

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

<p>We had some input but developing this kind of system didn't make sense to many of our faculty.</p>
<p>Technically yes - but primarily by a few outspoken people who do not value research. Their ideas fall in line with a long history of devaluing intellectual curiosity in our department and so fit with our official T & P criteria (which in my view need change)</p>
<p>Input was not sought from this faculty group for evaluation criteria.</p>
<p>The department head took the existing work and brought it back with suggested changes. There was little input from all faculty and a great deal from one or two.</p>
<p>At the departmental level it was developed by faculty although the final criteria were changed by the Dean. We actually self-rated and our Departmental Committee reviewed and made some changes then the Department Head either supported or changed the ratings and reported them back to individual faculty members respectively.</p>
<p>It was developed by one program and we were all told to use it. This was probably due to the time element. Our suggestions for revision were not considered.</p>
<p>by a committee who volunteered and then was later appointed by the dean to work on this</p>
<p>It was definitely top-down</p>
<p>Although faculty members of our department worked on this we ended up using a system that was primarily developed by another department. There was confusion regarding what was to be done and there seemed to be an implication that we all had to have a unified college evaluation. Thus the final evaluation criteria came primarily from one created by another department.</p>
<p>It was hastily put together by a committee using a template from another dept in college. The communication between the committee and college was poor at best. The draft criteria were presented to the department at a department meeting. There was confusion about whether each program would have separate criteria or not. Various programs wished to have different criteria as I remember it. A short maybe 1 page document was drafted. It included criteria that supplemented the draft that was put together by the committee. Time was short so the draft version was put forward to the college compensation committee without the additional page(s) of criteria.</p>
<p>We were told that we would be using the criteria developed by the college</p>

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

Again technically yes. But I think our department head has felt obliged to take into heavy consideration statements made by a group of faculty who do not want to be evaluated based on the quality of their scholarship. I think their resentments of research.
I don't remember being asked. Maybe it was done by committee?
Input was not sought as a group.
Yes except after the first rough draft in which there were lots of problems no other input was allowed.
The Compensation Committee was working on a plan that we were going to bring to the faculty as a whole when we were told to use one submitted by another Dept. in the college.
This was pretty much done by the committee--if you weren't on the committee you had no opportunity to offer any feedback in this process.
Yes but in fact what we suggested was not done.
See the response to # 14
See previous response.

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

I was presented with my weights.
We simply gave the head our self-determined weights. He accepted whatever the faculty member wanted.
We did not have a discussion in this regard. The committee set a figure and the department head raised one of the levels. I have not discussed this with any one or sought any negotiations.

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

Ratings were subjective and influenced by personal relationships.
However they do not really represent what I do but how I can best "play the game"
I would like to see some standards regarding the percentages. For example if 24 credits can be taught in a year then a person seeking an 80% load for teaching should be teaching 24 credits; someone teaching at 50% should have a 12 credit per year load and so forth.
No because one cannot predict the future. Things may change such as a different teaching load research opportunities that present unexpectedly and/or personal matters that impact all areas. I have unexpectedly been asked 1 week before classes to teach a course totally foreign to me. I did this to support the program and dept. However I was penalized because of lower than the norm student evaluations (usual for a new course) and less Research and Service because I was scrambling to keep the course going. Got no "compensation" for my efforts.
Persons with significant service responsibilities for college and professional education association accreditation folios (on top of regular service responsibilities) are at a significant disadvantage from other faculty who do not have those additional service duties in terms of having time to conduct research and other scholarly activities.
The percentage options did not reflect the requirements of my position. Teaching an undergraduate survey course in (my department) is given the same weight as teaching a labor intensive graduate methods course. In addition faculty load assignments are not equitable.
(EDIT – Teaching should be stressed within our department.)
I was satisfied with my FINAL weights but...I do think by making the scale so stringent it doesn't show that all the work that goes above and beyond someone else ranks any higher unless you do what "the chosen" few think is significant. I believe it is difficult for someone in another area to know what is significant in my area - even though people from my area were on the committee they still have a hard time judging others work.
I feel as hard as I work and as many extra hours as I put in I should have had a higher rating.
We have not done any negotiated performance weights for next year yet.
I think I desired a higher rating for service.
This has not been done for next year (2008)
The parameters of each I would have liked to be more variable. Secondly not knowing what merit requirements needed to be met prior until the year was almost over made it very difficult to be assessed in a fair way.
I work off campus and the committee assigning the weights knows little of what I do. I think the system is controlled by tenured faculty and doesn't effectively represent true performance. However I am new to the system and have no complaints to offer at this time. Pay me what you want. If I think it is inadequate I will pursue other opportunities. Please don't tie it to some ubiquitous performance standard and downgrade my performance to justify the low pay.

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've received no written feedback about anything yet.
I'm not sure I was given the "committee's" ratings (I may be mistaken about this).
The rating was the same when rounding but an explanation for small discrepancies was nevertheless provided.
I was verbally informed.
I did not receive a reason for the change; it was a matter of moving from a score of X to a score of X-.
He implied it was due to low student evaluations but did not say directly. No consideration was made for the fact that I taught someone else's course on short notice for the first time ONLINE with no support!
However the department head's rating was incorrect and he decided after discussion to forward the committee's ratings unchanged.
The Dean rated me lower than my score from my Dept. head. The justification given listed on the merit letter only said research=4. When I asked the dean for feedback he referenced the letter and said research=4 (instead of the original research=5). What the feedback consisted of is what he did--that is lower research score from 5 to 4. No reason was given for the lowered score.
The COE Dean lowered my ranking from the both the committee and the Department Head's rankings. The Department Head was copied on my email to the Dean where I requested performance feedback. I was emailed by my Dean and later by my Department Head that I would need to appeal by the April date but my Department Head did not intervene and request specific performance data in regard to my lowered ranking nor did he offer any insight on criteria used to make this decision. Again the Department head simply indicated I could appeal. Note that I was referred to a spreadsheet on the web when asked for specific performance feedback. Also note that my email to the Dean (and copied to the Department Head) did not include an reference to an appeal just a request for information specific to my lowered ranking per my understanding of the merit/compensation guidelines.
I didn't receive them.
But I still think it wasn't fairly done.

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>The initial request for information was presented like other annual updates so I listed basic things without much detail. Only when I saw what others has submitted (during the evaluation process itself) did I realize that I should have been more detailed and inclusive. This probably cost me some merit points.</p>
<p>On a Sunday night we received emails from our department head stating that we were to rate and rank each other on the dimensions of merit and submit to the department head within two days. This part of the process came as a surprise to me (and others). I had not realized that my colleagues would be rating and ranking me - - and so wrote my merit summary as if only my department head would be reading it.</p>
<p>Our approved departmental criteria were not used when my evaluation was changed at the college level.</p>
<p>We were unclear even after we received our ratings. Our Dean changed criteria and rankings without any comment to faculty. We were up and down about the 1 year vs. 2 years. We also rated ourselves as the primary rating.</p>
<p>Many parts of the process are not clear.</p>
<p>There were still a lot of unanswered questions concerning the matrix by which we were to be evaluated. We were informed about what to turn in but then after I had already turned in my materials that got changed.</p>
<p>I was on the committee and I didn't know for sure what to do or how to say it. There are so many factors and everyone is so uniquely different that it was difficult to evaluate everyone using the same criteria. The qualitative element was considered informally and made it very difficult.</p>
<p>I think you need a 'somewhat' category here b/c this was not really a clear black and white situation. there was a lot of confusion about this entire process going into the evaluation and as far as giving myself the numbers I did there was still some confusion as to why and where I should and would actually fall. Even though there was a panel discussion over this with the university committee in Hill 1 prior to faculty evaluating ourselves even the members of the panel argued between and among themselves during this panel discussion--because obviously they still didn't full understand the process themselves. if they didn't--and they were the ones who were supposed to be advising us on this process how were we expected to have understood the process as well?</p>
<p>The process really made no sense and seemed to continually change. I am also philosophically opposed to a merit system and so from the start such plans are flawed.</p>
<p>Not completely. It was not for lack of effort on our part. There were and remain many questions.</p>
<p>Because of the myriad of changes given to us. I never truly understood it until I got my final score.</p>
<p>There was confusion and uncertainty. It seemed that the communication from the dept compensation committee and the dept head was not timely and guidelines were unclear. While all of us had access to the original timeline provided by the Provosts Office (I believe) not everyone focused on the important deadlines and due dates for each phase of the process. More timely direction and more guidance as to the form in which documentation should be provided to whom it should be turned in and when would have alleviated some confusion.</p>
<p>There were no specific criteria for merit/compensation and no option for submitting a portfolio. We were provided with an option to submit a vita and a 5 page written summary of outcomes.</p>
<p>It is too complicated to understand thoroughly besides is changed on a regular basis. Perhaps there is hope for me next year when there won't be so many changes.</p>
<p>The presentation of materials was not discussed to my knowledge.</p>

I knew the criteria but it was difficult for anyone to explain and understand the process because it was so complicated and it was new.

No one told me how I was supposed to put the portfolio together and when I met with the Head she told me that the way I had done it counted against me.

This is a very frustrating point...I am not sure the original university committee understood the process as it seemed to be made up as we went along. When I went to a meeting in our college where it would be explained further the university committee did not seem to agree on many issues among themselves when asked to account for various reasons they made the decisions they made. I came out of that meeting even more confused.

I was aware of the criteria but not of what all was wanted in documentation. The turnaround time was too short. Also the fact that it could be either for 2 years or current was not clear to me.

This was not clearly communicated in a timely manner.

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 all still being negotiated.
Somewhat - - again there have been aspects of the process that have come as a surprise.
This process was murky constantly shifting and full of potential land-mines.
Yes but it was not followed by the Dean. I believe the Department Head did advise but may not have given written comments.
No one at any level seemed to know what was going on.
Again I think there needs to be a 'somewhat' here. i don't know about other colleges on this campus but on this one the dean and many times the department head have totally disregarded the tenure and promotion process of the department personnel committee in regards to these 2 issues. What is the point in having a committee carefully and thoroughly review all of the documentation of a faculty member who is applying for tenure and promotion when the department head and dean ignore what the committee recommends? Additionally in terms of applying for equity once again when the committee highly recommends it but the dept. head and dean ignore the committee recommendations what's the point of even having a faculty committee? Are all of the other colleges run like this?
Again so many changes over a short period of time made it nearly impossible to guess at what would be expected next.
In a sense I understood but I never received appropriate feedback with a rationale.
NO-I am still unclear about the feedback that is actually to be provided related to my performance rating.
As in #25 the "rules" kept changing
There seemed to be numerous changes and revisions. I'm not sure we ever truly understood how the process was to work.
The communication from the dean dept head and compensation committee was neither timely nor clear.
The process changed each week.

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

<p>Since our P&T guidelines were used to judge performance areas and our P&T guidelines are weak and tend toward "bean counting" with little judgment involved the evaluations were meaningless. I'm hopeful we can improve them and that they will become more equitable. HAVING EVERY DEPARTMENT MEMBER RANK EVERY OTHER DEPARTMENT MEMBER is divisive and should be done away with.</p>
<p>I had hoped this system would encourage productivity and allow us to each capitalize on our strengths. However it ultimately resulted in more divisiveness between faculty. I find myself (almost) unsure about WHAT constitutes quality work now. To resolve my confusion and dismay I've decided to keep focused on those aspects of my work that (1) I do well and that (2) bring me joy. I will continue to work on research and writing that are of quality and that can be published in quality venues (an admittedly slow process) versus counting every newsletter article or laundry list I write as actual scholarship or starting to count every meeting attended as service. I will continue to ask students to write (and edit their papers) and go to the library and read research - - even though I know they will give me lower course evaluations than they give my colleagues who do not ask these things of them. If all of this means that others get a disproportionate piece of the merit pie then so be it. Thanks for listening . . . I needed to vent . . .</p>
<p>Pay for Performance decreases morale. It creates competitive and negative relationships where collegial relationships would best benefit the department College and University.</p>
<p>It is becoming quite obvious that the evaluation process is to show that administration is "getting tough" on perceived lack of performance by faculty. In memos to the faculty as well as in open meetings the provost and dean have indicated that there were "too many high scores given" and that "ways of bringing average ratings own have to be found". The provost has also stated that most advancement is linked to longevity rather than performance a clear message that faculty are not looked upon in a favorable light. The amount of money that is available to faculty is insufficient to support cost of living adjustments let alone merit and the formula that has been put forth has been constructed more to make sure that monies available are divided in a manner that gives the impression of fairness versus rewarding meritorious work. The current system will not motivate faculty to improve (which I doubt was ever the intention in the first place) and in the end will create an even more negative work place climate than before. I found it a degrading process and one that holds little promise for the future.</p>
<p>I think that a system based on percentages of existing salary is inherently inequitable. Not every person has the potential to earn the same amount of merit increase for equitable work. It is analogous to extra credit being worth more points to students who already are making A's than to those who are making B's or C's. For example a person making \$30000 is eligible for half as much merit increase as a person making \$60000 because the merit increase is based on base salary. It should be based on a set maximum amount per person. This would be more fair and would be an easier system on which to plan budgets. It is also contentious to force a distribution of performance rankings on faculty who are then pitted against each other -- in an environment that should seek to be collaborative. Is it really fair for example for a teacher to announce that only 5% of the class will receive A's in a class? That is in essence what is happening with a forced distribution. Students hate that -- why would we expect faculty to like it? If the university really wants to motivate faculty to higher levels of performance then a set amount of merit pay should be available to all faculty members. Their performance rating would then earn them a percentage of a total amount possible. People would then compete against themselves rather than competing against each other for limited top slots. Set the standards and set them high. Then let the individuals determine how hard they work to achieve those levels. Otherwise people are frustrated because they are moved to lower categories because there are too many people in the top category. Would a student who earned an "A" be pleased if the teacher decided at grade time that too many A's were given therefore that student would be given a B?</p>
<p>There is a tendency in our department to place merit on giving national presentations on research that was completed by graduate students rather than research done by the individual professor. Writing a book for example should have a higher merit than presenting at a national conference on graduate student research.</p>
<p>The Dean's changes seemed to be prejudicial to hard workers and only in favor of quantity of pubs. If this continues faculty will retreat from service and teaching and simply play a numbers (and not necessarily quality) game. Communication was rare and vague. This was defeating for those of us who work hard.</p>

<p>During the years while we had the award system to reward faculty who were productive I was able to get two \$1200 pay increases. After these merit and equity raises faculty who never received any of those awards have equaled or surpassed my salary.</p>
<p>This needs much more time for development especially now that we are reorganizing. It is unfair to people who have uncontrollable and unforeseen circumstances as I outlined before. We should not penalize people for personal tragedies. They should at least get Cost of Living increases. If we expect a level of performance we need to back that up with the support that is needed. Ex. Teaching an online course should automatically be supported with a GA--especially since the dept. gets money for the course! STUDENT EVALUATIONS SHOULD NOT BE USED AS A MEASURE FOR TEACHING!!!! We know they are not valid or reliable yet we continue to ignore the body of research that tells us this. We need to find a better way NOW! In our dept. the secretary chose the form. The faculty did not even see it! Performance review is the preview and responsibility of administrators and peers/faculty should have no part in reviewing their co-workers. This does not lead to a positive cooperative work environment!</p>
<p>I think this system will set up a very negative atmosphere among colleagues--in fact it already has especially in the area of requesting a reduction in course load so we have time to do research and write for publications. Our teaching loads in this college are so heavy and intense that at 12 hours of classes a semester if you don't get a reduction to 9 hours writing and research is just a dream. And for the most part we are all teaching summer courses too which makes it even more difficult. Are faculties across campus doing this as well? The idea that this system will "reward" people who want to teach and people who want to do research is just not true. We all know that its research and publications that hold the most weight. and it seems that those who write more and do more research are currently the ones who are consistently given the reduction of course loads to keep doing what they're doing--which is not fair to the rest of us. Pay for performance? This is a teacher's college first and foremost. so let's not forget that and make sure that those of us who DO hold the art of teaching in high regard are not forced to give into lower standards in our classrooms so we can do more research & write more articles just so we can get paid for what we do best--TEACH!</p>
<p>Faculty who had their merit rating reduced by our Dean did not receive justification for the reduction. This was an issue for many of us. For the most part I feel our Department Head was reasonable and forthcoming about the process.</p>
<p>I have never liked a merit system. I believe across-the-board pay increases are much better.</p>
<p>Although my personal merit evaluation went well there were too many questions and there was too much confusion regarding the system for any of us to feel positive about it. Also members of the committee were put in a difficult position of evaluating colleagues for salary issues -- that doesn't seem to be appropriate for the role of faculty members. It is a committee on which I personally will never want to serve because I don't want to be in the position of deciding how much money others will make.</p>
<p>I think the process could have been implemented better. There were numerous corrections made to the evaluation criteria which left me unsure of exactly how I would be evaluated. I think there are too many merit evaluation composite ratings (perhaps 3-4 ratings instead of 7). I am still unsure of how the department evaluation committee judged my efforts (the adjective "substantive" is used in our evaluation criteria but I am almost completely unaware of how an activity or effort would be considered "substantive".) I do think the equity portion of the system is needed and is welcomed however I'm a little unsure of how comparisons should be made for (other) faculty salaries.</p>
<p>It seems that the instructors who have been here the longest have "fixed" the system so that they continue to receive the best raises and those who have not been here even though they may be far below the "market value" of a teacher with their experience are rated low so they receive low raises. The criteria are skewed away from the classroom performance in the teaching area and toward things that I believe should be considered professional affiliation service or research - not TEACHING!!! While a few instructors are out constantly looking good in some opinions others of us are really here TEACHING!!! (EDIT – information deleted)</p>
<p>In my opinion the system places no value on dedicated consistent high-quality teaching. It rewards projects and activities outside of the classroom that may or may not improve the quality of teaching and learning but does little to recognize the preparation and skill that can make every hour spent in the classroom rewarding for the students. No doubt some of the activities that are rewarded are worthwhile but some look like much more on paper than they are in reality and they represent much less effort and dedication than the daily effort that many educators exhibit. I believe that the system encourages faculty to do things for the wrong reason and is actually detrimental to the improvement of teaching. (EDIT – information deleted) I am convinced that merit pay programs reward the self-promoters and the politically astute while suppressing many of the most dedicated and</p>

effective faculty members.
I believe that by "deeming" some committee work worthy of putting on your vita to maybe get a raise makes people hesitant to volunteer for committee work that needs to be done simply because it will not help you get a raise. Before the merit pay system people in our department volunteered just to be helping - now if it doesn't count - why put in the time? We are all here because we are hard workers. If some people here are not hard workers and do not deserve raises then they should be targeted. I think this pay system seems demeaning in the sense that we have to document every step we take just to get ahead... when what we want to do is be the best we can be without spending our sparse time documenting what we hope qualifies to be significant. We can only hope that our department head knows (and she does) how hard we are working because the committee can not always judge other people's work because they have not walked a mile in their shoes. I think the committee worked very hard and tried to be fair but it is impossible to know what work went into things written on a paper. Some people can make anything sound extravagant.
Since we don't know the amount of money earned it is difficult to answer some of the above questions. How can we tell if the amount of money in the salary raise pool was sufficient to reward meritorious performance?
I was given one score from the committee department head and the Dean all stating that I had performed at a high level. I then was lowered by one whole number on my performance rating from the Provost office. I asked why my score was lowered and was told we had too many high numbers in our department. I would see this as a positive problem however my score then had to be lowered. I feel that I earned my score and everyone had agreed to my score so why couldn't I keep my score? It would be as if I had made a course syllabus with the grading scale posted at the beginning of a semester and then at the end of the semester figure up the grades and see that there were "too many A's" I would not be allowed to go in and change the grading scale and give a "B". I would probably be in a lot of trouble for doing something like this. I feel that I was punished for doing a great job because my score was taken away from me. I asked what I could work on for this not to happen next year.... nobody has given me an answer. I now think this was a complete waste of time because of the drop in my score. Why not stick with the score and tell me that there was not enough money and the percentage of my raise had to be lowered. I want to know that I'm doing a great job and that it is appreciated I care about the money but that's not the reason that I am here. We find funds to pay off a coach and an instructor but we slit the throats of our dedicated employees???? I am sure there will be a "politically correct" response to the public but talk about lowering the morale around here... it's sad.
I think there should have been a year of thinking this through before it was started. Every time there was a meeting about it there was different information given. Stress evolves when the rules keep changing. I could feel it all through our department as well as with colleagues across campus.
I felt that eventually the faculty understood the process and I believe that process was followed. Little guidance was given re. Assembling the portfolio. But frankly given the amount of work (time (man hours) energy worry) I personally put into the promotion of our department I didn't feel that was rewarded. I also felt that we were under the gun to get something turned in and that some amount of work went into assembling the materials... but I continue to feel "so what". No \$\$\$ figure has been attached to any rating. Faculty are left wondering if indeed there will be monetary reward. The whole process left me feeling down...not uplifted...not proud of all the work that I do and "no" I don't feel that my contributions are rewarded. Right now I'm feeling..."let someone else do this!" I see # 34 for below. I can honestly report that "yes" I got 2 sheets of paper from the review and "yes" there are #'s on it but honestly I have no clue about what it all means. I think that I rate about the middle as best I can figure.
With so little money for raises pay equity is not going to motivate most faculty. As with the prior merit pay system it is time consuming for very little reward for doing the paperwork. The amount of documentation required is much improved over the prior system (system before the roles and reward system. The number of hours taught needs to be reduced for all faculty for equality to exist.
My merit is currently under appeal - so after that process I will have a better idea of how this ENTIRE process works.
The definition of service seems to be self-serving rather than related to public affairs. The overall mission and co-mission of each department needs to be clearly defined.

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

NO MUTUAL RANKING SYSTEM
Announce to all those who prefer teaching to research that they will get all of the merit points if they take on extra classes and let the researchers do their thing. Those of us who want to write can find grant monies to supplement our incomes sell books
Improve the criteria with coordination across college as distributions are at the college level.
Suspend it.
I think I have made suggestions in the box above. The entire matrix system is a mess. Equity should be removed from the process because a person who is not meritorious will eventually be given raises as their pay falls below CUPA using the matrix system. Faculty should be given ratings as before and those ratings should be used to determine a percentage of merit pay increase for which everyone is eligible. For example a 4.7 rating would earn a person 94% of a possible amount. A 3.5 rating would earn a person 70% of a possible amount. This would eliminate the need for an arbitrary amount of ordinal categories be that 5 or 8 or whatever. The math is simple and fair.
Faculty have great difficulty looking at a business model of which competes them against each other for merit. For some faculty an increase of \$1000 - \$3000 for example is just not worth the extra effort. Some faculty see this as creating a major morale problem and research in the field of education over the years seems to support that assumption.
We need leadership who is fair and honest. We are not supported in terms of commitment to programs and suffer when we challenge administrators. I believe an across the board raise is more effective as a baseline for faculty with merit going to those who are truly going beyond the call in one of more of the areas. This will give everyone the chance to specialize in service teaching or research and yet reward those who still do it all at the highly expected levels.
Instead of giving raises based on percent of salary make the raise for each level a specific amount. Faculty in departments who are well paid can receive significantly greater raises. For example a faculty member in a well paid department could receive a significantly greater raise for receiving a 3 rating than a faculty member in a lower paid department who received a 5 rating.
Since we are all different individuals there is much to be done to make the system flexible enough to cover all circumstances. In another state I taught in a number rating system was used for all activities. This allowed quantification of all activities and therefore there was no need for a peer review committee. In addition a COLA should be awarded to everyone and then Performance reward on top of that (if we even keep it.) Please tell the BOG that trying to implement this system into this setting is not practical! We are not like business!
What happened to the discussion on equity pay? will the pay for performance system take care of the inequity in our salaries within our dept? when new faculty get hired for \$5000-8000 more than associate professors are making--when will that inequitable distribution be made equal? fix this aspect of our system first please!
Get rid of this system! It is amazing how humans continue repeating historical mistakes. I have seen merit systems in other educational settings flop just as wondrously as this has. Universities are designed to encourage community collaboration and are typically populated by intrinsically motivated people. All merit pay systems do is pit faculty members against one another and encourage back biting triviality and competition--all of which are destructive for universities colleges and schools. Maybe if the college was populated by educators rather than business people there would be some understanding of this...
It appears to me and the colleagues I have talked to that the University is only concerned with research. Our fear that the administration would be "paying for publications" clearly came through with this first round of merit pay. If teaching and service is going to be valued then those of us who are strong in those areas should not be punished as we were this time.
The process should become more faculty driven/empowered and administrators should be more accountable for their decision making.
Not all faculty received letters of merit ranking from Dept. Head. All should receive letters from the Dept. Head. Dean dropped a number of persons' scores in the research area with no rationale other than stating that the score was lowered. Feedback on the reason for the score lowering needed to be provided.
There needs to be flexibility to truly allow an evaluation of faculty members. Having maximum numbers of

<p>faculty who can receive specific ratings imposes a "quota" system that is in itself inequitable. That means that a department that attracts and rewards high-performing faculty can only rate a percentage of those faculty as "meritorious". Ratings should be allowed to truly reflect each and every faculty member not penalize someone because their department is filled with meritorious faculty & only a certain percentage can receive that level of rating.</p>
<p>Change the leadership in COE. Enforce implementation of the policy after you clarify and improve policies. Allow a reasonable amount of time to develop equitable policies. Policies were developed too quickly without ensuring you had leadership in place capable of implementing such a policy with equity.</p>
<p>I do think there should be some provision for new faculty in the performance system. For instance being a new faculty hired in August there were only a little over four months in which I could have activities and efforts for the performance system. As a result my rating was likely affected by this and now qualifies me for a pay increase less than a cost of living increase (considering a conservative 3% cost of living). I also do not think that faculty should be compared with other faculty on campus. It would seem that faculty performance and therefore the rewarding pay increases should be independent of the performance other faculty in the department/college. I also am not in favor of taking the proposed budget increase for salaries (approx. 4%) and then dividing that in such a way to cover all performance ratings of all faculty. It seems that each performance rating should merit a salary increase that is independent of the funds available (although of course pay raises cannot occur if there are no funds) and independent of other faculty ratings (i.e. How many faculty received a 4+ rating 3+ etc.) Perhaps a pool of salary increase funds could be started for such a system.</p>
<p>Make teaching be what we do in our classroom for our students and the direct preparation for those activities.</p>
<p>Merit pay systems are divisive disruptive ridiculously complex and inherently ineffective. In reality the only way to fairly evaluate faculty competing for the same dollar is to have the same administrator invest enormous quantities of time and do all the evaluations in a thorough consistent manner. In my opinion the only way to improve a merit pay system is to abandon it. I have seen and participated in several; none were effective all were destructive and all were ultimate abandoned.</p>
<p>I think the merit pay should not be in place anymore. As I have stated earlier I think we are hard workers and those who do not deserve a raise should be targeted in another manner.</p>
<p>Reward teachers who do an extra good job of teaching (which is what we are here for) instead of being out of the classroom a lot making presentations.</p>
<p>(My department's) teachers are in a whole different teaching situation with more face time in teaching than others on campus. It is difficult for us to do quantitative research but that is what we have been told will count toward higher ratings--not teaching and service which is what most of our time is taken up with doing day after day. Assisting someone else's research within the classroom ultimately doesn't count toward our research. That really isn't too fair for us.</p>
<p>Rubrics for evaluation need to be made consistent from department to department. All involved need to understand the "bell curve" nature of the performance distribution expectations.</p>
<p>(Our department) first needs to develop a salary schedule comparable to the (other departments) and then develop a merit system to reward those individuals that excel in teaching service and research.</p>
<p>When you are given a score by your peers department head and dean - allow them to keep that score.</p>
<p>I feel our department and college had problems because the information was not always accurate from persons higher up...I feel we tried our best. Re-evaluate our department's criteria for what each person must have at each level.</p>
<p>I think the process should be uniform across the departments. Maybe a sub-committee of personnel committee chairs can get together and develop something.</p>
<p>This would have been a good year to "try out" the system but without any actual monetary costs or benefits. This would have eliminated the fairness issue on being evaluated on criteria "after the fact" and would have given departments and colleges a chance to work out the kinks without upsetting most folks.</p>
<p>Definition of the categories needs to be in alignment with a clearly defined mission.</p>

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.

What was the use?
I wrote a letter to the dept. head but declined to pursue it further because of the current state of flux of the program. It would have taken much more time that I really didn't want to invest. The amount of benefit if any is too small to bother to take the time.
It just didn't seem worth the trouble. We should get a rationale for a lowered rating by the dean than what was sent up the chain of command from the committee. That didn't happen. I am just too busy to fuss with it and shouldn't have to really.
I did not want to go through what I am sure would be a lengthy process but rather would just like more detailed feedback for my score lowering to be provided by my Dean. I am also interested in understanding how faculty with significant education accreditation duties are going to be able to perform at the same level of performance for merit in the research area than faculty who do not have such extensive service duties.
Did not need to appeal.
Why bother? I could not obtain performance feedback the criteria were unknown to me on what grounds could I appeal? Equity and leadership problems within the COE are common knowledge; yet decisions that impact my ability to take care of immediate and long term financial needs falls under the discretion of these individuals. The most highly productive and yet outspoken members of (my department) all had rankings lowered by the Dean. There is a well documented history that the outcome for questioning the actions of leadership within the COE will be punitive action even if the process is conducted through appropriate channels. In addition I was told that the Office of the Provost was aware of these problems with implementation of the merit/compensation process within the COE. Still I did not received performance feedback. It seemed both futile and financially irresponsible to appeal.
NO need to appeal
I did not feel it would make a difference.
It wouldn't be worth the time and effort.
I accepted the performance rating.