

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

College guidelines were primary
A rough draft was prepared by an administrator - then we made comments on it.
Developed by Associate Dean
I believe it was a collaboration between several faculty members in college
A college administrator produced a draft that each department reviewed and then adopted with some changes. The administrator did a good job on a difficult task and should be commended but not enough discussion and involvement occurred in the department.
College initiated the criteria with departments being invited to give input.
No. The college recognizing the value of consistency within the college developed draft criteria that were critiqued by departments and then later reviewed revised if desired and approved. This approach was extremely efficient and effective given the short time frame for development. Further this approach reflected college level norms and expectations. If individual departments had developed criteria in isolation it would have been less efficient on the front-end and required additional resources overtime resolve differences.
It was developed by the college and the policies used were dictated by the Provost and President.
It was developed primarily by the administration
Primarily developed by the Associate Dean in the college then briefly reviewed and approved college Dept. faculty.
It was developed by the business school
constrained by external accrediting body
The development was split between college and department.
It is really a "yes but." We did draft the portion of our document over which there was discretion -- primarily what journals counted in the top tier. There were a lot of mandates and prohibitions dictated by the College and the higher administration such that the criteria and process would not have at all looked the same if we had created it from scratch. We really wanted each faculty member to be able to opt out of having peer evaluation and just let the Dept. Head do it.
Essentially faculty were informed by administration of elements in the plan acceptable to administration AFTER the departmental faculty has spent much time developing the procedures. So our participation was largely superfluous.
College developed the criteria.
While we hade input much of the info came out of the dean's office.
They were as a practical matter developed at the college level.
The associate dean wrote it and we were to implement it.
It was developed at the college level.
Performance criteria were developed by the Dean's office with little or no input from faculty.
A department committee provided input to a college-level committee that standardized a set of criteria
Faculty was involved but it followed closely to a top down "suggestion" of what things should be.
The dean provided the guidelines.
Developed at the college level
It came in large part from the associate dean of our college.
Imposed by college

It was more or less passed down to us from the college level.
A document originating in the Dean's office was provided; very few/minimal changes were made to the document by departmental faculty.
No clue as to how the guidelines were developed.
The Dean's office and Dept. Heads developed the criteria and then gave it to the faculty.
It was developed by the college Administrators
The criteria came from college administration.
To my knowledge the criteria was primarily developed by an Associate Dean with some customization by the department head with limited feedback from faculty.
Much of it sort of appeared to meet the deadlines put together by the Provost
We were given a draft to review and asked to comment. But I did not see changes to include our departments concerns as discussed in our departmental meetings.
Primarily developed by Department Head and then examined by faculty.
The dean specified the criteria which had to be followed for the college
The Merit Pay Evaluation Criteria was developed by the College. It was given to us in the department to implement almost verbatim.
It was given by the college
It was created according to stringent criteria from the college. The Department Head also stated that it was to be strict compliance with everything proposed by the college.
The dean's office passed down what was to be included in the merit pay evaluation criteria. The department's committee made minimal changes in order to satisfy the overall college's model supplied by the dean's office.

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

It was a top down process.
It came from above.
Only certain faculty with human resources experience were allowed to contribute.
We had no departmental meetings to discuss anything. I think a departmental committee worked on the plan but I have no idea who was on the committee or when they met or when I could have given input.
It was adopted without full departmental approval. No vote was taken.
To my knowledge few if any faculty participated in the process.
A smaller task force a subset of the faculty developed the input
The dean provided the guidelines.
See above
A committee modified the criteria that were proposed by the associate dean.
Never voted on
To some limited but appropriate extent.
We weren't asked; in addition there was not adequate time to do so.
They were revised so many times I don't know who had input.
Assoc. Dean met with our Dept. to explain the criteria. Then the Dean's Committee (heads etc.) developed the criteria and gave it to the faculty.
No the document was designed by the college Administrators.
The plan came from college administration.
Limited participation was solicited by faculty. While the yes/no answer is probably yes I checked no due to the fact that emails were sent along the way to solicit feedback; however there were steps where emails were not sent and I don't believe we ever.
See #14
Only minor opportunity was given.
It was handed to a committee 2/3 of which were not tenured who were told to emulate the document created on a College level. The rest of the faculty had nothing to do with development. Because it was created by faculty who were predominantly untenured t
The committee reviews the changes with the rest of the department but little effort was made at involving the entire faculty in the development process.

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

We weren't given the choice for this year they were set for us.
We were told to use specific weights
No opportunity for input given.
My department head never discussed the evaluation with me. The committee who reviewed our submissions sent it back for me to revise which required me to lower my scores. I did not negotiate as I did not see it as worthwhile.
Our college dean required standard weights.
Standard weights for our college. If I wanted a different weight I would have an opportunity to negotiate.
Don't understand what is meant by negotiation. The department committee evaluated the performance weights.
The weights were fixed.
They were determined by the college
I believe we were simply informed what the weights would be.
They were assigned
Used college recommendation
Weights are set by college.
We were told that we should have specific weights unless we could show a compelling reason for a change. It did not matter in my case as I was rated the same in each category.
We were STRONGLY encouraged to use a set weighting system
We were told that this issue had been decided either by the dean or by upper level administration.
College imposed the weights.
It was communicated that a specific weight for teaching research and service was expected.
40/40/20 was expected in the college
My department head tells me what to do I am not consulted on any aspect of my job.
I received my weights when I received the department head's evaluation of my performance.
There was no opportunity provided to do so.
Did not know this was an option
We were told what the weights would be. Weights were not negotiable.
They were assigned by my Department Head. Although they were responsive to my situation there wasn't any negotiating involved
The standard weights accurately portrayed my performance.
The weights were fixed: Specific weights
I was told that non-tenured faculty could not deviate from a 40/40/20 teaching/research/service percentage breakdown
We were not given an opportunity to do so. Our college dean told us what the performance weights were to be.
Imposed by college
They were not negotiated - they were mandated.
There was absolutely NO discussion about the weights to be assigned for teaching research and service.
Never had a meeting
We were TOLD that our weights were specific weights.
We were not given a choice of performance weights by our Dept. Head.
There was a set of criteria we were required to meet for each level we either met it or didn't there

was no negotiation.
We had input on our weights.
The weights were set by the college administration.
We were told by our Dept. Head that the weights had been already determined and that there would not be any changes.
College used specific weights for full time faculty.
The performance weights are dictated by the Dean of the college
I just followed the instructions
The weights were technically negotiated but the variance allowed was minimal. Research could not be less than 40% teaching could not be more than 50%.
No discussion occurred. Weights were based upon expected college "guidelines". Specific weights for research teaching and service.
I was satisfied with the college guidelines and did not request a change from that.

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

We were told to use a specific weight.
Did not have opportunity to negotiate performance weights.
Whereas I did not find it extremely low and it gives me "room to improve" in the future I was disappointed to hear my score was lower than other instructors who have fewer preps and less research related activities.
No discussion has occurred for next year. I do not know whether I will be allowed to negotiate different weights. I do not know whether different weights would result in a different teaching load.
Your survey design is flawed... If #17 is "No" weights not negotiated how can one answer #19 "final negotiated...".
The same fixed weights will be used.
I do not know if I will be forced to change them later. I did turn in something other than specific weight.
I have not been asked for the weights for next year
No options.
I did not have any input.
I have no idea what those weights are for next year so how can I be satisfied with them? I was never allowed/asked to offer input.
I had no opportunity to negotiate them.
See above
If I would have had the opportunity to negotiate the weights I would have preferred they be different.
I am a (program director). Nowhere in the performance weights is program administration recognized. I spend ~25-30 hours each week on program administration for which I receive release time from one course section. I still teach two courses each semester perform a large array of service obligations unrelated to my program directorship and am expected to publish research. College dictates that program director duties and performance fall under the "teaching" category but I do not agree with this inclusion. Program directors should have a separate category of weighting....1) administration 2) teaching 3) research & 4) service
There haven't been any negotiations for next year.
1) Nothing was negotiated 2) I am developing and teaching new courses this year. I would like more emphasis on teaching
I don't think forcing a non-tenured faculty to a specific weight percentage breakdown is fair when tenured faculty who judge us on the dept. merit pay committee can emphasize areas heavily then potentially rate us in a biased manner.
I haven't negotiated any.
No negotiation there either; imposed by college
I had no input so how could I be satisfied?
no meeting
These were not negotiated
We did not choose for 2007 and we have not been asked regarding performance weights for next year.
I do not know my weights for next year. I assume they will be dictated by COBA administration next year too.
The negotiation is not complete as of the time of this survey.
More emphasis should be placed on teaching the mandated specific weight does not represent the

expectations placed upon me.

I have been here for one semester felt this was a great disadvantage. I was comparing 4 months of research to the two years everyone else got. I taught three sections of the same class last semester so where others have as many as 6 classes to average their evaluation numbers from I had one chance in a class I'd never taught before.

They do not reflect my effort nor the job for which I was hired.

Did not occur.

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 was rated higher on one score and lower on another. I received justification for both but I explained that on the one I was downgraded I had only been here one year and should not be downgraded because it was for two years. He had already submitted the ratings to the Dean. The composite score would have been the same.
The difference affected only one element of the merit procedure and I was not upset about it.
No justification was provided. My department head never talked to me about it.
Nothing in writing
I received no communication from the department head; I only received communication from the Dean.
During my meeting with the Dept. Head he apparently came up with his own "rank order" of our departmental faculty. He never explained the formula to me even when I asked him to elaborate on his formula.
I was originally evaluated with a (high rating) and at the time of final review with my department head I was told that there were too many (high ratings) and I was ranked as a lower rating w/o justification based on the original criteria just that there were too many (high ratings).
The committee did not rate me--I did not apply for merit. However my department head gave me a rating anyway.

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:

I knew there was a new process being implemented but did not understand it until I started to put my packet together. It was discussed in faculty meeting.
I would say that I did not fully understand what was expected especially the detail timing. I find this question a bit confusing. The middle issue of how the portfolio was to be put together was not known.
Telling us the plan in November for the whole year is the same as changing the rules of the game in the 8th inning.
Every document was late. We spent the year not knowing what would be valued and what would not be valued. Questions were added to our fall student evaluation forms without my knowledge and the questions were never debated or approved in my department to my knowledge. Rules changed at the last minute. We went from two years performance to one year performance without any discussion or notification after the Provost had publicized that two years would be used.
It was so rushed that no one knew exactly what was wanted or why. Same is true for this coming year the guidelines are not available and a full semester is almost over.
The system seemed to be made up "on the fly"
It was confusing and seemed very tedious. I felt like I was evaluated blindly. We did need some earlier notification on the criteria.
I understood how I was to be evaluated but it seems that how much I am paid is important and as of yet I do not know how much that will chop off my raise as I am in quartile 4.
The compensation plan should have been developed first and then implemented instead of demanding dept. guidelines before the college and university guidelines were fixed. Things changed even after evaluation packets were submitted. COBA ended up with a 5+ category (for was not in college or dept. guidelines and for which we have still not received criteria even with today's gride). We have been told that we have to start over from scratch with criteria again this year. The PROCESS has to be fixed. I am not dissatisfied with my ratings but am very dissatisfied with the lack of systematic process.
It was very interpretive by each individual as to what criteria meant and how it was to be applied.
You gotta be kidding. Without a budget attached there was no way to make a practical application.
COBA driven system was used.
Too many areas were focused on tenure-track faculty activities that avoided the issues pertinent to non-tenured individuals. Areas of activity connected to a profession beyond that of academia where not considered (ie: market research as opposed to academic research).
I did not know my "weights" until I received my evaluation sheet.
I did not understand that I HAD to turn in anything for the UPPE System. Everyone called the system a merit system and so I couldn't see applying for merit to get the few dollars available which were to be doled out by administrators who always rewarded their favorites regardless of ability. (For example how does a well-paid department head deserve a \$3000 salary increase in one year?)
No information was provided.
Nothing about this process was ever explained to faculty. We were handed the self-evaluation and told to complete it by a certain date. That is all I know about this process.
Our department committee tells me they "got stuck" trying to figure out how to evaluate my program director performance and just punted the issue up to the department chair. I didn't know what my weightings were going into the process but learned them afterward.
The timing of everything was way too limited. We got the details and a couple of days later the

packet was due.
Criteria were distributed by e-mail on Friday December 22 within 2 hours of shut-down for holidays.
The pay for performance system was a joke. It was mandated and rushed on every level and the administration should be ashamed of forcing this upon the faculty in a hasty manner. It caused frustration and negative experiences for all I have encountered.
The process was continually changed so there was no way to understand how the system would be implemented.
Did anybody understand it?
It was never explained the faculty.
The portfolio process took 5-6 hours of initial work and that included asking other professors in the dept. for feedback on the required documentation.
It seemed the system was applied after the fact. I had no idea how I was to be evaluated throughout the year.
The process was a moving target.
I responded yes however by the time the process was complete the criteria had changed because there were too many (high ratings).
The system needed to be pre-tested before it was implemented.
We received the criteria only a few days before our packet was due which was over the Christmas break. We were granted a week extension but it was concerning that we were evaluated on criteria (new rules) which were unknown during the evaluated time frame.
The whole department seemed to be figuring it out as we went along.

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.

It was barely explained after the fact.
This was never clear. I still do not know whether I will be allowed to review evaluations that were higher and lower than mine to triangulate how fair the process really was. The equity part was not backed up with any statistics. I do not know how departments differed in equity quartiles. I do not know what salary norm I am being compared to.
Too rushed. Carrington forced the system before it could be well organized and communicated.
The timing and nature of feedback from each level was not clearly described. Easy fix for next iteration.
didn't know what the feedback would be
Was not given feedback as to the Dean's change of rating.
There were too many cases where upper administration would make an announcement to be interpreted by faculty the dean and the department head then later re-stated by admin.
No feedback about my performance rating until dean's notice.
no communication
New to University many changes during the development of the guidelines
Again we were told nothing.
Did not know what feedback I would get from whom I would get it or when.
Not enough info. given
No communication
Some high level goals were articulated but implementation was woefully inadequate.
I understand that the Department Head and Dean would be providing feedback; I only received communication from the Dean.
This was all kept secret.
My understanding was that the Personnel committee (5 elected dept. members) would review the departmental packets and assign a 5 4 . . .based on the established guidelines by the college Administrators. That was done and then the rules changed when someone in administration said we had too many (high ratings) for a college. The next step was to "rank" everyone in each dept. JOKE!
The process changed on a daily basis.
I thought I understood however the process changed because there were too many (high ratings).
I would have said yes but we were told that we did not have the CORRECT NUMBER of faculty in the upper performance evaluative numbers after the Dept PC Dept. Head and Dean completed their review. It is still unclear to me who said (THE DEAN THE DEPT HEAD OR THE PROVOST) we had too many people in the higher performance category (although it was implied the PROVOST). Consequently our Dept. Head was told to go back and rank everyone to make sure we had the correct percentages of faculty in the right categories. This made it feel like everything our peers (DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE) did was disregarded and that our own evaluations and performance as outlined by the evaluation guidelines were thrown out.

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

<p>The program should have been explained in 2006 and then implemented the next year (2007) with everyone knowing exactly what is expected of them.</p>
<p>First this survey missed the real issue. How the upper administration handled the merit pay? Very badly! How do you expect that a merit pay plan can be effective when the time being judged has already passed? If I am being judged based on my performance but the judgment criteria was not in place when I started then the merit system is not the carrot that draws the cart. Because of this we can also see the criteria being written to fit the past performance. No surprise there. What was the hurry? Just like the faculty handbook is supposed to have one year to come into effect this should have had at least that much time. We are expected to come back to work and put together all this information on time but the administration can't get the undergraduate catalog out until November. Do they have a merit system? Does athletics have a merit system? The merit system is dysfunctional at best and encourages pandering to the students grade inflation quantity versus quality of research and ignores real service to the student population. It also is demoralizing to the faculty and greatest conflict. We have a very peaceful department but ended up arguing over this. The amount of work for the expected return is too much. I asked one of my colleagues what he thought in light of his experience in the business world. He replied that the system may be similar in business but the rewards would be substantial. I get to watch the great money pit deepen every day and money that could go to real support for research and the student spent on sports. What a joke! The timing was awful. I have been behind all semester because of this. In addition having to read your evaluations just before returning to the classroom puts a cloud over the entire semester. I teach very rigorous classes to students that don't respond well to the rigor so the nastiness of some comments is also demoralizing. I like many see the criteria based on student evaluations as grade inflation waiting to happen. In general the administration needs to quit beating on the faculty and try to support us some more. We need research resources but we are forced to beg for what we can get out of the pool that should be going to increased salaries. I would suggest that the faculty senate also try to focus on the real needs of faculty and students and quit being a doormat for an administration that has its priorities out of focus.</p>
<p>The problem is the forced distribution by the Provost. We have an outstanding department and it gets totally screwed over if only 15% can get a (high rating). There is no incentive to work with others since you are competing with them to get into that top 15%.</p>
<p>The final merit distributions have not been made but I think they will be in due time.</p>
<p>There was no feedback as to how my rankings compared with the rankings of other faculty in my department or college</p>
<p>You are "pitting" faculty against each other by using the faculty committees to make decisions that should be made by management. This system will probably cause a decrease in faculty morale. The money involved is not enough for the problems created within departments. I guess it is nice to have the faculty mad at each other versus mad at the administration. Will lead to more "toxic" departments at Missouri State.</p>
<p>It sucks.</p>
<p>This system was divisive and de-motivating. Faculty have no motivation to strive to do more threatening to disengage (more) and are saying that they will not participate in the future.</p>
<p>Historically corporations and universities alternate between Pay for Performance and across-the-board pay increases. We will see how long Pay for Performance lasts this time.</p>
<p>I would like someone to explain to me how 10% of the faculty in our college earned an appraisal rating greater than 5. I am not sure the evaluations are fair across departments much less across campus when each appraisal is performed by different committees. It seems to me one committee might evaluate more harshly than others and when that is the case the faculty in their department does not benefit as much as faculty from departments who evaluate more fair OR those who inflate the scores for the benefit of their members. I also think the instructors were at a severe disadvantage because they were suddenly required to measure up to standards that were not in place previously and that were not included in their original job description.</p>
<p>We ended up with 10% of faculty receiving 5 plus so my initial impression of my (high) score was better than later proved to be the case. 5 plus has not been defined and I plan to ask to see the dossiers to better understand how performance was actually measured. At this time I do not feel we have been advised of any details about the</p>

<p>process behind the final scale (where the 5 plus came from). We also have no information on how performance varied across departments. I don't know if any 5 pluses were in my department or whether the five pluses were distributed equally across departments.</p>
<p>The peer review process caused friction and ruined relationships. I doubt the process will be any better received in future years. The negativity associated with the process needs to be addressed. A few extra dollars in my paycheck are not worth ruining the working dynamics of a group.</p>
<p>I've heard various rumors from outside my college that college faculty had merit criteria "forced upon them" and that weights aren't negotiable. I've no doubt that one or more college faculty have complained but I would caution the Senate and for that matter the Provosts Office not to accept a small sample as representative. The approach to developing merit criteria that college employed was acceptable to the vast majority of the college's faculty with whom I've interacted. The same can be said for weights. College has a tradition of expecting balanced contributions from faculty thus the specific weights to meet the needs of students and maintain accreditation. The vast majority of the faculty which not surprisingly are productive in all three areas do not see the specific weight standard as a burden. On the contrary faculty see colleagues who fail to perform their share of research teaching and service as a burden as someone must take up the slack.</p>
<p>The composite rating matrix is too complex and needs more work to be equitable.</p>
<p>The dept committee did an excellent job.</p>
<p>It seems to be "ever changing." I'm not sure who's really running the process.</p>
<p>I have very serious concerns about using a system that is norm-referenced (with fixed percentages in each performance category) rather than criterion referenced. I much prefer to view my fellow faculty as colleagues than competitors and a norm-based model will promote unhealthy competition and perhaps even gamesmanship instead of cooperation.</p>
<p>How can this have any meaning without knowing what the raise is? Matrix should have been ready to go day one. Way too much personal interpretation of each aspect of the system. We were told what our emphasis distribution was to be.</p>
<p>The survey seems predisposed to allow faculty to express disappointment with respect to department heads and deans. Was this survey written by upper administration?</p>
<p>You must be one of the "good old boys" to receive anything.</p>
<p>What a monumental waste of time and spirit! The whole process was very demoralizing and the inequities among faculty members were magnified. The college system violated the Faculty Handbook in place at the time. I am seriously concerned about this administration's breach of respect and ethics in overturning the Faculty Handbook.</p>
<p>It was a disaster. No communication no feedback no oversight no transparency.</p>
<p>The system is far too complex. Those chosen to leadership (administrator) positions need to be leaders and managers. Allow faculty to develop criteria make the administrators administrate. Far too many man-hours went into this process for the relatively few dollars involved. I should quickly add that I believe that my merit evaluation was arrived at fairly and I have no complaints about the process or result as it pertains to me.</p>
<p>There are numerous faculty to direct manage and administer academic programs. These faculty receive various proportions and amounts of release time special compensation etc. but the proportions of release and amounts of compensation evidently differ all over campus. Most importantly at least in COBA (I don't know about other schools) program administration (which is a heavy tedious and relatively unrewarding activity) is not explicitly recognized in the merit plan not measured independently of teaching and not rewarded at all in proportion to the amount of work required.</p>
<p>The current system promotes destructive and competitive behaviors. It pits colleagues against one another and does not encourage cooperative behavior.</p>
<p>The committee (and dept. head) agreed with two of my three self-ratings but lowered me a point on the third. NO EXPLANATION was given as to why this was done BASED ON THE CRITERIA of that category. I was not told which criterion/a that I claimed to meet were either actually not met or insufficiently documented. The feedback was vague general and disheartening rather than specific directly related to the criteria and constructive.</p>
<p>Criteria were poorly communicated; committee process was inefficient; peer evaluation under such circumstances undermined collegiality. Criteria vs. norm are a disastrous way of frustrating all involved.</p>
<p>This process was doomed to fail from the outset. First it clearly violated the Faculty Handbook; the new Handbook was not voted on by the Board of Governors until the end of the fall semester and the evaluation</p>

period was already covered under the previous Handbook. Furthermore performance for the spring semester of '06 had already been evaluated in the previous evaluation period which was done for the academic year as opposed to the calendar year. Thus those who did well in that period had the added benefit of a second evaluation for that period. The Roles and Rewards plan was NOT followed which was clearly a violation of the Faculty Handbook in place at the time. The awarding of the designations of University Fellow and Distinguished Professor were eliminated for the past two years even after faculty (the first year) had already completed their applications. The amount of money that would have been expended to honor this commitment to faculty achievement and recognition would have been small compared to the degree of trust that was sacrificed. The compensation plan was poorly implemented. In fact during my many years of university teaching I have never witnessed a more poorly executed change process. The evaluation period was already in progress while the process to be used (including the criteria for each level in the areas of teaching research and service) were being developed. Numerous changes in the process were made even after the evaluation period was over. Anyone involved in developing compensation plans should realize that criteria and the evaluation process to be utilized should be completed BEFORE the evaluation period begins. This allows faculty members to make choices during the evaluation period to take advantage of behaviors that will be rewarded. Furthermore when these concerns were brought up in faculty meeting faculty were told to "trust" the system that the plan will have to be "tweaked" next year and that the compensation committee would be the vehicle to see that through. Forcing a normal distribution on the composite ratings is not a desirable outcome. If faculty put forth considerable effort to meet the criteria for a composite rating of 5 and then are told that since too many other people also met the same criteria their rating had to be lowered their morale would most certainly be adversely affected. Ideally over time more people should want to achieve a composite rate of 5 but as they put forth more effort everyone else will do the same. So as they become more accomplished and the results are normalized what should have been judged a very high performance will probably instead receive a composite rating lower than a 5. When faculty realize they will have to do more each year to even get an average rating this will demoralize faculty and productivity will surely decline--something this performance plan was supposedly designed to avoid. There were many consequences of implantation that were never anticipated during the development of the plan. The plan was developed too quickly and implemented without adequate faculty input. (The reason cited for the hasty development for the process was that the Board of Governors ordered this change; however the Board rarely acts without receiving direction from the President.) Over all there was very limited discussion of the plan and its impact on faculty. In fact there were numerous "solutions" to problems that were offered from time to time; this confused faculty and administrators alike. The Provost at times seemed at odds with the President. This process was chaotic to say the least. The evaluation plan was criterion-based but the implementation was norm-referenced. If faculty treated their students in the same way students would be justified in protesting e.g. if in my policy statement I indicate that an "A" will be assigned when a student earns 90% or more of the total possible points for the class and then I lower the student's grade to a "B" after I determine there are more than 15% (for example) "A's" in the class the student would have a right to complain about the inequity. In another student scenario how would a student react if s/he achieved a 3.90 grade point average to graduate summa cum laude and then were told AFTER achieving it that there were too many summa cum laude graduates so s/he would have to be satisfied with graduating magna cum laude? Students and their parents wouldn't tolerate this unfair treatment and rightly so. Why should faculty be treated similarly? This plan gives extraordinary authority to deans and department heads; in fact it has become a patronage system in my college not a plan that provides equitable rewards to deserving faculty. With the decentralization that has occurred the Provost has lost the authority to ensure equitable compensation across colleges. Colleges that are poorly paid (e.g. college) will continue to be poorly paid since college budgets for personnel are determined by the percentage of the E & G budget they currently receive for personnel. The provost model of governance was intended to strengthen the role that the VPAA previously held; in fact the Provost has little responsibility in overseeing the work of the college deans. This is unfortunate as the deans (who are generally not trusted) wield too much power in determining the compensation of individual faculty in their colleges. Faculty indicated through many surveys their preference for across-the-board raises until college average salaries were reached. Unfortunately this preference has been soundly ignored. The salaries of administrators are much higher relative to the applicable college salaries than those of faculty. There has been little or nothing done to address this inequity. Department heads and deans have received higher equity adjustments than faculty have received and this has continued under the new administration. I was hopeful this administration would take steps to rectify this situation. This is even more distressing when some of those administrators have received unfavorable evaluations by faculty. The time and energy that went into the implementation of this plan has been essentially. Faculty spent many hours evaluating the work of their colleagues but the resulting ratings were not honored to

<p>any great degree in my college. No feedback was provided when ratings from the department head or dean differed from that of the committee or department head respectively. Inherently a faculty member serving on evaluation committees has a conflict of interest--it is in his/her best interest to NOT award a level 5 composite rating to a peer since so few level 5 composite ratings will be assigned via the forced distribution.</p>
<p>As with all teaching merit system the teaching evaluation process will be based almost exclusively on student evaluations. The end result will be grade inflation and a lowering of academic standards in order to appease students and achieve high evaluations scores. This President has taken us to the next level. Unfortunately it is a lower level.</p>
<p>In COBA the Administrators unilaterally developed the criteria without seriously considering input from the faculty. They developed the criteria and the format for the evaluation. Then after the faculty submitted their evaluation forms (which took several hours) and after the committee did a TERRIFIC job of fairly evaluating the forms we were told that we had too many 5 ratings. Consequently the Dept. Head took it upon himself to change the levels of performance. We had no chance to change our packets change submitted information etc. We have NO idea how performance was eventually rated. The entire process was a total sham. If one makes the rules one should live by the rules that they made. Imagine what would happen if a professor entered class with a syllabus giving the criteria for grades only to discover that too many "A's" were being given. Then the professor unilaterally changes the criteria and lowers grades based on some student trait (e.g. height). This is a violation of the trust.</p>
<p>When the Dept. Head took over it became a joke. He came up with his own forced ranking system and then ranked the dept. from 1-20+. Dept. morale is now non-existent and everyone is furious with him. When he changed the criteria for evaluation he would not let anyone revise their documents based on his "secret" requirements. For example under the original guidelines one research article in the top 20% of our depts. publication list would give you a top rating. Therefore faculty only listed the 1 article they needed for a top ranking and were going to "save" the other publications for next year. When the rules changed we were not allowed to revise our packets. Therefore if you only listed to one article your evaluation rating was lower.</p>
<p>It seemed our department had a ceiling effect going here. It was fairly easy to receive 5s in teaching and research and more difficult to receive a 5 in service. This was disappointing to people that performed at a high level in teaching and research.</p>
<p>I believe the merit system is a very good idea. However the reward pool for merit is still extremely limited. Even at the top of the scale we might expect at most somewhere around 5%. While this is much better than past years it is still less than what comparable institutions are getting in our field. Just as an example I am at least (a certain dollar amount) below every other graduate in my PhD cohort all of whom started the same time as I started here. Each of them has received cost of living increases equivalent to our top merit rate almost every year. We are not even close to the current market rates.</p>
<p>What a mess. In my college department the evaluation committee's ratings were ignored dept head ranked faculty by some unknown criteria then dean changed ratings and some how we all wound up in a compensation matrix. The process was a total mystery and was very divisive. Most faculty are very angry at the whole process. Some college depts. got to choose their teaching research service percentages; our dept did not. And having the process span a calendar year rather than an academic year is another mystery. If we graded students the way this merit process graded us the students would revolt.</p>
<p>We were given a set of criteria and when the criteria was applied to the faculty apparently we had too many 5s so we were ranked in to high 5s and low 5s or 5s and 4+s which seemed a bit unfair. While not perfect up to that point the process appeared to be fair.</p>
<p>To force 15% and 35% categories as top performers and to say that 50% of our faculty are average will lower moral in the future. We need to set standards and when a faculty member hits that level they are rewarded. With the new system a faculty member may have an outstanding year but so does everyone else and they are arbitrarily lowered into the 35% or 50% categories.</p>
<p>I don't see why there has to be a limited number of "5" ratings for any one department. That wouldn't go over well in my classes if I held them to only 2-3 A's out of 30 students. I hope the ranking doesn't discourage co-authorship among our faculty.</p>
<p>I think the system encourages superficial work that creates numbers quickly rather than quality research that makes a real contribution.</p>
<p>Teaching is not sufficiently rewarded. The College limits weights possible for the three performance categories. The Department therefore is forced to carry out those limits. Equity is not a part of the plan. Merit in general is divisive. Pay is allocated on a percentage basis rather than a flat rate; this makes it impossible for those who</p>

have been here longer to make as much as newly hired faculty regardless of their quartile. The entire process/system is demoralizing and a tremendous waste of time.

The criteria and weight placed on the research component do not accurately reflect the environment within our discipline. In particular the division of journals by their acceptance rate is entirely inappropriate for finding high quality publications.

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

Dump it. Don't use student evaluations for judging teaching. Make journal rankings clear. Don't add categories after the fact. What is a 5+? A way for me get even lower merit pay. Reward service to students that is outside of the normal committees and such. By the way question 34 doesn't have the right classifications.
In the interest of transparency there should be a report posted to the Provost's website for all faculty to see that gives a good idea of what someone who was rated 4+ and 5 achieved in order to be rated that highly. This should be done by college and it can be done without identifying individuals. If a college claims this cannot be done it is reason to question the validity of the college's process. There should also be posted to the website of the Provost each college's system and performance rating criteria.
Provide more feedback see question 32. Allow more flexibility to allow a faculty member to maximize their strong points without being held back by their weak points. For example allow them to maximize their teaching and service contributions without being penalized for there weakness in publishing.
Let administrators be responsible for merit--don't put it off on faculty committees. If the faculty do not agree with the administrator let them take it up with the administrator.
Abolish it.
Use more precise scores than 12345 - ie. 4.2 as rating above four but substantially less than 5.
Discontinue wasting valuable time and resources implementing this system.
Instructors should have been allowed a one-year release from the new merit rules to allow them time to align their responsibilities and projects and participate in activities (not previously required) that would allow them to be evaluated more positively.
The teaching criteria and instructions are too complex and not clearly operationalized. Quality in each category is not emphasized. Discussions in the department and college to adjust the criteria will begin soon but it is not clear how much input I will have to any changes. I will likely write up some suggestions and comments and then hear nothing back. As to this survey I find identifying my department within my college problematic. I am usually vocal about my opinions and ideas but even so I am concerned that my comments will identify me in my college. I do not think I should have to be concerned about this on a faculty survey. I suspect many people who do not participate share this concern.
The complete guidelines must be available prior to the year under evaluation. Carrington insisting that percentages be applied are hurtful to the college dynamics. To force the Carrington demanded distribution the standards will be raised. To earn a 5 in research next year at least 5 publications will be needed for the year. (Or at least that is what has been reported.) Instead of motivating a person it is doing the opposite. Why bother. Walking on water type of standards is not motivational. Set percentages create negative working relationships. For example--If I am in the second tier the only way to get to the first tier is to "knock" someone in the first tier out. It promotes a negative type of competition and hurts working relationships.
Our departmental committee concurred with nearly 90 percent of the faculty self-assessments (i.e. ratings) for the department. In turn the department head concurred with the committee in virtually all cases. If this is the norm rather than the exception why are we spending the extra time and energy required by a committee review? Why not eliminate the committee review and have the department head complete the review. Faculty that do not agree with the department head evaluation (a minority of cases) could be appealed to a dept committee. In those cases the Dean would receive a report from both the dept head and the dept personnel committee. If we continue to use a departmental (faculty) review in the first round I would suggest the following:1) Require Dept committee's to complete reviews prior to seeing the applicants self-assessment (rating).2) Require dept heads to complete their review prior to seeing the committee or individual (self-assessed) ratings. 3) Require the Deans to complete their review prior to seeing any ratings from the dept head committee or individual.
I would suggest notifying us of the scales and guidelines at the beginning when adjustments can be made. Not at the end.
I have already provided numerous suggestions for making major improvements but I have the feeling that no one really cares.
Dates when due are bad. We should have until Feb 1 or so to submit--not the first week of classes! Also I spend 1st two weeks in Jan doing research--the time taken to do the merit reports cut into my research productivity significantly.

Equity quartiles should be eliminated. If faculty want to keep up with current market salaries they should give up their tenure and move. High salaries come with high risk (i.e. NO tenure) as well as high performance expectations.
The merit reporting needs to be integrated with the annual report (and for tenure-track faculty the reappointment application) so that we have only one set of reports to file and administrators have only one set of reports to evaluate. I spent three billable days putting together the merit report; that's "overhead" time that doesn't count for teaching research or service. I know there is always some uncertainty but administration needs to communicate well in advance the likely raise pool so that faculty are on board with the process and see it as worthwhile. Unless the process is integrated with the annual report faculty should not be required to produce a merit report in no- or low-raise pool years. That demoralizes faculty and defeats the whole process. We did not enter this profession to get rich but we also did not enter the profession to beg for raises that are less than inflation.
Some of us are so far behind in where our pay should be (in comparison to other universities) that we need to have immediate pay increases without all these performance games. We are losing faculty and can no longer hire what the market demands.
Dump the entire system and go back to across the board increases.
Some people received a 5+. What were examples of this performance and why was this done? How does one become a 5+?
Would like to see broader definitions of professional activity to include areas beyond academia where "real world" situations can be effectively incorporated into faculty evaluations for excellence especially related to research and service. As far as service goes there are a number of areas included in the evaluation as required for excellence in service that are not open to non-tenured faculty. Though I understand the concepts being evaluated there is no variation for the diverse faculty professionals on this campus.
Reward those who care about the students and the learning process.
Perhaps an outside consulting firm TRAINED in performance evaluation of educators exists and could be hired to set up a system. Individual strengths should be celebrated instead of cookie-cuttet out of existence.
Scrap it and start over again this time with someone competent to run it.
Reduce the 4 x 4 matrix to a 2 x 5. One column for performance compensation and the second column for 'equity' movement toward a more competitive salary structure. I am not sure what universities were used to determine 'equity' but none of my friends are working there. From the dozen or so recent graduates I know personally all started at least 20% above our starting salaries. It truly matters not to me but I suspect recent difficulty in attracting well-qualified job candidates is our salary structure. I also recognize that this goes well beyond our current ability to rectify.
For faculty with ESPECIALLY heavy administrative or service commitments explicitly recognize weight and reward those activities.
Departments should be evaluated also so as to curb competitive behaviors. When rewards are solely focused on individual accomplishments the environment WILL become competitive and destructive.
Eliminate it and explain the problem sufficiently to legislators: YOU CANNOT COMPARE APPLES TO ORANGES IN THIS TYPE OF ENVIRONMENT! If that's not possible two things MUST happen: 1. Reward allocation must be linked with SPECIFIC performance appraisals which must be previously linked with goal-setting. Take any of the goal-setting>performance appraisal>reward allocation links away and the whole chain breaks. 2. Evaluations for merit pay MUST be aligned with tenure/promotion criteria. Lawsuits will abound if they are not.
Omit faculty committees. Give this back to the administrators who get paid for this type of activity. Let the faculty return to what they should be doing ... teaching research and service. □□ Structure this review on an academic year basis as this follows our assignments and traditional record-keeping. We don't function in calendar years; why report that way? Recognize that your utopian allocation-of-duties model does not work in some accreditation systems. Quit making headlines and then making the faculty live up to them.
The current plan needs to be scrapped! Trying to fix something that is so damaged is not an efficient use of our time. I have yet to hear a single faculty member support this compensation plan--or even say anything positive about it. There is a general lack of trust in the deans (as well as some department heads) to administer it fairly and without that basic trust the plan cannot be successful. In fact the previous merit system in place in the late '80's and early '90's was superior to the one we now have and it was far from perfect. In short most people philosophically agree with a pay for performance system but that support evaporates in the implementation stage. Every compensation system has it advantages and disadvantages but the current plan is too full of the latter to

salvage it for another attempt at implementation.
Get rid of annual reviews. Let the faculty apply for salary adjustments when there is actually sufficient money to reward good performance (i.e. the old system). This administration appears to believe there is a formula that can be used to evaluate faculty performance. If they can develop a valid system they deserve a Nobel Prize. In reality the evaluation of faculty is always going to be subjective judgment based on administrator's opinion which is probably the way should be!
Develop criteria that truly assess performance as objectively as possible. If the goal is to have 10% with a 5 rating then start at the 'end' and see what levels of performance have in the past been levels attained by only the TOP 10% of the faculty.
Select a system and stick with it throughout the time period. It is not fair to change the rules mid-stream and not allow faculty to respond.
Instead of giving so many fives in research teaching and service and distinguishing the pay grades by whether you were a 5+ 5 4.6 to 4.9 etc. why not make it more difficult to get a 5 in research a 5 in teaching and a 5 in service?
1. Increase the funds available in the merit pool through other budget modifications and cuts and freeze new faculty hires until the salary pool funds are sufficient for existing faculty. Class sizes are so big now a few more students won't really matter. 2. Increase the merit pay differential so that top achievers earn 10% rather than 5% raises. That would be a real incentive!!!3. If we can not get pay rates up to market levels in a timely manner find other possible incentives for faculty (i.e. instead of a 12 credit limit give our kids free tuition like other schools offer their faculty reduce our health insurance costs etc..).4. Provide additional faculty compensation through grants that support research. Provide strong monetary incentives for faculty to generate their own grants through the university. Provide more graduate assistants for faculty who perform at high levels in research.
Span an academic year not a calendar year. Make rules equitable across depts within a college. Make fair rules and stick with them. Make the rules known up front...no changes to suit the administration. No forcing quality faculty into a normal distribution.
Don't force rank faculty into a predetermined distribution after the assignment of their score has been complete. We don't (or I don't) force ranks my students to fit a predetermined distribution. I tell them that 90% or above is an A and I stick with it.
Pretest any system before you implement it. This is especially important if it has to be done in a 6 months timeframe before it is being used.
By forcing a certain % of faculty into each category you have created a plan that forces us to compete with each other in a win - lose game. If that weren't bad enough you changed the rules after the game was played. If you wish to have higher levels of productivity and moral this is not the way to achieve your goal. While I won based on high levels of research this system encourages me not to work with junior members of the department as it would increase their levels of productivity thereby making them a threat to your "only 15% can be a level 5" game. I'm not sure how that benefits the department college or university.
Have a better method for evaluating the quality of research.
Make the top more difficult to attain. Allow more freedom in the weights. Increase the influence of inequity.
Eliminate it.

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.

The composite score would not change.
Shouldn't this be "If yes explain."
It's fair; I'm not sure if others didn't exaggerate a little and were not called on it.
No need to appeal as I was in agreement.
I do not disagree with the evaluation and feel no need to appeal. If I had to appeal I would not feel comfortable appealing to the college committee. We were also instructed to appeal first to our department head which I believe was not the original recommendation. I received my percentage increase and the college wide distribution just today (4/18) so I would not have had the information I needed to appeal. I suspect (but do not know) that appeals were resolved before the final matrix was developed which might be viewed as improper.
Do you really need an explanation for why I didn't appeal? Poor survey design! If #28 was "Yes" you should be interested in knowing why they appealed. If #28 is "NO" the Q is you satisfied (Yes/No) If No why didn't you appeal!
Why would I appeal a rating that has little impact on my salary?
I am not dissatisfied with my ratings but am very dissatisfied with the lack of systematic process.
Still don't have the matrix to know what any of the numbers really mean so why appeal
I have already spent too much time to justify an appeal of one difference in my ranking.
No feedbacks on ratings were provided before April 11.
Filing an appeal would be useless. It would change nothing.
I don't want to piss anyone off or rock the boat until I'm tenured.
No explanation is necessary; I've indicated I will appeal.
Not necessary.
Why should I? At this point I am so burned out that I can't imagine drawing this disaster out any longer. I believe in merit--but this process should have been pre-tested prior to destroying morale in my dept.
Did not feel that it was worth the time.
No reason to appeal
I didn't appeal my rating.
1) It would be useless. 2) It would make any further promotion impossible because I would never have support for advancement if I appealed my performance rating.

