuss each rating fully as a group. Outliers should be disregarded so that one person with a grudge cannot skew the final result.
The process needs to be transparent. If the DH and Dean can make arbitrary adjustments without any justification how can anyone be assured that the process is fair? Clearly faculty members that were rated lower than mine ended up with ratings well above mine. I don't believe that there should be that much deviation in ratings from the departmental level to the college level. THERE MUST BE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ADMINISTRATORS!!! The process in my department (at the DH and Dean level) was slimy if not unethical.
I cannot possibly imagine -- given the current dh and dean -- that there is any way this system could be improved.
There needs to be some way of assuring that those who evaluate make use of the established criteria and guidelines. Perhaps some sort of accountability can be added to the process.A new Dean will surely help this process.
A system is only as good as the people who maintain the system. my departmental committee conducted itself in good faith and followed the rules of the system but the administration followed no rules--they make it up as they go along. To improve this system we must improve the way the system is maintained. Department heads should be held with far more accountability in the way they make decisions.
Less weight should be given to ratings of the Department Personnel Committee.
- do not share comments of individual members of the department Personnel committee with the faculty being evaluated□- come up with guidelines for the portfolio - stick to the Departmental Evaluation Criteria
More detail and open communication is needed in the department level plan that would allow for greater transparency. Since documentation is limited to two pages the activities that are indicative of merit by the committee should be thoroughly detailed to the entire department.
The President has said the exercise is not worth it unless we have a 2 percent pool. I suggest two problems with this: that amount is too small for the trouble and since faculty have good and bad years going on and off this system can dramatically affect faculty differently. My suggestion is to either apply it universally or to abandon it. The department has said that a 5 in service cannot be earned through any kind of departmental local community work. Under its guidelines I can refuse committee work rating 3 and do national editing rating 5 and get a higher rating. This feedback was ignored by the committee. The President is convinced that this system is going to convince outside observers that we are accountable and doing good work. I think my comments show that is not necessarily the case. Individual faculty have very little control over the way this is implemented and I ask the senate and President to think about that.
Do away with it.□
The faculty handbook lists teaching as the primary function of the university yet the Tenure and Promotion process has always implicitly (if not explicitly) forced faculty to spend inordinate amounts of time engaging in self-promotion.

They should set all the guidelines at a certain date and absolutely be unable to change ANYTHING after that date.
Perhaps look at dropping the lowest rating to protect us from individuals who might have an agenda.
The need for an objective evaluation tool for creative activities and teaching is paramount. The anonymity of PC evaluators is extremely important and worthy of considerable conversation. The department head responsibilities to the PC are in need of clarification. For example: Does the head report faculty merit scores and narratives to the PC including justification for deviation from PC evaluation? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> FYI.. My department head evaluation resulted in a 3.6 merit rating. The Dean reduced what I assume would have been a 4 minus rating to a 3 rating. Conversation with colleagues revealed that the Dean raised or lowered scores arbitrarily without sufficient justification. I chose not to appeal but it is my hope that the maiden voyage of this new system will result in some major changes and improvements.
I honestly do not understand why Merit has been reinstated at MSU. It is a divisive measure exacerbating tension and competitiveness among the faculty. While I appreciate that the taxpayers of this state should be getting "their money's worth" there MUST be a better way.
Follow the guidelines approved by the department. Ensure that all faculty participate and that the committee members rotate each year. Give feedback. Ensure transparency in the process and the result. Communication is necessary! As is fairness and good will. We should be supporting not hurting each other.
It seems like if we had a job description and that our evaluation was based on a personalized job description and subsequently on whether we are responding to notes/advice from a committee/chair regarding said description then we would have an equitable and fair system.
Do not put faculty in charge of making recommendations for increased salaries.
The final numbers should not be subject to manipulation to fit an antiquated bell curve system. If someone deserves a 5 and it is clearly justified then they should receive a 5. <input type="checkbox"/> The criteria should be clarified including what can be done to improve. Non-tenured faculty should be represented on committee. The department head should advocate for the faculty member being judged since he/she probably knows the full picture of the work/accomplishments of the faculty.
There should NOT be a faculty committee in this process...it is already creating problems among faculty across the college. It is going to get very ugly. These are administrative decisions it is the job of the Head to know/understand what each individual faculty member is accomplishing. There needs to be more trust in the Dept. Head to make accurate decisions; there is an appeal process in place for faculty to appeal if they do not agree with the decision of their Head.
see 32
Find methods to include a "difficulty" factor for teaching assignments.

**I have formally appealed my performance rating by the appeal deadline date of April 11, 2007.**

**NOTE: The question was different for a proportion of the respondents. The question was “If No, please comment” for some respondents, and when the error was brought to the attention of the Senate, the mistake was fixed.**

Difficult to appeal a rating you have little or knowledge of how it was reached.
I am satisfied with my evaluation.
I wrote a three letters of appeal but still to today’s date (April 29th) I didn't receive any resolution.
Didn't seem worth the trouble for such a small amount of money and I will know what to consider the next time around.
Why bother?
no need to appeal
not worth an appeal
I don't want to appeal my rating which I believe is accurate and fair.
I am satisfied with my rating and do not feel the need to appeal.
Primarily to add material to my portfolio to make it similar to others.
While I did not wish to appeal faculty received no direction on the procedure for appeal.
I did not need to appeal it.
I will not be appealing the rating.
This question is written incorrectly. It should be "If yes explain."
I didn't even receive my departmental ratings until April 11.
We were not given the rating until that date.
The formal appeal process was never explained but I have copies of the emails where I questioned my ranking due to the math error.
I didn't appeal.
No answer.
There was no need to appeal.
What good would it do? I'm quite familiar with how things work around here.
Don't want to mess with this
I don't think our committee is interested in changing the way they operate. They don't like being accountable to anybody.
The Dean lowered my rating from 4.4 to 4 which is inconsistent with the criteria found in the Compensation Matrix Recommended Guidelines found on the website of the Office of the Provost. According to the guidelines my ranking should be 4 plus not 4. The Dean’s report contains no information under the section listed as Explanation for any change in the composite rating. It would seem likely that such a significant change in the merit rating would be accompanied by specific criteria. My appeal was essentially ignored explained as an "average" across the college.
Although the Dean lowered my rating with no written explanation I assumed I had no chance of success with an appeal. I also am not particularly disappointed with my rating this year.
I do not believe my department head or my college dean really have my best interests at heart. they are playing a numbers game only and can "justify" just about anything they please with statistics and comparisons from within the college--comparisons that I fail to see being objective and honest. i feel as a faculty member that yet again my immediate administration conducts its professional affairs in a deceitful and dishonest way and does care in the least about the welfare of its faculty.

The merit system (a misnomer if ever there was one) is but another way for the administration to undermine faculty morale all under the guise of incentive. In short to appeal my rating would only prolong the torment of knowing that I am so underserved by my superiors.

Didn't bother.

I was not satisfied with the rating I was given for the area of Teaching.

I received my performance rating on or about April 4 from department head and on or about April 9 from Dean. That is not enough time given other work that faculty have to make an appeal.

I am glad that my department head understands my contribution to the department despite the fact that the PC does not.

Do I need to appeal the rating? I'm comfortable with the score though I would love it to be higher.

The deadline happened before I had time to address the situation.

However I was told that it was too late on April 11 2007

I appealed one score but the Acting Head said he didn't have time to "send it back to the department personnel committee" (which is NOT part of the process) and therefore my appeal was not considered.

I was not aware that there was an appeal deadline and even though I was not happy with one of my numbers I did not see any reason to appeal.

There is a feeling of hopelessness and waste of time in the appeals process.

