Performance Appraisal Survey

As part of the implementation of the new appraisal process, a commitment was made to assess the results of the first year’s experience with the new system. Please complete this survey and return it to Human Resources by Friday, October 5.

Please indicate your primary role:  65 Faculty  38 Administrator  141 Staff  244 Combined

A. For all employees:

1. I attended an education session on the new appraisal process. Yes 79%  No 21%
2. I completed a self-appraisal on my performance. Yes 99%  No 1%
3. My supervisor met with me in person to review my appraisal. Yes 98%  No 2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The employee education sessions on the new appraisal process were informative.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I understood how to complete my self-appraisal.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The appraisal meeting with my supervisor was constructive and informative.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having a discussion of my goals and objectives with my supervisor for the next appraisal period was beneficial.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I understand my goals and objectives for the next appraisal period.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My supervisor objectively evaluated my performance.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I understood how my salary increase was calculated.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have had follow-up discussions with my supervisor on my goals and objectives since my appraisal.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe the new performance appraisal process was applied consistently across the College.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative/Staff Employees – Go to section B  Faculty – Go to section C
**B. For Administrative/Staff Employees**

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. My supervisor explained what the standards are for “Meets Expectations.”</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The defined appraisal criteria covered the key components of my job.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I understand how merit pay was awarded based on the overall appraisal rating.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My supervisor followed the standard that if you were meeting the requirements of the job, your performance “Meets Expectations.”</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisors – Go to section D  All others – Go to section E

**C. For Faculty:**

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. The self-appraisal covered the scope of my position.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I understood the criteria for receiving merit pay.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The self-appraisal is an effective evaluative instrument for determining merit pay.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The appraisal process resulted in a meaningful dialogue and goal setting with my supervisor.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Did you apply for merit pay? Yes 84%  No 16%

Go to section E
**D. For supervisors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. The training session on the new appraisal process was helpful.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The support from my supervisor in reviewing my appraisals before meeting with my employees was beneficial.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I felt confident conducting appraisals in person with my employees.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I related my employees' goals and objectives to the department/division objectives.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I followed the standard that if an employee is meeting the requirements of the job that they were “Meeting Expectations.”</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The January-April timing and deadlines for conducting performance appraisals is workable for me.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I felt confident that I conveyed to my employees my expectations related to their jobs.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Which statement best describes your overall use of the ratings guidelines (i.e.: If an employee is meeting the requirements of the job, they “Meet Expectations.”)

- **21%** I generally rated higher than the defined standards.
- **79%** I generally rated following the defined standards.
- **0** I generally rated lower than the defined standards.

*Go to section E*
Performance Appraisal Survey Responses

Please share any specific feedback or suggestions you have regarding the following:

30. Forms:
   - Forms were poorly worded and vague. There was no clear guide as to what was being asked.
   - Even though training was available on several occasions, there were many who did not use the opportunity to find out more about their performance appraisal and how information was to be collected and the forms to be completed.
   - The forms were a little confusing and vague.
   - Just fine.
   - The self-appraisal form I filled out was at worst vague and unspecific in terms of goals and self-appraisal. Instead of asking questions about performance strengths, a series of statements were made that were presented in such a manner that left you wondering how you’re supposed to respond? I feel the self-appraisal form was poorly thought out and presented with little consideration to measure the employee’s true strengths and performance.
   - Forms are good.
   - Need to have all forms online for ease of attainment and completion.
   - It would be much fairer if we got short evaluations from those at the college who depend on us to service them, instead of one evaluation from a biased boss.
   - Strange and not appropriate.
   - Should be more explicit.
   - Statements were vague regarding my specific job.
   - Extensive.
   - Wording is still difficult to understand.
   - The wording on the forms was very confusing. Someone needs to rewrite them.
   - #13. Meets expectations means that doing your job accurately isn’t going to (be) rewarded.
   - The forms do not adequately reflect all levels of job responsibilities and/or training. Staff who had never filled one out before struggled with many of the categories.
   - Too vague, nebulous, and ambiguous to be of any real value.
   - Waste of time.
   - Professional Performance Appraisal forms still vague and redundant in its wording. Job duties and activities don’t fit any one category.
   - Forms are fine.
   - Too much complaining going around my campus, especially from faculty. They probably don’t understand. Could someone please give them assistance? It’s annoying to listen to their constant complaints.
   - Somewhat confusing.
   - I think the forms are effective tools.
   - I felt that some of the questions were not fairly evaluated, specifically question 7 dealing with dependability and fulfilling position responsibilities. Either an employee is meeting those expectations or not there is no way that an employee can either “exceed expectations” or partially meet expectations. Therefore, the answer choices, in terms of exceeding expectations leads the employee and their supervisor to mark either “meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations.” There is a similar problem with question 8 which deals with safety habits and dress. Again these are areas where an employee is either meeting expectations or not. The way the answer choices are designed, it should be impossible for anyone to gain full merit pay. Knowing that some people did receive full merit pay, I believe the system is biased.
   - Forms seem lengthy and filled with jargon.
   - The forms are fine, it’s the supervisors that are the problem.
   - The forms are redundant and repetitious. Supervisors tend to use it as a “negative” assessment tool instead of a positive. Experts teach that negativity begets negativism.
   - I did not really understand question number 21. I thought we were given merit pay, I did not know we had to apply for it.
The forms were easy to complete, but for new employees who have never been through this kind of appraisal process, it was not easy to know HOW to answer some of the questions. The form questions are not very clear. For instance, what does “Demonstrates Behavior Consistent with TCC’s Core Values and Mission Statement” mean? How does one answer that? I do what I consider my part and then some to promote TCC to friends, family and the community. Does that benefit me when it comes to merit compensation?

This was the first year for this new process. It will more than likely take a few tries to perfect a form that works for most, hopefully all.

Horrible wording to questions.

The self-appraisal forms were difficult to fill out. Self-evaluation is not an easy thing to do and trying to evaluate your own performance and have it fit in the criteria was difficult.

Not enough room on the form to accurately describe duties or details of jobs.

The forms are easy to follow and fill out.

Did not care for the formatting, can’t spell check, didn’t allow enough space for responses, page breaks in wrong places, waste of space, etc.

As usual, poorly done and in need of revision. Get faculty to revise it. How about the newly promoted Associate Profs?

Don’t really include the many tasks performed by Workforce Program faculty. Considerable time is spent outside regular business hours arranging for clinical, teaching experiences, field trips. Additionally, patient care is not recognized.

Not enough room in the other area to adequately explain what you achieved—too much emphasis on Faculty Association (Committees and Executive Board area) and not other college wide committees like the Curriculum or Workforce committees.

OK

The forms were pretty self-explanatory, the training I received from my AD was a joke. He didn’t have the correct forms or information. I had to get those from another source on my own.

The forms did not have enough space to list all of the extra stuff in which I am involved.

The forms seemed effective.

Merit Pay: I believe that some activities should receive more credit than others. For example, receiving credit for working one day at Day of Caring is fine. However, receiving the same credit for being the sponsor of an organization that requires many, many hours over the course of a semester or year should count more. In fact I think that a sponsor of an organization should receive meritorious pay whether they do anything else or not.

We needed more space for writing. If we had more space to explain how an action or activity is meritorious, you would not need any documentation.

Seems easy enough.

The forms are cumbersome but do reflect the teaching faculty job description. Perhaps receiving merit pay for doing that (teaching) well would make more sense than getting merit pay for everything beyond the classroom as it is now.

The self-appraisal form should be altered as some of the items require a yes or no answer rather than a multiple choice. For example, faculty either distribute and explain their syllabus or they don’t. There is no exceeding expectations on this. This is just one of many possible examples. The form should be fixed.

Progress toward a more objective evaluation was a welcome change! On the faculty forms, please add additional objective information such as number of students as this can drastically impact the workload of a faculty member and, in some cases, may be one longer-term indicator of the quality of instruction.

Okay.

I don’t know if I applied for merit pay or if I got it or how in the world my salary was figured for this year—or last for that matter. Although I am faculty, my job requirements don’t fit the mold, completely. We had to “make things fit” on my evaluation. I have no idea if that helps me or hurts me. ??? I’m going to trust the college. :-D

Fairly self-explanatory.

Forms are okay.

Fine—in general, I thought they were easy to use.

See next.

Difficult to complete.

The merit categories did not fit for several meritorious activities. One example there was no category to demonstrate collegial/collaborative projects across disciplines or campuses. Also not an easy determination for a category for serving on community or state boards. Used “Other” category a lot.
• Criteria too narrow: This very form has range of “5” boxes. Form I took had only “3” boxes—Needs “10” boxes. I felt form was biased and premeditated and fell short of what could have been assessed. Too brief.
• The forms are adequate.
• Forms need much work. Double-dipping and triple dipping is possible; the forms make it so. We received contradictory communications about how reassigned time fits into merit pay. Being listed as on a committee doesn’t equal merit pay. What does a person add to the committee, task force, council, etc., on which he/she is listed as a member? Merit pay should be for meritorious effort and action and product. Merit pay was not defined well. According to the present form almost any employee is meritorious. Of course, we would love for that to be so, but the form should not be the cause.
• One of the 6 options given in the OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING section seems to need to be reworded; as it does not literally mean what it states. For example, best is (1) Exceeds expectations on a consistent basis (2) Exceeds some, meets most and (3) Meets expectations. Number two should probably state (2) “Exceeds some, meets all” but because the way it’s worded, it sounds like the person didn’t meet the minimum requirements on all expectations—even if they did. Seems this wording could artificially inflate your results, allowing you to give a person who didn’t meet all expectations a number (2) ranking, which IMHO shouldn’t occur. I interpret a (2) would be someone who met all their performance expectations like a (3) and was doing more than necessary but not consistently like a (1). Just a thought…Good job, overall. Glad TCC went to this process.
• Forms are cryptic and too general to be useful.
• I do not agree with the form. This same type of form and evaluation was used at a previous job and it puts a cap or ceiling on what an employee can earn. If you marked too high, HR told us to go back and re-rate everyone. Not to say this would happen at TCC, but the possibility is there. There aren’t clear defined items of two of the items which are similar which can make for problems in the workforce. As an example “Ms. X” thought she was way above exceeds expectations and “Ms. Y” thought meets. It was all about feelings and there was no actual way to measure goals. Feelings were hurt this year and the staff didn’t like the forms.
• Good forms.
• Functional.
• It is unclear regarding the overall rating as to whether this is linked to the individual areas or to the goals. What if someone “exceeds” in several of the individual categories but not on meeting their goals? Or vice versa?
• I like the fact that within the various categories on the self-appraisal we are able to make statements about what we have done rather than just checking boxes. The supervisor is also able to make comments on how they rated us in each category.
• Forms are helpful because a supervisor can show extreme areas of deficiency without penalizing an above average employee.
• I suggest a Likert scale attached to the Merit Pay categories on the faculty appraisal form so that individuals can be recognized for different levels of performance rather than “acceptable” or “not acceptable.” Then points could be awarded to determine the level of merit rather than how many boxes were checked and “accepted.”
• I feel that the forms are easy to use and easy to understand.
• Confusing and redundant.
• This is a waste of time.
• Fine.
• Is difficult to type and read the very small print in the small areas of the forms.

31. Process:
• We all get lost in the requirements of committees or the next demand coming down the road. We need to consider having quarterly “tune-ups” with our supervisors and with our staff if we are truly going to follow specific goals and objectives. The year can slide by with just trying to respond to the next request. It would be good to become more involved in the real development of ourselves and our employees.
• The worst aspect of the process was no professional communication was sent to the recipients. A letter from the president’s office should have been sent to each recipient’s home address. Instead, they were left to wonder if they had received it. Then, they were told, “Look at what you earned last year and what your new contract says. After allowing for the 4% raise to all, you should be able to tell between the difference of last year’s salary and this if you received merit pay.” Tacky and demeaning. If we are a profession, let’s treat our employees as such.
• I did not feel that all of the ADs looked at the faculty appraisals from the same general point of view.
• A weakness in this process is the lack of a mechanism for getting feedback from those forced to work on a team or group project with one or more employees who do not report to them. In one instance that I am familiar with, a supervisor continued to send emails of high praise to an employee, with copies to the team, at the same time this employee was creating utter havoc for the team and the College.
The supervisor rejected any criticism from team members. Our current evaluation system does not have a mechanism to provide a reality check for people working with anyone other than their direct supervisor. The problem with attempting to create such a mechanism is that it can so easily become nothing more than a finger-pointing exercise.

- The appraisal process is compromised by distractions about pay increments that are too small to be significant.
- Easy to understand.
- I didn’t like being put in the situation I was in. I wasn’t able for a raise but I had to evaluate staff and give them raises since I hadn’t been here long enough. Again, I still had to evaluate and be evaluated but I was so new it just wasn’t fair at all. Nor did I get a fair evaluation and I was scared to say anything because I was so new. Knowing now what I do, I would have handled differently. I see a future problem this upcoming year again with an employee.
- Rocky, but first time implementation. Timing is lousy via-a-vis APB and other time commitments/constraints. Do not agree with nor accept statement that HR has a great deal of additional work with this process and needs additional time. It was extra work for every department in the college, but the timetable followed was not negotiable.
- We are required to complete appraisals before the college has outlined goals/initiatives for the year (we also have to do APB prior to this) and then typically a major initiative we were unaware of develops and interferes with meeting our goals. In the past, we just adapted but now that pay is linked to goal attainment (theoretically), how do we proceed? Rewrite goals in the middle of the year? If so, then we have a short window to try to attain them before the next appraisals are due. In addition, no one knows what “exceeds in some” means…how many is “some”?
- Process this past year was rushed. Supervisors were told to request to visit faculty classrooms, but did not have enough time to do so and then to use this as a part of the performance appraisal.
- The process is ok. The discussions seem to be more positive when goals and objectives for the upcoming year are discussed.
- The process is not consistent within the College and makes for disruptions in the evaluation of employees within my department. As a result, some people (especially some faculty) believe this a system designed to reward favoritism, due to a lack of consistency.
- I enjoy the entire process, it gives me time to reflect on all of the things that I have accomplished over the year, and also allows me to see the areas in which I could make improvements.
- Process this past year was rushed. Supervisors were told to request to visit faculty classrooms, but did not have enough time to do so and then to use this as a part of the performance appraisal.
- The process is ok. The discussions seem to e more positive when goals and objectives for the upcoming year are discussed.
- The process is not consistent within the College and makes for disruptions in the evaluation of employees within my department. As a result, some people (especially some faculty) believe this a system designed to reward favoritism, due to a lack of consistency.
- I enjoy the entire process, it gives me time to reflect on all of the things that I have accomplished over the year, and also allows me to see the areas in which I could make improvements.
- Please add to evaluation of everyone doing the self-evaluation—that was very beneficial. Will part-time employees ever be evaluated for the raise they receive?
- It may not be a portfolio process, but I had to create one to fully address the questions.
- Not applied equally, my provost, who has not expertise, was making assessments on things she knew nothing about and overrode my AD. The process is seriously flawed and needs faculty to evaluate faculty.
- My provost already had decided whether or not my activities were deemed meritorious BEFORE I had a chance to meet with my supervisor to discuss them. Fortunately, I have a good supervisor who went to bat for me and supports me. I wonder about those who aren’t as fortunate as I.
- The process really needs to be applied consistently across the college. I think once the new associate deans have been through this a couple of times, they’ll be a little more realistic about what is required.
- Fine.
- This is OK. Much better than the promotion process. It is not clear, however, how this process will feed into the promotion process in the future.
- Very confusing. Never knew if I got the merit or not till I got my first paycheck.
- Almost any conversation with my AD is a waste of time. He’s pleasant fellow, but useless. The evaluation is in no way constructive or realistic. He sits and types in his own answers while the faculty member looks on. None of the comments have any basis in fact. He just says “nice” things to maintain the status quo. My AD has no idea what I do or how to help me improve myself. He has no idea what the programs in our division actually do or need. It’s too bad, because with a little leadership, the programs in this division could really excel. We have good people, but we need leadership. Also, the “personal goals” thing is flawed. No one ever asks me how I intend to pursue or meet those goals. My AD doesn’t really have any intention of pursuing that or of encouraging me to pursue it beyond a kind word. I’m never expected to account for how or why I did or didn’t pursue my goals. Next year I could fill in anything in the “last year’s goals” box and no one is ever the wiser. I hear some faculty make it up anew every year just to get the process over with. There’s a huge disconnect here. The information goes nowhere, does nothing, is tied to nothing.
One problem with the process is all extraneous activities are weighted equally. For example, I can put down that I was a member of a committee, but there is no way to actually know how involved I was with the committee, or how instrumental the committee was to the mission of the college. I got the same credit for a committee on which I only attended one meeting as I did for the committee which met 6 hours a month and I was instrumental in planning presenting the program. Another problem with the process is that the only thing being measured in any area is quantity. The quality of the participation and the value of the activity is not given any weight. A third problem is that there is no verification of anything put down on the forms. A person can put down anything he/she wants because no supporting evidence is required. (However, the time it takes to put together a portfolio isn’t worth the amount of $5 given in merit pay.) Finally, I think it is somewhat odd that I can take time away from my normal job duties to do an “approved” merit pay activity. This essentially means I am rewarded for not doing my regular work by participating in something that has no direct bearing on what I’ve been hired to do.

The process worked fine for my situation, but seemed inconsistent overall.

It took a LONG time to gather the information and write out the form. Maybe once the process is established, we’ll be gathering the info all year long and it can go more quickly.

Employees need to be told exactly how they are going to be evaluated. Decisions on salary and merit need to be sent by letter to the employee’s home address. Many employees did not know if they had received merit pay or at which level. That should be part of your contract letter.

My supervisor has never effectively evaluated my performance – he doesn’t quite understand what it is that I do nor he doesn’t seem to care. It is a waste of time to meet with him. I have never felt that these sessions were helpful.

Totally arbitrary. Some supervisors required documentation for merit pay, others did not. Many people falsified their merit pay forms claiming they served on committees. People sign up for a committee so their name is on some list, but then they NEVER attend or do any work for that committee.

Which process are you talking about? The process that led to the policy and procedure or the process of implementation of this procedure? On our campus the implementation should not have taken place. Supervisors with less than two months on the job and no recent teaching were in no place to make a valid judgment of faculty performance over the previous twelve months. That fact contributed to the disdain felt by many for what we perceived as a flawed idea. The idea that if a clerk does marginally below expectations they can get a small merit raise, but faculty must not only do everything in their job description to achieve the lowest level of merit is ludicrous. Are not faculty worthy of pay based on what is required in the job description like others in the employ of the State of Oklahoma through Tulsa Community College? Why not?

The process is fine. However, getting the form back took quite a bit of time, and it was not clear in some cases whether individuals received merit pay. A letter from human resources to that effect and the level of merit pay received would be helpful and relieve much concern among faculty.

The process needs improvement. Based on conversations with colleagues, I do not believe that the criteria for determining merit pay were clearly identified or consistently applied. There were many activities that were considered meritorious for some and not for others. Although I got my merit pay, I did not feel good knowing that other colleagues who were deserving did not get it.

The Associate Deans (or supervisor as applicable) should be required to substantiate (in-depth written explanation) goals for the upcoming year and outline the expectations. This should help to minimize misunderstandings. In addition, there needs to be a better way to ensure that fairness and consistency is maintained throughout the entire college for evaluation process. Faculty need to know ahead of the evaluation period what actions are going to be considered meritorious. In addition, faculty and staff should be able to evaluate Associate Dean’s and the Provost’s performance with regard to meritorious performance evaluations.

Different colleges do not view criteria in the same way. I was told that many of the factors that might exceed expectations in another college, were just basic expectations for my division so meeting those expectations do not result in any increase in pay.

Fine.

The process is more sophisticated than what we’ve done in the past. We are moving in a positive direction. There will be growing pains. I’m sure.

Simple.

The idea of having an AD with a couple of semesters of adjunct teaching, or maybe even a couple of years teaching full-time, mentoring faculty members with over a decade of experience and numerous teaching awards is both silly and insulting. For the most part, when it comes to teaching, faculty need to be mentoring ADs, not the other way around! Let the ADs be the low-level managers that they are, not “teaching coaches,” which they do not have the qualifications to be. The process should also include informing people of whether or not they got a variable pay raise and, if so, at what level. If not, why not. Virtually no one knew! Finally, the process lacked consistency. Some ADs told faculty at the end of the meeting whether they were recommending them or not. Others told faculty that they were going to wait until they had met with all faculty and COMPARED them before deciding. This was completely against the procedure developed by the Faculty Subcommittee of the Compensation Committee. Some ADs counted service on the Faculty Association, the Forum, and FA committees; others didn’t. The process was a mess.

This seemed to be unnecessarily messy and uneven. If we are to function as “one college,” then policies need to be consistently understood and implemented. My impression from listening to colleagues is that satisfaction with the process was more a matter of luck of the draw (=a fair and conscientious AD) than well-applied policy.

Improve lead time awareness. Improve “calendar” of “events” to be completed in a table view form. Checkbox completion.
• Took time away from teaching/learning.
• Totally inappropriate to throw this at employees without presenting at the beginning of the contract year! All AD’s on the NE campus were new to evaluation and to their divisions. Much discrepancy within divisions and across the college in which activities counted as meritorious. I have NEVER seen an effective merit pay system with any of the previous employers I have had, and this one seems to be following suit by falling into administrative barriers to fairly assessing individual performance. I believe the levels required managed to lower standards for many of us. It has taken some of the personal fulfillment out of choosing to participate in activities because I do not want the assumption that I am choosing activities for this reason. I believe the faculty system of a specific amount awarded is a better plan than the admin/classified b/c it awarded people equally for meritorious activities, although I question how the amounts were established. I think awarding someone merit pay when they performed below expectations or even meeting expectations is inconsistent with the whole idea of “merit”—you cannot perform below standard and exceed the standard as well! If the standard of meeting expectations is applied for faculty—TCC gave a higher overall % to some individuals who were not meeting expectations than to faculty who performed 1, 2 or 3 meritorious activities—how can that be good for morale! A % system unfairly rewarded administration over most other employees because 1% of higher paying salaries far exceeded the 1% to a secretary or $500 to a faculty member.
• Had one meeting prior to distribution. I felt lack of eye contact with supervisor which left an uncomfortable and uneasy feeling about the form when it was seemingly brushed off by supervisor. Many questions were incompletely answered at this meeting (I kept notes) and I assumed X either didn’t know or did not want to answer.
• I believe all of us were led to believe that this appraisal was not a foundation for merit pay.
• Did not know that I could (apply for merit pay).
• I feel the appraisal process was a little cumbersome during this first year. With additional training to help aid staff in how they view the process, how to complete forms and how to set their goals, I think most staff members will see an improvement in their job performance because they see the results of the goals they set.
• The process needs an appeal process – what about evaluations that the employee feels were unfairly submitted, If there is such a policy it needs to be better advertised.
• Just fine.
• I don’t really care too much for the evaluation. I like the old way better.
• The whole process is at least at a starting point and headed in the right direction. A check and balance system is needed though. What if your supervisor has something against the employee and gives them a poor performance rating based on their own biased points of view? There is no way to contest a poor performance review? This happened to my former boss and she was denied a raise because the women giving her an evaluation did not like her and discredited everything she did and stated she was a substandard employee. This was a flat out lie and made her look really bad. There was no way she could go about this thought and when she objected to the poor review, the women did not want to listen to her.
• My boss took forever to do our evaluations. I had no idea what my raise was. Boss had no idea how to do a proper evaluation. Worst part?—I have no idea what I will be judged on next time!
• I was told in my meeting that no one could or should receive a perfect score of “Exceeds Expectations” in all categories per higher administrators (i.e., the deans, etc.) I was just recently told that several people among the college received the highest score. This is the reason I scored question 12 as “strongly Disagree.” I feel that better communication needs to take place amongst the supervisors when they’re informed on how to rank their employees, especially those who truly deserve a higher rating.
• Not good.
• My evaluation was based on what the 3 others in our office said about me. While they were spending hours gossiping and playing computer games/surfing the web, I was working trying to get my job done. They obviously had a lot of time to find fault in everything I did. This joke of an evaluation took away any spirit I had in doing my job.
• Do not believe these are appropriate.
• Acceptable.
• Labor intensive.
• All very fuzzy.
• Joke.
• Despite my asking if he would like me to submit my self-evaluation form to him beforehand, my supervisor did not look at my self evaluation prior to preparing his evaluation of my work performance. He glanced at my self-evaluation briefly only during my official performance review meeting with him. He appeared to be unaware of many of my completed projects, regular job duties, and activities accomplished during the evaluation period, and had to amend several times the official evaluation form that he turned in to HR. I strongly question the process of requiring the employee to complete a self-evaluation if it is not going to be reviewed or considered. I was disappointed in the entire experience. It was quickly obvious that this supervisor is highly unlikely to ever recommend any employee for merit
During the performance review discussion he told me that he was aware some other employees under his supervision were not performing their basic required duties, but because this was a long-standing situation, there wasn’t really anything he could do to change their behavior. What I took away from this meeting was that it’s okay with him to be a problem employee, and pointless for people to strive to do their best work, as he is oblivious to any such effort. Not exactly inspiring.

- I appreciated the questionnaire about our position. Doing the self evaluation was an interesting experience.
- What a joke!
- The process could use some work. I felt that my employees were meeting expectations, at least in accordance to what they knew to do. However, my immediate supervisor instructed me to knock their marks down in some areas. I felt like since my signature was on the form my immediate supervisor did not have a right to make me change the form. There needs to be some clarification on this.
- Again, faculty complaints are annoying. They need help.
- OK.
- I was unsure until very late in the process what I could expect my merit salary increase to be.
- The merit system is not fair to everyone. The favorites get the raises. Also if they don’t want to give you a raise they give a bad or negative review even though it’s not true.
- My supervisor dictated to me how to fill out my employees’ evaluations and was not very open to discussion about it. I felt like I had to argue on behalf of my employees that I work with daily. I did not agree with my supervisor’s assessment of them due to the fact that she does not work with them every day and only sees part of their work. My supervisor did not take into account that our department rarely receives any complaints about service from either students or staff. I felt obligated though to follow my supervisor’s instruction in evaluating my staff and was somewhat uncomfortable conveying some of that information to my staff. It was frustrating for me and I feel that maybe my supervisor should do the evaluations of my staff rather than myself since I felt forced to do what she wanted rather than what I believed.
- Completely bogus. No way to control supervisor bias in the process.
- Process seems needlessly complex.
- The evaluation process is completely unjust. There is differential treatment within departments. If an unacceptable evaluation is given, why isn’t an investigation conducted to find the truth of the matter?
- We have not clearly defined what it means to “exceed expectations.” Since this was the 1st year, how we do our job (well or mediocre) set the standard for “meets expectations.” How do we take it to the next level?
- I believe that my appraisal was not based appropriately on my work presentation. My supervisor was relocated to another campus during the implementation of the new raise/merit structure and, logically, the next person to inherit the responsibility of evaluating my performance was the Dean of Student Services. Upon receiving my personal assessment with (the Dean) and having the information that was provided to us on the raise/merit system, a few errors came to my attention. First, how can I be evaluated appropriately if the assessor is very rarely present? Secondly, without any support structure and lack of communication, I feel that my office and individuals did not receive any kind of information in a timely manner. Having received this type of experience I hope that in future these types of kinks will not reoccur.
- The process would be good if supervisors would treat all employees fairly.
- I think this process is breeding grounds for falsifications of evaluations. How can an employee “ALWAYS EXCEED EXPECTATIONS” in order to get the full 1% merit compensation? Are there other ways in which to receive the full 1%? And those who are evaluated by honest people are left with their honor but little or no merit pay. This makes me believe that the evaluations were NOT equal across all TCC.
- I think that All the Staff Employees would like to know what their hourly wages are per hour when it comes time for their pay increase. Then a note letting them know what they received per pay increase and the merit increase as well. We have no clue just what these are. We are able to figure out but to see it in writing from the college would be more appropriate.
- The process like the forms is new so acclimation to a new form and process will take time to perfect. As a learning institution perhaps we can streamline this so it is well supported by all.
- Supervisor did not request and nor review my self-appraisal several days prior to the performance review. He referred to my self-appraisal worksheet at the time of our meeting for performance appraisal.
- Long, need set deadlines.
- Stressful. The time period we had to meet with our supervisor is probably the busiest time of year in our office. In addition, my supervisor had already completed her evaluation for me before I had met with her to discuss my self-appraisal. I don’t feel my self-appraisal made any difference in my overall evaluation. I am not sure all the situations I handle on a daily basis are recognized by my supervisor or the college in general. Also, the training session explained the differences of the merit pay and the timeline for completing the evaluation. It did not really discuss how to set goals or how to complete the form.
- The appraisal process was going on when our office was busy and employees were striving to keep up with their jobs. I was so stressed that I can’t remember most of what was discussed at my appraisal. So much emphasis was placed on the appraisal that I was worried that my livelihood would be affected. Also, it’s not right for some employees to be on numerous committees that allows them to be away from their workplace during office hours while others do not have the same opportunity. Then allowing the number of committees an employee is on and how many activities they participate in boost their appraisal score.
- OK.
I would like feedback on the merit pay, so we know what kind of raise we received.
I like the process of meeting with the supervisor and discussing goals for the year.
I realize this is the first time using this process, but my evaluation was several months ago and nothing has been said about my progress or helping me to meet my goals. I have created myself a portfolio and documented my own progress for each goal. When I asked about my merit pay, my AD could not explain my pay or how much I would receive. It seems to be a once a year task and after the evaluation is submitted, it is forgotten. I was very disappointed because my AD is new and did not know of my job experience and the 8 years working in this division. I have the job title of Admin. Assistant II, and with my merit pay, I am at the lowest range for an Admin. Assistant II, but at the highest range for the Admin. Assistant I. There does not seem to be a check system in place.
I thought this was nothing more than a joke! Too many people received higher titles with higher merit that were not warranted and were completely undeserving. Too many people were less titled, moved to lower pay scales, minimal merit. This I think was too confusing to most and people are still shaking their heads over it.

32. Training:
- Hosts were not trained well enough to answer questions that needed answers.
- I would like to see additional training for everyone, to reinforce what we were taught last year and to aid us in refining the goal setting process for the coming year.
- Just fine.
- Not too informative.
- What training?
- Training was good.
- The continuance of SPOD classes is very important. Debbie Fillmore did a wonderful presentation at our NEAT meeting. These should be encouraged in other areas and other groups.
- Training was good.
- The supervisors need training on how to evaluate consistently.
- Training on job excellent. Training to understand raise horrible.
- Training?
- Should be more detailed.
- Very minimal.
- I think HR did the best possible training for the process...it was difficult for people who had been here a long time to understand the rating Meets Expectations. See comment below.
- Not enough training of how to fill out self appraisal for staff.
- For what?
- Training is in short supply and is ineffective at TCC. There is too much resistance from the employees being "trained." If my supervisor supposedly was trained to administer the new performance review process effectively or even explain the "meets expectations" ratings, he neglected to do so.
- Waste of time!
- Training was good.
- I have been to one off-campus training in 9 years.
- Maybe training would help them, but they don't have time. Could college classes be cancelled so faculty could get some training?
- Was useful.
- The training was pretty much nonexistent. During the meeting I attended the only sample form distributed was for administrators. The trainers couldn't answer over half of the questions that were asked. I don't know if the person asking the question ever received an answer; but even if they did, no one else in attendance ever received the benefit of that information.
- I think supervisor training should be better so that the above type of problems are lessened. I have also heard from other employees that their supervisor was more lenient. I think more training would be beneficial to have some consistency in the evaluation process. I do think that having goals now is good so that the staff, including myself knows what is expected.
- I don't feel that employees with a degree or working towards one were compensated for their educational efforts. Those employees with continued education are setting an example for our students.
- Training was adequate.
- In regards to the evaluation process, why training? Are we so ignorant that we can't answer questions presented to us?
• None.
• Supervisors need more training. The evaluation is not a “high priority” for some supervisors. Supervisor evaluations should only be completely AFTER they have submitted all forms for their employees.
• The training was lame. The session I went to was nothing more than someone reading a PowerPoint presentation (which was outlined on the handout) to the group. Questions that people in the group had, the facilitators could not answer. I found no benefit in attending the training session. It didn’t address things like I mentioned in section 30 of this survey.
• It is always good to have.
• Training like anything else needs to be ongoing, the issue here may be the availability of additional time in the work schedule. Many individuals feel their time is so valuable that they cannot take off for training. Workloads should be addressed as well, many employees throughout the college do multi jobs within their area and outside to support the college.
• Supervisors need training on how to help their employees attain their goals and therefore give a better performance.
• OK.
• I very much appreciated the training to inform me what the evaluations are, how they were going to work and why we were doing them.
• I suggest that new AD’s receive more training. Especially on how to communicate and to follow-up with their employees. This was “too across the board unfair,” made no sense and as many or the majority think was a complete insult! I have myself for a long time gone almost daily “above and beyond.” That’s just part of my job, not to be recognized is just a slap.
• A brief training session with supervisors and staff before this process begins each spring would help all of us stay on track.
• Too much defensiveness and “oh, that’ll never happen” responses from the trainees.
• The ADs need additional training or discussion moderated by an outside the group individual.
• Training seems focused on how to implement the new system. They provided no mechanism for listening to employees and addressing their concerns. It was a huge missed opportunity to build some badly-needed employee trust and institutional good will.
• As a supervisor, I would like more opportunity for interactive discussion of how specific issues can be addressed. One that I have is how to address the issue of when I evaluate a person as “needs improvement” in a specific area and that person self-evaluates him/herself as “exceeds expectations” in the same area. How do we discuss these very different perspectives with the person we are evaluating? All employees need a copy of their own job description, with duties listed, to assure that they know what they are supposed to be doing to “meet expectations.” Also, supervisors need a copy of the job description for each person they evaluate. Without a job description and list of duties, we have no official written guide against which to measure performance. Since job descriptions cannot list all duties, each should have a section for the supervisor to add measurable duties specific to the office or campus that will be considered in the evaluation of an individual. We need these job duties to discuss with those we supervise well before the evaluation so they will know for sure the criteria for their evaluation. Examples of activities and conversations that illustrate good and poor interpersonal skills and communication would be helpful. All employees should have a copy of this so they can hopefully see themselves in the illustrations and have a better idea of what is considered meeting expectations and what is considered needs improvement.
• Training needs to continue. There are opportunities to provide training for everyone on how to keep documentation of our projects and professional development so they can be reported in future appraisals. Also additional training for supervisors on using the process for staff improvements and monitoring departmental progress toward mission and APB goals.
• I was trained on how to do this by Debbie and the training went well. However, asking to sit down with my boss to evaluate an employee that my boss didn’t know enough about her work experience and them me giving the appraisal with my boss didn’t help. This person had applied for my position and there is just tension on how a new boss can evaluate an employee. I think it should have been assigned in the training that anyone with under 6 months shouldn’t have to be put in that position. Just a suggestion...
• Excellent.
• Not bad. Some useful pointers, and probably very beneficial for those who had never done performance evaluations before.
• Reading from a PowerPoint is not my definition of training. Supervisors receive no real training when hired so how can anything be consistent? I was here 3 years before knowing that my staff should be evaluated every 3 months for the first year when hired. Evaluations are somewhat subjective and I see no real way of making them solely objective. Faculty evaluations are a little better with more defined criteria for receiving merit pay. With subjectivity factored in, merit pay will never be consistently applied across the college.
• Supervisors still need more training in merit pay criteria. There’s confusion on whether or not reassigned time projects can be evaluated for merit. Faculty have a different perspective than what was given to supervisors.
• Since we have many new employees, additional training sessions will be needed next year.
• Training is difficult. There are no clear standards for departmental training expectations. This supervisor has developed a “generalist” training check list that seems to have been incorporated inherently into other areas in the College, however, there are no clear policies to define training.
• We desperately need “training” sessions regarding merit pay and consistency. Information sessions, which better describes what was offered, will not get us where we need to be.
I did not receive training as to how to use the appraisal instrument as a supervisor. The supervisors need training in order to provide consistency in across campuses and divisions.
A training session by HR staff in assisting all employees who exhibit unsatisfactory performance might be helpful.
Overkill.
More specific. I can read a PowerPoint.
My supervisor could not convey to me how I could improve to meet the higher levels of the survey. How to move above just “Meeting Expectations.”
Sounds better than it plays out.
It was admitted that he/she did not understand some of it, and we had much work to do. Some of us have been at the college over 25 years, and we had someone evaluate us in their first year? Get real!
Didn't need to attend.
The AD in our division took us through the instrument and helped us to determine what would meet expectations and what would exceed expectations so we were pretty sure of how to fill it out and what to expect in the interview.
Completing a form is not an issue. How about some training in the Assessment Process that the Performance Appraisal is supposed to be? Connect it so something where true growth & development can be realized? We need training in how to write goals & objectives that are meaningful & measureable, relevant to teaching/learning, relevant to student success! Then perhaps the process could yield some useful results and TCC could actually demonstrate some improvement that really counts for something besides lip-service.
Training was sincere and somewhat helpful, but could have been more specific. Everyone seemed to be a little unsure of the new process, especially the merit pay process.
Ads need more training to be more consistent across the college about what is acceptable for merit. Some Ads required absurd levels of documentation, others required none.
What training?
The Associate Deans made statements in our training that directly contradicted what was in the self-appraisal form provided to the faculty. For example, in the section entitled “acquisition of knowledge and/or skills,” the third item listed is “Attendance at professional conference, workshops, or seminars.” The very fact that this item is in the form indicates that attendance counts toward merit pay. Both the AD’s and the Provost on my campus indicated that attendance alone would not be counted for merit. I am willing to concede that the first time not everyone had the level of training desirable—as an institution we should have had the patience to slow down the process so that it could be done well not just done—but to directly contradict the form which is all that the faculty had to go on led to distrust and doubt that anyone really knew what they were doing!
Some administrators reportedly did not follow guidelines on accepting/rejecting criteria for merit pay, hence while some individuals received merit pay for participation of the Faculty Association Executive Board or Faculty Forum and some received credit for professional publications, others did not. I was personally quite satisfied in the evaluation results I received from both my AD and my Provost, but I have heard many complaints from faculty and would like to see these go away the next time we are evaluated.
Training on virtually all aspects of an Associate Dean's responsibilities need to be completed with the current AD. It was evident he was being told what to do/say on each item by either the former AD or Provost.
I had none. Did I need any?
Did not receive.
The training for administrators/supervisors was nothing more than yet another Mercer PowerPoint. This is probably why there were so many discrepancies between supervisors. Good training should include a wide variety of hypothetical situations, so supervisors are all on the same page and not making arbitrary decisions. In the open information session, a lot of misinformation was passed along, indicating clearly that the AD and provost training left a lot to be desired.
There need to be more; at least supervisors and AD’s need to work out how they are interpreting their instructions.
Strong advocate of T.T.E. training—perhaps a quarterly brush-up session must attend?
ADs were not trained. Major inconsistencies exist.
Only heard that training was late and inadequate—not my area.
For me, nonexistent. (I have finally acquired Louts Notes with considerable effort over four years.) X helped to complete this process just in time for me to acquire this very memo.
No questions answered.
33. Other:

- The process is a mess. Good thing there was little incentive in it, because you have changed the rules established since the beginning of the college without sufficient time to make the adjustment. Do research—when, how with NO support? And you have raised no more money for professional travel, so why evaluate us for not going to professional meetings? Many faculty think the process is a joke, so it motivates NO one.
- Some of the criteria for merit was totally unrelated to my job (teaching). How does participating in a United Way day of caring make me a “meritorious” teacher? So what if I am a crappy teacher who shows up late every day, is never prepared for class, and my students can’t follow or understand a thing I’m discussing but I participate in a United Way activity, work on an advanced degree, and publish or do research…that earns me merit? Judge me on my primary duty…good and effective teaching that helps students achieve their goals.
- Much more consistent across the college.
- I understand and support merit pay in theory, but don’t believe any system in the country has applied it fairly and consistently…including ours. It is my understanding that a number of schools/colleges that have tried it have backed off. If we are going to have such a system, the “evaluators” must be well trained, consistent standards must be applied across the college and some kind of process should be provided for employees who have a grievance about their evaluation (due to previous strained relations with their supervisor). You really are putting a lot of power in a few hands.
- Thanks for taking the time to ask.
- I believe this process is still way too subjective and the expectations for the highest merit are too high to achieve in such a short notification process for this year.
- I would like to see some form of table or list pertaining to the level of pay increase associated to the merit pay. Also, if we qualified and are to receive the merit pay, I would like to receive a letter of notification.
- I do not believe a merit system has ever proven to be a positive process for classroom teachers. I strongly disagree with the current process at TCC. We have had a good environment for personnel in the past, this structure has had a negative impact and, I believe, it will not only get worse. This is NOT a for profit business but an educational system.
- Thank you for asking. I hope the information you get will be useful. By the way, why didn’t Faculty get to answer items 13-16? They apply to us too! I would have answered: 13, 14, 15 = Disagree; 16 = unknown – absolutely no way of knowing. Sorry I wouldn’t email this. Need to keep it anonymous.
- The whole idea of needing three areas of exceeding expectations to be considered for merit pay is misguided. Merit pay could be based on doing one thing very well, instead of three checks in the boxes which could be minimal involvement.
- The self-appraisal form does not address what we do as faculty and it is not clear how the form sets the basis for even going on to the next portion on merit.
- “Attendance at professional conference, workshops or seminar” is a criteria for merit pay. However it is often impossible to attend a national conference because of the lack of money. Even though the conference costs are included in my budget, my division’s budget for travel is not important enough to allow every faculty to attend conferences. Faculty that cannot attend are at a disadvantage for merit pay.
- Those faculty that meet the exceed the criteria should get more than $1.00 more than those that meet or are below the criteria. I felt my efforts were not valued!
- Lastly, it is unconscionable that classified staff are given merit based on percentages. Anyone who does simple mathematics knows that percentage raises benefit only those at the top. Shame on us for compounding the problems in our pay system that led to the need for something like a Mercer Report in the first place! Everyone with merit should participate at the same flat dollar rate.
- Again, the major concern I have is that all individuals be evaluated fairly and with uniform criteria in order to create a more pleasant working environment.
- Associate Deans, both former and current, were unable to explain or substantiate their comments for the goals and objectives for the coming year. There is a strong need for human resource department intervention on our campus. Blatant preferential treatment with regard to administrative actions and enforcement of policies toward specific faculty members was/is prevalent by the former and current Associate Dean as well as other administrator(s). There have been attempts by some faculty and staff members to approach/discuss/resolve many issues professionally (several times in the months/years) but these informal meetings have resulted in retaliatory actions by the Associate Deans and Provost. It is evident that our current Associate Dean is under-qualified for the position, continues the unethical decision-making and treatment of employees from his predecessor, and appears to mask his incompetence by delegating virtually everything; ranging from completing projects or dealing successfully with student situations to the completion of a form. He has been employed in this position for almost one year at this time and the treatment of some employees and his ability to successfully perform the qualifications of the position is steadily deteriorating instead of improving. Is it possible for someone with the performance described in the aforementioned sentences to complete an evaluation for employees in an equitable manner?

Some of the suggested goals for increasing merit involve things that incur money or time, such as paying to be in various organizations outside of the college or paying to attend conferences. That negates the merit increase. I have to make a personal choice to be away from my family more than just the requirements of my work in order to get a merit increase.

- My paperwork was lost and I was not notified of the results, but may have been due to AD transition.
- I feel we have played the most important issue in this process that teachers do—TEACH! There is very little emphasis on teaching. Is that not the MOST important aspect of our jobs?
I had to go down the hall and ask what “performance appraisal survey” referred to. I think most people discussed this under the rubric of “merit pay”; why not call it the merit pay process or at least the “variable pay” process? The latter appears on our forms; one name for one process is part of clear communication and a consistent understanding of procedure.

Where faculty owns “content,” administration should aggressively own the curricula—(no watering down to meet “trends” only.)

The requirements for “Meets Expectations” are not clearly defined for faculty. Faculty are expected to teach, hold office hours and participate on committees as well as advise students and student organizations and many other things. Some faculty do much much more and some do nothing. If faculty who do nothing but show up to teach still receive full pay, then all things other than teaching should count toward merit.

Supervisors need to be evaluated by employees.

All things equal—the need for change in the right direction for all of us seems an imperative. I am thankful for this form (this very one) but would like more than 24 hours lead time.

A commendable effort that was handled so inappropriately and not professionally.

At the time of the original appraisal, departmental roles and expectations were loosely defined because of the IT reorganization. The appraisal process was conducted in a manner consistent with the information that was provided by HR. However, because of the reorganization, the actual goal setting was handled by an outside agency (not my official TCC supervisor). As the year has progressed, there have been very few staff meetings and no meetings to discuss personal progress toward goals. Positions (including my own) have continued to be redefined throughout the year, yet the new position expectations and goals have NOT been clearly developed or communicated. In my view, the communication failure is extreme! I have reported these issues to my TCC supervisor. The current state of affairs causes me tremendous concern as it related to a constructive appraisal process.

I think we did the best we could within the time frame designated. However, I did not think the time frame was realistic last year.

Probably, after we go through the process a number of times, we will become more adept at making it fit our needs.

The institution of merit pay at TCC was done in such a way that it badly damaged trust and tainted the new appraisal process. Our employees are thoroughly demoralized, and the new merit pay and appraisal process only intensified this burgeoning disenfranchisement. We have not only lost the trust of many valuable employees, but we have lost many employees, who have left the College in sadness and defeat, and also with the sense that clearing the ranks was one of the unspoken goals of the process. I am sad for TCC and deeply regret the impact of this new practice on our employees. The resulting negative employment climate is one of my greatest challenges as a supervisor, and it is a challenge I face on a daily basis.

Favoritism is a huge issue in dealing with Merit pay. I was appalled at how some supervisors ranked employees.

The only problems encountered were in relation to changing job functions. This was to be expected with such a large amount of change.

I am pleased with the college effort to reward staff that is performing above and beyond. I like the concept of merit pay and not just entitlement...however, I do think there always needs to be a base raise when there is state funding to support raises. Could there be a mechanism for employees to submit a special project they may be involved in for consideration for a merit raise or bonus?

With my staff, I have the challenge of working on one of the larger campuses. Therefore, we have more students to serve on a daily basis. This limits staff involvement in things such as committees and other college initiatives. It limits them from operating above the “meeting expectations” category. If my staff person saw 50 students in one day and their counterpart on another campus saw 10 and was able to participate in a committee and develop a training program for an area. Who is exceeding? Who deserves the merit pay? Should we sacrifice student needs in order to increase our pay? That is the choice many express being faced with, on top of having the appraisal process be even more stressful. At this point, with merit pay being a small amount comparatively, most aren’t complaining but if the percentage increases, I expect several will feel the need to be more vocal.

Please consider adding the merit portion of the salary increase to the basic salary for those loyal employees whose salaries are above the maximum for their salary range. This year it was awarded in a one-time lump-sum payment which will not increase the salary as much over time.

My supervisor has not met with me to specifically address goals and the appraisal process other than the initial evaluation. Yet, I’m sure that there will be “challenge” areas that I do not agree with…

Employees need a letter sent to their home explaining how much salary increase they were awarded and it should be broken down to see the amount that was “across the board” and the amount that was “merit pay.”

I would have no way of knowing if “the new performance appraisal process was applied consistently across the college.” (Question 12)

Merit pay is an outdated, outmoded business practice with little application to a higher education system.

This is exactly what everyone knew it would be, if your boss likes you, you get the maximum whether you do your job or not. Furthermore, if you are doing everything that is asked of you without any problems, how can you not get the maximum rating. This merit pay is so subjective that it can not be distributed equally.

Please consider changing the timing on the evaluation process. Having ABP and appraisals due at the same time is a bit overwhelming at times. May not be feasible to do, but consideration would be appreciated.
Major concern: “Exceeds” criteria—When my staff is consistently exceeding goals because of the high volume of students and the extra Tulsa Achieves students I was not supposed to give our staff “consistently exceeds” ratings unless they were on College committees or did things way beyond their normal duties—they already do things far beyond their normal duties—so next time I will rate them higher. I feel they got cheated for that criteria.

I never received information on what my salary increase was for this year—I still don’t know—even though I received a good performance appraisal.

I don’t think that it is right to give out inflationary raises as “performance merit raise.” If a raise is going to be given for performance, it should go beyond an inflation raise. This would encourage people to stay with the college.

I still feel like our area is the proverbial square peg needing to be put in some round hole. What most of us do is not a “normal” office job. We have some staffers who work like crazy and they didn’t get a dime of merit pay; the questions didn’t apply directly to what they do, and yet they have to go through the process.

I believe that some unfair evaluations were submitted either for reasons of personal prejudice or because efforts were made to keep TCC costs at a minimum.

I feel this is unfair considering how each supervisor from different departments evaluate their staff differently, i.e., one supervisor from another department may be lax when another supervisor from another department may be strict. I feel it’s not fair for the ones who proves themselves but yet still rated poorly on the evaluation when another department supervisor may rate their staff who is very lax in their department but yet the supervisor of the department rate them outstanding. Where is the fairness and the balance? Therefore, I do not agree with the way how the evaluations are done. I understand its taking in consideration of different factors, but when one who is always late or misses work routinely but still get rated outstanding when one is loyal, on time, dependable and is a hard worker gets rated poorly. That’s wrong. My philosophy the nice ones still gets “beaten” for doing their best when the slackers gets away with being too lenient knowing they will get a raise, a good evaluation, and such...

At the time of my evaluation I had transferred to a different department. My evaluation covered the previous position held at the college, so setting goals was not covered at the performance review. My main concern is that the evaluation may not be conducted in an objective way depending on the supervisor. I was pleased with my evaluation, but disappointed to learn that a fellow worker who does very little work received the same review and merit raise. The reward or merit pay is positive incentive despite the problems that will occur with this system.

Was done very unfairly college wide! Word of mouth says it was very subjective; each boss did something different.

I’ve only been on my job since late July and have only had a one month review.

It was not worthwhile compensation for all of the time and effort expended in the process.

I didn’t understand how the merit pay was calculated into our regular pay. I saw that it was applied toward my paycheck, but I couldn’t differentiate between the merit pay and the cost of living increase. I thought the whole process was confusing.

All rating systems suck and should be done away with.

It’s nice to finally be recognized for the hard work put in above and beyond some other employees. Though I believe the systems has kinks, as most do in the beginning, the effort ti improve the system, and as a result morale, is definitely appreciated!

Extremely unfair process. My boss is usually in meetings, so depends on the others in our office to tell the truth on what I am doing and how I am doing. They have no idea of what I do, and they do not follow me around all day to see what I do.

The problem with merit pay will always be that there is NO way to evaluate fairly. Our supervisor holds us to a much higher standard than others at the same job title. I know of employees who always do the minimum and get 100% of the merit pay.

Hard work. Long hours. Not much of a merit raise.

Merit pay doesn’t work fairly.

Title changes are meaningless and do not reflect duties performed.

We should have some kind of input when it comes to our supervisor’s evaluation. Her supervisor does not work with her on a daily basis and is completely unaware of what is happening in this department nor do I think they care just as long as no one rocks the boat. It is hard to have respect for a supervisor that does not do anything to an employee that is late every day for the last 2-1/2 years. We are not talking about a few minutes, but hours. All the supervisor does is makes excuses for her and we all know that she has no medical notes from a doctor. She has some medical problem like the rest of us. The employee takes advantage of this supervisor because she knows she will do nothing and has become a close friend. This sets a bad environment and example for the office. We are tired of this. I have asked the supervisor many times about what can be done like a verbal or written warning, but she says TCC has nothing like this available. This should be changed.

I do not think staff jobs lend themselves to merit pay.

Am not sure about item 10, 11, 12, number 11, I do not recall having any follow-up discussions with my supervisor.

NSU advertised for a copy cataloger. That position was a Tech. II. Why is my job still classified as an Assistant I? To me the results of the Mercer Study are questionable. I do not believe that I have been rewarded for my work experience and expertise. I believe that others benefited who do not deserve it.
The transition from the old performance evaluations was somewhat difficult because the "Meet Expectations" seemed a lower rating as it was in the middle. Employees who had received higher ratings before looked on paper as though they had not performed as well… it was very difficult explaining to them that Meets Expectations was the appropriate rating especially when they knew it would be reflected in their pay.

If you have a personality conflict with one supervisor it should not be left up to them only on your appraisal— their supervisor is too scared to stand up to them (NEC).

Objectives and evaluations need to be clear and objective— get rid of all the subjective fuzziness.

I have an issue with supervisor to overlook with one of our coworkers, the person comes in of her own choosing hours often don't show up until in the afternoon and often during the week she will miss about or around 25 to 30 hours and one day she showed up for work at 4:45pm. The supervisor always has excuses for her or covers for her and it is not fair to our department. We all have medical problems but we know our working hours is from 8AM to 5PM and we don't choose our hours...

All a waste of time and resources.

The list of my goals and objectives for the coming year were selected, apparently at random, by my supervisor. They have little to do with my primary job responsibilities and completely miss the major goals of my role at TCC. I find it interesting and predictable that only TCC faulty have the option to apply for merit pay. Do professional or classified staff have the option to apply for merit pay? Or are we eligible only on the whim of our supervisor? I'm in favor of merit pay, but it is frustrating, to say the least, to work for a supervisor who is oblivious to what constitutes meritorious effort.

It seems like we had a few people "caught in between" with the restructured levels. Since the new salaries were based on the number of years a person was in their current position and not their experience, some lost out. The former Dean of Instruction Admin positions need to be upgraded— maybe Admin III.

How many more hoops are we supposed to jump through?

There needs to be clarification on what is to be evaluated. My performance appraisal was not as good as I would have like but the things which were marked negatively did not have any real effect on my job performance as far as my actual job is concerned.

Most of my comments were not allowed.

I was fortunate but for those not so fortunate, I hope the across the board increase is always in place for everyone.

I wonder how consistent evaluations are between supervisors. I fear some supervisors are lax in their evaluations and give “exceeds expectations” to all of their employees while others are too rigid and give only “meets expectations” or below to theirs.

We should go back to across the board raises. When will be able to evaluate supervisors that don’t work or do as little as possible to get by and then have the nerve to evaluate others.

I think Human Resources should look at departmental evaluations as I believe trends can be seen. Some departmental evaluations should show differences in how all employees in those areas are evaluated and which departments are stricter as well as more lenient. I would also like to suggest that groups of lower level supervisors look at employees that are in same positions on other campuses together with upper management to promote meaningful discussions amongst all like areas. This would tie into the one college concept in that employees that are doing the same jobs are being evaluated also against other employees doing that same job. Now that evaluations are tied directly to merit pay consistency amongst supervisors and standards of evaluations are extremely important. I would also like to see supervisors be evaluated, including myself, by their employees as part of the overall appraisal process. These processes should be used by the upper chain of commands to help them in their evaluations of their supervisory staff. Supervisors should be held accountable for their leadership qualities or lack thereof as part of their appraisal process. I believe that employees can only be as good as their managers allow and this seems to me to be an integral part of the overall evaluation process.

Manuals and procedures need to be updated and distributed to staff offices in order to have better understanding of rules and regulations.

I really though the way people were moved up one or two levels was not fair, when they clearly do not do the same type or level or work done in their area. You cannot judge what a person handles in a day by a piece of paper. There is no way to write down everything that I handle in a day that is not handled by anyone else.

Merit pay of “up to” 1 percent is NOT WORTH MY TIME. If this is the best you can do, we should be able to opt out of the appraisal process all together and just accept the across-the-board amount.

Merit pay rewards so low at my pay level that there isn’t anything to strive for. Percentage system rewards those with already high salaries and does little for those without. Some supervisors still rate based on opinion. If you get an “easy” supervisor your raise is assured. If you get a “hard” one you get less of a raise. It’s purely “luck of the draw” as to what you end up with. Having to create goals for a year in advance is counterproductive. Not everybody can say what their department will be like a year in advance. One size fits all mentality doesn’t make exceptions for specialized departments.

Whatever a particular department has as their median merit raise score (meets expectations for example) that score should become the supervisor’s grade as well.

Why isn’t there a process for classified staff to evaluate supervisors? I understand there is a rebuttal process, but no clear guidelines and no satisfactory results. Tulsa Community College supervisors use a "negative management" technique. If there is a personality clash with someone in the department and/or supervisor, you are at the mercy of the supervisor. There is no accountability for a supervisor.

Tulsa Community College has no arbitration, no grievance or recourse for the individual involved. There will be no monetary raise for that person ever.

As was suggested, if an employee is liked by supervisor, they get merit. If not, nothing. Was told that I was to have another review in 3 months, it’s been 5 now and not a word.
I was asked to "sign" my evaluation form without having the opportunity to see or read it first. I still have not met with my supervisor to discuss my evaluation or to talk about my goals for this year. I know what I listed as this year's goals on my self appraisal, but have not discussed these goals with my supervisor or seen if my supervisor made any changes to my goals. I have never received a copy of my evaluation from my supervisor.

What is very confusing about Merit Increase pay...we get a pay increase in July and come December 31st, we get the total of what our yearly wages are for our income taxes...yet...in the following fiscal year we get another pay increase but we are not sure just what our annual salary is because it keeps changing. Increase is good however, how are we to know really what hourly pay is?

I am sure in time I will have additional questions, but since this is new for our college, it is difficult to determine if this is good for TCC or not. Too many questions have come up over the new form, process, and training to be able to get a good consensus of the overall feel; also some of the goals are not clear because they appear to not be equal for all. I applaud the individuals that have worked so hard on this; I know it is not an easy task. I hope this is not going to further divide the support system, we have lost far too many quality and qualified individuals to other institutions and businesses.

Supervisors should not belittle the employee during the appraisal process and then never say anything to help the employee. Then at the next appraisal the employee may not have made progress and will be belittled again.

Some employees are evaluated by all the committees they are on—not by their "on the job" performance. In my position, in order to adequately care for the students and "Make EVERY Encounter Count," I can’t be out of my office and involved in every committee. Does this mean I don’t exceed expectations? I did meet expectations. I fortunately did receive the full 5% pay raise, but I know others who did not. I believe being involved is important, however, it should not be the goal of every employee to escape their primary responsibilities to get on a committee.

This survey should have been given to employees shortly after appraisals were done. Much has happened during the summer months and the beginning of the fall semester. Memories begin to fade and employees may not be able to remember details of the appraisal process.

It’s a lot of paperwork and time for a tiny %.

I will never do more than meets expectations. What a joke!

I did not receive an initial increase in my pay in the fall of 2006 when the new pay scale was implemented. This was based on the title of my position and where my current pay fell within the range of pay for that title of position. Unfortunately, my position title does not effectively describe what I do, as I am the only person in the college in such a position. The title was chosen based on current HR job position titles due to the fact that unique positions cannot receive their own HR title, they must be "fit" into what is already available (similar to the round hole, square peg theory). The problem with that is that my position actually requires a larger number of responsibilities than others with the same title. I felt that my pay was unfairly judged as a result. However, I understand that guidelines are required in larger institutions and took that slight in stride with the thought that merit pay would be my reward for the inequity in pay. After my evaluation I felt somewhat vindicated because I would be receiving merit pay as it is duly noted that I go above and beyond the expectations of my position. My disappointment came when I learned the amount of merit pay I was to receive. While it’s nice to be recognized for my efforts, the amount seemed somewhat paltry in comparison to the 1000s of dollar raises other employees received for doing much less work than I do. While the amount of my salary has never been a driving force in the jobs I have chosen, I am disappointed that I have put in so much more than many others and yet they seem to have been more rewarded for lesser efforts. It’s somewhat of an insult and honestly, I was happier prior to fall 2006 when merit pay wasn’t implemented and I was being fairly paid according to my job duties in relation to others with the same job title but fewer responsibilities.

Supervisor did not go through any of supervisor's typed answers. Supervisor was vague. I thought this was a work performance evaluation. Supervisor had no idea of my workload, even when advised. Supervisor graded me on hearsay. Supervisor chose what to go over and neglected to discuss actual Questions and Answers.