

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

While we developed the plan itself what was to be in the plan was pretty much dictated by the Dean's office.

If this question refers to the criteria within the department then the answer is yes. However if the question refers to the use of quartiles etc. then the answer is no.

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

All individuals who were faculty at the time were involved. However some individuals have been changed from faculty to staff (were staff when systems were developed) so they didn't participate.
Everyone had the opportunity to participate but several faculty members refused to attend the meetings where we developed our plan.
I wasn't involved but college if most of the others were.
I don't know if all had the opportunity.
There was a committee responsible for creating the document.
not the new people
Tenured faculty (personnel committee) developed the plan with guidance from director and dean.
Once it was drafted by tenured faculty there was little time to get input from anyone---This was the quickest thing I have ever seen done with almost no directions.
It was developed by the personnel committee
Just tenured faculty which is about 2/3rds of the faculty

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

The performance weights should reflect work load in teaching scholarship and service so NO I did not get to negotiate my teaching load and did not get sufficient work time for scholarship.
No negotiation took place I merely stated my weightings
I put forth my recommendations...
Lots of pressure there to hurry and get the meeting little discussion little time to make sense of what one was to do.

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

Next year will be my last year at MSU.
Some faculty get points in the highest level of criteria based on the job description: for example being a program director. So.. they get these points for just showing up for work everyday. I don't have anything like that in my job description so I have to do something extraordinary in my job performance to meet the highest level criteria. It is unlikely that I will ever get a "5" rating because of this while others have an advantage just because of their particular job description and I assume they already get paid more because of the extra duties.
see 18
While I was satisfied with the weights I didn't feel as though that translated into a workload that was consistent with those weights.
OK however there is a limit to service percentages... and due to several college university and community working committees this weight was not appropriate... Consideration needs to be made in such cases or I need to say no; however some are hard to say no when appointed by the administration...
It was just too fast and too mandated.
Hasn't been completed as yet; however changes were made to service totals without my knowledge; they were lowered which placed me in a (-) category for raise calculations.
But I was not satisfied with the current year. We had predetermined ranges from the provost office and as you know our department has been doing a whole lot of service with a very small service multiplier. Next year had better be better.

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?

Said he had not received mine which had been turned in. Found out through the Dean. Refused to listen to me about my concern and it took another faculty member coming to my defense to get it changed. Then I was never notified of anything written or verbally.
I have no idea. We were not given any scores until AFTER they returned from the Dean and College Committee. We had no idea what we were rated after the dept committee and the department head were finished. This information was not shared with the faculty. We were told by department head that "information will be shared after the Dean finishes her work on it".
I do not know how the department head finally rated me. I know that at one point the dept. head was asked to rank faculty in order of merit because too many people were rated at a high level. The final outcome of ratings was not communicated to me by the department head.
I don't know if there was a difference -- I don't know how I was rated and by whom -- only what the final rating was. This has been the other problem -- lack of feedback.
This comment is in response to # 21. I wasn't told what the Committee and the Department head's composite scores were for me. I received a letter from our dean that gave me a final score only which I assume combined the two.
It was explained verbally.
I did not get the rating or have a meeting re: the ratings from either the personnel or the department head--when was that supposed to happen?
The faculty did not assign a score only recommend or not recommend

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:

Didn't have the first clue about putting together a portfolio or should I just write a letter--nobody seemed to know.
There was a lack of clarity which could have been due to this being the first time to use this process.
Although I understood it I did not anticipate all of the major problems with implementation. Almost everyone in my dept. was rated extremely high. The system did not differentiate performance adequately.
The entire process was quite confusing. The process had changed several times before it all began. We were told (by acting department head)to put together our portfolio one way and the departmental committee then needed it another way. I had never seen the evaluation criteria checklist before I started using it as a member of the departmental committee.
It changed from week to week first it was 2 years then a year then some college were doing it different from other colleges. it was put together way to fast without establishing university wide criteria.
This was the "first time" and I am sure it will get better but the portfolios were all over the place and difficult to compare and rate. Some of this confusion were because of frequent changes coming down from the Administration about the what where how etc.
As chair of the committee I communicated this information via e-mail to the faculty.
Merit levels are poorly defined.
I was confused about what things went in what section of the portfolio -- what counts for service and scholarship -- some things seemed to fall in both places. After the portfolio was reviewed there was no feedback so I don't know whether or not I guessed right.
You can't be serious!
I can't remember if the process was explained and I was unaware that there would be quartiles etc.
Not completely but I don't think anyone did. For example how do you deal with ratings of 5 5 and 4??? I don't remember a 4+ ever being discussed before.
i had no idea; 1/2 dept head ; 1/2 leave; was told one thing and then that was later changed as the system was changed
But only somewhat...
Our previous department head left (EDIT – information deleted). We received no information from the previous department head about the compensation plan (e.g. implementation plans) prior to her leaving. We started new in fall 2006 and did not have an interim department head until the third week of school. □It seemed like the expectations kept changing. For example at one point tenured faculty did not have to complete a notebook. Then it became clear that tenured faculty have to complete one each year.
Again it was so rushed!
The process was confusing. We did the best that we could under short notice. We had very little time to put the packet together.
Not really but I know now. I got burned. I'm here more than almost anyone including some of the administrative faculty and I was rated a (edit – information deleted) and did not get a raise.

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.

Had absolutely no clue what the College committee was about who was on it and what it was going to do.
Again some vagueness initially.
I was somewhat unclear about the role the Dept. Head would play. I expected him to be able to differentiate ratings more but he was not comfortable with disagreeing with the committee which had not really differentiated people adequately.
I was clear regarding the Department Personnel Committee and Department Head Role but I still am unsure about the role of my Dean.
Still don't our college just accepted our dept rankings with out going thru the portfolios just accepted them on face value. So what is the college committees purpose just to do equity?? No sure.
Not much to say - just was not aware - i do not think none of us were.
Absolutely not. The rules seem to change week by week.
It seemed like the Deans and above did not understand and we kept getting conflicting information.
Again I am unaware that I received a good explanation until after the bloody deed had been done again I didn't know that the feedback would be in terms of quartiles and etc.
see above
Not clear on what feedback would be included when it would come etc.
While I commend our Dean for not forcing too much distribution among highly similarly rated faculty it seems that different deans on campus took on different roles. This seems to indicate that the role of dean is not well specified and the Dean can choose to adopt the role of referee or heavy handed judge. The latter seems to violate the spirit of the system.
Faculty member's materials were submitted how the departmental committee reviewed them and weighted them was not known... it was assumed that the committee took consideration of our tenure/promotion documentation to make a decisions... regarding the department head and dean's office... no idea
See explanation in 25 above. We really did not understand the expectations and roles. For example we are unclear why colleagues review peers' notebooks. We had been under the impression that it was the department head's responsibility to review faculty's notebooks for accuracy.
Little time little explanation by the Acting Director or anyone else.
The process was a rush job at the beginning of the fall semester. We had very little time to put the procedure together in my department. We worked on the project for numerous hours trying to put the process and criteria together.

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

<p>Linking Merit to Equity results in merit being diluted. I received a high merit score but because I earn above the college mean my salary increase was little more than a cost of living increase. Hardly a way to motivate me to continue to work harder than others in my college.</p>
<p>The performance ratings in college were entirely too high and did not discriminate between those that are truly performing at a high level and those that were merely "doing their job."</p>
<p>Within our department things were handled fairly well. Our Merit pay document reflected departmental requirements for promotion and tenure. One problem however is that in order to achieve high ranking in teaching you had to teach unpaid overloads. I don't feel that this is fair.</p>
<p>The system was developed far too quickly and the Dean was forced to send forward departmental plans that varied too much because she didn't have sufficient time to work with the Dept. Heads to compare the systems to ensure consistency.</p>
<p>The time commitment that has to be put to have a portfolio for Merit Performance System. There are additional activities (research teaching and service) were not listed/missing because of the short time commitment to submit the portfolio that causes me to forget to add those activities! I would suggest that if a faculty member remembers additional activities that he/she needs to add to the portfolio after the submission deadline he/she should be allowed to do so.</p>
<p>The difference between a 3 and a 5 for my category was approximately \$100. This certainly does not motivate me to do more... I could go work at McDonalds and earn that! I think assembling the portfolio is just another task to complete during time that I should be teaching or doing research. If the rewards were more substantial it would make sense.</p>
<p>I have been told that part of the President's goal with this evaluation system is to identify a bell-shaped curve of faculty performance. If this is true I do not believe the system that was created for my department (and which is the primary system used in the college) will allow for this outcome. From the data I have seen so far for my college the ratings do not represent a bell-shaped curve. Again if this is the President's goal then I feel there is a major flaw in the system.</p>
<p>The System was implemented in haste and departments had very little time to create their evaluation systems. The charge was given at the very beginning of the semester when faculty should be concerned with students. I feel that regardless of the effectiveness of the System students were neglected and did not receive quality instruction and attention this academic year.</p>
<p>Despite the Quartile System a few faculty members across campus due to very unique circumstances are still and will continue to be woefully below the national and campus averages of salaries across campus unless something drastic is done. The Pay for Performance System did as I predicted: it created a great deal of animosity and frustration across campus. It doesn't create collegiality it antagonizes it.</p>
<p>Many of the questions I was just ask to answer I had not idea about ... was it fair how would I know I don't know how I was ranked compared to others. Was my service as valued as others in my department I don't know? is there sufficient money... how do we know. Will High quality work be rewarded.... maybe but I am not confident. The system is inherently biased. If I rank you high then maybe I won't get as much. I do believe that some people were treated unfairly because of issues beside performance and know of several who are appealing because of the bias of even departmental committees.</p>
<p>I am confused as to what will actually be the percentage of raise that will be received by each individual. I know that there are variations between faculty members but no highs/lows were explained. Was all this work worthwhile or could I have made better use of my time?</p>
<p>Too much time too much effort not enough money etc. For example people have been trying to evaluate good teaching for decades and have yet to come up with a satisfying document. Continued grade inflation tremendous variances in course content and difficulty and requirements within departments added to considerable student apathy and lack of preparation for college level work will continue to contribute to this problem. Why don't we at least try to develop a course evaluation document that is valid. That would be a start. I could address similar issues in research and service but it gets too depressing to think about.</p>
<p>We have had these systems in place before: they have great potential for creating deep morale problems...and</p>

typically the money is consistently reduced to make all this not worth the time and effort. We need to evaluate ourselves ONLY ONCE per year...it seems we repeat things a lot.
In general we did not have enough time to develop criteria that would create a clear distinction between ratings. Some criteria appeared to allow faculty to count activities in two areas rather than one. For example some research advising may be counted under research some may be counted under teaching. It is confusing to be evaluated from January to December on one set of evaluations and then be evaluated as part of the department head's annual review from July to June. I do believe that the personnel committee tried to be objective and fair in the treatment of all faculty. Each faculty member was asked to provide additional information when required. One faculty member refused to provide some information to the committee that he/she considered confidential thus making it difficult for the committee to determine whether or not criteria were met. The process seemed to take a lot of time that could have been devoted to research. I also understand that a 12 month salary was somehow converted to 11 month salary (making it seem that I am paid more per month) when compared to college or national average salaries. This seems unjust...9 month employees have vacation days as well and did not have salaries converted to 8 month pay. It put several of us into higher pay quartiles... Confusing
Overall there appears to be a lack of understanding of how the ratings specifically translate to salary.
Pay for Performance does not sufficiently address the equity issues. We are significantly paid less than similar positions at other universities. I think that should be a priority.
This was a lot of extra work for all faculty. Putting together the portfolio and documenting achievement of all the criteria. Then faculty must review each other's portfolios and evaluate them. This was a nightmare to work out logistically so that each faculty didn't have to review everyone and so that senior ranked faculty were not being evaluated by lower ranked faculty (we have non-doctoral prepared tenured instructors who served on the personnel committee). And faculty were generally not comfortable in the role of evaluation when it impacts their coworkers salaries.
Using the college (?) does not reflect what the current salary of (what my position) should really be. Plus bringing new faculty in at a higher salary really angers me!!!!
The department head told me that in order to receive the highest scores for teaching in my department faculty members had to be conducting research and involving students in that research. While our policy says that involving students in research is valuable nothing in the document says that this is NECESSARY to get the highest ratings. In other words selected parts of the document were weighted more heavily by the departmental committee in a manner that was inconsistent with the departmental document. As a result my intense teaching efforts in a non-research area were under-valued.
The money in the salary pool was not sufficient given that there were very small differences between the money received by a 4 and a 5. And a large chunk of the money went for equity. For example if 60% goes for equity then only 40% is left for merit which reduces the monetary benefit for those who worked very hard to get into top categories. Combined with equity it is possible that a 5 in Q4 for equity would receive less than a 4 in Q1. It is my belief that excellent performance should be heavily rewarded with larger distinctions (monetary amounts) between categories.
I harbor deep resentment and outrage. I believe factors BEYOND MY CONTROL (who's "in" and who is "out" in the department) factored strongly into my evaluations. I have little doubt others who are dissatisfied will express this same sense of injustice. However I have special circumstances again beyond my control and without my consent that place me at a disadvantage. I was actually told by one person in the department I should go out and drink with the boys. I am disgusted. PS: I doubt that would even have worked had I pursued that avenue.
Frankly I was surprised at the lack of discourse within the department about the system.
Service and committee work are discounted under this system. They take a tremendous amount of time.
I have concerns that we might get something (faculty pushing to improve in certain areas such as scholarship) and lose something (faculty not emphasizing student contact). In my opinion we do not need to emulate R-1 institutions. We lose our uniqueness and will eventually lose what makes Missouri State special. My concern is that this system is rewarding activities that eventually will hurt us. An old article said "Don't reward A (in this case research activities) and expect B (in this case good teaching student contact and service)."
1st-my rating is not listed in Q34 below plan seems to assume all differences in pay are the result of inequities; not prior performance
While I support merit pay the inability to evaluate teaching with any reasonable validity will continue to undermine our course standards and fuel grade inflation. It is typical for students to study 2-4 hours per week for all their courses combined and if we are not troubled by that we have lost our sense of mission.
Compliments to the University level committee who did the arduous and thankless work of putting together this

system.
Thanks to our Acting Dean who had the good judgment to heavily favor equity in the college when performance ratings were skewed and packed. Forcing a large distribution where none existed is highly problematic unfair and of questionable management practices (assuming morale and commitment are management concerns). I have three large projects that I'm advancing but if I want 'merit' I will choose to pursue more modest and easily published work. This is not hard to do... but my impact on my field and as a scientist would be compromised... I choose NOT to be motivated by pay. Never have been and never will... or it would bother me more that my grad students make more with 2 years of experience & a masters degree than our associate professors make.
Some of these items assume we know what others' ratings were and how these were determined -- I do NOT know what ratings all of the other faculty in my dept received not to mention other faculty in other depts. in my college. It seems to me the system needs to be more transparent (open for public scrutiny) is we want to reinforce "trust" in others' judgments -- both on the portfolio end (or at least the crib-sheet summaries) AND on the summary ratings end coming out of each step of the process (dept committee dept head & dean).
This process was a farce. The department personnel committee and the college personnel committee performed their duties admirably. The process is flawed. This was to be an experimental year. We were informed that a '3' meant that people were doing their jobs. Instead a '3' is interpreted to mean someone is inadequate. The provost keeps changing her communication as to the meaning of numbers. This has been a waste of time energy and money.
1. There is no reward campus for doing the maintenance activities in a department or in the university (e.g. for serving on committees doing recruitment). 2. We were rushed to put ours together; therefore it over rewarded some activities and under rewarded others. It was a conglomeration of each person's ideas so it focuses on what we thought was important.
Why so quantitative? What about qualitative input?
Not sure about the performance system. I think that it is a way of weeding people out of the university

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

Separate merit from equity
Just cut out all the fluff and admit that this is a system designed to reward research productivity. So just ask everybody how many papers they got funded grants they got funded and go with that. In time that's what is going to happen anyway so just go ahead and make that distinction and quit wasting my time because to be quite honest I really don't care. The difference between the highest and lowest rank is so small in terms of actual pay that it's not worth it.
Need more time to make adjustments to the system at all levels before it's implemented next year. This was way too fast! Why couldn't we have developed them done a trial run made necessary modifications and then used them in the future?
Again if part of the goal is to generate a bell-shaped curve of ratings then I suggest that they primary system used in my college be scrapped. Without getting into too much detail I feel a system of points for faculty outcomes should be created instead of using a system of specific requirements needed for a specific rating.
Allow more flexibility in percentages and allow workload to actually reflect these percentages. Administration needs to accept that we are far from becoming a Research I instruction especially without better resources - library grant office enough faculty to allow research faculty to have lighter teaching loads etc.
Clarify the portfolio process. Eliminate the College Committee from the process. It's just another step to lower the scores.
I think we should take the committees out and just have the department heads evaluate. As we did a year ago. Too many unknowns at this point.
Get rid of it!
Standardize the portfolio format AND included information including limiting the number of pages...so that poor teachers cannot just create "good paper" or build an enormous unreadable document and therefore continue to exploit the system.
Review and modify criteria based on faculty feedback after implementation of the system. Apparently we have not received the final calculations in our college...so I am not sure how my comments on this will apply to the final outcome.
Need to define what a 3 really is a common definition across campus. Different departments define that "starting" point so differently that I think it would be impossible to compare faculty across departments or colleges.
Explanation of how ratings translate to salary increases in relation to funds allocated for raises.
Need feedback and perhaps a personal interview to go over the criteria with the committee so they understand the documentation
It is discouraging when we are told that only a very few faculty will earn the highest rating and that the Department head should not award many 5's. Administration should not put artificial caps on how many faculty will be at a 5 or at any rating. Let the ratings fall were they may. There needs to be MUCH more money made available for raises... It needs to be worth our while to go through this extensive portfolio development process and all the review time etc.
The committee needs to pay more attention to being balanced rather than emphasizing selected parts of the document. Perhaps a checklist of activities and estimates of amount of effort would help the committee be more aware of ALL the components that contribute to effective teaching.
Have less of the money designated for equity. Clearly there are salaries that do need to be raised in terms of equity but reducing the funds available to reward excellence also reduces the incentive to shoot for 5's in a given category. I worked very hard and received a composite 5 and am delighted with that merit evaluation. But it makes me question how much to bust my buns if a 5 is rewarded nearly the same as a 4. However having said this I am pleased with getting anything over and above college for a change. Thank you for that!
How do we get rid of subjective biases in people? I have NO idea if this would improve the situation but what about having people who don't know the persons involved evaluate the portfolios? Then it would be up to each faculty member to make a strong case to an unknown evaluator who did not know her/him.
I liked the previous system better where faculty could choose to submit their work for meritorious consideration. To me the system stressed the importance of intrinsic motivation and those who wished external recognition could

<p>choose to do so. Under the new plan it is more difficult to separate out performance that is intrinsically or extrinsically driven. However it is probably best for the administration to stress extrinsic forms of motivation for the public area legislators and the University to reach their respective goals. However I am concerned about this emphasis placing greater stress on faculty and staff and perhaps leading to burnout.</p>
<p>I think there should be more discrimination among the final ratings. That is I believe someone who receives a 5 5 4 is qualitatively different than someone who receives a 5 4 4. Maybe using a "total score" system where as long as all ratings are 3 or above the ratings are summed and compared against a predetermined criteria. For example a 5 4 4 (=13) would be seen as the same as a 5 5 3 (=13) in terms of reward. This method would encourage faculty to focus on their strengths which will ultimately benefit the dept and University.</p>
<p>Other departments in our college had higher ratings perhaps unjustifiably so. My performance ratings were above average (4) but I was in the 10-20th percentile in the college rankings even when there was a "toxic" department in our college. The basis for rankings should be more equal across departments.</p>
<p>read the literature</p>
<p>We should use exit exam data to seriously explore what students are learning. Tests can be misused e.g. no child left behind but the flip side no standards really isn't a good idea either.</p>
<p>Make deadlines clear at the beginning of the semester. Allow greater flexibility in weighting (while the report suggests that the guidelines are negotiable especially under "unusual" circumstances) in many cases I don't believe these were taken into consideration at the department or college level. The process has changed considerably since the work of the compensation committee a revised version of the process needs to be produced by the provost's office</p>
<p>I'm not sure if Deans or the provost office really buys into the 'people should be rewarded for what they do well' model. Surely the business school does not. If a department has capable personnel with diverse skill sets then allocating those personnel and using those skills well will cram a lot of bodies between 4 & 5 ratings. I anticipate that pressure will exist to get those departments to create variation in ratings... and ultimately departments will decide which important faculty functions are less worthy in their departments and we will be paying for publications. How demoralizing-- and I publish.</p>
<p>1. Reduce the workload to prepare for evaluation. There has to be a more effective yet efficient way to provide the information than preparing portfolios. 2. Campus wide - I don't know what the kinks were campus-wide but I imagine there were commonalities. I think those should be published and then worked on. 3. Find ways to more equitably reward activities. Some get a lot of points while others do not. See other departments and how they put theirs together.</p>
<p>Do away with it!</p>
<p>It needs more thought and work. More direction from the Provost's office regarding what they want to see in the document.</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.

My rating was accurate
I was satisfied with my ranking so I saw no reason to appeal.
I am not appealing my performance rating.
Don't you mean if Yes explain?
No reason since I was satisfied
I don't even understand how they came to rate me with two fives and then a 4?????