

Means for Merit evaluation 2008 Evaluation			
Question 1 – strongly disagree; 5- strongly agree	SD	Mean 2008	Mean 2007
1. Criteria used to evaluate my teaching were valid.	1.28	3.11	3.13
2. Criteria used to evaluate my research were valid.	1.26	3.35	3.34
3. Criteria used to evaluate my service were valid	1.23	3.37	3.35
4. Our Dept Evaluation Plan fairly distinguished higher from lower performing faculty.	1.25	2.97	2.88
5. The procedure for putting a performance portfolio together was made clear	1.18	3.39	2.90
6. My Dept Personnel Committee's assessment reflected evaluation criteria outlined in our Department Evaluation Document	1.15	3.63	3.53
7. My performance levels/rankings as documented by our Dept Personnel Committee were shared with me.	1.05	4.02	4.05
8. My Dept Head fully explained my final performance rating.	1.21	3.66	3.50
9. During my performance review, my Dept Head and I talked about strategies and forms of support that will assist in my professional development and performance in the upcoming year(s).	1.31	3.03	2.67
10. My Dept Head managed the performance review process well.	1.22	3.37	3.34
11. Overall, the implementation of the merit evaluation process went well in my dept.	1.30	3.04	2.91
12. My Dean described all aspects of the new compensation system in both an accurate and timely fashion.	1.21	2.69	2.54
13. To the extent that was appropriate, Deans allowed negotiation of weights, evaluation plans, and individual merit decisions to occur in depts rather than at the college level	1.10	3.17	3.12
14. My Dean assured that the Pay for Performance System was fairly implemented across depts.	1.19	2.76	2.83
15. Final college merit distributions were shared with all faculty.	1.23	3.31	2.89
16. Overall, my performance evaluation was conducted in an equitable manner.	1.35	3.06	3.09
17. Overall, the merit evaluation process was in my college was well managed.	1.33	2.75	2.77
18. The Pay for Performance System reinforces faculty for participating in activities that strengthen our dept.	1.33	2.45	2.69
19. The Pay for Performance System reinforces faculty for participating in activities that strengthen Missouri State University.	1.30	2.42	2.70
20. The Pay for Performance System is sufficiently flexible to reward faculty who excel in different roles (e.g., service or teaching or research).	1.22	2.15	2.34
21. The Pay for Performance System will help our department and college make progress toward the equitable distribution of pay.	1.22	2.30	2.44
22. If managed well, the Pay for Performance System can effectively motivate faculty productivity.	1.44	2.61	2.86
23. I am confident that, in the future, high quality work will be rewarded in my department.	1.31	2.41	2.62
24. The amount of money in the salary raise pool was sufficient to reward meritorious performance.	1.22	2.28	2.15
25. I have a favorable view of the Merit/Equity System as implemented at MSU	1.22	1.98	-----

Qualitative Comments across University

The Merit Pay Evaluation Criteria were primarily developed/revised by faculty in my department. If no, explain.

Yes but with guidelines provided by the College.
Yes but then they had to be in compliance with COE
While the plan was developed by faculty there were many restrictions imposed in order to meet the University guidelines.
Too many demands from above
This was by the approval of the college -- it was not developed in isolation.
This entire evaluation process is unfair. If I answer the questions then the department will know WHO I. That is a problem because I am non-tenured and I DO have numerous complaints. The system is TOTALLY unfair.
The plans were developed with an eye toward consistency in the College.
The merit evaluation criteria were foisted on the faculty by the Provost and President. Most faculty who have the courage to speak up would say that this administration's approach to merit is demoralizing devisive and counter productive; yet the BOG seem
The faculty developed but were told at one point that it was not acceptable as it was and needed to be revised.
The department faculty did the work but the recommendations from the College and the University Compensation Committees dominated the input used to revise the document. I guess that is how it is supposed to work but to say that the faculty in this depart
The Dean arbitrarily changed the criteria and their implementation after accomplishments according to plan were achieved and materials were submitted.
The criteria by which people were evaluated were determined in an all day meeting of the department heads held March 4th. As they changed the rankings given by departments they did not consult the department compensation documents agreed upon and develop
Pretty much by two faculty members in the department who have a particular interest in highly detailed and complex compensation models
One faculty member seemed to drive the process and it didn't seem that the criteria were collaboratively decided.
Much of the criteria -- that is distribution of 5s 4+s etc. came from upper administration.
Merit pay evaluation criteria actually used were developed by the department heads meeting in secret and doing essentially what the dean directed. The departmental plan was used only by the departmental committee.
Many of the ideas did not meet the guidelines from above.
Initially developed by faculty in department but increasingly "revised" by higher authorities.
I believe there are too many stipulations put on us by someone else. We are to be compared to another part of the university that is not comparable. We are a different beast - no one is like us.
I assume you mean criteria departments use to rank faculty for purposes of "merit" based upon university-mandated evaluation criteria.
Given to department by dean's office. Effort was made to have all departments using same form and criteria.
Department criteria were ignored and derided by the college.
Criteria were determined generally by the college with some specifics determined by the department
But we still know we have to use the arbitrary 153050 percent guidelines which do not motivate anyone.
At its base the foundation of the document was imposed by the university's administration (Dean Provost President). The faculty had ample opportunity to tweak their expectations.
Answer Given
Although the criteria were developed in my Department AFTER the process had ended the Dean unilaterally changed evaluations of most faculty in my Department even though she did not find that our evaluations were inconsistent with the plan. She did the sa
Although I'm per course I had not heard of this system until I received this email.
A college wide revision

All faculty in our department had an opportunity to participate in the development/revision of our departmental evaluation plan. If no, explain.

Yes over and over again.
Yes but we had to adjust to meet the COE
we did not revise anything this year as a department
We could make comments but the committee did not have to take them into consideration.
They were given a chance to provide input so participation to that extent.
They were developed by our personnel committee and unranked and tenure-track faculty had no input.
There was an ad hoc committee and they did not seem overly responsive to input from the entire department.
The process was dominated by ONE person who claimed to be an expert. The document was so verbose that important specifics got lost. The dept head called a meeting and forced an open vote on the entire document rather than allowing votes on some important issues separately. No confidentiality was ensured. Thus the dominant senior person carried their way all the way because junior faculty felt intimidated by the process and people.
The departmental Advisory/personnel committee worked on revisions decisions evaluations.
The criteria were revised by committee and then approved in faculty meeting
tenured faculty on the personnel committee worked on the document
Revisions were not complete until mid-December. Faculty were unable to adjust their workload and/or assignments to address the new concerns within the merit changes. Only tenured faculty members were on the committee and no input (other than a mandatory "approve" vote) was sought from non-tenured faculty. No input or approval status was sought from non-tenure track faculty at all.
No although we did revise our previous plan and those revisions were accepted officially by the dean she arbitrarily made further significant changes on rules and implementation on her own.
Most no longer interested
It was a meaningless participation and one that I will not engage in in the future.
It didn't matter since the departmental evaluation plan was not used outside the department.
Instructors have a very limited role in evaluation plans. We get only what is handed to us.
Instructors had limited input. Many ranked faculty did not want instructors to participate in any way.
I'm not convinced that every faculty member had the opportunity to provide input. I believe input was solicited via e-mail rather than during a faculty meeting.
I was not given an opportunity to even know of its existence.
I had no opportunity to participate in the development of our plan.
Criteria only indicate what is meritorious not how meritorious. No indication of what is expected for a certain level
As far as equity length of service should be counted.
Although primary input and decision making was from a Faculty Department committee.
Again Nietzel and Belinda foisted this system on us as part of their "divide and conquer" approach to "ethical leadership!"
Again it seemed that one faculty member drove the process.
A college wide revision

Last year's performance weights for teaching, research, and service were negotiated with my Department Head

Yes but he got them wrong for several people even though they were provided in writing.
We were not and never have been allowed to negotiate teaching loads in our department. The current Head has tried to rectify this to what little extent we are allowed to. It is very frustrating for those who have major research projects ongoing and who cannot get a little time off to work on those projects.
We had the option of keeping our scores so there was no negotiation of the weights. Even so very limited interaction between head and faculty about setting these weights.
This was never explained to us and the time table for performing such a negotiation" was never passed along. Again changes to the merit document were not completed until December of the year being evaluated."
This was a requirement but there was much confusion about what the weights could be and if and when they could be changed and under what conditions. Very poor leadership from the president and provost made this a horrible plan.
There was some confusion but this process is now better defined
There is no room for negotiation for instructors in COBA. COBA requires at least 10% weight on research for instructors. Since the university requires 80% teaching there is no way to allot more than 10% for service.
The teaching loads in my department are rigidly consistent and do not allow for release time for research. We are working on ways to address this problem but there are not yet enough faculty lines to allow anyone release time for research. We have only a few administrative positions which reduce the course loads for those faculty.
The department head seemed unsure about whether/when the weights should be negotiated.
The department head intentionally kept me in the dark as to what percentages I could ask for.
Set by administration
Same answer as to question 15 & 16
No negotiation allowed.
My total points included teaching @ 84.5; research 180.0; and service 239.0. The personnel committee for SSWK unilaterally eliminated 80 points without any justification. I am pursuing an explanation of this decision.
My department head chose these figures for me even though I requested other weightings.
Just officially hired in August
I was never offered the opportunity to do this. I didn't know when the window of opportunity was. It was never communicated to me.
I suggested some that the Department Head approved but subsequently a slightly different set of weights were applied either by the Department Head or the Dean
I simply set my weights. There was no communication/feedback from the department head regarding these weights.
I just wrote down some numbers no discussion.
I didn't get a chance to renegotiate this year.
I did not see much room for negotiation
Forced on us by the Dean
Dept head did as good as job as possible in administering the weighting process.
Because of the required teaching load in my department there IS NO ROOM for negotiation.
As long as it is a quota system it makes no difference.
Although there was such done under the plan as officially accepted no opportunity was given to revise those performance weights after the dean made her arbitrary changes to the plan rules and implementation.

I was satisfied with my final negotiated performance weights. If no, please explain.

We were limited to 30-60 percent each for teaching and research and 10-20 percent for service. We had no ability to negotiate anything different.
Was forced to participate in all 3 performance areas while other faculty could chose 2 areas.
Too much emphasis on student evaluation. The current student evaluation is a flawed system.
They were not what I had asked for due to some confusion in process. Even so I do not understand why we must predict these one year in advance. Opportunities in service teaching and publishing arise throughout the year that we cannot predict beforehand. Why can we not take these into account at the end of the year and determine our weights then. As it seems we are forced to play some sort of guessing game.
There are too many gray areas / situations not covered in the systems rules. This has happened tw years in a row for myself. Last year I was told by both my chair and the evaluating committee face to face that I qualified for a 5 in service but "was being punished" for their assessment of another departmental matter in which they decided I was at fault though through no official university policy or board. I am on nine committees head a university event committee and two tasks forces and run a major university wide event each year. Since I was up for tenure I was told to take it and remain quiet. This year my service remained almost exactly the same and I was awarded a 5 because I was no longer "being punished". Last year published 2 articles and I submitted and received a contract for a already written book for which I received a 5 rating. This year the book is not out but is in type setting and is scheduled for release later this year so i am told it cannot count for a second year because it is still under contract. i cannot find this rule in our book. I am also told by my a superior that I could appeal but it wouldn't be upheld. This year I also submitted 2 new articles under review submitted and negotiating another book at a press (which I incidentally just received notification of for a forthcoming contract). However since the only item that was actually published this year was a 2 page book review I am given a rating of 3 (Competent). This is the same rating that a coworker received for doing only a 2 page book review and no further research or writing. Our policy says we can get up to four years of a five rating for a book It says nothing about whether it is in press or out. Furthermore once articles and books are submitted - WE HAVE VIRTUALLY NO CONTROL OVER THE TIMING OF THEIR RELEASE. I was also told this year that I should not have turned in all of my publications last year as i had enough to merit a 5 for two years in a row so i wasted some of them concerning the potential return for merit pay. So we are evaluated and rewarded or punished for TIMING rather than Quantity Quality or CONTRIBUTION. I am beyond insulted. This policy allows one to be nickle and dime-ed down in a variety of ways. Each year our committee makes up the rules as it goes along but when it comes to an issue it hasn't though of it decides and enforces policies not in our guidelines.
The ranges are too narrow to recognize all of the unique contributions that faculty make.
The entire plan is flawed and should be scraped.
The department chair's evaluation was higher than the overall evaluation the dean gave. I was not given a reason for the difference.
Teaching was downgraded at the college level. In other words the department gave me one score but this was down-graded at the college level.
Since we are evaluated by fellow professors they have no idea of what we do and thus it is very difficult to them hand out equitable ratings. The criteria will naturally favor the professor's performance since it was created by professors.
See above.
see above
See #17 esp. under teaching load which affects involvement in research.
See #17
Per Course instructors are not given this opportunity?
Our teaching criteria is nebulous at best. Our document says that student evaluations can hold not more than 50% weight but since we do not have peer evaluations or peers visiting our classrooms it is hard to believe that this weighting is accurate. Also I teach entry level classes. These are classes that students do not usually want to take but are required to in the curriculum; is there a tilt that can be used?
Our dean would not allow the percentage allotment for service to accurately reflect the service obligation that faculty were engaged in on/off campus.
Other departments in CNAS received mugh higher average ratings than our department. Our department is being penalized for being strict on each other. People are doing some activities solely to improve merit ratings.
Only after I went through the appeals process (last year)
One person's success guarantees another person's failure. It is a quota system and has nothing whatsoever to do with merit. It is one more level of bureaucratization between faculty and their pitifully low pay checks. It wastes our time our talent and our optimism. The system is completely and utterly flawed. The psychology is ridiculous: tell a Ph.D. that s/he is a 3 and expect them to be excited about improving? Absurd. A Ph.D. was not awarded that degree by functioning at a 3-level. The entire department is used to functioning to the very highest level of their capabilities and for your peers to sit down and decide that you really only performed at a 3 or 4 level is entirely divisive and arbitrary. I want nothing to do with a university who exhibits such Dark Ages mentality. MSU is becoming an embarassment to the thinking independent individual that universities are supposed to encourage support and promote.
Not allowed to reflect the amount of time I spend on service

No negotiation allowed.
No had the dean acted properly and done her homework at the beginning of the year and advised faculty of the changes she would later impose after the fact I would certainly have negotiated different performance weights.
Negotiation of the performance weights is a waste of time and money. If the upper administration loves this concept so much then they should set the weight for all faculty groups to tell us how they expect us to do our jobs. For most of us we cannot foresee what our preferred or needed work schedule will be like a year out. Also each merit evaluation scheme for a dept has its own systematic biases that can be played with using the weights. Faculty know this and so there is no value in the information obtained from "bean counting" the weight data. This problem also comes up since the weighting distribution selected by a faculty member will not usually reflect the actual workload of that faculty member--so the information does not help with faculty management. If the administration used this data for its decision making then they are not qualified for the position they hold.
My ratings in teaching and service were not an accurate reflective of my achievements/accomplishments.
My overall rating would have been commendable rather than competent.
Last step reduced my merit raise from 3% to 2.8. while that is a small amount it is symbolically significant. It's now obvious that it is not advantageous to have a heavy teaching component.
I'm a Graduate Program Director and nowhere in the performance weights was this substantial administrative responsibility explicitly reflected
I'd like to see Service raised to a maximum of 15 percent.
I would have preferred to have an option to weight higher in research.
I would have preferred higher on one category than was allowed
I was unable to negotiate weight changes.
I was satisfied but I think that these weights should be negotiated toward the end of the merit period. Some factors (e.g. review time for publications) are beyond one's control.
I was not allowed to have more than 15% service yet I was asked to manage several different programs run data for the dean and take on myriad tasks for the department and university. This usurped time for the preparation of teaching mentoring students and completing data collection and analysis per the research projects I'm conducting.
I was not able to select more than 20% for service but am routinely asked to perform service to the department college and university that greatly exceeds 20% of my time. I was offered a chance to increase greater than 20% but was told I would have even higher expectations for service than before.
I was definitely not satisfied with my evaluation by the committee. Some of the committee members may have been biased and I doubt my performance statement/document was thoroughly reviewed.
I think Service should have been weighted more heavily (the full 20 instead of just 10) given the amount of time I spend. In general I don't think Service counts enough with the University in terms of Merit given the amount of time some faculty commit and the value it provides.
I spend most of my time in teaching and service yet cannot reduce % time allocated to research.
I say no only because during the year I took on a lot of service. But I was not able to change. I have a hard time predicting my time allocation a priori. E.g. if I get a large grant then I say no to some service.
I requested release time for research knowing that it doesn't happen. The weights worked to my advantage within the merit system and I did very well with the evaluation but I was not allowed any choices in where I concentrate my energies. I would have opted for more research time if it were possible.
I never had the chance to do it.
I don't understand the final decision and I feel if I could see what people who received higher numbers are doing then I might understand my rating
I carry a very large service load but I did not negotiate for a commensurate Service percent because of the 20% cap. Due to the service load my research and sometimes my teaching suffer. I wish I had negotiated a much larger service % since I do a large amount of program department and college service from which these entities benefit but I did not benefit financially.
I believe the system weights student evaluations too high.
Final rankings were subjectively determined.
Felt encouraged to weight a certain way
Comment on the system NOT on my department: I find it demoralizing to be forced to "excel" in every area every year in order to have a crack at even a minimal cost of living increase. This system fosters stress overcommitment and workaholicism all three of which are incompatible with the university's "Wellness" plan. The message I am getting is "Teach more students. Produce more research. Chair more committees. Exercise more. Spend more time with your family. Volunteer more in the community. Attend more professional meetings. Edit more professional journals." Sounds like a recipe for ending in the psych ward to me. Simple solution: Factor inflation into the PFP system. Decree that everyone performing at a level of three gets cost of living. Any monies left over above that are distributed to 4's and 5's. That would be a true merit system rather than the charade of a system we have now.
As long as it is a quota system it is unfair
Although negotiation did not take place the default 40/40/20 was OK with me.

I understood the University Merit/Equity System including the criteria to be used, how my portfolio was to be put together, and how I was to be evaluated before the process was initiated in our department.

We're still largely making this up as we go. Each year the criteria change. Each year the material for the portfolios change. There are no clear guidelines for the preparation of such materials. It varies greatly within and between departments.
We were given things that we wanted to be evaluated on. However we did not know what was weighted more heavily. Also no justification was given why a five was not scored. I want to know why I did not receive a five and thus what I need to work on rather than tell me what I am doing right but give a score lower than a five.
We did not receive the final criteria until January. So we were evaluated post hoc.
Two reasons: 1) I understood the system beforehand but this system was pre-empted by the March 4th meeting. 2) What is stated as qualifying a faculty for a particular level (e.g. level 5 level 4 etc.) in a department's compensation plan is only suggestive in practice. A faculty member may qualify as a level 4 but that score may be lowered once compared with the college. So there is no ceiling but only a "minimally qualified" ranking when a department's rating leaves the department. No one knows really how they will be rated or why because no one really knows what the Dean and Department Heads will do. Nor are their decisions explained as transpired with the appeals process this year.
Timing
This changed continuously and we did not receive final criteria until a few weeks before we had to fill out our merit forms. I was basing my performance on all I had--last year's criteria but ended up being evaluated by an entirely new set developed late Fall and finalized a week before due. This was hugely unfair. I imagined how my students would feel if I told them a week before finals that here is the new syllabus--this is now how I will evaluate you and what you are required to do. Such a system is grossly unfair.
There's an issue regarding how sabbaticals are figured in to the mix. I felt like I was penalized for having a sabbatical. Some on the compensation committee argued that sabbatical was compensation itself. I don't know how I would even rule on the matter if put in that position - I was just unpleasantly surprised. It should be a university-wide policy on how sabbatical should be counted. My service and teaching were lowered because of my absence for a semester.
There were no specific guidelines given.
There was much room left open for interpretation. Having seen how people replied in one of our committees much more direction is needed; so evaluation of personal record keeping is fair.
There was a lot of confusion about using last years' numbers. This results in confusion about what should be submitted. The Department Head outside of any previous compensation discussion distributed a 3 page paper outlining huge quantities of paperwork that he felt should be submitted. This was never discussed.
There was a document of criteria but some criteria were pretty generalized and not all that clear. Maybe that was o.k. If it is to specific and delineated it cause problems by being over-rigid.
There still seems to be confusion in our college between the individual departmental plans and the implementation of these plans at the college level. The college needs to do a better job coordinating the individual departmental plans before the merit pay process rather than during the merit pay process. There is still ambiguity in how the plans will be administered beyond the departmental level.
There seems to be a lack of clarity about when to turn things in. If you do not turn enough in and get a lower score you cannot submit more even if you have published it. You can turn too much in and get a high score but in effect waste a publication. We get mixed messages about saving items to turn in later than they are published.
There is no explanation of this at any level because (I believe) no one really knows what is going on with this system.
The quota system that is not supposed to exist does not allow fair evaluation by departmental standards. One's score is based on what others in the department did.
The procedure explained to us was not followed in the college. The dean's attitude toward the faculty is to ridicule them and ignore their concerns.
The personnel committee did not inform the faculty in advance that they would be imposing quotas for each level and ranking each faculty member from one to thirty in the three categories.
The fact that 50% of scores in CHPA were bumped down at the Department heads meeting indicates that neither faculty nor department personell committees knew what the final standards were going to be.
The entire merit system is a mess calculated to lower faculty morale. It should be abandoned now.
The Dept head is a poor communicator and only interested in pleasing the Dean
The department head simply cited the criteria that he was using without trying to reconcile them with the departmental plan which the dean and the provost had approved. I have never heard of the "University Merit/Equity System."
The department head and the dean used criteria developed in secret and substituted those for the criteria previously developed by the department and approved by the dean and the provost.
The criteria were unclear and confusing because of the complexity and lack of clarity they contained.
sort of - although the ratings give still don't make complete sense. the head raised by teaching score which made sense given my evaluation scores; however my research score was lowered which frankly i do not understand given the departmental criteria
Somewhat. I was new. We switched department heads during this time. The new department head answered many of my

<p>questions. I still am not sure I understand it completely but have looked over it several times in faculty meetings and I am sure if I have more questions I will be able to get them answered.</p>
<p>Some things had yet to be determined by University administration so everyone including dept heads were adjusting on the fly. I did have a good enough understanding at the beginning though that nothing too important was changed that I couldn't adjust to.</p>
<p>Provost kept changing it.</p>
<p>Our document was confusing and the specifications for documentation were not complete.</p>
<p>Our criteria is a huge nebulous mess. After completing the merit system two years I still am largely confused about necessary criteria for obtaining a higher score than I received.</p>
<p>Only because I was on our college committee did I understand it all.</p>
<p>Not at all!!! The year was over before our merit document was complete. In fact some minor changes were still being made as I was preparing my document.</p>
<p>No our original understanding and performance in accordance with the officially accepted departmental plan was undermined significantly by later arbitrary changes made by the dean.</p>
<p>No one understands the University Merit/Equity System; however I understood the things mentioned.</p>
<p>No one in the university was given any advance warning that we would have merit evaluations last year. It was just dropped on us. I don't see how anyone on campus could have known how they would be evaluated on a system when it just appeared "out of the blue."</p>
<p>Nitzel and Belinda have created a mess. They will leave and then someone else will have to clean it up. The lame BOG is oblivious to the REAL goings-on at MSU and apparantly is not interested in learning the truth.</p>
<p>My department's compensation plan lists activities that are deemed meritorious but does not describe what quantity or quality of these activities is required to achieve any particular level of merit. I still don't understand how the personnel committee the department head or the dean arrive at particular scores.</p>
<p>Little feedback last year different personnel committee little confidence that the make-up of that committee cold reasonable evaluate faculty outside their area.</p>
<p>It was very unclear to me what happened after the material left the department. Also no feedback was given regarding the portfolio at any point in time.</p>
<p>It is always confusing for many faculty to know exactly what and how a portfolio will really be evaluated. There are too many biased opinions as to "what" is worthy or valued in research and/or teaching. The entire process is too subjective.</p>
<p>It has changed so often it is hard to keep track. Nobody has a concrete idea of what EXACTLY is expected.</p>
<p>In the fall of '06 we had about thirty days to develop a plan that applied to 2006 retroactively and this year's revisions had about the same time frame.</p>
<p>I was given no guidance regarding this. When I asked questions it was overwhelming how the other faculty did not know either how this was to be done.</p>
<p>I understood the process that was used at the dept level. Before the portfolios left the dept. the dept head agreed with the recommendations of the personnel committee. However he changed his mind when meeting with the other heads and reported to me that he did support the ratings intially and then he didn't support the ratings. I thought I understood the process but the process used at the Dean's level remains somewhat obscure and it changed from the process used the first year. This year adhering to dept plans was not a major factor in how individuals were rated at the dean's level.</p>
<p>I understood the departmental process. I still do not understand how a point sum can mean one thing at one level and something else as it moves up the hierarchy. Either a 4 is a 4 is a 4 OR an apple is an orange. There seems to be a moving target here.</p>
<p>I understood the criteria but do not believe the criteria were used</p>
<p>I thought the process was confusing and cumbersome. It was a lot of paperwork.</p>
<p>I still don't know how equity figures into the equation.</p>
<p>I have no complaint about my compensation numbers. However because of the many overrides of department plans and decisions that occurred this year at the Dean's level I think would appreciate a more definitive idea of how the process is supposed to work from beginning to end. My own view is that until department plans are actually comparable across the College there will be confusion about what one may expect for a compensation rating.</p>
<p>I don't recall receiving a score from the head or the committee. I have a copy of my score from the dean only. I thought I understood the system but based on the outcomes of the evaluation process I didn't realize that I could negotiate for a larger service percentage. Others in my department chose to omit research altogether and therefore received a 5 rating based on service and teaching only. I would have taken similar action had I realized it was allowed and would not be challenged.</p>
<p>I don't really understand any of it because it has changed a few times since we first set up the criteria. Also there have been changes the awards of the merit - i.e. at first if an individual met the criteria it was considered good now there are only a certain percentage who can receive "award". This can lead to competition and lack of teamwork for the good of the department/school.</p>
<p>I am not aware of these criteria</p>
<p>I am eventually understanding the system and how the ratios are figured. I'm not sure that EVERYONE really understands this.</p>
<p>Equity for an instructor in the English department is highly skewed. CUPA data cannot possibly reflect full time faculty with an expectation for service. Missouri State instructors earn less than instructors at other Missouri 4 year colleges. Locally we earn significantly less than full time facutly at OTC. We are not on parity within the state or locally yet by CUPA data there are no disparities.</p>

Did not understand that this was MANDATORY
Department just following what Carrington says must be done.
Criteria for service still confusing and unclear.
Confusion reigned supreme: the Department Head listed a large number of criteria for the 'portfolio' just before it was due that was in addition to the committee's recommendations. Some faculty turned in encyclopedia sized 'portfolios' some turned in two pages.
But it never seems to work quite like we understand it is going to work.
At the last minute we were given spreadsheets to fill out. Didn't have a portfolio. The process was stream-lined but I am not sure there was room for everything to be considered. The spreadsheet had not been discussed prior to our instructions to submit it.
At the college level there was apparently an additional set of criteria for judging rankings and we were not informed that this existed or what the new criteria were until after the process.
As a committee we had questions that still have not been answered
Although I understood the system/process my Dean violated procedures and as a result I didn't understand the DE FACTO system.

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, before the process was initiated in our department.

While the department head gave me the same rating as the Committee the head's comments were not based on the department plan.
While I've received my merit ranking and my percentage increase based on the matrix from the dean I've not heard anything yet about the extra equity money provided by the president and dean and since I am woefully short of the national average I hope to see some extra money.
Unclear about the role of College Dean in the process.
Twenty-seven ratings adjustments occurred in our College this year (at the Dean's level I'm almost sure). I think the breakdown happened for two reasons: The plans preapproved for use this year were not equivalent and the Dean's explanation to the affected faculty was inadequate. For similar reasons the appeals process did not work as it was designed.
This was not well-conceived nor was it well-explained.
This was never explained.
There was a bit of confusion regarding weights.
The roles of the department head dean and college-committee are NOT clearly explained. Also the decisions of the college committee from 2006 did not match the types of decisions handed down by the 2007 committee. Therefore there is no means of predicting how your performance will ultimately be evaluated. This leads to a serious loss in the sense of self-determination and a concomitant loss in motivation.
The role of DPC was not clear. Can they REALLY change anything? Enough time was not available once Dean made the matrix available. Surprisingly the matrix has PENALISED a performance at a level of 4 because 4 has become the average even though there are supposedly 5 levels. Dean created too many levels between 4 and 5 and that created too much difference between the raise at these levels.
The nature" of the feedback is questionable. What feedback? No one is going to take the time to give another colleague feedback. The chair hasn't the time to do it if it is a large department. The only feedback that can be gained is via a general announcement in a faculty meeting."
The last minute spreadsheet made the roles of each confusing.
The feedback I received from the college dean was a short statement about one rating not being comparable to others in the college. That reason was given but no explanation was provided.
Still do not understand the nature of the feedback. Believe that detailed feedback is important in being able to justify merit scores.
See above.
see above comment
see above
See #23 above. What I understood beforehand did not take place. Nor do I understand why the Dean has two opportunities to decide a faculty member's ranking the second without an opportunity to appeal. That is to say the evaluation leaves the department and goes to the Dean and Heads meeting. There is an appeal but those decisions go back to the Dean. Why would she support a finding for the appellant when she was involved in the decision in the first place?
Process seemed somewhat confusing and it took awhile before I figured out the whole system.
Process not entirely clear but conflicting messages from administration. (Head was as clear as they could be)
Not that I understood the arcane rating system required by the University.
Not sure what the Dean's role is
Not sure because the Dept. Personnel Committee makes decisions not covered by our guidelines.
Not completely
Not at all!!! The year was over before our merit document was complete. In fact some minor changes were still being made as I was preparing my document.
not a clear line of communication between the committee dept head and dean
No explanation was ever given as to how each of these levels would evaluate data. A very very very poor process.
Little if any feedback was received from the department head. In COBA the department heads have divorced themselves from this process. Faculty are not provided the benefit of insight from the DH's perspective. They seem to have no role responsibility or accountability for the results of this process (so why do they make the big bucks?).
Learned it on the college committee on which I served this year.
It changed in process when we asked for clarity of policy.
I was unaware that Dean Stone would be able to veto the decisions of our departmental committee and our department head.
I understood all this but it was not implemented correctly. I had all positive comments about my work yet it shows that I need to improve in my job. When asked of my Department Head/Dean and the Personnel Committee I received no answer.
I understand the role of the departmental committee but I am still unclear what role the Dean and Department Heads play in implementing the plan at the college level. I am sensitive to the need to coordinate departmental plans so there is fairness across the college but this should be clarified before the process begins.

I thought I did but wasn't all that sure.
I thought I did but I received no feedback from the committee; I received a very positive narrative annual review from my department head but there were no ratings attached; I received a form letter from the deans office that decribed the process and listed my score for each area and a composite but included no feedback.
I still don't understand the quartile business.
I still do not understand the process used by the Deans office.
I only say no here because many of the decisions were being made on the fly and we really never knew how the dust was going settle on the merit process. It is still new" and we should expect it."
I know the information is shared in tables and numbers and grids...but to say I truly understand or understood how the final turns out...I don't! The whole process makes me feel like that what I'm doing is just not enough....and end up feeling pretty badly about the process....plus the notion of having my peers evaluate me!!!!
I have no idea what deliberations occurred to what degree they were aware of criteria or why I was given lower ratings than the stated criteria dictated.
I expected more feedback.
I don't understand why the committee rec. can be changed ...don't understand the quotients to be fulfilled.
I do not understand how particular scores are determined. If I wanted to achieve a particular merit score I am unsure what quantity or quality of teaching research and service I should be doing. I think most people simply give the effort that they are accustomed to giving fill out the paperwork and see what happens.
I do not know why the Department Personnel Committee exists because all decisions in our college are made at higher levels. It is a waste of time to have a Departmental Personnel Committee.
I did not understand the process until I had to figure it out on my own.
Ditto #23 above.
Didn't know dean could down grade rating of dpc.
Did not understand the role of the college committee.
Did not understand prior to the process what specific kinds of feedback would be received by whom. I was ultimately satisfied with the feedback but didn't understand how feedback would work a priori.
CHPA Dean and Department Heads appear to have used alternative criteria from dept. plans to make final rankings.
But once the process happened it did not go as it seemed it was supposed to.
Beyond these people will review the applications no further information about their review and balancing" process was shared. This seems highly unethical."
At this time I do not understand these individuals are involved and do not understand how my performance is determined.
Although I understood what was SUPPOSED to occur my Dean did not follow procedures. Her letter informing me that my evaluation had been lowered did not say where I fell short of our Department's targets or upon what other basis my evaluation was changed other than the need to evaluate faculty consistently (whatever that means) across the college. If I am not mistaken she sent out about 30 of these letters in our college with no SPECIFIC feedback for faculty whose evaluations were changed.
Although I understood what was supposed to be the role of each the dean arbitrarily changed rules and implementation and later overruled even the judgment of the college appeals committee.
Again there was confusion about using the previous year's numbers. If i used the previous year's number the committee needed no paperwork from me but that is not what we were told.
Adminstration did not know either

Please provide any additional comments that you have about the implementation of the Merit/Equity System in your Department and College.

<p>While I understand the rationale behind the merit system there is such horrendous inequity not only in our department but also in our college that more emphasis should be based on equity. New assistant professors in other colleges are making twice what I am as a full professor and I am one of the farthest from national average in our college while a number of faculty are making more than the national average.</p>
<p>While I have many problems with the merit/equity system my greatest concern is the appeal process. I was very disappointed with the time table. Dean Adams' evaluation arrived in my office by fax on April 1st. Given the crush of end-of-semester things that need to be done I did not read the VERY small print indicating I had to appeal by April 4th. Even if I knew the deadline was three days after receiving the evaluation do you think it reasonable or fair?</p>
<p>What's to say? Its not a merit system. Its a system to reward favorites of the dean.</p>
<p>What a mess! I am so discouraged that the administration has no recognition of what they have done to faculty morale and collegiality.</p>
<p>We revised our guide for faculty to make it easier to understand and follow. I think that our committee implemented the system with little problem.</p>
<p>This survey asks questions about how the Department Head and Dean handled the merit system. For the most part they could do very little as the upper administration seemed not to have a clear plan and were just making it up as they went. If merit systems are so widespread and successful why did we have to reinvent one? Could it be that they are not?</p>
<p>Things are changing and we are still getting used to the new system. Hopefully things will stay consistent from the beginning to end of the process this year.</p>
<p>There was a major breakdown this year at two different points in the process itself. First the process the dean used to evaluate faculty was neither clear nor transparent and remains unknown to most faculty. Second the appeals process did not work. Given the fact that 27 ratings were changed and 23 or 24 went down based on factors and a process that are somewhat unknown to faculty means that confidence and trust in this system are low. Faculty believed that they would be evaluated on the basis of their dept plans which had been reviewed for comparability by the dean and others months prior to the evaluation itself. Based on the number of ratings that were changed one must speculate that the plans were not comparable. If this is the case at that point the dept heads and dean had two choices: a) recognize the differences and request major changes in future years while still honoring the stated policy for this year which was to base judgments on dept plans unless there were signs of extreme leniency in a given dept. (see Comp Matrix 101" document; or b) take a hard-line position and change a lot (45%) of faculty ratings this year despite the fact that the faculty met dept criteria in order to try to create comparable plans (or as some have called it--they were evolving a "college-wide" plan as their deliberations went on). They chose the hard-line approach. This is not to say that there doesn't need to be comparability--we need that. I am also confident that some of the 27 changes were made for "compelling reasons." But we need a process to judge comparability that is fair transparent and has input from faculty. What "evolved" this year did not. Another example of what I perceive to be the hard-line approach is the fact that some of the changes in ratings did not affect the salary. Since salaries of some weren't affected why change the ratings downward? The only purpose it served was to make more people feel worse. Another point: all faculty scores were put on a grid at the dean's level--without consideration of a ceiling. That is--it appears that whomever excelled the most got the highest rating. Others were then held to that standard. If this process continues in future years then what is a "5" or "4" will always fluctuate based on who is the highest in a given year--again without consideration of a ceiling. Just as there is a floor in ratings there should also be a ceiling so faculty can know that if they're achieving outcomes that will be judged to be a "5." A "5" should not be knocked out of that rating simply because of a given superstar in a given year. This is especially true because of the fact that we have complimentary college plans not a college-wide plan. "</p>
<p>There simply isn't enough money to bring older faculty's salaries up to levels comparable to those of new hires. That is the equity adjustments within the university are inadequate.</p>
<p>There are several issues that have not been resolved. 1. Evaluation of persons on 12 month vs 9 month contracts. Should more productivity be expected of the 12 month employees because they ARE employed for 12 months and technically they have three more months of employed time in which they should be productive...or should less productivity be expected because they do not have summers off? 2. How do you evaluate the productivity of persons who have part of their workload outside of the department or in an administrative capacity? In other words what constitutes a meritorious level of work for an administrative or non teaching workload? 3. Should activities that are already rewarded be credited when evaluating merit? For example some people who are given reduced teaching workload to maintain skills in clinical practice obtain part-time clinical jobs for which they receive an additional salary. In addition they have a reduced teaching load at MSU but still receive their full-time MSU salary. These individuals also get acknowledged through our merit criteria for working in the clinical setting.. I realize that this may be an internal problem in our specific merit criteria but because certain persons hold a vested interest in being able to earn two salaries and get merit for it.. we have not been able to get this criteria changed.</p>
<p>The whole system is a joke. It is a contest not a merit system. It is designed to get faculty squabbling among themselves rather than join together to protest the rampant administrative incompetence that pervades every level of MSU.</p>
<p>the system promotes contentious behavior and is counter to collegiality</p>

The system is self serving to departments and does not provide a way to reward an individual. Rank and seniority and the good old boy network still rule the day.
The system is poorly conceived but works when Heads and Deans use it appropriately.
The service component in the evaluation is only allowed 20% of total weighted distribution score but in social work is service-oriented so this 20% does not accurately reflect all the work that is done in the university and community.
The process went well at the departmental level but there were some real problems at the college level. While I am sensitive to the need to coordinate departmental plans for fairness across a college this process needed to be handled much better. Faculty members in this college had their departmental ratings lowered at the college level without any explanation. The level of communication between the Provost Dean and faculty in this college needs to be improved. There is still a lot of ambiguity about how the merit pay plan will be implemented beyond the departmental level. This has created a lot of resentment and distrust both in this college and across campus.
The process is flawed when a difference of 0.02 points can mean the difference in several percentage points pay. The merit system has no chance of improving productivity and in fact past evidence suggests just the opposite. It is a waste of time to fight over the measly raise pool we have.
The notion that your colleagues are the ones who decide how you get a raise does not meld with how a business would operate. I feel like I work like a dog...share a considerable portion of time doing my part" to keep our dept. functioning through committee work mentoring advising teaching to say nothing about service to my professional field. Who's going to do this work if everyone has to be publishing to stay a "5". I feel that those folks get rewarded for successful research and publication. Do they also do their share in terms of service to the college department university and community????"
The MSU merit system is an ill-fated attempt to make Nitzel look good. The BOG has bought it hook line and sinker. Belinda is a witless wonder; she doesn't know what she's doing and cannot communicate effectively. She has mismanaged the merit system and then blames others for her own shortcomings. We currently have very poor leadership at the presidential and provost levels here at MSU and I think it is a shameful display of unethical leadership.
The Merit System injects mandatory competition into systems that were working very well under conditions of cooperation. It seeks to inject economic motives where social/academic motives formerly prevailed. This will gradually erode the social contract between faculty and the university. (Maybe that's the intent--to make us all act like employees" instead of committed dedicated academics?) I am NOT saying this out of sour grapes; I did very well under our merit system but I think it's a divisive wrong-headed system. "
The Merit System at is a joke not only in our college but across campus and should be revoked. The Administration made fools of themselves (President and Provost) trying to impliment a poorly thought out process.
The main issue is getting consistent standards across different departments -- I'm not sure that's possible.
The inordinate time and effort spent on the Merit/Equity System is a waste of resources.
The forced distribution system is totally inappropriate in an environment where cooperation is needed. Many large organizations have done away with such systems because they can be counter-productive. How c we possibly adopt a system that other organizations are abandoning?
The faculty in my department work very hard most exceptionally hard. They would regardless of compensation considerations because we are understaffed dedicated anyway and care about our students. I'm sure faculty who did not achieve the highest scores still feel they earned it; we've had a tough year with little support and many expectations. We have many promising events in our future but are working so hard to address our immediate needs that we can give little time or thought to how we want to improve ourselves and our work. The merit system seems incidental potentially divisive and not necessarily a motivation for doing our jobs well. It has helped me a great deal in both equity and merit but I have doubts that the long-term effects of the system will work.
The did as well as they could considering the system provided to them by the administration.
The departmental plan operated smoothly and properly in all respects until the dean meddled arbitrarily.
The Dean's plan" was the one that was ultimately followed not the department plan."
The confusion of this year will probably not be repeated as there will not be the option to use previous years' numbers in the future.
The components of peer evaluation and forced distribution/ranking are fatal flaws in the design of the current system. I would encourage the Senate leadership to stop posturing for self-promotion purposes and finally recognize what a horrible system we have in place. But given the recent political posturing by Senate leaders I'm not optimistic.
The biggest problem is the attitude of the college administration to the merit system. Instead of working with departments on their plans and commenting in writing one member of the department sent a draft of the plan to the dean who then replied to the individual about certain aspects of the plan in need of revision. The dean never communicated with the committee directly we never had a clear idea of the unwritten plan and despite the statement from the dean's office we still don't. The reality is that to make the program work in CHPA the college leadership has to work with the committees to develop plans which will produce equity across departmental lines.
The appeal process was a joke.
The administration should have taken on the role of determining criteria. Excessive amounts of faculty time were wasted on these efforts. I got very little research done due to service on numerous related committees. (this is a broader problem with this administration which needs to be addressed as well)
The adjustment" made to my salary increase based on the quartile I fell into was very frustrating. Although equity adjustments are

<p>needed in SOME cases we have moved to an across-the-board equity adjustment system. This is frustrating to those who have received pay raises (e.g. potentially due to performance awards previously) resulting in a salary at the higher end of the scale. In the long run this results in a regression to the mean and I find it frustrating to receive a lower % salary increase simply because I have worked hard in the past. As a result to me the merit system does not encourage hard work as equity supercedes performance.</p>
<p>Such a system cannot possible measure the quality of performance in teaching and service. Our department did a good job following its plan but it's impossible to really evaluate how fully and faithfully faculty perform their service. Thus a long list of service gets a high rating regardless of whether it was done well. To truly evaluate the quality of performance would choke the system because it would be too time consuming. Similarly it's next to impossible to truly evaluate the quality of teaching. Overall service on the compensation committee is much too time consuming. We spend much too much time evaluating ourselves which interferes with the very work we are to evaluate.</p>
<p>Seems to be a de-moralizing process for most.</p>
<p>Performance evaluations in teaching research/scholarly activities and service should be the responsibility of the Department Head. The use of faculty to evaluate other faculty is ludicrous. The present system encourages back-stabbing among faculty members in the Department and College for a few dollars. Awarding lower paid faculty higher % raises within the same performance level penalizes senior faculty members.</p>
<p>Our departmental committee adhered to imposed guidelines of how many faculty members could receive each score. Other departments in the college did not so many more high evaluations were awarded in other departments which was not in adherence with how the Dean said the system would work and disadvantaged our department for playing according to the rules. In order for some to be well above average and above average some must be below average. Instructors (who teach heavy loads and are not trained or hired to do research) have a required research component figured in and are likely rated below average because of inadequacies in the research area. Also instructors have few opportunities for service which factors against them. So instructor increases are very low though they carry a major portion of the teaching hours in the college. We understand our role and are happy to have our jobs but to not even receive cost of living increases is insulting and wrong.</p>
<p>Our Dean completely mis-managed the merit system. She intervened in an arbitrary fashion in Departmental issues willingly failed to follow established procedures and changed evaluations without providing detailed and specific feedback that would permit faculty members to improve their merit evaluations in the future. Moreover the Provost did not make a meaningful effort to investigate this issue and made insulting remarks to faculty who appealed the Dean's evaluations and raised questions about her role in the process. From my own experience and from remarks I have heard others make in future years there will be less effort to excel in teaching/research/and service because merit evaluations are arbitrary and standards are established retroactively.</p>
<p>Our college/department does as well as it can with what it has to do for this merit/equity but I'm afraid the the problems inherent in the system as given from above just make everyone frustrated. For myself I don't understand why if I kept my same score from last year and ended up a Q1 instead of Q2 with a slightly larger pool of money available this year than last that I ended up with a lower % increase. I mean I know our college committee decided the % values in the matrix but since they had to change them this year to allow the dean more money for equity and time in rank it just seems like the system is not really rewarding anything.</p>
<p>One department in our college was allowed to Opt out" of the research requirement which many in that department did. This was not allowed in other departments in the college and I do not believe it should be allowed for any tenure-track faculty member. Teaching research and service are all part of the role of tenure-track faculty. "</p>
<p>Once again it appears you're not interested in how the Merit/Equity" system was mishandled by upper-level administrators and how it lowers faculty morale. What will it take before people who came up with this terrible idea will make an honest effort at evaluating it? "</p>
<p>No comment</p>
<p>My department and college did as good job as I could expect with the system that has been provided. The process continues to be cumbersome and takes up far too much valuable time in my opinion.</p>
<p>Merit seems to bring out the worst in faculty in many ways. Our department has always focused well on current effectiveness in teaching research and service and planning ahead and is dedicated to the education of students. Now it seems nearly everyone wonders whether any particular activity event teaching idea or presentation will score enough points to improve the merit rating. Reminds me of students trying to figure out what they need to do to get an A...focus is on the process and not on the outcome or nontangible benefits like personal satisfaction or real learning.</p>
<p>Merit pay systems promote nothing but animosity distrust and negativity. People are encouraged to do the right things for the wrong reasons and/or the wrong things for the right reasons. Good teaching becomes secondary to personal promotion. I have seen absolutely nothing good emerge from any of the several merit pay systems of which I have been a part. Indeed all but this one have eventually abandoned because they did far more harm than good. This one promises to do the same.</p>
<p>Like most things the merit pay system is run by a cartel of senior faculty many of whom are quite unproductive who push other faculty who don't do the activities they do/value to the rear. Accordingly the expectations and interpretations change every year and make this a moving target.</p>
<p>Let the merit committee have direct input on the revisions since they know what did and didn't work and don't let the merit guideline committee wait until this fall to meet.</p>
<p>Less curving of ratings needed at the head level would help maintain more positive feelings about the merit system.</p>
<p>Last year percentages were changes - I have no confidence that will not occur this year as well. People were provided no response to equity adjustments.</p>

It's biased and implemented on the whims of the faculty involved. When the faculty members on the committee have integrity the process works unfortunately this is not always the case. a colossal waste of everyone's time.
It would be extremely helpful if the merit guidelines were available at the beginning of the year being evaluated instead of 15 days before the evaluation period was over. This process is broken and favors only tenured faculty as they are the only ones allowed on the compensation evaluation committees.
It would be better if we could develop a system that rates merit similarly across all depts in the college (not in specific items but general merit process and components that go into the ranking. Some department rate everyone high not matter what and other try to spread it out to get a range.
It is a quota system
It does not matter what you show the Dean and this department head already have decided that student evaluations are perhaps the only thing that really matters.
Is the university a business or academic institution? Pay for performance is difficult when the criteria is different for everyone involved especially considering some of our salary bases are so low. I have a hard time just making ends meet on my current salary. Prove to me this system will do me justice as the economy keeps tanking and I'll have a better opinion of it.
Instructors should have a more active role in this process. If this is not going to happen then stop asking us to participate in meetings that we will ultimately have no voice.
In your questions above it is unclear what you mean by equitable. Some people do more than others and should be rewarded by the system. Perhaps a better word would be fair".
In our criteria the administrative work involved in running a program (Entertainment Management Health Administration etc.) counts" within Teaching. This is nonsensical. Faculty who have ongoing significant management jobs in addition to teaching research and service expectations (and there are many within MSU) should be evaluated on four rather than three dimensions the fourth being administration."
In my case it serves as a disincentive as I got the highest possible rating from the personnel committee which was then bumped down to allow for the suggested distribution of rankings. My understanding was that a particular range of points would result in a particular rank. However as it turned out the rankings were relative and we were graded on a curve." This of course discourages collegiality. The whole experience has been unreasonably unpleasant and while I appreciate getting a salary increase however modest my morale has suffered."
If a hard working faculty member is in Q4 they should receive at least the equivalent of a cost-of-living wage. Why should we be punished for these averages?
I was treated unjustly.
I was greatly disappointed in the fact that SSWK and the director unilaterally eliminated research activities that were measurable and documented. I didn't find out until I received the dean's evaluation that I had earned a 3.35 instead of the 3.75. Just another indicator of what is wrong in the department.
I think our phone/e-mail systems are broken. People who had their levels changed were not notified until after the change. Why not discuss changes with these individuals? The department's plan was very good and the committee did a wonderful job. But changes above seemed rather arbitrary.
I strongly support the Merit Evaluation process as inherently more equitable and productive than the old the Awards system and more in line with national trend toward accountability at all levels.
I strongly believe that the same rules that apply to our students should apply to faculty. We tell our students what to do to achieve an A B etc. However while we know how to succeed according to the rules of the Dept. merit portfolio those rules change because of some quota system. So we are competing against each other...not against the system AND we have no idea what we are all doing throughout the year.
I personally do not like the merit system in a university setting.
I have problems with the equity portion of the plan. For some of us who have been here for many years the matrix works against a fair compensation for merit. If past awards and many years of service helped to raise our salary then the present equity structure takes those awards away and lowers the merit increase in salary.
I feel my evaluation was very fair and the entire process gave me a better understanding of the work of my colleagues (and they work hard!). But in some ways the whole process seems very demeaning (especially to senior faculty). There must be some way of making it feel more useful--rather than just an exercise in bean-counting.""
I don't feel that rankings were equivalent across departments and colleges. A 4" in our department was very good but in other departments it was less than average. When competing for the same pool of money this seems unfair."
I do not think it fair to be given the criteria for evaluation a week before the merit portfolios are due. Also the forced distributions ended up harming some who really are doing very well in various areas. This year the entire process was very demoralizing and has negatively impacted my desire to excel. My feeling of belonging to the department the college and the university has all but disappeared. I mostly feel I belong to a profession and this year have made decisions in terms of benefiting my profession and myself rather than the university. Finally faculty are penalized for the following: going on sabbatical teaching on line courses and mediated courses (evals are radically different and problems with blackboard impact evals) and developing course related technologies (this time consuming work is not even given consideration in the evaluation of teaching). In the evaluation of teaching all weight is on the student evaluations of professors. Even an average score above 4.results in a 3 level rating. Other activities are NOT considered no matter what is said in the criteria. Innovation is very much discouraged. In general the merit systems devalues faculty strengths. One could have done exceptionally well in one area for instance very well in another and just

<p>fine in a third--yet in the end hardly do better financially than one who is average (when factoring in the fact those who get paid closer to the norm are given far less money). The focus is on making faculty average. In fact the better you do the less you make.</p>
<p>I believe that too many ratings arrived at by department personnel committees were adjusted lower by the College Heads and Dean. In theory the different departmental guidelines were already judged to be equitable. But nearly half of the faculty in our department had their scores lowered. In my view the recommendations of department committees should broadly be accepted except in cases of obvious inflation of scores across the board.</p>
<p>I believe that this system does not encourage hard work in our department. Before this system we all jumped in when work needed to be done. Now people do not volunteer unless it will be counted toward compensation. It also does not allow one to be rewarded by how well they perform as a teacher but by how many extra things they do for service or research. I am terribly disappointed.</p>
<p>I believe that my service rating should have been higher - I had significant service on departmental University and professional committees or organizations this past year.</p>
<p>I believe that my department head was too concerned about making certain that everyone fitted in the curve" that determines percentages of faculty who can receive higher grades--I feel that my accomplishments in teaching and research were not accurately acknowledged in order to assure that only a certain percentage of people within my department would receive a grading of 5."</p>
<p>I believe that length of service should be included in equity. Faculty who are performing well in quartiles other than 1 now need an equity adjustment.</p>
<p>Having a faculty committee rank the faculty of their Department from 1-30 and then imposing a quota system on the results is virtually guaranteed to cause strife and mistrust among the faculty at a time of year when they need to be working most closely together to produce student success. It's a bad idea and was implemented by the departmental Personnel Committee without the knowledge of the full faculty.</p>
<p>From my perspective the merit system seems to be working much much better than the old system but this may also be because I am doing very well in this system. (I do not believe however that the old system worked well at all -- in any event this system is still better!) I still am not aware of how my individual departmental colleagues are performing nor of how they have been rated within the system so I cannot evaluate how the system works overall or rewards people with different levels of performance. (This is the prerogative only of our compensation committee... which I believe is actually better than all of us knowing everyone's performance and score. But this also means that I cannot evaluate the system until I serve on the compensation committee.)</p>
<p>Forced distribution has to go. Cut scores drawn after evaluation and feedback are punishing to high performing faculty-- as final feedback becomes lower than the (approved) departmental criteria indicate it should be.</p>
<p>First of all internal inequity should have been totally addressed before implementing the merit system. Someone with a highly deflated salary compared to comparable peers can score more highly on the evaluation but end up getting a smaller monetary raise falling farther and farther behind. Another primary flaw in the system is that it imposes a level of performance stratification that often does not reflect the stratification in actual performance. For example one dept member was given a 4 in research when a colleague with comparable accomplishments was given a 5. The department head responded that only one 5 can be awarded so a subjective (biased in my opinion) judgement had to be made to determine who got the 4 and who got the 5. The system also discourages assisting colleagues with teaching and research since that will only increase the chance that they will be edged out in a tight call. The system also discourages diversity of research and teaching since traditional methods commonly used tend to be valued more and better understood by the majority of faculty. I am totally frustrated at this point my morale is rock bottom and have no desire to continue working under these conditions.</p>
<p>FAR FAR FAR too time consuming. Involvement of faculty in process creates real collegial problems. The fact that only a certain percentage can be 5's is counter productive. You can work your butt off have (in your estimation) a stellar year and get a 3.5 if most other folks also did really well that year. AND the quartiles. As a tenured full professor here for over 30 years with one of the highest pay levels -- no matter how hard I might work I would never achieve the level of a recently promoted colleague who performed at the same level I did. COUNTER PRODUCTIVE. YOU ARE CHASING OFF YOUR BEST TEACHERS AND RESEARCHERS. Perhaps that is what you want. then you can replace them with lecturers. This year a 4.5% increase for salaries but the total amount of dollars going to faculty salaries is less than this year's. Are we replacing PhD's with lecturers? Do we regularly have MA faculty teaching graduate courses. We should be ashamed of ourselves!</p>
<p>Committee members change from year to year and they seem to value different things. Last year I got a 4 from the committee. This year I had several extra things on my PDF and I got a significantly lower number. There was nothing to tell me what I needed to be doing differently. I think this year's committee was simply trying to keep the numbers low. Our guidelines enumerated things under the ranking of 4 that did not seem to be considered in my final evaluation. My Dean said she would have rated me higher than the committee did in two of the three areas.</p>
<p>Because the 2006 committee differed in how they forced the distribution from the 2007 committee the results of the second distribution (2007) did NOT reflect my increased productivity. In other words the 2007 committee had a tougher curve when grading our departmental merit scores. So even though I was more productive last year than in the previous year it did NOT appear in my overall merit raise! So my question is why should I even bother to work smarter?! It does NOT result in an increase in merit pay!</p>
<p>At the department level the process was handled fine but when it reached the college and Dean level it became opaque. There was little communication between the Dean and faculty (simply a letter stating the merit ranking and the quartile I was in); and to this day I do not know what my percentage raise will be taking into account both merit and equity. It's also not clear that the Dean is making sure that departmentns are being held to the same level of accountability...and from what I've gathered she isn't. But some</p>

<p>communication beyond administrator babble would be nice. Simply put the information out there on each department's criteria how they are equitable with each other and then some way of being certain that everyone is being treated equally. And the amounts in the quartiles is disappointing. This does not reward truly meritorious faculty. When someone scoring a five (in the highest quartile) gets barely above the amount in the raise pool the term 'merit' becomes a joke.</p>
<p>At the department level in our department we are having to change our rubric for evaluation to better reflect teaching. In some instances because of the way our rubric scored this past year there were some who rated higher that should have rated lower because their teaching was extremely low. They scored high because on paper our committee had to score them higher than they deserved to be. Whereas in a couple of cases because teaching is not reflected well in our rubric good teachers scored lower.</p>
<p>At the college level there was a good faith effort to create a fair system of outcomes. Others would claim that it was not fair to overturn preapproved department plans; nor was it fair to overturn department decisions. Unfortunately for the appeals procedure a rationale for overturning department decisions was not forthcoming. A sentence fragment indicating comparability" as a reason is a reason but not an informative explanation to provide individuals overturned or the appeals committee committed to see both sides of particular cases. In effect the appeals process was a non-starter. My personal belief is that individuals were assigned ratings comparable to their peers but because the logic of these cases was not shared it gave the appearance of autocracy. In any case it left faculty without an appeals process. "</p>
<p>As long as there are only certain percentages allowed for how many people may be a 4 or 5; the merit plan is not a merit plan but a quota system.</p>
<p>As first year faculty I was given the opportunity to participate in merit equity. I chose to do so and scored an evaluation of 4" at the department level. My evaluation was changed by the dean to the average (so I was told) for first year faculty of "3" although it was described on the letter from the dean as not differing from the evaluation from my department head. It was later explained to me that the reason for this decision was that it would not be fair to more senior faculty to rate me above "3" based upon my performance over only 5 months. I can accept this explanation but I am not happy that my dean had changed my score and then simply hoped that I would not notice. I think that such behavior is deceptive."</p>
<p>As a member of our Comp Committee the past two years I found it disconcerting and fragmenting to decide if someone would get a raise or not. If you are determining whether a faculty member even gets a raise or not much less extra merit pay it creates a good deal of animosity towards those committee members.</p>
<p>arbitrary evaluation of teaching</p>
<p>A system based on percentages of existing salary is inherently inequitable. Meritorious performance is worth more or less money based on pre-existing salary. Someone making \$90000 who receives a 6% raise for example would receive a salary increase of \$5400. A similar person making \$45000 and receives a 6% raise based on the SAME MERIT score would receive a salary increase of \$2700. This is analogous to a student who is making an A in a course receiving twice as much extra credit for the SAME work as a student who is making a C. Would that be fair? No it would not be.</p>
<p>A forced distribution system does nothing to motivate faculty especially when you are in a College that out performs all other Colleges in publications and teaching scores.</p>
<p>1. After last year we were asked to make our department's criteria more rigorous. We did this and we understood it to be in line w/ the college's expectations. However some apparently saw our criteria as still not rigorous enough. So even though our Departmental Personnel Committee and our Department Head deemed we had met criteria much of that seemed to have been abandoned by the dean's office and department heads. It is my understanding that at the college level there should not be an excessive number of changes to departmental rankings. However in our department and college the changes of rankings were excessive. This seems problematic. The criteria seems to be a moving target.</p>
<p>1) This system creates competition among faculty. A faculty member may (and to their credit most do) rise above it but if the system worked the way it was designed faculty would want their colleagues to fail because that would be the only and best way for their own selves to succeed. 2) The merit system is tied to research but we are not a research I institution. We are public affairs institution but there is nothing in the compensation plans that rewards or incentivizes us to implement public affairs in our work. 3) The system seeks to encourage certain work over other work but the workload is never adjusted. In other words a person may weight their plan to reward them for research but they receive no adjustments in their course load. 4) Instructors are not valued. Indeed they are insulted regularly. 5) the system is set up for faculty to make a case for their salary to be raised and they need to make a good case because they are in competition with other faculty. But the University clearly by definition does not have enough money to grant everyone the ratings they are asked to argue for. So the system then must go back and tell a faculty member why it does not value work that they themselves do value. It's an insulting offensive system. 6) Faculty are told that 3" is a good score and that they should be happy with that. But a level 3 is funded below the average increase in the salary pool which sends the message that in reality a level 3 is below average."</p>

Please suggest ways to improve the Merit/Equity System in your Department and College.

<p>You might as well scrap it now. History is repeating itself just like it did during Marshall Gordon / VP Bowen merit fiasco. There are many of us who recognized this new" plan as soon as it appeared last year. All we could do was sigh and say "here we go again." What will happen next is - about the time the merit system gets rolling there won't be any money for raises or merit out of Jeff City."</p>
<p>When the numbers crunch to a score that stays as the score. There is no quota. Either a 5 is a 5. So maybe one year there will be an extraordinary amount of high achievers and the next none. So no one gets a 5. Why are we curving?</p>
<p>We still have some bugs" to work out to help faculty understand how to best present themselves when they create and submit the PDF and supporting documentation."</p>
<p>We probably need more of a portfolio system rather than just a spreadsheet with numbers. Yes it may be more to read but evaluators would get a better picture of the faculty member's actual work.</p>
<p>We are in the process of rewriting our rubric to strengthen the area of teaching. We are grappling with finding ways to evaluate teaching since with especially younger children we have no student evaluations. we are not sure how to get evaluations for our teachers. Having administration come in once during the school year to evaluate what we do is not acceptable either. Somehow we need to evaluate our teachers on a more regular basis and in a fair and consistent manner. We are grappling with ways to do that.</p>
<p>use some co-operative performance measures improve the evaluation of teaching socialize faculty better to their roles</p>
<p>This system is dysfunctional in its core. It reduces faculty to completely dispensable rats in an inhuman system. The remedy however is simple: Decree that all faculty performing at 3 and above are granted inflation. Any monies left above that are distributed according to the criteria developed by departments.</p>
<p>This merit system is cumbersome and time consuming. I do not find the process to be transparent or reinforcing of hard work.</p>
<p>There are two major problems that I still have with this system: 1) The raises in this system are based upon percentages which means that those high-performing faculty with lower salaries still can and do receive substantially smaller raises than lower-performing faculty who somehow managed to procure a higher salary in the first place. A flat raise amount for each merit score and quartile seems to be a MUCH more fair way to distribute raises. And 2) my understanding is that most of the highest-performing faculty in our college are still well below the CUPA average salary in their areas. With the current system and raise pool will be a VERY long haul for excellent faculty who have low salaries to raise them up to average much less for them actually to receive real merit pay" above and beyond this average. I think that it should be more of a priority to raise our best-performing faculty to at least the AVERAGE pay rate for people in their areas. "</p>
<p>The University's merit policy should explicitly state that a head dean or provost can only adjust evaluations by showing that a faculty member's performance was not accurately evaluated according to the department's approved plan. Arbitrary changes in evaluations or ex-post introduction of new criteria for evaluating faculty should absolutely not be permitted. The University's merit plan is flawed in ASSUMING that administrators will follow procedure without being forced to do so and by assuming that higher administrators will require lower administrators to follow procedures. The Provost explicitly told colleagues in this College that she would not overrule the Dean merely because she failed (refused) to follow procedures.</p>
<p>The system should be abandoned. However as was stated it is here to stay. So I am committed to doing my work and enjoying it for what it is. I will deal with the PFP process as little as possible ignore the messages I receive from the University and enjoy my own work for its own sake without regard for the University.</p>
<p>The rating established in the department should not be changed when weighted with other departments in COAL.</p>
<p>The method is too cumbersome. I don't support a merit system for what amounts to cost-of-living pay raises. More money is needed for departments that are lower than the average (i.e. equity).</p>
<p>The Merit System incorrectly imposes a distribution of faculty performance that is not rationally justified. Get rid of the distributions. Also the Provost and others strongly discourage any type of checklist" system thus discouraging objective evaluation of faculty. Go to an objectives-based system of evaluation."</p>
<p>The dean should act with honesty and integrity regarding the merit equity system.</p>
<p>The dean or associate dean needs to work directly with compensation committees their critiques of plans need to be in writing and the dean should not accept a plan that doesn't work. Department heads should not become the uber-committee that makes the real decisions. If we continue to go that route there is little incentive for faculty to participate in the system.</p>
<p>The amount of salary increase possible should be a set amount (such as maximum of \$3000 per person) that could be earned through merit. The merit ratings would then be used to earn a percentage of that set amount (4.6 --> 92% of \$3000). This system would be fair to all and would not pit colleagues against each other for a spot on a proportioned continuum. In addition a set cost of living increase should be provided to ALL faculty regardless of merit. The cost of living goes up for everyone and the ability to keep up with that should not be based on competition for a spot on a proportioned continuum.</p>
<p>System now has no set criteria. Example: If you have 7 publications in year one that may earn a 5. If you have 7 the next year it may be a 4. It depends on how many others have published. Criteria needs to be set.</p>
<p>Sorry the system is flawed.</p>
<p>Serious professional development for personnel committees and heads</p>
<p>Scrap the one dress fits all approach and implement a system that is specific for each discipline.</p>
<p>Scrap it.</p>

Replace the merit system with currently have with a career ladder approach that will address equity and reward high performance. The Kentucky merit system was a bust and ours is as well.
Replace the dean if she continues to treat faculty disrespectfully and arbitrarily
Remove the forced distribution and focus on work load of faculty
Raise the service component percentage to 30% of the total and reduce research by 10%
Provide the basic number of faculty lines to make the college departments and compensation system effective. We cannot make the negotiation of workloads and weights an effective part of the system until we have sufficient staffing.
Provide more flexibility about percentages of faculty who can receive a particular grade. There was some talk about assigning merit over a two year period of time instead of an annual rating---I still think that this would be a good system for tenured faculty---eliminating need to participate in a fairly tedious system on yearly basis and would ultimately reward more significant long-term research. System for evaluating faculty who might be on sabbatical or otherwise outside normal routine of school year needs to be addressed.
Peer evaluation of faculty within a department containing 4-5 fundamentally different academic disciplines and including faculty members with service and administrative responsibilities about which their peers know very little is a fundamentally flawed approach. No physician legal or accounting firm in the real world would use peer evaluation as the major determinant of performance appraisal and compensation. The Department Head and Dean negotiate expectations with various faculty and are familiar in detail with what is expected from whom. It is management's" job to evaluate performance. That's why they get the big bucks. Asking colleagues (who aren't peers in an academic sense) to evaluate each other is time consuming non-productive highly divisive and generates considerable game-playing."
Overall I'd suggest that merit and equity be completely separated. There are too many problems with putting them together. Instructors are still not being treated in a way that recognizes and evaluates them in light of their unique roles and responsibilities. The appeals process should be reviewed and revised. Deans should not have two votes in the appeals process--as it stands now they have one on the front end and another on the back end. A faculty member who appeals should be offered a written explanation for why the change of ratings was made.
More opportunities for instructors to earn 4 and 5 ratings. Many activities that contribute to points in these categories are not practical for instructors.
Merit committee has fostered game playing and coalition rewarding and heightened professional jealousy. Senior members shoot for important service positions leaving very little for juniors to volunteer for. Dept heads should be asked to generate the initial ratings which can be petitioned. The faculty personnel committee can then intervene as necessary. Administrators should od what they are paid for not pass the buck. Use a 4 level scale to uphold the value of above average performance.
Make those adjustments necessary to fairly treat the full professors who have many years of service.
Make the Departmental Personnel Committee accountable to someone.
Make it real dollars rather than percentages. The highest ranked faculty tend to be junior and receive smaller actual raises than more senior faculty with far worse ratings.
Make it COMPLETELY criterion-referenced (no expected or forced distributions) COMBINED with the equity adjustments based on the CUPA (SP?) averages. (I DO appreciate the effort to build in equity adjustments via the CUPA averages.) By the way with regards to the next item - I believe my college score was a 4- (that option is not listed in the item!)
Make everyone's salaries merit rankings and merit awards public and available by department and college across the university so everyone can see exactly how equitable" the system is."
It needs to fair across departments.
Information is not shared about who makes the 5's" and what are they do that makes them a "5". The process makes anyone less than a "5" seem just not to quite be doing their job."
Inform faculty beforehand of the criteria to be used by the Heads and Dean to evaluate scores assigned at the department level. The Heads and Dean should be less willing to revise the numbers assigned by department personnel committees.
Improve the consistency between departments and colleges.
Improve lines of communication between Dean and the College - and simply going through department heads is not sufficient as this will depend on how competent the department head is. Make the system transparent and timely.
If you're going to leave this wretched thing in place make it entirely an administrative thing from the ground up. No way competing faculty should be allowed to judge one another. Why do we need chairs and deans if they're not going to supervise and lead? If you leave this in place as is you as the university administration are going to run off every good faculty member who can possibly leave and demoralize every other good one who can't. Here's a better suggestion: GET THE F--- RID OF IT!!!!
If the suggested distribution of rankings is immutable then this should be clear and transparent. Significant mentoring should take place. But why would my department mentor me to help me get a higher ranking if he needs to assign ranks based on a distribution?
I would suggest hiring an outside firm to evaluate teaching and other aspects of work by an individual. Peer review would be more effective and relying on things such as student evaluations.
I would prefer to have my Dean do the evaluations (not a committee that changes). This works if you have a fair Dean. When MSU did merit pay a number of years ago that was not the case and there was no faculty committee. There should be some way we can know what we need to be doing differently to increase our merit evaluation number. Right now the Dean has to make a

guess as to what the committee was thinking and make suggestions based on the guess.
I would like to see the process become more transparent so I understand what is necessary to do to receive the high numbers...
I think the Merit/ Equity system should be just that Merit / Equity. It should have nothing to do with anyone getting even a minimal raise or not. That is what creates animosity. If you are doing your job in teaching research/creative activities and service you should at least be getting adequate/average scores for Merit/Equity. I agree that a committee in the department can make decisions on the T R & S aspect. However EVERYONE deserves a raise!
I think people on the University Evaluation Committee should rotate off that committee and the College Evaluation Faculty should rotate off as well.
I see how the system is working to reward merit however I am not clear how the system is improving pay equity across disciplines and or academic ranks.
I really don't have any suggestions. I dislike merit based systems so my suggestion would have to be not to have one at all.
I don't agree with faculty who want to use only qualitative measures; they seem to be out of touch. But the system could make more room for qualitative evaluations. I'm not against quantitative methods--and believe they must be used. But many of my colleagues have not been trained to do this type of assessment (partly due to our discipline) especially when it comes to the evaluation of teaching. And there's a lot of resistance. The university could go a little further in providing guidance in this area. We have great resources on campus and have offered workshops--perhaps offering a workshop that focuses on the relationship between merit evaluations and assessment of teaching would help lessen the resistance.
I disagree with the current process of treating each department equally. That may be a convenient starting point but clearly at some point the dean has to make hard decisions about differences among departments in performance. The same holds true for the provost and comparisons among colleges.
I believe that the matrix needs to be revised again with more specific information particularly with regard to research.
I believe a salary schedule for Greenwood would be beneficial. Our committee is made up of all areas from the school. In theory that sounds great but... secondary does not really know what elementary does and vice versa. Same for special areas and counseling. It is difficult to judge someone else unless you have walked in their shoes. If the salary schedule were in place you would get credit for years of experience higher degrees etc. If there are problems with a specific person not performing in any area then that is where administration steps in.
I appreciate the work of our departmental committee our department head and our dean. However I feel strongly that additional changes must be made in order for this system to be equitable for instructors. Instructors are given different opportunities and different responsibilities depending upon the department in which they work. We cannot be compared to tenure track faculty and in many cases it is unfair to be compared to other departments because of the discrepancies in opportunities available. If we are not allowed to teach more than one course per year we should not be penalized for not developing courses. If we teach four intro courses every semester--how can we earn a 5? I was told that my student evaluations were at the top in our department but that cannot earn me a 5! If we are only allowed to count research for 10% then we cannot be expected to publish. For 10% I believe it would be fair to count a paper presentation that was worthy of acceptance at a professional academic conference as 5--that indicates exceptional research for an instructor who has only been allowed \$600 per year to attend a conference. This year our department head and committee agreed but in the end it was vetoed by the dean. And as for service again for 10% the expectations cannot be the same as they are for 20%. I would like to see both the dean and our department head be more supportive of the teaching instructors do. We earn considerably less and teach more classes. I am hopeful there will be opportunities to develop and teach upper division courses or even other intro courses. I strive to be an excellent teacher in the classroom and when I am successful at that task I would like to know that it counts for something at the institution I have served for nearly two decades.
I am pleased that there has been an attempt to financially reward achievement. My suggestions are not directed toward my department or college. As stated previously my department and college did as good a job as I could expect with a system that I feel is cumbersome and time consuming. Maybe this is as good as it gets. It seems to me that it would be a better use of time for faculty who feel they have demonstrated exceptional achievements for the year under consideration to apply for a higher than satisfactory" rating. It doesn't take that much time and effort to demonstrate that one is doing a "good" job for the university (which is supposed to be where the majority of faculty and staff function if a distribution is to be used). Less than satisfactory performance is obvious and should be addressed immediately. "
Go to an attribute achievement system instead of a forced distribution system.
Go back to a fair system where everyone realizes a cost of living raise not as a percentage but as a flat rate. Then reward outstanding performance with merit. There is no equity for instructors in this university. I have LOST MONEY and BUYING POWER every single year I have worked here. There is a wider gap between tenured and non-tenured faculty and staff now than there has ever been. The morale of this university is suffering.
Give as much of the pool as a COLA raise as possible as a baseline then go back to the College Awards system for merit or let people seek to be evaluated only in areas where they felt they did well not make them compare themselves to all in the department in every area (teaching/service/research). Then keep a small part of the pool for equity and let people apply for that if they feel they deserve it.
Get rid of the forced distribution. A forced distribution forces evaluation outside the criteria (e.g. here we have two equally good people but person A is not paid as well as person B so lets give him the higher score). If we must change the criteria do it a year before it is implemented. Take evaluation out of the department. It harms collegiality.
Get rid of the dean.

Get rid of quota system
Get rid of it. Go back to the old Roles and Rewards system and have a pool of money specifically for equity. Keep equity separate from merit.
Get rid of it and get rid of the Dean. It makes us all bean counters; it encourages mediocre work that counts" rather than true quality and passion in teaching research and service. Make the dean follow the rules."
Get more money.
For my College it is absolutely necessary to bring department plans in alignment so as to avoid the problem of comparing results after the fact. Also there needs to be less indifference to the compensation in terms of communication oversight and transparency for the system to hit on all cylinders.
Focus more on equity if you want to improve morale.
First the final distribution of ratings is not close to the suggested distribution. Also having less rating options (5 4+ 4 3+ etc.) would be a better fairer method of pay increases. Currently the system puts an exact pay increase to subjective ratings. It would seem that broader evaluation ratings (maybe a 1 2 or 3 only) would better compensate for the subjective ratings. In addition the equity portion for my department places us at an unfair disadvantage (our salaries are compared to Springfield public schools' salary schedule with our salaries prorated for less school days). I don't believe that other departments on campus are compared with other institutions (CUPA dat?) and then prorated for number of days each semester.
First abolish the forced ranking. It is destroying the atmosphere in the College/Dept. Let managers manage. If you only want a few people to reach the top establish criteria only a few can reach. Then if numerous people make it to the top level you can revise the criteria. It's not all that hard. We HAD a wonderful Dept. that operated as a real team. Why not let everyone excel if they chose to? This is probably the WORST system I've ever heard of. COMMUNICATE even if it's bad news communicate. Make it objective not subjective.
Figure a way to get rid of the cloud of punishment inherent in a system that has actively and effectively minimized the performance of excellent faculty. Faculty attaining up to 4.5 scores in our college were actually deemed ineligible for the president/provost equity pool. What a great way to anger and under-appreciate high-achieving scholars.
Eliminate the process immediately.
eliminate it. as that is probably not possible have the head decide ratings bypassing faculty having to judge" each other."
Eliminate it. It's purpose is to pit faculty against one another. It encourages publications in mediocre journals and with lower quality presses. It also encourages faculty to avoid any type of work which will not contribute to obtaining a higher rating. Thus informal mentoring of students and colleagues is a waste of time because it can't possibly be incorporated into the system.
Eliminate it.
Eliminate it completely.
Each college should have the same percentages at the very least.
Drop the committee system and streamline the criteria. Some flexibility is good total lack of clarity is not. I would rather have a solid set of criteria by which my department chair consistently evaluates me than to have flexible but unclear criteria which is open to constant reinterpretation depending on who is on the committee.
Drop it altogether. The current system is fatally flawed.
Do away with the X@#\$ matrix! Compressing faculty salaries toward the CUPA or any other composite average is unfair and demoralizing to faculty especially faculty with over 20 years of service to MSU. Have Department Heads evaluate faculty - after all he/she is paid to make decisions!
Do away with it and go back to the Roles and Rewards system just funded and followed (unlike in the past).
delete the process
cost of living raises for everyone
Coordinate the departmental plans before the merit pay process begins. Improve communication between the Provost Dean and faculty as to what constitutes university and college policies on merit pay. We still get contradictory responses from the Provost and Dean over university/college policies on merit pay.
Colleagues should not have the power to review and rank the quality of a peer's research teaching or service when it comes to merit/equity pay. It is too easy for favoritism or bias toward another faculty member to slip into the process.
Clear performance objectives should be established for every level of performance and if one reaches a particular level he/she should get rewarded accordingly. The current system (forced distribution) creates stress (due to uncertainty)and unhealthy competition among people who should cooperate rather than work against one another. As a result it is demotivating.
Allowing a greater percent of weighting to be applied to service might help prompt faculty to engage in more activities related to our Public Affairs mission. Also more training is needed to help effectively evaluate teaching. Training opportunities and opportunities for the exchange of information in this process have been sadly absent.
Administer it honestly and fairly.
add weighting for heavy teaching load if the University values teaching and learning. Schedule university committee meetings after 3:30 p.m.
Across the board cost of living with merit to high achievers
Abolish the merit pay system. Evaluating teaching and research is too subjective and there is no way to make it work fairly for

everyone.

Abolish it.

Abolish it.

Abandon the forced distribution/ranking aspect of the system. Require Department Heads to contribute more to the process and to provide documented support for their views. Reduce the wholesale reliance on faculty to review one another. The effect on morale and engagement have been highly negative.

(1) Unified the process and instrument across the college to some degree. (2) Get rid of performance weights or prescribe them as the same for all similar groups of faculty. This as biases and a random number generator to the process this is not valid since it does not accurately quantify on the ground work load. (Give credit to what a person does not what they think they will do) (3) Try not to classify ratings until the last possible step. As you keep norming and indexing at different layers you lose track of the actual breakdown and reporting of scores. Most systems we are using problem would suffer from the lack of statistical balance and precision. If you get rid of weights this would help this problem. If you coordinate similar instruments across a college this will help too.