

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

Not by all faculty only a committee of 3
It was developed in our department. However upper administration influenced how criteria were developed.
While much of the criteria was developed by the faculty the final evaluation tool for teaching and research were not presented to the faculty for approval.
It's not clear to me which level (faculty dept college univ) played what role and contributed how much to the Evaluation Criteria
The criteria were developed just to fit what a selected few members do in the department.
Influenced too much by Head.
It was essentially developed by our department head.
The plan and the criteria were initially set by the University administration. It was not like the Department decided to do this on its own. Therefore the entire policy reflects what the administration wanted to be done.
Actually only partially. We were asked to develop a plan but when we used a plan that had been approved as far as the dean's level and the scores were too high the department head insisted we change the plan after the fact so the scores would be better for department head!
Yes but criteria was changed by persons outside the faculty (department head and dean).
It appeared as though faculty were being involved but the process was changed by upper administration to a point that the criteria that was decided upon by our faculty was not used at all or was minimized. For example it was reported to me by our department head that none of the faculty in our department was scored higher than above average for our teaching scores. Certainly this is a vital point in our department's evaluation process and our faculty did not set up the review process to artificially minimize our higher teaching scores to a point that was merely above average or below average as it turned out in some cases.

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

Individual faculty members were involved in developing criteria in one of the three areas of evaluation. One meeting was held to discuss all three areas but an endorsement of the plan was not approved by faculty.
I wanted assistant professors in on the formation of our evaluation plan but they were excluded from the process. Our policy committee (made up of only tenured faculty) was charged with the task and received no formal input from other departmental faculty.
The suggestions from certain faculty members were deliberately ignored by the committee.
There were no instructors on the committee.
There was intimidation involved.
Our plan was devised by just a few individuals working in coordination with the department head.
A small committee put it together. By the time the rest of the faculty were informed of the details most of it was chiseled in stone because of the rushed time-frame. A few details were adjusted.
Everything in this dept seems to happen at the last minute. When final decisions about the evaluation plan were done I was invited to help during my class times. We are asked to look at things as they are due.
This was left up to a committee.
Very short turn on this committee little or no guidelines
A committee was selected
Some were on sabbatical and were not consulted. This is a crucial process and could have been easily facilitated via email.
Our program gave our recommendations but they were completely disregarded
Our program spent a huge amount of time developing the criteria and then none of our suggestions were used. The group that got to make the final decisions based all criteria on what they had done so they would be assured of scoring at the top.

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

We discussed it and set it at the maximum allowed for instructor for service but it did not fit my assignment.
we selected our own; he didn't suggest changes
We had to decide on weights before we knew the criteria for evaluation.
Yes I negotiated with my department head on weights but they had to be within the ranges specified by the administration. I do not think the specified ranges were an adequate fit for everyone in the department.
The constraints originally set do not reflect my duties
We actually just set our own within the guidelines provided.
Completed by committee; department head made no corrections.
We chose our weights within the general guidelines for the college
It is my first year in this position. This hasn't happened yet.
Not really. There was a range that we had to work within.
My department head did a great job in leading the dept through this process. I said no because our head made us aware of the University-specified ranges for the weights and the each faculty member could select there own combination as long as it was "legal" according to university rules. I am not a big fan a weights since you need to estimate far in advance of deciding on your real work load and you can select weight that best fit the scoring of merit system rather than what you do.
We were required to select our weightings prior to the evaluation but no negotiations were held.
I decided on my performance weights (I am referring to the performance weights for the merit evaluation just conducted) and turned them into my dept. head but no negotiation or discussion of the weights although my dept head would have been willing to discuss.
I negotiated with no one.
Selected by myself.
We were asked to e-mail the weights.
Negotiation is not the term I would use to describe the process. There were ranges in the weights that were apparently set by the College Dean. The Department Head strongly pushed me to weights he thought appropriate. I would argue against rigid requirements
The dean and department head changed what was originally decided by the committee.
DH submitted incorrect weights to the Dean causing me not to properly categorize my achievements
There was not much negotiation done.
They were assigned

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

My job description requires significantly more service than is allowed for an instruction/lecturer position.
Since this ties in with money I wish we could determine them after we complete the year-- so we can weight ourselves where it will matter (\$\$) the most
Too much emphasis is placed on research when many of us old timers were brought in at a time when research was literally discouraged.
Did not reflect my contributions I make to the university.
Weights were set before evaluation criteria was known. Evaluation tools were confusing and unfair to many faculty within the department. Criteria for different performance ratings were changed at the Provost Dean and Department Head levels after faculty submitted self evaluations.
Yes I am reasonably satisfied; however I do not think the weights are an exact fit for me.
Does not reflect my work duties.
See above
While I was satisfied with weights applied this year I do not entirely have an idea of how productive I will be in each area apriori. It depends a bit on e.g. whether I receive a grant on how many graduate students I have. I would rather chose my weights based on what I end up doing (within 5-10% of a range).
See above
There are gaps in how to evaluate lecturers on service.
It is almost a random process. I don't think we even picked weights for next year yet--maybe we did in the grips of redressing merit plan issues and changing university rules and I have forgotten this... Why take a score than classify it by rank interval then multiply this number by a performance weight that is not tied to reality then rank it again for a quartile... This is not statistically valid or logically value. You end up losing information and distancing from real performance during the process.
I would prefer to reconsider these in light of my recent evaluation.
I have not negotiated performance weights for next year. Even if I had I would not be satisfied with them. I believe setting performance weights before the evaluation period may deter faculty members from responding to unforeseen opportunities that may arise but are not in their highest weighted evaluation category. Furthermore in a true merit system the weights would be calculated to maximize the reward the reward to the employee rather than serve as rigidly set tracks to follow each year.
I have not been asked to determine my performance weights for the next year (round of merit evaluation) yet.
No option was available for my (part-time position).
What I negotiated as percentages was based on what the department determined would be used to evaluate merit for the 3 areas; but the committee determining merit did not use this stated criteria. So my percentages hurt my overall rating.
Need Better criteria for teaching
Well yes and no. I came out fine but in my field (specific field) we do FAR more service than others in research and we were only allowed to go as high as 20% for that.
For next year? Uh?
See #18. I picked weights that I thought appropriate for my situation and was strongly encouraged to change them.
The mandated ceiling on service weight is unrealistic.
I was asked to submit performance info before a completed list of merit points was available to us.

I do not think I have a list even now. So I assume the 2 people in our department who actually made the list of merits are those who also scored the highest.
We haven't negotiated anything for next year yet. We just finished for this year. I think we must be behind.
I believe our area of study is different then the rest of our college and the dean did not take that into consideration.
I do not know what my weights are for next year. Our department head in (my department) has not facilitated this as yet.
It was not to my advantage.
I was so disgusted with the whole process by the end I didn't even contest the ranking.
I would have preferred the opportunity to negotiate weights

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?

not really sure if it was the same/different
Verbal explanation given.
Our dept head refused the first two sets of committee recommendations and kept coming back to us (I was on the committee) and telling us to get the scores into a bell curve even though when using the approved plan they didn't fit.
The criteria changed from the original committee review which changed my score.
Our department head has no clue what is going on with this activity or any other sort of activity that requires attention to detail. So when it comes to details she will go with whatever the committee reports - bank on it.
DH did not follow up with the change that the DH indicated would be made
The whole process was unclear. One day I was a five which then turned into a 3.
I have no idea how the committee or DH ranked me. To have to make an appointment with either was too horrible. I'd sooner never get another raise than deal with them.
No explanation although an opportunity to come to her office was extended.

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:

no real coordination or explanation at any step of the process
Basically we learned as we went so I knew as we began each step but that was fine.
The process was ever shifting during this process as further input on the process was received from administration.
That wording above doesn't make sense. Anyway this system is outrageously flawed. I resent the fact that I now have 17 or so bosses. My boss is my Department Head. These other folks have little or no idea of how I perform other than some self-reported "matrix" form. Plus you put the 9 month appointment people in competition with the 12 month appointments. There's a three month handicap. Unless this is some coercive way to get three more months out of nine month appointees.
It changed pretty often.
No one could have known this because it was being developed as we did it - moving target.
The criteria were evaluated on what you wrote down on a sheet of paper. Some people spent hours filling this out others spent a few minutes. This allowed for a lot of "padding" of credentials. Not the actual performance of the individual. Example: You
Very few if any faculty understood the process prior to being evaluated. Every time the administrators were asked about the process the replied "It's a work in progress!!"
Instructions were unclear. Several of us had to re-submit our materials after being told we had submitted them in an incorrect format.
Know one knew until it was over how to do it. Still don't This includes the adminstartion who seemed to be flying by the seat of there pants.
It was very confusing to me.
The matrix has still not been explained.
Portfolio? We were asked to submit our annual evaluation document and our CV. Subsequently an excel file was sent around less than 48 hours before it was due and we were told to fill this out. The excel file included our own idea of what points we should receive for each criteria. The department merit committee only had time to look at the excel files and pretty much gave everyone the points they wrote on the excel file.
For the most part yes. But there was a lot of confusion. We ended up competing with ourselves (within Department competition) much more than we competed with others in our college.
The criterion developed by our policy committee was very loose and open to interpretation hearsay and gossip. Evaluators were not given a clear picture of what constituted a 5 4 or 3 etc. - I say this as a departmental evaluator - the job was too difficult because the criteria were too subjective.
Instructor requirements were not established yet.
Different people told me different stories on the procedure and criteria
Again my department head did a great job but there was a moving target from the university that confused the process. I got confused about whether to list everything I did to get a total credit score OR to just list three top efforts to qualify for a given performance rank. I ended up doing something in between...
I understood the criteria but the guidelines to put the portfolio together did not mesh with the stated guidelines. In addition our departmental guidelines were entirely too vague about how the faculty members were to be evaluated so it was impossible to understand this aspect.
I did not try very hard to understand the system. As an untenured ranked faculty member I felt it best to spend my time focused on research.

I would say that I was aware of the criteria but how it was going to be used still seemed open to interruption of the committee we did not turn in a portfolio per say but completed questions (all same questions and format) and submitted the form electronically so a portfolio format or paper documentation per say was not really invited and I was unsure how my accomplishments would specifically be evaluated as not all areas of expertise within our dept was represented on the committee. So in general I knew.
How pay quartile and equity adjustments are to be used is still unknown.
The details were not there; the form used did not even match the guidelines.
Although the stated criteria did NOT match the actual criteria used by the Personnel Committee.
No one had a clue about how the personnel committee would interpret the criteria. The makeup of this committee (random selection) significantly impacts how the criteria was valued (even though the department criteria did have some hierarchy for meritorious items there was some interpretation left open to the committee which was influenced by a bias of perspective which is natural and not intentional.) The only solution would be to fight over assigning points to various criteria (still with some bias involved as majority perspectives overrule minority perspectives) so that in the end all the personnel committee has to do is add points. I think there is NO way to fix this in a fair manner.
Faculty meetings are at 3 P.M. and I was teaching at this time. I had very little idea what was going on.
On the surface yes of course. Yet we were discouraged from submitting anything other than electronically so it is hard to focus on certain strengths (and give evidence of same) if one is restricted to electronic submissions. And then my "teaching" was evaluated on things that have nothing to do with "teaching" like developing curricula submitting Policy Sheets etc. As I say I came out fine but it's VERY hard to evaluate good teaching and that showed in this process. (Someone who is not as good a teacher got a higher rating for supervising grad theses which is more service than teaching.)
There was no indication of what instructors were to include in the portfolio.
Everything was incompetently handled.
We were pigeon-holed into using the standard "annual evaluation form" which was not in a format useful for our merit pay criteria.
There was little information on how the criteria were to be used.
The goal posts for the ranking system have been moving throughout the process. Central administration created a 5 point system that has devolved into a defacto 3 point system.
I understood the general criteria but 'putting the portfolio together' was a last minute kluge using a pre-existing form that did not fit the criteria very well.
I would like to have had specific requirements and then respond to those.
Everything was last minute. The committee received such a variety of input that it took 7 hours just to format the submitted info so it could be used.
First time through not a positive experience.
Once again there should have been different expectations with in the college
The weighted calculation was not explained at all. I requested an explanation on three separate occasions. First from a committee member representing the program area in which I teach and she shrugged and said "I don't have a clue how they did it". Then I requested a meeting with the chair of the departmental review committee and got no response until (coincidentally) the day after the deadline passed for any type of appeal. However before the appeal deadline passed I also asked for a meeting with our Department Head ... to explain the process to me and all I received by way of response to my request was an email with an attachment that merely illustrated the final calculated score which had been forwarded to her from the Dean's office. To date I have received no explanation of the weighted calculation process - either verbally or in writing. I believe this is because she cannot facilitate the explanation and refuses to get any help on SO MANY of the things she has no clue about - including the calculation of the weighted scores.

Our program was given a form to fill out for the review process that in no way shape or form accurately represented what we were being evaluated on. Had to seek repeated clarification from college secretary as to what we needed to submit.

It was unclear from the beginning.

The committee used a form that was designed for something else to make the determination if you qualified or not.

I am not sure if anyone from the committee or the DH could tell any of us how this works. Changes were made. The wrong form was given out to apply for this. the entire experience was a terrible mess and has caused a lot of unhappiness within the department. For 5% this was a total waste of time.

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.

very poor coordination and explanation
but I guess I could have-- a lot of information coming down the pike at once on all this; I generally understood-- again learned as we went along
What I've understood is that I report to my Department Head. That's the person I'm accountable to. If I'm to report to everybody else in this department then somewhere along the line I missed the memo.
Rules were made as the process went along.
Still don't have a clue.
For this year I would say the understanding was 'on the fly'. It was not completely clear before the evaluation process began.
Same as above
The procedure needs to me more clearly explained.
It was very confusing to me.
I thought I understood it because I was under the impression that they would actually look at our narrative and CV etc. Instead they just looked at the excel file mentioned above. The department head then subsequently used those same numbers in our yearly performance evaluation (I thought this wasn't supposed to happen). Also each faculty member was ranked against everyone else (regardless of rank release time variable weights for the three categories etc.).
I had no idea how the Dean would compare scores among departments; each department used different criteria for developing scores.
Yes for everything except the department personnel committee - as noted in question 25.
Just as confusing as it can be
It took so long to do and it was very complex that this explanation got lost in process.
Let's be honest there was a moving target process that was going on during the merit evaluation period. Our dept head tried to keep up as best he could. However in general I do not think that this hurt the process in the end. It was a learnig experience for all.
It was not entirely evident - and it still is not - how decisions are reached. There are many tiers and the whole system if one is serving on the committee (I have not yet but surely will) must be ultra-frustrating.
None of the roles described above were explained to any degree of clarity nor was the nature of the feedback made clear.
I did not try very hard to understand the system. As an untenured ranked faculty member I felt it best to spend my time focused on research.
Yes but I still don't understand the feedback (or lack thereof) meaning I just want to know what I should have done or need to do to improve my individual area ratings and I don't believe it should be necessary to go through the official appeal process to get such feedback.
The guidelines were as vague as possible.
Yes to everything except there is no guidance about the nature of the personnel committee feedback. In particular we have not been given feedback about how many faculty got each rating and more importantly the feeling is that it will just cause trouble if the committee shares how they interpreted the criteria so that we can ALL know what a "5" looked like or what a "4" looked like so that we could anticipate improvement (or so we could identify problems with how the

committee interpreted the criteria). I think this is essential for uncovering problems and for doing what the merit was supposedly in place to do - improve performance.
Same as #25 above.
I did not know how the Departmental Personnel Committee's rating would be used by the department head and the dean.
There was too much politics.
Although I understood it did NOT occur.
The process was in a constant ongoing state of flux; still is.
How were we to know all of this?
Our dept head did not seem to understand the process and kept giving us different information and kept refusing the committee's reports.
None of this process was ever explained to me in any form.
I don't understand the role of the Personnel Committee. We had a Compensation committee just for that job.
Really not discussed well although Dean Jahnke hosted a town hall meeting with Dr. Nietzel the particulars from dept. to dept were then set up differently.

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

<p>The resistance to the process in the department made implementation a challenge. The ability to move ones percentage outside the ranges identified early on was available to some but not others--probably no ones fault but my own because I accepted the legislated percentage and went on rather than insisting that it did not fit my position. It did not impact my rating in the long run but I'm not sure the level of leniency may not have limited the processes effectiveness in changing behavior.</p>
<p>it sucks</p>
<p>This took a lot of time per person (via preparation of personal material and serving on evaluation committees) and per department (our department head sweated this for a lot of the time between implementation and turning in of our ratings) for the amount of money awarded. After faculty prepared their own information and saw what others had done via committee evaluations there was concern of people either under or over-reporting criteria for the different categories which was not conducive to good departmental collegiality. This should not have been done for past 2 years of work but should have begun this year after the criteria had been decided. I wonder if criteria sometimes were decided based on what people had already done rather than what was appropriate for good performance in the particular 3 areas.</p>
<p>The above matrix is silly. It asks questions that no one can possibly answer. For example: The amount of money in the salary raise pool was sufficient to reward meritorious performance. Would somebody like to tell us what that dollar amount will be? This Pay for Performance System will effectively motivate everyone to go after each other's throat. This is a classic "divide-and-conquer" strategy. And besides if the "University administration" doesn't like the result generated from the faculty they'll change it. This questionnaire is just another classic example how we'll make it sound officially "well done". For example: "My Department Head managed the performance review process well." If that person could be candid I'll bet their response would be overwhelmingly negative concerning this whole process.</p>
<p>THIS SYSTEM IS WORSE THAN THE ONE WE SUFFERED THROUGH DURING THE BOWEN / GORDON YEARS. I NEVER DREAMED THAT THAT COULD BE POSSIBLE.</p>
<p>In many cases rewarded people who were not deserving and motivated faculty in a negative manner. As a whole this is a poor way to financial motivate faculty. Who ever can embellish the best gets rewarded.</p>
<p>Evaluation tools used in the Department and College were poorly designed and totally unfair for measuring "performance" of faculty. Weights were arbitrary and had very little correlation to actual responsibilities in teaching scholarly activities or service. Individual is certain positions were allowed to use 0% weights others in the same department and college were forced to weight all three areas.</p>
<p>I believe that some pay adjustment should be based on 'cost of living' besides 'pay for performance'. There are a lot of faculty doing good work in the University that may not become high achievers. Basing salary only on 'pay for performance' will event</p>
<p>This system seems to set up a climate of looking out for your self and not the University as a whole.</p>
<p>It was clear due to the way that the rules kept changing that the plan was not well thought out ahead of time. The Dean and the Department Head were put in a bad situation by the poor planning of the upper administration.</p>
<p>These questions do not get to the actual problem namely equity across the campus for meritorious work. The current system has us competing within our department for the meager funds and competing within the college for the same. To give percent raises based on current college salaries will just keep the low low and the high high. However this is the biggest raise non-administrators or non-coaches have seen in a long time so why complain more?</p>
<p>I've been a professor (for many years) and have taught performed service and conducted scholarly activities including publishing in peer reviewed journals books and receiving grants and have received almost zero meritorious financial compensation for this effort during a period of mainly across-the-board (if any) raises during this period. There is absolutely no plan or intention of compensating me or others in similar situations for these meritorious activities. Tell me how that is fair reward for many years of meritorious service? The present plan is woefully inadequate in this and other respects. The level of equality across colleges and departments is woefully inadequate and the weightings for activities within departments is also unbalanced. Why is an unsuccessful grant proposal worth almost as much as a peer reviewed journal article?</p>

It is not done yet so this evaluation is premature.

Our department head clearly communicated the process to the faculty but I did not hear much about how the faculty did as a whole in my college.

I see no distinction between this question and #33 since any criticism of the implementation is also a suggestion for improvement so I will put all of my comments here. I find it curious that this survey (including this question) is all about the implementation at the college and departmental levels without any opportunity to address problems with the system itself. (EDIT – information deleted). My major concerns and suggestions are enumerated below: (1) Merit evaluations were conducted independently by each department but funds were allocated to colleges. Because departments in the same college are all competing for the same fixed pool each department was strongly motivated to inflate its merit scores and several did so. The upshot was that all departments converged on the same distribution of scores with the consequence that all competition for merit funds occurred between colleagues in the same department. This is disastrous for morale. If this is the intent (a bad idea) then funds should be dispersed to departments rather than colleges so that the incentive to inflate scores is removed. If this is not the intent then you should require the development of college-wide guidelines for the assessment of merit. (2) Without exception merit evaluations in college were based on productivity i.e. number of publications number of committees served on number of workshops attended number of advisees etc. Given this assessment of merit in any given area MUST be contingent on what %effort a faculty member devotes to that area. A person who devotes 60% of their effort to research (or teaching or service) should be twice as productive as someone who devotes 30% of their effort to the same area in order to earn the same merit rating. Thus it is not possible for the departmental committees to assign equitable merit scores without knowing and taking into consideration the % time allocations. Yet the current system prohibits the departmental committees from accessing this information. (3) Equity adjustments need to take into account years of service. We crunched the numbers for college and the effect of years-of-service is pronounced. Mean compare ratios decrease significantly with increasing rank. Among full professors salaries increase only modestly with years of service such that older professors are farther behind comparable colleagues elsewhere than are younger professors. The purchasing power of a Professor's salary at MSU does not rise noticeably with years of service because there has been no significant merit pay at MSU over the past 30 years. If years of service are not taken into consideration when making equity adjustments then the new merit system will offer young professors the opportunity to retire with considerably higher purchasing power than senior professors a situation that would be decidedly unfair. (4) I understand that the matrix approach requires discrete merit categories and eight is probably a reasonable number. But it makes no sense to establish discrete categories at any earlier point in the process because that just introduces round-off error. Without exception each department in college has a scoring system for each component of merit (teaching research service) that results in an arbitrary numerical score that is then normalized to span the desirable scale (1-5 or 3-5). The rules require that the three scores be rounded to whole numbers (12345) before they are averaged together to yield the total merit score. Why? Why introduce another episode of round-off error at this step? Every single appeal that was submitted to the college personnel committee centered on this issue; they were given a 3 in teaching and want a 4 or they were given a 4 in research and want a 5. Such concerns would be eliminated and the system would be fairer if scores were not broken into bins until the very last step (in the college committee). (5) Why only four levels (the quartiles) for equity adjustments? The smaller the number of bin the greater the salary jump between bins even though there may be very small differences in compare ratios between individuals in different quartiles. A few more rows would not make the matrix any more cumbersome than it already is. (6) Mixing equity adjustments and merit pay into the same pool penalizes colleges that have the worst equity problems. If the members of such a college want to aggressively address their low salaries they can only do so by reducing their merit pool. While I can appreciate the decision to distribute merit funds to colleges in proportion to their current salary pools it makes no sense to allocate equity funds in this way. Equity funds should be dispersed according to need. The current system gives colleges that are already well paid a bigger number of equity dollars which is silly. (7) If merit scores and compare ratios are permitted to contribute additively to the %raise for folks in the "normal" (3-5) range [we used an additive scheme in college then the cumbersome matrix can be replaced with a single equation that takes the merit score and compare value as input and produces a %raise as output. This would be vastly superior to the matrix since it would eliminate the need to break the continuous merit and compare scores into discrete bins; everyone's salary would be based on their actual merit score and actual compare value.

The process was rushed unfair comparisons were made and our actual "portfolio" (using that word loosely) was pretty much ignored. Also last year we formed a committee to determine the criteria spent many hours working on it and those criteria were thrown out in favor of the very old criteria that were used 20+ years ago (just retyped from the old dot-matrix printed version and tweaked a very small amount).

<p>Each department developed their own method of assigning rankings. This made it impossible to equitably assign evaluations among faculty members. There needs to be some guidance from administration as to what is considered a "good" performance - particularly in the area of teaching. For example my department did not consider factors such as number of courses taught contact hours or use of technology in the classroom at all; and only considered student evaluations minimally.</p>
<p>Distributing merit pay as allotments to colleges or departments regardless of the performance of their faculty defeats the concept of "pay for performance". The old system of awards despite its admitted drawbacks had the effect of rewarding the strongest faculty on campus because they competed across campus. Those of us in the most productive departments are now penalized- we compete only with our (deserving) colleagues for a smaller portion of merit pay. Another problem is that faculty who earned raises by merit in the past will now receive less equity adjustment as a result. This effectively removes their past merit awards.</p>
<p>System for evaluating teaching needs to be developed. System where Departments are competing with other Departments in the same college and similar disciplines across colleges needs to be implemented. E.g. There are two biology departments but they are in different colleges.</p>
<p>We don't even know how much has been placed in the merit pool or what the final %raises are for each cell of the matrix. Those numbers will affect my perception of the process.</p>
<p>I have great concern that there will be significant discrepancies in how departments evaluate their faculty potentially leading to some departments receiving disproportionately high evaluations relative to others. There needs to be more uniform review of the departments so some do not manipulate or abuse the system.</p>
<p>The real issue was that there was little consistency in criteria across departments and no adequate mechanism to address this problem. Most departments totally ignored University guidelines about anticipated ratings distributions inflating ratings to the</p>
<p>The questions in this survey seem very naive to me. They assume that I know how my colleagues have fared and how everyone in the department and the college are ranked. In fact I have no idea how others in my department were ranked and even I have no idea if there were major problems. Furthermore I have no idea how the evaluation was done across the college. Basically it is just a black box as far as I can tell with a few individuals on the "inside". I have no problems with my ranking but it is clear that individuals can play a game when they are on the evaluation committee and either help "friends" or shoot down "non-friends".</p>
<p>The Department excelled at implementing the system. However at the College level it failed due to poor management. Departments who used rigorous criteria and achieved expected distributions were told to *raise* their numbers while those that did not do as rigorous a job kept their composite scores intact. And to my knowledge no justification were given for keeping those scores intact. This undercuts the entire compensation system.</p>
<p>The whole thing is just so unclear/confusing. No body seemed to know what was/would be really going on. For example I was informed by the head that the performance would be rated to 5 levels (1~5) but I found out it was actually (or had since changed to?)</p>
<p>This is the same old thing we've seen in the past a time or two. The verbiage changes a little and the people are different. The people involved appear to have a better attitude this time around and it doesn't appear to be as much a top-down implementation but the impetus to do it quite obviously came from Carrington again and still emphasizes research and things that can be counted over teaching and getting the daily business of the university accomplished.</p>
<p>t should allow higher weights for research because right now there is a range of weights for research. it is hard to evaluation for teaching and get a higher score for teaching. it is not fair for new faculty in service part because they are hard to act</p>
<p>I'm not really sure the merit system here will have any dramatic affect on performance. looking at my department and other colleagues I am friends with (other departments on campus)--I don't think "money" is the motivating factor in relationship to the "effort" they put into their jobs as a teacher. Most teacher/professors (on campus) put maximum effort into their jobs service to the community research etc... regardless of the compensation.</p>
<p>I have been closely involved in the development implementation and review of the merit-pay process at both the department and college levels. Already it is apparent that factions and ill feelings are developing within and between departments as a direct result of the merit-pay system. Burdening faculty with endless squabbles backstabbing and factionalism will not increase real productivity. I have also noted changes in the way that faculty approach their jobs; this change is not positive. Faculty (being the clever people that we are) are very adept at "gaming" any system like this. Already faculty seem to be making decisions not based on what's best</p>

<p>for their long-term development as scholars but rather on how this-or-that activity (whether needed/appropriate or not) affects next year's "point" totals. Moreover this system is a tremendous drain on the time of many faculty for very little financial benefit (a 4% salary pool)! I think that I could have written two manuscript drafts in the time that I've had to spend in meetings arguments reviews... In summary it's difficult to imagine how we could design a compensation system that would be more counterproductive to scholarship but yet extremely efficient in destroying faculty morale collegiality and cooperation.</p>
<p>I think we need to do this. Other universities have some sort of system like this. Why even have performance weights? Why not just get credit for what you do? Not get credit for how well you can individually guess your work load 1 to 2 years in advance or manipulate your weights to gain the most out of the biases in your dept's merit system.</p>
<p>I don't like this system it is too much time and energy consuming and divides the people within the department in the college and in the university</p>
<p>SINCE WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THE INCREASE WILL BE SOME OF THE QUESTIONS CANNOT BE ANSWERED. IT WOULD HAVE SERVED YOU BETTER TO CONDUCT THIS SURVEY AFTER EACH OF US KNOWS EXACTLY WHAT WE ARE RECEIVING. IF ONE RECEIVES ALL 5S AND THEN ALL HE/SHE GETS IN MONEY IS A FEW HUNDRED DOLLARS THEN THE EXERCISE WAS HARDLY WORTH CONDUCTING. MAYBE THE POOL ALLOCATED THIS YEAR WILL BE LARGE BUT WITH NO GUARANTEES THAT THIS WILL HAPPEN IN THE FUTURE MY WORRY IS THAT YOU HAVE CREATED MORE WORK FOR EVERYONE OF US WITH NO GUARANTEES OF REWARDS.</p>
<p>I think this system will motivate some but many of my colleagues were highly motivated already. I am concerned that this will make faculty more busy but not necessarily more productive. I am also concerned that departments are placed in competition within our college and the results of the assessment are not readily available to faculty.</p>
<p>Our department outlined very vague criteria. My department head observed my teaching but offered on feedback. Without asking I am offered no suggestions about what I can do to earn a 5. I think this system is only promoting competition and not cooperate</p>
<p>It has never been explained clearly why a departmental personnel committee (that has no power to make a decision) must issue ratings when the dean and department head make the actual decision. This only serves to create "bad feelings" among departmental colleagues. In addition it seems that it will become the task of the personnel committee to spend hours poring over the portfolios and the head and dean just check to see if all the numbers will fit into the distribution properly. I believe it is an administrative duty to evaluate employees. But in this system the head and dean see few if any portfolios (and thus do not get to see what the faculty in their department/college have been doing) and simply crunch numbers to fit a given budget.</p>
<p>I think the committee needs better defined (objective criteria) and different areas of expertise need better representation</p>
<p>After (many years) at MSU and several permutation of 'merit' pay I have yet to see a system that is capable of fairly evaluation teaching performance. The current equity quartile has a built in age discrimination factor. Someone who has been a full professor for 20 years should have higher salary than a first year full professor. This system produces a lower raise for the same job performance. The general impression I have is we went through a lot of time and effort for pocket change. Service appears to have little value Why should faculty spent time on a performance review committee. A real superstar in say teaching with a 3 rating is research has an incentive to reduce the teaching effort less is still likely a 5 and try to move the research number up. Numbers games do not tent to get the best effort form the faculty.</p>
<p>For Equity years of service needs to be included. In giving equity we have to be careful to not undo what we are doing with merit.</p>
<p>As long as raises are based on a percent of base salary the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.</p>
<p>The entire system has led to severe discord and disharmony university wide and is totally inadequate at addressing the terrible low pay on this campus. It appears we are to be forced to do far more than our already significant required workloads before even addressing the fact that our salaries have fallen seriously behind the cost of living. After (many years) here my current salary is worth significantly less than my starting salary. Merit has nothing to do with that and that is what needs to be addressed here. MSU faculty have a long history of low pay with little administration support and the result has been terrible morale problems with poor faculty recruitment/retention. To even discuss some arbitrary and subjective merit pay system under these circumstances is offensive to many of us.</p>
<p>I want to be fair - I'm NOT "complaining" about our Evaluation System in our Department. I can't really - I have</p>

<p>a class that met during our faculty meetings in which we discussed all the criteria. So I can't complain. And as I say I came out well as a result of the process. But partly that was because my Head raised my teaching evaluation. I consider teaching as my strength and if I had received a lesser score than someone who worked with Grad theses but is not as good a teacher I would have been even more cynical of the process.</p>
<p>I am strongly in favor of a merit-pay system. Our dept. set good guidelines for evaluation however no guideline were set in what to include in our portfolio to prove our merit.</p>
<p>The market values of different specialties were not reflected in this process.</p>
<p>Untenured temporary people voted and decided on the research criteria. Believe it or not. Everything was arbitrary and chaotic.</p>
<p>A similar plan was initiated under Gordon and Bowen. Faculty spent many hours developing a plan for their department and then attempting to implement it. For minimal financial return the plan served only to alienate faculty and produced little that was positive. I see little difference in this plan.</p>
<p>The implementation was rushed. We lost a week of the semester due to the ice storm and still had to complete the process during the spring semester.</p>
<p>Final matrix received on April 30 2007.</p>
<p>The word "transparency" was used a lot yet the process was anything but. I have no idea why I got the ranking I received it was not the ranking that I put on my evaluation according to our department's criteria. How do I compare with others in my department? I have NO idea! How can I compare my performance within the college? That is impossible. There are too many departments which are too diverse. In the end though I am the highest department research performer my pay raise in actual dollars will be one of the lowest. How can that be "Pay for performance?" I performed but am not receiving a raise to reflect that.</p>
<p>The usual people who usually get support from the department head surprise came out on top of the system. My head lowered my score and claimed that I did not ask for a 4 or 5 when I stated so on the survey. I have a valid reason to complain but who wants to work with a complainer? Not me.</p>
<p>Surely there are some faults in our system of evaluating faculty. Our college made rank 5 only who got 5 in all three categories. Let me give an example here: If someone is really excellent (5) in Research (50%) and Teaching (40%) but is very good (4) in service (10%). He will not be able to reach level 5. For example if he publishes 10 papers per year get 1 million dollar external funding per year and do exceptionally good teaching still he will not be able to get level 5. However if someone do descent job in all three category he/she will reach level 5 easily. I think easy grading leads fault result. Really exceptional faculty do not get 5 but other faculty can get level 5 easily.</p>
<p>In college 2.5% of the pay was across the board. Only 1.5% was then left for merit and equity. The College Personnel Committee tried its best to gut the system by putting most of the 1.5% into equity. ("To hell with merit seemed to be the attitude). The Dean finally compromised possibly with Dept. Head and higher admin. Intervention to put some merit into the system. Even to call the system a Pay for Performance system is stretching the reality a lot when much less than 1% of the total raise pool was actually used for merit though. I could do almost nothing on this campus other than meet my classes hold my office hours and talk about doing some research and I would still receive most of the compensation raise I will actually get. As it is I had a 4.9 merit rating and will get the 4% average for the university. This is not an incentive to increase performance; it is a demonstration of how a little concession on my part (give up 1% or so of salary increase) could lead to a lot more time for my garden and my leisure pursuits.</p>
<p>When there is a clear financial gain for any of this it will be easier to judge.</p>
<p>What this process has done is to create strong negative feelings in the department. Morale is at the lowest I've ever seen it. Faculty are now pitted against each other. There is no expectation of privacy for faculty. We are not allowed to post student scores so students can have privacy yet our peers are allowed not only to see all our documentation but to make decisions and to know our ratings. This is an invasion of my privacy and I do not appreciate that. In addition a faculty member who received a 5 ranking in an area this year could do the same thing next year and get a 3 or even less. How is that fair? Our faculty (every single one of them) has decided that since we're not being rewarded for serving on committees that we'll just stop serving. I spent over 60 hours on (a) committee and now faculty are arguing over their scores. The dept head asked us to do her report and did not make ONE change to it when she cut and pasted it for each faculty member. In other words the committee did her job completely! Doesn't she get paid the big bucks to make these decisions? I can guarantee I will NEVER EVER serve on (that) committee again and I am cutting down my committee work to 2 a year. Other faculty are cutting their committee work to one or even none a year. I will get barely any credit at all for spending 60 hours plus being harassed by dissatisfied faculty. Why would anyone put themselves in that position voluntarily?</p>

Faculty were given absolutely no guidance as to how to properly submit information for review. As a result many faculty members lost out on potential "points". Additionally in our department we were actually penalized if we collaborated with colleagues on projects.

The process is flawed. Expectations were not clear. The same criteria do not fit across the board.

Stink stank stunk

This was I realize a first time process and of course had some very rough edges BUT this was an awful example of how to evaluate anyone. This has divided the department terribly. People are updating their resumes to make moves to other schools because they believe this will impact their retirement pay over the long run.

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

<p>An effective way of measuring teaching performance must be implemented that does not pit one faculty member against another in a competitive situation or we need to resign ourselves to less emphasis on quality teaching and more emphasis on more readily documental publications record as our standard of measure.</p>
<p>Need to allow a wider range of % for service teaching and research so all could technically go from 0-100% and you wouldn't have to have all 3 but only 2 or 1 if appropriate. Need to be able to change % in each category if appropriate after the year is completed to reflect what %efforts went into each category. Need to change ratings so that if you choose a low % in a particular area (such as service) the expectations for you to do well (4 or 5) should not be as high as someone who chose a high percent devoted to service. We need to revise our departmental teaching and service criteria particularly to address problems brought forth this year; research plan may need slight revision to require refereed publication for a 3 or 4. Need to remove "quotas" of so many 5s 4s 3s etc. so that all who do well in a given year can be equally rewarded-- just like in classes-- some years the grades run higher the others lower; when grades/PPS are based on performance criteria it is unfair to lower the ratings of someone who in another year/class would be a 5/A if others hadn't been better. This is the main demoralizing aspect of the college exercise-- the comparative issue.</p>
<p>The amount of time and ridiculousness that went into this process is abominable. We've been down this path before it didn't work then and it doesn't work now. You cannot reduce all talents to some cozy convenient clean number. Scrap it!!!! Junk it!!! Shred it!!!! I have a Department Head that gets paid to "administer" over a faculty. LET THAT PERSON DO THEIR JOB!!!! And let's take our time and energy and put that towards the instruction of our clientele.</p>
<p>DO AWAY WITH IT IMMEDIATELY!!!!!!!!!!!!!! <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> DOES OUR ADMINISTRATION HAVE ANY IDEA WHAT THEY HAVE DONE TO MORALE WITH THIS MESS?????????????</p>
<p>Do away with it or have the Department Head to do the evaluation.</p>
<p>The responsibilities for evaluating faculty should rest with the Department Head. In a faculty member disagrees he/she can appeal to either the Department Head or Dean. Having faculty evaluate faculty is nonsense and does nothing but create dissention among colleagues.</p>
<p>The Department criterion needs to be reviewed again before next year. It would also be good to know how criteria compare across Departments and Colleges.</p>
<p>Allow evaluation your Department Head as they have the most impact on your work load. We are being evaluated by people who have no understanding of our programs and expected outcomes.</p>
<p>Resources should not be distributed evenly across colleges if the colleges are not equally meritorious. This is a hard judgment to impose because the Provost would have to make value judgments across a wide range of disciplines (comparing apples to oranges) but the fairness in the campus evaluation system would be greatly increased if this could be accomplished.</p>
<p>See above comments. Some system of meritorious award for past contributions during the across-the-board or no raise years would be a good start.</p>
<p>At some point the provost will have to deal with the issue that not all departments or colleges have the same average productivity.</p>
<p>First rank should be considered. For example junior faculty are encouraged/told not to be on many college or university committees and we cannot be chair of one until serving for at least a year. Yet MUCH higher points are given for chairing a University committee. Also the time spent actually doing something is not taken into account. Some committees meet for 5+ hours a month while others meet 1/2 hr a semester. You get way more points for chairing that 1/2 committee than you do for being on the time-consuming committee. The criteria should be more flexible. For example some grants may be related to both teaching and research. Several people were ranked really low in one category because the grant went in the other category. Our department had a difficult time agreeing on all of teh criteria. Maybe an outside person should assess our resources etc. and determined what criteria and ranking might be more fair for everyone. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Also until all of these kinks are worked out our annual performance review should not be based on these "merit evaluations." MANY of us felt completely demoralized after getting our reviews back. This year's system ABSOLUTELY did not help most people feel like they were appreciated or going to be rewarded for the hard work they do. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>A standard method of assigning rankings and scores needs to be applied through the College. And a method needs to be developed by which Colleges across campus are compared; a poor performing College receives the</p>

<p>same pool of money as a high performing College. For the individual faculty this means that outstanding faculty in a high performing college may receive the same (or lesser) reward compared to a poorly performing faculty member in a poorly performing college. This does not equitably reward the best faculty; in fact it could serve to encourage mediocrity (as long as the rest of your college is mediocre why work hard). The system only encourages you to "outdo" the colleagues in your college.</p>
<p>Increase the size of the pool in which faculty competes. The competition should (at least) be across departments within a college. Of course this will require leadership to devise a college-wide system. Equity salary adjustments should be based on present salary MINUS PAST MERIT INCREASES. Otherwise the system robs meritorious faculty of their hard-earned salary merit increments.</p>
<p>There should be both a Departmental ranking (like there was this year) and a College ranking. That is I want to "compete" against more than just the faculty in my own Department.</p>
<p>Make the evaluation methodology more transparent.</p>
<p>Have the Dean(s) enforce the uniform grading system mentioned in question 32.</p>
<p>We need clearer guidelines about what constitutes merit and they need to be ones that will allow a rating of "4" in one department to be equivalent to a "4" in another (though allowing the specific measures for accomplishment to differ according to discipline).</p>
<p>Deans and department heads need to make the difficult decisions to be sure that the system is fair equitable and truly rewards merit.</p>
<p>Given the expectations of the overall plan I think our department and college have done quite a good job.</p>
<p>(1) Give similar performance weights to each of the different faculty ranks: lecturer non-tenured assistant or tenured for example. If you want to have teaching faculty and research faculty then provide a set weight distribution for each of those too. Having each faculty member pick their own just takes away from the actual accounting process.(2) There needs to be a way to correct for different loads among faculty. Say someone is 50% dept faculty and 50% outside dept administration they only get 50% of the time to compete with the 100% dept load. In a way this person should have their scores multiplied by 2 to be fair for the amount of time dedicated to the department in official capacity. Or at least the service score should be doubled (x2) and maybe the teaching score by 1.25 with research being correctly depending on the person.(3) Get rid of all the ranking and classification until the last step. Keep as much of the actual numerical or ratio data until the last step.(4) Try to find a merit system structure that is the same for all departments in a College but with flexibility for some departments to adjust scoring. I doubt that all depts. can fit under one "exactly the same" system the over process can be the same.</p>
<p>Simplify categories and put a cap on the amount of awards being given do not use percentages as salaries vary too much among faculties within the department use flat amounts of money. The awards would be based on (1) number of students being mentored for thesis and undergraduate research only for teaching (2) number of research grants and research papers published for research nothing for additional service. The rest of the money can be evenly distributed among everyone who does the minimum acceptable in teaching research and service in the department.</p>
<p>MAKE IT LESS CUMBERSOME. A RESUME SHOULD SUFFICE. IT IS A LOT OF WORK THAT CUTS INTO OUR TIME WHERE WE COULD BE DOING SOMETHING USEFUL. OUR DEPARTMENT HEADS SHOULD KNOW WHO IS DOING WHAT.</p>
<p>Don't limit the number of 5's/4's/3's etc that a college can have. Outline ways to improve without my having to ask for it.</p>
<p>I would eliminate the departmental personnel committee. Faculty input is provided with well written departmental evaluation criteria. These committees have great potential for harming the collegiality of a department. Additionally they are a heavy service burden for the committee to not only review portfolios but to be well-versed in the departmental and university evaluation criteria and rules. Since service can be weighted at most 20% there is little reward and/or motivation to put a lot of effort into a big service burden. For each department the department head and dean would review each faculty portfolio and USING THE DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES determines the ratings in each category. Certainly the head and dean are as qualified as any other faculty member to evaluate teaching and the head and dean are arguably more qualified to evaluate service. The head can provide guidance to the dean when evaluating research since the head is likely to be more familiar with the areas of research in the department.</p>
<p>I think the committee needs better defined (objective criteria) and different areas of expertise need better representation and faculty need feedback on how to improve.</p>
<p>Incorporate years of service within rank into the equity quartiles.</p>

Merit Pay is not reasonable with limited resources -- we will always be taking money away from personnel meeting expectations to give to those determined to excel in one or more areas. Merit should be given based on merit (so all should be equally likely to receive merit pay is all are productive).
Do some real effort to make sure various roles are rewarded for their contributions. And do some real work to go beyond some discussions about what good teaching is and how it can be assessed. So far teaching merit numbers have been arbitrary or based on measures that are easy to generate rather those valid measures.
Put a non-tenure track person on the committee.
This process produces FAR more ill will than it's worth especially in my Department and especially for no more than it actually measures. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> This system evaluated "faculty performance" no better than "grades" evaluate "learning" at our level. Nothing that's meaningful can be successfully evaluated uniformly and/or fairly across the board. To hope otherwise is naive. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> I know "accountability" is important - politically and as a University - and I'm not knocking that. I'm just saying this system provides that elusive quality no better (or worse) than any other method.
Have departments clearly state what is to be submitted to the performance committees i.e. evaluation summaries student comments lecture notes final exam averages for common finals number of students completing the course....
Salary should be consistent with the market values of the faculty's specialties.
Why? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Nothing is going to change in some departments anyway - it never has.
The merit pay plan as instituted is divisive. Instead of promoting collegiality and cooperation it pits colleagues against one another in competition for pay increases. I believe that most faculty in the University are committed to their jobs and work diligently and responsibly toward the goal of a successful education for their students.
Question 34 below is missing category Four-Minus. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Try to keep the portfolio requirements simple. Lengthy portfolios take too much unproductive time to prepare and evaluate.
Better define performance. If we have an outstanding teacher why should s/he also have to be the best service person in order to get a reasonable raise? It does not define our roles but insists that we spread ourselves all over the place. I am the most productive researcher but because I think that others in the department that only work about 15-20 hours a week should do outreach I get less pay. So on top of my 60+ hours of teaching and research a week I should do public outreach and service for K-12 graders?!!! That is ridiculous. Also so long as the raises are on a percent basis I will get screwed. Why not work in real dollars?!
Eliminate it.
Scrap it. It is a mechanism for bean counters to justify their existence. It devalues service that does not have a research outcome. Business faculty will continue to get huge salaries. COAL staff will continue to make less though they do more than the COBA staff. Inequalities will continue unless faculty devote more time to self promotion rather than work. A five point system has also been shown to be ineffective in the journal literature.
To improve the Pay for Performance System we need to do really hard grading to all categories and they curve it if necessary. <input type="checkbox"/> Hard grading always gives the mousy better result. <input type="checkbox"/> For example if there are 50 students in the class and by easy grading 40 students get A in all three subjects then it is very difficult to find top 10 out of 50 students. Through hard grading assume only three students get A in all three subjects and others get combination of A B and C ... But From here picking up top 10 students is very easy by curving the overall grade. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Separate the across-the-board the merit and the equity issues. Put them into completely separate pools. Putting them together just gives the minimally-performing the perfect opportunity to see a way out of the non-performance dilemma: push for across-the-board and equity. But putting too much into the equity adjustment at the expense of merit just demonstrates to the meritorious (who are performing well) that no good deed goes unpunished. As a separate issue the problem of time-in-rank for Professors needs to be considered in the equity considerations. Someone who has been a professor for 20 years should not be compared directly with someone who was just promoted last year when it comes to comparisons with other averages. The long-time well-performing faculty member gets the shaft. A separate issue: put faculty on the college committee that have bought into the Pay for Performance plan in the first place. Putting faculty that want to sabotage the process in favor of an across the board raise onto the committee is counter productive.
Communication
Get rid of it! It is absolutely divisive. If it must be in place there should be a cost of living increase for everyone and extra monies assigned for merit. There should also be an objective set of criteria and the criteria that have been approved should not be allowed to be manipulated after the fact by department heads and deans.
The university needs to do research in the corp. world. Merit pay is given for many different reasons not just based on research. Unfortunately in our department we are under-staff and we are teaching overloads. We do

not have time to do research verses another department where they are teaching 3 classes or 2 classes and have ample time to do research. At this point the faculty members who are doing more for the students and department should be rewarded for that performance not punished or rewarded less merit because we didn't publish a small article.

Clearly state what is expected and then stick with it. Make the expectations attainable.

Give it all to Athletics like it's always been and throw us the crumbs.

Please get a form together which reflects what you will be judged over. Make sure that everyone knows the criteria how it will be evaluated.... I believe a larger portion of the monies should be used to address inequities within ranks of colleagues in the same college. This seems to be a bigger problem than merit issues.

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.

won't do any good
Didn't feel I needed to appeal
But I should have.
No use to appeal!
I did not appeal it so the answer is NO
I will most likely be moving to a new institution next year.
Will it do any good?
?? didn't need to appeal it
There was no need - I think here the question should be why you appealed not why you did not. YOUR SURVEY IS SCREWED UP!!!!!!!
I have not appealed
I did not formally appeal my performance rating.
I choose not to appeal.
I was not so unsatisfied as to create more work for me to initiate an appeal. Perhaps you meant to ask those who answered yes to explain why they appealed?
I was aware that some members with less performance than was given higher rating - a case of favoritism to some members.
I appealed mostly for principle to get the issue addressed that in a department with diverse duties among faculty from a particular are may not understand or value contributions from faculty in other areas because they lack perspective. In particular (my department's) faculty may have difficulty having their work valued in academic colleges if there is no representation on the department personnel committee IF their work is seen through the eyes of faculty engaged in traditional academic research or teaching.
no problem
I do not think this is worth spending time with. I have never received a cost of living raise. We were told in a department meeting that the merit raises would take the place of our cost of living raise! If the university gives a raise at some point I will take these issues more seriously in the future. Meanwhile I will spend my time doing only Merit worthy tasks.
I have forwarded an appeal to my department head.
The small amount of money available is just not worth the time it takes to file an appeal
I don't trust any of the process.
NOT WORTH IT> The only people who did are the ones who always complain if they don't get everything.
Not enough information to even complain and it wouldn't make a big difference as the amount was so small.

