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To: ikloppi@cba.bgsu.edu, mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu, lwoods@bgnet.bgsu.edu, bjmbm2@earthlink.net

Attached are the revised versions of the surveys. The changes made included:

1) including questions from a supervisor and employee perspective for the administrative staff employees (the length of the survey went from 6 to 6.25 pages which still seems reasonable to me);

2) took out one question on marital issues. folded two marital-related questions into the system section;

3) Removed the IPPA research questions related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. I did put in 2 of Darsh Steinbrunner's questions related to feedback and form of feedback (in-person or in writing) into section IV (interactions). If you think those questions are obtrusive, I will remove them.

4) Added a checklist of reasons for why supervisors might not use the current performance appraisal system.

5) Made other various grammatical and stylistic changes as suggested by the client group.

I will assume that we're meeting on Wednesday at 8am unless I hear to the contrary.

Thanks for your help, Mike

Michael Zickar, Ph.D.  Dept. of Psychology
Assistant Professor
Bowling Green State University
(419) 372-9984 (office)
(419) 372-6013 (ext.)
mrichar@bgsu.edu

http://arnia.bgsu.edu/~mrichar/ (last updated: 2/14/99)
Dear administrative staff employee:

Enclosed is a survey designed to assess your opinions of the performance appraisal (PA) system for administrative staff employees. Earlier this year, the Human Resources Department commissioned BGSU’s Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) to conduct a formal evaluation of the current performance appraisal system. IPRA has already conducted twelve focus groups with over 50 randomly-sampled employees and supervisors; we are now seeking reactions from all administrative staff employees and their supervisors. Your completion of this survey will help evaluate the effectiveness of the current system.

Your participation in this evaluation is voluntary. All responses to this survey are anonymous; there is no way for your responses to be linked to you. Responses on individual surveys are confidential; only the researchers will see individual surveys. However, grouped results will be made available via the World Wide Web.

We know that your time is valuable, and we hope that you will take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to us. Please return the survey via campus mail by July 15th in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact me at 2-9984. Also, the University’s Human Subjects Review Board may be contacted (2-2481) if any questions or concerns arise during completion of this survey (study reference #xxxxxx). Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

Michael J. Zickar, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
372-9984 (office)
mzickar@bgnet.bgsu.edu
**Survey Instructions**

We will be asking you questions that relate to several of the components of the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the **tool**, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees' performance. The current form has twelve performance dimensions with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the Human Resources web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/hr). If you do not have access to the web, please contact IPRA (2-9984) and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the **process**, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site.

When we refer to the **system**, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

**Your Background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>25 to 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years at BGSU:</th>
<th>___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to less than 5</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to less than 10</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more years</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/ Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool

The number of categories is appropriate.

The categories are too general.

The categories make sense to use.

The tool is easy to use.

The length of the tool is appropriate.

The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.

The tool accurately assesses my performance.

The criteria used in performance reviews are included in my job description.

Some aspects of my job are not assessed by the tool.

Behavioral examples within categories are relevant to my job.

I have a good understanding of the tool.

Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.

Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?

Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process

There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.

The prescribed process takes too much time.

The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university.

Having to meet with my supervisor about my performance is anxiety-provoking.

The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors.

The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement.

My supervisor and myself decide together on appropriate goals.

My supervisor does not follow up on the goals that we have set.

Generally, the goals that I set with my supervisor are attainable.

The timing of the process (e.g., due dates) is reasonable.

I have a good understanding of the process.

Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.

Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?
Part III: How Your Performance is Evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the criteria used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance:
1. I understand the standards of performance my supervisor expects. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
2. The performance information that my supervisor collects is accurate. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
3. My supervisor collects information about my performance through direct observation. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
4. My supervisor collects information about my performance by having discussions with my coworkers. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
5. There are aspects of my job that my supervisor is unable to evaluate. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
6. Overall, I am satisfied with the way my supervisor collects information about my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?

Part IV: Interactions with Your Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the criteria used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance:
1. The performance appraisal meeting between my supervisor and me is productive. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
2. My supervisor lets me know when I've done well on a project or task. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
3. I would prefer to receive positive feedback from my supervisor in person rather than in writing. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
4. Some kind of written format is the best way to receive positive feedback. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
5. The new performance appraisal system has changed the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
6. The new performance appraisal system has changed the type of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
7. My supervisor takes the process seriously. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
8. My supervisor listens to me when discussing my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
9. My supervisor discusses performance-related issues when they arise. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
10. When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, my supervisor lets me know. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
11. When I disappoint my supervisor, I'd rather hear about it in person than in writing. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
12. The best way to receive negative feedback is in some kind of written format. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
13. My supervisor and I agree on the meaning of the criteria used in the performance appraisal. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about supervisor interactions that you would like to share?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)**

1. I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work.  
   - The system is fair.  
   - The system is used consistently across areas of the university.  
   - I have a good understanding of the purpose of the system.  
   - The system is a good way of assessing performance.  
   - The system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses.  
   - My supervisor uses the system to determine my merit.  
   - I would benefit from additional training in the performance appraisal system.  
   - I understand the implicit bias in the performance appraisal system.  
   - An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system.  
   - Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system.

**Are there additional comments about the system that you would like to share?**
Dear supervisor of administrative staff employees:

Enclosed is a survey designed to assess your opinions of the performance appraisal (PA) system for administrative staff employees. Earlier this year, the Human Resources Department commissioned BGSU’s Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) to conduct a formal evaluation of the current performance appraisal system. IPRA has already conducted twelve focus groups with over 50 randomly-sampled employees and supervisors; we are now seeking reactions from all administrative staff employees and their supervisors. Your completion of this survey will help evaluate the effectiveness of the current system.

Your participation in this evaluation is voluntary. All responses to this survey are anonymous; there is no way for your responses to be linked to you. Responses on individual surveys are confidential; only the researchers will see individual surveys. However, grouped results will be made available via the World Wide Web.

We know that your time is valuable, and we hope that you will take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to us. Please return the survey via campus mail by July 15th in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact me at 2-9984. Also, the University's Human Subjects Review Board may be contacted (2-2481) if any questions or concerns arise during completion of this survey (study reference #xxxxxx). Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

Michael J. Zickar, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
372-9984 (office)
mzickar@bignet.bgsu.edu
Survey Instructions

We will be asking you questions that relate to several of the components of the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the "tool," we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees' performance. The current form has twelve performance dimensions with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the Human Resources web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/hr). If you do not have access to the web, please contact IPRA (2-9984) and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the "process," we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site.

When we refer to the "system," we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

Gender: ____ Male ___ Female

Age: ____ Less than 25 ___ 25 to 29 ___ 30 to 39 ___ 40 to 49 ___ 50 to 59 ____ 60 or over

Years at BGSU: ____ Less than 1 year ___ 1 year to less than 5 ___ 5 years to less than 10 ___ 10 or more years

Job: ____ Faculty administrator (e.g., someone who spends the majority of time doing administrative tasks) ___ Faculty (regular appt.) ___ Other (please specify): ........

I supervise ________ administrative staff employees on a regular basis.

I complete performance appraisals for _______ administrative staff employees.

I sign-off on performance appraisals for ______ administrative staff employees as the second-level supervisor.

Have you used the University's performance appraisal system when evaluating administrative staff employees? ____ Yes ____ No

Are you currently using this system? ____ Yes ____ No

If not, why not (check all that apply)?

___ My department already has a good performance appraisal system. ___ My department does not use performance appraisals. ___ I do not understand this performance appraisal system. ___ Takes too much time ___ Not relevant for my department ___ Other, please specify below: ........

Other reasons

____ Do you use another form instead? ____ Yes ____ No

Even if you have not used this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool**

- The number of categories is appropriate.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The categories are too general.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The categories make sense to me.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The tool is easy to use.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The length of the tool is appropriate.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The criteria used in performance reviews are included in my employees’ job descriptions.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- Some aspects of my employees’ jobs are not assessed by the tool.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- Behavioral examples within categories are relevant to my employees’ jobs.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- I have a good understanding of the tool.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  

Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?

**Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process**

- There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The prescribed process takes too much time.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- Having to meet with my employees about their performance is anxiety-provoking.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- My employees and I set goals together in a reasonable amount of time.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- My employees do not follow up on the goals that we have set.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- Generally, the goals that I set with my employees are attainable.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- The timing of the process (e.g., due dates) is reasonable.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- I have a good understanding of the process.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  
- Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.  
  - Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 ?  

Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?
Part III: How You Evaluate Your Employees' Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I have enough information to evaluate my employees' performance.**

**The performance information that I collect is accurate.**

**I collect information about my employees' performance through direct observation.**

**I collect information about my employees' performance by having discussions with them.**

**There are aspects of my employees' jobs that I am unable to evaluate.**

**Overall, I am satisfied with the way I collect information about my employees' performance.**

Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?

Part IV: Interactions with Your Employees

**I feel comfortable meeting with my employees for a performance appraisal.**

**The performance appraisal meeting between my employees and me is productive.**

**I let my employees know when they've done well on a project or task.**

**I would prefer to give positive feedback to my employees in person rather than in writing.**

**Some kind of written format is the best way to give positive feedback.**

**The new performance appraisal system has changed the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.**

**The new performance appraisal system has changed the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.**

**My employees take the process seriously.**

**I address performance-related issues with my employees when they arise.**

**When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I let him/her know.**

**When an employee disappoints me, I'd rather tell him/her about it in person than in writing.**

**The best way to give negative feedback is in some kind of written format.**

**My employees and I agree on the meaning of the criteria used in the performance appraisal.**

Are there additional comments about employee interactions that you would like to share?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system is fair.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system is used consistently across areas of the university.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of the purpose of the system.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system is a good way of assessing performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system helps my employees recognize their strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the system to determine my employees' merit.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would benefit from additional training on the performance appraisal system.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the implications of the performance appraisal for merit.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the system to determine my employees' merit.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there additional comments about the system that you would like to share?**
Dear administrative staff employee: *(this is the form for those who also supervise)*

Enclosed is a survey designed to assess your opinions of the performance appraisal (PA) system for administrative staff employees. Earlier this year, the Human Resources Department commissioned BGSU's Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) to conduct a formal evaluation of the current performance appraisal system. IPRA has already conducted twelve focus groups with over 50 randomly-sampled employees and supervisors; we are now seeking reactions from all administrative staff employees and their supervisors. Your completion of this survey will help evaluate the effectiveness of the current system.

Your participation in this evaluation is voluntary. All responses to this survey are anonymous; there is no way for your responses to be linked to you. Responses on individual surveys are confidential; only the researchers will see individual surveys. However, grouped results will be made available via the World Wide Web.

We know that your time is valuable, and we hope that you will take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to us. Please return the survey via campus mail by July 15th in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact me at 2-9984. Also, the University's Human Subjects Review Board may be contacted (2-2481) if any questions or concerns arise during completion of this survey (study reference #xxxxxxxx). Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

Michael J. Zickar, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
372-9984 (office)
mzickar@bgnet.bgsu.edu
Survey Instructions

We will be asking you questions that relate to several of the components of the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the tool, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees' performance. The current form has twelve performance dimensions with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the Human Resources web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/hr). If you do not have access to the web, please contact IPRA (2-9984) and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the process, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site.

When we refer to the system, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

Gender:  
____ Male  
____ Female

Age:  
____ Less than 25  
____ 25 to 29  
____ 30 to 39  
____ 40 to 49  
____ 50 to 59  
____ 60 or over

Years at BGSU:  
____ Less than 1 year  
____ 1 year to less than 5  
____ 5 years to less than 10  
____ 10 or more years

I supervise _______ administrative staff employees on a regular basis.

I complete performance appraisals for _______ administrative staff employees.

I sign-off on performance appraisals for _______ administrative staff employees as the second-level supervisor.

Have you used the University's performance appraisal system when evaluating administrative staff employees?  
____ Yes  ____ No

Are you currently using this system?  
____ Yes  ____ No

If not, why not (check all that apply)?

____ My department already has a good performance appraisal system.  
____ My department does not use performance appraisals.  
____ I do not understand this performance appraisal system.  
____ Takes too much time  
____ Not relevant for my department  
____ Other, please specify below

Other reasons

__________________________________________________________________________________________

Do you use another form instead?  
____ Yes  ____ No

Even if you have not used this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Because you have are both an administrative staff employee and a supervisor of administrative staff employees, there will be some questions which we will ask you to respond to twice, once using your experiences as a supervisor who has used the system and a second time using your experiences as an employee who has been evaluated using this system. If unspecified, please respond using your general impressions and experiences with the system.

Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool**

- The number of categories is appropriate:
- The categories are too general:
- The categories make sense to me:
- The tool is easy to use:
- The length of the tool is appropriate:
- The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals:
- I have a good understanding of the tool:
- Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool:

**Part Ia: The Performance Appraisal Tool (from your perspective as a supervisor)**

- The tool accurately assesses my employee's performance:
- Some aspects of my employees' jobs are not assessed by the tool:
- Behavioral examples within categories are relevant to my employees' jobs:

**Part Ib: The Performance Appraisal Tool (from your perspective as an employee)**

- The tool accurately assesses my performance:
- The criteria used in performance reviews are included in my job description:
- Some aspects of my job are not assessed by the tool:
- Behavioral examples within categories are relevant to my job:

Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?
Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process

There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.

| The prescribed process takes too much time. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| The timing of the process (e.g., due dates) is reasonable. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| I have a good understanding of the process. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |

Part IIa: The Performance Appraisal Process (supervisor perspective)

| Having to meet with my employees about their performance is anxiety-producing. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| My employees and myself decide together on appropriate goals. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| My employees do not follow up on the goals that we have set. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| Generally, the goals that I set with my employees are attainable. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |

Part IIb: The Performance Appraisal Process (employee perspective)

| Having to meet with my supervisor about my performance is anxiety-producing. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| My supervisor and myself decide together on appropriate goals. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| My supervisor does not follow up on the goals that we have set. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| Generally, the goals that I set with my supervisor are attainable. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |

Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?

Part IIIa: How You Evaluate Your Employees' Performance (supervisor perspective)

| I have enough information to evaluate my employees' performance. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| The performance information that I collect is accurate. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| I collect information about my employees' performance through direct observation. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| I collect information about my employees' performance by having discussions with them. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| I collect information about my employees' performance by having conversations with their coworkers. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| There are aspects of my employees' jobs that I am unable to evaluate. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
| Overall, I am satisfied with the way I collect information about my employees' performance. | 1 2 3 4 5 ? |
Part IIIa: How Your Performance is Evaluated (employee perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I know the criteria used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance.
- I understand the standards of performance my supervisor expects.
- My supervisor has enough information to evaluate my performance.
- The performance information that my supervisor collects is accurate.
- My supervisor collects information about my performance through direct observation.
- My supervisor collects information about my performance by having discussions with my coworkers.
- There are aspects of my job that my supervisor is unable to evaluate.
- Overall, I am satisfied with the way my supervisor collects information about my performance.

Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?

Part IVa: Interactions with Your Employees (supervisor perspective)

- I feel comfortable meeting with my employees for a performance appraisal.
- The performance appraisal meeting between my employees and me is productive.
- I let my employees know when they've done well on a project or task.
- I would prefer to give positive feedback to my employees in person rather than in writing.
- Some kind of written format is the best way to give positive feedback.
- The new performance appraisal system has changed the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.
- The new performance appraisal system has changed the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.
- My employees take the process seriously.
- I discuss performance-related issues with my employees when they arise.
- When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I let him/her know.
- When an employee disappoints me, I'd rather tell him/her about it in person than in writing.
- The best way to give negative feedback is in some kind of written form.
- My employees and I agree on the meaning of the criteria used in the performance appraisal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IVb: Interactions with Your Supervisor (employee perspective)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The comfortable meeting with my supervisor for a performance appraisal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance appraisal meeting between my supervisor and me is productive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor lets me know when I’ve done well on a project or task.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to receive positive feedback from my supervisor in person rather than in writing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kind of written format is the best way to receive positive feedback.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new performance appraisal system has changed the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new performance appraisal system has changed the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor takes the process seriously.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor listens to me when discussing my performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor discusses performance-related issues when they arise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, my supervisor lets me know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I disappoint my supervisor, I’d rather hear about it in person than in writing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best way to receive negative feedback is in some kind of written format.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor and I agree on the meaning of the criteria used in the performance appraisal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there additional comments about supervisor-employee interactions that you would like to share?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)**

- Have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The system is fair. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The system is used consistently across areas of the university. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I have a good understanding of the purpose of the system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The system is a good way of assessing performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I would benefit from additional training on the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

**Part Va: The Performance Appraisal System (supervisor perspective)**

- The system helps my employees recognize their strengths and weaknesses. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I use the system to determine my employees’ merit. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

**Part Vb: The Performance Appraisal System (employee perspective)**

- The system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My supervisor uses the system to determine my merit. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about the system that you would like to share?
Here is a description of the changes that I made to the survey. Bill Balzer (BE) went through the survey and had many good suggestions that I incorporated into the present forms of the survey. Suggestions that were based on BE's comments and not discussed at yesterday's meeting have been asterisked.

I think the main thing is to pilot the survey to someone who is a supervisor-employee to see if the layout of the survey makes sense to them and to get a rough estimate of completion time. Karen, you had mentioned some possible people who would be willing to fill it out. Could you give them this version and solicit any comments. Also, I'd be happy to call them after they've completed it to get their reactions. Thanks.

I think the survey is looking pretty good.

Changes

Demographics Section

On the employee survey, I put in the question of whether they have been evaluated using the prescribed system. I also gave them boxes to check for reasons why they have not been evaluated. The only option I removed was the "I don't understand the performance appraisal system." I didn't think it would be polite to give them an option "My supervisor doesn't understand the performance appraisal system."

The "other options" box has been indented for clarity.

*BE suggested different wording for the discriminating between faculty supervisors and administrators.

Part I. The Tool

"Categories" has been replaced with "performance areas". The actual tool uses the phrase "performance area" so I made the survey consistent with that. The instructions have also been changed.

The criteria used in performance appraisals are included in my job description. changed to

My performance appraisal is based on what is in my job description.

Part II. The Process

"Anxiety-provoking" has been replaced with "stressful" which is more direct.

"Follow up" has been changed to "follow through".

"Due dates" has been changed to "scheduled deadlines for completing."

*BE suggested that we add two additional questions about goal-setting which relate to the effectiveness of goal-setting.

*Generally my goals are well-defined.

*Generally my goals are challenging to achieve.

Part III. Evaluation of Performance

The performance information that my supervisor collects is accurate. changed to

The information about my performance that my supervisor collects is accurate.
having conversations changed to "soliciting information".

Changed "Generally the goals that I set with my supervisor are attainable" to "My goals are attainable."

Part IV. Interactions with your employees

I feel comfortable meeting with my supervisor for a performance appraisal.

changed to
*I feel comfortable meeting with my employees to discuss their performance appraisal.

*I discuss performance-related issues with my employees when they arise during the year. (Last phrase added).

*The new performance appraisal system has changed the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.

*The new performance appraisal system has changed the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.

*BE raised a good point. He asked "do you want to know whether the frequency has gone up or down." I propose that we change "changed" to "increased."

*I believe" added to "My employees take the process seriously."

"meaning of the criteria" changed to "standards to be"

Added the question "I take the process seriously."

Part V. System

Deleted the implications for merit question.

*Changed "purpose" in the 5th item to "purpose(s)".

Added "Using" to the front of "The system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses."
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******************************************************************
Michael Zickar, Ph.D.                                           Dept. of Psychology
Assistant Professor                                            Bowling Green State University
(419) 372-9904 (office)                                        Bowling Green, OH 43403
(419) 372-6013 (fax)                                           michael@bgsu.edu
http://anla.bgsu.edu/~michael/                               (last updated: 2/14/99)
******************************************************************
Dear Supervisor of Administrative Staff Employees:

Enclosed is a survey designed to assess your opinions of the performance appraisal (PA) system for administrative staff employees. Earlier this year, the Human Resources Department commissioned BGSU’s Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) to conduct a formal evaluation of the current performance appraisal system. IPRA has already conducted twelve focus groups with over 50 randomly-sampled employees and supervisors; we are now seeking reactions from all administrative staff employees and their supervisors. Your completion of this survey will help evaluate the effectiveness of the current system.

Your participation in this evaluation is voluntary. All responses to this survey are anonymous; there is no way for your responses to be linked to you. Responses on individual surveys are confidential; only the researchers will see individual surveys. However, grouped results will be made available via the World Wide Web. The results from this survey will be used to evaluate the present performance appraisal system and to provide suggestions for its potential improvement. Therefore, this survey is an excellent opportunity for you to express your opinions about the performance appraisal system.

We know that your time is valuable, and we hope that you will take the time (an estimated 15-20 minutes) to complete the survey and return it to us. Please return the survey via campus mail by July 15th in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions about the research, please contact me at 2-9984. If you prefer, the University’s Human Subjects Review Board may be contacted (2-2481) to address any questions or concerns (study reference #xxxxxxxx).

Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

Michael J. Zickar, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
372-9984 (office)
mzickar@bignet.bgsu.edu
Survey Instructions

We will be asking questions about several of the components of the performance appraisal system. To eliminate possible confusion, we will define several of the concepts related to the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the **tool**, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees’ performance. The current form has twelve performance areas with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the following web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/meridian/pa_example). If you do not have access to the web, please contact 372-9984 and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the **process**, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site. Some questions will also relate to interactions with your employees and how you evaluate their performance.

When we refer to the **system**, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

- **Gender:**
  - ______ Male
  - ______ Female

- **Years at BGSU:**
  - ______ Less than 1 year
  - ______ 1 year to 4 years
  - ______ 5 years to 9 years
  - ______ 10 years to 19 years
  - ______ 20 or more years

- **Age:**
  - ______ Less than 25
  - ______ 25 to 29
  - ______ 30 to 39
  - ______ 40 to 49
  - ______ 50 to 59
  - ______ 60 or over

- **Job:**
  - ______ Faculty administrator (e.g., chairs, directors, deans, VPs)
  - ______ Faculty (regular appt.)
  - ______ Other (please specify): ____________________

I supervise ______ administrative staff employees on a regular basis.

I complete performance appraisals for ______ administrative staff employees.

I sign-off on performance appraisals for ______ administrative staff employees as the second-level supervisor.

Have you used the University’s performance appraisal system when evaluating administrative staff employees? ______ Yes ______ No

Are you currently using this system? ______ Yes ______ No

If not, why not (check all that apply)?

- ______ My department already has a good performance appraisal system.
- ______ My department does not conduct performance appraisals.
- ______ I do not understand this performance appraisal system.
- ______ Takes too much time.
- ______ Not relevant for my department.
- ______ Other, (please specify below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you use another tool instead? ______ Yes ______ No

Even if you have not used this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number.
Please use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool**

The number of performance areas is appropriate.  
The performance areas are too general.  
The performance areas make sense to me.  
The tool is easy to use.  
The length of the tool is appropriate.  
The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.  
The tool accurately assesses my employees' performance.  
My employees' performance appraisals are based on what is in their job descriptions.  
Some aspects of my employees' jobs are not assessed by the tool.  
Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my employees' jobs.  
I have a good understanding of the tool.  
Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.

*Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?*

**Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process**

There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.  
The prescribed process takes too much time.  
The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university.  
Having to meet with my employees about their performance is stressful.  
The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors.  
The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement.  
My employees and I decide together on appropriate goals.  
My employees do not follow through on their goals.  
Generally my employees' goals are attainable.  
Generally my employees' goals are well-defined.  
Generally my employees' goals are challenging to achieve.  
The timing of the process (e.g., scheduled deadlines for completing) is reasonable.  
I have a good understanding of the process.  
Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.

*Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?*
Part III: How You Evaluate Your Employees’ Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have enough information to evaluate my employees' performance.  
The information about my employees' performance that I collect is accurate.  
I collect information about my employees' performance through direct observation.  
I collect information about my employees' performance by having discussions with them.  
I collect information about my employees' performance by soliciting information from their coworkers.  
There are aspects of my employees' jobs that I am unable to evaluate.  
Overall, I am satisfied with the way I collect information about my employees' performance.

Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?

Part IV: Interactions with Your Employees

I feel comfortable meeting with my employees to discuss their performance appraisal.  
The performance appraisal meeting between my employees and me is productive.  
I let my employees know when they've done well on a project or task.  
I would prefer to give positive feedback to my employees in person rather than in writing.  
Some kind of written format is the best way to give positive feedback.  
The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.  
The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.  
I believe my employees take the process seriously.  
I take the process seriously.  
I discuss performance-related issues with my employees when they arise during the year.  
When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I let him/her know.  
When an employee has performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I’d rather tell him/her about it in person than in writing.  
The best way to give negative feedback is in some kind of written format.  
My employees and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.

Are there additional comments about employee interactions that you would like to share?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)

I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The performance appraisal system is fair: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The performance appraisal system is used consistently across areas of the university: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I have a good understanding of the purpose(s) of the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The performance appraisal system is a good way of assessing performance: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I use the performance appraisal system to help my employees recognize their strengths and weaknesses: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I would benefit from additional training on the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I use the performance appraisal system to determine my employees' merit: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about the system that you would like to share?
Dear Administrative Staff Employee:  *(this is the form for those who also supervise)*

Enclosed is a survey designed to assess your opinions of the performance appraisal (PA) system for administrative staff employees. Earlier this year, the Human Resources Department commissioned BGSU’s Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) to conduct a formal evaluation of the current performance appraisal system. IPRA has already conducted twelve focus groups with over 50 randomly-sampled employees and supervisors; we are now seeking reactions from all administrative staff employees and their supervisors. Your completion of this survey will help evaluate the effectiveness of the current system.

Your participation in this evaluation is voluntary. All responses to this survey are anonymous; there is no way for your responses to be linked to you. Responses on individual surveys are confidential; only the researchers will see individual surveys. However, grouped results will be made available via the World Wide Web. The results from this survey will be used to evaluate the present performance appraisal system and to provide suggestions for its potential improvement. Therefore, this survey is an excellent opportunity for you to express your opinions about the performance appraisal system.

We know that your time is valuable, and we hope that you will take the time (an estimated 15-20 minutes) to complete the survey and return it to us. **Please return the survey via campus mail by July 15th in the enclosed envelope.**

If you have any questions about the research, please contact me at 2-9084. If you prefer, the University’s Human Subjects Review Board may be contacted (2-2481) to address any questions or concerns (study reference #xxxxxxx).

Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

Michael J. Zickar, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
372-9984 (office)
mzickar@bignet.bgsu.edu
Survey Instructions

We will be asking questions about several of the components of the performance appraisal system. To eliminate possible confusion, we will define several of the concepts related to the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the tool, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees' performance. The current form has twelve performance areas with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the following web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/hr-chair/pa_example). If you do not have access to the web, please contact 372-9984 and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the process, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site. Some questions will also relate to interactions between supervisors and employees as well as how performance is evaluated.

When we refer to the system, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

Gender: _____ Male _____ Female
Years at BGSU: _____ Less than 1 year _____ 1 year to 4 years _____ 5 years to 9 years
Age: _____ Less than 25 _____ 25 to 29 _____ 30 to 39
_____ 40 to 49 _____ 50 to 59 _____ 60 or over

I supervise _____ administrative staff employees on a regular basis.

I complete performance appraisals for _____ administrative staff employees.

I sign-off on performance appraisals for ____ administrative staff employees as the second-level supervisor.

Have you used the University's performance appraisal system when evaluating administrative staff employees? _____Yes _____No

Are you currently using this system? _____Yes _____No

If not, why not (check all that apply)?

_____ My department already has a good performance appraisal system. _____ My department does not conduct performance appraisals. _____ I do not understand this performance appraisal system.

_____ Takes too much time. _____ Not relevant for my department. _____ Other, (please specify below)

Other reasons

Do you use another tool instead? _____Yes _____No

Even if you have not used this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Because you have are both an administrative staff employee and a supervisor of administrative staff employees, there will be some questions which we will ask you to respond to twice, once using your experiences as a supervisor who has used the system and a second time using your experiences as an employee who has been evaluated using this system. If unspecified, please respond using your general impressions and experiences with the system.

Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool**

The number of performance areas is appropriate.

The performance areas are too general.

The performance areas make sense to me.

The tool is easy to use.

The length of the tool is appropriate.

The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.

I have a good understanding of the tool.

Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.

**Part Ia: The Performance Appraisal Tool (from your perspective as a supervisor)**

The tool accurately assesses my employees' performance.

My employees' performance appraisals are based on what is in their job descriptions.

Some aspects of my employees' jobs are not assessed by the tool.

Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my employees' jobs.

**Part Ib: The Performance Appraisal Tool (from your perspective as an employee)**

The tool accurately assesses my performance.

My performance appraisal is based on what is included in my job description.

Some aspects of my job are not assessed by the tool.

Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my job.

Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?
Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what goes on in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process takes too much time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The timing of the process (e.g., scheduled deadlines for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completing) is reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IIa: The Performance Appraisal Process (supervisor perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having to meet with my employees about their performance is stressful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees and I decide together on appropriate goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees do not follow through on their goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are attainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, my goals are well-defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are challenging to achieve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IIb: The Performance Appraisal Process (employee perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having to meet with my supervisor about my performance is stressful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor and I decide together on appropriate goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not follow through on my goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are attainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are well-defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are challenging to achieve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?

Part IIIa: How You Evaluate Your Employees' Performance (supervisor perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have enough information to evaluate my employees' performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information about my employees' performance that I collect is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance through direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance by having</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are aspects of my employees' jobs that I am unable to evaluate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the way I collect information about my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees' performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IIIb: How Your Performance is Evaluated (employee perspective)**

1. I know the standards used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance.
2. I understand the standards of performance my supervisor expects.
3. My supervisor has enough information to evaluate my performance.
4. The information about my performance that my supervisor collects is accurate.
5. My supervisor collects information about my performance through direct observation.
6. My supervisor collects information about my performance by having discussions with me.
7. There are aspects of my job that my supervisor is unable to evaluate.
8. Overall, I am satisfied with the way my supervisor collects information about my performance.

**Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?**

**Part IVa: Interactions with Your Employees (supervisor perspective)**

1. I feel comfortable meeting with my employees to discuss their performance appraisal.
2. The performance appraisal meeting between my employees and me is productive.
3. I let my employees know when they’ve done well on a project or task.
4. I would prefer to give positive feedback to my employees in person rather than in writing.
5. Some kind of written format is the best way to give positive feedback.
6. The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.
7. The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.
8. I believe my employees take the process seriously.
9. I take the process seriously.
10. I discuss performance-related issues with my employees when they arise during the year.
11. When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I let him/her know.
12. When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I’d rather tell him/her about it in person than in writing.
13. The best way to give negative feedback is in some kind of written form.
14. My employees and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.
Part IVb: Interactions with Your Supervisor (employee perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel comfortable meeting with my supervisor to discuss my performance appraisal:

The performance appraisal meeting between my supervisor and me is productive.

My supervisor lets me know when I've done well on a project or task.

I would prefer to receive positive feedback from my supervisor in person rather than in writing.

Some kind of written format is the best way to receive positive feedback.

The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.

The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.

I believe my supervisor takes the process seriously.

I take the process seriously.

My supervisor listens to me when discussing my performance.

My supervisor discusses performance-related issues when they arise during the year.

When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, my supervisor lets me know.

When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather hear about it in person than in writing.

The best way to receive negative feedback is in some kind of written format.

My supervisor and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.

Are there additional comments about supervisor-employee interactions that you would like to share?
Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)

I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work. 1 2 3 4 5
The performance appraisal system is fair. 1 2 3 4 5
The performance appraisal system is used consistently across areas of the university. 1 2 3 4 5
I have a good understanding of the purpose(s) of the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5
The performance appraisal system is a good way of assessing performance. 1 2 3 4 5
I would benefit from additional training on the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5
An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5
Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5

Part Va: The Performance Appraisal System (supervisor perspective)
I use the performance appraisal system to help my employees recognize their strengths and weaknesses. 1 2 3 4 5
I use the performance appraisal system to determine my employees' merit. 1 2 3 4 5

Part Vb: The Performance Appraisal System (employee perspective)
Using the performance appraisal system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses. 1 2 3 4 5
My supervisor uses the performance appraisal system to determine my merit. 1 2 3 4 5

Are there additional comments about the performance appraisal system that you would like to share?
Dear Administrative Staff Employee:

Enclosed is a survey designed to assess your opinions of the performance appraisal (PA) system for administrative staff employees. Earlier this year, the Human Resources Department commissioned BGSU's Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) to conduct a formal evaluation of the current performance appraisal system. IPRA has already conducted twelve focus groups with over 50 randomly-sampled employees and supervisors; we are now seeking reactions from all administrative staff employees and their supervisors. Your completion of this survey will help evaluate the effectiveness of the current system.

Your participation in this evaluation is voluntary. All responses to this survey are anonymous; there is no way for your responses to be linked to you. Responses on individual surveys are confidential; only the researchers will see individual surveys. However, grouped results will be made available via the World Wide Web. The results from this survey will be used to evaluate the present performance appraisal system and to provide suggestions for its potential improvement. Therefore, this survey is an excellent opportunity for you to express your opinions about the performance appraisal system.

We know that your time is valuable, and we hope that you will take the time (an estimated 15-20 minutes) to complete the survey and return it to us. **Please return the survey via campus mail by July 15th in the enclosed envelope.**

If you have any questions about the research, please contact me at 2-9984. If you prefer, the University's Human Subjects Review Board may be contacted (2-2481) to address any questions or concerns (study reference #xxxxxxxx).

Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

Michael J. Zickar, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
372-9984 (office)
mzickar@bignet.bgsu.edu
Survey Instructions

We will be asking questions about several of the components of the performance appraisal system. To eliminate possible confusion, we will define several of the concepts related to the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the tool, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees’ performance. The current form has twelve performance areas with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the following web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/myichai/pa_example). If you do not have access to the web, please contact 372-9984 and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the process, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site. Some questions will also relate to interactions with your supervisor and how your supervisor evaluates your performance.

When we refer to the system, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

Gender: ___ Male ___ Female

Age: ___ Less than 25 ___ 25 to 29 ___ 30 to 39 ___ 40 to 49 ___ 50 to 59 ___ 60 or over

Years at BGSU: ___ Less than 1 year ___ 1 year to 4 years ___ 5 years to 9 years ___ 10 years to 19 years ___ 20 or more years

Does your supervisor currently use this system? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, why not (check all that apply)?

___ My department already has a good performance appraisal system.
___ My department does not conduct performance appraisals.
___ Takes too much time.
___ Not relevant for my department.
___ Other, (please specify below)

Other reasons

Do your supervisor use another tool instead? ___ Yes ___ No

Even if you have not been evaluated using this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool**

- The number of performance areas is appropriate: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The performance areas are too general: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The performance areas make sense to use: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The tool is easy to use: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The length of the tool is appropriate: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The tool accurately assesses my performance: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My performance appraisal is based on what is included in my job description: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Some aspects of my job are not assessed by the tool: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my job: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Overall, I have a good understanding of the tool: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool: 1 2 3 4 5 ?

**Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process**

- There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The prescribed process takes too much time: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Having to meet with my supervisor about my performance is stressful: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My supervisor and I decide together on appropriate goals: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I do not follow through on my goals: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Generally my goals are attainable: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Generally my goals are well-defined: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Generally my goals are challenging to achieve: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The timing of the process (e.g., scheduled deadlines for completing) is reasonable: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I have a good understanding of the process: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process: 1 2 3 4 5 ?

**Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?**

**Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part III: How Your Performance is Evaluated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know the standards used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the standards of performance my supervisor expects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor has enough information to evaluate my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information about my employees' performance that my supervisor collects is accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor collects information about my performance through direct observation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor collects information about my performance by having discussions with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor collects information about my performance by soliciting information from my coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are aspects of my job that my supervisor is unable to evaluate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the way my supervisor collects information about my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?

**Part IV: Interactions with Your Supervisor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable meeting with my supervisor to discuss my performance appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance appraisal meeting between my supervisor and me is productive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor lets me know when I've done well on a project or task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to receive positive feedback from my supervisor in person rather than in writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some kind of written format is the best way to receive positive feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my supervisor takes the process seriously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take the process seriously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor listens to me when discussing my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor discusses performance-related issues when they arise during the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, my supervisor lets me know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather hear about it in person than in writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best way to receive negative feedback is in some kind of written format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there additional comments about supervisor interactions that you would like to share?
Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

The performance appraisal system is fair. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

The performance appraisal system is used consistently across areas of the university. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

I have a good understanding of the purpose(s) of the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

The performance appraisal system is a good way of assessing performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Using the performance appraisal system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

My supervisor uses the performance appraisal system to determine my merit. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

I would benefit from additional training in the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about the system that you would like to share?
Decisions for eligibility for merit and merit recommendations will be made on the basis of staff performance. Staff contracting at the beginning of each semester of the academic year and annual goal setting will be fundamental to the evaluation process. It is expected that individual goals will be relevant to one or more of the administrative staff performance areas and consistent with Center goals. Both quantitative measures and qualitative judgments will be used in the decision making process in accordance with guidelines proposed by the Division of Student Affairs and the performance areas designated in the Administrative Staff Appraisal document.

A three tiered paradigm with criteria to guide merit decisions is presented below.

I. Minimum Performance Requirements

Fulfillment of basic job requirements: Intake assessments, acceptable client caseload, adequate case management, participation in emergency coverage, individual direct and indirect service consultations as needed, attendance at all or most staff meetings, participation in Orientation and Registration Program, attendance at all or most in-house professional development activities, progress toward or maintenance of licensure, and maintenance of liability insurance. Additional duties as specified in individual job descriptions.

II. Meritorious Performance

Fulfillment of basic job requirements.

Additional time and effort devoted to two or more activities listed below, with at least one activity included from group 1:

Group 1—Supervision, Outreach, Group Consultation, Administrative Duties;

Group 2—Service to the Center, Division, University or community; Professional development activities beyond the minimum requirement which enhance performance; Activities which contribute to the profession of psychology.

III. Exceptionally Meritorious Performance

Fulfillment of basic job responsibilities.

Fulfillment of requirements for merit recommendation.

Outstanding performance or achievement in counseling-related activities, service, or research/creative work.
Recommendations for Student Affairs Merit Document

Basic Merit

The first task of the committee was to review the performance evaluation tools for each department in the Division of Student Affairs. Upon review, the committee found that there is no consistency in the performance evaluation criteria by departments in the Division. Since the administrative duties of staff in the Division vary by department, the committee does not recommend a standard evaluation tool for the Division. However, there are some areas of accountability that are common to all administrative staff regardless of their administrative duties in the Division. The committee recommends that the following performance evaluation criteria should be included in each department’s evaluation process for basic merit.

- Linkage between performance and individual goals
- Linkage between performance and Division goals
- Professional development
- Service and leadership
- Human and resource management (includes fiduciary responsibility)
- Team building/collaboration
- Written and oral communication

For units that report performance evaluations in a narrative format, a rating scale that includes the following benchmarks: did not meet the criteria, met the criteria, exceeded the criteria, should be listed for each performance evaluation criterion. Other procedures for determining basic merit will be determined by each unit director.

Super Merit

The committee recommends that a common set of criteria and procedures be used for determining super merit within the Division. Staff who exceed the job expectations of the position and are recommended by the Unit Director may be considered for Super merit. Super merit is awarded when salary increases exceed 3%. Salary increases beyond 3% will be pooled across the Division.

Eligibility Criteria

- To recognize the individual achievement of staff who have significantly contributed to the goals and priorities of the department.
- To recognize the individual achievement of staff who have significantly contributed to Division goals and priorities, as well as to the vision and core values of the Institution.
To enhance the recruitment and retention of staff and students.

**Procedures**

Recommendations for super merit are made by each unit director and are forwarded to a selection committee appointed by the Vice President. The selection committee uses a common set of criteria to determine eligibility for super merit. The University's core values will be used as the criteria for super merit. Documentation from the unit director should address the application of the University's core values by each employee that is recommended for super merit. Examples for how the criteria can be demonstrated are listed below.

**Respect for One Another**

- Demonstrates an appreciation for the values and beliefs of other cultures.
- Seeks out opportunities to learn about other cultures.
- Engages in acts of compassion, kindness, courage, extra effort, and caring toward students, faculty and staff.
- Is considerate of other points of view, even if they are different from your own.
- Takes in consideration diverse perspective in programs and activities, print media, policies and procedures, and hiring practices.
- Engages in ethical behavior in all aspects of one's job.

**Cooperation**

- Demonstrates an understanding of the "big picture" of BGSU and its mission, and the respective role that he/she plays in accomplishing that.
- Collaborates with other departments, divisions and areas, as well as other employees and community members in the accomplishment of common goals.
- Demonstrates patience and generosity in assisting others to accomplish projects and goals, even if there is no immediate credit or benefit on his/her part.
- Utilizes participatory leadership principles and supports/demonstrates a team approach and mentality.
- Participates successfully in joint work assignments (new, continuing, or special projects or initiatives).
- Initiates assistance of others in the accomplishment of their goals, rather than always needing to be asked to do so.
- Participates on committees, task forces, events, and cross-functional teams.
- Shares information with new and veteran employees/colleagues.
- Sets an example from a supervisory or other viewpoint for others to follow in terms of cooperative behavior.
Intellectual and Spiritual Growth

- Contributes to the accomplishment of department, division, and university goals and objectives through providing thoughts, viewpoints, and analysis whenever possible at meetings and otherwise.
- Demonstrates active involvement in and support of staff development and continuing education within the department and division, (e.g., attendance at staff development/training events, setting an example for others, or active participation on the committee for same).
- Develops new processes to resolve existing problems.
- Receipt of, nomination for, or pursuit of an award from the university, community, or professional organization.
- Obtaining certification or enhanced education in one's profession.
- Demonstrates support for staff to attend diversity-related seminars/programs.
- Involvement in and support of community service activities.
- Involvement in professional organizations (such as NASPA, NIRSA, ACPA, etc.) through leadership, programming, and/or conference attendance.
- Contributes to the profession through research and publications.

Creative Imaginings

- Develops creative solutions to challenges.
- Takes the initiative to address problems.
- Always looking for a better way to increase or improve results.
- Looks for creative ways to partner with other areas of the Division.
- Consistently and positively influences the lives of our students.

Pride in a job well done

- Promotes the Division and our success.
- Represents the University with Pride and distinction.
- Supports the efforts and programs of other Departments in the Division.
- Promotes cooperation throughout the University and the Division.
- Active and involved in the Community.
- Positive role model and mentor for students and staff.

Distribution of Merit Funds

If the merit pool is more than 3% but less than 5%, the allocation will be distributed in the following manner:

- All employees who are eligible for merit will receive a 3% increase in salary.
• The remaining funds, the difference between the total merit and 3% will be allocated to the super merit pool for the Division and distributed to employees who are recommended by the Student Affairs Merit Selection Committee. The amount of the award will be determined by dividing the number of employees receiving super merit by the dollar amount in the pool.

If the merit pool is 5% or more, the allocation will be distributed in the following manner:

• Sixty percent of the merit pool for the department will be distributed equally among employees who meet performance expectations.
• The remaining 40% will be allocated to the super merit pool for the Division and allocated based on a rating system [that is yet to be determined].
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) was contracted by Bowling Green State University's Human Resources (HR) Department to evaluate the performance appraisal system used to evaluate administrative staff employees. A project team was formed of a representative from HR and two administrative staff council members. This project team interacted with the IPRA team to create a two-phase research project used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the existing system and to explore differences in perceptions of the system between employees and supervisors. Research areas included the appraisal tool, the prescribed process, the system, and the effects of the system on daily interactions.

The first stage of the research involved conducting 15 focus groups with randomly-sampled employees, administrative staff employees who supervise other administrative staff, and faculty supervisors. A set of questions and focus group protocol were developed by the IPRA team in conjunction with the client team. Transcripts of these focus group sessions were coded for reoccurring themes related to the research questions.

In the next phase, surveys were developed to pursue themes that were identified in the focus group sessions. All administrative staff employees and their supervisors were sent surveys to complete. Responses to the survey were used to answer the questions relating to identifying strengths and weaknesses as well as testing for differences between employees and supervisors. Results from the focus groups were used to supplement the survey analyses as well as to provide anecdotal data and suggestions.

Results indicated that participants were most dissatisfied with the tool. On average, they thought the tool was too long and that the performance areas were not relevant to their jobs or their employees’ jobs.

Participants were relatively more satisfied with the process, interactions with their supervisor, and methods that supervisors used to collect information about their performance. Also, respondents tended to be satisfied with the goal-setting aspects of the process. These appear to be strengths of the system.

Regarding the system as a whole, respondents expressed concern that the system was not used consistently across the university. Employees in focus groups also expressed concern that supervisors were not accountable for their ratings and completing the evaluation.

Finally, participants were confused about the link between the current system and determination of merit. Some participants were concerned that such a link would create an atmosphere of divisiveness.

Across the different aspects of the system and its components, there were few systematic differences between employees and supervisors. General levels of satisfaction with the tool, process, system, and methods of evaluation were similar across the groups. A few
differences emerged in the focus groups regarding concern for supervisory accountability and whether supervisors imposed goals on employees. In general, though, there were more similarities across the groups than differences.

A set of recommendations, based on this data, is provided at the end of this report. IPRA suggests focusing on making the tool more flexible, improving supervisor accountability, working to achieve higher levels of consistency across campus, and better communicating the link between the current system and determination of merit.
BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The university implemented a new performance appraisal (PA) system for administrative staff employees in 1997. This new system was designed to provide consistency in performance evaluation across the wide range of administrative staff jobs. In the initial memo describing the new system, Provost Chuck Middleton stated that the new system would be evaluated on a periodic basis. This report details the first evaluation of the new system.

IPRA was commissioned by the Bowling Green State University’s Human Resources (HR) department to provide an independent evaluation of the PA system for administrative staff employees. A project team, which consisted of one member of the HR department (Karen Woods) and two representatives from the Administrative Staff Council (Inge Kloostering & Mary Beth Zachary), was formed to help assist the IPRA team generate initial research questions as well as help facilitate the project by reviewing documents and providing critical information about the PA system.

The project team proposed that the research be divided into four separate areas for further investigation. These four areas are defined now to provide clarity for the rest of the report.

1. **The tool**—this refers to the actual form that is completed by the supervisor when evaluating employee’s performance. The present tool consists of 12 performance areas, space for supervisors to document performance examples, and space for goals to be placed.

2. **The process**—this refers to the set of procedures that are used to evaluate performance and complete the tool. Elements of the process include deadlines for completion, guidelines for observing performance, guidelines for setting goals, and suggestions for conducting the PA meetings.

3. **The system**—this refers to how the tool and the process interact with each other.

4. **Daily interactions**—this refers to the relationship between the supervisor and employee during daily interactions not directly related to the PA. This area was deemed to be important because it was possible that the new PA system could have changed how supervisors and employees interacted on a regular basis. For example, relationships could have become more formal and adversarial due to the new system. Alternatively, they could have improved due to the new system removing some of the ambiguity about performance evaluation.

For each of these four research areas, there were two main research goals. The first goal was to accurately measure the perceptions and evaluations relevant to each of the four
components. This would allow for a determination of the strengths and weaknesses of the PA system and its components. The second goal was to identify differences in perceptions and evaluations of the PA system and its components among relevant constituent groups.

There were four constituent groups that were identified. Administrative staff employees were the group of employees who were evaluated with the new PA system but who did not supervise other administrative staff employees. Administrative staff employees supervisors were the group of administrative staff employees who also evaluated other administrative staff employees. Faculty supervisors were one group of faculty who supervised administrative staff; this group of faculty were in non-administrative faculty positions that required substantial teaching and research components. Finally, faculty administrators also supervised administrative staff; unlike faculty supervisors, members of this group (e.g., deans, department chairs, and VPs) primarily had administrative responsibilities. As will be noted later, because of small group sizes and low participation rates for faculty, faculty administrators and faculty supervisors had to be combined into a single faculty group.
DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODOLOGY

The IPRA research team used two complementary research methodologies, focus groups and surveys, to collect data germane to the objectives stated in the previous section. These two methodologies have their own strengths and limitations which complement each other. Focus groups are primarily a qualitative research strategy which results in rich but unfocused data. Surveys, on the other hand, are primarily a quantitative research strategy which results in focused data. Focus groups are a good first step in a research enterprise because they often result in data that can help generate hypotheses. Surveys, because of their quantitative nature, may be better suited for testing hypotheses.

Focus Group Research

Focus groups use a series of pre-arranged questions to generate discussion among participants. The strength of the focus group methodology is that it is an excellent way to allow participants to express themselves in an unhindered way. The data that are generated by the focus groups are often open-ended and rich in detail. We decided to use this methodology as an initial method for two reasons. First, by using focus groups, we would allow participants to communicate to us whether there were additional issues and concerns about the PA system that had not been anticipated by the IPRA and client teams. Second, focus groups would provide rich, anecdotal data that could help interpret the more quantitative survey results.

Development of focus group questions. Focus group questions were written by the IPRA team and edited by the client group for relevance and clarity. Suggestions for possible items came from examination of training materials used in the initial training sessions, input from the client group, and examination of the research literature on performance appraisals. Questions were written to generate discussion among focus group participants in the four previously mentioned research areas (i.e., the tool, process, system, and daily interactions). Additional questions relating to merit and the process supervisors use to collect performance-related information were also written. Questions were written to be unbiased or non-leading so that participants would feel free to provide negative or positive comments about the PA system and its components.

The questions were developed to be parallel in structure and content for both employee and supervisor groups. Therefore, the question asked to employees “Does your supervisor have enough information about your performance to adequately evaluate you?” was modified to “Do you have enough information about your employees’ performance to adequately evaluate them?” for the supervisors. Sessions for employee-supervisor participants used an amalgam of the employee and supervisor questions which gave participants an opportunity to answer the questions from both perspectives. The questions used in the focus group research are in the Focus Group Handbook which is located in Appendix A.

Once the client group and IPRA team agreed on an initial set of focus group questions, a randomly-sampled pilot focus group of administrative staff employees was conducted to
evaluate the appropriateness of the questions and the focus group procedure. After this pilot focus group was over, the primary investigator listened to an audio tape of the session and was satisfied with the quantity and quality of discussion that the questions generated. In addition, informal feedback was solicited from the pilot participants who judged the focus group session to be appropriate. Finally, an unsolicited e-mail was sent from one of the participants to the PI commenting on the professionalism and quality of the focus group. Based on these data, the content and structure of the focus group questions was deemed to be appropriate.

Session format. The development of the focus group procedure was guided by consideration of several handbooks on focus group research (e.g., Krueger, 1994; Krueger, 1998b; Morgan, 1998). We decided to use a moderator-led format in which a moderator would be responsible for leading the focus groups through the list of prepared questions. The moderator would be allowed to ask participants to clarify responses to questions, ask follow-up questions, and call on participants who were reluctant to share their opinions. The moderator would also make sure that sessions did not exceed their time limit. In most sessions, participants would discuss material related to a forthcoming question and so the moderator would have to use his or her judgment on whether that forthcoming question had been sufficiently answered to be skipped.

We decided to aim for focus groups with eight participants. Research suggests that focus groups larger than eight are too big. We also decided to have a second member of the IPRA research team present in the sessions as a note taker and assistant to the moderator. In addition to the note taker, we decided to use an audio tape recorder to keep an audio record of each session. The tapes of the session were transcribed by Mary Henning of Continuing Education. To maintain anonymity, participants were assigned a number ranging from 1 to 8 and were requested to use numbers (instead of their names) when talking between themselves. Sessions were scheduled for 2 hour blocks with a 10-minute break sometime near the first hour mark. Most sessions were conducted in a room and 30 minutes. Refreshments (e.g., juices, soda, cookies, fruit bars, and chips) were provided to focus group participants. All focus groups were conducted in the first-floor conference room in Conklin Hall. The protocol used to conduct the focus groups can be found in the Focus Group Handbook which is located in Appendix A.

Because of the judgment involved in moderating a successful focus group, several steps were taken to ensure that moderators (who were IPRA team members and students in the doctoral program of BGSU's psychology department) were well-trained. First, all potential moderators read several articles and book chapters on how to run a successful focus group (e.g., Krueger, 1998c). Second, moderators watched a video tape of Professor Jeffrey Stanton of the Psychology Department conduct a focus group that he had conducted as part of his own research. Finally, role-playing focus group sessions were conducted with "worst-case scenario" participants. In this role-playing session, mock participants were given abrasive or timid roles (e.g., someone who has a bad temper) to act out. Moderators led these mock participants through the sessions using the protocol previously established. After the role-playing was over, moderator and participants discussed the nature of interactions and proper moderator responses to these episodes.
Sampling of participants. We conducted 7 employee focus groups, 4 employee-supervisor groups, 2 faculty administrator groups, and 2 faculty supervisor interviews. We randomly sampled more participants than needed because it was expected that some sampled participants would not be able to participate or would refuse to do so. Participants were sent a letter notifying them that they had been sampled, outlining the nature of the research, and notifying them that a IPRA member would be calling them to schedule a focus group session. All faculty administrators and supervisors were eventually contacted and asked to participate because of low participation rates in these groups. Focus groups were conducted from April 12 to May 24.

Survey Research

We decided to use a survey in conjunction with the focus groups because of the survey’s capability of providing easily quantifiable data. Survey results would be used to more precisely answer the client groups’ questions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the system and its components as well as identify differences between participant groups. An additional benefit of the survey was that it would allow a cost-effective method of allowing all members of the relevant constituency groups the chance to participate. This feature was deemed to be important because we wanted all administrative staff members and their supervisors the chance to participate. Limitations of the survey methodology (e.g., difficulty in getting rich, anecdotal data) were overcome by the strengths of the previously-mentioned focus group research.

Development of items. Survey items were written to address the questions that were asked in the focus groups. A format was chosen in which a statement (e.g., I believe my supervisor takes the process seriously) was presented and then participants were asked to circle a number from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strong agree) that corresponded to their attitude toward the item statement. This format was chosen because it is standard in organizational survey research and allows respondents to answer items relatively quickly. Focus group transcripts were also analyzed to make sure that the survey items would cover relevant themes and topics important for evaluating the system and its components. Finally, existing measurement instruments in the literature (Dipboye & de Pontbriand, 1981; Williams & Levy, 1992) were analyzed to see if there were any relevant items that had been asked in previous research on performance appraisal systems.

Three formats were constructed, an employee version, a faculty version, and a version that combined those two versions for administrative staff employees-supervisors. Items were written to be parallel across the supervisor and employee versions. For example, the item on the employee version “The tool accurately assesses my performance” was modified to “The tool accurately assesses my employees’ performance.” The employee-supervisors were asked to complete these items under both the employee and supervisor perspectives.

After collecting items through these methods, the client group edited them for further clarity and relevance. Next, a draft version of the survey was sent to two employees, two
employee-supervisors, and two faculty supervisors. They were instructed to complete the survey and then provide comment and feedback. Based on their comments, some minor changes were made to the survey format. Copies of the surveys are located in Appendices B-D.

**Sampling and Administration.** Mailing labels for all faculty administrators (n = 41) and supervisors (n = 21) and administrative staff employees (n = 418 employees; n = 106 employee-supervisors) were generated by the HR department. Surveys were sent out on July 2nd. It was requested that the surveys be completed and sent back to IPRA by July 27. Reminder cards were sent out two weeks after the survey was initially sent out. The reminder cards urged members to complete their survey if they had not done so; instructions were given on how to request additional surveys if recipients had lost their original. Copies of the survey were placed on the web so that they could download a replacement copy.
RESULTS

In this section, we will discuss participation rates for the focus group phase and describe how coding of focus group transcripts was done. Next, response rates for the survey phase are discussed as well as survey sample characteristics. Finally, results for the evaluation of the system and its components will be discussed. In this last section, results from both the focus group and survey phases will be integrated together, when possible.

Focus group participation and coding

Table 1 presents summaries of the participants of the number of focus groups conducted by the IPRA staff. Of the 204 people requested by IPRA to participate, 51 participated in the focus group research. Participation rates were highest for the employee-supervisors (42.8%), next for faculty administrators (19.5%), next for employees (16.3%), and lowest for the faculty supervisors (9.5%). The most common reason for declining to participate was that the potential participant was too busy at the time research was conducted. Around 85% of the participants who agreed to participate showed up to the focus group sessions. Because of low participation rates, focus groups were smaller than anticipated.

Transcripts of the focus group sessions were analyzed by IPRA team members for mention of consistent themes. Before coding, lists of possible answers to the focus group questions were developed. When coding, if a particular statement could not be placed into an existing category, a new category was developed. Responses to all questions within the different components are grouped together because participants often discussed information related to particular focus group questions during the discussion related to other questions.

Table 2 presents the frequency of reoccurring response themes by respondent category. Total frequency is presented in the table as well as the percentage of focus groups in which that comment arose. Because it is impossible to determine from transcripts the participants' identifications, it is possible that multiple comments from a session were made by the same participant. Illustrative comments are presented for each response theme so that the reader can get a better sense of the response themes. Because there were only two faculty supervisor participants, their responses have been collapsed into the faculty administrator category.

Finally, at the end of the tool, process, and system discussions in the focus groups, participants were asked to rate on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied) their satisfaction with each of the areas. This was done via a "secret ballot" and was done to get a more quantitative "read" on overall satisfaction with these areas. These mean ratings can be found in Table 1.

Survey Response Rates

The following number of usable surveys were completed: 117 employees (28.0% response rate), 49 employee-supervisors (46.2%), and 15 faculty (24.2%). As with the focus
group research, we had to collapse the two faculty groups into an overall faculty group because of the small number of faculty responses.

Table 3 describes the demographic characteristics of the respondents broken down by respondent category. As can be seen in the table, the sample was fairly evenly split between men and women, although employees were more likely to be female, whereas employee-supervisors and faculty were more likely to be male. The average participant was in the 40-49 years old category and had been employed at BGSU between 5 to 9 years; employee-supervisors and faculty tended to be older than employees and also employed longer at BGSU. The vast majority of respondents (91.7%) reported having used the current PA system and 70.7% reported that they currently used the system.

Participants were asked to check reasons that they did not use the current performance appraisal system. The most popular reason given for why the current system was not used was that their department already has a good performance appraisal system (40.3% of the non-users). The second most popular reason for not using the current system was that it took too much time (14.9%).

Research Question Results

Results will be broken down by tool, process, daily interactions, system, evaluation methods, and merit. In each section, relevant data from both the focus group and survey results will be presented. Within each section, strengths and problem areas will be identified and potential differences between supervisors and employees will be discussed.

The tool. In general, all participants were least satisfied with the tool compared to other components of the PA system. The mean for the survey item “Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool” was lower than similar items for the process, system, and evaluation method. Slightly over half (53.8%) of all survey participants indicated that they were either “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with the tool. In contrast, only 23.9% of the respondents reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the tool. These results are consistent with the focus group “secret ballot” evaluations of the tool which were lower than ratings of the process and system.

Specific criticisms of the tool included that the categories were too vague, not relevant for the job, the length was too long, the tool does not eliminate subjectivity, and that the tool does not result in accurate evaluations. Survey items related to these issues had mean scores that were in the dissatisfied direction (e.g., above the midpoint of 3 if the item was negatively worded and below the midpoint if the item was positively worded). In addition, comments during the focus group sessions further suggested dissatisfaction in those areas. For example, comments criticizing the relevancy of the performance categories to particular jobs were made in 100% of the employee focus groups, 75% of the supervisor groups, and 75% of the faculty groups.
On the survey, the only items that were answered in positive directions were “I have a good understanding of the tool” and “the appraisal is based on what is included in my job description.” However, comments during the focus groups suggest that many employees and employee-supervisors feel that the tool is not based on their job description. Nearly half of the focus groups had at least one comment that suggested participants believed the performance areas on the tool did not relate to their (or their employees’) job descriptions.

With the survey items, there were few significant mean differences in item responses across respondent category. The item “the tool accurately assesses my performance” had a lower mean score (m = 2.61) for employees compared to the mean for the parallel item for faculty (m = 3.13). In addition, items related to tool evaluation were summed to form a tool satisfaction scale. There were no significant mean differences in these overall evaluations of the tool by respondent category. Therefore, the survey results suggest little differences in perceptions of the tool across categories.

For the focus groups, there was a fair amount of consistency across respondent categories in terms of perceptions that performance areas were not relevant and that the tool was too long. Employees (71% of the groups) and employee-supervisors (75% of the groups) were more likely to suggest that the tool needs to be more quantitative and that ratings based on the tool are not accurate compared to faculty (25% of the groups).

The process. Participants were mixed in overall evaluations of the process. 41.3% of the participants chose “strongly disagree” and “disagree” ratings to the item “Overall, I am satisfied with the process,” whereas 38.0% chose “agree” and “strongly agree” responses. These ratings are consistent with the “secret ballot” responses in the focus groups which suggested that employees and supervisors evaluations were all near the midpoint.

In general, participants were satisfied with many of the aspects of the process. Participants tended to disagree that “having to meet with their supervisor [employees] about their [my] performance is stressful.” They tended to agree that “the timing of the process was reasonable,” and that they “have a good understanding of the process.” During the focus group sessions, however, six focus groups (40% of the total) had comments indicating dissatisfaction with the timing of the process.

On average participants were satisfied with the goal-setting aspect of the process. Items related to goal-setting had means in the satisfied direction (i.e., greater than the midpoint). Thus, survey participants decided that goals on average were decided upon by both employees and supervisors, goals were attainable, they were well-defined, they were challenging to achieve, and were followed through. All of these are characteristics of effective goal-setting procedures (Locke & Latham, 1990). Also, on average the goal setting process was judged to help highlight areas for improvement. A negative aspect related to goal-setting did surface with some regularity in the focus groups. 60% of the focus groups had at least one comment that spurious goals were often set just to have a goal in each performance category. Also, 57% of the employee groups had at least one comment that supervisors often impose goals on
employees. This comment did not surface in any of the employee-supervisor or faculty groups.

On the negative side, survey respondents tended to agree that the process took too much time. They were mixed on whether the process that their department used followed the prescribed process. They were also mixed regarding whether the process "allows for consistency across different areas of the university" and whether the process "fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors."

Again, there were few differences across the respondent categories in terms of survey evaluations of the process. The one exception was that employee-supervisors were more likely to agree that the goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement compared to employees. There was no significant difference between employees and faculty or employee-supervisors and faculty on this item. Also, employee-supervisors were more likely to agree that "my employees and I decide together on appropriate goals" compared to the parallel item asked of them "my supervisors and I decide together on appropriate goals." These differences in responses according to perspective were also significant for items relating to the attainability of goals and the degree to which goals are well-defined. In essence, employee-supervisors believe they are more capable supervisors than the people who supervise them.

There were a few differences that emerged in the focus groups. Faculty and employee-supervisor groups were more likely to have comments that indicated that there was a close match between the process that their department used and the prescribed process, whereas employees were more likely to comment that there were large differences. Also, in 57% of the employee focus groups, comments arose that suggested supervisors impose goals during the performance appraisal. None of the employee-supervisor or faculty supervisor groups indicated this. Finally, 50% of the employee-supervisor groups and 67% of the faculty groups indicated that the process was fair whereas none of the employee groups specifically indicated this.

The system. Overall, respondents were mildly dissatisfied with the system. The mean for the item "Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system was below the scale midpoint for all three respondent categories. 43.6% of the survey participant responded "strongly disagree" or "disagree" with this item, whereas only 29.5% responded "agree" or "strongly agree." The means of the "secret ballot" vote in the focus groups was below the midpoint for employees (2.22) and at the midpoint for employee-supervisors (2.99); the mean of this vote was above the midpoint for faculty supervisors (3.50) and administrators (3.25). In general, satisfaction with the system as a whole was less than for the process by itself and more than the tool.

Survey participants tended to agree that they understood "how the performance appraisal is supposed to work" and that they "have a good understanding of the purpose of the performance appraisal system."
Survey participants were mixed on whether the system is fair, whether it is a good way of assessing performance, whether the system helps employees recognize their strengths and weaknesses, and whether the system is used to determine merit. The means for these items were close to the midpoint of the scale.

Survey participants were also mixed on whether training on the system would be beneficial. The mean for the item “I would benefit from additional training” was below the midpoint for all respondent categories, suggesting that people tended to think they did not need additional training. Alternatively, the item “An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the system” had means above the midpoint for all respondent categories. These conflicting results suggest that participants believe that they do not need training though others do. In the focus groups, 71% of the employee focus groups and 100% of the employee-supervisor groups had at least one comment suggesting that additional training would be beneficial.

Finally, survey participants were critical about whether the system was used consistently across areas of the university. This item had the lowest mean of survey items for employees (m = 1.86). This is interesting because 64% of the focus groups had at least one comment that suggested that the system helped increase consistency across the university. 27% of the focus groups had comments that suggested the present system was not used consistently.

There was one difference on the system section of the survey. Employee-supervisors were more likely to agree that using the system “helps employees recognize strengths and weaknesses” compared to employees and faculty. In addition, on that item, employee-supervisors thought the system was better at recognizing their employees’ strengths and weaknesses compared to recognizing their own strengths and weaknesses.

In the focus groups, 57% of the focus groups had comments that suggested that supervisors need to be held accountable for not doing performance appraisals or not taking the system seriously. None of the employee-supervisor or faculty groups suggested this. Also, 43% of the employee focus groups had comments that suggested that Human Resources needed to be more consistent in their application of deadlines and procedures. None of the employee-supervisor or faculty groups had comments related to this. Finally, 43% of the employee focus groups had comments that suggested that the system was a good “first step.” This comment did not emerge in the employee-supervisor or faculty groups.

Daily interactions. In general, people tended to be satisfied with interactions between supervisors and employees and believed that the implementation of the system did not influence the quality or quantity of daily interactions. Means on survey items were in the favorable direction for items relating to whether respondents felt “comfortable meeting with my supervisor [employees] to discuss my [their] performance appraisal,” that this meeting is “productive,” that their supervisor lets them “know when they do well,” that the supervisor or employee takes the “process seriously,” that the supervisor or employee “listens to me when discussing performance,” that “performance issues are discussed as they arise,” that the
supervisor lets the employee know "when they have not performed satisfactorily," and that there is agreement between employees and supervisors on "the standards to be used in the performance appraisal."

Focus group results suggest that, although there tends to be satisfaction with the relationship between supervisors and employees, this satisfaction is not universal. 53% of the focus groups had at least one comment that suggested performance appraisal meetings were not anxiety-provoking but 53% of the focus groups also had at least one comment that suggested that these meetings can be uncomfortable.

Survey results suggested that participants tended to agree that implementation of the system had not increased the frequency and quality of performance-related conversations between supervisors and employees. This was confirmed by the focus group comments in which more comments were made suggesting a lack of change in frequency or quality of conversations compared to comments that suggested an increase or decrease.

In terms of differences between supervisors and employees, two survey items showed significant differences. Employee-supervisors were more likely to agree that the new system has increased the quality of work-related conversations compared to employees. Also, employee-supervisors were more likely to believe that they take the process seriously compared to employees. With the focus group results, 43% of the employee focus groups had at least one comment that suggested that supervisors do not listen during appraisal meetings. None of the employee-supervisor or faculty focus groups indicated this. Also, 57% of the employee groups had at least one comment that suggested that supervisors were not committed to the system. Comments that suggested a lack of supervisor commitment surfaced during only one employee-supervisor focus group and one faculty group.

Evaluation. Survey item data suggest that participants were generally satisfied with the way that supervisors collect performance related information. Item means were in the satisfied direction on whether employees knew and understood the standards their supervisor expects, that supervisors have "enough information to evaluate performance," that this "information is accurate," and that they were satisfied with the way performance information was collected.

Survey results suggest that supervisors use direct observation most often to collect performance related information; the next popular method is having discussions with the employee and the least often used of the three is soliciting information from coworkers.

Focus group comments suggested that there may be differences in perceptions of the adequacy of performance information between supervisors and employees (though there were no significant mean differences with the survey items). 57% of the employee focus groups had at least one comment that suggested supervisors do not have enough information to evaluate performance whereas one (25%) employee-supervisor focus group and two (50%) of the faculty supervisor focus groups also suggested this. Half of the faculty and employee-
supervisor groups had at least one comment suggesting that the supervisor had enough information; 43% of the employee focus groups had at least one comment indicating this.

Two survey items had significant differences across respondent categories. Employee-supervisors believe that the performance information they collect is more accurate than employees believe. Also, employee-supervisors are more likely to claim that they collect information through direct observation than employees.

Merit. One survey item related to merit. Both employees and supervisors had responses near the mean for the item that asked whether the system was used to determine merit. The majority of focus groups indicated that participants did not know what the link was between the PA system and merit. In five focus groups, comments were made that participants worried that this link would create a divisive environment. In two focus groups, comments were made that this link would make it difficult for the PA system to be developmental. Three of the employee groups mentioned this link would be unfair; none of the supervisor groups mentioned this. Three of the focus groups (one from each respondent category) suggested that there was not enough money in the merit pool for this to make a difference.
IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results from the focus groups and survey, IPRA has developed the following recommendations for improving the PA system for administrative staff employees.

Length of the Tool

The length of the tool was criticized by a large number of participants. Also, the survey item related to length of tool indicated very low satisfaction. In addition, many performance areas were deemed to be of low relevance. It is recommended that through communication and training efforts, that HR help supervisors recognize that not all performance categories are relevant for all employees. As an example of this confusion, one employee stated in a focus group session that “the first time I had to fill this out I was told to put something in every category.” In addition, employee focus group participants commented that they felt the need to propose goals in each performance area even if the goals in some areas were trivial. These misconceptions contribute to the perceptions that the tool is not relevant to particular jobs and that it takes too long to complete.

Supervisors and employees should meet at the beginning of the evaluation period to agree on the relevant performance dimensions. There clearly are several of the 12 dimensions that are relevant to all jobs in the university. For example, areas 1 through 3 should be critical aspects of all administrative staff positions. Therefore, HR should consider making this core set of areas required and then leave the others to be considered optional.

In addition, supervisors should be given the flexibility to include additional performance areas that might not fit well into the existing performance areas. We recommend having two blank areas (#13 and #14) placed into the PA tool document to encourage supervisors to add performance areas.

Supervisor Accountability

A concern of employees was that supervisors need to be held accountable for their behavior. There was concern that if merit is linked to supervisors’ evaluations, some employees could get penalized for having supervisors who do not take the process seriously. If the PA system is used for determining merit, we predict that supervisor accountability will become even more of an issue than it is presently. HR should develop strict guidelines for when forms are due and develop enforcement mechanisms for supervisors who do not take the process seriously.

One way to achieve this would be to have employees evaluate their supervisors’ performance as part of the PA system. Presently, the PA system is all downward focused. Supervisors evaluate employees’ performances. If done properly, the PA system will include some aspects of employee self-evaluation. However, HR should consider incorporating upward and lateral feedback and evaluations. These types of systems, often called 360°
performance appraisal systems, have been used with some success in industry; these systems include evaluations from supervisors, subordinates, and co-workers (Tornow, 1993). Collecting these types of evaluations would enhance perceptions of fairness, make supervisors more accountable, and enhance the developmental aspects of the PA system.

Consistency

One of the strengths of the system and its components is that it encourages consistency in evaluations across the campus. This was judged to be especially important with reliance of the allocation of merit to the PA system. However, many focus group participants complained that use of the system was not being enforced. Use of the system was not uniform across the campus. Also, some participants complained the deadlines for completion were being changed by HR. One participant said “You have to have an across the board common... calendar... If you don’t want it [the evaluation] for another three months, don’t ask for it then.” Another participant suggested “across the university, make it mandatory, and have time frames of when it is due.”

IPRA believes that many of these initial inconsistencies were due to the “growing pains” involved in implementing such a large-scale performance appraisal system. Also, some initial resistance is to be expected with any change of organizational policy. Conducting this independent evaluation is a good first-step for healing some of the initial frustration of employees and their supervisors. Making available results from this evaluation and proposed responses to themes presented in this data should help build support for the PA system.

It needs to be acknowledged, however, that there will never be a “one-size-fits-all” tool and PA system for a group of employees doing such diverse jobs as the administrative staff. Therefore, consistency in the tool and system needs to be at a general level. The process can be standardized and it appears there has been some success in this area. Although, employees and supervisors are mixed when asked directly about their overall satisfaction with the process, when asked specific questions about the nature of goal setting, how their supervisors collect performance information, and the nature of the performance appraisal they tend to express general satisfaction. The standardization of the process will only get better as use-in— the system continues.

Complete standardization of the tool is an impractical goal. As mentioned early in this section, finding a complete set of performance areas that is relevant to all administrative staff jobs is impossible. Therefore, the tool should be made more flexible. Guidelines for using the tool can be standardized but the tool itself should maintain some flexibility.

Merit

With regard to merit, there was a lot of confusion about the nature of the link between the PA and any merit pay increases. Concern was expressed that this link would create a divisive environment. This concern may have some validity because compensation research
suggested that strictly merit-based pay systems tend to create problems with relations between employees (Gerhart & Milkovich, 1992).

This concern should not, however, be directed at the PA system. If the Board of Trustees has decided to move to a 100% merit-based pay system, it should be paramount that a standardized performance appraisal system be used to determine who is meritorious. This current PA system is a good first step at achieving this level of standardization.

Additional concern was made that there was no quantitative output from this PA tool. Employees and supervisors are confused how merit decisions will be made based on the qualitative output generated on this form. Also, a few focus group participants expressed a concern that if the system was used to determine merit, they would be more likely to set goals that were less challenging. These issues need to be resolved and communicated to administrative staff and their employees.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we think this PA system is a good first step toward achieving a more consistent, university-wide method of evaluating administrative staff employees. However, there is a lot of fine-tuning that is needed with the system. The issues presented in the recommendations section are the ones that we feel deserve immediate attention.
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Footnotes

1 The only potential members excluded from participation in this phase of research were President Sidney Ribeau, Provost Chuck Middleton, Rebecca Ferguson (director of the HR department), Bill Balzer (chair of the Psychology Department who had provided some advice and assistance with development of the system and also the evaluation), and the three members of the client group. This exclusion was done because of IPRA's concern that focus group participants would be less candid if these any of these members were in a focus group. All of these excluded members were sent surveys during the survey phase of research.

2 A cautionary note needs to be made here for these tests of mean differences (ANOVA). There were only 15 faculty supervisors which reduced the capability (i.e., statistical power) to identify significant differences if they exist. Tests for differences were also done combining employee-supervisors and faculty into one "supervisor" category. These tests of differences were consistent with the analyses which separated employee-supervisors from faculty.

3 Comparisons between respondent categories for focus group themes were not conducted with significance tests. The number of groups was too small to reach statistical significance. Also, average group sizes differed across respondent categories (e.g., faculty groups tended to be smaller). Therefore, these focus group comparisons should be viewed as exploratory.

4 There was a discrepancy between the survey results and the focus group results for this topic. One explanation for this is that during the focus group discussion with other participants, it may have become apparent that different participants believed that the system served different purposes. This discussion may have made it salient that they really did not know what the purpose was.
## Table 1

Focus Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Class</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Show-up rate</th>
<th>Mean Tool</th>
<th>Mean Process</th>
<th>Mean System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Administrators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Supervisors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Staff Employees (non-supervisors)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Staff Employees (who supervise)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Evaluation of the tool, process, and system range from 1 (poor) to 3 (adequate) to 5 (excellent). Show-up rate.
Table 2
Focus Group Results

The Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Emp-Sup</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Illustrative Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Like it</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>“Once everyone understood it, it worked fine.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Dislike it</td>
<td>3 (3/7)</td>
<td>3 (3/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“Nobody liked it in our area.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories make sense</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>“From my position, it [the categories] was very good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many categories</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>6 (2/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>“I think there is too much overlap with each of the categories as well as too many categories.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories are too vague</td>
<td>8 (5/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“I think it [the categories] can be interpreted as a variety of ways.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much overlap with categories</td>
<td>3 (3/7)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>6 (3/4)</td>
<td>“I have a problem with things fitting into several categories.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories are too broad</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“They are broad categories.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate width for categories</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>3 (3/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>“If you make them [the categories] too narrow I’m not sure they would fit an office that has a variety of functions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories are not relevant</td>
<td>10 (7/7)</td>
<td>8 (3/4)</td>
<td>3 (3/4)</td>
<td>“People thought that they had to fit each of the 12 areas: You found yourself trying to put a square peg in a round hole.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool is too long</td>
<td>6 (4/7)</td>
<td>4 (4/4)</td>
<td>5 (3/4)</td>
<td>“A particular supervisor spent close to three weeks going through this [the tool] and marking down and meeting with…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need more room for narrative information</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>“[with the new tool] there went the two or three paragraph narrative that you really sum things up with.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need an electronic version</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“It really makes a difference to have an electronic copy of files and we had to make it ourselves.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers most things in job description</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>“In general I think these do fit areas in job description.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not based on job description</td>
<td>3 (3/7)</td>
<td>8 (3/4)</td>
<td>3 (1/4)</td>
<td>“I could not take my job description and plug it into most of these categories in a clean way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accurate</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>“I think so.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isn’t accurate</td>
<td>7 (5/7)</td>
<td>4 (3/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“It [the evaluation] is all subjective, it is what my supervisor happens to think I do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals are emphasized compared to unit goals</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“The tool doesn’t talk about the relationship of goals to the unit.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to be more quantitative</td>
<td>8 (5/7)</td>
<td>3 (3/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>“It doesn’t really quantiﬁ... There really is no way to rank people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps developmentally</td>
<td>2 (2/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>3 (1/4)</td>
<td>“it is helpful because I could see from year to year if I was making improvement.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need more area</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“There are some other ones [areas] that could be included here.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignores creativity</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“There is not too much about creativity.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Emp-Sup</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close match between prescribed process and</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>5 (3/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department's practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor differences from prescribed process</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major differences from prescribed process</td>
<td>9 (5/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is made more explicit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad timing for the process</td>
<td>6 (4/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process takes too long</td>
<td>2 (1/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages unattainable goals</td>
<td>2 (1/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals aren't taken serious</td>
<td>4 (2/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like goal setting component</td>
<td>4 (2/7)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create spurious goals</td>
<td>5 (1/7)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>3 (3/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are dynamic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>4 (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to clarify acceptable goals</td>
<td>3 (2/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor imposes goals on me</td>
<td>6 (4/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies issues</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like mid-year evaluation</td>
<td>2 (2/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process is fair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (2/4)</td>
<td>3 (2/4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample Comment

- "It is pretty close to what we actually do. We have been good soldiers."
- "We don’t start with [step] #1, we start with #4 each year."
- "My personal experience is that it is pretty much of a sham."
- "[employee] know what is going to happen during the year... they feel more comfortable."
- "Not everyone is on the same time line so we shouldn’t be made to turn it in at the same time."
- "It is also a time-consuming process."
- "People don’t reach a realistic goal."
- "Sometimes we go through the motion when setting goals."
- "People come up with great ideas."
- "For some of these [areas] it [the goals] seems a bit artificial."
- "We set goals at a particular point in time and then there are new initiatives at the University."
- "One of the things I think might improve this is some further illumination on what constitutes an appropriate goal."
- "I think it is greatly that only the supervisor decides the goals."
- "created dialogue to see if people are on the same page."
- "I like knowing [at the mid-evaluation] that if I am not meeting expectations then I know early enough to be able to improve."
- "I think the process leads to good evaluations."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Emp-Sup</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Added consistency</td>
<td>7 (5/7)</td>
<td>9 (5/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used consistently</td>
<td>3 (5/7)</td>
<td>5 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more training</td>
<td>6 (5/7)</td>
<td>6 (4/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors need to be</td>
<td>6 (4/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose for development</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose for increasing</td>
<td>2 (1/7)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>3 (2/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose for increasing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose for increasing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (2/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose for merit</td>
<td>2 (2/7)</td>
<td>6 (3/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear purpose</td>
<td>4 (4/7)</td>
<td>4 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more commitment</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a good start</td>
<td>3 (3/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more incentives for</td>
<td>2 (1/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completing it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear what HR does with</td>
<td>2 (1/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Comment**

"It did help to formalize it [the appraisal] a little bit... It put some definition and focus to it."

"Make it consistent."

"I know there is mandatory training provided but I think once is not enough and needs to occur on a regular basis for everybody."

"HR... needs to say "you didn't do it" and that there are going to be ramifications for not doing it."

"to help employees grow."

"I think that communication aspect is best."

"employees always thought there was some kind of bias."

"to make sure that university-wide performance evaluations happened."

"It's all designed to help make merit decisions."

"What is the desired outcome? Is it to bring the employee along... is it for a reward system?"

"The date: keep changing."

"It's a good model and could be very effective if the effort were put into it."

"I think that it needs to be implemented in a way that it's an incentive for people."

"I don't know if they're given all this stuff and they just put them into files."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Emp-Sup</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Sample Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in observing performance</td>
<td>3 (2/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;We have people in several different buildings who really don't get observed.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of daily interactions has decreased</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>&quot;Interactions are a little more formal.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of daily interactions has increased</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;It has helped people be more comfortable.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of daily interactions has increased</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>&quot;I think we may have thought of things that are interesting to talk about... that we may not have even focused on previously.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of daily interactions has not increased</td>
<td>6 (5/7)</td>
<td>5 (2/4)</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>&quot;No, not because of this [the system]&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good meetings</td>
<td>8 (5/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>&quot;It has not changed it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety-provoking</td>
<td>3 (3/7)</td>
<td>3 (3/4)</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>&quot;I feel comfortable.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor doesn't listen</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;It is uncomfortable.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees not committed to it</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;I am not listened to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor not committed to it</td>
<td>6 (4/7)</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>&quot;It's something they have to do and they pretty much go through the motions.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor doesn’t have enough information to evaluate</td>
<td>8 (4/7)</td>
<td>2 (1/4)</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>&quot;If there were a commitment to doing it... it wouldn't be two or three months late.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor has enough information</td>
<td>4 (3/7)</td>
<td>3 (2/4)</td>
<td>2 (2/4)</td>
<td>&quot;I'd like [the supervisor] to be better prepared with information&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I feel that my supervisor probably does have the information to evaluate me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Merit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Emp-Sup</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Sample Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult in being developmental if linked to</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;[once it was linked to merit I realized that] I was criticizing that individual and that would affect [their merit]&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit is performance based</td>
<td>1 (1/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;If you don't do your job, you don't get merit.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>5 (3/7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;You could get hanged by it [the evaluation].&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear what the link is</td>
<td>10 (5/7)</td>
<td>5 (3/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>&quot;The criteria hasn't been bad out [for determining merit].&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough money to make a difference</td>
<td>3 (1/7)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>&quot;With the small amount of money in the merit pool, it doesn't make a difference what they do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates divisiveness</td>
<td>2 (2/7)</td>
<td>4 (2/4)</td>
<td>1 (1/4)</td>
<td>&quot;To give this person five cents more, this person gets five cents less.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Description of Survey Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Employee-Supervisors</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at BGSU¹</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age²</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees they supervise</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees they sign-off as 2nd supervisor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have they ever used the PA system?</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they currently use the system?</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Years at BGSU was coded 1 = less than 1 year, 2 = 1 year to 4 years, 3 = 5 to 9 years, 4 = 10 to 19 years, 5 = 20 or more years; Age was coded 1 = less than 25, 2 = 25 to 29, 3 = 30 to 39, 4 = 40 to 49, 5 = 50 to 59, 6 = 60 or over.*
## Table 4
Means for Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool</th>
<th>Emp</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The number of performance areas is appropriate.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The performance areas are too general.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The performance areas make sense to me.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The tool is easy to use.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The length of the tool is appropriate.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. The tool accurately assesses my performance.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. The tool accurately assesses my employees' performance.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. My performance appraisal is based on what is included in my job description.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. My employees' performance appraisals are based on what is included in their job descriptions.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a. Some aspects of my job are not assessed by the tool.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. Some aspects of my employees' jobs are not assessed by the tool.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a. Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my job.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my employees' jobs.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have a good understanding of the tool.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emp</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The prescribed process takes too much time.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>Having to meet with my supervisor about my performance is stressful.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>Having to meet with my employees about their performance is stressful.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a.</td>
<td>My supervisor and I decide together on appropriate goals.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b.</td>
<td>My employee and I decide together on appropriate goals.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a.</td>
<td>I do not follow through on my goals.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b.</td>
<td>My employee does not follow through on their goals.</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a.</td>
<td>Generally my goals are attainable.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b.</td>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are attainable.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a.</td>
<td>Generally my goals are well-defined.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b.</td>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are well-defined.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a.</td>
<td>Generally my goals are challenging to achieve.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b.</td>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are challenging to achieve.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The timing of the process (e.g., scheduled dates for completion) is reasonable.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I have a good understanding of the process.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part III: How Your Performance is Evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Emp</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I know the standards used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I understand the standards of performance my supervisor expects.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My supervisor has enough information to evaluate my performance.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I have enough information to evaluate my employees' performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The information about my performance that my supervisor collects is accurate.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The information about my employees' performance that I collect is accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My supervisor collects information about my performance through direct observation.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance through direct observation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My supervisor collects information about my performance by having discussions with me.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance by having discussions with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My supervisor collects information about my performance by soliciting information from my coworkers.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance by soliciting information from their coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>There are aspects of my job that my supervisor is unable to evaluate.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>There are aspects of my employees' jobs that I am unable to evaluate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the way my supervisor collects information about my performance.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the way I collect information about my employees' performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part IV: Interactions with Your Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emp</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable meeting with my supervisor to discuss my performance appraisal.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable meeting with my employees to discuss their performance appraisal.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The performance appraisal meeting between my supervisor and me is productive.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The performance appraisal meeting between my employees and me is productive.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My supervisor lets me know when I've done well on a project or task.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I let my employees know when they've done well on a project or task.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I would prefer to receive positive feedback from my supervisor in person rather than in writing.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I would prefer to give positive feedback to my employees in person rather than in writing.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Some kind of written format is the best way to receive positive feedback.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Some kind of written format is the best way to give positive feedback.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I believe the new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I believe the new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My supervisor takes the process seriously.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I believe my employees take the process seriously.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I take the process seriously.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My supervisor listens to me when discussing my performance.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My supervisor discusses performance-related issues when they arise during the year.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I discuss performance-related issues when they arise during the year.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, my supervisor lets me know.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I tell him/her.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather hear about it in person than in writing.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather tell him/her about it in writing.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The best way to receive negative feedback is in some kind of written format.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>The best way to give negative feedback is in some kind of written format.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My supervisor and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>My employees and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emp</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The performance appraisal system is fair.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The performance appraisal system is used consistently across areas of the university.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have a good understanding of the purpose of the performance appraisal system.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The performance appraisal system is a good way of assessing performance.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Using the performance appraisal system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. My supervisor uses the performance appraisal system to determine my merit.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. I use the performance appraisal system to determine my employees' merit.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would benefit from additional training in the performance appraisal system.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Focus Group Handbook
Focus Group Guide:

Evaluation of Performance Appraisal System for Administrative Staff Employees

Institute for Psychological Research and Application

Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Phone: 419.372.2693
Fax: 419.372.6013
Quick Guide to Focus Group Research

by Jeff Stanton

You:

• Mentally prepared with the major research questions, all of the subordinate questions of interest, and results of previous interviews,
• Open to new insights and able to follow hot leads,
• Well practiced with the focus group guide: preferably multiple opportunities to practice on hostile respondents,
• Apparently naive from the perspective of the respondents,
• Are able to balance informality with the seriousness of the research itself,
• Have developed active listener skills and non-directive probing skills,
• Provide verbal and non-verbal cues to create an open, receptive, non-judgmental interview environment where expression is encouraged.

Your Resources:

• Focus group guide
• Tape recorder and notepad at the ready
• Quiet, uninterrupted time and space
• Appropriate attire for face-to-face interviews
• Scripted introductory statement that outlines research goals, assures confidentiality, and sets the tone for the interview
• HSRB approval number (H99P207FE7)

Your Respondents:

• Must consent to all procedures (taping, note-taking, etc.)
• Must have a block of free and uninterrupted time to concentrate on the focus group process
• Should feel like a valued participant in the research process
• Should feel like an expert in their own sphere of knowledge and experience
• Should feel comfortable expressing self in non-rational domains (moods, emotions, non-verbal behavior, biases, beliefs, values)
• Must not be forced to "construct" responses. Think carefully before asking "why" questions and before asking respondent to respond for others.
• Should be thanked at the close of the focus group.
Checklist

___ List of participants
___ Copies of tool and process for each participant
___ Beverages: coffee and soda, cups
___ Snacks
___ Blank tapes for recording and tape recorder
___ Two notepads: one for moderator, one for note-taker
___ Proper attire
___ Cards for numbering participants
___ Debriefing sheet
Introduction

Thank you for attending. My name is ______________ and I am a ___ th year graduate student in the industrial-organizational psychology program here at BGSU

(Have the note-taker introduce themselves also).

This project is being conducted by the Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) for the Human Resources division of the university. As you well know, a year ago the current performance appraisal system for administrative staff employees was rolled out. At the time of the roll-out, you were promised that there would be periodical evaluation of the system. This focus group session is designed for that purpose: to systematically gather your opinions and experiences about the performance appraisal system.

We will be conducting around 12 focus group sessions similar to this session so that we can gather a wide variety of opinions. A follow-up survey will be sent to all administrative staff employees and supervisors. Results from both the focus group sessions and the survey will be reported back to Human Resources.

I will be moderating this focus group session and ____ will be taking notes during the session. We have a series of questions that will be used to guide the discussion today.

We will be taping the session for the purposes of having a complete record of what's discussed today. However, I want to assure you that all of the things that you say today will be kept confidential. Also, your name will not be linked to the transcript of this tape. Summaries of these sessions will be reported back to the Human Resources division but there will be no information to identify what you personally said. The IPRA project team, as well as the person doing the transcription, will be the only ones who have access to the tapes. After the tapes have been transcribed, they will be destroyed.

I want to stress to you that your participation in this research is voluntary. You may choose to withdraw from participation at any time during the focus group session. Also, if you do not wish to answer a particular question, you may choose to do so. Do you understand your rights as a research participant?

Are there any questions about the procedure or the nature of this research?

There are several definitions that we need to make clear before we proceed. When we refer to the "tool," we mean the actual form that is used for your performance evaluation. A copy of the form is in front of you for reference if needed.

Show them your copy of the tool.
Introduction (Cont.)

When we refer to “process”, we mean the seven steps that are described on the first page of the form under the heading “General Instructions.”

Show them your copy of the process.

When we refer to “System,” we mean both the “tool” and the “process.”

Make sure everyone understands the difference between the tool, process, and system.

We will be asking questions about the form, the process, and the system throughout this focus group.

Are there any further questions before we begin?

At this point, I am going to turn on the microphone and begin recording.
Closing

*Turn off the microphone!*

Thank you for your participation in this focus group. We realize that two hours is a large commitment from your busy schedules and we appreciate your willingness to give us that time. The results of these focus group sessions will be analyzed by the Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA) and will be fed back to Human Resources, along with results from a follow-up survey. They have promised to make available, via the WWW, results of this research after it has all been completed. If you have any questions about the research, please contact Prof. Michael Zickar of the Psychology Department.

*Give a debriefing sheet to each participant.*

Thanks again!
Focus Group Questions: Employees

1. What do you think of the tool used for performance evaluations?
   Refer them to the tool in front of them. Give them a minute to refamiliarize themselves with it.
   a. Do the categories make sense to you?
   b. What do you like and dislike about the tool?
   c. Does the evaluation tool accurately assess your performance?
   d. Are the criteria used in performance reviews a part of your job description?
   e. Are any aspects of your job not assessed by the system?
   f. How would you rate the evaluation tool on a scale of 1 to 5?
      (Secret ballot: 1 = poor, 3 = adequate, 5 = excellent)

2. What are your feelings about the performance evaluation process?
   Refer them to the process which is the front page of the tool. Give them a minute to look at it.
   a. What is the relationship between the prescribed process and what goes on in your department?
   b. What do you like and dislike about the prescribed process?
   c. What advantages and disadvantages do you see by going through the prescribed process?
   d. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the goal setting component?
   e. How would you rate the prescribed process on a scale of 1 to 5?
      (Secret ballot: 1 = poor, 3 = adequate, 5 = excellent)

3. How is your performance evaluated?
   a. Does your supervisor have enough information about your performance to adequately evaluate it?
   b. How does your supervisor collect information about your performance?
   c. Are there aspects of your job that your supervisor is unable to evaluate?
Focus Group Questions: Employees (Cont.)

4. What are your interactions with your supervisor like during the evaluation process?
   a. What is it like when you meet with your supervisor for your performance evaluation?
   b. Has the number of conversations about your work between you and your supervisor changed as a result of this performance evaluation system? Explain.
   c. Has the quality of those conversations changed? Explain.

Remember to take a 5-minute break roughly after the first hour but at the end of one of the sections.

5. What do you think of the current performance evaluation system overall?
   a. What do you like and dislike about the performance evaluation system overall?
   b. Do you have a good understanding of how the performance evaluation system is supposed to work?
   c. What do you believe the purpose of the system to be?
   d. What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the overall system?
   e. If you could change one thing about the system, what would it be?
   f. How would you rate the overall performance evaluation system on a scale of 1 to 5?
      (Secret ballot: 1 = poor, 3 = adequate, 5 = excellent)

6. Do you know that merit is linked to the performance evaluation system?
   a. What does that link mean to you?
   b. Have you read the new merit policy?

7. Are there any other issues you'd like to discuss?
Focus Group Questions: Supervisors

1. What do you think of the tool used for performance evaluations?

Refer them to the tool in front of them. Give them a minute to familiarize themselves with it.

a. Do the categories make sense to you?
b. What do you like and dislike about the tool?
c. Does the evaluation tool accurately assess your employees' performance?
d. Are the criteria used in performance reviews a part of your employees' job descriptions?
e. Are any aspects of your employees' jobs not assessed by the system?
f. How would you rate the evaluation tool on a scale of 1 to 5?
(Secret ballot: 1 = poor, 3 = adequate, 5 = excellent)

2. What are your feelings about the performance evaluation process?

Refer them to the process which is the front page of the tool. Give them a minute to look at it.

a. What is the relationship between the prescribed process and what goes on in your department?
b. What do you like and dislike about the prescribed process?
c. What advantages and disadvantages do you see by going through the prescribed process?
d. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the goal setting component?
e. How would you rate the prescribed process on a scale of 1 to 5?
(Secret ballot: 1 = poor, 3 = adequate, 5 = excellent)

3. How do you evaluate performance?

a. Do you have enough information about your employees' performance to adequately evaluate it?
b. How do you collect information about your employees' performance?
c. Are there aspects of your employees' jobs that you feel unable to evaluate?

Remember to take a 5-minute break roughly after the first hour but at the end of one of the sections.

4. What are your interactions with your employees like during the evaluation process?

a. What is it like when you meet with your employees to discuss their performance evaluations?
b. Has the number of conversations between you and your employees about their work changed as a result of this performance evaluation system? Explain.
c. Has the quality of those conversations changed? Explain.
Focus Group Questions: Supervisors (Cont.)

5. What do you think of the current performance evaluation system overall?
   a. What do you like and dislike about the system overall?
   b. Do you have a good understanding of how the performance evaluation system is supposed to work?
   c. What do you believe the purpose of the system to be?
   d. What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the overall system?
   e. If you could change one thing about the system, what would it be?
   f. Does the evaluation system accurately assess your employees' performance?
   g. How would you rate the overall performance evaluation system on a scale of 1 to 5?
      (Secret ballot: 1 = poor, 3 = adequate, 5 = excellent)

6. Do you know that merit is linked to the performance evaluation system?
   a. What does that link mean to you?
   b. Have you read the new merit policy?

7. Are there any other issues you'd like to discuss?
Appendix B

The Survey for Employees
Survey Instructions

We will be asking you questions that relate to several of the components of the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the tool, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees' performance. The current form has twelve performance areas with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the following website (http://www.bgsu.edu/~mzickar/pa_tool.html). If you do not have access to the web, please contact 372-9984 and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the process, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned website. Some questions will also relate to interactions with your supervisor and how your supervisor evaluates your performance.

When we refer to the system, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

Gender: ___ Male  ___ Female

Years at BGSU: ___ Less than 1 year  ___ 1 year to less 4 years  ___ 5 years to 9 years  ___ 10 years to 19 years  ___ 20 or more years

Age: ___ Less than 25  ___ 25 to 29  ___ 30 to 39  ___ 40 to 49  ___ 50 to 59  ___ 60 or over

Have you used the University's performance appraisal system for your performance appraisal? ___ Yes  ___ No

Are you currently using this system? ___ Yes  ___ No

If not, why not (check all that apply)?

___ My department already has a good performance appraisal system.
___ My department does not conduct performance appraisals.
___ I do not understand this performance appraisal system.
___ Takes too much time.
___ Not relevant for my department.
___ Other, (please specify below)

Other reasons

___

Does your department use another tool instead? ___ Yes  ___ No

Even if you have not used this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of performance areas is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance areas are too general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance areas make sense to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tool is easy to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The length of the tool is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tool accurately assesses my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My performance appraisal is based on what is included in my job description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some aspects of my job are not assessed by the tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of the tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?**

**Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process takes too much time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having to meet with my supervisor about my performance is stressful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor and I decide together on appropriate goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not follow through on my goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are attainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are well-defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are challenging to achieve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The timing of the process (e.g., scheduled dates for completion) is reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?**
### Part III: How Your Performance is Evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I know the standards used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance.
- I understand the standards of performance my supervisor expects.
- My supervisor has enough information to evaluate my performance.
- The information about my performance that my supervisor collects is accurate.
- My supervisor collects information about my performance through direct observation.
- My supervisor collects information about my performance by having discussions with me.
- My supervisor collects information about my performance by soliciting information from my coworkers.
- There are aspects of my job that my supervisor is unable to evaluate.
- Overall, I am satisfied with the way my supervisor collects information about my performance.

*Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?*

### Part IV: Interactions with Your Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I feel comfortable meeting with my supervisor to discuss my performance appraisal.
- The performance appraisal meeting between my supervisor and me is productive.
- My supervisor lets me know when I've done well on a project or task.
- I would prefer to receive positive feedback from my supervisor in person rather than in writing.
- Some kind of written format is the best way to receive positive feedback.
- The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.
- The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.
- I believe my supervisor takes the process seriously.
- I take the process seriously.
- My supervisor listens to me when discussing my performance.
- My supervisor discusses performance-related issues when they arise during the year.
- When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, my supervisor lets me know.
- When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather hear about it in person than in writing.
- The best way to receive negative feedback is in some kind of written format.
- My supervisor and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.

*Are there additional comments about supervisor interactions that you would like to share?*
Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The performance appraisal system is fair. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The performance appraisal system is used consistently across areas of the university. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I have a good understanding of the purpose of the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The performance appraisal system is a good way of assessing performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
Using the performance appraisal system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
My supervisor uses the performance appraisal system to determine my merit. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I would benefit from additional training in the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about the system that you would like to share?
Appendix C

The Survey for Employee-Supervisors
Survey Instructions

We will be asking questions about several of the components of the performance appraisal system. To eliminate possible confusion, we will define several of the concepts related to the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the tool, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees' performance. The current form has twelve performance areas with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the following web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/~meiskar/pa_tool.html). If you do not have access to the web, please contact 372-9984 and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the process, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site. Some questions will also relate to interactions with your employees and how you evaluate their performance.

When we refer to the system, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

Gender:  ___ Male  ___ Female

Age:  ___ Less than 25  ___ 25 to 29  ___ 30 to 39  ___ 40 to 49  ___ 50 to 59  ___ 60 or over

Years at BGSU:  ___ Less than 1 year  ___ 1 year to 4 years  ___ 5 years to 9 years  ___ 10 years to 19 years  ___ 20 or more years

Job:  ___ Faculty administrator (e.g., chairs, directors, deans, VPs)  ___ Faculty (regular appt.)  ___ Other (please specify): ___________

I supervise ______ administrative staff employees on a regular basis.

I complete performance appraisals for ______ administrative staff employees.

I sign-off on performance appraisals for ______ administrative staff employees as the second-level supervisor.

Have you used the University's performance appraisal system when evaluating administrative staff employees?  ___ Yes  ___ No

Are you currently using this system?  ___ Yes  ___ No

If not, why not (check all that apply)?  ___ My department already has a good performance appraisal system.  ___ My department does not conduct performance appraisals.  ___ I do not understand this performance appraisal system.  ___ Takes too much time.  ___ Not relevant for my department.  ___ Other, (please specify below):

Other reasons

Do you use another tool instead?  ___ Yes  ___ No

Even if you have not used this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool

- The number of performance areas is appropriate.  
- The performance areas are too general.  
- The performance areas make sense to me.  
- The tool is easy to use.  
- The length of the tool is appropriate.  
- The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.  
- The tool accurately assesses my employees' performance.  
- My employees' performance appraisals are based on what is in their job descriptions.  
- Some aspects of my employees' jobs are not assessed by the tool.  
- Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my employees' jobs.  
- I have a good understanding of the tool.  
- Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.  

Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?

Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process

- There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.  
- The prescribed process takes too much time.  
- The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university.  
- Having to meet with my employees about their performance is stressful.  
- The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors.  
- The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement.  
- My employees and I decide together on appropriate goals.  
- My employees do not follow through on their goals.  
- Generally my employees' goals are attainable.  
- Generally my employees' goals are well-defined.  
- Generally my employees' goals are challenging to achieve.  
- The timing of the process (e.g., scheduled deadlines for completion) is reasonable.  
- I have a good understanding of the process.  
- Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.  

Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?
Part III: How You Evaluate Your Employees' Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have enough information to evaluate my employees' performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The information about my employees' performance that I collect is accurate. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I collect information about my employees' performance through direct observation. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I collect information about my employees' performance by having discussions with them. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I collect information about my employees' performance by soliciting information from their coworkers. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
There are aspects of my employees' jobs that I am unable to evaluate. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
Overall, I am satisfied with the way I collect information about my employees' performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?

Part IV: Interactions with Your Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel comfortable meeting with my employees to discuss their performance appraisal. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The performance appraisal meeting between my employee and me is productive. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I let my employees know when they've done well on a project or task. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I would prefer to give positive feedback to my employees in person rather than in writing. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
Some kind of written format is the best way to give positive feedback. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I believe my employees take the process seriously. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I take the process seriously. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
I discuss performance-related issues with my employees when they arise during the year. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I let him/her know. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather tell him/her about it in person than in writing. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
The best way to give negative feedback is in some kind of written format. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
My employees and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about employee interactions that you would like to share?
### Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Statements:

1. I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work.
2. The performance appraisal system is fair.
3. The performance appraisal system is used consistently across areas of the university.
4. I have a good understanding of the purpose(s) of the performance appraisal system.
5. The performance appraisal system is a good way of assessing performance.
6. I use the performance appraisal system to help my employees recognize their strengths and weaknesses.
7. I would benefit from additional training on the performance appraisal system.
8. I use the performance appraisal system to determine my employees' merit.
9. An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system.
10. Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system.

#### Additional Comments:

Are there additional comments about the system that you would like to share?
Appendix D

The Survey for Faculty
Survey Instructions

We will be asking questions about several of the components of the performance appraisal system. To eliminate possible confusion, we will define several of the concepts related to the performance appraisal system. When we refer to the tool, we mean the form that is used to evaluate administrative staff employees' performance. The current form has twelve performance areas with behavioral examples for each dimension. If you need to familiarize yourself with the content of the tool, please visit the following web site (http://www.bgsu.edu/~meiskopu/tool.html). If you do not have access to the web, please contact 372-9984 and we will send you a paper copy.

When we refer to the process, we mean the five prescribed steps to be used when completing the PA appraisal. These steps include ways of collecting performance information and guidelines for completing the tool and setting goals. The prescribed process is also available at the previously mentioned web site. Some questions will also relate to interactions between supervisors and employees as well as how performance is evaluated.

When we refer to the system, we mean the combination of both the tool and the process.

Your Background

Gender: ___ Male ___ Female

Age: ___ Less than 25 ___ 25 to 29 ___ 30 to 39 ___ 40 to 49 ___ 50 to 59 ___ 60 or over

Years at BGSU: ___ Less than 1 year ___ 1 year to 4 years ___ 5 years to 9 years ___ 10 years to 19 years ___ 20 or more years

I supervise ___ administrative staff employees on a regular basis.

I complete performance appraisals for ___ administrative staff employees.

I sign-off on performance appraisals for ___ administrative staff employees as the second-level supervisor.

Have you used the University's performance appraisal system when evaluating administrative staff employees? ___ Yes ___ No

Are you currently using this system? ___ Yes ___ No

If not, why not (check all that apply)? ___ My department already has a good performance appraisal system. ___ My department does not conduct performance appraisals. ___ I do not understand this performance appraisal system. ___ Takes too much time. ___ Not relevant for my department. ___ Other, (please specify below)

Other reasons

Do you use another tool instead? ___ Yes ___ No

Even if you have not used this system before, we would like you to complete the survey using your perceptions of the performance appraisal system.
Because you have are both an administrative staff employee and a supervisor of administrative staff employees, there will be some questions which we will ask you to respond to twice, once using your experiences as a supervisor who has used the system and a second time using your experiences as an employee who has been evaluated using this system. If unspecified, please respond using your general impressions and experiences with the system.

Please rate your agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Please use the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: The Performance Appraisal Tool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of performance areas is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance areas are too general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance areas make sense to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tool is easy to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The length of the tool is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tool eliminates subjectivity in performance appraisals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of the tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part Ia: The Performance Appraisal Tool (from your perspective as a supervisor)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tool accurately assesses my employees' performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees' performance appraisals are based on what is in their job descriptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some aspects of my employees' jobs are not assessed by the tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my employees' jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part Ib: The Performance Appraisal Tool (from your perspective as an employee)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tool accurately assesses my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My performance appraisal is based on what is included in my job description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some aspects of my job are not assessed by the tool.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral examples within performance areas are relevant to my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there additional comments about the tool that you would like to share?
Part II: The Performance Appraisal Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a high degree of similarity between the prescribed process and what goes on in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process takes too much time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process allows for consistency across different areas of the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prescribed process fosters good rapport between employees and supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal-setting component helps to highlight areas for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The timing of the process (e.g., scheduled deadlines for completion) is reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good understanding of the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the appraisal process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IIa: The Performance Appraisal Process (supervisor perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having to meet with my employees about their performance is stressful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees and I decide together on appropriate goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employees do not follow through on their goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are attainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are well-defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my employees' goals are challenging to achieve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IIb: The Performance Appraisal Process (employee perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having to meet with my supervisor about my performance is stressful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor and I decide together on appropriate goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not follow through on my goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are attainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are well-defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally my goals are challenging to achieve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there additional comments about the process that you would like to share?

Part IIIa: How You Evaluate Your Employees' Performance (supervisor perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have enough information to evaluate my employees' performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information about my employees' performance that I collect is accurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance through direct observation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance by having discussions with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collect information about my employees' performance by soliciting information from their coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are aspects of my employees' jobs that I am unable to evaluate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the way I collect information about my employees' performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part IIIb: How Your Performance is Evaluated (employee perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I know the standards used by my supervisor to evaluate my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I understand the standards of performance my supervisor expects. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My supervisor has enough information to evaluate my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The information about my performance that my supervisor collects is accurate. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My supervisor collects information about my performance through direct observation. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My supervisor collects information about my performance by having discussions with me. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My supervisor collects information about my performance by soliciting information from my coworkers. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- There are aspects of my job that my supervisor is unable to evaluate. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Overall, I am satisfied with the way my supervisor collects information about my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 ?

**Are there additional comments about information collection that you would like to share?**

### Part IVa: Interactions with Your Employees (supervisor perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I feel comfortable meeting with my employees to discuss their performance appraisal. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The performance appraisal meeting between my employees and me is productive. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I let my employees know when they've done well on a project or task. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I would prefer to give positive feedback to my employees in person rather than in writing. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Some kind of written format is the best way to give positive feedback. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my employees. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I believe my employees take the process seriously. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I take the process seriously. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I discuss performance-related issues with my employees when they arise during the year. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I let him/her know. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- When an employee has not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather tell him/her about it in person than in writing. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The best way to give negative feedback is in some kind of written form. 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My employees and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal. 1 2 3 4 5 ?


### Part IVb: Interactions with Your Supervisor (employee perspective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I feel comfortable meeting with my supervisor to discuss my performance appraisal.**

**The performance appraisal meeting between my supervisor and me is productive.**

**My supervisor lets me know when I've done well on a project or task.**

**I would prefer to receive positive feedback from my supervisor in person rather than in writing.**

**Some kind of written format is the best way to receive positive feedback.**

**The new performance appraisal system has increased the frequency of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.**

**The new performance appraisal system has increased the quality of work performance-related conversations I have with my supervisor.**

**I believe my supervisor takes the process seriously.**

**I take the process seriously.**

**My supervisor listens to me when discussing my performance.**

**My supervisor discusses performance-related issues when they arise during the year.**

**When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, my supervisor lets me know.**

**When I have not performed satisfactorily on a project or task, I'd rather hear about it in person than in writing.**

**The best way to receive negative feedback is in some kind of written format.**

**My supervisor and I agree on the standards to be used in the performance appraisal.**

**Are there additional comments about supervisor-employee interactions that you would like to share?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V: The Performance Appraisal System (Tool plus Process)**

- I have a good understanding of how the performance appraisal system is supposed to work: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The performance appraisal system is fair: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The performance appraisal system is used consistently across areas of the university: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I have a good understanding of the purpose(s) of the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- The performance appraisal system is a good way of assessing performance: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I would benefit from additional training on the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- An attempt should be made to increase understanding of the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- Overall, I am satisfied with the performance appraisal system: 1 2 3 4 5 ?

**Part Va: The Performance Appraisal System (supervisor perspective)**

- I use the performance appraisal system to help my employees recognize their strengths and weaknesses: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- I use the performance appraisal system to determine my employees' merit: 1 2 3 4 5 ?

**Part Vb: The Performance Appraisal System (employee perspective)**

- Using the performance appraisal system helps me recognize my strengths and weaknesses: 1 2 3 4 5 ?
- My supervisor uses the performance appraisal system to determine my merit: 1 2 3 4 5 ?

Are there additional comments about the performance appraisal system that you would like to share?
TO: All Administrative Staff and Supervisors of Administrative Staff

FROM: Rebecca C. Ferguson, Assistant Provost
       Human Resources

DATE: September 3, 1999

RE: Merit Documents for Administrative Staff

In December of 1998 Deborah Boyce, then Administrative Staff Council Chair, and I sent a memo to all units asking that they please pay particular attention to creating or refreshing their merit criteria documents for administrative staff. We also requested that you send a copy of your latest merit criteria document to our office for review and retention in a file of such documents.

So far we have received seven (7) unit documents of which three (3) are actually unit merit criteria. We know we should have received many more if we are truly to have a merit system in place for all administrative staff on campus.

These merit documents need not be elaborate, but they must establish criteria for awarding merit, first at the 3% level (meets expectations) and for any possible awarding of funds in years when the increase exceeds 3%. These requirements are articulated in the Performance-Based Merit System passed by the Board of Trustees in June of 1997. This document may be found on our web site at http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/ohr/handbook/ under additional administrative handbook information.

Also, the merit document should have a provision for a 3-year rolling average for merit. Further, in years where merit exceeds 5%, 60% of the merit pool shall be used to increase the salary of all administrative staff who meet expectations; and 40% shall be allocated to reward administrative staff whose performance exceeds expectations according to the merit document.

For your review we have enclosed the merit criteria documents from Libraries and Learning Resources (LLR), the College of Technology, and the Center for Environmental Programs (CEP). These are three similar yet different approaches. Your document need not be as detailed as LLRs or CEPs but should be something agreed upon by administrative staff in the unit and executable according to the basic tenets stated above.

We look forward to having all unit merit criteria documents submitted to our office by November 15, 1999 and will be informing the vice-presidents on a periodic basis as to which units have submitted the documents.

We appreciate your attention to this request. If you have any questions please contact my office at 372-2259 or e-mail me at fergusb@bgnet.bgsu.edu.

Enclosures
Please share this info with your constituents...

Mary Beth Zachary, Claudia Clark and myself met with Rebecca Ferguson this morning to start our dialog about what we feel are our priorities for Human Resources for the coming year...

These are what we took to her...I ran these by the Exec Committee but didn't give very much time to respond so I qualified the list with Rebecca in an email prior to the meeting stating we may make some changes based on feedback from our constituents...

After each numbered item is what we took from the meeting...

1) Placement (We will be stating our need to move employees with salary compression and inversion concerns to appropriate places in their ranges...using the argument in the compensation plan - current positions in this predicament are there because of "market" hires since the "Mercer" compensation plan was put in place...which of course supports what we have been saying all along, many people were not placed correctly in their ranges at the Mercer implementation. Again we will state we feel this is a necessary step to prevent the erosion of fairness within a 100% merit environment driving range progression.)

Becca says HP will be putting together a list of employees they feel need a market study done on (persons affected by salary compression, inversion, persons at their cap). This list will go to the VPs for additions to the list. Once they have the list we will get a look at it. I guess at this point we may have an opportunity to ask for adds? The study will take place and hopefully we will be able to fund the necessary changes to place our people correctly ($160,000 set aside for this) and move ahead with 100% merit being our driving force for progression. (Will [fill in this next step] make it clearer? Becca will try to put the plan in writing.)

2) Merit (The BOT have a merit document. We are operationizing part of it this year. The part that is not being operationailized is the "super" merit portion, due to the pay increases being at or below 3%. Three things about merit we must address. One is the generating of unit level discussions setting "super" merit criteria. Two, feeling secure that HP will gate-keep the process and outcome to assure participation and relative conformity. And third, if there is a move by VPs to change the way "regular" merit is distributed (rumor), we want to make sure HP knows we want a say in this discussion and framing for the BOT.)

Becca promised a note to all concerning the need to have unit level discussions to put together merit criteria (which would include merit-3% and "super" merit-above the 3%). This will be seriously pushed by the Procost and Becca at Cabinet meetings, etc. The Library's most recent plan will be available as a template for those looking to not reinvent the wheel. It was implied HP will shepherd this thru to completion...getting criteria from all, forming relative conformity, holding units accountable when they award merit. Does the Library want [fill in this next step]?

3) Performance Evaluation (Follow-thru with survey and outcome...which we believe will be - The Process is good, the Tool is not - where do we go from there??)

The committee (ASC, HP, IPPA) work moving along, supported by HP funding. There will be a survey coming out from the committee. Please take the time to fill it out and send it back. Looking ahead to probably outcome: "Process" good, "Tool" is not... Need to actualize the BOT clear message of merit tied to performance in supporting the Performance Evaluation "Process" and realizing a Performance Evaluation "Tool(s)"

4) Handbook (Where will the update live? We feel the web - HP's page, linked to from our page. Who will update it? We feel HP should but we are certainly prepared to help with this.)

Headed for the web, probably Fall...may have to get by the BOT. It will be at the HP site and we will link to it at our site. Issue update is a collaborative process...one of
our committees (TBD) and HR.

5) Professional Development (Budget from HP...hoping to continue the good work done last year by our Professional Development committee. We would also like to create a database of Professional Development activities done by all Administrative staff to add to HP’s accounting for their end of the year report. We see this as another duty of the Professional Development committee.)

Becca says the money is there and ours to use as we did this past year. Database a good idea and will be a responsibility of the new training position in HP. We will probably start it and hand it over to this person in HR.

Other...
HP has asked for us to give them some feedback on a new employee orientation to the University.
UL Administrative Staff/Faculty Administrators (ASFA) Merit Document

This document fulfills the charge and requirements of the Bowling Green State University Board of Trustees (BOT) and the university administration as represented by Human Resources (HR) that administrative staff develop criteria for determining meritorious performance. This document may include faculty with administrative responsibilities because of University Libraries’ (UL) unique organizational structure.

It is the intention of this document that all personnel covered by the following document are to be treated with equity and their work be valued within the context of the faculty or administrative staff hiring models.

Assumptions

The following assumptions stem in part from the requirements set forth by the BOT and the university administration represented by HR and UL’s attempts to establish an equitable merit criteria within the framework of these requirements.

Definitions: Basic Merit – the first three percent (or less, if the BOT approved annual increase is less than three percent) of any annual increase approved by the BOT.

Super Merit – The portion of a BOT approved increase that is greater than 3%.

1. Merit is a salary increment awarded for the job performance that meets or exceeds UL administrative unit criteria. Performance is judged to be either satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on the supervisor’s evaluation. The evaluation includes a review of the job performance which is based on the employee’s job description and annual goals.

2. When university salary increments are three percent or less, any administrative employee whose performance is deemed satisfactory will be awarded the full basic merit amount.

3. Salary increments of greater than three percent constitute super merit. Under this scenario, 80% of a super merit awarded is based on the performance criteria listed below, and 20% is based on super merit criteria which are listed immediately below the performance criteria.

4. As directed by the BOT, those not eligible for basic merit are not eligible to be considered for super merit.

5. Differences between the faculty and administrative staff hiring models must be acknowledged.

6. For administrators with faculty rank, the following performance criteria are applicable only to the annual evaluation and assignment of merit and do not replace any language within the faculty handbook regarding promotion, tenure, and other issues. The UL administrative merit document cannot be changed by UL faculty.
7. Responsibilities specific to each position will be considered when conducting annual evaluations and assigning merit.

8. The performance criteria and the super merit criteria listed below are not in any rank or priority order.

**Performance Criteria**

These criteria are to be used for assessing whether an employee is meritorious and for assigning basic merit. Additionally, these criteria are to be used where applicable and are listed in no rank order. Note that there is overlap of specific examples among the criteria listed below.

I. Professional knowledge and skills

- Understands, communicates and applies appropriate policies and procedures (position-related)
- Participates in appropriate professional development activities
- Sets, meets or exceeds all appropriate goals and objectives
- Assesses and improves own performance relating to goals and objectives

II. Oral and written communication skills

- Uses appropriate channels for communication
- Maintains open channels of communication with supervisor and supervisees
- Oral: (Communicates clearly relevant, job-related information. Gives effective presentations. Facilitates/contributes effectively in meetings or other activities.)
- Written: (Writes coherent and well-organized documents. Communicates effectively in letters, memos and electronic mail, etc.)

III. Interpersonal/Work Relations

- Demonstrates respect for colleagues' professional expertise, viewpoints, and responsibilities
- Gives and accepts constructive criticism
- Willingly shares expertise
- Collaborates effectively with colleagues
- Maintains professional confidentiality
- Sets a professional example overall

IV. Resource use

- Effectively manages time
- Effective use and/or management of human resources
- Effective use of financial resources
- Effective use of equipment and technology
V. Leadership

- Exercises independent judgment
- Demonstrates vision, initiative, and innovation
- Develops new programs and/or practices or improves upon existing ones
- Demonstrates flexibility in response to change
- Promotes a diverse workplace (sensitivity to ideas, cultures, learning styles, etc.)
- Demonstrates accessibility and approachability
- Effectively manages unit or area of responsibility
- Demonstrates commitment to BGSU's and UL's mission and core values

VI. Internal/external relations and service

- Effectively represents area/unit/department, UL, and Bowling Green State University to external and/or internal constituents
- Advocates for area/unit/department to external and/or internal constituents
- Demonstrates positive service orientation

Super Merit Evaluation Criteria

I. Publications and Presentations

A. Book/Chapter
B. Article
C. Review
D. Published Finding Aid/Index/Bibliography
E. Editing Scholarly Works
F. Presentations Internal/External

II. New/Special Projects

A. Individual Unit
B. UL
C. University

III. Grants and Development

A. University
B. External
C. Review
D. Grant Management/Administration
IV. Outreach Activities/Participation

A. Unit
B. UL
C. University
D. State/Regional
E. National

V. Professional Activities

A. Courses Taken/Degrees Earned
B. Professional Meetings - Attended or Participated
C. Seminars/Workshops - Attended or Participated
D. Professional Organizations - Officer/Program Participant/Local Arrangements
E. Advising Students/Thesis and/or Dissertation Committees
F. Teaching (uncompensated)

VI. Committee Assignments

A. Member - Unit/UL/University/Regional/National/International
B. Chair/Officer

VII. Honors and Awards

A. UL/University/State/National/International
B. Professional

VIII. Other

Procedural Steps and Sequence

The merit recognition process is a function of the fiscal year.

By early May*, administrative staff/faculty administrators (ASFA) will submit to their immediate supervisor 1) a written narrative description of their previous fiscal year’s accomplishments as they relate to UL administrative performance criteria (recommended format provided in this document), 2) three-to-five goals for the coming year, and 3) a narrative description of their previous year’s activities related to super merit criteria.

If the ASFA member does not report directly to the Dean, the immediate supervisor will recommend a merit rating to the Dean according to the process and definitions stated below. The Dean will consider this recommendation when assigning the final merit rating. The immediate supervisor’s recommendation and the ASFA member’s accomplishments, including super merit are due to the Dean on May 15.
If the total merit allocation in a given year is three percent (3%) or less, the Dean will assign full merit assuming that the AFSA has met expectations. If the total merit allocation in a given year is greater than three percent (3%), the Dean will assign merit ratings based on a review of the AFSA's written narrative descriptions related to UL administrative performance criteria and of activities related to super merit criteria.

The Dean will assign merit ratings according to the following scale:

- Consistently performs in a superior manner 4.0
- Performs substantially above expectations 3.0
- Usually performs above expectations 2.0
- Performs according to expectations (in a competent and professional manner) 1.0
- Does not perform at an acceptable, competent, professional level 0.0

In applying the scale of 0 to 4, ratings of .5, 1.5, 2.5, and 3.5 will be used in addition to the whole numbers.

The Dean will inform the ASFA member in writing of her/his merit rating and ranking by June 15.

*date to be determined annually

**Expectations Thresholds**

Based on UL administrative performance criteria and super merit evaluation criteria, ASFA may qualify for merit by meeting or exceeding expectations. The thresholds which define "meeting expectations" and "exceeding expectations" are described below.

**Meets Expectations**

An ASFA who receives a merit rating of 0.5 or greater from the Dean "meets expectations." Should an ASFA receive, in any given year, a merit rating of zero (0) from the Dean, he/she shall not be eligible for merit. Any ASFA who is not eligible for merit, in any given year, will not receive a salary increase.

**Exceeds Expectations**

An ASFA who receives a merit rating of a three (3) or greater "exceeds expectations."

**Calculation of Merit Points**

If the total merit allocation is three percent (3%) or less, the ASFA merit rating is based solely on UL administrative performance criteria. If the total merit allocation is greater than three percent (3%), 80% of the merit rating is based on UL administrative performance criteria and 20% is based on super merit criteria. In the latter scenario, the merit rating could be calculated by using the formula .8x + .2y = merit rating.

For example:
If the merit rating based on UL administrative performance criteria is three (3) and the merit rating for super merit criteria is four (4), the following calculation would apply.

\[ .8(3) + .2(4) = 3.2 \]

If the merit rating based on UL administrative performance criteria is four (4) and the merit rating for super merit criteria is three (3), the following calculation would apply.

\[ .8(4) + .2(3) = 3.8 \]

Merit point scores from the three most recent years - including the current year - will be kept on file in the Dean's Office. A three-year average will be calculated for each ASFA with at least three years of service. Averages for ASFA with fewer than three years of service will be calculated on the basis of the number of years served. ASFA who receive a zero in a given year will have that score included in their average for the appropriate range of time. The ASFA is not eligible for merit in the year in which a zero is given.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>3 yr ASFA</th>
<th>2 yr ASFA</th>
<th>1 yr ASFA</th>
<th>3 yr ASFA w/o merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0 merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.5/3</td>
<td>5/2</td>
<td>3.5/1</td>
<td>4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This three-year average merit point score will be used in ranking and distributing merit funds.

**Distribution of Merit Funds**

If the total merit allocation for ASFA salary increments in a given year is three percent (3\%) or less, all ASFA who qualify for merit by meeting or exceeding expectations will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

If the total merit allocation for ASFA salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3\%) but less than five percent (5\%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

1. Three percent (3\%) of the total salaries of the ASFA shall be allocated as a three percent (3\%) increase to all ASFA who meet expectations and thereby qualify for merit.

2. The remaining difference between the total merit allocation and the three percent (3\%) of the total salaries of ASFA shall be allocated for recognition of those ASFA whose level of performance exceeds expectations as defined in this merit document.

If the total merit allocation in a given year is five percent (5\%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

1. Sixty percent (60\%) shall be allocated to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary for all ASFA who meet expectations and thereby qualify for merit.

2. Forty percent (40\%) shall be allocated for recognition of those ASFA whose level of performance exceeds expectations as defined in this merit document.
Any ASFA who does not qualify for merit in their annual performance review should not receive a salary increase. A professional development fund equal to the uniform percentage raise(s) that would have been allocated to the individual(s) will be established within UL for employee development, with priority given to assisting employees who have failed to qualify for a merit increment.

Although the intent is that all ASFA be included in one merit pool, the University administration may determine otherwise.

Approved 2/26/04
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

BGSU Performance Appraisal

The University has established the following guidelines to assist you with assessing performance, which is a continuous process occurring throughout the year. The purpose of performance appraisal is to help facilitate the growth and development of individuals; and, in so doing, provide for the growth and development of the organization. A performance appraisal process for Administrative Staff should

- clearly define job expectations
- improve communication between employee and supervisor
- align employee goals with the overall goals of the University, college or department
- link performance with rewards such as compensation increases, promotions, recognition, assignments, professional development opportunities and career advances
- be consistent across University departments and areas
- identify employee training and professional development needs
- establish clear-cut intervention strategies when performance does not meet identified job requirements

Mandatory training in the performance appraisal process will be provided by the Office of Human Resources for all Administrative staff and their supervisors (including Faculty who supervise Administrative staff).
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

Mandatory training will be provided by the Office of Human Resources to all administrative staff and supervisors of administrative staff. New hires will also go through a training session as part of their orientation to the University.

GETTING STARTED 1ST YEAR. After conducting the performance appraisal for the current year, supervisor and employee jointly establish goals and objectives for the coming year.

1. The supervisor observes and documents employee’s performance regularly sharing feedback throughout the year.

2. Employee reviews job analysis, making appropriate changes, and completes "PAF" Performance Appraisal Form for the previous year; using goals and objectives for the coming year.

3. Supervisor reviews employee’s job analysis and completes "PAF" performance, plans goals and objectives for the coming year.

4. Supervisor sends employee copies of previous year’s "PAF" and current job analysis to Human Resources. Copies of all documents are given to the employee.

5. Supervisor completes "PAF" and finalizes goals and objectives for the coming year.

AT END OF NEXT YEAR

The Performance Appraisal Process cycle continues with Step #1
**BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY**
**ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Evaluation Period:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form Completed By:</th>
<th>Date Form Completed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

The purpose of this appraisal is to evaluate employee performance.

**Step 1** - **Identify preliminary goals for discussion.** Prior to meeting, employee and supervisor each should identify major goals, initiatives, and accomplishments and be prepared to discuss these.

**Step 2** - **Complete the employee information block at the top of this page.**

**Step 3** - **Record your performance observations as well as performance information.** Comments should be job-related, specific, accurate, and concrete. Consideration should be given to employee's major strengths and areas for improvement.

**Step 4** - **Conduct performance appraisal interview.** Give consideration to changes that may be needed in the employee's job analysis. Remember: goals and objectives define success in the job and must be flexible in response to changes throughout the year, but any changes should be made with the full participation of both employee and supervisor. Keep the goals SMART: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Timely. Clearly state how the goals will be measured. Focus on measurable performance such as "deliver, develop, produce, increase, or improve." Goals must also have a time frame.

**Step 5** - **Provide additional relevant comments, sign, and date completed form.** Consider types of training or additional skills that would be desirable in order to fulfill the duties of this position; internal and external professional activities performed in the community; mentoring of students; BGSU committee work; personal goals, etc.

**Step 6** - **Allow employee an opportunity to provide comments and have employee sign and date form.** Comments here might include how supervisor could better aid employee in effectively performing job duties, what the employee needs in terms of feedback; and timely communication with supervisor, concerns about safety, confidentiality, objectivity, etc.

**Step 7** - **Return original completed form and current job analysis to Human Resources and provide employee with a copy of the completed form.**
### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 1 - Commitment to BGSU Mission, Goals, Policies &amp; Regulations:</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotes and works toward achievement of university-related goals within the framework of university policies and procedures (e.g., maintains regular and reliable attendance, enforces and complies with safety and health policies/procedures; promotes equity and diversity in the workplace).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals for next rating period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 2 - Core Professional/Technical Knowledge &amp; Skills:</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands and applies job-related knowledge and skills, policies and procedures, and technical expertise to fulfill responsibilities of the position (e.g., comprehends and applies concepts, policies and procedures and technical skills; adapts to changes in job, methods, or surroundings; originates or improves work methods).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals for next rating period**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 3 - Professional Development: Maintains and updates professional knowledge and skills necessary for success in current position (e.g., participates in individual/staff training and development activities provided by unit, division, or university; attends off-campus development and educational activities contingent upon support in terms of financial resources and release time by supervisor).</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals for next rating period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 4 - Written &amp; Oral Communication Skills: Communicates effectively with supervisor, coworkers, and others (e.g., shares information, communicates job-related information, prepares written documentation and administrative procedures, facilitates and participates in meetings, prepares and delivers oral presentations).</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals for next rating period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5 - Resource Use &amp; Management: Uses appropriate resources to increase effectiveness of unit/area and DGSU (e.g., monitors financial status of unit/area, schedules employees, prepares and interprets statistics, develops and manages budget).</td>
<td>Observations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for next rating period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 6 - Service &amp; Quality Orientation: Provides effective customer service and sets and monitors quality standards for service delivery by self and unit/area (e.g., delivers quality services in friendly and professional manner, ensures that work products such as completed forms, records, and answers to questions have no errors; modifies old and develops new programs to improve customer service or program quality).</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals for next rating period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area 7 - Interpersonal Relations at Work: Develops and maintains effective working relationships with supervisors, staff coworkers, and others (e.g., deals effectively with interpersonal problems at work, consults with colleagues, demonstrates loyalty, collaborates with colleagues and is able to maintain professional confidentiality).

Goals for next rating period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Area 8 - Internal/External Relations & Service: Presents a positive impression of self and university while participating in university and non-university service activities (e.g., delivers presentations and lectures to the community, networks with off-campus community leaders, participates on university and non-university committees).

Goals for next rating period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Supervisory/Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 9 - Human Resources Development: Hires, trains, instructs and evaluates staff members (e.g., aids in selection of staff members; provides release time and financial support for development; develops and monitors performance expectations for staff members; provides continuous feedback, conducts effective performance reviews).</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals for next rating period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 10 - Program Monitoring, Coordination &amp; Management: Monitors, coordinates, and directs program activities to ensure adherence to policies and procedures given available resources, and to meet short and long-term goals (e.g., ensures quality improvement in programs, reviews customers' progress and attainment of goals, collaborates with appropriate others for program modification and development).</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals for next rating period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 11 - Supervision/Team Building</td>
<td>Observations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides direction and support to individuals and teams to improve their work effectiveness (e.g., assigns tasks and responsibilities to staff/teams; ensures and monitors adequacy of resources necessary for staff/teams to accomplish their jobs; develops an atmosphere of teamwork and cooperation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for next rating period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 12 - Leadership &amp; Vision</th>
<th>Observations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops and implements new programs and policies in area/unit to enhance work effectiveness, customer service, and staff morale and motivation (e.g., proposes or champions new initiatives or directions to improve area/unit and university; generates employee support, enthusiasm, and trust; effectively represents area/unit on campus and in the community).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for next rating period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Appraisal Summary

Supervisor Summary:

Supervisor Signature:

Additional comments by employee:

Employee Signature:

Signature indicates review of evaluation has taken place, not agreement or disagreement with contents.
Second Level Supervisor's Signature:
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Faculty Compensation Task Force (FCTF) was charged by the Provost/VPAA to review the existing 1997 Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University (i.e., Faculty Merit Policy). Several strategies were used by the FCTF to gather information and input: (a) a review of the professional literature on performance-based merit systems, (b) solicitation of input from department chairs and program directors, (c) a survey of all full-time BGSU faculty, and (d) benchmarking data on faculty merit policies from Ohio institutions.

Based on the information reviewed, the FCTF makes the following recommendations:

- An effective performance-based merit system requires that the University commit to significant salary increment pools on a continual, annual basis.

- The existing policy for allocating salary increments for continuing faculty should be revised to include both an across-the-board component and a merit component; specifically:
  (a) Salary increment pools up to but not exceeding 4% should be distributed 50% across-the-board to all continuing faculty; the remaining 50% should be distributed to continuing faculty based on merit according to the internal merit policies of the respective department/unit.
  (c) Salary increment pools greater than 4% should be distributed 20% across-the-board to all continuing faculty; the remaining percentage should be distributed to continuing faculty based on merit according to the internal merit policies of the respective department/unit.

- The present policies of allocating funds for market adjustments, equity adjustments, and promotions should be continued.

- The present policy of using three-year rolling averages for computing the merit allocation of any faculty member should be continued.

- Where appropriate, assistance should be offered to departments/units to support their review and modification of existing internal merit policies.

- Individual faculty members should be able to receive written feedback regarding their performance under the internal merit policies of their respective department/unit.

Other suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the 1997 Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University are also included within this report.
Overview and Charge

The Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University were approved by the Faculty Senate in May 1997 and the BGSU Board of Trustees in June, 1997. A copy of this document is included in Appendix A. Beginning with the 1998 calendar year, full-time faculty performance was evaluated using this new performance-based merit policy. As stated in the original document,

The foregoing principles and policies/procedures of the performance-based merit system for faculty at Bowling Green State University shall be reviewed in the fall of 1999 and revised as appropriate. Thereafter, they shall be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and the appropriate Senate committees every three years.

Transitions in the leadership in the Office of the Provost delayed the initiation of this required review. In February, 2001, Provost John Follins, with input from the Faculty Senate, appointed the Faculty Compensation Task Force (FCTF). The eight member FCTF included representatives from the Faculty Senate, department chairs/directors, and college deans. Provost Follins charged the FCTF to review the 1997 Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University (hereafter referred to as the “Faculty Merit Policy”) and provide him with a final report and recommendations no later than October 1, 2001.

It is the prerogative of the Faculty Senate and central administration to review the recommendations of the FCTF and, where appropriate, propose revisions to the 1997 Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University. Members of the FCTF are prepared to offer their assistance and support as needed. Any changes in the current Faculty Merit Policy would need to be approved prior to January 1, 2002 so that they could be in place and clearly communicated for the evaluation of faculty performance for the 2002 calendar year. Merit allocations under a new policy would be determined in Spring 2003, with merit increases applied to 2003-2004 contracts.

History

The development of a performance-based merit system for faculty at Bowling Green State University was begun in response to the Board of Trustees preference for a compensation system that rewarded merit rather than across-the-board salary increases. The process began with some level of contentiousness, which never fully dissipated. For example, Provost/VPAA Charles Middleton appointed members of the Task Force on Faculty Evaluation and Reward Policy (TFFERP) to propose merit system recommendations. This unilateral appointment of members to the TFFERP by the Provost raised concerns that faculty and the Faculty Senate may have limited opportunity for input into any final policy recommendation. To assure some of these concerns, the TFFERP included a member from the Faculty Senate during the last month of its deliberations and began working in conjunction
with the appropriate Senate Committees (Faculty Welfare Committee, Committee on Academic Affairs, and Senate Executive Committee) to obtain Senate approval for a performance-based merit system for BGSU faculty. During the ensuing Faculty Senate floor debates, several issues were discussed, including (1) the importance of increasing the overall level of faculty compensation, (2) the importance of funding significant and regular merit increases in an effort to motivate and reward faculty performance, (3) the need to review and correct, where necessary, the merit policies of individual academic units to ensure fairness in the process and outcomes of merit decisions, (4) the issue of equality (i.e., across-the-board salary increases) versus reward for individual performance, (5) the process by which "non-meritorious" faculty would be identified (e.g., how public would the process be?) and the resulting consequences from this rating that went beyond eligibility for professional development opportunities to improve performance (e.g., reassignment of courses or removal from graduate faculty), and (6) whether a performance-based merit system for BGSU faculty and staff would be at odds with compensation systems in place for other groups of state employees (teachers, police, firefighters, etc.). Finally, there was considerable discussion centered on the action levels of 3% and 5% that determine how merit increases were to be distributed among faculty who performed at meritorious levels. Specifically, the economic climate of the late 1990s led many to believe that the size of the available salary pool for merit increases would be approximately 3%. Coupled with the perception that few faculty would be judged non-meritorious, the mandated equal distribution of merit increases among faculty who meet performance expectations when an annual merit increase is 3% or less would result in a de facto across-the-board increase.

The Task Force on Faculty Evaluation and Reward Policy conducted its work during the 1996-97 academic year. Discussions by the Faculty Senate and its committees began in February 1997, and the 1997 Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University was approved by the Faculty Senate on May 6, 1997. The policy was forwarded by the central administration to the University's Board of Trustees, who approved the policy at their June 27, 1997 meeting. Current provided at the end of the Spring 1997 semester. This Faculty Merit Policy was implemented for the 1998 calendar year.

Methods

In our review of the Faculty Merit Policy, several strategies were used to gather information and input. They included (a) a review of the professional literature on performance-based merit systems, (b) solicitation of input from department chairs and program directors, (c) a survey of all full-time BGSU faculty, and (d) benchmarking data on faculty merit policies from Ohio institutions.

Literature Review. A review of the literature on performance-based merit systems was conducted. A major source of information was the 1992 book by P.L. Heneman, Merit Pay: Linking Pay Increases to Performance Ratings, which provided a comprehensive overview of merit compensation systems in organizations. Although limited in number, articles specific to performance-based merit systems in higher education were also identified and reviewed. Appendix B includes a bibliography of readings reviewed by the FCTF.
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**Input from Department Chairs and Program Directors.** In Fall 2000, Provost Pollins asked the deans to solicit information from each college’s department chairs and program directors regarding their view of how the University’s 1997 *Faculty Merit Policy* was working. Each dean provided the Provost with a written document outlining any concerns and recommendations provided by the chairs/directors. Appendix C includes copies of the reports provided by each of the college deans.

**Faculty Survey.** In April-May, 2001, a four-page survey was distributed to all full-time faculty requesting their evaluation of the University’s 1997 *Faculty Merit Policy*. This voluntary and anonymous survey included demographic items, perceptions of merit compensation systems in general, perceptions of the 1997 *Faculty Merit Policy*, and an opportunity to write in any additional comments or concerns. A total of 236 useable surveys were returned for an overall response rate of 36% (relative to the faculty population, the sample was slightly over-represented with full professors and slightly under-represented by instructors and faculty with 1-3 years of experience.) A copy of the survey including summary of responses to the closed-ended items is included as Appendix D. A summary of responses from 130 respondents to the open-ended item is also included as Appendix E.

**Benchmarking Data.** E-mail requests were sent to Human Resource Officers at the other 12 four-year public universities in Ohio requesting information about their faculty compensation systems and the distribution of merit. Responses were received from eight institutions. Information from the four non-respondents was obtained by phone and by visiting each institution’s web pages.

These four sources of information will be referenced in the following sections of this report to substantiate the task force’s findings and recommendations.

**Areas of Satisfaction with the Faculty Merit Policy**

1. *Faculty support for merit pay.* An overwhelming majority (92%) of faculty “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that some portion of a salary increase should be given based on a faculty member’s performance (Survey Item #18). Three-quarters of respondents either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that 100% of any salary increase, regardless of the size, should be distributed across the board (Survey Item #8). A small number of survey respondents provided written comments arguing that merit systems are ineffective or inequitable (Appendix E, Category 7). Interestingly, the research literature has not demonstrated a consistent link between merit pay and future performance (Gerhart & Milkovich, 1992), and some arguments have been made against the use of merit pay (e.g., merit pay can lead to a decrease in workplace cooperation and teamwork; Heneman, 1992, p. 49).

2. *Three-year rolling average.* Approximately two-thirds of faculty “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the use of a three-year rolling average for calculating a faculty member’s performance is a good idea (Survey Item #23).

3. *Salary adjustments beyond merit.* The majority of faculty support current BGSU practice of salary
adjustments beyond annual merit increases. Specifically, 84% and 80% of faculty "strongly agreed" or agreed" that some portion of a salary increase should be given to make external and internal market adjustments, respectively (Survey Items #16 and #17). In addition, over 95% of the survey respondents indicated that they support faculty members receiving a salary increase when they are promoted (Survey Item #22). Finally, almost two-thirds of survey respondents agreed that bonuses (i.e., one-time awards that are not added to a faculty member's base salary) would be acceptable in some circumstances (e.g., receipt of a major grant, national recognition for an artistic performance) as an additional option to the performance-based performance system at BGSU (Survey Item #14).

**Areas of Dissatisfaction with the Faculty Merit Policy**

1. **Overall dissatisfaction with the current merit system.** More than three-fifths (61%) of faculty who completed the survey indicated that they were "dissatisfied" or "strongly dissatisfied" with the current merit system for faculty at BGSU (Survey Item #30), and an additional 23% indicated they were "neither satisfied or dissatisfied" with the current system. This conclusion is also supported by comments from department chairs, program directors, and college deans which indicated that there is general dissatisfaction with the current merit system for a wide variety of reasons, some of which are reported below.

2. **Merit pay is distributed unfairly.** Approximately half (46%) of survey respondents "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" that the current procedures for distributing merit pay are fair (Survey Item #1), and 51% "disagreed" or strongly disagreed" that the actual distribution of merit raises is fair (Survey Item #2). Open-ended survey comments (Appendix: E, Category 2) indicated that this perception resulted both from "local" (i.e., department or unit) procedures for distributing merit pay as well as dissatisfaction with the university-wide Faculty Merit Policy. In addition a small number of survey respondents were concerned about the unfairness of the equal distribution (by percent of continuing faculty salarier) of merit pools to departments/units, arguing that smaller and/or more productive departments are hurt by this policy (Appendix E, Category 8).

3. **Fixed 3% merit increase for meeting or exceeding department/unit performance expectations.** Comments from chairs/directors and deans indicate general dissatisfaction with the Faculty Merit Policy's requirement that the first 3% of a merit increase be distributed equally (i.e., all faculty receive 3% increases) among all faculty identified as meeting or exceeding department/unit performance expectations. This may also be the source of some of the dissatisfaction with the distribution of merit pay noted above (i.e., Survey Items #1 and #2). Because of the large percentage of faculty who are judged as meeting or exceeding expectations, and the fact that the portion of merit increases beyond 3% has been at best modest over the past years, there are not enough merit dollars to reward the university's most productive faculty. The inability to provide significant merit increases to the strongest faculty makes them more vulnerable to external offers. In support of this interpretation, 49% of survey respondents "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" that the university's current merit plan is having a positive effect on faculty retention.
4. 100% merit policy. Seventy percent of faculty who completed the survey either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that 100% of a faculty member’s salary increase should be based on merit, regardless of the size of the salary increase provided by BGSU (Survey Item #7). Written comments made by survey respondents indicated that a larger number of faculty feel that across-the-board increases have a higher priority or are more important than merit increases, arguing that faculty salaries should be brought up to an acceptable level before distinctions are made based on merit (Appendix E, Categories 4 and 5).

Faculty Compensation Task Force Concerns and Recommendations

Although the size of merit increases for faculty might appear to be beyond our charge to review the Faculty Merit Policy (i.e., which addresses the distribution of merit increases), it is in fact related to the effectiveness of any merit compensation system and by all accounts the most significant issue noted by all constituencies. The professional literature does not prescribe a certain size for merit increases, but it does indicate that for a merit increase to influence future performance it must be of a sufficient magnitude to be perceived by faculty as a meaningful difference. The merit increases over the past three years (3.0%, 4.5%, and 3.75% for calendar years 1998, 1999, and 2000, respectively) do not appear to have been perceived as meaningfully sufficient in magnitude by BGSU’s faculty. Three-quarters (77%) of survey respondents evaluated the size of merit increases over the past three years as “less than adequate,” and 86% reported that they are compensated somewhat below or well below what they feel they should receive (Items #32 and 31, respectively). Write-in comments (Appendix E, Category 1) also indicated a significant degree of frustration about low salaries in general; specifically, faculty felt that the merit distribution system is unimportant when the size of the merit pool is consistently small.

While reported levels of satisfaction with pay are typically lower than other aspects of the job across all types of organizations and employee groups, the survey results are of a sufficient magnitude to warrant careful consideration. This is particularly important given the faculty’s expectation that the university will increase BGSU faculty salaries, on average, to the 70th percentile among comparable institutions.

Recommendation 1. The President and Board of Trustees must continue to make every effort to increase faculty salaries at BGSU, providing significant and meaningful increases each year.

It is important to recognize and applaud, despite the absence of any projected increase in the University’s State Share of Instruction during the second year of the biennium, the Board of Trustees’ approval of a 3.75% salary pool for faculty for 2001-02 and President Ribeau’s recent statement that faculty salary increases will be included in the 2002-03 budget as a strategic university investment. But there is concern among many faculty that the university has fallen behind on the President’s plan to
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raise faculty salaries to competitive levels, and the current economic environment does not suggest that the promised progress on salary levels for faculty will be possible in the near future.

The professional literature describes work situations or settings where pay-for-performance compensation systems may be feasible (Heneman, 1992; Chapter 3). While space limitations preclude a complete discussion of all 30 characteristics, we focus on several key areas that may be critical to successful pay-for-performance plans:

(a) Adequate measurement of performance. Current unit methods for assessing, either subjectively or through a complicated point system, each faculty member's teaching, research, and service contribution may not provide a complete picture of performance; only 50% of survey respondents report that their department/unit is able to measure performance fairly and objectively (Survey Item #11).

(b) Faculty control over job performance. Faculty would appear to have the opportunity, autonomy, discretion, and authority to influence or effect their performance (and therefore their subsequent performance evaluation), since faculty assignments and workload distributions may be negotiated with their director or department chair; 58% of survey respondents felt that faculty members in their department/unit have control over their own levels of performance (Survey Item #12).

(c) General endorsement of pay-for-performance. While merit systems make salary recommendations on the competitive basis of merit or best performance, alternative salary distribution methods do exist (e.g., in an egalitarian compensation system, everyone receives the same pay increase). What is critical is that the philosophy of pay-for-performance be congruent with the present culture (or, through structured organizational change, future culture) of the institution. Survey responses reported above indicate faculty support for merit pay with the important proviso that the compensation system not be 100% merit pay driven.

(d) An adequate budget. Effective merit plans require consistent and adequate funds for their implementation. In environments where economic conditions are unstable or where the size of merit increases are modest and/or are not perceived as a psychologically meaningful difference (e.g., the "actual" salary increase is negligible or non-existent after factoring in cost of living increases), pay-for-performance plans may be less motivating and satisfying (particularly if the implementation costs are high). As noted in the survey results, faculty have indicated a high degree of dissatisfaction with the size of merit increases over the past three years. In organizations where it may be difficult to provide a merit pool each single year that sufficiently motivates high levels of performance, better communication that the "compounding effect" of merit increases will result in cumulatively larger increase in salary over time can help retain the motivational properties of a merit system.

(e) Adequate distinction among individuals' levels of performance. Good pay-for-performance plans provide merit increases that correspond to actual levels of performance, providing a clearly
perceived contingency between work behaviors/outcomes and rewards. However, “high risk” merit plans (i.e., where only above average performers are granted merit increases) may not be preferred in general. Findings suggest that actual or perceived contingencies between annual performance and merit increases may be missing in the Faculty Merit Policy (i.e., at best, there is only a small difference in the size of merit increases among exceptional, good, and average performers). “High risk” merit plans (i.e., only a small percentage of faculty whose performance exceeds department or academic unit expectations who are eligible for additional merit dollars receive awards) were not widely supported at BGSU since only 26% of respondents endorsed a merit plan that would provide larger merit increases to a smaller number of the highest performing faculty members (Survey Item #29).

(f) Consistency between merit policy and university mission and goals. Although merit plans are designed to motivate and reinforce good performance among employees, the organization must be vigilant that the system does not motivate or reinforce too narrow a set of behaviors or outcomes nor create individual incentives that diminish important group or unit behaviors or outcomes. There may be some concern that the Faculty Merit Policy, as implemented at the department or academic unit level, may not adequately recognize and reinforce some behaviors and outcomes that are important to BGSU (e.g., student recruitment and retention activities, unit academic goals, etc.).

Recommendation 2. Efforts must be made to ensure that the appropriate environmental and cultural conditions exist at BGSU to support an effective merit plan for faculty. These efforts may include, but not be limited to, the following:

2A. Training programs should be offered to academic units to help them develop appropriate systems for measuring faculty performance, including activities and behaviors that support important unit, college, and university initiatives.

2B. Recognize that retaining productive faculty in a competitive market environment requires that funds be set aside for promotions, market adjustments, and equity adjustments. The remainder of the total salary pool, hereafter called the salary increment pool, is to be distributed as across-the-board increases and merit.

2C. Recognize the egalitarian philosophy of many faculty at BGSU (see, for example, Appendix E, Category 4), which supports both the core values of the university as well as collegiality and teamwork essential to the effective functioning of a university striving towards high levels of success. Specifically, the Faculty Merit Policy, which ostensibly provides 100% merit pay but in practice rewards salary increases to virtually all faculty, should be revised to provide a modest across-the-board salary increase. We propose that 50% of the salary increment pool be distributed as an across-the-board increase, with the across-the-board increase not to exceed 2%. This salary increase component would be distributed to all faculty. The remainder of any salary increment would be distributed according to department/unit merit policies.
Review of BGSU's Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty

In support of Recommendation 2C, the professional literature underscores the significant difficulties faced by organizations which try to implement 100% merit pay policies. In fact, it appears that most organizations with merit systems often have compensation programs that include other compensation factors beyond merit (Heneman, 1992, p. 14; O'Dell, 1986; Wallace, 1990); a recent survey of institutions of higher education in the California State University system indicated that while 31% of the responding institutions had faculty compensation systems based solely on merit, the majority (58%) of institutions included one or more additional compensation factors in addition to merit (e.g., cost of living, length of service; Ontiveros & Stafaci, 1998). Benchmark data from sister four-year public universities in Ohio (see Appendix F) indicate that seven of the 12 include merit pay in their faculty compensation plans, but only one (i.e., University of Akron) has a 100% merit pay system. The clear majority of the four-year public universities in Ohio (11 of 13, or 85%) include other factors (e.g., across-the-board increments, longevity increases, lump sum payments), either exclusively or in addition to merit, when determining faculty pay. For these reasons, as well as faculty survey responses, we believe the faculty compensation plan should include both a modest across-the-board component and a more significant merit component.

Concern 3: The evidence suggests that the Faculty Merit Policy may not be meeting its stated goals and objectives.

The goals of the Faculty Merit Policy state that it should “promote faculty recruitment and retention; adequately reward conscientious performance of normal duties and responsibilities; and provide incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative, and creative achievements...” (Principle I)

Perceptions among college deans, department chairs, and program directors suggest that the merit plan is having limited impact on faculty recruitment, and anecdotal evidence indicates that the size of merit increases has resulted in the loss of some exceptional faculty. Survey responses indicate that only small percentages of the faculty feel that the Faculty Merit Policy is positively impacting faculty recruitment and retention; only 3% responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statements that the university’s merit plan is having a positive impact on faculty recruitment (Survey Item #5) or faculty retention (Survey Item #6), and 70% disagreed that the current merit plan is having a positive effect on faculty satisfaction (Survey Item #3). Only 23% of faculty indicated that they felt the size of merit increases over the past three years has been either “adequate” or “more than adequate” (Survey Item #32). Six per cent of respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that the university’s current merit plan is having a positive effect on unit morale/performance. Anecdotaly, there is also the perception that some faculty who have remained at BGSU because of dual career, family, or other personal reasons may have psychologically withdrawn from the university (e.g., performing at the minimum level, unwillingness to engage in university service activities, etc.).

Recommendation 3. Merit pay for faculty should continue given its endorsement by BGSU’s Board of Trustees, the President, the University’s central administration, and department chairs/program directors and faculty. One significant component of the Faculty Merit Policy is to be retained, based both on (a) dean, chair, director,
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and faculty recommendations and (b) professional recommendations based on research and best practices, to enhance the acceptability and effectiveness of proposed faculty merit policy:

3A. The "merit pay" component of any salary increment pool (i.e., 50% of the amount up to 4% and 100% of the amount in excess of 4%) should be distributed according to the merit policies of individual departments/units. Each faculty member's annual merit review should be based upon his/her accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis (i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year, and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file).

The experience of the FCTF as well as anecdotal evidence suggests while many policies and procedures incorporated in the Faculty Merit Policy are being followed consistently, some are not. Specifically, all faculty may not be receiving "an annual performance review with informative written feedback provided to them in a timely manner" (Policy and Procedure #3; italics added). Colleges may not consistently be providing faculty members who do not qualify for merit with a "professional development fund equal to the uniform percentage raise that would have been allocated to that individual... [to be]... used exclusively for professional development activities to improve his/her performance to a level which will meet or exceed the performance expectations of the department/unit (Policy and Procedure #11). Although due to exceptional circumstances, the Faculty Merit Policy was not reviewed (and revised as appropriate) in the Fall of 1999 (Policy and Procedure #12). Finally, we are unaware of any formal planning to develop a process and make funds available for salary adjustments in 2002 as "deemed appropriate following comprehensive five-year reviews of faculty performance and salary" (Policy and Procedure #2).

**Recommendation 4.** The Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost should work to ensure that all policies and procedures included in the current Faculty Merit Policy be implemented.

4A. Consistent with the Faculty Merit Policy, faculty should be able to receive specific, written feedback that communicates the linkage between his or her performance and any merit-based salary increase. However, mandating that this occur may be a burden on department/unit merit committees, especially where existing department/unit merit policies make the linkage quite clear. One option might be simply to require that written feedback by the committee or individual making the merit recommendation be provided on demand at the individual request of faculty.
Conclusions

The implementation of the 1997 Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University introduced some positive changes to the university's policy for rewarding full-time faculty. In particular, the introduction of a three-year rolling average for calculating faculty merit for the current year and the requirement that faculty must perform at some minimally acceptable level to be eligible for a salary increase are consistent with the professional literature and positively perceived by many faculty. However, there is considerable dissatisfaction with the modest salary increases over the past three years as well as the inability of the current Faculty Merit Policy to differentially reward average, good, and outstanding performance. The FCTF believes that the proposed modifications of the existing performance-based faculty merit policy can help to improve faculty satisfaction with the policy and lead to positive changes in individual, unit, and University performance.
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The Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University
Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University

The faculty and administration of Bowling Green State University believe that the following principles must form the foundation for the periodic process of faculty review and the equitable distribution of faculty salary increments. The concept of a performance-based merit system for awarding faculty salary increments is endorsed, provided that such a system is fair, equitable, and firmly grounded on these principles. In this policy, "merit" is defined as a salary increment that is allotted for the performance of duties that meets or exceeds department or academic unit expectations. The rationale for this definition is provided by the following principles:

1. An effective merit system should promote faculty recruitment and retention; adequately reward conscientious performance of normal duties and responsibilities; and provide incentives that encourage distinguished, innovative, and creative achievements to meet unusual challenges and opportunities when they arise.

2. A salary system should be designed to promote internal equity (based upon salary comparisons within the University, college or department) as well as external equity (based upon salary comparisons among individuals from similar universities, colleges, or departments). Internal salary equity promotes performance, whereas external salary equity promotes retention.

3. A performance-based merit system should be based on a collegial peer review process that places primary responsibility on the collegial department or academic unit and that requires careful evaluation of performance utilizing the collective best judgment of faculty.

4. The merit system should engender the type, quantity and quality of performance that contributes to the achievement of university, college, and department missions and goals. The merit system also needs to recognize that there are often multiple paths that may be taken in support of missions and goals.

5. The department or academic unit approved allocations of effort and evaluative criteria should be reflected in its merit review process. That process must ensure that faculty who have unit-approved individual variations of effort are reviewed and rewarded proportionately to their own approved percentage of effort distributions.

6. The merit system needs to establish a clear connection between faculty performance and reward. A department or academic unit must clearly identify the normal expectations and performance standards for teaching, research/creative activity, and service that are expected of all faculty in the department or unit. Through this process, the department/unit must identify indicators of performances that fall below standard expectations for merit as well as those types of achievements that surpass the standard expectations of the department/unit.

7. The process of performance review should provide faculty members with results and constructive feedback that enables them to develop professionally and to make improvements in their performance.

8. Whenever resources are limited, the merit system must respond to a more restricted set of institutional priorities in order to avoid trivializing the system by spreading too thinly, and thus minimizing, the impact of any merit awards given as incentives.

9. Even the best annual review systems may produce salary inequities or fail to appropriately reward contributions or performances that occur over longer periods of time. Thus, an annual merit review system needs to be supplemented by periodic five-year comprehensive reviews on a rotating schedule.
10. A performance-based merit or salary reward system should foster cooperation rather than antagonism among faculty, should reward groups and teams as well as individuals for collaborative work, performance(s), and should generate wide support and general satisfaction of the University campuses.

Bowling Green State University is committed to follow the foregoing ten principles, and hereby, adopts a performance-based merit reward system for its faculty as outlined by the policies and procedures listed below:

1. This merit policy shall neither be implemented retroactively nor in the middle of a calendar year. It shall be implemented at the beginning of the calendar year commencing on January 1, 1998. In the meantime, faculty in each academic unit should determine the means of implementation in that unit. All faculty must be aware of the revisions in department standards and processes sufficiently in advance of implementation to understand the implications of those revisions and to adjust their performance accordingly.

2. Funds should be made available on a regular ongoing basis to support raises for promotions in rank, salary equipment and marker adjustments, and salary adjustments deemed appropriate following comprehensive five-year reviews of faculty performance and salary. These funds should not be considered a part of the annual merit pool for continuing faculty salary increments. The merit pool is the product of the total salaries of the continuing faculty times the percentage salary increase approved by the Board of Trustees.

3. All faculty should receive an annual performance review with informative written feedback provided to them in a timely manner. Faculty have a right to expect that their annual reviews accurately reflect their actual workload responsibilities, assigned duties, and percentage allocations of effort.

4. With the exception of external peer review, the same performance indicators described in the department policy for annual review, merit, contract renewal, promotion and tenure used in department tenure and promotion policies should be used for annual merit review, and they should be consistent with those criteria found in the Academic Charter (E-1C and E-1D). A faculty member’s review should reflect the agreed upon allocation of that faculty member’s efforts. External peer reviews of faculty should not be used for purposes of the annual merit review or contract renewal.

5. The annual merit review should be based upon the accomplishments over the most recent three-year period on a rolling basis, i.e., each year new information is added to the file for the most recent year, and information for the oldest year is eliminated from the file. This will help to reduce inequities that can result both from differences in the merit funds available each year and from fluctuations in performance that may occur from year to year.

6. Each department or academic unit shall receive the full amount available for merit as a percent of the total salaries of the continuing faculty in that department or unit. The faculty of a school or a college may decide, with the approval of its dean, to allocate merit on a school-wide or college-wide basis rather than on a department or academic unit basis if the faculty unanimously decide that such an approach would be more appropriate.

7. Continuing faculty members will be evaluated in their annual performance reviews at the department or academic unit level to determine their eligibility for merit. The department/unit shall recognize and reward levels of performance that meet or exceed its standard expectation. This recognition and reward shall be based on the policies of the department/unit and the Academic Charter criteria, with appropriate indicators, which establish standards of performance that determine whether the faculty member: (a) qualifies for merit by meeting or exceeding department/unit standards, or (b) does not qualify for a merit increase by meeting, as well as exceeding, department/unit standards, it is expected that very few faculty will fail to qualify for merit.
8. If the total merit pool for continuing faculty salary increments in a given year is three (3%) or less, all continuing faculty who qualify for merit by meeting or exceeding department/unit expectations in their annual performance reviews will receive the same percentage increase in salary.

9. If the total merit pool for continuing faculty salary increments in a given year is more than three percent (3%) but less than five percent (5%), it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

A. Three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the continuing faculty shall be allocated as a three percent (3%) increase in salary to all faculty who meet department/unit expectations and thereby qualify for merit based on their annual performance reviews.

B. The remaining difference between the total merit pool and the three percent (3%) of the total salaries of the continuing faculty shall be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition of those faculty whose level of performance exceeds department or academic unit expectations as defined by the merit policy of the department or unit.

10. If the total merit pool in a given year is five percent (5%) or more, it will be allocated according to the following guidelines:

A. Sixty percent (60%) shall be allocated to departments and academic units to be used as an equal percentage increase in salary for all faculty in the department who meet department/unit expectations and thereby qualify for merit in their annual performance reviews.

B. Forty percent (40%) shall be allocated to departments and academic units for recognition and reward of those faculty whose level of performance exceeds department or academic unit expectations as defined by the department’s/unit’s merit policy.

11. Any faculty member who does not qualify for merit in their annual performance review should not receive a salary increase. A professional development fund equal to the uniform percentage raise that would have been allocated to that individual, had he/she been deemed to meet but not exceed department/unit expectations, shall be made available to him or her. This fund shall be used exclusively for professional development activities to improve his/her performance to a level which will meet or exceed the performance expectations of the department/unit (as defined by the merit policy of the department/unit), and thereby, qualify him/her for merit in subsequent performance evaluations and rewards for merit.

12. The foregoing principles and policies/procedures of the performance-based merit system for faculty at Bowling Green State University shall be reviewed in the fall of 1999 and revised as appropriate. Thereafter, they shall be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and appropriate Senate committees every three years.

Approved by the:
Faculty Senate on May 6, 1997
Senate Executive Committee on 4/2/97 and 4/29/97
Faculty Welfare Committee on 4/3/97, 4/10/97 and 4/24/97
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Appendix C. Department Chair/Program Director Evaluation of the University's 1997 Faculty Merit Policy
John,

I presented the issue of merit for discussion at last Friday's music faculty meeting. While the discussion was civil and informative, no consensus emerged. Some favored the current system while others supported 100% merit.

Those in favor of the 100% merit seemed to me to be some of the more productive faculty. Why am I not surprised? One consideration: are all faculty treated equally or do we favor some over the others? Should we listen more carefully to those faculty who will make a difference here, or do we work to build a larger faculty consensus before changing the rules? In other words, while our governance structure works for democratic idealism, our reward structure is clearly competitive.

One faculty member suggested that it was easier to respond to a specific proposal than it is to discuss the philosophical merits of merit in the abstract! This might be one way of proceeding: float two or three specific merit proposals and seek reactions to each.

Just a thought.

Dick

Interim Dean
College of Musical Arts
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
http://www.bgsu.edu/colleges/music/
October 1, 2000

To: John W. Folkens
    Provost

From: Donald G. Nieman
    Dean

Re: University Merit Policy

This is in response to your request for information about how the University’s merit policy, adopted in 1997, is working in practice.

I have consulted with chairs and directors to find out how the policy has worked in their units and what modifications they would recommend. While opinions vary, most chairs and directors in the College of Arts & Sciences find the University merit policy defective because it does not adequately reward meritorious performance. Indeed, most echoed the assessment offered in the report on merit policy developed by the Arts & Sciences Chairs’ Steering Council and dated May 10, 2000 (attached).

The biggest shortcoming chairs see in the current merit policy is the provision that awards the first 3% of salary increment to all faculty who are judged to “meet expectations” on an across-the-board basis. Because most departments have set the threshold rather low, almost everyone is judged to “meet expectations.” Even if departments set the bar higher, a large majority of our faculty would (and should) be judged to “meet expectations.” The result would be that a very few would receive no salary increment. However, most would receive a 3% increment that would not distinguish between those who were merely doing their jobs competently, those who were exceeding expectations, and those who were truly outstanding.

Granted, when salary increments exceed 3%, there are funds to distribute to faculty judged to “exceed expectations.” This allows departments to reward faculty on the basis of their relative accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. The amount of reward is seriously limited, however. Last year, for example, when there was a 4.5% increment, two-thirds of the pool (3%) was distributed across-the-board and only one-third (1.5%) was distributed on the basis of relative performance. The result is that even in a relatively good year, there are very limited resources to reward our most productive faculty and most raise money is distributed with little regard to performance.
In my opinion, the current policy is not having the intended results and, in fact, is damaging our ability to retain our most productive faculty. Indeed, if we do not have greater commitment to rewarding meritorious performance (as judged by departments themselves), the salaries of outstanding faculty will become uncompetitive, they will become dissatisfied, and we will be hard-pressed to retain them in the face of offers from other institutions. This is especially alarming because we have hired a large number of excellent tenure track faculty members in recent years and are investing heavily in their professional development. We have generally hired them at competitive salaries, but if they fall behind over time, they will be ripe for the picking by institutions who are bent on recruiting top notch faculty. Should this happen, we will lose what we have invested in these faculty members and incur the expense of recruiting and investing in faculty members to replace them. And we’ll be forced to do so in a much more competitive environment because the market for faculty in most disciplines is opening. It’s far cheaper and much better policy to retain productive faculty members around whom we are building programs. A new merit policy is essential to do so.

I look forward to discussing this matter in Deans’ Council. If some other Colleges find the current system acceptable, however, I hope that units that find it damaging have the opportunity to develop a system that more nearly meets their needs and aspirations.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John W. Folkins
   Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Ron Lancaster, Steering Committee Chair
       Arts & Sciences Chairs and Directors

DATE: May 10, 2000

RE: Merit Policy

I am writing on behalf of the steering committee of the College of Arts and Sciences Chairs and Directors. The other members of the steering committee for 2000-2001 are:

Jim Child, Philosophy
Gary Lee, Sociology
Tim Pogacar, German, Russian, East Asian Languages
Vickie Shields, Telecommunications and Women’s Studies

We are writing to express concern about the University’s current “merit” policy. This issue has been under discussion by the Arts and Sciences Chairs and Directors during 1999-2000. In brief, we feel that the University currently has no real merit policy at all unless the annual increment percentage exceeds 3% and, even then, the impact of the “merit” portion is minimal. What this means, in effect, is that departments and schools have no way to recognize in a meaningful way performance that far exceeds expectations. While we have the ability to withhold merit from faculty who do not meet minimal merit standards, there is no effective mechanism for distinguishing between the levels of performance of meritorious faculty.

As chairs and directors, the inability to reward outstanding performance naturally leads to morale and motivation problems among our faculty. One consequence is that it is hard to ensure that salaries of highly-productive faculty remain in step with the salaries of comparable faculty at other institutions. This situation occasionally puts us in the position of trying to retain talented faculty who receive attractive offers from other institutions. By the time this situation develops, it’s often too late. It is far preferable to provide ongoing incentive and reward to such faculty during their productive years than to try to remedy this problem retroactively at some later date.

We suspect that this problem might be more pronounced in the College of Arts and Sciences than in some other colleges. If that is indeed the case, perhaps the campus-wide merit policy that was approved in 1997 needs to be revisited. Specifically, we recommend that the development of a merit policy be decentralized to the college level. Perhaps some colleges would prefer to

The merit policy states: “In this policy, ‘merit’ is defined as a salary increment that is allotted for the performance of duties that meets or exceeds departmental or academic unit expectations.” [emphasis added]

1
maintain the current university policy. We suspect that Arts and Sciences would adopt a policy that is more heavily weighted towards merit. Specifically, we recommend the following:

1. Each college develops a merit policy that must be approved by a majority of all the college's continuing faculty who are included in the merit pool. The college policy should specify an algorithm that can be used each year to determine the across-the-board and merit components of the increment.

2. Departments retain the responsibility for assigning merit dollars to individual faculty in a way that is consistent with the college and departmental merit policies.

General guidelines for college policies could be developed by Faculty Senate. For example, perhaps all colleges would be required to retain the current three-year rolling average for merit computations.

We don't propose any specific college policy. Many reasonable college merit policies can be designed. Some samples are on the next page. A college that wants to increase the impact of merit might choose a variation of one of the latter policies. Different colleges might approve very different models. That is healthy and desirable, in our view. In the view of the A&SS Steering Committee, an approach modeled on Option B or Option C comes closest to meeting the needs of Arts and Sciences, but a final determination of that would require discussion and debate within the college. The current merit policy effectively precludes us from initiating such a discussion.

Making such a change in the University's merit policy is certain to be controversial. However, as chairs and directors of Arts and Sciences, we will do whatever we can to encourage and promote such an initiative. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our concerns and potential solutions in the Fall.
Sample College Merit Policies

**Sample College Policy A:** If the increment pool is 3% or less in a given year, the entire amount is allocated across-the-board by percentage to all merit-eligible faculty. If the increment pool is between 3% and 5%, 3% is allocated across the board by percentage to merit-eligible faculty and the remainder is allocated by departments according to their merit policies. If the increment pool exceeds 5%, 60% of the increment percentage is allocated across-the-board by percentage and 40% is allocated by departments according to their merit policies. [This is essentially the current University policy.]

**Sample College Policy B:** If the increment pool is 1.5% or less in a given year, the entire amount is allocated across-the-board by percentage to all merit-eligible faculty. If the increment pool exceeds 1.5%, any amount above that threshold is allocated by departments according to their merit policies.

**Sample College Policy C:** If the increment pool is 3% or less in a given year, the entire amount is allocated by departments according to their merit policies. If the increment pool is between 3% and 6%, 3% is allocated on the basis of merit and the remainder is allocated across-the-board by percentage. If the increment pool exceeds 6%, one-half of the increment percentage is allocated across-the-board by percentage and one-half is allocated by merit.

**Sample College Policy D:** The entire increment pool is allocated by departments according to their merit policies.

**Sample College Policy E:** If the increment pool is 3% or less in a given year, the entire amount is allocated by departments according to their merit policies. If the increment pool is between 3% and 6%, 3% is allocated on the basis of merit and the remainder is allocated across-the-board as a flat amount (all full-time faculty receive the same across-the-board dollar amount). If the increment pool exceeds 6%, one-half of the increment percentage is allocated across-the-board as a flat amount and one-half is allocated by merit.

**Sample College Policy F:** A portion of the college's increment pool is retained in the college to recognize outstanding performance by college faculty. The remainder is processed using the current merit policy. Departments would apply for college-level merit funds for individual faculty using procedures established by the college and approved by a majority of the continuing faculty of the college included in the merit pool.

Clearly, these are just examples of the kinds of merit policies that might be approved by a college intent on rewarding outstanding performance. Many other models are possible, and different colleges might approve very different models. That is healthy and desirable, in our view.
Commentary from the College of Education and Human Development

Compiled by: Ellen Williams
Dean, College of EDHD

For: John Folkins
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Regarding Common Time

The following commentary is offered from EDHD faculty/administrators regarding the issue of common time.

1. The proposed common time program for meetings is basically a good concept to allow for dedicated times for specific meetings at the university.

2. There isn't adequate "common time" to accommodate all the meetings that occur.

3. Common meeting time eliminates scheduled times for classes.

4. Common meeting times are excellent for residential living learning centers where faculty and students can meet.

Regarding General Education

Commentary from EDHD faculty/administrators include:

1. General Education as a requirement bodes well for BGSU graduates. The profile of a BGSU grad is one of a student "well grounded/rounded" in liberal arts/studies.

2. The selection of acceptable courses for the general education requirements seems to be limited. Can they be expanded to include more courses?

3. The transfer/substitution of general education courses should be evaluated/decided upon by a general education committee.

4. The general education faculty need to inform students how the general education course(s) impact on various majors. The major advisors/faculty need to explain the relevance of general education courses.

5. The amount of general education courses offered currently is adequate if we are to also train/educate students for a career/profession.

Regarding the Hess Report

The only commentary from the school directors regarding the Hess Report were "vague" and "ambiguous."
> X-Sender: jsullivan@cba.bgsu.edu
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)
> Date: Fri, 29 Sep 2000 08:05:01 -0400
> To: folklore@bgnet.bgsu.edu
> From: Jim Sullivan <jsullivan@cba.bgsu.edu>
> Subject: feedback
>
> December 16, 1999
>
> I am sending this message to怼 you to let you know that the feedback I have received from Chairs during the evaluation process is now complete. I would like to receive the final evaluation report by 09/29/2000, as stated in the email I sent to you on 08/30/2000.
>
> This message includes recent feedback on the feedback process. I will submit feedback on General Education in a separate message.
>
> The statements below summarize input received from Chairs.

---

> This year will be the first year that the recommendations will be based upon these years. It does not appear that there have been major implementation problems to date based on the new policy. I am aware of one department where this could change this year because the three-year average will be fully in place.

> There is strong opinion that there is a lack of true merit because of the allocation when the percent available is 2 or less. I sense that there is much unhappiness with the merit process because of this issue.

> One Chair stated that the evaluation process would be streamlined if merit were based upon an academic year as is the evaluation for probationary faculty.

> Jim

---

> James A. Sullivan, Dean  
> College of Business Administration  
> Bowling Green State University  
> Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Phone: (419) 372-8795  
Fax: (419) 372-2875  
E-mail: jsullivan@cba.bgsu.edu
September 25, 2000

TO: John Folkins
     Provost and VPAA

FROM: William K. Balzer
       Interim Dean

RE: Department Chair Views of Merit Policy

The academic department chairs at BGSU Firelands unanimously agree that the current university policy document for determining merit pay for faculty should be reviewed and revised. Some issues, that were discussed, including my own views on merit, are noted below:

1. **The policy is not predictable.** Given that there is no predictability in whether and/or how large the merit increment will be, there is no strong incentive for faculty performance. The use of three-year averages, while allowing meritorious behavior from years without merit increment to be included in larger periods where merit is available, does not provide a predictable level of merit pay for faculty. Merit policies demand that merit dollars, however limited, be available each performance period.

2. **The policy is not simple.** The various merit distribution formula (based on whether the merit increment is 3%, between 3-5%, or greater than 5%), the multi-year averaging (across years with and without merit pay), the dynamic nature of faculty responsibilities (varying efforts for teaching, scholarship, and service across and within years), and faculty issues (e.g., calculating three-year averages for faculty with less than three years of service or for faculty on various types of leave during a three-year period) make it very difficult to develop a clear, objective system for merit.

3. **The policy is ambiguous.** The policy provides little guidance or direction as to how merit pay should be distributed among meritorious faculty (e.g., should each faculty member receive the same dollar increment, a percentage based on his or her base salary, a proportion consistent with his/her percentage of the merit points accumulated by all meritorious faculty, or some amount based on the subjective judgment of the department’s salary committee or chair?). Should this distribution policy be consistent across years and merit committees and independent of the size of the merit increase provided? The current lack of consistency can create morale problems and diminish the incentive value of merit increases.

4. **The policy does not create performance incentives.** Since only the marginal percentage of a merit increase over 3% is distributed based on performance, and because this percentage above 3% has been minimal during the past several years, the overall merit increase loses its effectiveness as a motivator of faculty performance. For example, with a 4.0% raise, only 25% of the merit increase (i.e., the percentage increase over and above 3%) is available as performance incentive. The small amount that is distributed as performance incentive requires a great deal of effort and fails to offset the rancor and bitterness associated with subjective evaluations of performance.

5. **The policy is not fully implemented.** Departments fail to provide an adequate amount of
constructive feedback along with their merit assessment/recommendation, and it is very difficult to provide an adequately clear description of "normal expectations and performance standards" that will lead to merit; different merit committees over the years may have different interpretations resulting in different (and potentially confusing) messages to the faculty. In addition, faculty have seen no implementation of the policy's "five year review" of faculty salaries by the central administration.

6. The policy does not require merit distinctions among faculty. Currently, virtually all faculty are evaluated as meeting expectations. While it might be argued that the distribution of performance among BGSU faculty is non-normal (i.e., a negatively skewed distribution with many high performers), the lack of arguably valid discriminations of performance dilutes the magnitude of performance incentives for truly extraordinary faculty.

Overall, the current merit policy, recommended by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees, needs to be reviewed. Revisions may help provide greater recognition of performance differences among faculty, creating incentives for all faculty members to do their very best and supporting the university’s efforts to attract and retain the very strongest faculty. However, while a review of merit policy and procedures seems necessary, the more critical and pressing issue is bringing faculty salaries to the 70th percentile.
Comments from Chairs and Directors:

1. Environmental Health; Gary Silverman, D.Env., Professor and Director
   The current merit system process is working fine. Obviously, we agree with everyone else on campus that more total dollars need to go into the system. However, the current process for awarding merit and distributing dollars is fine.

2. Human Services; Steve Lab, Ph.D., Professor and Chair
   The system worked fine last year. That assumes, of course, that the intent of the system remains the same. If the system is to change to a more “merit” orientation than the current three year average, that may impact on our assessment. It is unclear if the feelings that the system did not work are more a reflection of the feeling that the system is not a true merit system or if the process is wrong. This needs to be clarified before a true evaluation of the system is possible.

3. Public Health; Fleming Fallon, Dr.P.H., Associate Professor and Director
   The pool concept is reasonable but the current pools are too small and the additional money is too minimal. Across the board raises are fine but providing the same for everyone is a concept that is currently used by the civil service commission and labor unions. Both of these concepts are not terribly well regarded in the field.
Appendix D. Results from the Faculty Survey
BGSU Faculty Survey: Review of Merit Policy

Dear Colleagues,

In 1997, the Faculty Senate and the University’s Board of Trustees approved a new merit pay policy for full-time faculty at BGSU, *Principles and Policies/Procedures of the Performance-Based Merit System for Faculty at Bowling Green State University* (a copy of this document is enclosed). The policy also stipulated that it was to be reviewed after several years and revised as necessary. Provost John Follins recently appointed our group, the ad hoc Faculty Task Force on Compensation, with representation from the Faculty Senate, University Chairs and Directors, and College Deans, to conduct this review.

As part of our review, we are asking all full-time faculty to complete this survey which asks for your evaluation of the University’s current merit policy (i.e., no salary increase unless meritorious; 0-3% of merit pool evenly distributed; etc.) as well as general perceptions about merit compensation systems. All responses will be anonymous. We have also included several demographic items which will be used to group responses according to college, faculty rank, and so forth. All responses are voluntary. You may, of course, elect not to answer any item, although complete responses are very helpful and much appreciated.

Faculty views on the current merit policy and general perceptions on merit compensation are critically important to our review. Please complete this survey within two weeks of the time it reaches you and return it to the Office of Institutional Research, 301 McFall Center using the campus mail envelope provided.

Thank you in advance for your participation. We look forward to sharing the results with you.

Sincerely,

The Ad Hoc Faculty Task Force on Compensation

Dave Albrecht, Accounting & MIS/Faculty Senate  
Bill Balzer, Interim Dean, BGSU Firelands  
Bonnie Berger, Director, School of HMSLS  
Jim Evans, Geology/Faculty Senate

Gary Lee, Chair, Sociology/Faculty Senate  
Don Nieman, Dean, College of A&S  
Sue Petroshiue, Chair, Marketing  
Clyde Willie, Dean, College of H&HS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The current procedures for distributing merit pay are fair</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The actual distribution of merit raises is fair</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The University's current merit plan is having a positive effect on faculty satisfaction</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The University's current merit plan is having a positive effect on unit morale/performance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The University's current merit plan is having a positive effect on faculty recruitment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The University's current merit plan is having a positive effect on faculty retention</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Regardless of the size of any salary increase, 100% of the increase should be based on merit</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Regardless of the size of any salary increase, 100% of the increase should be across the board</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Regardless of the size of any salary increase, 100% of the increase should be based on faculty need (i.e., to those with low pay and high expenses)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regardless of the size of any salary increase, only a portion of the increase (i.e., &lt;100%) should be based on merit</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My department/unit is able to measure my performance fairly and objectively</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Faculty members in my department/unit have control over their own levels of performance</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Salary increases should be across-the-board for all</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The use of bonuses (i.e., one-time awards that are not added to a faculty member's base salary) would be acceptable in some circumstances</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Some portion of a salary increase should be given based on seniority (i.e., years of service at BGSU)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Some portion of a salary increase should be given to make external market adjustments (i.e., equity adjustments based on comparison with colleagues outside BGSU)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to each of the following statements by checking the appropriate box:

SA = Strongly Agree (1)  D = Disagree (4)
A = Agree (2)            SD = Strongly Disagree (3)
N = Neither Agree nor Disagree (0)  DK = Don't Know/Not Applicable (9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Some portion of a salary increase should be given to make internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market adjustments (i.e., equity adjustments based on comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with colleagues inside BGSU)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Some portion of a salary increase should be given based on a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty member's performance</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Some portion of a salary increase should be given based on a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty member's unit/department performance</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Merit increases should be distributed in absolute terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., the same dollar increment for all faculty in a unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who perform at the same level)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Merit increases should be distributed in relative terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., the same percentage increment for all faculty in a unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who perform at the same level)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Faculty members should receive a salary increase when they are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoted</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The use of three-year rolling averages for calculating a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty member's performance is a good idea</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The Provost should have the discretion to distribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merit increases differentially to colleges based on differences in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their performance</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The Dean should have the discretion to distribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merit increases differentially to college units based on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differences in their performance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Chair/ Director should have the discretion to distribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merit increases differentially to college units based on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differences in performance</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. A significant portion of the salary pool should be set aside for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal (i.e., inside BGSU) and external (i.e., outside BGSU) market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjustments</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Each college should be allowed to determine, within some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broad guidelines, how salary increases will be distributed for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty members in this college</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Rather than providing modest merit increases to a large number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meritorious faculty members, it would be acceptable to provide larger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merit increases to a smaller number of the highest performing faculty</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Overall, how satisfied are you with the current merit system for faculty at BGSU?
   2% Very Satisfied (1)
   14% Satisfied (2)
   23% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied (3)
   33% Dissatisfied (4)
   28% Very Dissatisfied (5)

31. Overall how would you evaluate your current compensation?
   14% I am adequately compensated (1)
   46% I am compensated somewhat below what I believe I should receive (2)
   40% I am compensated well below what I believe I should receive (3)

32. Overall how would you evaluate the size of merit increases over the past three years?
   1% More than adequate (1)
   22% Adequate (1)
   77% Less than adequate (1)

33. College (primary affiliation):
   48% A & S (1)
   13% Business Administration (2)
   5% Firelands (4)
   4% H & HS (2)
   7% Musical Arts (7)
   3% Technology (5)

34. Faculty Rank:
   27% Professor (1)
   3% Lecturer (4)
   36% Associate Professor (2)
   7% Instructor (3)
   27% Assistant Professor (3)
   0% Other (6)

35. Gender:
   42% Female (1)
   58% Male (2)

36. Years at BGSU:
   26% 1-3 years (1)
   11% 4-6 years (2)
   17% 7-10 years (3)
   17% 11-15 years (4)
   17% 16-20 years (5)
   17% or more years (6)

37. Please write in any additional comments or concerns regarding the University's merit policy in the space below:

Sample size N = 238
35% Response Rate

Thank You!
Please return completed surveys to:
Office of Institutional Research, 310 McFall Center
Appendix E. Summary of Open-ended Comments from Faculty Survey
The survey of the faculty conducted by the Faculty Compensation Task Force generated 238 responses. Of these, 130 respondents made written comments about the merit system, the survey, and (sometimes quite tangentially) related issues. These comments have been coded into eleven somewhat distinct categories plus a miscellaneous category (n=14). Because some of the written comments made two or, in one instance, three distinct points, a total of 158 separate codes were recorded.

In the following paragraphs, the coding categories are detailed, together with the number of responses fitting into each category and a small sample of these comments, taken verbatim from the typed transcript distributed to Task Force members. They are arranged from the most to the least frequently mentioned categories. Brief editorial comments are included in italics for each category.

1. **Salaries in general are too low.** (N=29)

*Many people used the opportunity provided by the survey to voice their frustrations about low salaries in general. Comments to the effect that the distribution system doesn’t matter when the number of dollars available for distribution is so small were frequent. Representative comments:*

Until EGSU faculty salaries are brought up to an acceptable level overall, this fixation on “merit” is merely a distraction from the real issue – i.e., inadequate compensation.

Fewer surveys and more money. This university should be ashamed of how it compensates its faculty.

Until the issue of base salary equity with other state institutions is addressed, the merit revision process is a diversion of time and energy. It is reprehensible that we will soon be (if we are not already) the 11th out of 11 in the state, even behind Shawnee State! Dr. Ribbeau needs to remember that we cannot become the “premier learning community in Ohio” and “one of the best in the country” if our teachers and researchers are constantly reminded of the better pay and benefits elsewhere. Pay does matter.

The merit policy would be fine if there were ever any money to be distributed.

2. **Departmental merit systems are inequitable.** (N=28)

*Although the survey was about the university merit policy rather than internal department policies, many respondents did not differentiate the two or responded as if the department policy was the university policy. Representative comments:*

In my opinion, students’ evaluations of faculty teaching are given too much weight in the overall merit evaluation process.

Determining levels of merit within the department seems very arbitrary, as faculty who “work the system” and over inflate their self-assessments always end up with the lion’s share of the merit pool. The rest of us (especially new faculty) don’t have a shot. Also, our department merit document grossly overemphasizes research over teaching and service.

The evaluation process in our department seems to be a good old boys network. I believe I have gotten a fair share (a fair evaluation) but recommending merit raises for professors who haven’t published a thing in years and the tenured professors co-signing this process is ridiculous and counterproductive (and demeaning)!

The quality of work is never valued in my department. Pay raises often depend on how long the vitae is. Meritorious = how much one has done but not how well one has done. We should turn it around. We should value quality of work, along with quantity of work.

3. **Respondent’s individual salary is too low.** (N=18)
Many people expressed strong dissatisfaction with their own salaries, sometimes in the context of complaints about the operation of their departments' merit systems, and sometimes in the context of the general lack of funds for raises. Representative comments:

1. I am tired of being one of the lowest paid full professors in my field in the state!

2. I have consistently scored at the top of our merit pool for 13 years. Raises, not to mention merit increases, have allowed me to "achieve" one of the lowest salaries for a full professor in all of Ohio. There are probably a number of faculty across campus who have been "rewarded" in much the same way.

3. I have been here 5 years and we just hired someone who just completed their Ph.D. at $2000 more than I make. Plus I have done well in merit each year. This is not encouraging me to stay.

4. Cost-of-living increases have a higher priority than merit increases. (N=18)

The essence of most of these comments is that faculty members are entitled to keep pace with the cost of living. This is often mixed with the idea that everyone's salary should be brought up to an acceptable level before distinctions according to merit are made. Representative comments:

- All faculty should receive standard of living raises. Give "extra dollars" to highly meritorious faculty, but make public who these faculty are and why they received meritorious pay.

- Any merit system will be ineffective until we first adjust salaries overall to a competitive position. Only after this is done should we use a merit (or partial merit) based system.

- Merit is the most disruptive, demoralizing, divisive thing I have ever experienced. Give us at least 3% COLA then give merit to those truly judged above and beyond. Down with 100% merit – it's a turn-off.

- Cost of living increases should be made across the board – then any excess can be allocated to merit increases.

5. Merit increases have a higher priority or are more important than cost-of-living increases. (N=11)

These comments strongly favored merit increases based on performance. Several were critical of the current system because it disguises across-the-board raises as merit raises. Representative comments:

- Across the board raises of any type are a bad idea. All raises should be differential and performance-based, with performance determined primarily by the faculty in a given unit.

- The current policy rewards mediocrity. It rewards the most marginally productive and the most productive equally. We need financial rewards for excellence.

6. The current system is inequitable. (N=10)

This category is closely related to the previous one. Many comments here noted the fact that the current system distributes "merit" raises to virtually all faculty. Others focused on specific aspects of the current system as being unfair to some types of faculty. Representative comments:

- I think the current policy is ridiculous in using basic merit to camouflage across the board raises. Merit should be above and beyond doing your regular job. That should be reflected in an across the board amount and then merit will reward truly meritorious performance.

- Make the merit system a true reward for performance – increase the fraction amount for merit, decrease the fraction for across-the-board. . . . The professional development fund is not a solution, it's a patronizing bone thrown to an incompetent faculty member. The money won't help him/her improve, and it will just make that faculty member even more bitter. Simply deny a raise and direct the money to those that deserve it.
7. Merit systems in general are ineffective or inequitable. (N=10)

These comments argued that merit systems themselves don't work to increase productivity or morale or to achieve other system goals. Sometimes this point was made in the context of an argument for across-the-board raises, but in most cases no specific alternative was mentioned. Representative comments:

- The merit system promotes an unhealthy competition among colleagues. Research is of high value. Teaching less and service does not count for much at all.

- I question the very idea of merit pay. While in theory it sounds reasonable, in practice it creates conflict and affects morale.

- There is extensive research literature on the motivational impact of merit pay. The research clearly suggests that annual merit funds that amount to less than 10% of base salary are ineffective. Failure of the current system to enhance faculty motivation is essentially guaranteed.

8. The method of distributing merit money to departments is inequitable. (N=7)

Although this is not a unique property of the current merit system, several respondents were most concerned about unfairness in the equal distribution (by percent) of raise money to departments. The essence of these comments was that smaller, more junior departments have fewer dollars to distribute. Several people also pointed out that departments vary in productivity, but all receive the same percentage of their salary pools. Representative comments:

- Current policy greatly disadvantages members of small departments, especially those with very active and meritorious faculty.

- You need to examine differential allocation by department across all colleges, not just within colleges. Faculty in highly performing departments are currently being penalized because the merit pool is distributed across many people. This is a great injustice.

- Because the merit pool is derived from a unit's salaries, those of us in low-paid units (and with a large number of probationary faculty) are forever doomed to receiving inadequate merit raises. The merit pool for these units is woefully inadequate to provide for a "meaningful" raise.

- The university should adopt policy suggested in #24. Some departments on this campus are doing a greater deal more work than other departments with the same number of faculty. Faculty in departments that are carrying a disproportionate number of undergraduates, graduate students, grants, and/or publications should receive proportionally more resources for salaries. Almost not all of the faculty in my department are grossly underpaid relative to their workload and compared to other people in the external market in the same field. This has to stop!

9. Instructors (and lecturers) are treated unfairly. (N=5)

These complaints focused on the general situation of non-tenure track faculty, often mentioning both workload and salary. They have less to do with the current merit system than with the low salary levels of these faculty. Representative comments:

- Any system which compensates instructors for half the pay at twice the work cannot include principles of fairness or equity. The reality is most of us do service work, serve on committees AND publish at rates comparable to tenure track faculty hires. Without the possibility of tenure, fairness/equity would suggest greater salaries for the increased workload.

- Faculty on 1 year General Studies Writing contracts don't get raises even if hired year after year - pretty unfair, eh?
10. Decentralize all decision-making on raises to the departmental level. (N=4)

These comments were generally parts of other comments that were critical of the distribution of the first 3% of raise money to all “meritorious” faculty. The point was that departments are best qualified to judge merit in the context of their disciplines. Representative comments:

Do not impose a system of “merit increases in relative terms” on departments that don’t want it.

If there are issues with evaluation not being appropriate, let the unit deal with it. Decentralize the entire process!

11. The current merit policy is good. (N=4)

These respondents expressed no complaints with the current system, although this sentiment was sometimes expressed in the context of other complaints. Representative comments:

I like the 3 year rolling average so that when merit is given it isn’t all or nothing and work/achievement that is spaced out is still rewarded rather than lost because of one person who had the highest scores getting all of the merit (in one year). However, that star performer should be well rewarded. I also like the split between across-the-board and merit.

The policy would be fine if there were ever any money to be distributed.

Summary

In summary, there were more comments critical of the current merit system than supportive of it. However, the majority of the comments (101 of the 158, by my count) actually didn’t address the university’s merit policy, but instead focused on department policies, individual salaries, or the generally low salaries characteristic of the university.
Appendix F. Benchmarking Data:
Ohio Public Universities' Faculty Compensation Policies
E-mail requests were sent to Human Resource Officers at the other 12 four-year public universities in Ohio requesting information about faculty merit policy issues. Responses were received from eight institutions. Information from the four non-respondents was obtained by phone and by visiting each institution’s web pages.

Ohio State University
- Each college is a “strategic enterprise” which establishes its own compensation policy guided by central (i.e., university) principles and guidelines
- All salary increases are awarded based on “merit,” which is defined to include performance, internal and external equity, and the impact of the position or team on the mission of the unit and university
- The use of one-time cash payments is allowed to reflect truly outstanding achievements on time-bound projects, and/or to supplement the salary increase process in recognizing unusually outstanding performance

Ohio University
- Each academic department’s “pay delivery” is different, as is each department’s performance management system. However the actual pay out (i.e., range of salary increases) is not too dissimilar across units

Youngstown State University
- Provides negotiated salary increases to faculty which are not performance based

Kent State University
- The AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement, which identifies a portion of annual salary pools for merit, spells out procedures for the evaluation of accomplishments and distribution of salary

University of Cincinnati
- The AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement contains across-the-board increases and does not contain a merit pay or performance-based compensation component

Shawnee State University
- All salary increases are across-the-board or step progression increases

Wright State University
- The AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement provides annual pay increases that consist of an across-the-board percentage that is received by each faculty member and a merit increase pool where performance, time in position, and other factors are considered

Cleveland State University
- Faculty are represented by the AAUP, with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement containing only across-the-board increases
University of Toledo
- Faculty are represented by the AAUP, with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement including an across-the-board increase, a lump sum increase in base, and merit increases based on funds available at the departmental and collegiate level.

Miami University
- Annual salary increments for the instructional staff are determined as a result of guidelines set by the President. From these guidelines increases for Oxford campus faculty are then recommended by Oxford campus department chairs, through the academic deans and the Provost, to the President.

Central State University
- No information found on CSU web pages.

University of Akron
- Although salary adjustments may be considered at any necessary time, the deans, after conferences with their department chairs, normally review and recommend changes in salaries in the spring so that the president's recommendations may be presented to the board during the spring semester and salary changes can go into effect at the beginning of the academic year.
[Helping] ENCOURAGING employees TO KEEP OR TO restore [harmony] BALANCE between their work and personal lives is the personal goal of Mary Beth Zachary, chair of Administrative Staff Council, this year. They are a loyal group and have become caught up in the national trend toward "ratcheting up the work week," she said, and in the process may have lost some of the balance in their lives.

Creative thinking and imaginative solutions are best fostered when people are mentally and emotionally healthy, Zachary said.

She urged employees and supervisors to remember this and to model good, healthy work behavior for BGU's students. Zachary credited President Sidney Ribeau with creating an atmosphere in which this type of issue can be discussed.

Council is having a good year so far in terms of involvement, she said; so good, in fact, that there are more volunteers for committee work than the by-laws allow. She would like to amend the by-laws and committee charges to enable more people to participate.

The number-one goal for ASC, in her opinion, is to raise the principal in the scholarship fund. Now the corpus is about $90,000. The Scholarship Committee is working on setting a target and exploring ways in which it might be reached. This year, ASC is giving out nearly $4,000 in scholarships.

"We need to help our students as much as possible," she said.

The second goal is to present to council this fall a draft, in conjunction with Human Resources, of a revised performance-evaluation form. This is particularly important now that there is the component of merit as well, Zachary said. The goal is to devise a form that encompasses universal values but which can be customized to individual areas.

The Performance Evaluation Revision Committee worked intensively all summer on this effort.

In a related area, council will continue to work with Human Resources on implementing the president's compensation plan by gathering data on University administrative positions that have not been previously surveyed to determine market levels.

Other employee-related issues to be addressed include salary caps and the revision of the non-compensation conciliation process. The caps that were imposed as a result of the Mercer study several years ago are discouraging, she said. Since administrative staff is the only group on campus to have salary caps, "We need to do our homework, look at other universities and think creatively about how to resolve this problem," she said.

She would also like to continue to offer administrative staff opportunities for professional development and to implement the "Invest in Yourself" initiative.

"Investing in administrative staff is a good investment, as the Family Campaign demonstrated," she said.

It is also important to create an equitable compensation plan for the many administrative staff who teach, Zachary said. A committee surveyed these
employees and found that salaries/STIPENDS were "all over the board," she said. Now that the data have been gathered, the committee will work on a recommendation.

An ongoing goal of council is to build a groundswell of support for the creation of a Wellness Program for faculty and staff. Council encourages the administration to conduct a survey of BGSU employees to gauge support for the idea.

Administrative staff is also interested in the possibility of creating a catastrophic sick-leave pool. "Human Resources already works very closely to help people through those situations while staying within the letter of the law," she said, but more help might be possible. In order for such a pool to be implemented it will be necessary to study the Ohio Revised Code TO DETERMINE IF WE ARE ALLOWED TO DO THIS and also be very creative ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION, Zachary said, as the "logistics are enormous." The Constituent Group Caucus is a good avenue through which to explore the idea, she said.
Helping employees restore harmony between their work and personal lives is the personal goal of Mary Beth Zachary, chair of Administrative Staff Council, this year. They are a loyal group and have become caught up in the national trend toward "ratcheting up the work week," she said, and in the process may have lost some of the balance in their lives.

Creative thinking and imaginative solutions are best fostered when people are mentally and emotionally healthy, Zachary said.

She urged employees and supervisors to remember this and to model good, healthy work behavior for BGSU's students. Zachary credited President Sidney Ribeau with creating an atmosphere in which this type of issue can be discussed.

Council is having a good year so far in terms of involvement, she said; so good, in fact, that there are more volunteers for committee work than the by-laws allow. She would like to amend the by-laws and committee charges to enable more people to participate.

The number-one goal for ASC, in her opinion, is to raise the principal in the scholarship fund. Now the corpus is about $90,000. The Scholarship Committee is working on setting a target and exploring ways in which it might be reached. This year, ASC is giving out nearly double the scholarships. Last year ASC awarded scholarships, and would like to increase.

"We need to help our students as much as possible," she said.

The second goal is to present to council this fall a draft, in conjunction with Human Resources, of a revised performance-evaluation form. This is particularly important now that there is the component of merit as well, Zachary said. The goal is to devise a form that encompasses universal values but which can be customized to individual areas.

The Performance Evaluation Revision Committee worked intensively all summer on this effort.

In a related area, council will continue to work with Human Resources on implementing the president's compensation plan by gathering data on University administrative positions that have not been previously surveyed to determine market levels.

Other employee-related issues to be addressed include salary caps and the revision of the non-compensation conciliation process. The caps that were imposed as a result of the Mercer study several years ago are discouraging, she said. Since administrative staff is the only group on campus to have salary caps, "We need to do our homework, look at other universities and think creatively about how to solve this problem," she said.

She would also like to continue to offer administrative staff opportunities for professional development and to implement the "Invest in Yourself" initiative.

"Investing in administrative staff is a good investment, as the Family Campaign demonstrated," she said.

It is also important to create an equitable compensation plan for the many administrative staff who teach, Zachary said. A committee surveyed these
employees and found that salaries were "all over the board," she said. Now that the data have been gathered, the committee will work on a recommendation.

An ongoing goal of council is to build a groundswell of support for the creation of a Wellness Program for faculty and staff. Council encourages the administration to conduct a survey of BGSU employees to gauge support for the idea.

Administrative staff is also interested in the possibility of creating a catastrophic sick-leave pool. Human Resources already works very closely to help people through those situations while staying within the letter of the law," she said, but more help might be possible. In order for such a pool to be implemented it will be necessary to study the Ohio Revised Code, and also be very creative, Zachary said, as the "logistics are enormous." The Constituent Group Caucus is a good avenue through which to explore the idea, she said.
Charge to the ad hoc committee on Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Revision

The Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Revision should direct its efforts to the following goals:

- Make recommendations about improving the evaluation process to clarify requirements for both employees and supervisors (E.g. pamphlets, memos, training programs, etc.)
- Recommend a process to ensure compliance by supervisors through Human Resources
- Revise the current performance appraisal tool taking into consideration the following:
  - recognition of the importance of unit level priorities
  - integration of the performance appraisal tool and the unit level merit criteria
- Develop suggestions to units for integrating the performance appraisal process and tool with the unit level priorities and merit documents.
- Examine the evaluation of supervisors by employees; articulate implications and make recommendations

The challenges will be to

keep the tool broad enough to assimilate the unit level merit criteria into the evaluation process and to keep the process open enough for units to draw the relationship without telling them that this is the way--maybe making suggestions about best practices;

identify a few core performance areas which should be commented on by all supervisors --in addition to the unit level criteria for evaluation

assure compliance by supervisors without making the employee vulnerable to the supervisor

allow the use of any number-rating system at the discretion of the unit level.

Committee members:

Karen Woods
Inge Klopping
John Clark
Sidney Childs
Judy Donald
Beverly Stearns

April 4, 2000
I. Overview for Annual and Mid-year reviews
   A. Each supervisor and administrative staff member will meet mid year to
      1. Review performance to date.
      2. Review progress toward merit.
      3. Review progress toward goals and modify appropriately.
      4. Send completed and signed statement addressing the employee’s
         performance to date, progress toward merit, and progress toward goals to
         Human Resources on or before December 31 with copies to employee.

   B. Each supervisor and administrative staff member will meet annually to
      1. Review the performance evaluation and merit process.
      2. Review current job description.
      3. Establish goals for the upcoming year.
      4. Send completed and signed document(s) to Human Resources on or before
         May 31 with copies to employee.

Steps for the Annual Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal Process

1. Employee’s Responsibilities Prior to Supervisor/Employee Meeting
   a. Reviews the job description page from the employee’s Job Analysis
      Questionnaire making appropriate changes.
   b. Prepares a summary of the year’s activities and accomplishments based on the
      goals and objectives for the past year.
   c. Identifies goals and objectives for the coming year based on current job
      description and the mission of the Unit and the University.
   d. Sends these documents with appropriate changes to immediate supervisor.

2. Supervisor’s Responsibilities Prior to Supervisor/Employee Meeting
   a. Reviews the job description page from the employee’s Job Analysis
      Questionnaire making appropriate changes.
   b. Identifies goals and objectives for the coming year based on current job
      description and the mission of the Unit and the University.
   c. Reviews documents sent forwarded by administrative staff member.

3. Supervisor and Employee Meeting
   a. Meet to discuss job performance and merit recommendation based on the
      individual’s job description, established goals, and accomplishments.
   b. Jointly establish goals for the upcoming year based on current job description and
      the mission of the Unit and the University.
c. If necessary, begin the joint process of modifying the employee's job analysis questionnaire. If changes to the position are substantive, collaborate with Human Resources and follow the Administrative Compensation Plan Position Evaluation/Revaluation Process.

4. Supervisor's Responsibilities following the Supervisor and Employee Meeting
   a. Prepares the final evaluation and appraisal document addressing the employee's overall performance, progress toward goals, and recommendation for merit using the following merit designations:
      i. Exceeds performance criteria
      ii. Meets performance criteria
      iii. Does not meet performance criteria
   b. Gives employee the final evaluation and appraisal document addressing the employee's overall performance, progress toward goals, and recommendation for merit for review and signature. Discuss document with employee if the supervisor did not do so at supervisor and employee meeting. If necessary, the employee has the opportunity to provide additional documentation.
   c. Sends the following documents to Human Resources on or before May 31 and copies of these documents are given to the employee and immediate supervisor:
      i. Final evaluation and appraisal document addressing the employee's overall performance, progress toward goals, and recommendation for merit signed by the employee, immediate supervisor, and second-level supervisor and any documentation provided by the employee.
      ii. The employee's goals and objectives for the upcoming year signed by the employee, immediate supervisor, and second-level supervisor if this was not incorporated into the signed final evaluation and appraisal document.
      iii. The current Job Description page of the employee's Job Analysis Questionnaire.
6/8/00 Meeting of the Performance Appraisal Subcommittees-Administrative Staff Council

6 committee members (Sidney Childs was absent), attended the 6/2/2000 meeting: Karen Woods, Judy Donald, Doug Kruehl, Bas Stearns, Inge Hopping, and John Clark.

Inge Hopping, Chair, began the meeting by distributing copies of the Performance Appraisal materials currently on the ASC website and suggested that the "BGSU of Performance Appraisal" description last updated 5/12/98 be updated to become an all-inclusive document for Performance Appraisal and Merit.

The next agreement among committee members was that the Performance and Merit Appraisal process document should be general, inclusive, and yet flexible, containing no more than 4-6 general stipulations that each unit should follow in appraisal of administrative staff employees. In this conceptualization, each unit would conform to the general stipulations and could provide its own more specific items, tailored to that unit, in the unit implementation document submitted to Human Resources.

A suggestion was made that, as possible, language used within the university appraisal policy for administrative staff should be consistent across the institution. Of particular concern was the terms to use to define merit categories-e.g., "meritorious," "super-meritorious," etc. Committees members will discuss these labels and other definitional statements in the 6/22 meeting.

"Administrative Staff BGSU Performance and Merit Appraisal Process" was a unanimous committee choice as the title of the appraisal process. As conceptualized by the committees, this process document would be a set of institution-wide implementation guidelines for the "Principles and Recommendations for a Performance-Based Merit System for Administrative Staff at Bowling Green State University," (board approved and last updated 12/31/99). Units then would have the option of submitting a procedural description document to H.R. and following its stipulations, as well as long as those stipulations are in accord with the two institutional documents of policy and procedure.

Additional discussion resulted in a consensus terminology, to be used throughout the NSBMPAP, of "appraising performance for use in assessing merit." This terminology will continue to be revised, with an eye toward clearly identifying performance and merit appraisal as a single process. This terminology is intended for Item 1 of the Process Flowchart currently on the ASC website.

The next item discussed and agreed upon was replacing "job analysis" in
Items 2 and 3 of the Process flowchart with "job description (from page 2, percentages of time, of the employee's Job Analysis Questionnaire)."

The committee then decided that the formal recommended process for performance and merit appraisal must include a timeline, along with procedures flexible enough to allow for some unit variance yet stipulative enough to maintain necessary consistency and realistic conformity with university budgeting timelines (i.e., the contract year for administrative staff). By committee consensus, each unit area must adhere to "basic" procedural stipulations such as merit based on the performance appraisal for the year in question and thus, performance appraisal prior to determination of merit.

Documents H.R. will need, in all appraisal cases: a copy of the current job description for the employee, a copy of the written BGSU Performance and Merit Appraisal document (with supervisor signatures) for the employee, and upcoming year goals (based on the current job description) for the employee.

Ings Hopping will complete a draft of the activities required for each step in the appraisal process for our next meeting, so that committee members may review these activities and their descriptions. Karen Woods and Doug Krutz will bring a draft of the required timeline for the process (and specific activities within the process) to our next meeting.

According to this meeting's committee discussion, Item 4 within the process description would, in theory, consist of activities that take place during the employee-supervisor construction of an annual performance and merit appraisal document. Item 5 would detail those components necessary for submission to Human Resources. Earlier in the timeline, however, mid-year performance appraisals (progress toward established goals) also need to be completed and submitted to H.R.

The committee will continue to meet for two hours each second and fourth Thursday throughout the summer, beginning June 8th. Other meeting dates already arranged–each meeting to take place from 10:00-12:00 in B.A.A. 3000–are June 22nd, July 13th, July 27th, and August 10th.

Dr. John Clark  
General Studies Writing  
Bowling Green University  
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
5/23/00 Meeting of the Performance Appraisal Subcommittee—Administrative Staff Council

To begin our meeting, each of the 6 committee members, along with Doug Kruzel from Human Resources, reviewed several of the merit policy documents currently on file in Human Resources, copies provided by Karen Woods. Approximately 50 unit merit documents were reviewed.

Our goals in reviewing these merit policy documents, committee members suggested, could include creating a consensus document that shows units what they might do in accordance with established merit policy for the university, also to show units, employees, supervisors that performance and merit are interrelated and how they interrelate.

The committee determined that its overall goal in terms of establishing a “model” merit document or policy will be to show certain commonalities or points of consensus while still allowing individual units to add, delete, or change items as appropriate to the unit.

Education of possibilities for concept definitions, procedures, criteria, measurement methods, and determining merit recommendations from the process was agreed upon as a primary benefit of an articulated university-wide merit model. “The tool,” process interactivity, supervisor accountability, and consistency were listed as other priorities.

A suggestion was made that, since “process” is the most satisfactory element reported in the IPRA research, our committee should begin with a descriptive modeling of the process to be instructive to the university community. One suggested example of necessary instruction is in relation to the timing of “performance” and “merit” reviews, which in some units occur on very different timetables, but shouldn’t. Another example suggested is in relation to instruction in goal-setting. Employees might need to learn to adapt their procedures toward goals to fit in with changing emphases or initiatives coming from central administration.

The committee decided to meet for two hours each second and fourth Thursday throughout the summer, beginning June 8th. Other meeting dates already arranged—each meeting to take place from 10:00-12:00 in B.A. 280—are June 22nd, July 13th, July 27th, and August 10th. For the 8th, the committee’s goal will be to review the current performance appraisal process in the Administrative Staff Handbook and come to the meeting with revision suggestions.
John M. Clark, 12:29 PM 6/22/2000, How do you know when you've lo

X-Sender: jclark2@popj.bgsu.edu
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2000 12:29:04 -0400
To: Performance Appraisal Committee;
From: "John M. Clark" <jclark2@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: How do you know when you've lost it?
X-MIMETrace: Items by SMTP Server on MAIL03/SJFVP/BSGU(Palassa 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
06/22/2000 12:26:26 PM,
Serials by POP3 Server on MAIL04/SJFVP/BSGU(Palassa 5.0.2b |December 16, 1999) at
06/22/2000 05:32:22 PM;
Serials complete at 06/22/2000 05:32:22 PM

Folks,

Here are the notes. Yikes. -- JMC

6/22/00 Meeting of the Performance Appraisal Subcommittee-Administrative Staff Council

6 committee members attended the 6/22/2000 meeting: Karen Woods, Judy Donald, Doug Krutz, Eav Starns, Inga Kloppling, and John Clark.

Committee members distributed handouts of a process outline draft, of a draft introduction to the explanatory document, of a summary of several areas' performance evaluation categorical terminology (meritorious, etc.), and of an annual timeline for performance and merit evaluation.

Committee member Beverly Starns suggested that we incorporate in item IV-C of the process outline draft a parenthetical notation of what the employee and supervisor should look (in the Administrative Staff Handbook) for documentation of the process for a position reevaluation. Each of these process documents then was reviewed and commented upon by the committee. A suggestion was made and agreed upon to stipulate that stated goals and objectives for the year should be reviewed and modified as appropriate in the mid-year review process. The committee also agreed that the supervisor should send M.P., following the annual review, the one-page job description-amended if appropriate—from the position JMG. For ICC and IIIB, the committee agreed upon a change from the term "establishes" to "identifies." The draft outline, at this stage in committee proceedings, is intended to be overlaid with a timeline, appropriate evaluative terminology, and so forth in the "actual writing" of a performance and merit policy document.

Extended discussion then took place on the issue of how many performance/merit judgment categories should be included in the process description—three or four. Consensus was easily established that "does not meet performance criteria," "meets performance criteria," and "exceeds performance criteria" are (perhaps) the most appropriate terms for three categories. A fourth category of tier, however—"greatly exceeds performance criteria"—was the subject of intense discussion. Several arguments were made for listing three merit/performance categories, with the understanding that second-level supervisors could award exceptional and extra-exceptional merit as they see fit (percentages-wise). Three categories—"does not meet performance criteria," "meets performance criteria," and "exceeds performance criteria"—were voted the best choices by the committee.

With regard to timelines, the committee decided that May 31 is an appropriate deadline for submission of annual performance and merit evaluation documents. Further, the committee recommended a stipulation to be appended, stating that observance of a May 31 deadline is crucial to allow merit recommendations to be incorporated in the employee's next annual contract, which must (of course) be entirely processed prior to June 30.

The logic of a December 31 deadline for mid-year reviews also was discussed and approved. For example, a probationary (3 years or fewer) employee may be notified by December 31 that s/he is not going to be renewed for the
following year. Should this happen, a mid-year performance appraisal definitely should have taken place prior to the instigation of such a letter.

Immediate future plans: The committee decided upon a structured, semi-outline format for the eventual performance and merit appraisal process document and that the eventual performance and merit appraisal document have (a) an introductory/prefatory/explanatory statement, (b) an overview of the entire process, and (c) a section with detailed descriptions of all the process responsibilities, with timelines, for employees, supervisors, employees, and supervisors, and second-level supervisors. Chair Inga Bopping will take the committee decisions and suggestions from today's meeting and rewrite the outline draft for our next meeting, with the goal in mind of further discussing the wording of each section, now that the essential content has been at least generally established by consensus.

The committee will continue to meet for two hours each second and fourth Thursday throughout the summer, beginning June 8th. Other meeting dates already arranged—each meeting to take place from 16:00-18:00 in B.R.A. 3000—are July 13th, July 27th, and August 10th.

Dr. John Clark
General Studies Writing
Bowling Green University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
X-Sender: jclark2@mailstore.bgsu.edu
Date: Tue, 16 Jan 2001 09:35:34 -0500
To: Rebecca Ferguson <ferguson@bgsu.edu>, mzachar@bgnet.bgsu.edu
From: "John M. Clark" <jclark2@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Draft Charge for FMLA
Cc: dwickwe@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Folks,

It's clear that the "Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal Document [and Process]" should go into the Administrative Staff Handbook under "Merit Policy" in Section III (and under "Compensation Information"). One problem, however, is that the material currently in that section talks about some issues that are not specified in the new document--and I am loath to toss that whole section without some careful consideration among Administrative Staff.

Under Merit Policy specifically, I think we should keep the initial blurb and the list of 10 philosophical points and insert the new document (of 3 1/2 pages) after the Recommendations section--but we must delete the TIME DEADLINES portion from that current section in the handbook, as the time deadlines are newly (and more clearly) explained in the new document.

An alternative method of insertion—which might be even clearer—would be to put the new document first in the Merit Policy section and to follow with the material, as a more narrative explanation of the fairly terse new document, that currently appears in that section. Again, we'd want to (I think) delete the TIME DEADLINES list in Recommendation 11.

Does that make sense? I think we keep most of what's already there but append the new document as a sort of quick overview. For your viewing pleasure, I am attaching a draft copy of the new document, which you can compare to the handbook sections I am mentioning.

Best wishes,
John

Attachment Converted: "C:\\Documents\Attach\performance-merit-process-final.doc" -- Dr. John Clark General Studies Writing Bowling Green University Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Introduction

Effective performance evaluation systems facilitate the growth and development of individuals and, in so doing, provide for the growth and development of the organization. The University has established the following guidelines to provide supervisors and administrative staff employees with an overview and step-by-step approach to the performance evaluation and merit appraisal process. In compliance with the Bowling Green State University Board of Trustees policy regarding 100% merit for administrative staff salary increases, this process incorporates the principles and recommendations for a performance-based merit system as outlined in the Merit Policy for BGSU administrative staff (see BGSU Administrative Staff Handbook).

Rationale

The Bowling Green State University Administrative Staff Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal Process is designed to accomplish the following goals:

- Align the administrative staff employee’s goals with the overall goals of the University, college, and/or department on an annual basis
- Link performance with merit
- Provide consistency in performance evaluation and merit appraisal across university colleges, departments, and areas
- Provide opportunities for ongoing dialogue between the supervisor and the employee to accomplish the following outcomes:
  - Identify and define job performance expectations
  - Identify instances of performance that do not meet job performance expectations so that the supervisor and the employee can develop intervention strategies
  - Identify employee training and professional development opportunities
  - Identify instances of performance that exceed job performance expectations

Moreover, the process is designed to allow for maximum flexibility in determining the format of the performance evaluation and merit appraisal instruments. The underlying philosophy of this Administrative Staff Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal Document is to balance fairness and consistency in employee evaluations with allowance for the realities of specific jobs and the preferences of both units and individuals.

Process Description
The Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal Process described in this document outlines the activities that must take place, the documents that must be produced, the individuals who must be involved, and the time line within which each document must be submitted. This process allows individual contracting units to employ their merit documents in determining the criteria and mechanism for measuring performance and awarding merit to administrative staff in the unit. For example, merit appraisal measurements may be numerical or not, based on the unit’s merit document. Performance evaluation reports may be written in narrative or some other format, such as a table or list.

Time Line

- December 31, mid-year review submitted to the Office of Human Resources
- May 31, annual performance evaluation and merit appraisal recommendation submitted to the Office of Human Resources (in accordance with the University administration’s annual budget schedule)

Definition of Terms

The Bowling Green State University Administrative Staff Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal Document stipulates three classifications with regard to employees’ annual performance and merit:

- Exceeds performance criteria. Eligible for more than the % increase approved by the Board of Trustees.
- Meets performance criteria. Eligible for the % increase approved by the Board of Trustees.
- Does not meet performance criteria. Not eligible for a merit increase.

Other definitions significant to this document include the following:

- Immediate Supervisor. Employee’s first-line supervisor, or supervisor who normally prepares the employee’s annual performance evaluation.
- Second-Level Supervisor. Employee’s immediate supervisor’s supervisor, or position to which employee’s supervisor reports.
- Contracting Unit. Unit that produces employee’s contract (e.g., college dean’s or vice-president’s areas).

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MERIT APPRAISAL PROCESS

Overview for Mid-Year Review and Annual Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal
A. Each supervisor and administrative staff member will meet mid year to
   1. Review performance to date.
   2. Review progress toward merit.
   3. Review progress toward goals and modify appropriately.
   4. Send to Human Resources on or before December 31, a completed and
      signed statement addressing the employee's performance to date,
      progress toward merit, and progress toward goals, with copies to
      employee.

B. Each supervisor and administrative staff member will meet annually to
   1. Review the performance evaluation and merit recommendation.
   2. Review current job description.
   3. Establish goals for the upcoming year.
   4. Send to Human Resources on or before May 31, completed and signed
      documents with copies to employee.

Steps for the Annual Performance Evaluation and Merit Appraisal Process

1. Employee’s Responsibilities Prior to Supervisor and Employee Meeting
   a. Reviews the job description page from the employee’s Job Analysis
      Questionnaire, making appropriate changes.
   b. Prepares a summary of the year’s activities and accomplishments based on the
      goals and objectives for the past year.
   c. Identifies goals and objectives for the coming year based on current job
      description and the mission of the unit and the University.
   d. Sends these documents to immediate supervisor, with appropriate changes.

2. Supervisor’s Responsibilities Prior to Supervisor and Employee Meeting
   a. Reviews the job description page from the employee’s Job Analysis
      Questionnaire, making appropriate changes.
   b. Identifies goals and objectives for the coming year based on current job
      description and the mission of the unit and the University.
   c. Reviews documents prepared by the administrative staff employee.

3. Supervisor and Employee Meeting
   a. Meet to discuss job performance and merit recommendation based on the
      individual’s job description, established goals, and accomplishments.
   b. Jointly establish goals for the upcoming year based on current job description
      and the mission of the unit and the University.
   c. If necessary, begin the joint process of modifying the employee’s Job Analysis
      Questionnaire. If changes to the position are substantive, collaborate with
      Human Resources and follow the Administrative Staff Compensation Plan.
4. Supervisor’s Responsibilities Following the Supervisor and Employee Meeting
   a. Prepares the final performance evaluation and merit appraisal document, which addresses the employee’s overall performance, progress toward goals, and recommendation for merit, using the following merit designations:
      i. Exceeds performance criteria
      ii. Meets performance criteria
      iii. Does not meet performance criteria
   b. Gives the employee for review and signature the final performance evaluation and merit appraisal document, which addresses the employee’s overall performance, progress toward goals, and recommendation for merit. Discusses the document with employee if the supervisor did not do so at supervisor and employee meeting. Allows the employee the opportunity to provide additional documentation.
   c. Sends to Human Resources, on or before May 31, the following documents, with copies of these documents to the employee and immediate supervisor:
      i. Final performance evaluation and merit appraisal document--signed by the employee, immediate supervisor, and second-level supervisor--which addresses the employee’s overall performance, progress toward goals, and recommendation for merit.
      ii. Additional documentation provided by the employee, if any.
      iii. The employee’s goals and objectives for the upcoming year--signed by the employee, immediate supervisor, and second-level supervisor--if this was not incorporated into the signed, final performance evaluation and merit appraisal document.
      iv. The current job description page of the employee’s Job Analysis Questionnaire.
Subject: Re: 2/12/01 meeting

Folks,

On the issue of values, I'd like to hear (not that I am likely to hear) an expression of the PCC's goals regarding not just compensation but hiring, development, and retention of professional/administrative staff at BG. Mary Beth and I had some conversation with Donna W. and Becca this morning about what's being done to prepare AS for higher/better positions within the university and what's being done to keep AS happy in the positions they occupy. Although AS clearly has some focus on the former, our consensus is that a lot more can/should be done to prepare AS employees for the concept of upward movement within the institution. That's a tough nut to crack, given the high degree of specialization many of our AS positions require (position announcements typically include degree requirements, or at least coursework, in very specific fields). However, the latter concept providing for and satisfying the employee who wants to make a career out of the same position, may be even tougher—and tougher yet if the management perspective is that most AS positions are 3-5 years and out.

As tough and embarrassing as asking tough questions may be, to get direct answers, sometimes one has to ask direct questions. I can't see any way to frame a philosophy of compensation for a 500-strong group of professional staff without asking some semblance of these questions:

What level of qualification do you realistically aim for in your "typical" hiring for an Administrative Staff position? [Hint: "the best we can get" is an insufficient answer.]

To what extent, if at all, would the expected level of qualification or experience depend upon the scale rank of the position?

From date of hire in a position, how long do you expect or hope to maintain that employee in that position? If you have a goal in this regard, what methods or inducements are you willing to provide to reach this goal?

What relative degree of compensation equity do you perceive for Administrative Staff at BGSU, and how does this compare to your sense of optimum compensation equity? How long must and should it take for us to reach a realizable goal for AS compensation equity, if you don't believe it exists now?

Answers to any of these questions would be illuminating, because a logical plan that establishes clear expectations across the spectrum of AS employees must consider all of these people, and they all (in principle) should be willing to support such a plan. I'd like to see a compensation plan for Administrative Staff that we all can support—that, even though it doesn't do as much as we'd like for our own positions, sets clear and positive goals toward becoming a healthier institution. As long as we're talking about this person or that job, dealing with every position without consideration for (or with minimal consideration for) the impacts on our 500+ AS colleagues—the best outcome for all Administrative Staff at BGSU—we don't have a compensation plan, and there's no such thing as fair.

That's my 50 cents worth. Get out the envelope, Mary Beth.

john
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS FOR BGSU ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Click here for the printable format of this document.

You can jump to a certain section of this document using these links:

TRAINING OBJECTIVES

Spring, 1998:
- Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Training with the mission and core values of the University
- Establish a comfort level with the new Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal
- Enable employees and supervisors to utilize the new process correctly and effectively
- Learn and practice how to set goals
- Establish a foundation for giving and receiving effective feedback

Fall, 1998:
- Learn and practice the principles of appraisal feedback and on-going interaction to improve work performance
- Learn and practice how to identify employee strengths and developmental areas and to give support to mutually create an effective and efficient work force

OBJECTIVES OF THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

Provide a tool and recommend a process to:
- Clearly define job expectations
- Improve communication between employee and supervisor
- Align employee goals with the overall goals of the University, college, and department
- Link performance with rewards such as compensation increases, promotions, recognition, assignments, professional development opportunities, and career advances
- Be consistent across University departments and areas
- Identify employee training and professional development needs
- Establish clear-cut intervention strategies when performance does not meet identified job requirements

BACKGROUND

Need for a new performance process was identified by:
- Input from the Building Community Project
- Input from administrative staff, supervisors, Human Resources, President's Administrative Council

A committee with representatives from each Vice Presidential area was designated by the President’s Administrative Council to:

- Gather additional input from University personnel
- Research processes used by other universities
- Design a new process
- Provide recommendations for implementation

Committee members:

- Shelley Applebaum, Athletics
- Bryan Benner, Physical Plant
- Shirley Colaner, Human Resources
- Judy Donald, Continuing Education
- Robert Graham, Institute for Great Lakes Research
- Joann Kroll, Career Services
- John Moore, Human Resources
- Dan Parratt, Environmental Health and Safety
- Judy Paschalis, WBGU-TV
- Lori Schumacher, Payroll
- Karen Woods, Human Resources
- Dr. William Balzer, Psychology Department, Consultant to the committee

Results of further survey of administrative staff:

- 62% said a new performance process was needed
- 40% said they were not evaluated at all or that appraisals were incomplete, ineffective, or inconsistent
- 65% said they had never received any performance appraisal training
- 70% said the current process was not effective
- 71% said there was not enough trust at BGSU for a new performance appraisal process to be effective

THE NEW PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

Designed to address identified concerns:

- Mandatory process
- Mandatory training
- Will be evaluated for effectiveness and revised as needed
- Will provide input into other processes such as reward/recognition, career development, and intervention strategies

New process was a part of the 5 University priorities for 1996-97 and will be ongoing:

- Establish University-wide assessment/review processes for academic and non-academic units
- Provide on-going training and support for faculty and staff to assist in the implementation of the University’s vision
- Align reward structures with institutional goals

Process is aligned with achieving the vision of being the premier Learning Community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation

Process is aligned with the University’s Core Values:

- Respect for one another
- Cooperation
- Intellectual and spiritual growth

• Creative imaginings
• Pride in a job well done

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Key: Dates in bold are mandatory
Dates in bold italics are recommended

February-March, 1998 Training for administrative staff and supervisors
  • Focus on goal setting

May-June, 1998 Discussions with administrative staff and supervisors:
  • Review of job description
  • Review of performance for 1997-98
  • Setting of goals for 1998-99

June, 1998 Review of forms by second-level supervisor

July 1, 1998 Forms due to HR

Early Fall, 1998 Training for all administrative staff and supervisors
  • Focus on giving and receiving feedback

September, 1998 Feedback discussions with administrative staff and supervisors

December, 1998 Mid-year performance review with administrative staff and supervisors
  • Review of forms by second-level supervisor

March, 1999 Feedback discussions with administrative staff and supervisors

May, 1999 Discussions with administrative staff and supervisors:
  • Review of job descriptions
  • Performance review for 1998-99
  • Goal-setting for 1999-2000

Review of forms by second-level supervisor

June, 1999 Forms due to HR

TOP

ACTIVITY: PERFORMANCE AREAS

PURPOSE: Become familiar with the 12 performance areas on the appraisal form and identify additional specific behaviors for which feedback can be provided.

PROCESS:

1. Individually, review each of the 12 performance areas and examples in this section.

2. In small groups,
   - Identify additional examples of specific behaviors for which feedback can be provided that would help assess the performance area(s) you were assigned.
   - Select a spokesperson to share the results of your discussion with the entire group.

3. Take notes for future reference.

PERFORMANCE AREAS

1. Commitment to BGSU mission, goals, policies, and regulations. Promotes and works toward achievement of university-related goals within the framework of university policies and procedures.

Examples:
   - Maintains regular and reliable attendance
   - Enforces and complies with safety and health policies/procedures
   - Promotes equity and diversity in the workplace

2. Core professional/technical knowledge and skills. Understands and applies job-related knowledge and skills, policies and procedures, and technical expertise to fulfill responsibilities of the position.

Examples:
   - Comprehends and applies concepts, policies and procedures, and technical skills
   - Adapts to changes in job, methods, or surroundings
   - Originates or improves work methods

3. Professional development. Maintains and updates professional knowledge and skills necessary for success in current position.

Examples:
   - Participates in individual/staff training provided by unit, division, or university
   - Attends off-campus development and educational activities contingent upon support in terms of financial resources and release time by supervisor

4. Written and oral communication skills. Communicates effectively with supervisor, coworkers, and others.

Examples:
   - Shares information
   - Communicates job-related information
   - Prepares written documentation and administrative procedures
   - Facilitates and participates in meetings
   - Prepares and delivers oral presentations

5. Resource use and management. Uses appropriate resources to increase effectiveness of unit/area with BGSU.

Examples:

- Monitors financial status of unit/area
- Schedules employees
- Prepares and interprets statistics
- Develops and manages budget


Examples:

- Delivers quality services in friendly and professional manner
- Ensures that work products such as completed forms, records, and answers to questions have no errors
- Modifies old and develops new programs to improve customer service or program quality

7. Interpersonal relations at work. Develops and maintains effective working relationships with supervisors, staff coworkers, and others.

Examples:

- Deals effectively with interpersonal problems at work
- Consults with colleagues
- Demonstrates loyalty
- Collaborates with colleagues
- Is able to maintain professional confidentiality

8. Internal/external relations and service. Presents a positive impression of self and university while participating in university and non-university service activities.

Examples:

- Delivers presentations and lectures to the community
- Networks with off-campus community leaders
- Participates on university and non-university committees


Examples:

- Aids in selection of staff members
- Provides release time and financial support for development
- Develops and monitors performance expectations for staff members
- Provides continuous feedback
- Conducts effective performance reviews

10. Program monitoring, coordination, and management. Monitors, coordinates, and directs program activities to ensure adherence to policies and procedures given available resources, and to meet short- and long-term goals.

Examples:

- Ensures quality improvement in programs
- Reviews customers' progress and attainment of goals
- Collaborates with appropriate others for program modification and development

11. Supervision/teambuilding. Provides direction and support to individuals and teams to improve their work effectiveness.

Examples:
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1. Assigns tasks and responsibilities to staff/teams
2. Ensures and monitors adequacy of resources necessary for staff/teams to accomplish their jobs
3. Develops an atmosphere of teamwork and cooperation

12. Leadership and vision. Develops and implements new programs and policies in area/unit to enhance work effectiveness, customer service, and staff morale and motivation.

Examples:

- Proposes or champions new initiatives or directions to improve area/unit and university
- Generates employee support, enthusiasm, and trust
- Effectively represents area/unit on campus and in the community

GOAL SETTING PROCESS

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD GOALS:

- S = Specific
- M = Measurable
- A = Attainable
- R = Relevant
- T = Timely

PROCESS FOR SETTING GOALS:

1. Identify areas for goal setting. These might include:
   - Personal development
   - Process improvements
   - Teambuilding
   - Activities/projects to help department/university achieve its goals
   - Activities/projects that focus on providing better service

2. Write a goal statement, focusing on observable, measurable performance (e.g. "deliver, develop, produce, increase, or improve"). Include a time frame for completion.

3. Determine measures of success. Determine how you will know if the goal has been achieved.

4. Develop a specific action plan to include what needs to be done, who is responsible, and when each step will be completed.

5. Identify resources needed to accomplish the goal and how they will be obtained.

GUIDELINES:

1. Identify 3-5 major goals for each employee.
2. Goals may apply to more than one performance area on the form.
3. Some performance areas may not have a specific goal identified.

EXAMPLES OF EFFECTIVE GOALS

   - Success Measures:
     - Effective use of new skill on the job
     - Positive feedback from colleagues
     - Positive self-assessment
   - Action Plan:
     - Identify a job-related skill that needs improving (Employee 7/98)
     - Identify ways to improve that skill (e.g. training class, seminar, reading)(Employee 7/98)
     - Develop the skill (Employee 10/98)
     - Begin to apply the skill (Employee 10/98)
     - Assess the use of the skill and solicit feedback from others (Employee 5/99)

2. Goal: Assess the level of customer satisfaction in your area and develop an improvement plan by December, 1998.
   - Success Measures:
     - A representative sample of customers was selected
     - Effective methods were used to gather feedback
     - The improvement plan is implementable and realistic
     - Appropriate university resources were used
   - Action Plan:
     - Develop criteria to measure the level of customer satisfaction (Employee, Supervisor 8/98)
     - Develop a tool to use as a survey (Employee 9/98)
     - Select a sample of customers to survey (Employee 9/98)
     - Distribute the survey (Employee 10/98)
     - Analyze the survey results to determine areas of strength and improvements; prioritize improvement areas (Employee 11/98)
     - Develop a plan to address the improvement areas (Employee 12/98)
     - Discuss plan with supervisor; modify as appropriate; implement (Employee 12/98)

   - Success Measures:
     - Project completed on time and within budget
     - Appropriate resources were utilized
     - Project objectives were met
   - Action Plan:
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- Define the project scope (Employee 7/98)
- Get approval on resources needed (Employee 7/98)
- Identify significant milestones (Employee 7/98)
- Provide updates to supervisor (Employee Monthly)
- Complete project (Employee 1/99)

4. Goal: For the 1997-98 academic year, increase by 16% the number of students successfully placed in intern positions, as compared with the 1996-97 academic year.

- **Success Measures:**
  - Use of reliable data collection method
  - Positive student feedback
  - Positive employer feedback
  - Positive feedback from academic departments
  - Intern placements increased by at least 10%

- **Action Plan:**
  - Summarize data on intern placements for 1996-97 (Employee 7/98)
  - Develop and make presentations to student professional groups (Employee On-going)
  - Develop partnerships with academic advisors so they will refer students (Employee On-going)
  - Develop partnerships with potential employers to increase the number of intern opportunities (Employee On-going)
  - Provide follow-up services to students/employers during the internship; solicit feedback (Employee On-going)
  - Summarize data on intern placements for 1997-98 (Employee 5/99)
  - Identify strengths and improvement areas for 1998-99 (Employee 5/99)

ACTIVITY: GOAL SETTING

PURPOSE: Practice the goal setting process using the areas identified on the performance appraisal form.

PROCESS:
For each performance area you are assigned:

1. Read the description and examples.
2. Write one specific goal statement for 1998-99 for yourself or someone you supervise related to that performance area. Refer to the goal setting process in the previous section.
3. Develop success measures for that goal. How will you determine whether that goal was successfully and effectively achieved?
4. Develop an action plan to achieve that goal. Include what needs to be done, who is responsible, and when each step is to be completed.
5. Share your goal statement, success measures, and action plans with others in your group.
6. Use their input to modify what you have developed.
7. Be prepared to share your work with the entire group.

**ACTIVITY: RESPONSIBILITIES**

**PURPOSE:** Define what responsibilities both employees and supervisors have to ensure that the performance appraisal process is effective.

**PROCESS:**

1. Think of a time when you have been associated with someone whose advice and counsel you sought and valued. That person might be a parent, a teacher, a coach, a mentor, a peer, or a friend.

2. Write down the characteristics of that person that made you value their advice and counsel. Include when and how they offered advice.

3. What did you do that made it comfortable for that person to provide you with advice and counsel?

4. Based on the insights you gained from above, what specific attitudes and behaviors will you bring to the performance appraisal process...
   - as an employee?
   - as a supervisor?

---

### ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>EMPLOYEE</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job analysis, job description</td>
<td>Update job analysis, job description</td>
<td>Discuss with employee; Gain consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss with supervisor; Gain consensus</td>
<td>Send changes to second-level supervisor for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Send changes to HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Develop goals for the coming year</td>
<td>Develop goals for the coming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss goals with supervisor; Gain consensus</td>
<td>Discuss goals with employee; Gain consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document goals</td>
<td>Document goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Send form to second-level supervisor for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Send form to HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Self-assess progress</td>
<td>Assess progress of employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather feedback from others</td>
<td>Gather feedback from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet with supervisor to discuss strengths/improvement areas; Gain consensus</td>
<td>Meet with employee to discuss strengths/improvement areas; Gain consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Document discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEXT STEPS

1. Distribute performance appraisal forms to all employees and supervisors. Distribute, also, any goals for the department or function.

2. Schedule time for each employee and supervisor to meet individually.

3. Prior to the meeting, the employee and supervisor each should:
   - Review the current job description for the employee and identify potential changes.
   - Draft an assessment of the employee's performance for 1997-98, including strengths and improvement areas.

4. Conduct the discussion.
   - Gain consensus on any changes needed to the job description.
   - Discuss the employee's performance for 1997-98.
   - Discuss potential goals for 1998-99.
   - Gain consensus on 3-5 major goals, how those goals will be measured, and an action plan.
   - Discuss how the supervisor can support the achievement of those goals.
   - Discuss who appropriate feedback sources might be.

5. Document the discussion.
   - Revise the job description, if needed.
   - Use the new appraisal form to document performance for 1997-98.
   - Use the new appraisal form to document goals and success measures for 1998-99.
   - Add summary and/or additional comments.
   - Sign and date the form.

6. Send the job description and appraisal form to the second-level supervisor for review.

7. Submit the job description and appraisal form to Human Resources by July 1, 1998.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

Supervisors and employees:

1. Are able to communicate openly with each other.
2. Are willing to commit the time to have meaningful discussions.
3. Develop goals which are S-M-A-R-T.
4. Agree on when and how goals will be measured.
5. Are comfortable with the process.

6. Conduct follow-up discussions to measure progress.

7. View the process positively.

---

**Copies of Transparencies**

**TRAINING OBJECTIVES**

**Spring, 1997:**

- Tie Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Training with the mission and core values of the University
- Establish a comfort level with the new Administrative Staff Performance Appraisal Process
- Enable employees and supervisors to utilize the new process correctly and effectively
- Learn and practice how to set goals
- Establish a foundation for giving and receiving effective feedback

**TRAINING OBJECTIVES**

**Fall, 1997:**

- Learn and practice the principles of appraisal feedback and on-going interaction to improve work performance
- Learn and practice how to identify employee strengths and developmental areas to give support to mutually create an effective and efficient work force

**OBJECTIVES OF THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS**

Provide a tool and recommend a process to:

- Clearly define job expectations
- Improve communication between employee and supervisor
- Align employee goals with the overall goals of the University, college, and department
- Link performance with rewards
- Be consistent across University departments and areas
- Identify employee training and professional development needs
- Establish clear-cut intervention strategies when performance does not meet identified job requirements

---

BACKGROUND

- Need for a new process was identified by:
  - Input from the Building Community Project
  - Input from administrative staff, supervisors, Human Resources, President's Administrative Council

- A representative committee was designed by the President's Administrative Council to:
  - Gather additional input from University personnel
  - Research processes used by other universities
  - Design a new process
  - Provide recommendations for implementation

NEW APPRAISAL PROCESS

- Designed to address identified concerns:
  - Mandatory process
  - Mandatory training
  - Will be evaluated for effectiveness and revised as needed
  - Will provide input to other processes:
    - Reward/recognition
    - Career development
    - Intervention strategies

NEW APPRAISAL PROCESS

- Part of the 8 University priorities for 1996-97:
  - Establish University-wide assessment/review processes for academic and non-academic units
  - Provide on-going training and support for faculty and staff to assist in the implementation of the University's vision
  - Align reward structures with institutional goals

NEW APPRAISAL PROCESS

- Process is aligned with achieving the vision of being the Premier Learning Community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation
- Process is aligned with the University's Core Values:
  - Respect for one another
  - Cooperation
  - Intellectual and spiritual growth
  - Creative imaginings
  - Pride in a job well done

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD GOALS

S = Specific

PERIODIC PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS FOR BGSU ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

TOP

PROCESS FOR SETTING GOALS

1. Identify areas for goal setting:
   - Personal development
   - Process improvements
   - Teambuilding
   - Projects to achieve department/university goals
   - Projects that focus on providing better service

2. Write a goals statement

3. Determine measures of success

4. Develop a specific action plan:
   - WHAT needs to be done
   - WHO is responsible
   - WHEN each step will be completed

5. Identify resources needed

TOP

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

Supervisors and employees:

1. Are able to openly communicate with each other

2. Are willing to commit the time to have meaningful discussions

3. Develop goals which are S-M-A-R-T

4. Agree on when and how goals will be measured

5. Are comfortable with the process

6. Conduct follow-up discussions to measure progress

7. View the process positively

TOP

PERFORMANCE AREAS

1. Commitment to BGSU mission, goals, policies, regulations

2. Core professional/technical knowledge and skills

3. Professional development
4. Written and oral communication skills
5. Resource use and management
6. Service and quality orientation
7. Interpersonal relations at work
8. Internal/external relations and service
9. Human resource development
10. Program monitoring, coordination, and management
11. Supervision/teambuilding
12. Leadership and vision

TOP

NEXT STEPS

1. Distribute forms and department goals
2. Schedule time for each employee and supervisor to meet
3. Prepare for the meeting
4. Conduct the discussion
5. Document the discussion
6. Send job description and appraisal form to the second-level supervisor for review
7. Submit the job description and appraisal form to Human Resources by July 1, 1997

TOP
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