

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

The other departments the Dean and the Provost had too much to say.
The plan was initially developed by faculty but substantially changed by the Dean by fiat.
The time allowed to develop the plan was so brief that changes required by the Dean were incorporated by the Chair of the Personnel Committee without consultation with the department.
Army pays most of the personnel in the department minus the secretary and one part time administrative assistant.
It was developed in the department but with what seemed to me so many constraints from the dean and provost that it's not accurate to say that it was primarily developed by faculty in my department.
Our department committee thoughtfully drafted clear and relevant criteria on which to be evaluated. But after the committee identified these criteria (working under one set of assumptions) aspect of the University policy (like the time-period we had in which to meet these criteria) changed. So yes the committee drafted the criteria but did so under certain assumptions that at the end of the policy process no longer hold true.
Faculty in department developed the plan and were repeatedly told to change it. When faculty voted not to change some portions the changes were made without faculty approval.
Authorities beyond our department decided that the PRINCIPAL criterion for evaluation of teaching would be statistical data from student teaching evaluations; thus the PRINCIPAL criterion for a score of 5 would be "well above average" student evaluations.
As we developed it we were told what higher-ups were doing and that we should follow that.

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

Personnel committee
It was created by a committee; the administration's deadlines left no time for substantive faculty input. It was a rushed job.
Again the quick time-frame set for developing the plan did not allow the department to think about or debate important philosophical issues essential to writing even an adequate plan.
A committee created a very complex plan and gave us insufficient time to go through the plan. It was accepted without faculty understanding how it would actually work.
same as 15

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

same as 15
Yes and no. We were initially given one range of performance weights from which to choose. After faculty in our department turned in preferred weights and they were approved by the department head some faculty were told they had to revise their weights to
Within the parameters
Head made decision based on recommendations from personnel committee
They were not negotiated. The Head simply asked each of us to choose our weights.

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

I believe the faculty evaluation committee was very inflexible and unfair in the way they evaluated my teaching and service.
I served on several very important University committees and chaired one of them. This occurred over the last two years. Yet I was able to only count service at 20% in my merit weightings.
We haven't done this yet for 2007.
The range for weights was arbitrary and does not correspond to how much time we actually do spend on each of the categories. Moreover the system discriminates against Assistant professors by giving them less flexibility than tenured faculty. The reality is that the workloads for Assistants are heavier and more varied than they are for tenured faculty.
The final numbers did not correlate to the plan.
The process is flawed because it is not possible for me to predict in which areas I will do well. There is no guarantee that my performance (particularly in scholarship) will match my guesses. This system is designed to minimize the money paid out not reward faculty for the work actually accomplished.
same as 15
Hasn't been negotiated yet.
Flexibility given the parameters is limited
Overall performance weights are general in a merit system. Was I satisfied? I'm not satisfied with the system therefore it is difficult to say that I'm satisfied with the premises upon which it is based. Weights can work well if every worker does the same thing--thus it can work when evaluating assembly line workers doing the same thing. However it doesn't take into account overlaps between our categories of work or uniqueness in our workload from semester to semester--at best it paints a broad brush stroke over the general work of all faculty.
My department head urged me to modify the weights I initially proposed so that research is weighted more heavily and teaching less heavily. But this makes me a bit nervous. Not sure it was a good modification.
There were too many "holes" in our department policy which weren't discovered until the committee tried to follow it. For example qualitative remarks from evaluations weren't considered at all didn't count. Just like there's grade inflation now there's "evaluation" inflation. Just like in Lake Wobegon everyone is above average.
I am asked (required) to spend half of my time on service yet the most I was allowed to count for service is 20%. This puts me at a tremendous disadvantage in competing for high performance ratings.

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?

The department head did not explain the reason for the higher rating only that he was giving a higher rating.
I was show a written justification but not given a copy of it.
I did but it didn't make much sense.
The department head provided a narrative explanation of his ranking but did not explain the discrepancy between the committee's ranking and his ranking.

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 am new here.
The criteria were somewhat unclear as was how the portfolio was to be put together. The final evaluation especially the break points in the college for the composite scores were not made known ahead of time.
Get real the whole university was making this up as we went along--always claiming "the Board made us do it." Nobody knew what to put in their portfolio--generally we threw in more than the committee probably had time to read. The department's criteria was known but the interpretation of these criteria created several surprises. The performance matrix was created by the Dean after the fact and made very little sense.
This process evolved up to the time that the rankings were decided due to changes made by College or Provost level administrators and due to department level personnel members' various in their interpretation and application of the criteria.
The system makes no sense. We were told that faculty performance would be rewarded on the basis of performance but were also told that only a small number of faculty would be placed in the highest category regardless of performance. Thus this was not a system of rewards but a contest among the faculty at the department and (especially) the college level. A more flawed and corrupt system could hardly be imagined and no tinkering next year can fix it.
The department personnel committee did not offer clear guidelines for putting together portfolios nor did the personnel committee follow the plan as it was written.
The department have no time to discuss the process by which its plan would be evaluated; mostly it seemed to be made up on the fly by the Chair of the personnel committee.
Our plan was needlessly complex it was constructed far too quickly to allow adequate discussion. No one including the committee which created the plan completely understood what was required or how to package it.
The committee ranked all faculty in each of three areas giving out level 1 to many faculty in some areas. They claimed that many faculty were not reaching expected levels of performance on the basis of numerical scores.
Much confusion this first go round.
The final version (ie the "approved by the Dean and the Provost" version of our department criteria) was not available before our information needed to be submitted. We knew what the department decided but we had no clarity about what had been accepted/allowed and what had been changed/denied. The College's Dean's office requested the performance review material in a format different from the format requested by our departmental review committee such that I ended up compiling the same information in two different ways (doing twice as much paperwork).
We would often get conflicting answers to our questions about the process from the Head Dean and Provost.
The "equity" portion of the process is unclear and shrouded in mystery. No one understands the "matrix." Why not just use merit like any other university? What is the problem with these people?
Up until and after I turned in my performance weights the criteria were being adjusted. The departmentally approved criteria were being changed by those above the departmental level.
Very complex process for which the rules kept changing
Because the plan was put into effect toward the end of 2006 none of us knew how we would be evaluated for 2006 until 2006 was almost over.
(EDIT – information deleted) ... there were many many questions about almost every aspect of this

process. For example what was to go into the portfolio? How was a portfolio for merit different from a portfolio for promotion? How was a committee supposed to evaluate portfolios for those not going up for a promotion? Who was going to pay for the portfolios? 2.) The process kept changing throughout the fall semester--I think everyone knows that. 3) I still don't think I understand the entire process and it's over. For example for those who don't do numbers and stats it is very unclear as to what happens once it leaves the hands of the department head. What is the role of the college committee--do they rubber stamp the deans and dept heads actions or do they have autonomy and if they have autonomy how is that autonomy protected? Who decided how many "5's" there could be? It certainly seems that a quota was in place--based on several hearsay conversations. What about the appeal process? The compensation report is fuzzy on this process. It mentions that it can go to the Provost--what does that mean? If faculty and dept heads are fearful of a dean's potential retaliation then it is unlikely they will ask for it to move on up. The process of tying merit to equity seems quite complicated and I admit I don't fully understand it or understand why we are choosing to attempt it.

The Department spent a lot of time putting together criteria which were discussed in many department meetings. These criteria then went to the college level and was "approved" with virtually no changes none of any significance. In addition Chris Craig examined the document and did not make any changes. □ □ The Professional Standards Committee of the department and the department head followed these criteria closely when evaluating faculty. However the Dean disregarded them viewing them only as something akin to "recommendations" but she lowered several faculty who met the criteria for the level of their performance recommended by the committee and the department head. Specifically two lecturers were lowered from (high level) to (lower level) for no reason other than they were lecturers and could not be received by definition as high as ranked faculty. This was despite the fact that their teaching evaluations were the highest in the department. The parameters allowed them to list 90% of their evaluation on teaching and they performed at an optimal level but they were downgraded for no reason other than the fact that they were lecturers. □ □ So in answer to the question #24 yes I understood "the Pay for Performance Evaluation System including the criteria" but that system was in the end only a "recommendation" and was not how faculty were evaluated.

How portfolio was to be assembled was not entirely clear.

I understood everything except the weights - these were how we wanted to be evaluated or should be comparable to our actual workload. This was quite unclear!

I think all of us were unclear about aspects of the system not having gone through it before. We knew the criteria but not how to put the portfolio together.

The process was carried out so rapidly that basic elements of it changed from week to week during the fall 2006 semester.

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 supposed to be a transparent process throughout but it did not seem transparent when it unfolded.
Was not here at that time.
I understood what we had been told. Contrary to this understanding the faculty role was very weak and the Dean's role was very strong.
Much of this was made clear only after department ratings had been made.
No in terms of effective communication of the process it was inconsistent mess start to finish.
I never had an understanding about what to expect about the nature of feedback from the committee head and dean.
Honestly I'm not too sure about the role of the head and dean. It's all way too complicated and the money involved will surely be small potatoes so why invest a lot of time in learning about it?
I was not aware of the Dean's role.
All of this seemed unclear even at the university level.
I cannot recall how many conversations stated in some fashion "We'll just have to see how this goes this first time through."
It may have been stated but there was information overload too. Departments in the colleges processed applications differently.
We had to create two new committees very quickly and their responsibilities and reporting systems had to be worked out in January as we did our work.

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

<p>I think the criteria needs to be different for new versus older faculty. There is no way new faculty can ever compare in service to people who have been here for years. Therefore no matter how much service a new faculty member puts in it will always get a lower ranking. There needs to be multiple ways of evaluation effective teaching. That was not done in my department. Moreover it was assumed that lower GPA automatically implied good teaching and vice versa. This is not universally accepted. If anything there is more proof on the contrary. I believe my students did well because I taught them well. None of the additional material that we were asked for was used for judging effective teaching.</p>
<p>Dean appointed herself as chair of the college rather than attend meetings as an ex-officio member. The result was that the committee's role was less of a force in the decision-making process than it could (should) have been. Hopefully that will be corrected next year.</p>
<p>Our dean did not make arbitrary and capricious decisions in implementing the system nor did she feel it necessary to explain the rationale for those decisions.</p>
<p>The process is still plagued by a lack of transparency and a good bit of administrative caprice. What we have is the illusion of faculty participation but all of the key decisions are dictated by the Dean. For example: key parts of the Department's evaluation document were vetoed the ranges for the pay matrix were dictated by the dean (what good does it do for the department to hammer out faculty rankings if the dean can change a 4 to a 4 minus?); the salary divisions were also set by the dean--with the disheartened bewildered capitulation of the college committee.</p>
<p>I believe that this process served to divide faculty and demoralize departments. To ask faculty that are not trained in personnel evaluation or equity evaluation is misguided and dangerous. It basically created havoc throughout our college.</p>
<p>It is a joke. It is hard to believe that this faculty could be any more demoralized about pay than it was last year - but that has been achieved.</p>
<p>The fundamental flaw of this system is that the same people being evaluated are the ones who create and administer the evaluations thereby setting up a system of self serving interests. Few in my department have any knowledge of or interest in developing an effective measurement tool for the evaluation of teaching leaving someone like myself with required high ratios in teaching feeling slighted. Additionally the process of developing and implementing a compensation plan in my department created a fractured mean-spirited accusatory work environment--so much so that we now have a mandated conflict mediation meeting scheduled for later this month; hardly the anticipated result of a reward system based on professional conduct!</p>
<p>This plan serves no purpose other than to divide the faculty amongst themselves and keep them distracted from the real problems at MSU. This plan was implemented with needless haste. It is fundamentally flawed. It does not work at the department college or university level. This plan actively discourages good work. It prohibits faculty who work on long-term projects from achieving recognition and reward. When questioned at college meetings and at the Faculty Senate the Provost was unable to explain the system; she could not give definitive answers to even the simplest questions. In (many years) of teaching here I have never known the faculty to react as negatively to anything as they have this plan.</p>
<p>The implementation of the plan in (our department) was a disaster. Numerous faculty were given the lowest possible rating in research by the personnel committee despite those faculty having an active research agenda and in clear violation of the written criteria in the plan. This resulted in all but one tenured members of the department who were not on the committee signing a letter complaining about the practices of the committee. The department head tried to avoid dealing with the issue simply by saying he would just raise the ratings in his report. But this did not adequately resolve the issue and the department head's written report did not explained the difference between his rating and the committee's as it was supposed to. In short the implementation of the plan lead to deep and bitter divisions in the department which is what merit pay plans often produce.</p>
<p>To ask teachers who have loyally and ably served this institution through a long period of small or non-existent pay raises to compete among themselves for the meager monies available this year is outrageous; I would go so far as to say immoral. This was not a merit pay plan and I am disappointed that so many of us took it seriously as such.</p>

<p>The dean created policies based on prejudging the activities of particular faculty members rather than allowing evaluation committees to make independent decisions.</p>
<p>I do think that it was an error to include Equity weights in the "Pay for Performance" part of the evaluation system. Personally I received a "5" across the board in all three categories but in the end due to my equity quartile I was rewarded less than others in the 4 category. THIS IS NOT MERIT PAY. Including equity here cheapens the merit value of the pay increase.</p>
<p>Without College guidelines individual faculty are made to wonder if merit scores were comparable across the College. The two attempts to achieve comparability consisted in meetings between department heads and the Dean. In the first instance to see if Department criteria were in line with one another; in the other to see if composite scores were comparable. This is a very imperfect to go about standardizing performance ratings. My composite score of 4.0 reflected a very good year but it did not hold its weight in the College's final merit distributions. Indeed according to my final outcome I am underachieving in the College. The truth is I'm probably not. The issue is that without guidelines to ensure faculty that Departments are in close alignment I will never know from one year to the next. My prediction is that there will be greater pressure to inflate merit scores now that Departments who played it straight have seen that almost certainly not every department did.</p>
<p>I'm surprised there weren't any questions on this survey about the University level management of the implementation process. I attended all the forums where the Provost and/or University-wide Compensation Committee presented the plan. At these forums I heard unclear and conflicting answers; I also heard valid concerns raised in September and October that weren't responded to (taken seriously or heard) until February (after many of us had already submitted our portfolios). In light of the recognition of the need to have a formal clear plan in place before we submit administrators to a new performance review I'm surprised that the unfairness of subjecting faculty to a performance review process that was neither clear or in place (but rather still changing daily) didn't seem to register. Finally the channels of communication were really rather jumbled. When asking for clarification of what the current policy was or for an explanation regarding some decision about or change to the policy I found it rare to get a clear answer or a full honest explanation. More often the Dean claimed the Provost made the decision and/or blamed the Provost; the Provost claimed not to have the power to make decisions and directed us to the Committee for clarification or explanation; the Committee claimed not to know about the concern raised or decision made.</p>
<p>No one understands the mysterious "equity" issue which seems to violate the spirit--if not the letter--of performance based evaluations. At this institution "equity" is used as a weapon by lazy and unproductive faculty to try to "catch up" with the working faculty. Very very rarely does it actually involve faculty with similar levels of accomplishment. Consequently the lazy and unproductive love "equity" and hate "merit."</p>
<p>The biggest frustration many in my department feel is that departmental decisions are overturned at the college or university level without adequate explanation. As a department we agreed to criteria and tried to use the agreed upon criteria to evaluate faculty. This process was hindered by administrators above the faculty level changing the criteria repeatedly and often seemingly arbitrarily.</p>
<p>IT is just too much work to develop the criteria and to implement it. There are still some confusion. Hopefully the future implementation can be smooth and clear.</p>
<p>I agree with Pay for Performance in principle but I suggest the following changes: 1. Please do not use student teaching evaluations as the PRINCIPAL criterion for determining a faculty member's score in teaching and especially not if standard deviation on responses is not taken into account. 2. Please allocate money so that all faculty performing at 3 or above get an adjustment equal to inflation; then give an extra reward to the 4's and 5's.</p>
<p>Our Departmental committee worked hard and our Department Head is very supportive of his faculty. Overall I am convinced that the Pay for Performance System is a waste of time energy and money.</p>
<p>I believe equity considerations may have had more influence on the outcome than we were previously led to believe. I think the accepted practice of counting published books for multiple years cheapens the process and eschews the results. Current system actually leads to under-reporting as well since reporting a signed book contract or accepted article one year prevents faculty from reporting a publication in a later year.</p>
<p>The Dean cut too many people down to achieve her quotas/guidelines.</p>
<p>(EDIT – information deleted) I was very mindful as were others of the need to try to protect faculty morale and trust in the process starting with our committee. Regardless the system works to set people against each other. It also results in a certain amount of bean counting in order to have any differences emerging. For example on a teaching evaluation scale of 1 to 5 with one being the best how "fair" is it to make a difference between an overall score of 1.2 and 1.4? Yet that is what we had to consider. In some departments actual points were given for every little thing--faculty spent hours putting the material together and then additional hours were spent</p>

sorting through it. The time invested is a huge question. And the masked "quota" system may be masked but it is real. Perhaps what bothers me most of all is the way lecturers have been treated. (I think tenure-track folks did fine because their portfolios were comprehensive etc. I also think full profs did fine--at least from those with whom I'm familiar.) However based on what I know I believe in our college the dean may be guilty of discrimination against a certain category of full-time employee--the full-time lecturer. In our department separate criteria were laid out for lecturers and those guidelines were approved all the way through the Provost's office. Hearsay has it that this dean didn't think lecturer's should be competing for the same money as tenure/tenure-track faculty and elsewhere I heard that the "quota" was the issue--too many 5's so the lecturers were cut down. (They had received 5's from the committee and the department head.) An appeal resulted in the dept head supporting the appeal but the college committee turned down the appeal but the language was mixed. I don't think anyone believes it would be wise to send the appeal to the Provost--too many fears. Again I recognize that I'm close to the situation and could be biased and I don't have all the information but based on what I know there seems to be a real problem that needs follow up. One way to do it would be to formally ask in writing for all appeals to be forwarded to the Provost's office as is hinted at in the compensation report but again it is not clear. If the same thing is happening campus-wide to lecturers then a serious review of lecturer roles needs to be done. This has already led to demoralized faculty--who are some of the department's and colleges finest teachers. The bottom line is that if lecturers couldn't earn a "5" then they should've been told that the highest level wasn't open to them from the beginning--it should've been in the Compensation Report. Our committee spent a great deal of time attempting to be fair and communicative with the faculty--even to be optimistic that the merit plan could help raise salaries that needed to be raised. But in addition to concerns mentioned earlier this last topic has caused me to be very frustrated and pessimistic and to feel that injustices have occurred. I am not supportive of doing it in this manner again. Finally a question from another area: whatever happened to the Administrators evaluation criteria? If the Administration had gone through the process that was asked of the faculty how easy would it be for the Provost for example to look around her table of deans and tell them that she couldn't give more than 3 or 4 of them a "5?" How about a dean who must limit "5's" to maybe a couple of dept heads? Has anyone considered a moratorium on this system until everyone is subjected to the same process?

At the department level (Professional Standards Committee and Department Head) the process was fair and open. The Dean acted by fiat. It is discrimination for lecturers to receive a level 4 rating simply because they are outstanding lecturers doing precisely what is being asked of them. (EDIT – information deleted)

A system should have been modeled after an existing one that appears to work well rather than spending inordinate amounts of time in committee work developing one from scratch we cannot avoid faculty's personal biases when they evaluate each other's work.

The system is too complex and requires far too much time that could be put to more productive use. The criteria reward individual achievement at the expense of working for the good of the student or department. This system will create tension among faculty and demoralization.

I am skeptical of the argument that merit pay is a strong incentive or motivator to improve faculty performance. However I feel that in our department we designed evaluation criteria and applied the performance evaluation process in a reasonably fair manner.

I have no idea how much money was in "the pool" so how could I tell you whether I think faculty will be motivated by the college process? If there's too little reward for those of use who rated highly there's not likely to be a very satisfactory response to the process. It would have been a waste of a great deal of time - hours upon hours of gathering materials putting them in order and on my part evaluating and rating them.

Faculty who put high standards above "counting" are punished. Faculty who do only what they'll be rewarded for are rewarded. Only quantitative matters. FAR too much time and energy wasted. Faculty shouldn't be the ones evaluating each other especially not when it bleeds the faculty of time energy and collegiality.

The various activities required to effectively accomplish university goals are too varied to list in a menu. By rewarding only the activities on the menu there is little motivation to do anything else. Often certain faculties do not have the expertise or value diversity of scholarship to fairly rate performance of those activities. Another problem with the merit system is that it motivates performance level for which the university cannot adequately reward. I believe this is a driving force behind the high attrition rate. Faculties realize they can earn higher salaries for the level of performance they are being compelled to meet here. Other problems include the wide variation in label descriptions (i.e. commendable vs. competent). One label is complementary while the other is demeaning while the difference in performance between persons receiving these two ratings is often relatively negligible. Finally the process (preparing and evaluating performance summaries) is so time consuming it seems

counterproductive. In summary I work hard. I spend more hours in my office than any of my colleagues and I work the whole time I'm here. I also feel I accomplish many important tasks (student mentoring and assistance directing our colleges research center doing applied research that is not suitable for refereed publications assisting my colleagues in doing things that I am experienced or good at) that are not considered or credited in the merit system. I am currently considering quitting directing the applied research center because I feel I can produce 1 to 2 refereed articles with the time I would save earning me a 5 for performance. As it is I spend all of that time and only to be told I'm competent.

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

I believe that over time the system will improve by updating/modifying the chosen evaluative criteria and by altering the procedures used this year in determining faculty merit ratings.
The process needs to be made more transparent with more faculty involvement.
In the matrix the faculty pay increases should be a percentage of the CUPA mean rather than their actual salary (those above the mean would use their actual salary). In my department three people of the same rank earned a performance rating of 4.45.
I would suggest that any merit performance be coupled with cost of living. This would assure faculty (especially those considering a position here) that the university actually does want faculty and staff to have a living wage and one that is representative of positions in their fields. I would also suggest that with the wealth of Human Resource knowledge available that faculty NOT be asked to recreate the wheel. I am certain there are sufficient models/resources to pull from professional in the field of Human Resource.
Give everyone a \$5000 raise across the board first - then back to the drawing board. There must be some sort of model where this worked elsewhere - I frankly do not have the answer.
It must be scrapped. The old merit pay system under Gordon was far superior to this one. The money was minuscule but it was a genuine merit pay system with performance rewarded. It was not a contest.
Abolish it. It is not a merit pay plan. Rather it is a competition for merit pay. Unless there is a regularized pool of money from which raises are automatically given for accomplishing certain things then it's a fraud. With a real merit pay plan faculty would know that publishing a book or an article would get them a certain raise. Now we just have to hope that not too many other people published books the same year and that the legislature happens to appropriate enough money in our year that we get something significant.
The whole system should be scrapped.
The time window is too narrow to measure performance in my discipline effectively.
The dean and department heads did not enforce the University-wide procedures set up in the Provost's explanation of the system. This created a gap between expectations and outcomes. For instance in some departments committees did not provide faculty with narrative performance reviews just a bare ranking or none at all. Committees divided up folders so that a single individual came to be responsible for particular rankings. The Provost's office required a more professional system.
I suggest that Equity and Merit pay be separated out and not included together. This way there would be more flexibility to how each category is distributed. I would also urge the Deans to take more power in the decisions. Our department has been permanently damaged in terms of morale due to the divisiveness of having faculty design the entire system. Already bad faculty relations got much worse as factional divisions created a toxic environment.
Publish and follow College guidelines.
Please please please stop adding new forms that ask me to document every little thing I do. I find myself gathering this information up at least four times a year: the Faculty Activity Survey the College Annual Activity Report the yearly reappointment portfolio and review process and now the Pay for Performance portfolio. Though much of the information is the same it is gathered at different times of the year and reported in different formats. I don't have any objections to being asked to document my accomplishments; I do have objections to being asked to do so so regularly that the documentation of work done gets in the way of doing real work. (It is also demoralizing on three counts -- 1) I realize how many hours I'm actually devoting to work and easily calculate that at my current salary I'm not making minimum wage working those hours; 2) I begin to think the institution doubts that I've earned my salary that it has doubts about the integrity of my work; and 3) along with the message of doubt and a lack of trust that the institution implicitly communicates in asking me to justify myself so often it also implicitly devalues my work insofar as it seems more concerned about quantifying "bean counting" in particular categories than the assessing recognizing and rewarding the QUALITY of my contributions or accomplishments.
No silly and incomprehensible equity or matrix is needed. Just use performance based evaluation. Time for the lazy and/or unproductive to either grow up or get another job. Not surprisingly those who complain about their evaluation and threaten to appeal usually don't follow through as it requires about ten minutes of work on their part!

<p>(1) Have tenured and non-tenured (or "probationary") faculty evaluated on performance over the same time period. As I understand it tenured faculty members can report performance from the past two years (averaged) and non-tenured can report only one year. (2) Let department faculty have a real voice not just a token one in the process of designing criteria. Give some explanation why things are changed once they leave our hands. (3) Separate equity from performance. A very high performing faculty member who happens to have been hired at a decent salary can potentially be punished under this system relative to a weaker performing faculty member who was hired with a lower initial salary.</p>
<p>See my answer to no. 14.</p>
<p>Call it a failure and do not do it again. The focus should be on equity throughout the university.</p>
<p>Re-examine percentages established for research teaching and service. Address inequity for assistant professors who must report yearly. Require yearly reporting for all faculty. Limit credit given to published books to two years (down from five).</p>
<p>Lecturers must not be lumped together with ranked faculty. Lecturers must be included on every committee including the college personnel committee. Appeals need to have timely responses and there must be assurance that AA will overrule unfair treatment.</p>
<p>1) The process has to be simplified. It is far too complex. It is not transparent to all because it's not understandable. 2) The process needs to be fair--I suppose people may never be completely honest but there has to be more checks on department heads and deans--maybe even the committees too. I'm not sure how to achieve this but I think getting these responses to the governing bodies quickly is a first step. 3) merit has to be separated from equity. Having these two together puts them in conflict with each other. For example a highly gifted faculty member probably has a higher salary than others because of merit raises of one sort or another through the years (Faculty may have been given more because of a larger offer from elsewhere because of their specialization because of other award systems or other equity increases etc.) However in the current system giving higher salary increases to faculty who are farther below a CUPA average than ones who are closer or above the average tends to negate all of the salary differences that are based on solid justifiable reasons. So a very meritorious faculty member could receive a lower salary increase than one who is lower paid and much less meritorious if the difference in the merit adjustment is less than the difference in CUPA adjustment. Even if there isn't a reversal in the size of the total increase it still blunts the significance of the merit increase--which is probably not what the administration intended to do. I recognize that this isn't always the case--thus it is important to look at equity on a case by case basis not on the basis of a formula.</p>
<p>The pay for performance system incites faculty to do research even though we are not a research I university and our work load is not geared to allow us to focus sufficiently enough on research. We are however a comprehensive university with a mission in public affairs. But nothing in the merit plan rewards faculty for implementing public affairs into their teaching or research. Why do we have an incentive program that directs faculty away from the mission of the university?</p>
<p>Drop it.</p>
<p>Make sure high performers get a very nice raise - that will reward them and motivate both them and those who do not yet perform well.</p>
<p>The way to improve it is to get rid of it.</p>
<p>Go back to across the board raises with awards/bonuses for high performance. Sub-standard performance should be addressed through informal social control. If departments were required to have monthly meetings where all faculty members would tell what they have done in the past month and what they intend to do over the next month low performers would be "shamed" into increasing their productivity. If we must keep the merit pay system it needs to be more transparent. I have no way of even judging the fairness of the system since I don't know what my colleagues have done nor do I know what rating they received. All pay for performance materials submitted as well as performance ratings assigned should be disseminated to the faculty. Until this system is abolished or made more transparent I will remain extremely dissatisfied.</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.

I don't think its any use. It will take up more time and i worry about retaliation Especially since I am not tenured yet.
No need to appeal.
I appealed the break points which substantially changed the meaning of the composite ranking. not fucking worth it
I did not disagree with my ranking but looking at the criteria and the process I can only conclude that the committee got a reasonably accurate result by chance.
The department head's rating was satisfactory.
I've not appealed my score in part because it's within a reasonable range of fair assessment and in part because our departmental committee really did good fair thoughtful work and I trust their judgment. But because the process has been so convulsed and the rules so changeable I doubt I'd be able to identify any solid ground on which to base an appeal even if I deemed one necessary.
The department's personnel committee acted in an impartial fair and professional manner. The department head and dean did not challenge their findings.
My ratings were not changed.
No one seems to know exactly what the appeals process is and how it compares with other colleges in the university.
My evaluation our departmental committee's evaluation and our department head's evaluation all concurred. The dean said otherwise but the explanation was unclear based on the criteria that were to be met.
I concur with my performance rating
I don't appeal at all.