

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2002, the Institute for Communication Improvement was contacted by the Performance Management Oversight Team to gather data regarding the recently implemented Performance Management Plan. Three main objectives were established for the research project: to gain knowledge of the Classified Staff's opinions regarding the first three months of the program, to research the opinions of the supervisors of Classified and Information Technology Staff regarding the same issues, and to gather comprehensive data on the entire Performance Management Plan from the Information Technology Staff, who had completed a condensed version of the program prior to the 2002-2003 academic year.

To reach these objectives, the Institute for Communication Improvement wrote a survey for each of the three populations and distributed them to the employees identified by University Human Resources. Respondents were given ten days to return the surveys. Useable return rates were approximately 40% for Classified Staff, nearly 20% for supervisors, and about 18% for Information Technology Staff. Upon the surveys' return, ICI members entered the data into a computer program and prepared a report based on the findings.

Significant findings of the closed data include rate of use for the various forms and meetings. Respondents indicated a significant percentage of those responding to the questions used the forms and parts of the program that were asked about in the surveys. For example, rates of use for respondents who answered a question regarding the use of the Supervisor Feedback Form were between 28% and 43% for each survey population. The rates of respondents who participated in the initial Performance Planning meetings were nearly 45% for Classified Staff, nearly 63% for supervisors, and about 59% of Information Technology Staff who answered a question regarding whether the meeting was held.

Main themes of the open data findings were desires for simplified forms and rewards, and a need for further supervisor training and accountability. Many respondents indicated a

need for less or simplified paperwork throughout the Plan due to time constraints, and several commented on a desire for monetary rewards based on performance. Respondents also indicated that supervisors need more training in the program and need to be held accountable for implementing the program.

Further details of the data can found within Institute for Communication Improvement's written report, which details the methods of research, results and analysis, and a cross-survey comparison.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Table of Contents.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Methods.....	5
Classified Staff Survey Results.....	8
Supervisor Survey Results.....	59
Information Technology Staff Survey Results.....	99
Cross-Survey Data Comparison.....	152
Appendices.....	156
A: Surveys.....	156
B: Classified Staff Open-Ended Data Responses.....	157
C: Supervisor Open-Ended Data Responses.....	176
D: Information Technology Open-Ended Data Responses.....	183
E: Additional letters from Respondents.....	188

Acknowledgements

The success of this project could not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of many contributors. The Institute for Communication Improvement would like to acknowledge the Performance Management Oversight Team along with each of the following people for their contributions:

Vice-President for Operations

Dan Modaff

Project Manager

Leslie Thornton

Human Resources

Cristin Hudson

Katie Widmeyer

Training and Presentation

Elizabeth Draggett

Katie Held

Stephen Matsko

Internal Communication

Amanda Camisa

Nikki Johnson

Brie McMahon

Client Services Team 1

Julie Bergh

Andy Buzzelli

Amy Gabler

Sara Mabe

Allison Ross

Kate Weiss

Client Services Team 2

Concetta Coletta

LaMar Martin

Nicole Pedrotty

Jessica Spector

Joe Trinosky

Client Services Team 3

Jessica Beck

Kelly Cuson

Abby Fogel

Vince Giovannazzo

John Otten

Methods

The Institute for Communication Improvement was contacted by the Performance Management Oversight Team to gather data regarding the newly implement Performance Management Plan. The objectives for the project were three-fold: (1) to determine the opinions of Classified Staff after three months of working under the plan; (2) to investigate the opinions of the supervisors of the Classified Staff regarding the same issues; and (3) to gather comprehensive data from Information Technology staff who experienced a compressed version of the entire Performance Management Plan prior to the beginning of the 2002-2003 academic year.

Survey Creation

Three surveys were created, each designed to meet one of the aforementioned objectives. Each survey consisted of a variety of question types, including Likert Scale, forced-choice, check all that apply, and open-ended questions. The questions were arranged in chronological order, such that the first questions asked on each survey involved issues related to the first steps in the Performance Management Plan. Surveys concluded with an optional Demographics section.

The *Classified Staff Survey* (see Appendix A) consisted of 38 questions broken down into the following 5 topic areas: Performance Planning, Ongoing Coaching and Feedback, Training, Benefits and Areas for Improvement, and Demographics. The *Supervisor Survey* (see Appendix A) consisted of 35 questions broken down into the following 7 topic areas: Performance Planning, Coaching and Feedback, Midyear Review, Yearend Review, Training, Benefits and Areas for Improvement, and Demographics. Only supervisors of Information Technology staff were instructed to fill-out the Midyear and Yearend Review sections, and instructed to answer in light of the compressed version of the Performance Management Plan. The *IT Staff Survey* (see Appendix A) consisted of 44 questions, broken down into the following 7 categories: Performance Planning, Ongoing Coaching and Feedback, Midyear Review, Yearend Review, Training, Benefits and Areas for Improvement, and Demographics. Again, respondents to this survey were

instructed to answer the questions as related to the compressed version of the Performance Management Plan.

Survey Distribution

In conjunction with the Performance Management Oversight Team, ICI decided to survey every member of the three relevant populations: Classified Staff, Classified Staff and IT Staff supervisors, and IT Staff. Names and campus addresses were provided to ICI by University Human Resources in the form of pre-printed mailing labels divided by population.

After removing labels that were printed inscrutably or that contained incomplete addresses, ICI affixed the labels to large campus mail envelopes. Due to a short time frame and difficulties associated with using campus mail to reach regional campuses, different mailing procedures were used for Athens campus recipients and those on the regional campuses. For Athens campus recipients, each large envelope contained the appropriate survey and a smaller campus mail envelope pre-labeled with ICI's return address. These surveys were mailed through campus mail on October 11, 2002. For the regional campuses, the return address on the campus mail envelope contained the name of the Performance Management Plan sponsor for the particular campus. All surveys (sealed individually in the large envelopes) were sent via Priority Mail to the regional campus plan sponsors on October 11, 2002, who, upon receipt, were instructed to distribute them to the recipients. Completed surveys were returned to the sponsors in enclosed, sealed envelopes and mailed back to ICI. Recipients of all surveys were asked to return them to ICI by October 21, 2002.

Response rate for the surveys was higher than expected for the Classified Staff survey, and approximately what was expected for the Supervisor and IT Staff surveys. The chart below details the distribution totals, return totals, and relevant response rates.

Survey	Sent	Gross Returned	Gross Response Rate	Useable Returned	Useable Return Rate
Classified	729	323	44.31%	290	39.78%
Supervisor	422	98	23.22%	83	19.67%
IT	251	50	19.92%	44	17.53%

The useable response rate column on the far right of the table represents the percentage of surveys returned before data entry was completed on October 24, 2002, and therefore is the official response rate to be considered. However, an additional 54 surveys were returned after this date and could not be included in the report. The “Gross Returned” and “Gross Response Rate” incorporate these 54 additional surveys. Importantly, all surveys from the Southern campus were returned after the October 24 data entry conclusion data. Therefore, the Southern campus data is not included in this report. These surveys, in addition to the other surveys returned after data entry was completed, have been retained and can be entered at a future date.

The following report contains the results of the surveys with a descriptive analysis. All statistical data was analyzed using SPSS for Windows. Open-ended data was entered into Microsoft Word and analyzed for common themes (see Appendices B, C, and D for all open-ended answers).

Performance Planning

Question 1: Did you meet with your supervisor in order to complete the Performance Planning Form (PM2)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	128	44.8
No	158	55.2
Total	286	100

Approximately 45% of the 286 respondents to Question 1 indicated that they had met with their supervisor in order to complete the Performance Planning Form (PM2). About 55% had not met with their supervisor.

Performance Planning

Question 2: How long was the Performance Planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
1-15 minutes	12	9.4
16-30 minutes	43	33.6
31-45 minutes	30	23.4
46-60 minutes	23	18
More than one hour	20	15.6
Total	128	100

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents to Question 2 indicated that they spent from 16 minutes to 45 minutes in the Performance Planning meeting. Nearly 34% said they spent between 46 and 60 minutes or more than 1 hour in their meeting, while 1 minute to 15 minutes were spent in the meeting by approximately 9% of the respondents.

Performance Planning

Question 3: The amount of time dedicated to the Performance Planning meeting was:

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Too Little	6	4.7
Just Right	103	81.1
Too Much	18	14.2
Total	127	100

Approximately 81% of the Classified Staff members who responded to this question said that the amount of time dedicated to the Performance Planning meeting was just right. However, nearly 14% said that they spent too much time in this meeting.

Performance Planning

Question 4: Was the PM2 Form completed in the meeting between you and your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	92	74.2
No	32	25.8
Total	124	100

Nearly three-quarters (74%) of the 124 respondents to Question 4 indicated that they had completed the PM2 Form in the meeting with their supervisor. However, close to 26% did not complete the form in their meeting.

Performance Planning

Question 5: To what extent did the PM2 Form clarify what is expected of you by your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at All	10	8.0
Minimal	8	6.4
Neutral	49	39.2
Somewhat	38	30.4
Very Much	20	16.0
Total	125	100

Approximately 46% of respondents to this question indicated that the PM2 Form somewhat to very much clarified what was expected of them by to their supervisors. Conversely, almost 14% said the PM2 Form clarified supervisors' expectations minimally or not at all, while approximately 39% felt neutral in this regard.

Performance Planning

Question 6: How comfortable did you feel discussing the information on the PM2 Form with your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Uncomfortable	7	5.6
Somewhat Uncomfortable	4	3.2
Neutral	28	22.2
Somewhat Comfortable	27	21.4
Very Comfortable	60	47.6
Total	126	100

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents to Question 6 indicated that they were somewhat to very comfortable discussing the information on the PM2 Form with their supervisor, while approximately 22% of the respondents said they were neutral.

Performance Planning

Question 7: How useful was the PM2 Form in structuring your goals?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	19	15.2
Somewhat Unuseful	14	11.2
Neutral	39	31.2
Somewhat Useful	36	28.8
Very Useful	17	13.6
Total	125	100

When respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of the PM2 Form in structuring their goals, approximately 31% reported being neutral on this subject. However, about 42% of the respondents to Question 7 responded the PM2 Form was somewhat to very useful in this regard, while approximately one-quarter (26%) indicated that it was somewhat unuseful to not useful.

Performance Planning

Question 8: How useful was the Performance Planning meeting in structuring your goals?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	18	14.3
Somewhat Unuseful	15	11.9
Neutral	40	31.7
Somewhat Useful	31	24.6
Very Useful	22	17.5
Total	126	100

Approximately 42% of the respondents to Question 8 revealed that the Performance Planning meeting was somewhat to very useful in structuring their goals. On the other hand, roughly 26% of the respondents indicated the meeting was somewhat unuseful to not useful in goal-structuring.

Performance Planning

Question 9: To what extent has setting goals and objectives helped you to perform your job more effectively?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at All	27	21.6
Minimal	18	14.4
Neutral	39	31.2
Somewhat	31	24.8
Very Much	10	8.0
Total	125	100

Approximately 22% of the respondents to Question 9 answered that setting goals and objectives did not help them to perform their job more effectively at all, while about 14% indicated that goal- and objective-setting helped minimally. Nearly one-third of respondents (31%) were neutral on this topic, while the remaining third (33%) said that goal setting helped them perform their job more effectively somewhat to very much.

Performance Planning

Question 10: Did you and your supervisor discuss if you would use the Supervisor Feedback Form (PM3)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	83	70.3
No	35	29.7
Total	118	100

Approximately 70% of the respondents stated they had discussed using the Supervisor Feedback Form with their supervisor, while nearly 30% of the respondents said they did not discuss using the PM3 Form.

Performance Planning

Question 11: Did you decide to use to the PM3 form?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	44	43.1
No	58	56.9
Total	102	100

Approximately 43% of the respondents to Question 11 answered yes, they decided to use the PM3 (Supervisor Feedback) form in the Performance Management Plan. On the other hand, nearly 57% answered no, they decided not to use the PM3 form.

Performance Planning

Question 12: How much trust do you feel has been created as a result of the Performance Planning Process?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
None	24	19.5
Minimal	13	10.6
Neutral	49	39.8
Some	21	17.1
Very Much	16	13.0
Total	123	100

Approximately 30% of respondents to this question answered minimal to none when assessing how much trust was created as a result of the Performance Planning phase. At the same time, nearly 30% of respondents answered that some to very much trust was created as a result of the Performance Planning phase. The remaining 40% were neutral on this topic.

Performance Planning

Question 13: How committed was your supervisor to the Performance Planning part of the Performance Management Process?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at All	7	5.6
Minimal	11	8.7
Neutral	18	14.3
Somewhat	51	40.5
Very Much	39	31.0
Total	126	100

A total of 126 respondents answered Question 13 regarding their supervisor's commitment to the Performance Planning phase. Approximately 14% of the respondents indicated that their supervisor's commitment to the Performance Planning part of the Performance Management Plan was minimal to non-existent. However, approximately 72% of respondents reported that their supervisor was somewhat to very committed to this phase of the plan.

Performance Planning

Question 14: To what extent did the Performance Planning phase provide you with a sense of empowerment?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at all	31	24.8
Minimal	14	11.2
Neutral	50	40.0
Somewhat	20	16.0
Very Much	10	8.0
Total	125	100

A total of 125 respondents answered Question 14. Approximately 36% of these respondents answered minimal to not at all for the extent to which the Performance Planning phase provided them with a sense of empowerment. Twenty-four percent of the respondents reported the Performance Planning phase somewhat to very much provided them with a sense of empowerment.

Performance Planning

Question 15: What opportunities, if any, did this part of the program create?

Fifty-eight respondents to this question provided 65 different responses that were broken down into 5 categories:

- No opportunities (23)
- Communication (15)
- Job Development (13)
- Goals (11)
- Time Concerns (3)

Question 15 asked employees to voice what opportunities, if any, the Performance Planning phase created. Nearly 35% of the responses suggested that the Performance Planning phase did not create any opportunities. Many of those who responded believed this program either added extra work to their day or did not provide any extra opportunities. Included in the *Communication* category, approximately 23% of the responses stated that communication, trust, clarification, and awareness were all opportunities created by this phase of the Performance Management Plan. The next category, *Job Development*, included responses dealing with job improvements, job performance, expectations, acknowledgements, and classes. Twenty percent of all responses to this question fell into this category. The *Goals* category accounts for about 17% of the total responses to this question. These responses indicated that the planning phase of the program created both positive and negative goals. The last category, *Time Concerns*, accounts for approximately 5% of the responses, and includes those that stated time issues concerning the Performance Planning phase.

No Opportunities

Approximately 35% of the respondents felt that this stage of the program did not create any opportunities. Many respondents stated this stage added extra work to their workdays. Some comments from those respondents were, “To become more frustrated at

work,” and “More confusion.” Sixteen respondents indicated no opportunities were created by the Performance Planning stage by answering, “None,” to this question.

Communication

The *Communication* category includes responses indicating the program created the opportunity for communication, trust, clarification, and awareness. This category accounts for nearly 23% of all responses to this question. Many responses suggested that this program encouraged them to discuss and write down their work goals. One respondent said it provided an opportunity “to discuss what is expected in the way of goals.” Another respondent said, “The opportunity to discuss until goals and outstanding projects.” This category also consists of respondents who said clarification in their job position and job duties was an opportunity brought about by this stage of the program. A respondent said, “Gave me a chance to define what I want in my position, clarify what needs to happen, should happen, and what I would like to happen.”

Job Development

Job improvements, job performance, expectation, acknowledgements, and classes all fall within the *Job Development* category. This category accounts for 20% of all responses to Question 15. Five respondents felt that knowing exactly what was expected of them would enable them to perform their job better. One of them stated, “opportunity to discuss expectations.” Other responses said that the overall job environment was improved as a result of the program. One respondent stated, “It gave me the opportunity to really think about what I need to do to enhance my career.” Another said, “We were able to create 2 new assignments for my position.” Overall, the respondents in this category felt this stage enhanced their positions.

Goals

Roughly 17% of responses indicated positive and negative opportunities goals were created from the Performance Planning phase. Many responses suggested that goal setting helped better define respondents’ everyday work agendas and focus on future goals. One person said, “An opportunity to see my goals in writing and to discuss with

others, goal setting and office practice.” On the other hand, some responses implied that goals were not an opportunity gained from this program. Some employees felt that they could not or did not have time to set and meet goals within the workplace. These comments included, “I have not been given opportunity to meet the goals. The only goal I will meet will be the one I could initiate myself.”

Time Concerns

This category represents approximately 5% of all responses given to this question. All 3 respondents in this category had time issues concerning the Performance Planning phase and their job responsibilities. Their responses included, “Less time to do my job,” and “Extreme Waste of my time. Many goals cannot be set because much of what I do is dependent of other people.”

Performance Planning

Question 16: What changes do you suggest be made to the planning stage of the Performance Management process?

Thirty-seven respondents provided 40 different responses that were broken down into 5 categories:

- Remodeling (10)
- Supervisor Concerns (10)
- Contentment (8)
- Eliminate (7)
- Rewards (5)

Half (50%) of the responses to this question suggested that changes be made to the planning stage of the Performance Management Plan either by remodeling the process or addressing concerns with their supervisor. Twenty-five percent of responses suggested that the planning stage should be remodeled; a more personalized process for each department and simplified or changed forms to address time concerns should be used. The same percentage indicated that there are supervisor concerns that affect the success of the planning stage. The category of *Supervisor Concerns* includes these responses, which stated that there was a lack of explanation, commitment, and training on the part of the supervisor. In contrast, the *Contentment* category, which accounts for 20% of responses, includes responses that indicated respondents had no suggestions or felt that the planning stage is currently effective. The *Eliminate* category accounts for approximately 18% of responses and includes those that indicated that the planning stage is not necessary or is unsuccessful to the Performance Management Plan. Lastly, nearly 13% of responses fell into the *Rewards* category, which includes responses suggesting that more benefits and rewards be included in the planning stage of the Performance Management Plan.

Remodeling

Twenty-five percent of the responses indicated that the planning stage of the Performance Management Plan should be remodeled. This category includes respondents who felt that forms should be simplified and changed in order to address time concerns with the planning stage. Some respondents in this category felt that the planning stage is too confusing. This category also includes those who felt that the planning stage should be more personalized for each particular department. One respondent said, “Make it less disruptive, unclear, and time-consuming.”

Supervisor Concerns

This category accounts for 25% of the responses. Respondents in this category felt that supervisors have a lack of knowledge about the planning stage of the Performance Management Plan. These respondents also stated that they felt there should be a more extensive training process for supervisors, which might help them be more committed to the planning stage. For example, one respondent said “that the supervisors be better trained and knowledgeable in material.” Another respondent in this category claimed, “It also took 15 weeks for my supervisor to schedule my performance planning meeting after I attended my initial classified staff training on May 6, 2002! Ridiculous! This makes me feel like the form is not important.”

Contentment

The *Contentment* category represents 20% of all responses given for this question. Respondents in this category either provided no suggestions or felt that the planning stage of the Performance Management Plan is currently effective. Four respondents said that they had no suggestions. One respondent said, “It’s effectiveness initially seems solid and well constructed.”

Eliminate

Approximately 18% of responses fell into the *Eliminate* category. This category represents respondents who felt that the planning stage of the Performance Management Plan was unsuccessful and felt the stage should be eliminated. Some comments made by

respondents include, “Cancel it altogether,” and, “Drop the entire concept.” Another respondent stated, “My purpose at this university is to work. Projects like these defeat that purpose. We’ve already spent way too much time on this whole ordeal. Does it ever stop?”

Rewards

The *Rewards* category is comprised of responses that suggested the offering of more benefits and rewards for successfully accomplishing daily tasks. One respondent in this category suggested that a goal-setting workshop would have been an added benefit for this stage of the process. Responses in this category included, “Performance pay,” and “Still not sure of the final purpose and if it will truly benefit employees or not in terms of compensation.”

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 17: Have you and your supervisor discussed the goals you established in the Performance Planning phase since the initial planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	45	17.0
No	220	83.0
Total	265	100

Seventeen percent of the respondents to Question 17 indicated that they had discussed their goals with their supervisor since the initial planning meeting. On the other hand, 83% of the respondents said that they had not.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 18: How motivated were you to discuss the progress of your goals with your supervisor throughout the year?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Unmotivated	40	20.7
Somewhat Unmotivated	19	9.8
Neutral	85	44.0
Somewhat Motivated	28	14.5
Very Motivated	21	10.9
Total	193	100

Nearly 31% of the respondents to Question 18 indicated that they were somewhat unmotivated to unmotivated to discuss the progress of their goals with their supervisor throughout the year. However, approximately 25% of the respondents said that they were somewhat to very motivated, and 44% indicated that they were neutral.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 19: How much did the discussions between you and your supervisor help in completing your goals?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at All	59	34.3
Minimal	10	5.8
Neutral	60	34.9
Somewhat	27	15.7
Very Much	16	9.3
Total	172	100

Approximately 34% of the respondents to Question 19 indicated that the coaching and feedback discussions held with their supervisor helped not at all with the completion of their goals, while nearly 6% indicated that they helped minimally. However, 25% of the respondents said that the discussion helped somewhat to very much with the completion of their goals. Approximately 35% of the respondents indicated that they were neutral about this issue.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 20: Since the Performance Management Program was implemented, have you received more coaching and feedback from your supervisor than prior to the program?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	33	15.4
No	181	84.6
Total	214	100

Approximately 15% of the respondents to Question 20 indicated that they had received more coaching and feedback from their supervisor since the Performance Management Plan was implemented. However, nearly 85% of the respondents said that they had not received more coaching and feedback from their supervisor since the program's implementation.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 21: How much time was spent providing coaching and giving feedback since the initial Performance Planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 30 min	143	84.6
30 min-1 hour	14	8.3
1-2 hours	5	3.0
2-3 hours	3	1.8
3 + hours	4	2.4
Total	169	100

Nearly 85% of the respondents to Question 21 indicated that less than 30 minutes was spent providing coaching and feedback since the initial Performance Planning meeting. Three percent of the respondents said that 1 to 2 hours was spent providing coaching and feedback, and approximately 4% of the respondents indicated that 2 to 3 hours or more than 3 hours was spent in this regard.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 22: The amount of time taken between you and your supervisor providing coaching and feedback was:

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Inadequate	67	43.5
Just Right	78	50.6
Too Much	9	5.8
Total	154	100

Nearly 44% of the respondents to Question 22 thought that the amount of time spent in coaching and feedback with their supervisor was inadequate. However, approximately 51% of respondents to Question 22 said that the amount of time spent was just right, and almost 6% of respondents felt that too much time was spent on this stage of the process.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 23: What suggestions do you have to improve this stage of the program?

Eighty-four respondents to this question provided 87 different responses that were broken down into 8 categories:

- Time Issues (16)
- Missing Elements (15)
- Supervisors (14)
- No Suggestion (12)
- Eliminate (11)
- Ineffective (10)
- Simplify (6)
- Miscellaneous (3)

The most common category was *Time Issues*; nearly 18% of the responses reported time constraint issues in regard to the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage of the Performance Management Plan. The *Missing Elements* category comprised approximately 17% of all the responses. Respondents in this category either were not aware of this stage in the Performance Management Plan or gave responses about goal setting, employee benefits, and commitment to the program. The next category, *Supervisors*, which accounts for 16% of those surveyed, displays comments about the behavior of supervisors in relation to this program. The *No Suggestion* category, which makes up nearly 14% of the responses, is composed of those who had no suggestion for improving the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage.

About 13% of those surveyed believe the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback section should be eliminated in the Performance Management Plan; these responses make up the *Eliminate* category. The next category is *Ineffective* and accounts for approximately 12% of the responses to Question 23. This section includes comments about negative results from this part of the Performance Management Plan and those respondents who have not implemented this process into their work environment. The *Simplify* category represents

nearly 7% of the responses to this question and displays the respondents' concerns for the length of the PM2 Form. The last category for Question 23 is *Miscellaneous*; close to 3% of the responses to this question fit into this category.

Time Issues

Nearly 18% of the responses said that time concerns were major issues facing the Performance Management Plan. The responses showed a concern for forms taking up too much time throughout respondents' workdays. Many respondents felt that these forms were too long and extensive, and they simply did not have the time to complete them. These respondents stated, "We really don't have time for any of this," "Too time consuming," and, "Let's get back to work now!"

Missing Elements

The *Missing Elements* category includes responses that illustrate a need for such things as more awareness about this stage of the program, more goal setting, more commitment from both supervisor and classified staff, and rewards and benefits for deserving employees. This category accounts for approximately 17% of all responses to this question. Respondents felt that these missing elements hinder an employee's success in the Performance Management Plan. These respondents offered comments and suggestions like, "...we never sat down and discussed individual goals..." and, "Find better ways to reward hard workers." Five respondents felt that there were commitment issues in the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage by both supervisors and Classified Staff. One such respondent said, "Actually do it."

Supervisors

Approximately 16% of responses to this question expressed concerns about supervisors. Most concerns revolved around the supervisor's lack of participation. Many respondents remarked that their supervisor did not take this process seriously and openly expressed to their employees that they felt it was a waste of time. One Classified Staff member said, "My supervisor indicated this sort of thing would just cause people to bring guns to work."

No Suggestion

The *No Suggestion* category is comprised of responses that expressed no suggestions for improvements of the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage. Approximately 14% of responses had no suggestions to offer for this stage of the program. All responses in this category indicated no suggestion for improvement by answering, “None.”

Eliminate

Approximately 13% of responses suggested that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage of the Performance Management Plan should be eliminated. The respondents in this category felt that, because this stage takes up valuable time, it should not be included in the process. The respondents said things such as, “Do away with the program,” or “Drop it.” This category also includes one respondent who felt the process would not work.

Ineffective

The *Ineffective* category deals with respondents who discussed not having experienced positive results or had not yet started the process. This category includes nearly 12% of the question’s responses. These comments were most concerned with the lack of involvement in regard to the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage. One respondent wrote, “We have not even discussed this in our department since the initial planning meeting.” Other respondents commented that they did not feel that the extra work was relevant unless they knew that the program would remain implemented in their department.

Simplify

The *Simplify* category refers to respondents who had concerns about lengthy paperwork. All six respondents in this category felt that the paperwork involved in the Performance Management Plan needed to be less extensive. This nearly 7% expressed that the forms needed to be abbreviated or shortened. The respondents in this section also reflected a need for more clarification of the forms. Respondents suggested, “Abbreviate it,” and “Less forms to complete.”

Miscellaneous

This category accounts for approximately 3% of all responses to this question. This category is comprised of 3 responses that reflect employee's feelings about the program as opposed to their suggestions. One of the responses to this question was, "You can bring a horse to water but you can't make him drink."

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 24: What are the benefits you have incurred from this stage of the program?

Eighty-six respondents to this question provided 88 different responses that were broken down into 3 categories:

- No Benefits (67)
- Communication (15)
- Effectiveness (6)

When the responses to Question 24 were broken down into categories, three were found: *No Benefits*, *Communication*, and *Effectiveness*. Nearly 76% of responses indicated that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage provided no benefits. Roughly 17% of the responses to Question 24 considered communication as a benefit that came from the implementation of the stage. About 7% of the responses found that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage created a greater level of effectiveness in their department.

No Benefits

The *No Benefits* category includes responses that indicated this stage of the program incurred no benefits. This category accounted for almost 76% of the responses to Question 24 and included comments like, “None so far,” and “Quite honestly – I think this whole thing is crazy.”

Communication

Approximately 17% of responses stated that communication was a benefit of the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage. Different forms of communication that were discussed as beneficial were more feedback, increased support, goal setting, and the better realization of expectations. One respondent commented, “I know more what my supervisor expects of me in my job duties.”

Effectiveness

Approximately 7% of the responses to Question 24 found that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage created a greater level of effectiveness in their department. These responses suggested an increased level of commitment, empowerment, implementation, and improvement within the work environment. “I feel a sense of worth concerning job performance. My ideas and suggestions are taken seriously, and sometimes implemented,” said one respondent.

Training

Question 25: Do you have any training needs that still need to be fulfilled?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Goal Setting	36	12.8
Coaching/Mentoring	23	8.1
Performance Management and Development	30	10.6
Communication	30	10.6
Motivation	19	6.7
Conflict Management	26	9.2
Teamwork	25	8.9
Other	19	6.8

This question asked respondents to check all the categories in which he or she felt a need for training remained. Because respondents could check more than 1 response, the valid percent totals more than 100%.

Approximately 13% of respondents to Question 25 stated that they had goal setting needs that still need to be fulfilled. Nearly 11% of responses indicated a need for more performance management and development training in the Performance Management Plan. Communication training was still needed by roughly 11% of the respondents.

Eighteen respondents indicated other training needs aside from the options listed. Eighteen separate responses were provided by these respondents and were divided into 3 categories:

- Computer Skills (6)
- Training and Further Education (5)
- Commitment to Program (4)
- None (3)

One-third (33%) of the responses in the write-in category indicated respondents needed an advance in computer skills. Nearly 28% of the responses indicated that there was a

general need for more training, and approximately 22% suggested that there was a lack of commitment. Nearly 17% suggested that no training needs remained.

Computer Skills

Nearly 37% of the responses listed under other training needs indicated a need for more computer skills. These respondents expressed an interest in having some computer classes offered in order to better train them. Responses stated such things as, “More computer use skills - access, excel, power point, etc.,” and, “CD’s and CAD programs cover all of this except for PM-D.”

Training and Further Education

Approximately 32% of the responses suggested that there were training needs to be fulfilled. This category includes responses that stated concerns about in what areas they are trained and the amount of time for which they are trained. Respondents stated such things as they needed more extensive “educating and job training” and that “these all need to be continuously maintained or they can never be fulfilled.” One respondent stated that his or her “supervisor needs training.” Also included in this category is one respondent who stated, “MBA.”

Commitment to Program

This category includes responses that expressed a lack of commitment to the Performance Management Plan and accounts for about 32% of all responses given for this section of the question. Respondents discussed supervisor and coworker concerns and questioned the program’s purpose. For example, one respondent stated, “How to deal with people that do not care. Office personnel,” and another stated, “We have no meetings!” Yet another respondent stated that he or she has “not met supervisor to discuss anything.” One respondent said that he or she did not know the purpose of the process.

None

Three respondents who responded with other suggestions for training needs suggested that there were none. Two of their responses were, “None,” and one was “N/A.”

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 26: What are the main benefits of the Performance Management Plan?

One hundred and ten respondents provided 128 different responses that were broken down into 5 categories:

- No Benefits (59)
- Communication (40)
- Rewards (16)
- Time Concerns (8)
- Effectiveness (5)

The most common categories of responses identified for Question 26 were *No Benefits* and *Communication*. Nearly 46% of responses fell into the *No Benefits* category, comprised of responses from respondents that had started the program and felt it resulted in no benefits. Approximately 31% of those surveyed stated that communication benefits, such as goals, expectations, feedback, and the overall level of communication, were benefits that came from the Performance Management Plan. Almost 13% of the responses indicated that rewards like actual pay raises, extended learning, and other incentives could be a valuable benefit derived from this Performance Management Plan. Nearly 6% of responses, included in the *Time Concerns* category, indicated time constraint concerns with regard to the program. And finally, the *Effectiveness* category includes responses regarding recognition, implementation, and the overall effectiveness of the program.

No Benefits

Of the responses to Question 26, approximately 46% fell into the *No Benefits* category. This category is comprised of those respondents who had started the program and felt it resulted in no benefits. These respondents said things such as, “Is wasted time a benefit?” and, “I have no idea because I know very little about it.”

Communication

The *Communication* category includes responses regarding goals, expectations, feedback, and overall communication. Of the responses to this question, approximately 31% stated that benefits regarding some sort of communication came from the Performance Management Plan. One respondent commented that the program provided the opportunity to be open about concerns and changes in their department, while others welcomed feedback from supervisors. Thirteen percent of responses to the question discussed the importance of goal setting and the positive communication that it encouraged.

Rewards

Nearly 13% of responses suggested that rewards were a possible benefit of the Performance Management Plan. The category of *Rewards* includes those responses that indicated that departmental budget concerns, actual pay raises, possibilities for extended learning, and other incentives are rewards of the Performance Management Plan. Many respondents discussed the current state of these rewards as well as what they would like to see in the future. Some responses illustrated that the Performance Management Plan could not compensate for individual work achievements throughout the year. Responses stated such things as, “Pay for work done—If we ever get to that point.” Another response was written, stating, “I don’t see any unless the ‘pay for performance’ is implemented.” Some respondents said that this program provides incentives to be a good employee.

Time Concerns

Roughly 6% of responses indicated that the extensiveness of the process resulted in a lack of benefits. Most of these responses stated that, due to busy workdays, this process was a waste of time. Responses implied that the process was too lengthy and respondents did not have the proper amount of time to complete many sections of the overall plan. These respondents said things such as, “Disadvantages, as far as taking up far too much of my work hours,” and, “A waste of time.”

Effectiveness

Approximately 4% of the responses suggested that effectiveness was a benefit of the Performance Management Plan. The *Effectiveness* category includes responses that discussed possibilities of recognition by higher management and the overall effectiveness of the program. One respondent wrote, “I feel this will benefit people who like to have feedback on their performance.”

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 27: Compared to the amount of time spent on the Performance Management Program, the benefits were:

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Too Few	91	68.9
Just Right	37	28.0
More than Expected	4	3.0
Total	132	100

When asked to compare the time spent on the Performance Management Program with the benefits incurred, almost 69% of respondents felt that they experienced too few benefits. On the other hand, 3% of respondents indicated the benefits of the program were more than they had expected, while 28% listed the benefits as just right.

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 28: What are the areas for improvement in the Performance Management Program?

Seventy-five respondents to this question provided 82 different responses that were broken down into 6 categories:

- Time Concerns (18)
- Eliminate (16)
- Training and Follow-Through (16)
- Communication (15)
- Rewards (9)
- No Suggestion (8)

Approximately 22% of the responses indicated that time concerns were an area for improvement in the Performance Management Plan. These responses suggested that the program was too long and should be simplified to save time. Nearly 20% of the responses indicated that the program needed to be eliminated. These responses implied that the reason for eliminating the program was because of the lack of benefits. The *Training and Follow-Through* category accounts for approximately 20% of the responses to this question and consists of responses that expressed the need for supervisors to be better trained and to make the program mandatory for everyone. Responses in the *Communication* category indicated that communication improvements needed to be made in order to improve the entire program. This accounted for approximately 18% of responses. Nearly 11% of responses wanted to receive monetary rewards, placing them in the *Rewards* category. The *No Suggestion* category is comprised of responses that gave no opinion for improvement of the Performance Management Plan or indicated that the program lacked relevance. This category accounts for nearly 10% of the responses.

Time Concerns

Approximately 22% of the responses expressed time concerns with the Performance Management Plan. The responses suggested that the process be simplified to save time.

The respondents stated issues such as, “Too time consuming—our jobs do not give extra time for this.” They also suggested numerous times to “simplify documentation,” and that “the forms are too complicated.”

Eliminate

The *Eliminate* category includes responses that encourage abolishment of the Performance Management Plan. This category accounts for nearly 20% of all responses given for this question. Many responses commented that the program needed to be eliminated because of the lack of benefits. Two responses suggested the program be eliminated and the old evaluation system be reinstated. One response implied the program should not have been implemented, stating, “I believe that instead of implementing such a program as this, he could save a lot of time and paperwork just take care of those employees that do not have a good ethics at work and keep it as usual for employees who do a good job.”

Training and Follow-Through

The *Training* category is comprised of responses that expressed a need for more training for supervisors before implementing the Performance Management Plan. This category accounts for nearly 20% of all responses given for this question. Responses in this category indicated that their supervisors were not trained enough to execute the Performance Management Plan. One response stated that an area for improvement was, “Supervisor training on the Performance Management Program.” Three responses suggested that the program would be more effective if it was mandatory for employees and supervisors. One respondent said, “Force people to take time to do this.”

Communication

Approximately 18% of the responses indicated that communication is an area needing improvement in the Performance Management Plan. The *Communication* category includes responses that indicated that more communication would help explain the program and would benefit the entire process. Responses in this category also suggested that a higher level of responsibility, commitment, accountability, assurance, and goal

setting would help ensure that the Performance Management Plan become more successful. These respondents said things such as, “I do not believe that management is very serious about this because we have not even discussed this in our department,” and, “Some sort of realistic goals, not just yet another group of forms to fill out.”

Rewards

The responses in the *Reward* category had concerns about monetary rewards, recognition, and evaluation. Nearly 11% of the responses had reward issues. Seven of the responses indicated that respondents wanted to receive monetary rewards after completing the Performance Management Plan. Responses were, “Compensation phase needs to be put in place,” and, “It would be helpful if we knew whether or not there were going to be raises based on merit.” One respondent wanted the reward of recognition for his or her quality of work, while another respondent suggested the evaluation of his or her job performance would be a reward.

No Suggestion

The *No Suggestion* category includes approximately 10% of the responses. This category included those responses that showed dissatisfaction with the Performance Management Plan, had no opinion regarding the program, or felt that the program lacked relevance. One respondent said, “When this change was first being implemented I was its biggest supporter. Now that the changes have been made I am thoroughly disappointed.” Another respondent claimed, “What is the purpose of the program other than to allow management not to give across the board raises?”

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 29: What else do you need in order to be successful in the Performance Management Program?

Fifty-nine respondents provided 63 different responses that were broken down into 6 categories:

- Supervisor Concerns (20)
- Time Concerns (13)
- Rewards (12)
- No Suggestion (9)
- Miscellaneous (6)
- Eliminate (3)

The respondents for this question expressed supervisors concerns, time concerns, a need for rewards, no suggestions, and a desire to eliminate the program. Approximately 32% of responses fell into the *Supervisor Concerns* category, which includes responses that regarded a need for supervisor feedback, goal setting, and involvement and training in the program. Nearly 21% of responses indicated that they had time concerns with the Performance Management Plan. The category of *Rewards* includes approximately 19% of responses and contains those that suggested more benefits and rewards should be reflected through compensation and a higher level of trust between employees and supervisors. About 14% of the responses to this question offered no suggestions for improvement of the Performance Management Plan, and almost 10% fell into the *Miscellaneous* category, which includes responses about job security, hiring additional employees, and participating in outside interests. Nearly 5% of the responses fell into the *Eliminate* category, which includes those responses that indicated the program should be eliminated entirely.

Supervisor Concerns

The Supervisor Concerns category includes responses that stated a need for more feedback, mandatory supervisor participation, goal setting, supervisor involvement, and

training in order to be successful in the Performance Management Plan. Nearly 32% of the responses to Question 29 expressed supervisor concerns. Responses indicated things such as, “Supervisors need to realize performance management and development is more than free classes at OU,” and, “Supervisors who will participate.” To be successful in this program, respondents felt it was necessary for more training and feedback for their supervisors. One respondent said they wanted “a supervisor that has attended training and feels this is an important program to classified employees.”

Time Concerns

Approximately 21% of the responses to Question 29 fell into the Time Concerns category. This category includes responses that expressed a need for more time in order for participants to be successful in this program. Responses in this category said things such as, “If we are required to participate in the program time needs to be implemented in everyday routine and treated as part of the job description for supervisors as well as employees.”

Rewards

The *Rewards* category includes responses that expressed that, for the Performance Management Plan to be successful, rewards should be offered to employees. This category accounts for nearly 19% of responses given for this question. Many responses indicated a desire for monetary rewards. One respondent stated a benefit would be “the knowledge that someone who really performs well will be compensated for their efforts.” Further, two responses pointed out that Ohio University might not have the funds to give out this type of reward to employees.

No Suggestion

The *No Suggestion* category includes approximately 14% of the responses to Question 29. These 9 responses did not give a suggestion for what was needed to be successful in the Performance Management Plan. Responses in this category included, “None I can think of,” and, “Nothing—I am a success in my job!!”

Miscellaneous

Approximately 10% of all responses to Question 29 fell into the *Miscellaneous* category. This category includes responses that communicate a concern for job security, outside interests, and hiring an additional employee. One response suggested a fear about how long they would be employed by Ohio University, while another response indicated the need for permission to participate in other areas of interest that would benefit their job position. A third response in this category stated a need to have additional employees to share the workload.

Eliminate

The *Eliminate* category included approximately 5% of the responses for this particular question. This category represented responses that suggested reverting back to the old plan or eliminating the Performance Management Plan all together. One respondent stated, “Go back to the old yearly evaluation form and process.” Two respondents suggested eliminating the plan and said things such as, “I am successful without it,” and, “Even the supervisor agrees that this is just more paperwork being pushed on departments...”

Demographics

Question 30: What is your gender?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Female	240	92.0
Male	21	8.0
Total	261	100

When asked their gender, 92% of the respondents stated that they were female, while 8% indicated that they were male.

Demographics

Question 31: What is your ethnicity?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0
Black/African American, not of Hispanic origin	1	.4
Caucasian/White, not of Hispanic origin	245	97.6
Hispanic	1	.4
Native American	4	1.6
Total	251	100

Nearly 98% of the respondents indicated that they were Caucasian/White, not of Hispanic origin, while approximately 2% of the respondents were Native American. One respondent indicated that he or she was Hispanic, and another one indicated Black/African American, not of Hispanic origin.

Demographics

Question 32: What is your age?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Under 30	16	6.4
30-39 years	57	22.9
40-49 years	90	36.1
50-59 years	73	29.3
Over 60	13	5.2
Total	249	100

Approximately 23% of the respondents to Question 32 indicated that they were between the ages of 30 and 39 years. However, nearly 36% of the respondents stated that they were between the ages of 40 and 49 years, and approximately 29% of the respondents stated that they are between the ages of 50 and 59 years.

Demographics

Question 33: At which Ohio University campus are you employed?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Athens	229	88.1
Chillicothe	5	1.9
Eastern	3	1.2
Lancaster	16	6.2
Southern	0	0
Zanesville	7	2.7
Total	260	100

Approximately 88% of the respondents to Question 33 stated that they are employed on the Athens campus. About 6% of those that responded to this question stated that the Lancaster branch employs them and, the remaining 6% were spread out among the Chillicothe, Eastern, and Zanesville campuses. Note: responses from the Southern campus were received well after data entry was completed and could not be addressed in time for this report.

Demographics

Question 34: How long have you been employed at Ohio University?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 1 year	9	3.5
1 to 3 years	45	17.4
4 to 6 years	39	15.1
7 to 10 years	34	13.1
11 to 20 years	73	28.2
21 to 30 years	51	19.7
More than 30 years	8	3.1
Total	259	100

Approximately 17% of the respondents to Question 34 have been employed by Ohio University for 1 to 3 years. Nearly 15% of the respondents indicated that they have worked for the University between 4 and 6 years, and about 13% said that they have been employed by Ohio University for 7 to 10 years. On the other hand, approximately 28% of the respondents stated Ohio University has employed them for between 11 and 20 years, while nearly 20% have been employed for between 21 and 30 years.

Demographics

Question 35: Using the list below, please indicate your planning unit?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
College of Arts and Sciences	19	8.0
College of Business	3	1.3
College of Communication	6	2.5
College of Education	4	1.7
College of Engineering	12	5.0
College of Fine Arts	7	2.9
College of Health and Human Services	4	1.7
Honors Tutorial College and University College	1	.4
Osteopathic- Academic	20	8.4
Osteopathic- Clinic	24	10.1
Office of President	2	.8
Provost Senate Office	8	3.4
Information Technology	5	2.1
Library	19	8.0
VP Admin-Campus Safety	10	4.2
VP Admin-Enrollment Services	16	6.7
VP Admin-Facilities Management	7	2.9
Vice President for Finance	22	9.2
VP Education-Lifelong Learning	5	2.1
VP Education-OU Lancaster	11	4.6
VP Education-OU Eastern	3	1.3
VP Education-OU Chillicothe	3	1.3
VP Education-OU Zanesville	3	1.3
Vice President for Research	4	1.7
Vice President for Student Affairs	13	5.5
Vice President for University Advancement	7	2.9
Total	238	100

Approximately 10% of the respondents indicated the Osteopathic-Clinic as their planning unit, and about 9% of those who responded stated that Vice President for Finance was their planning unit. Nearly 8% of the respondents said that the College of Arts and Sciences was their planning unit, and the same percentage indicated either the

Osteopathic-Academic, Office of the President, or Library as their planning unit. The rest of the respondents were spread among the remaining planning units.

Performance Planning

Question 1: Did you and your supervisee(s) hold a goal-setting meeting to begin the Performance Management Program?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	52	62.7
No	31	37.3
Total	83	100

Approximately 63% of the respondents to Question 1 indicated that they had held a goal-setting meeting with their supervisee(s). On the other hand, 37% of the respondents had not yet held meetings with their supervisee(s) to begin the Performance Management Plan.

Respondents to Question 1 who responded that they did not hold a goal-setting meeting were asked why the meeting had not occurred. Thirty-one respondents answered that they had not had the meeting and provided 37 different responses explaining why the meeting had not been held. Their responses were broken down into 5 categories:

- Lack of Resources (9)
- No Supervisee (8)
- To be Scheduled (7)
- Time Issues (7)
- Alternative Methods (6)

Approximately 24% of responses indicated that there was a lack of information or materials in the Performance Management Plan that led to an inability to hold the goal-setting meeting. Approximately 22% of responses indicated the respondents did not hold a goal-setting meeting because the program did not coincide with the current status of their position. Nearly 19% considered time constraints to be the reason why respondents did not have a goal-setting meeting, and the same percentage stated respondents could not participate in the goal-setting meeting because of various barriers in their work

environment, but plan to hold it in the future. Approximately 16% of responses indicated that respondents were using alternative methods.

Lack of Resources

Almost one-quarter (24%) of responses commented on not having information or material to hold a goal-setting meeting. Nine of these respondents did not hold a goal-setting meeting because they were uninformed as to when to conduct these meetings. These responses included, “I was unaware that this was something I needed to do,” and, “...In the training it was stated that a reminder would be sent out to prompt us as to what we should be doing at certain points and it wasn’t.” One respondent stated that they “have not received forms.”

No Supervisee

Twenty-two percent of the responses indicated that no goal-setting meeting was held between the respondents and their supervisee(s) because they did not have a supervisee with whom to meet. One respondent said, “I no longer supervise a classified staff member.” Another respondent could not hold the meeting because his or her supervisee “resigned.”

Time Issues

Seven of the thirty-seven responses (19%) to this question indicated time concerns with the goal-setting process. The responses in this category addressed the lack of time available to complete this phase of the Performance Management Plan. “Our unit has been working overtime since June and has not had staffing time to implement,” and, “The process is so time consuming we were able to get a good start after eight hours of discussion and we still have not set goals,” are two specific examples of their concerns. One respondent simply answered that they had “no time available.”

To be Scheduled

Approximately 19% of the responses said that respondents did not hold a goal-setting meeting yet, but plan to hold one in the future. Two respondents stated that they

“forgot.” Another response was, “Haven’t got around to it.” Other responses to this question indicated that respondents have initiated the process and have scheduled a date for a goal-setting meeting. One response was, “Process initiated but not completed. Scheduled by 10/25/02.”

Alternative Methods

The *Alternative Methods* category includes responses that indicate that the supervisors did not follow the outlined Performance Management Plan. This category accounts for approximately 16% of all responses given for this question. Respondents commented that, “...the director is doing goal-setting,” and, “We have been holding weekly ‘where we are meetings.’” Another respondent stated that, “We discuss performance everyday as a part of our normal work...this program is paper intensive and silly.”

Performance Planning

Question 2: How satisfied were you with the outcome of the goal-setting meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Satisfied	6	11.3
Somewhat Unsatisfied	7	13.2
Satisfied	20	37.7
More Than Satisfied	10	18.9
Very satisfied	10	18.9
Total	53	100

Nearly 38% of the respondents to Question 2 specified that they were satisfied with the outcome of the goal-setting meeting. Another 38% of the respondents said that they were more than satisfied to very satisfied with the conclusion of the goal-setting meeting. However, about one-fourth (25%) of respondents were somewhat unsatisfied to not satisfied with the outcome of the goal setting meeting.

Performance Planning

Question 3: In the Performance Planning meeting, was there a discussion regarding the use of the Supervisor Feedback Form (PM3)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	43	82.7
No	9	17.3
Total	52	100

More than four-fifths (83%) of the respondents to Question 3 revealed that they had had a discussion regarding the use of the Supervisor Feedback Form (PM3), while approximately 17% of the respondents declared that they had not discussed the use of the PM3 Form.

Performance Planning

Question 4: Did your supervisee(s) decide to use the PM3 Form?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	12	27.9
No	31	72.1
Total	43	100

More than 72% of the respondents to Question 4 stated that their supervisee(s) decided not to use the PM3 Form. However, approximately 28% of the respondents' supervisee(s) did choose to use the PM3 Form.

Performance Planning

Question 5: How effective do you feel the Performance Planning phase has been in improving trust between you and your supervisee(s)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Effective	14	26.9
Somewhat Ineffective	3	5.8
Neutral	26	50.0
Somewhat Effective	7	13.5
Very Effective	2	3.8
Total	52	100

Nearly one-third (33%) of respondents to Question 5 indicated that the Performance Planning phase was somewhat ineffective to not effective in improving trust between them and their supervisee(s). Half (50%) of respondents said they felt neutral, while approximately 17% of respondents said the Performance Planning phase was somewhat effective to very effective in improving trust between them and their supervisee(s).

Performance Planning

Question 6: How much total time was taken to complete this part of the process for your supervisee(s)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
0	1	1.9
1-2 hrs	25	48.1
3-4 hrs	13	25.0
5-6 hrs	5	9.6
7-8 hrs	0	0
More than 8 hrs	8	15.4
Total	52	100

Approximately 48% of respondents to Question 6 specified that they spent between 1 and 2 hours completing the Performance Planning phase, and one-quarter of respondents (25%) spent between 3 and 4 hours. About 15% of respondents spent more than 8 hours. However, approximately 2% of respondents spent no time completing this phase.

Performance Planning

Question 7: On average, how much time did you spend *per supervisee* on this part of the process?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
1-29 minutes	7	13.5
30-59 minutes	14	26.9
1-2 hours	22	42.3
2-3 hours	4	7.7
More than 3 hours	5	9.6
Total	52	100

Fifty percent of respondents to Question 7 indicated that they spent between 1 and 3 hours meeting with each supervisee during the Performance Planning phase. Nearly 41% of respondents said they spent less than 1 hour meeting with each supervisee. However, approximately 10% of respondents spent more than 3 hours with each supervisee during this phase.

Coaching and Feedback

Question 8: Did you hold coaching and feedback sessions with your supervisee(s) after the initial planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	32	39.0
No	50	61.0
Total	82	100

Sixty-one percent of the respondents to Question 8 indicated that they had not held a Coaching and Feedback session with their supervisee(s). However, 39% of the respondents had held a Coaching and Feedback session since the initial planning meeting.

Coaching and Feedback

Question 9: To what extent did these feedback sessions help your supervisee(s) meet their goals?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at All	5	12.5
Minimal	4	10.0
Neutral	17	42.5
Somewhat	11	27.5
Very Much	3	7.5
Total	40	100

Of those that responded to Question 9, about 43% indicated that they felt neutral about the helpfulness of the Coaching and Feedback sessions to their supervisee(s) in meeting goals, while nearly 28% said the sessions helped their supervisee(s) somewhat. About 23% felt that the Coaching and Feedback sessions helped their supervisee(s) minimally to not at all.

Coaching and Feedback

Question 10: How much time was spent providing coaching and giving feedback since the initial Performance Planning Meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
1-15 min.	10	25.6
16-30 min.	7	17.9
31-45 min.	6	15.4
46-60 min.	10	25.6
More than 1 hour	6	15.4
Total	39	100

Forty-one percent of respondents to Question 10 indicated that they spent 46 to 60 minutes or more than 1 hour of time providing coaching and giving feedback to their supervisee(s) after the initial Performance Planning Meeting. About 26% reported that, after initial Performance Planning Meeting, they spent 1-15 minutes providing coaching and giving feedback, and approximately 18% and 15% spent 16 to 30 minutes and 31 to 45 minutes, respectively.

Midyear Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 11: Did you and your supervisee(s) hold a Midyear Review meeting to discuss progress toward the goals established in the Performance Planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	6	46.2
No	7	53.8
Total	13	100

Of the 13 respondents to this question, almost 54% did not meet for a Midyear Review to discuss progress toward the goals made during the Performance Planning meeting. Approximately 46% identified that they had met with their supervisee(s) to discuss progress toward the goals.

Midyear Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 12: How satisfied were you with the outcome of the Midyear Review meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not satisfied	0	0
Somewhat unsatisfied	0	0
Satisfied	4	66.6
More than Satisfied	2	33.3
Very satisfied	0	0
Total	6	100

Of the 6 respondents to Question 12, two-thirds (67%) reported being satisfied with the outcome of the Midyear Review meeting. The remaining third (33%) felt more than satisfied with the results of the Midyear Review meeting.

Midyear Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 13: Did you complete the Midyear Performance Management Review Form (PM6)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	6	85.7
No	1	14.3
Total	7	100

Approximately 86% of the 7 respondents to Question 13 completed the Midyear Performance Management Review Form (PM6). One of the 7 respondents (14%) did not complete the form.

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 14: Did you and your supervisee(s) hold a Yearend Review meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	8	80.0
No	2	20.0
Total	10	100

Four-fifths (80%) of the 10 IT Supervisors who answered Question 14 had held a Yearend Review meeting with their supervisee(s). The remaining fifth (20%) did not hold a Yearend Review meeting with their supervisee(s).

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 15: How satisfied were you with the outcome of the Yearend Review meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Unsatisfied	0	0
Somewhat unsatisfied	2	25.0
Satisfied	5	62.5
More than Satisfied	0	0
Very satisfied	1	12.5
Total	8	100

Eight responses were given for Question 15. Of these, 25% were somewhat unsatisfied with the outcome of the Yearend Review meeting, while about 63% were satisfied with the outcome of the meeting. The remaining respondent (approximately 13%) was very satisfied with the outcome of the Yearend Review meeting.

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 16a: In retrospect, please rate the usefulness of the PM1 form in regard to the Performance Management process.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	2	25.0
Less than Useful	2	25.0
Neutral	2	25.0
Somewhat Useful	1	12.5
Very Useful	1	12.5
N/A	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

Of the responses regarding to the Performance Management Review Form, 25% of the respondents stated that it was somewhat useful to very useful. However, half (50%) of the respondents stated that the form was either less than useful or not useful in completing the Performance Management process. Twenty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they were neutral regarding this form.

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 16b: In retrospect, please rate the usefulness of PM2 form in regard to the Performance Management process.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	2	25.0
Less Than Useful	3	37.5
Neutral	2	25.0
Somewhat Useful	1	12.5
Very Useful	0	0.0
N/A	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

Approximately 13% of the respondents to this question stated that the Performance Planning Form was somewhat useful. Nearly 63% of respondents indicated that it was less than or not useful, while 25% reported feeling neutral.

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 16c: In retrospect, please rate the usefulness of the PM3 form in regard to the Performance Management process.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	3	37.5
Less than Useful	2	25.0
Neutral	2	25.0
Somewhat Useful	0	0.0
Very Useful	0	0.0
N/A	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Approximately 63% of IT supervisors responding to this question stated that the Supervisor Feedback Form was less than or not useful. One respondent indicated that the PM3 form was not applicable. One-fourth (25%) indicated they felt neutral about this form.

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 16d: In retrospect, please rate the usefulness of the PM4 form in regard to the Performance Management process.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	2	25.0
Less than Useful	2	25.0
Neutral	2	25.0
Somewhat Useful	1	12.5
Very Useful	1	12.5
N/A	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

When asked the usefulness of the Supervisor Checklist Form, 25% of the respondents stated that the form was somewhat to very useful. However, 50% of the respondents stated that the PM4 Form was less than or not useful. The remaining 25% reported being neutral with regard to the usefulness of the PM4 Form.

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 16e: In retrospect, please rate the usefulness of the PM5 form in regard to the Performance Management process.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	2	25.0
Less than Useful	2	25.0
Neutral	2	25.0
Somewhat Useful	2	25.0
Very Useful	0	0.0
N/A	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

One-fourth (25%) of the respondents to Question 16e indicated that the Employee Self-Evaluation Form was somewhat useful. However, half (50%) of the respondents stated that the form was less than or not useful, and one-fourth (25%) of respondents stated that the form's usefulness was neutral.

Yearend Review – IT Supervisors Only

Question 16f: In retrospect, please rate the usefulness of the PM6 form in regard to the Performance Management process.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	1	12.5
Less than Useful	2	25.0
Neutral	3	37.5
Somewhat Useful	2	25.0
Very Useful	0	0.0
N/A	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0

When asked the usefulness of the Mid-Year Performance Management Review Form, 25% stated that the form was somewhat useful. On the other hand, roughly 38% stated that the Mid-Year Performance Management Review Form was less than or not useful to them in completing the Performance Management Plan, and approximately 38% reported feeling neutral in this matter.

Training

Question 17: Do you have any training needs that still need to be fulfilled? (Check all that apply)

Response	Frequency – Yes	Valid Percent – Yes
Goal Setting	10	13.8
Coaching/Mentoring	14	19.2
Performance Management and Development	13	17.8
Communication	6	8.2
Motivation	8	10.9
Conflict Management	9	12.3
Teamwork	7	9.6
Other	6	8.2

This question asked respondents to check all the categories in which he or she felt a need for training remained. Because respondents could check more than 1 response, the valid percent totals more than 100%.

Of those who responded to this question, approximately 19% indicated that they needed additional training in the area of coaching and mentoring. The area of performance management and development received nearly 18% of responses regarding additional training needs. The area of communication got the fewest responses, with nearly 8% of the respondents indicating that additional communication training was still needed.

While 6 respondents indicated that other training needs existed by checking this response in the close-ended survey question, 1 respondent wrote a response in the area provided for other training needs. This respondent wrote, “I went through the training and I have been reading the manual.”

The Performance Management Process

Question 18: Please provide us with any additional information concerning your thoughts on the benefits of this program.

Eighteen respondents to this question provided 20 different responses that were broken down into 4 categories:

- Time Issues (10)
- Benefits (4)
- Not Beneficial (4)
- Will Not Work (2)

Fifty percent of responses to this question indicated time concerns with the Performance Management Plan. Twenty percent of the responses suggested that there were positive benefits as result of the process. In contrast, another 20% said that the process had no benefits. The *Will Not Work* category included comments from respondents who felt the program would not be successful and included 10% of the responses to this question.

Time Issues

Fifty percent of the responses expressed the Performance Management Plan had time concerns. The *Time Concerns* category deals with respondents who felt there was not enough time for the Performance Management Plan. The respondents said things such as, "...every minute counts. It is absurd to devote all this "official" time..." or, "This process is very time consuming." One respondent commented that it was a "waste of time." Two respondents felt that their offices were too busy to incorporate this process. This category also included comments from 3 respondents who have not started the process yet.

Benefits

The *Benefits* category includes responses that expressed positive feedback about the process. This category accounts for 20% of all responses given for this question. Respondents said the process was, "compelling," "ideal," and that they were "anxious" to begin. All 4 of the respondents in this category felt that the Performance Management

Plan would bring benefits to the working community at Ohio University. Additional comments made about the program were, “increases positive communication” and “compels participants to focus on measurable standards of performance.”

Not Beneficial

The *Not Beneficial* category is comprised of responses that expressed negative opinions and concerns. This category accounts for 20% of all responses given for this question. The respondents in this category expressed reasons why the process was not working for them or why they were not happy with the process. All 4 responses in this category said that the process would not supply respondents with any benefits and that it was not useful. Their responses included, “This program is too complex and cumbersome to be worthwhile in the present financial climate of the university,” and, “No benefits.”

Will Not Work

This category represents 10% of all responses given for this question and includes two responses that stated the process would not work. The respondents in this category expressed their opinion on why the process would not be effective for them. One respondent simply stated that the program would not work. The second respondent felt that the process would not be successful because of his/her supervisor’s “negative personality” and belief that the process would not be effective.

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 19: Compared to the amount of time spent on the Performance Management program, the benefits were:

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Too Few	38	71.7
Just Right	1	1.9
More Than Expected	14	26.4
Total	53	100.0

When asked to evaluate the benefits of the Performance Management Plan, nearly 72% responded that there were too few, while approximately 26% felt that the benefits received in this program were more than expected.

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 20: Please provide us with any additional comments regarding areas of improvement for this program.

Twenty-eight respondents to Question 20 provided 36 different responses that were broken down into 4 categories:

- Eliminate (14)
- Restructure Program (8)
- Lack of Rewards (7)
- Communication Issues (5)

Approximately 39% of the responses to Question 20 indicated that the Performance Management Plan should be eliminated. The *Restructure Program* category includes comments from respondents who said the program needed to be modified in one way or another; nearly one-quarter (22%) of responses offered these suggestions. Five out of 36 responses (14%) indicated that there were not enough rewards in completing the program and discussed performance pay possibilities. Additionally, the responses in the *Communication Issues* category included comments regarding lack of information, consistency, and communication. Approximately 19% of responses were in the *Communication Issues* category.

Eliminate

Nearly 39% of the responses received said, in one way or another, that respondents would like to see the program eliminated. Many did not offer reasons beyond, “Do away with,” “...don’t feel its worthwhile,” and, “This program needs to be dumped.” One of the reasons for eliminating the program that was offered concerned time issues. This respondent said, “Takes way too much time—as well as employees. I can’t imagine those having 10-15 or even 20 employees!” Others stated that one should not need a program to recognize benefits. One such respondent said, “Get rid of program. Benefits should be seen by well-run offices without the Performance Planning Program.”

Restructure Program

Eight of the 36 responses (22%) said that the Performance Management Plan needs to be modified. Several responses indicated that the program should be simplified. Comments included, “Language and complexity of forms make the steps of the process unwieldy. Simplify! Just get on with it!” and, “There are too many forms and too many questions...more emphasis on the process...less on the paper and questions.” Other responses dealt with training for the program. One respondent suggested, “Provide examples—case studies—attributing successful situations and problems.” Another voiced, “There should be training sessions for goal setting several times per week at least long enough to provide assistance to those who need it.”

Lack of Rewards

Approximately 17% of the responses indicated that the program lacks incentives and benefits. One respondent stated, “Provide merit funding beyond raise pool funding to better tie performance management to compensation.” Five responses included comments regarding the lack of benefits of the program. “Employees who were already motivated have not increased their motivation through this process; likewise, employees who were not motivated, do not seem to have increased their motivation as a result of the process,” and, “Too [sic] much with little true benefit no one I have talked to likes it or believes in it,” are two specific comments regarding lack of rewards. Another respondent said, “The program was “rolled out” to classified staff as being merit based pay program yet it isn’t moving to merit based pay.”

Communication Issues

Six out of the 36 responses (17%) specified that they lacked information about this program. One respondent said, “Once I took the training I heard nothing else in regards to where we would proceed with it.” Two respondents commented that the program needs “follow up activities” and “local training, and feedback to supervisors.”

Demographics

Question 21: What is your gender?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Male	25	32.1
Female	53	67.9
Total	78	100.0

The demographics of the respondents displayed that nearly 68% of those who responded to this question were female, while the remaining 32% of the respondents were male.

Demographics

Question 22: What is your ethnicity?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Asian of Pacific Highlander	0	0
African American/Black, not of Hispanic Origin	3	4
Caucasian/White, not of Hispanic Origin	71	94.7
Hispanic	1	1.3
Native American	0	0
Total	75	100

Nearly 95% of the respondents to Question 22 specified that their ethnicity was Caucasian/White, not of Hispanic Origin. Four percent of the respondents specified African American/Black, not of Hispanic Origin, and approximately 1% specified Hispanic.

Demographics

Question 23: What is your age?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Under 30	4	5.2
30-39 years	13	16.9
40-49 years	24	31.2
50-59 years	31	40.3
Over 60 years	5	6.5
Total	77	100

Around 40% of the respondents to Question 23 were between the ages of 50 and 59 years. Roughly 31% of the respondents were from ages 40 to 49 years. Approximately 17% were between the ages of 30 and 39 years, while respondents over 60 years of age represented about 7% of the respondents, and those under 30 years represented about 5%.

Demographics

Question 24: At which University campus are you employed?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Athens	66	83.5
Chillicothe	3	3.8
Eastern	3	3.8
Lancaster	5	6.3
Southern	0	0
Zanesville	2	2.5
Total	79	100

Just fewer than 84% of the respondents to Question 24 were employed on the Athens campus. The Lancaster campus had around 6% of the respondents employed on their campus. The Chillicothe and Eastern campuses each represented about 4% of the respondents, while nearly 3% of respondents were employed on the Zanesville campus. Note: responses from the Southern campus were received well after data entry was completed and could not be addressed in time for this report.

Demographics

Question 25: How long have you been employed at Ohio University?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 1 year	1	1.3
1 to 3 years	9	11.4
4 to 6 years	12	15.2
7 to 10 years	6	7.6
11-20 years	33	41.8
21-30 years	15	19.0
More than 30 years	3	3.8
Total	79	100

Nearly 42% of the respondents to Question 25 have been employed at Ohio University for 11 to 20 years. Nineteen percent of the respondents have been employed at Ohio University for between 21 and 30 years. Approximately 27% of the respondents have been Ohio University employees for 1 to 6 years, and about 8% have been for 7 to 10 years. Roughly 4% of the respondents have been employed by Ohio University for more than 30 years, and around 1 % have been employed for less than a year.

Demographics

Question 26: Which best describes your job at Ohio University?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Classified	9	11.5
Administrative	61	78.2
Information Technology	2	2.6
Faculty with administrative role	6	7.7
Total	78	100.0

Approximately 78% of those who responded said their job could best be described as administrative. Approximately 12% of the respondents work as Classified Staff, and the remainder of those who responded, approximately 10%, worked in either Information Technology or had a faculty position with an administrative role.

Demographics

Question 27: How long have you served in a supervisory position?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 1 year	6	7.8
1 to 3 years	17	22.1
4 to 6 years	15	19.5
7 to 10 years	12	15.6
11 to 20 years	19	24.7
21 to 30 years	8	10.4
Total	77	100.0

Nearly one-fourth (25%) of those surveyed have been employed by the University in a supervisory position for 11 to 20 years, while approximately 22% have been employed in this role for 1 to 3 years. Approximately 20% of the respondents have worked in this capacity 4 to 6 years and approximately 16% have held their position for 7 to 10 years. Nearly 10% have served in a supervisory position for 21 to 30 years, and the remaining respondents, 8%, have done so for less than a year.

Demographics

Question 28: Whom do you supervise?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Classified Staff	62	83.8
IT Staff	2	2.7
Both Classified and IT	10	13.5
Total	74	100.0

Nearly 84% of those who responded supervise Classified Staff, while approximately 3% supervise IT Staff, and approximately 14% supervise both Classified and IT Staff.

Demographics

Question 29: How many supervisees do you have?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	30	40.0
2 to 5	33	44.0
6 to 10	8	10.7
11 to 15	1	1.3
16 to 20	1	1.3
More than 20	2	2.7
Total	75	100.0

When asked how many supervisees they were responsible for, 84% of respondents indicated 1 to 5, while approximately 11% are responsible for 6 to 10 supervisees. Two percent supervise anywhere from 11-20 people, and the same percentage supervise more than 20 people.

Demographics

Question 30: Using the list below, please indicate your planning unit.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
College of Arts and Sciences	5	7.2
College of Business	1	1.4
College of Communication	2	2.9
College of Education	1	1.4
College of Engineering	1	1.4
College of Fine Arts	2	2.9
College of Health and Human Services	2	2.9
Honors Tutorial College and University College	0	0
College of Osteopathic Medicine-Academic	4	5.8
College of Osteopathic Medicine-Clinic	4	5.8
Office of the President	2	2.9
Provost Senate Office	2	2.9
Information Technology	1	1.4
Library	7	10.1
VP for Administration- Campus Safety	2	2.9
VP for Administration- Enrollment Services	3	4.3
VP for Administration- Facilities Management	6	8.7
Vice President for Finance	4	5.8
VP for Regional Higher Education- Lifelong Learning	3	4.3
VP Education-OU-Lancaster	5	7.2
VP Education-OU-Eastern	1	1.4
VP Education-OU-Chillicothe	3	4.3
VP Education-OU-Southern	0	0
VP Education-OU-Zanesville	2	2.9
Vice President for Research	1	1.4
VP for Student Affairs	2	2.9
VP for University Advancement	3	4.3
Total	69	100

Each planning unit in Question 30 had a frequency ranging from 0-7. Approximately 10% of respondents to Question 30 indicated that their planning unit was Library. Nearly 9% of respondents to this question specified Vice President for Education-Facilities Management as their planning unit. The College of Arts and Sciences was specified by about 7% respondents as their planning unit.

Performance Planning

Question 1: Did you meet with your supervisor in order to complete the Performance Planning Form (PM2)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	26	59.1
No	18	40.9
Total	44	100.0

Approximately 59% of respondents to this question stated they met with their supervisor to complete the Performance Planning Form. However, nearly 41% did not meet with their supervisor to complete the PM2 Form.

Performance Planning

Question 2: How long was the Performance Planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
1-15 minutes	6	23.1
16-30 minutes	9	34.6
31-45 minutes	7	26.9
46-60 minutes	3	11.5
More than 1 hour	1	3.8
Total	26	100.0

Of the 26 respondents to Question 2, approximately 35% stated that their Performance Planning meeting was 16 to 30 minutes long, while Nearly 27% reported that it lasted 31 to 45 minutes. Roughly 23% responded that their meeting lasted between 1 and 15 minutes. The remaining respondents, approximately 16%, reported the meeting with their supervisor lasted 46 minutes or longer.

Performance Planning

Question 3: The amount of time dedicated to the Performance Planning meeting was:

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Too Little	3	12.0
Just Right	17	68.0
Too Much	5	20.0
Total	25	100.0

Of the 25 respondents to Question 3, 68% said the amount of time dedicated to the Performance Planning meeting was just right. Twenty percent of respondents stated the time spent in the Performance Planning meeting was too much, while 12% reported that it was too little.

Performance Planning

Question 4: Was the PM2 Form completed in the meeting between you and your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	17	68.0
No	8	32.0
Total	25	100.0

When asked if the PM2 Form was completed in the meeting with their supervisor, 68% of respondents stated that the form was completed. However, nearly one-third (32%) of respondents stated the form was not completed.

Performance Planning

Question 5: To what extent did the PM2 Form clarify what is expected of you by your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at All	3	11.5
Minimal	2	7.7
Neutral	11	42.3
Somewhat	8	30.8
Very Much	2	7.7
Total	26	100.0

Approximately 42% of respondents to Question 5 were neutral regarding whether the PM2 Form clarified what is expected of them by their supervisors. Nearly 31% of respondents thought that the PM2 Form clarified expectations somewhat, and about 8% said that expectations were clarified very much. However, approximately 19% of respondents said that expectations were clarified minimally or not at all.

Performance Planning

Question 6: How comfortable did you feel discussing the information on the PM2 Form with your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Uncomfortable	1	3.8
Somewhat Uncomfortable	0	0.0
Neutral	8	30.8
Somewhat Comfortable	6	23.1
Very Comfortable	11	42.3
Total	26	100.0

Approximately 65% of all respondents to Question 6 stated that they were somewhat to very comfortable with discussing the information on the PM2 Form with their supervisor. Approximately 31% reported feeling neutral in this regard, while nearly 4% reported feeling uncomfortable.

Performance Planning

Question 7: How useful was the PM2 Form in structuring your goals?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	5	19.2
Somewhat Not Useful	4	15.4
Neutral	11	42.3
Somewhat Useful	5	19.2
Very Useful	1	3.8
Total	26	100.0

Approximately 42% of respondents to Question 7 were neutral regarding the usefulness of the PM2 Form in structuring their goals. Nearly 35% of the respondents stated that the PM2 Form was somewhat not useful to not useful in structuring their goals. On the contrary, 23% of respondents said the PM2 Form was somewhat to very useful in structuring their goals.

Performance Planning

Question 8: How useful was the Performance Planning meeting in structuring your goals?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Useful	3	12.0
Somewhat Unuseful	4	16.0
Neutral	10	40.0
Somewhat Useful	7	28.0
Very Useful	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

Thirty-two percent of respondents indicated that the Performance Planning meeting was somewhat to very useful in structuring their goals. However, 28% of respondents stated that the meeting was somewhat unuseful to not useful, while 40% were neutral regarding the usefulness of the meeting in goal structuring.

Performance Planning

Question 9: To what extent has setting goals and objectives helped you to perform your job more effectively?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not At All	7	26.9
Minimal	5	19.2
Neutral	7	26.9
Helpful	7	26.9
Very Helpful	0	0.0
Total	26	100.0

About 46% of respondents to Question 9 indicated that the extent to which setting goals and objectives helped them to perform their job more effectively was minimal to not at all. No respondents rated the process to be very helpful. However, approximately one-quarter of respondents (27%) said setting goals and objectives was helpful in performing their job more effectively, and the same percentage found the helpfulness of the process to be neutral.

Performance Planning

Question 10: Did you and your supervisor discuss if you would use the Supervisor Feedback Form (PM3)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	18	72.0
No	7	28.0
Total	25	100.0

There were 25 respondents to Question 10. Seventy-two percent of these respondents reported that they discussed using the Supervisor Feedback Form with their supervisors, while 28% of respondents reported that they did not.

Performance Planning

Question 11: Did you decide to use the PM3 Form?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	9	36.0
No	16	64.0
Total	25	100.0

Sixty-four percent of respondents decided not to use the PM3 Form. However, 36% of those who responded to Question 11 decided to use the PM3 Form.

Performance Planning

Question 12: How much trust do you feel had been created as a result of the performance Planning process?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
None	8	30.7
Minimal	1	3.8
Neutral	10	38.4
Some	7	26.9
Very Much	0	0.0
Total	26	100.0

Nearly 31% of respondents reported that no trust was created as a result of the Performance Planning process. Of the 26 responses, 10, or approximately 38%, were neutral regarding the amount of trust created, while almost 27% thought some trust was created as a result of the plan. No respondents to Question 12 rated the amount of trust created as a result of the Performance Planning process as very much.

Performance Planning

Question 13: How committed was your supervisor to the Performance Planning part of the Performance Management process?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at all	3	12.0
Minimal	1	4.0
Neutral	7	28.0
Somewhat	10	40.0
Very Much	4	16.0
Total	25	100.0

Fifty-six percent of respondents to Question 13 said their supervisor was somewhat to very committed to the Performance Planning part of the Performance Management Plan. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents were neutral in regard to their supervisor's commitment, while 12% reported their supervisor was not at all committed to this part of the process.

Performance Planning

Question 14: To what extent did the Performance Planning phase provide you with a sense of empowerment?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at all	7	28.0
Minimal	5	20.0
Neutral	7	28.0
Somewhat	5	20.0
Very Much	1	4.0
Total	25	100.0

Forty-eight percent of respondents to this question said the Performance Planning phase provided them with minimal to no sense of empowerment. However, nearly one-quarter (24%) of respondents reported that they felt somewhat to very empowered by the Performance Planning phase, while the remaining 28% felt neutral.

Performance Planning

Question 15: What opportunities, if any, did this part of the program create?

Seven respondents described opportunities that the Performance Planning stage of the Performance Management Plan created. These responses were broken down into 4 categories:

- None (4)
- Focus (1)
- Objective Criteria (1)
- Goal Discussion (1)

Approximately 57% of the responses to Question 15 indicated that there were no opportunities created by the Performance Planning stage of the Performance Management Plan. The remaining responses suggested opportunities to provide focus, objective criteria and goal discussion.

None

Four of the 7 responses (57%) to Question 15 stated that no opportunities were created by the Performance Planning stage of the Performance Management Plan. Two of the 4 responses stated, “None,” in regard to opportunities created in the Performance Planning stage. The other 2 respondents elaborated, indicating that there could be equal opportunities without the program. One response stated, “None yet. The process is new and we’re too busy to do much with these tools. But we have used an informal method for similar purposes with good success.” The other response said, “It created no more opportunity than I already would have had.”

Focus

When asked what opportunities this part of the program created, one of the responses (14%) stated that the Performance Planning stage created an opportunity “...to focus on specific projects.”

Objective Criteria

One of the 7 responses (14%) to Question 15 creates the third category. This response stated that the Performance Planning stage created objective criteria to use when comparing work with other teams. This person stated, “To allow objective criteria to compare our team’s work load, professionalism, and performance with other teams.”

Goal Discussion

The fourth category includes 1 of the 7 responses (14%) to Question 15. According to the response, an opportunity created by the Performance Planning stage was, “Discussion of long term goals.”

Performance Planning

Question 16: What changes do you suggest be made to the planning stage of the Performance Management Process?

Of the 10 respondents to Question 16, there were 13 suggested changes to the Performance Planning stage of the Performance Management Plan. The responses were divided into 4 categories:

- Structure Issues (5)
- Supervisor Issues (4)
- Eliminate Phase (2)
- None (2)

Nearly 38% of the responses indicated that the Performance Planning stage could be improved if the structure was altered. Approximately 31% of the responses suggested that supervisor improvements would make the Performance Planning phase more effective. About 15% suggested terminating the phase, and another 15% did not have any suggestions to change the Performance Planning phase.

Structure Issues

Approximately 38% of responses to Question 16 said that the Performance Planning phase could be improved if the structure of the process were improved. The responses in this category indicated that this phase would be more effective if there were more role reversal, anonymity, collaboration in setting goals, simplicity, and if the entire process were more of a priority. One respondent said, “More role reversal (employee reciprocates with suggestions for management) greater efforts to insure anonymity for PM3, more assistance setting goals to align with dept. (group work, collaboration),” and another said, “Get rid of the competency section. It seems pretty useless so far. It’s too vague.”

Supervisor Issues

Approximately 31% of responses to this question suggested the importance of supervisors to the Performance Planning phase. One response in this category said, “Make sure all supervisors carry out the process.” Another response found supervisors to be too bureaucratic, while one response suggested, “Don’t let academics or non-IT people supervise IT personnel.”

Eliminate Phase

Almost 15% of responses said to completely terminate the Performance Planning phase of the Performance Management Plan. Responses in this category stated, “Do away with this,” and, “Delete it.”

None

Fifteen percent of responses to Question 16 gave no suggestions to improve the Performance Planning phase. Respondents in this category wrote, “None,” and, “N/A.”

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 17: Have you and your supervisor discussed the goals you established in the Performance Planning phase since the initial planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	19	43.2
No	25	56.8
Total	44	100.0

Approximately 43% of respondents said that they had discussed the goals established in the Performance Planning phase with their supervisor since the initial planning meeting. However, nearly 57% of respondents had not.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 18: How motivated were you to discuss the progress of your goals with your supervisor throughout the year?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Unmotivated	6	14.6
Somewhat Unmotivated	6	14.6
Neutral	16	39.0
Somewhat Motivated	7	17.0
Very Motivated	6	14.6
Total	41	100.0

Thirty-nine percent of respondents were neutral in regard to motivation to discuss the progress of their goals with their supervisor. Approximately 29% said they were somewhat unmotivated to unmotivated to do so, while nearly 32% reported they were somewhat motivated to very motivated to discuss the progress of their goals with their supervisor.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 19: How much did the discussions between you and your supervisor help in completing your goals?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not at All	11	27.5
Minimal	9	22.5
Neutral	12	30.0
Somewhat	5	12.5
Very Much	3	7.5
Total	40	100

Fifty percent of the 40 people who responded to Question 19 indicated that the discussions between them and their supervisors were minimally to not at all helpful in the completion of their goals. Thirty percent of respondents were indicated the discussions' helpfulness was neutral, while about 8% described the discussions between them and their supervisor to be very helpful in the completion of their goals. The remaining respondents, nearly 13%, described the discussions to be somewhat helpful.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 20: Since the Performance Management Program was implemented, have you received more coaching and feedback from your supervisor than prior to the program?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	4	9.1
No	40	90.9
Total	44	100.0

All 44 people who returned IT Staff Surveys answered Question 20. Nearly 91% of the respondents stated that no more coaching and feedback was received from their supervisors after the Performance Management Plan was implemented. However, approximately 9% indicated more coaching and feedback was received from their supervisors since the program's implementation.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 21: How much time was spent providing coaching and giving feedback since the initial Performance Planning meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 30 min	26	66.7
30 min-1 hour	7	17.9
1-2 hours	1	2.6
2-3 hours	2	5.1
3+ hours	3	7.7
Total	39	100.0

Two-thirds (67%) of the 39 respondents to Question 21 indicated that less than 30 minutes were spent providing coaching and giving feedback since the initial Performance Planning meeting. Almost 18% of the respondents said 30 to 60 minutes were spent coaching and giving feedback since the Performance Planning meeting, while approximately 8% stated that 3 or more hours were spent providing coaching and giving feedback since the initial meeting

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 22: The amount of time taken between you and your supervisor providing coaching and feedback was:

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Inadequate	13	36.1
Just Right	20	55.6
Too Much	3	8.3
Total	36	100.0

Approximately 56% of the respondents to Question 22 reported that the time taken between them and their supervisors to provide coaching and feedback was just right; however, approximately 36% felt that the time taken was inadequate. About 8% responded that too much time was spent providing coaching and feedback.

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 23: What suggestions do you have to improve this stage of the program?

Fourteen respondents provided responses to Question 23. These responses were broken down into 6 categories:

- Supervisor Follow-Through (3)
- Eliminate Stage (3)
- None (3)
- Structure Issues (2)
- Not Applicable (2)
- Supervising (1)

Three responses, or approximately 21%, stated that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage would be improved if their supervisors had followed-through with it. Another 21% of the responses said this stage did not need improvement but needed to be eliminated, while an additional 21% had no suggestions for improving this stage of the Performance Management Plan. Nearly 14% of the responses suggested that the structure of this stage should be improved. An additional 14% of the responses stated that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage never occurred between the respondents and their supervisors; therefore, Question 23 was not applicable. The remaining response (7%) commented on who supervises whom.

Supervisor Follow-Through

Three responses to Question 23 said that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback section could be improved if the supervisors were held accountable for following-through with this stage. They also indicated the need to make sure supervisors encouraged employees to complete the entire Performance Management Plan. One respondent said that he or she needed to “meet with my supervisor in the first place!” Another respondent suggests “accountability for supervisors not following through with this program.”

Eliminate Stage

About 21% of responses said the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback section of the Performance Management Plan needed to be eliminated altogether. One respondent remarked, “Do away with this,” while another stated, “Not needed.”

None

Nearly 21% of the responses indicated that no improvements were needed in the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage of the Performance Management Plan. Two of the responses in this category indicated that respondents generally received adequate coaching and feedback. One response stated, “None, my manager has always been proactive and highly motivated in objectives, clear goals and communicating expectations and feedback,” and the other stated, “None, I get enough feedback from my supervisor.” The third response in this category simply stated, “None.”

Structure Issues

The *Structure Issues* category consists of 2 responses (14%) that indicated that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage could be improved by a change in structure. One response said this stage of the Performance Management Plan is “too structured.” The other response suggested collaborative rather than individual goals, stating, “Goals should not be set independently...goals should be created as a collaborative project with peers and management input.”

Not Applicable

About 14% of the responses to Question 23 fall into the *Not Applicable* category because the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage never occurred. These comments were, “I don’t know as I haven’t gone through this stage,” and, “N/A—process did not occur.”

Supervising

One response to this question, accounting for approximately 7%, was a concern about who should be supervising whom. The respondent stated, “Don’t let academics or non-IT people supervise IT personnel.”

Ongoing Coaching and Feedback

Question 24: What are the benefits you have incurred from this stage of the program?

Thirteen Respondents provided 13 responses that were broken down into 2 categories:

- None (12)
- Positive Development (1)

Approximately 92% of respondents to this question indicated that the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage did not provide any benefits. This category includes those who stated that there were either no benefits or that this stage was not used. However, one of the 13 responses (8%) indicated positive development from the program.

None

Twelve of the 13 respondents who answered Question 24 said that they did not incur any benefits from the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage of the program. Four of the responses indicated that ongoing coaching and feedback never occurred. These respondents commented, “Process did not occur,” and, “Do it.” However, most of the respondents simply wrote, “None.” One response said that he or she already gets “constant feedback from my supervisor.”

Positive Development

One response indicated positive benefits incurred from the Ongoing Coaching and Feedback stage of the Performance Management Plan. This respondent replied, “My manger has continued to provide me with insight and encouragement in professional development and goal achievement.”

Midyear Review

Question 25: Did a Midyear Review meeting occur between you and your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	15	34.9
No	28	65.1
Total	43	100.0

Of the 43 people who completed Question 25, roughly 65% reported that a Midyear Review meeting did not occur between them and their supervisors. About 35% of the respondents said a Midyear Review meeting did take place.

Midyear Review

Question 26: Did you and your supervisor review the PM2 Form during the Midyear Review?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	14	60.9
No	9	39.1
Total	23	100.0

Of the 23 respondents to Question 26, approximately 61% reported reviewing the PM2 Form during their Midyear Review meeting. However, about 39% of the respondents stated that the PM2 Form was not reviewed during the meeting.

Midyear Review

Question 27: Did you and your supervisor fill out the Midyear Performance Management Review Form (PM6)?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	13	61.9
No	8	38.1
Total	23	100.0

Approximately 62% of the 23 respondents to Question 27 stated that the Midyear Performance Management Review Form (PM6) was completed. Approximately 38% of the respondents said that they did not fill out the PM6 Form with their supervisor.

Midyear Review

Question 28: How satisfied were you with the Midyear Review process?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Dissatisfied	3	16.7
Somewhat Dissatisfied	2	11.1
Neutral	6	33.3
Somewhat Satisfied	5	27.8
Satisfied	2	11.1
Total	18	100.0

Approximately one-third (33%) of the 18 respondents to Question 28 said they were neutral when asked how satisfied they were with the Midyear Review process. Almost 39% of the respondents indicated feeling somewhat satisfied to satisfied with the Midyear Review process, and about 28% described their feelings as somewhat dissatisfied to dissatisfied.

Midyear Review

Question 29: How much time was spent on the Midyear Review between you and your supervisor?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
1-15 minutes	3	20.0
16-30 minutes	4	26.7
31-45 minutes	4	26.7
46-60 minutes	3	20.0
More than an hour	1	6.7
Total	15	100.0

More than half (53%) of the 15 people who responded to Question 29 indicated that they spent between 16 and 45 minutes on the Midyear Review. Twenty percent said 1 to 15 minutes were spent, while another 20% spent 46 to 60 minutes. One of the 15 respondents (7%) reported he or she spent over an hour on the Midyear Review.

Yearend Review

Question 30: Did you and your supervisor have a Yearend Review meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	24	54.5
No	20	45.5
Total	44	100.0

Approximately 55% of respondents to Question 30 said that they had a Yearend Review meeting with their supervisor. However, almost 46% of the respondents reported that they did not have a Yearend Review meeting with their supervisor.

Yearend Review

Question 31: Did you and your supervisor complete the Employee Self Evaluation Form (PM5) during the Yearend Review meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	19	67.9
No	9	32.1
Total	28	100.0

Nearly 68% of the respondents to Question 31 said that they completed the Employee Self Evaluation Form during their Yearend Review meeting with their supervisor. However, about 32% of respondents reported that they did not complete the PM5 Form during their Yearend Review meeting with their supervisor.

Yearend Review

Question 32: Did you and your supervisor complete the PM1 Form during the Yearend Review meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Yes	19	70.4
No	8	29.6
Total	27	100.0

Approximately 70% of the 27 respondents to Question 32 said that they completed the PM1 Form with their supervisor during their Yearend Review meeting. However, about 32% of the respondents reported that they did not complete the PM1 Form during their Yearend Review meeting.

Yearend Review

Question 33: How beneficial was the supervisor feedback that you received during the Yearend Review meeting?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Not Beneficial	9	31.0
Minimally Beneficial	3	10.3
Neutral	10	34.5
Somewhat Beneficial	6	20.7
Very Beneficial	1	3.4
Total	29	100.0

Twenty-nine people responded to Question 33. Of these, approximately 41% said that the feedback they received during the Yearend Review meeting was minimally beneficial to not beneficial. Almost 21% of respondents reported supervisor feedback received during the meeting was somewhat beneficial, and approximately 3% felt the feedback was very beneficial.

Training

Question 34: Do you have any training needs that still need to be fulfilled? (Check all that apply)

Response	Frequency-Yes	Valid Percent-Yes
Goal Setting	7	16.3
Coaching/Mentoring	4	9.3
Performance Management and Development	7	16.3
Communication	7	16.3
Motivation	9	20.9
Conflict Management	6	14.0
Teamwork	4	9.3
Other	5	11.6

This question asked respondents to check all the categories in which he or she felt a need for training remained. Because respondents could check more than 1 response, the valid percent totals more than 100%.

Twenty-one percent of respondents to this question indicated more training in the area of motivation was needed. In the areas of goal setting, performance management and development, and communication, 16% of respondents indicated that more training was needed. Fourteen percent felt more training was needed in conflict management. Approximately 9% listed training needs in coaching/mentoring, and another 9% indicated teamwork training needs.

Five people indicated other training needs and provided 6 additional responses. These 6 responses were broken down into 2 categories:

- Computer Training/Current Technology (5)
- Miscellaneous (1)

Approximately 83% of respondents reported that training in computer and current technology would be beneficial to them, and one respondent gave an answer that did not apply to the question.

Computer Training/Current Technology

Eighty-three percent of the responses suggesting other training needs expressed the need to have more training in computers and current technology. These 5 responses indicated that training with computers and recent advances in technology would be beneficial. One response said more training was needed in the area of “new technology and software improvements,” while another said, “Technical training related to position.” “Computer skills training is necessary for it folks,” was another comment, and an additional respondent thought that the IT personnel would benefit by “keeping current with today’s technology changes.”

Miscellaneous

One of the 6 respondents wrote in the space provided for other areas of training needs that the categories provided on the Performance Management Plan IT Staff Survey were inadequate to all of their training needs. This response was, “Get better categories.” This response accounts for about 16% of the responses of the people who indicated other training needs on the survey.

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 35: What are the main benefits of the Performance Management Program?

Twenty-three respondents provided 23 suggested benefits in response to Question 35.

These were broken down into 6 categories:

- None (7)
- Planning Process (4)
- Communication (4)
- Not Applicable (2)
- Performance Evaluated Pay (2)
- Accountability (2)
- Miscellaneous (2)

Approximately 30% of responses to Question 35 stated that there were no benefits to the Performance Management Plan. About 17% of the responses said that the planning process was a benefit of the Performance Management Plan, and approximately 17% of responses stated that the improvement in communication was a benefit. Nearly 9% of responses to Question 35 stated that the question is not applicable to them because they did not complete the Performance Planning process. Approximately 9% indicated that the performance evaluated pay was a benefit of the program, while the same percentage commented on the benefit of increased accountability. The final category consisted of miscellaneous comments and also accounted for nearly 9% of responses.

None

Forty-one percent of responses stated no benefits of the Performance Management Plan were apparent. One respondent stated he or she saw the program taking a positive step, but has yet to see any benefits coming from the Performance Management Plan. Most respondents in this category answered, “None.” One respondent stated, “So far I see none.”

Planning Process

Of the 23 responses to Question 35, approximately 17% stated the planning process was a positive result of the Performance Management Plan. Responses indicated that setting goals and planning ahead were benefits of the process. One respondent stated, “It’s good to have that contract w/ my boss about my project goals for the year.” Another respondent wrote, “Improved planning process.”

Communication

Nearly 17% of responses to Question 35 stated improved communication was a benefit of the Performance Management Plan. Three responses out of 4 specified that communication had improved with their supervisors; one of these stated, “It creates open communication between you and your supervisor.” The fourth response stated that “increased Communication” was a benefit of the Performance Management Plan.

Not Applicable

Nearly 9% of responses to this question stated that the question was not applicable to them because they have not completed the Performance Management Plan or they did not participate in the process at all. One response stated, “I don’t know—I have not participated, other than filling out the JIQ.”

Performance Evaluated Pay

About 9% of responses to Question 35 stated that performance evaluated pay was a benefit of the Performance Management Plan. Two responses make up this category. One response stated that, “It’s nice to see O.U. pursuing a standards-based approach to Performance Eval.”

Accountability

Nearly 9% of the responses indicated that the amount of accountability involved in the Performance Management Plan was a benefit to the overall process. One respondent stated that the program “establishes standards of accountability.” The other response stated that the program “causes people to think about what we do.”

Miscellaneous

Approximately 9% of responses were miscellaneous and did not directly apply to Question 35. Both of the miscellaneous responses did not fit in to any of the above categories. One of the responses stated that the program “increased ability to perform paperwork,” while the other respondent commented that the program is a “top down joke.”

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 36: Compared to the amount of time spent on the Performance Management Program, the benefits were:

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Too Few	24	70.6
Just Right	10	29.4
More than Expected	0	0
Total	34	100.0

Nearly 71% of the respondents to Question 36 stated that, in comparison to the amount of time spent on the Performance Management Program, the benefits they received were too few. However, approximately 29% of the respondents stated that the amount of benefits they received from the Performance Management Program were just right. None of the respondents reported that the benefits were more than expected.

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 37: What are the areas for improvement in the Performance Management Program?

Twenty-three respondents provided 24 different responses that were broken down into 5 categories:

- Forms (7)
- Structure (6)
- Supervisor Follow-Through (5)
- Supervisor Issues (4)
- Pay (2)

Seven of the 24 responses (29%) to Question 26 stated that there needed to be improvements made to the Performance Management Program forms. One-quarter of the responses indicated a need for structural changes to the program. Nearly 21% indicated that supervisor accountability needs to be addressed, and about 17% discussed other supervisor issues. Approximately 8% of responses commented on the pay system.

Forms

Approximately 29% of the responses to this question indicated that the Performance Management Plan forms could be improved. This category includes responses that indicated that the forms were confusing or too long, that there were too many forms, or that the process takes a large amount of time to complete. Respondents made comments like, “Understanding the forms,” “Fewer evaluations/forms,” and, “Overall PM process has too many forms to complete.” Two respondents suggested “less paperwork.” One respondent stated the amount of paperwork was simply not worth the time they put in to the forms: “The amount of overhead and paperwork for this does not support the minimal benefits received.”

Structure

Six of the 24 responses to Question 37 (25%) indicated that there were structural improvements needed. Two of the responses said that the schedule of the Performance Management Plan needed to be changed; “The schedule for the process is completely off! FINAL should be due by March and midyear in Sept or Oct.,” and, “Prefer one initial goal setting, then review at the end of year,” were their comments. Two responses suggested categorical changes to eliminate the competency section and to weight each section individually, rather than giving each section the same weight. Another response was concerned with the supervisor being present while the supervisee fills out the Supervisor Feedback Form.

Supervisor Follow-Through

About 21% of the responses indicated that improvements in supervisor’s roles in the program needed to be addressed. Respondents in this category suggested supervisors are not implementing the Performance Management Plan and should be held accountable for this. Respondents said, “It needs to be done by all supervisors,” “SUPERVISORS MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE BY SOMEONE FOR NOT DOING THIS...TOO EASY TO IGNORE WITH EVERYTHING ELSE THAT HAS TO GET DONE,” and, “There should be consequences when it is not implemented by supervisors.”

Supervisor Issues

About 17% of the responses to Question 37 regarded supervising issues. Two of these responses commented on management following their own rules, one of which stated that the head of the department told the respondent “...we will not be participating in the IT Performance Management until 2003.” One response stated, “Don’t let academics or non-IT people supervise IT personnel. Find a way to encourage chairs to be objective, non-biased toward fellow academics.” Another indicated that the management is the only beneficiary of the Performance Management Plan, stating, “Currently, there seems to be no benefit to the employee, only to management. Viewed as top-down only, and only serves as a dangerous exercise for the employee.”

Pay

The final category, *Pay*, accounts for 2 responses. These responses indicated a need for new pay scales. One said to “get a real pay scale separate of outside departments.” The other response in this category commented that the program needs tied to performance-based pay.

Benefits and Areas for Improvement

Question 38: What else do you need in order to be successful in the Performance Management Program?

Thirteen respondents gave 13 responses to Question 38 and are broken down into 3 categories:

- Structure Changes (8)
- Supervisor Changes (3)
- None (2)

Nearly 66% of responses to Question 38 stated that for respondents to be successful in the Performance Management Plan, structure changes needed to be made to the overall plan. These respondents stated that they would like to see less overall time taken to do the process, more money put in to the program, and less paperwork. Twenty-three percent of responses to Question 38 fit in to the *Supervisor Changes* category. Responses in this category stated that, in order for employees to be successful, changes need to be made by their supervisor. Approximately 15% of responses were part of the *None* category. These respondents claimed there is nothing else they need to be successful in the Performance Management Plan.

Structure Changes

Approximately 66% of responses to Question 38 were categorized in the *Structure Changes* category. These respondents said that for them to be successful in the Performance Management Plan, structural changes to the process need to be made. Such changes include time issues, more direction, less paperwork, and more money put in to the program. One respondent said, “More money, more direction, less guessing.” In regard to the paperwork, one respondent said, “A more useful form,” and another respondent said that less paperwork would be beneficial to success in the Performance Management Plan.

Supervisor Changes

About 23% of responses to Question 38 stated that to be successful in the Performance Management Plan, their supervisors' actions needed to change. Responses in this category contain complaints about supervisors' motivation and communication. One response was as follows: "First of all I need to know if I should be participating or not. My supervisor has never mentioned the process or the program." Another response was to "please cut the bureaucratic taste."

None

Fifteen percent of responses to Question 38 were categorized in the *None* category. Respondents in this category did not provide any suggestions as to what they needed in order to be successful in the Performance Management Plan. Both responses in this category said that they wanted to be left alone.

Demographics

Question 39: What is your gender?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Male	24	55.8
Female	19	44.2
Total	43	100.0

According to Question 39, nearly 56% of the employees who answered Question 39 were male. The remaining 44% percent were female.

Demographics

Question 40: What is your ethnicity?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	9.8
Black/African-American, not Hispanic origin	0	0
Caucasian/White, not Hispanic origin	37	90.2
Hispanic	0	0
Native American	0	0
Total	41	100.0

Approximately 90% percent of respondents to Question 40 reported being Caucasian/White, not of Hispanic origin. The remaining 10% reported being Asian/Pacific Islander.

Demographics

Question 41: What is your age?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Under 30	10	23.3
30-39 years	12	27.9
40-49 years	16	37.2
50-59 years	5	11.6
Over 60	0	0
Total	43	100.0

Approximately 37% of respondents were between the ages of 40 and 49. Nearly 30% of respondents reported being between 30 and 39 years old. About 23% reported that they were under 30 years of age, and none of the respondents who answered Question 41 were over the age of 60.

Demographics

Question 42: At which Ohio University campus are you employed?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Athens	39	90.7
Chillicothe	1	2.3
Eastern	0	0
Lancaster	2	4.7
Southern	0	0
Zanesville	1	2.3
Total	43	100.0

Nearly 91% of respondents to Question 42 said that they were employed at the Athens campus of Ohio University. Nearly 5% of respondents were employed at the Lancaster campus, while about 2% of respondents work at the Chillicothe campus. There were no responses from the Eastern campus. Note: responses were received from the Southern Campus after the data entry was completed and are not reflected in this report.

Demographics

Question 43: How long have you been employed at Ohio University?

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 1 year	0	0
1-3 years	13	30.2
4-6 years	13	30.2
7-10 years	5	11.6
11-20 years	10	23.3
21-30 years	2	4.7
more than 30 years	0	0
Total	43	100.0

Approximately 60% of respondents to Question 43 have been employed at Ohio University for 1 to 6 years, while about 23% of respondents reported working at the University for 11 to 20 years. Nearly 12% of respondents have been at Ohio University for 7-10 years, and about 5% of the respondents have been for 21 to 30 years.

Demographics

Question 44: Using the list below, please indicate your planning unit.

Response	Frequency	Valid Percent
College of Arts and Sciences	4	10.0
College of Communication	2	5.0
College of Engineering	1	2.5
Honors Tutorial College and University College	1	2.5
Osteopathic-Academic	1	2.5
Osteopathic-Clinic	1	2.5
Provost Senate Office	2	5.0
Information Technology	23	57.5
Library	2	5.0
VP Admin-Enrollment Services	2	5.0
Vice President for University Advancement	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

The frequency of respondents from each planning unit ranged from 0 to 23, with the majority of units having 0 to 2 respondents reporting. However, nearly 58% of the respondents to Question 44 were a part of the Information Technology planning unit at Ohio University, and 10% of respondents were part of the College of Arts and Sciences planning unit.

Cross-Survey Data Comparison

The Oversight Committee had many similar information attainment goals for each population surveyed by ICI. Because of this, several of the questions asked on each of the surveys paralleled questions asked in the other surveys; in some cases, the questions were identical. This section was written to aid in comparing the results of similar questions across the three surveys. This section does not include all of the similar questions, but does include some of the more significant findings.

Completion of the Performance Planning Form

On all three of the surveys distributed, Question 1 asked whether respondents met with their supervisors/supervisees to complete the Performance Planning Form (PM2). Approximately 59% of the Information Technology (IT) respondents stated that they met with their supervisors to complete the Performance Planning Form, while nearly 45% of the respondents from Classified Staff also indicated that this meeting occurred. Approximately 63% of supervisors responding to this question reported that they had met with their supervisees to complete the form.

Comfort Discussing the Performance Planning Form

On both the IT and the Classified Staff survey, Question 6 asked respondents how comfortable they felt discussing the information on the PM2 Form with their supervisors. Sixty-nine percent of the Classified Staff respondents to this question indicated that they were somewhat to very comfortable discussing the information on the PM2 Form with their supervisors. Approximately 65% of the IT respondents also stated they were somewhat to very comfortable with discussing this information. On the other hand, nearly 22% of the Classified Staff respondents said they were neutral, compared to 31% of the IT respondents who gave this answer. Finally, nearly 6% of Classified Staff respondents reported feeling uncomfortable discussing this information with their supervisors, and approximately 4% of the IT respondents also felt this way.

Use of the Supervisor Feedback Form

In Question 11 on the Classified and IT Staff surveys, respondents were asked whether they decided to use the Supervisor Feedback Form (PM3) in the Performance Management Plan. Approximately 57% of respondents from the Classified Staff indicated that they decided not to use the PM3 Form, while 64% of respondents from the IT Staff decided not to use the form.

Similarly, in Question 4 on the Supervisor survey, respondents were asked whether their supervisee(s) decided to use the PM3 Form. Approximately 72% of respondents to Question 4 stated that their supervisee(s) decided not to use the PM3 Form.

Supervisor/Supervisee Trust

Question 12 in the Classified and IT Staff surveys asked respondents how much trust they felt had been created as a result of the Performance Planning phase. Approximately 30% of Classified Staff respondents and nearly 35% of IT respondents answered that minimal to no trust was created as a result of the Performance Planning phase. However, approximately 30% of Classified Staff respondents indicated that some to very much trust was created and nearly 27% of IT respondents reported that some trust was created as a result of the process (no IT respondents reported very much for the amount of trust created).

In Question 5 in the Supervisor survey, respondents were asked how effective the Performance Planning phase had been in improving trust between them and their supervisee(s). Approximately one-third (33%) of respondents to this question reported that the Performance Planning phase was somewhat ineffective to not effective in improving trust. However, approximately 17% of respondents said the Performance Planning phase was somewhat effective to very effective in improving trust between them and their supervisee(s).

Supervisor Commitment

In Question 13 of the Classified and IT Staff surveys, employees were asked how committed their supervisor was to the Performance Planning part of the Performance Management Plan. About the same amount from both staffs, 40% of IT Staff and approximately 41% of Classified Staff, reported their supervisor to be somewhat committed to this stage. Thirty-one percent of the 126 Classified Staff respondents to Question 13 reported their supervisors to be very committed, while 16% of the 25 IT respondents to this question said very committed. In contrast, about 14% of Classified Staff respondents and 18% of IT Staff respondents reported their supervisor to be minimally to not at all committed to the Performance Planning phase.

Empowerment

Question 14 on the Classified and IT Staff surveys asked to what extent the Performance Planning phase provided employees with a sense of empowerment. Twenty-four percent of both staffs' respondents reported somewhat to very much of a sense of empowerment was provided by this phase. However, 36% of Classified Staff respondents and 48% of IT Staff respondents said minimal to no empowerment was provided by this phase of the Performance Management Plan.

Occurrence of Coaching and Feedback Discussions

In Question 17 in both the Classified and IT Staff surveys, respondents were asked whether coaching and feedback discussions had been held between the respondents and their supervisors. For Classified Staff, 17% of the 265 who responded to this question indicated that they had discussed the goals established in the Performance Planning phase since the start of the Performance Management Plan, and approximately 43% of the 44 IT Staff who responded to the same question indicated that they had discussed their goals since the program's implementation.

Similar to Question 17 in the IT and Classified Staff surveys, Question 8 in the supervisor survey asked whether respondents had held coaching and feedback sessions since the initial planning meeting. Congruent with the IT respondents, 39% of the 82 supervisors

who responded to this question said that they had held coaching and feedback sessions since the plan's implementation.

Helpfulness of Coaching and Feedback Discussions

Question 19 on the Classified and IT Staff surveys and Question 9 on the supervisor survey asked respondents to what extent the coaching and feedback discussions helped them or their supervisees in completing their goals. Approximately 40% of Classified and 50% of IT Staff respondents reported that the discussions helped minimally or not at all, while 35% and nearly 30%, respectively, reported they were neutral regarding the helpfulness of the discussions. However, nearly 23% of supervisors felt that the discussions helped their supervisees minimally or not at all, and nearly 43% reported feeling neutral. Thirty-five percent of supervisors, in contrast with 25% of Classified and 20% of IT Staff, felt that the discussions helped somewhat or very much in goal completion.

Benefits Compared to Time Spent

Each of the surveys asked respondents to compare the amount of time spent on the Performance Management Plan to the benefits incurred from the program (Question 27 for Classified Staff, Question 19 for supervisors, and Question 36 for IT Staff). In each survey, the majority of respondents indicated that they felt there were too few benefits compared to the time spent on the program, with between 69% and 72% of respondents on each survey indicating the too few response. Of the remaining respondents, all of the IT Staff (29%) and 28% of the Classified Staff indicated that the benefits were just right, while the remaining 3% of Classified Staff respondents reported the benefits to be more than expected. In contrast, approximately 2% of the supervisors found the benefits to be just right compared to the amount of time spent, while about 26% felt they were more than expected.

Appendix A

Surveys distributed to populations

Appendix B

Responses to Classified Staff open-ended question and additional comments written.

Question 15: What opportunities, if any, did this part of the program create?

- Helped me to focus on future goals.
- An opportunity to see my goals in writing and to discuss with others, goal setting and office practices.
- None-my supervisor and I have a very trusting relationship based on mutual respect and understanding of workloads/deadlines/and capabilities
- An opportunity to talk about personal goals. Most of the times evaluations are just a look at whether or not I meet the expectations of the supervisor.
- None- we have always been open within our dept.
- In depth discussion of goals and objectives
- To look @ your job and function; see how it applies to OU goals; to determine how to improve it
- What is expected of me on the job. What I can do to better perform my job.
- I was more able to express my desire regarding my job.
- An opportunity to talk with my supervisor.
- Bond between co-workers.
- Less time to do my job.
- NONE!
- Opportunities? Get real.
- To become more frustrated at work
- None
- To ask questions & bring up any concerns or someone else had with their job description. I did not have any concerns but it gave us time to talk about it if we did.
- Established opportunity for my supervisor and for me to talk over issues more openly.
- None
- The opportunity to discuss unit goals and outstanding projects.
- None
- This supervisor is very open to suggestion also works with us in solving any problems etc we have in this department. Previous supervisor we not trustworthy.
- Opportunities to discuss expectations. It provides a baseline against which to measure future performance.
- None
- None
- None

- None, I have passed the CD's and will take the cap course. Still no one acknowledges my accomplishments. This should reflect in my job performance.
- To discuss what is expected in the way of goals.
- Not much
- Clarification of job
- A chance to express a need for better communication regarding used supplies and what needs the employees have in regards to need certain supplies.
- Discuss other matters of the office
- None
- None
- I don't know if it created any opportunity except to have someone listen to my concerns. No changes really come about.
- Opportunity to ask to take certain classes.
- None
- not much- doing as we have usually done
- Gave me a chance to define what I want in my position, clarify what needs to happen, should happen, and what I would like to happen
- The opportunity to discuss personality difference among co-workers & how well we all work together.
- Extreme waste of time. Many goals can not be set because much of what I do is dependent on other people.
- Gave me specific goals
- It gave me the opportunity to really think about what I need to do to enhance my career.
- Helped me to set goals that were achievable.
- We were able to create 2 new assignments for my position
- More confusion
- We discussed a potential change in duties and I was given the opportunity to voice my preferences.
- Allowing for exchange an implementation of new ideas/procedures to enhance job work place and performance
- I have not been given opportunity to meet the goals. The only goal I will meet will be the one I could initiate myself.
- Helped clearly define our goals
- None
- None
- Waste of time
- None
- N/A
- None
- Made aware of possibilities to participate in the improvement of services.
- I was able to take computer classes.

- Didn't seem to create any

Question 16: What changes do you suggest be made to the planning stage of the Performance Management process?

- A goal-setting workshop would have been an added benefit.
- That the supervisors be better trained and knowledgeable in material.
- Cancel it altogether
- I do not see where it is any benefit to the employee- we are listing goals and not being rewarded-this is creating more work-when we are understaffed as it is.
- 1. The president-powers that be-should set their goals 1st! 2. The planning unit should set their goals based on number one. 3. The department then would plan goals. 4. LAST-NOT-FIRST- the employee can plan their goals!
- I think this is fine.
- Make it less disruptive, unclear and time-consuming.
- No one knows how to properly complete the forms including my supervisor. It also took 15 weeks for my supervisor to schedule my performance planning meeting after I attended my initial classified staff training on May 6,2002! Ridiculous! This makes me feel like the form is not important! How ironic that the new evaluation form no longer has a rating choice of 1-10, but this form lets me choose from 1-5. Shouldn't it be below, meets, or exceeds expectations?
- Ditch it
- I think it should be more personal to the departments needs. Some departments may have more of a need for evaluations mid-year when other department feel it is unnecessary.
- Some individuals are caught in the loop
- Do not use.
- More training to provide a better understanding of the expectations of the process.
- I don't think this process will be of much help!
- Wasn't clear as to who the PM2 form should be turned into. Still not sure of the final purpose and if it will truly benefit employees or not in terms of compensation
- Shorten it
- My purpose at this university is to work. Projects like these defeat that purpose. We've already spent way to much time on this whole ordeal. Does it ever stop?
- Total Revamping
- Drop the entire concept!
- Supervisors that treat employees equally would be a good start. Favoritism should be left at the door.

- At this time I feel it is too early to suggest changes based on such a small demographic and actual usage of that form. Its effectiveness initially seems solid and well constructed.
- Performance pay
- I feel it is very confusing
- Do away with it too time consuming
- Drop the goal setting. It's pointless- much of what I do can not be measured by conventional means.
- More details as to what is expected from the employee during the meeting. What should the employee bring to the meeting
- None
- none at this time
- NONE
- N/A
- Make sure all supervisors are participating. (I believe my supervisor was the only participant in the department.)
- N/A
- None
- Teach supervisor how to plan achievable goals
- Hold supervisors accountable, and give them a better understanding of why the PM program is important to the employee, the department, they themselves, and to the mission of the University.
- Do away with the Performance Mgt. Process
- Don't feel suggestions would be acted on.
- Drop it!
- Bosses should take the initiative

Question 23: What suggestions do you have to improve this stage of the program?

- Commitment from supervisions and upper management to mandate this process for all.
- Too much paper work for supervisors.
- My supervisor has yet to schedule a meeting
- Luckily I have a supervisor that offers on-going coaching and feedback even though we have not officially met for this session
- Less forms to complete. Evaluation forms were effective as originally designed- less time involved and still effective.
- Have an excellent supervisor with an open door policy. We do not schedule the time- do as needed.
- Have never heard of performance management plan.
- I have had no meeting with my supervisor regarding the new performance plan. Why is this not mandatory for supervisors?
- Who has time for this?
- You can bring a horse to water but you can't make him drink

- This will still not help with difficult employees. They know how to manipulate the system and supervisors.
- It is fine with us
- That my supervisor attend training for this program
- To my knowledge....nothing has ever been implemented
- Doing a lot of work and don't know if this program will take hold.
- Abbreviate it.
- We met numerous times and discussed the university and offices' mission statements. But we never sat down and discussed individual goals for me. I set goals for myself and I briefly went over them one day. But we haven't met since summer.
- Less paper work.
- We still don't understand the competencies and how to complete this section of the performance planning form.
- This program needs to be initiated in our department.
- See item 16 above
- Abolish it
- Don't feel it's going to be successful
- Give more time for planning. It adds more work to our daily routines and many of us do not have time to complete the planning process when it is requested to be done.
- Supervisor needs to take the process serious. Nothing has been said to me since I met briefly with a supervisor and I was then told that another individual would be the supervisor. Nothing!
- It happens that my supervisor is very supportive and encourages involvement and improvement. But he leaves it up to me as to what I want to do to improve. OU offers a range of opportunities and he always makes it possible for me to have time to pursue my goals. Not a whole lot of discussion or paper work but much support. Personally, I think I already have this program seeks to provide for all.
- Do away with the program.
- The program is overall ineffective and unrealistic. Unfortunately, the root of the problem is the budget, it simply won't allow a fair distribution of 'bonus' rewards. If staff are not worthy of "cost of (?) raises"-they should not be here, yet it appears that the only way to "reward" the workers who are excelling is to "rob" those who appear to be only "adequate". It tends to create a great deal of animosity among people with differing views of who is the high achiever.
- We have not had a coaching/feedback session yet so I am unable to respond to this section.
- I had no problem with previous program
- I don't like the program and feel my job is just fine and my relationship with my supervisor is just fine without "coaching" and feedback from him.
- ?
- we really don't have time for any of this.

- None
- Shorten it
- (circled the word stage in the question) good word. Too many “stages”. Get a life. Lets get back to work now!
- Not Needed. Far too much paperwork for nothing!
- None
- Seems like most classified staff are not supportive of the program in my situation it seems like a big chore and time consuming-
- More time allotted-it is hard to take up time to do this when you are so shorthanded that your everyday work does not get done.
- None
- I don't see this helping. As far as I'm concerned it's more like being micro-managed. I know more about my job than my supervisor does. I don't think the supervisor should be setting goals, when they couldn't do the job if I wasn't there.
- Need more spare time to discuss and plan
- Need to be made mandatory with strong consequences for non-compliance.
- Would like the evaluation to take place when I didn't feel rushed to get back to pt.s
- Not all supervisors are supportive or think this process is necessary. There is no penalty or encouragement for them to participate. They think it is a waste of time since there is no change in pay associated with the outcome.
- We have not even disussed this in our department-since initial planning meeting
- Drop it. Too time consuming. Let us do what needs to be done.
- benefits are very dependent on employee/supervisor relationship-this varies greatly across campus
- actually do it
- None
- “This stage” of the program? We have not even started the program!
- Make it mandatory for supervisors—I've never even heard about it.
- More hours in a day. Supervisors do not have the time during their work day for this type of programs—if so then that would be an indication that they do not have enough work to do.
- Supervisors in my area do not have time/motivation to initiate discussions.
- Let's start by
- None
- None
- This won't work if it is never implemented. Supervisor does not have the time to work with employees
- None – There's just not adequate time in our department for all this
- This is still early. We meet regularly as a group and have some ongoing discussions weekly at which guidance is affected.
- Supervisor training

- None
- This stage is not applicable to my situation, my immediate supervisor and do the same work. We are more like co-workers if I figure out how to do something I show her and she does the same for me.
- Do away with it.
- None
- None
- To be honest, this entire program seems to be a waste of time and energy.
- None
- None
- We have not done this yet, but I think it's ridiculous and a huge waste of mine and his time.
- So far working fine
- N/A
- None
- Be constructive, less criticism, acknowledge progress
- My supervisor has now gone to another dept. When she came back from the informative mtg. She indicated this sort of thing would just cause people to bring guns to work—that was enough to scare me. If she would've stayed she was upset with me because I brought it to her attention when something was not done properly. Also, I have a problem with my supervisor setting goals for me when they are very much unwilling to do an appropriate job themselves. I am a very good, dependable worker and I do not need to a person like that to set goals for me. We usually don't have time for all of this in our department, we are too busy. I believe this could change good employees into employees that really don't care, if they are scrutinized by supervisors that don't have good work ethic.
- Eliminate the program. Big waste of taxpayers money. Find better ways to reward hard workers, like using big business operations do. Also, quit telling us according to the survey, staff people are overpaid. Funny when the new child support office Sec 1 position move paid \$16.03 an hour to start. That is more than one makes after working here for 20 years. Quit "buying data" to fit HR needs. We are not stupid people, we "the staff" is what has held this university together all these years.
- See answer to question 16. My supervisor has a PhD but knows very little of how to manage an employee. He is also chairing several committees, our department, and teaching- so I fee that his working with me on PM is al the bottom of his priorities.
- Should not be required if employee and supervisor agree. Long time, highly motivated, highly successful employees are generally to busy to participate in this exercise.
- To explain to the supervisor what the PM is about. And to allow it to or force it to go both ways (up and down).
- I would like some feedback on reaching my goals.

- Forget it!
- See #16
- Drop it
- I don't believe the Administrators at the Eastern Campus are taking this system seriously so it is futile to make improvement suggestions
- I don't have any
- "Actually" No one is required to participate? Rather no one is making all do this.
- Supervisors reminded!
- My supervisors/supervisor is new as of July 1 2002 therefore he is not trained nor has she been through the process so we don't feel prepared to have this yet.

Question 24: What are the benefits you have incurred from this stage of the program?

- Aggravation
- Open communication
- So I have not really reviewed anything
- We are too busily
- None
- No meeting has taken place
- I hear the criticism on my part because I am the one try to do a good job. Other employees that have the attitude it's this way or else receive no criticism.
- Seeing how I have improved
- None realized
- None
- None
- My supervisor requested goals. Receipt has not been acknowledged let alone discussed. Too busy with privatizing clinic, etc.
- I know more what my supervisor expects of me in my job duties
- I know my work goals-(excluding the competencies)
- None
- none
- None
- None
- None
- No benefits at this time. The orientation shed some hope but. ---none to date.
- None
- None
- None
- ?

- None
- Better rapport o my supervisor
- None
- None
- None so far. I sat with my supervisor only once to do the PM#1 form. The only feedback is supervisor complaining regarding her goals the rest of the staff doesn't bring the subject up. As far as taking advantage of training sessions either offered in our building or computer center is not encouraged but told their experience was not helpful. How does one handle that?
- Nothing
- Not sure yet
- None
- Not done
- None that are new
- None
- None
- None
- None
- Maybe made me a little more tolerant of my fellow workers and not to have expectations too high for any change.
- None
- None
- None
- Quite honestly—I think this whole thing is crazy—at least for our area. Either we do our jobs or we don't. "Coaching," "Empowerment," etc. are just catch phrases of the day...in my opinion. Give me a break.
- None. I'm the only classified person in this dept. Have nearly 25 years in. All the contract have less.
- clarify my vision of my position and my supervisor's vision to ensure they are the same
- NONE
- None
- None
- None
- NONE
- Nothing
- NONE
- The feeling of support for whatever I would like to do to enhance my career
- None
- NONE
- None yet.
- Continue to think about goals and responsibilities more often

- None
- None
- None
- None
- N/A
- Sense of worth concerning job performance. My ideas and suggestions are taken seriously, and sometimes implemented
- None, I have lost time, time that I couldn't afford to lose filling this out.
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- Working fine
- N/A
- Better communication with supervisor
- None
- Absolutely none
- None. It has created friction.
- None
- None
- None
- None
- None
- N/A
- That my supervisor is too busy for staff but not for contract staff
- None
- None
- How would I know? I think the forms are great, even if all weren't used. I think "the program" could give valuable feed back to Admin offices.
- Nothing
- None

Question 25: Other (please list all other training needs that still need to be fulfilled)

- How to deal with people that do not care. Office personnel
- We have had no meetings!
- Computer classes.
- None
- Have not met supervisor to discuss anything
- I'm still clueless on the process-what is the purpose?
- Supervisor needs training
- CD's and CAD programs cover all of this except for PM-D
- Computer

- All of the above
- MBA
- I need training in certain aspects of competent maintenance
- N/A
- These all need to be continuously maintained they can never be fulfilled.
- Educating and job training
- More computer use skills—access, excel, power point, etc.
- None
- Reference training

Question 26: What are the main benefits of the Performance Management Program?

- To document progress at attending goals.
- There are no benefits. It might be a good system if there was really merit pay attached. Now it is just a good way of holding down our salaries.
- Conflicts
- Don't know have had no trainings
- Not sure
- To be open about any concerns and changes within your department.
- Communication with my supervisor.
- The main benefit would be Actual pay-for-performance if that ever takes place. The next benefit would be to actually be able to look at the goals we have set and see how much improvement I have made throughout the year.
- None. If I had questions or problems arose I would immediately take care of them- not wait until advisor sessions.
- For Journalism there was not any
- To know what is expected of me
- For those who don't communicate with their supervisor I would guess it is beneficial in setting work goals and habits.
- The communication that I already have with my boss: frequent meetings, open discussion. If we ever get around to it, it will be nice to have a list of goals on paper so that we can evaluate progress later. Then my boss could let me know if he thinks I have too much on my plate.
- I see none at this point
- Pay for work done-if we ever get to that point
- The university will receive employees with a long list of unattainable goals or easy goals from employees-Employees will either meet these goals and not be rewarded or they will not reach them but do a great job and not be recognized fairly!
- It was a good way to examine our jobs and focus on the competencies established-however if we don't see \$\$ out of all this please tell us why we did it. Seems like a lot of \$\$ spent on it.
- Standardizing performance reviews, forcing the issue.

- Provides a formal mechanism for supervisor and employee to communication, if one is needed- if not it's a waste of time.
- There is non because depts. Will give straight raises so they do not have to listen to aggressive employee.
- Seems to be spending a lot of university money to save the university money?
- To set new goals and achieve them in a timely manner.
- Due to the nature of my position, planning, setting goals and such are not a big help.
- None!
- None- Disadvantages, far as taking up far too much of my work hours.
- Having goals and working towards them throughout the year.
- None
- I know more of what is expected of me from my supervisor.
- N/x
- None! It creates more paperwork and takes more time!
- none
- None
- Can't tell – haven't started
- It wastes a lot of time
- None that I can tell so far
- I feel this will benefit people who like to have feedback on their performance. However it is still a little much for some people and some supervisors have too many people to make sure they are doing their part.
- Haven't seen any yet. Would like for it to be a team effort. For the past several years my evaluations have been very late. Is the superior reprimanded? The employee suffers.
- Open communication of ideas between employee and supervisor.
- ?
- I don't see any unless the "pay for performance" is implemented.
- None
- Benefits include a better understanding by the employee of expectations and a better understanding by the supervisors of the employees duties and responsibilities.
- None
- I believe in my work setting-this process is useless
- I really don't see any
- Clarification of duties but no immediate benefits in terms of compensation.
- Way to get a raise based on your work
- Set goals
- Can't see any-nothing for a maxed out employee
- I cannot see any benefits.
- NA

- Improved communication with your group, and supervisor.
- Better communication
- To know where you stand and where you're going
- Discussion, goals
- None
- Chance to voice concerns, etc.
- None that I see
- None- a waste of time
- Evaluate and goal setting
- 1. communication between management and employees. 2. provides incentives to be a good employee
- Be sure you and your supervisor are "on the same page" would provide encouragement or suggestion for improvement.
- I don't see any
- None
- To let me know what is expected by me and to let management know what I would like to do and what I expect from management
- Don't see any
- Maybe good for other areas—not for me. We just wrote down what is expected of me & any changes we might implement. This has always been our way—verbal.
- documentation, clarification of expectations, goals, accomplishments
- I don't see any in my case.
- This office has always had an informal Performance Mgt. Prgm; not as structured. This program is good for departments who do not.
- don't know
- None, business as usual.
- Is wasted time a "benefit?"
- I am new to the University and am not fully up to date on this program.
- I truly see no benefit to this program.
- none that I see.
- NONE FOR ME AT THIS POINT. I STILL HAVE NOT HAD AN EVALUATION FOR ALMOST THREE YEARS.
- I see none
- ?
- The main benefit to me was the encouragement to take the CPS exam.
- Hopefully will allow for bonus when goals are met.
- I see none at this time
- None
- NONE
- I feel there is no benefit – waste of time and money. If you are a problem employee, you deal with them.
- Provision of mutually understood, measurable criteria on which evaluations can be based.

- Don't know yet
- Hopefully---get evaluations in a timely manner and more fair in the process-i.e.—you will know your goals and how to meet them.
- Setting and meeting goals; prioritizing
- Program is a joke, not being used
- I do not see any benefits of this program.
- None
- None
- It seems to be keeping someone employed
- None
- Don't know of any
- Exchange (honest) ideas
- None
- None
- Set goals and the knowledge was expected. I believe they could be a good thing if supervisors are trained in setting reachable goals.
- NONE- Just another example of a poor human resources dept.
- I've said this many times but feel it's worth saying again- this program lines us with Human Resources concept of employees today but while the program is in this mind set, the employees and supervisors are NOT!
- I have no idea because I know very little about it.
- I haven't seen any yet
- Setting goals to move ahead.
- None
- None
- None at this time
- What is the purpose of this program?
- Sent to 2 worthwhile workshops since
- I would hope (since I have not done the process) it will encourage feedback, planning unit goals, priorities, discussion. Possible to base merit pay on good evaluation process.
- Money
- Just changed departments
- To realize and achieve potential- to know where you stand

Question 28: What are the areas for improvement in the Performance Management Program?

- When this change was first being implemented I was its biggest supporter. Now that the changes have been made I am thoroughly disappointed. It has done nothing but shrink salaries, hurt morale, and give us more reason to distrust management.
- Equal working opportunities.
- The forms are too complicated.

- Basically setting the goals higher for myself and the department.
- Not so much paperwork
- Less paperwork
- Again the supervisor needs to know what is going on
- It takes a lot of time. We are all very busy. I think issues should be discussed as they come up not certain times of the year.
- It would be helpful if we knew whether or not there were going to raises based on merit.
- Force people to take time to do this!
- Table it
- All of it- I would rather improve my day to day questions and streamline my job than set more goals outside of my job-I'm only helping in getting myself more work that won't be recognized and won't be classified any differently.
- HR needs to take a more responsible role. See #16. Give everyone a copy of the presidents goals-have each unit hand out copies of their goals; start @ the top, not the bottom.
- Providing funds for merit raises
- Competency development is a sham-merely a way to have employers take on more and more responsibility instead of doing well what is scribed in their job description and what they were hired to do.
- Tell us what you are going to do for us.
- Needs to be simpler, much clearer language, less time-intensive.
- Less paperwork
- Shorten this procedure- go back to the way it was. Haven't had an evaluation now- it will be two years in Dec. 02
- N/x
- Entirely too much of my time has been spent on training and in completing forms. The "old" way was just as effective, took less time(once a year) I set goals for the year. I've tried voicing my opinion about this, but no one will listen to me!
- See item 16 above
- Better trained Supervisor
- ?
- Have it mean something
- Some supervisors take the PMP serious and feel it is a way to assist an individual in keeping up with the changing environment. Unfortunately not enough supervisors do this. Encouragement to all is needed plus time.
- Simplify documentation.
- Still no accountability. Haven't been evaluated for 3 years now.
- More detailed training on the various components of the PM process we had a goal setting workshop right after our first PM meeting that was most helpful to ee and supervisor.
- Abolish it.
- What was wrong with old evaluations.

- \$
- Total Revamping
- NA
- Not sure yet
- Compensation phase needs to be put in place
- There seems to be a total investment in a program that won't change anything but add more paperwork. My supervisor and I haven't discussed ANYTHING about the whole process because there aren't any benefits and/or changes that will occur.
- Do away with it
- I do not believe that management is very serious about this because we have not even discussed this in our department. I believe supervisors need to be trained on this to make it work.
- Paper work is not my thing. Our verbal interactions were fine. This is too time consuming.
- include Merit Pay component
- Ditch the program and start over. It is truly a waste of time and money.
- Too time consuming—our jobs do not give extra time for this
- COMMUNICATION
- What is the purpose of the program other than to allow management not to give across the board raises?
- None
- We can go through this process but what benefit will I get after completing the CPS exam if I can't increase my pay scale or classification? How will that work?
- One on one & time that we don't have from our job to work on this process to long and involved. Time, time.
- Evaluation should be based on Job performance.
- Management sees that NEW supervisors are trained to realize the importance of this.
- Supervisor training on the Performance Mgnt. Program
- A method of assuring that management is following the guidelines
- I think it will be easier for me in the future now that I've been through the planning stage once and have worked with the plans I made.
- N/A
- All areas
- It is a waste of time
- Follow through
- N/A
- Drop it
- Some sort of realistic goals, not just yet another group of forms to fill out.
- Fine
- Get rid of it and get rid of the incompetent and non qualified people in the Human Resources dept. Check their resumes, they are not qualified in the

roles they are in. Some people are employed in positions that require a degree, but the employer does not have one. Total incompetency.

- Need to set reachable goals. Educating supervisors.
- I believe that instead of implementing such a program as this, he could save a lot of time and paper work just take care of those employees that do not have good ethics at work and keep it as usual for the employees who do a good job!
- Keep training both supervisors and employees of the importance of the program. I've always set goals for myself in both my job and my personal life, but many people do not.
- Training and consistency between dept. Dir.
- Paperwork streamlining
- I haven't experienced enough of the program to tell- no feedback yet.
- More clear forms and procedures.
- Too new to assess
- Forget it
- Again this system will only work from the top down. Classified staff have little control over the system.
- All should be "required" to participate and not given "lip service".
- Our job is set at a time table, it is very hard to improve and make up goals that will work on this schedule.
- Supervisor required to be a part!

Question 29: What else do you need in order to be successful in the Performance Management Program?

- Tying merit pay to performance would be worth it.
- A performance planning session. Hard to be successful in a program where the supervisor hasn't taken the first step.
- Need someone who knows what they're doing so they can effectively train us on how to complete the forms anytime we asked questions nobody knew the answer.
- If this survey is to be an unbiased survey, I do not believe this question should be asked. Also, surveys should not be numbered. I also do not feel the pay for performance can be implemented in a fair and just way. It will only create anger and an unpleasant work environment.
- This is a waste of time I have an Asso. Degree and it doesn't help to advance me. My goals to make money and retire.
- An understanding of where this is going- I think most people who work here have a lot of pride in OU-it's history, its future, its reputation- we just don't have a lot of faith in the administration to do what is right for all of us.
- Funds for merit raises
- A willing "total" buy-in by all

- All employees would like to know how raises will be implemented if supervisors only have so much money for supplies, etc and employees and supplies are desperately needed? We have been total once that \$ had to go for equipment and supplies and we could not hire anyone to replace people leaving.
- A supervisor that has attended training and feels this is an important program to classified employees.
- Less paperwork and meetings.
- Continual feedback is nice
- N/x
- Go back to the old yearly evaluation form and process. Making more forms to complete will not make the supervisors will not make the supervisors complete them! One form was much better! Admit that the performance management program was a mistake and go back to the old form!
- To stop filling out ridiculous forms so I have time to do my job!
- Supervisors who will participate
- An idea if I am still going to be employed by O.U. or by a private medical practice
- More time. We just started the progress and I feel I don't have enough input to give because we have just started the planning stage. I do feel this will be good to determine what else you would like to work toward.
- Time and permission to participate in areas of interest plus areas that benefit an individual in their position.
- More time in the day to do the extra work this program requires.
- Hard to say until I've experienced a complete cycle.
- I am successful without it.
- Additional employee—to share job load, then perhaps time could be made for these management sessions.
- The knowledge that someone who really performs well will be compensated for their efforts
- Even the supervisor agrees that this is just more paperwork being pushed on departments and for those employees maxed out, it offers absolutely no incentive (due to budget cuts) to reward in any way employees.
- Administration to grasp the idea that some areas of the University cannot adhere to “goal” setting. We work as a team not as individuals.
- If we are required to participate in the program time needs to be included in Everyday routine and treated as part of the job description For supervisors as well as employees
- Get a new job there is only so many goals for one job.
- More time
- A supervisor you can work with.
- More coaching and feedback
- We just implemented this a few weeks ago. Not long enough into the program

- Time
- Supervisor support/involvement
- A plan that will actually have an impact on something. There is absolutely NO incentive to do anything above and beyond.
- This may be good for some job but inadequate for others
- Merit pay
- Nothing
- More hours in each day; more days in a week, etc. A supervisor who has time for such programs.
- program should be re-thought & re-organized & SIMPLIFIED for both employees & supervisors.
- I need to know that I will be accurately evaluated and what is in it for me
- Nothing
- ?
- Understanding, of the meaning behind these forms
- The meetings to take place.
- N/A
- I want credit for all the things I do on my job but this is not my supervisor's fault, it is the way any job is classified.
- More time
- I honestly can't imagine
- None I can think of
- Supervisor was happy with my goals—or seemed to be. I think my supervisor is purposely keeping me from reaching my goals.
- Fine
- Fine
- Educate the supervisors- set reachable goals. I had six pages of goals presented to me.
- Allow us to grow in our jobs and reward us for it. I am doing the job that 3 people did when I just started here. My supervisor would like to upgrade me and reward me for doing the work of 3 people. Big business reward you for your accomplishments, but not OU.
- If you can't train supervisors and employees to get a better understanding of the HR concept then you may have to labor along with this program for many years until those who are used to the "old way of doing things" retire and move on.
- Direction or leadership so I know where were going.
- Additional training
- Time for communicating with supervisor.
- Nothing- I am a success in my job!!
- Get my supervisor to evaluate me fairly!! Get my supervisor to develop dept. goals and share planning.
- Supervisor need to realize performance management and development is more than free classes at OU!

Appendix C

Responses to supervisor open-ended question and additional comments written.

Question 1: Did you and your supervisee(s) hold a goal-setting meeting to begin the Performance?

- Goal setting is an ongoing process for this unit; environment changes frequently.
- There are just two of us and we work as equals.
- My supervisor is new and has not been trained, and as I have not had my goal setting meeting, therefore I do not feel ready to speak with the person I supervise.
- I was told in our initial training that we would receive notice the 1st time around when each step was to take place. To date-- No notice received.
- Because I heard that a number of supervisor's that took this training had a number of issues about it and I was waiting for more information to come which it never did.
- This is a horrible program! We discuss performance everyday as part of our normal work and do integrated planning as a work team this program is paper intensive and silly.
- She resigned.
- Our unit has been working overtime since June and has not had staffing time to implement.
- I no longer supervise a classified staff member.
- To be scheduled.
- Will
- Honestly- I forgot. In the training it was stated that a reminder would be sent out to prompt us as to what we should be doing at certain points and it wasn't.
- I am an administrator but I do not supervise anyone.
- We have been holding weekly "where are we meetings".
- Forgot
- Supervisor has a new position elsewhere.
- We have had two such meetings
- I was unaware that this was something that I needed to do
- Time limitations added work load
- I currently supervise no civil service employees/classified staff
- We began the process but have not yet completed it. The process is so time consuming we were able to get a good start after 8 hours of discussion and we still have not set goals
- Ask my supervisor
- Just completed initial planning mtg on 10-15-02
- Unit mission statement is not complete. Have not received forms.
- Director is doing goal-setting.

- Process initiated but not completed. Scheduled by 10/25/02.
- Supervisor was listed incorrectly.
- Time constraints.
- Haven't got around to it.
- No time available.
- We met in the very beginning & discussed university and office mission statements. I did complete the form and set goals for myself but we haven't met together to discuss these. We haven't met for over two months.
- Haven't had time.

Question 8: Did you hold coaching and feedback sessions with your supervisee(s) after the initial planning meeting?

- Informal coaching and feedback sessions are held on a regular basis as needed. When problems/issues arise, they are taken care of.
- Not needed.
- Coaching is ongoing and informal.
- See above.
- Not yet.
- Same as above. Never received notice to begin. Currently waiting on first phase to begin but this was poorly implemented.
- Not yet planning to do this month.
- Same as above.
- We do this as part of our work routine.
- Employees are making progress on goals.
- Not time yet.
- Will do some in November.
- Our staff has been working overtime since June and has not had time to implement.
- Too busy, no problems, progress on goals is happening.
- Not required.
- I no longer supervise a classified staff member.
- We have been too busy to meet.
- Plan to
- Scheduled for Dec. Jan.
- Supervisor has been on medical leave since initial meeting. He does not plan to return to work.
- Both he and I are extremely busy. We communicate regularly, but neither of us have time or patience for this new process.
- See attached sheet.
- See above.
- Part of weekly meetings.

- Too much confusion.
- Time met informally.
- Forgot, no incentive.
- On occasion I attempted it.
- Coaching planned in middle of October.
- Waiting until goal-setting meeting takes place.
- No time.
- Haven't got around to it.
- Time constraints.
- We did not have the meeting
- We met weekly as a unit
- The supervisors still have not submitted their goals in final form. We have had two meetings since July 1st to try to finalize the performance planning but have not completed this phase yet.
- We are very busy, if we do this then we will all fall behind
- Time limitations
- Wasn't necessary
- Haven't been able to complete initial process
- Wasn't necessary
- We are all very busy – if we do this we just all fall behind
- Unit mission statement is not complete. Have not received forms.
- No formal sessions; issues were addressed as they arose.
- Informally
- Director is doing goal-setting.
- In Process

Question 11: Did you and your supervisee(s) hold a Midyear Review meeting to discuss progress toward the goals established in the performance planning meeting?

- We are just starting the process.
- Operate on a fiscal year. Mid year wont start until January 2003.
- We did not complete the goal setting meeting until late May, so midyear hasn't come yet.
- We got a late start in training and in the goals setting part.
- This year we did not have time for4 a mid-year review

Question 14: Did you and your supervisee(s) hold a Midyear Review?

- We are just starting the process.
- We're not there yet.

Question 17: Do you have any training skills that need to be fulfilled?

- I went through the training and I have been reading the manual.

Question 18: Please provide us with any additional information concerning your thoughts on the benefits of this program?

- The ideals behind the program are wonderful. However, the reality of the program is that it does not work. Our office is a very fast-paced office, where every minute counts. It is absurd to devote all this “official” time to this program when a good manager inherently does all of the steps of the program.
- The process is very time- consuming, while valuable the first time around , this will be less useful in subsequent years.
- Like this survey, too long and not very useful.
- This program is too complex and cumbersome to be worthwhile in the present financial climate of the university.
- No benefits.
- We had a well-developed system in place already, so this has just entailed a transition. All employees need a performance-based evaluation tied to merit pay, so I am anxious for classified and admin. To get on board!
- This program is poorly designed and something you would have seen 30 years ago in industry.
- It hasn't kicked in yet for me.
- Haven't started yet when we hire replacement we will try.
- No benefits. Waste of time.
- Too soon to tell. Very time consuming.
- The program is somewhat contrived. The relationship of my person is based on a bi-weekly meeting, which assist in the communication.
- Increases positive communication.
- This was a difficult process for my supervisee. He has a negative personality and feels very strongly that this new system does not help the classified staff.
- As an administrative employee who has not had a similar session with my supervisor it is difficult to set goals for those I supervise since I have not had benefit of me setting my goals. Process s/be top down not bottom up.
- This program is great in an ideal world. The program is extremely time consuming and takes much time to meet all requirements. Short cuts will be taken and the effectiveness will not be what was intended.
- Too time consuming if you are in a busy office.
- Compels participants to focus on measurable standards of performance.
- Not enough evidence that the follow through will happen.
- There aren't any benefits to my knowledge.
- The problem with this program in my job is that it is pretty routine the same thing as the same time everyday. Providing countless, prompt

services is the main job. It is hard to find goals that go beyond what we are doing.

- Employees say this takes too much time and it is hard to set goals when the work is provided for us.
- Regular evaluations are a great idea IF those who write the evaluations know how to do them AND if they are tied to compensation.
- This program should not have been introduced until it had a 2yr trial with IT and all the bugs worked out. It appears to have been pushed thru just to make those pushing for it look good.
- I think it's an excellent program. I know that my classified staff is concerned that this is not get any.
- I have never received any follow-up info after the training in Athens – I never knew when we were supposed to be implementing this.
- No benefit
- There is no benefit.
- I haven't seen this program accepted by classified employees as beneficial so they just go through the motions of fulfilling program obligations.
- I have been employed at OU for more than 20 years and I feel that this program is too time consuming and of no benefit. It is detracting from our ability to do our work thus creating a more stressful work environment
- It would have been much more effective and useful had it been part of a full year process. Honestly in communication was key
- As stated earlier. This is an extremely! time consuming process. It has given us a chance to tell about personal issues and personal needs in the position
- The benefit would be a more open dialog/ expressing expectations then just a once a year evaluation but without rewards/ compensation we just have a more elaborate evaluation process
- Provides a formal mechanism for supervisors & employee to communicate. If its not needed, the process is a waste of everyone's time.
- Classified employees have expressed concerns about how this process will work with a merit system. The job classifications seem too general, at least as perceived by the employees I work with.
- I do believe that the program's benefits will increase, esp. when they become tied to financial and monetary rewards.
- Not far enough into the program to provide any opinion.

Question 20: Please provide us with any additional comments regarding areas of improvement for this program.

- See above—get rid of the program. Way too costly for University in personnel time spent in relation to benefits. Benefits should be seen by well-run office w/o the Performance Planning Program.

- Reduce paperwork involved. Provide merit funding beyond raise pool funding to better tie performance management to compensation.
- Time spent in training for exceeded what was necessary. Language and complexity of forms make the steps of the process unwieldy. Simplify! Just get on with it!
- Once I took the training I heard nothing else in regards to where we would proceed with it.
- *[Unreadable writing]* then redesign.
- Do away with.
- Follow up activities.
- The program was “rolled-out” to classified staff as being a merit based pay program yet it isn’t moving to merit based pay. Be more consistent in what the plan will do through PR and training sessions.
- This program needs to be dumped. Too much with little true benefit no one I have talked to likes it or believes in it. Too much involvement and little true benefit. Much too complex.
- I had a good open relationship with my supervisees before this effort.
- Staff members don’t feel it is worthwhile.
- Too much paperwork without any benefits. It seems to have the same outcome that the previous evaluation system did but 3 times the amount of work until raises are linked this is worthless.
- See attached sheet.
- If this is to work, we need local training, feedback to supervisors, etc...
- Take it back to the drawing board.
- I think we are too slow to if I know all the benefits yet.
- See above and I have worked here over 15 years and I have never been involved in a supervisory evaluation. Hopefully, this will soon change.
- Why? No one does anything about it.
- Takes way too much of my time- as well as employees. I can’t imagine those having 10-15 or 20 employees!
- Employees who were already motivated have not increased their motivation through this process; likewise, employees who were not motivated, do not seem to have increased their motivation as a result of the process.
- Provide examples-case studies-attributing successful situations and problems.
- There should be training sessions for goal setting several times per week at least long enough to provide assistance to those who need it
- Improve with having less paper work
- There are too many forms with too many questions. There needs to be more emphasis on the process and less on the paper and questions
- If this is not tied to salaries
- Aligning pay (rewards) with a merit system.
- I apparently thought the benefits would be too few since I haven’t followed the program yet.

- Difficult to set different goals on positions where duties are routine.

Appendix D

Responses to Information Technology open-ended question and additional comments written.

Question 15: What opportunities, if any, did this part of the program create?

- To allow objective criteria to compare our team's work load, professionalism, & performance with other teams.
- It provided a chance to focus on specific projects.
- N/A
- None yet. The process is new and we're too busy to do much with these tools. But we have used an informal method for similar purposes with good success.
- None
- It created no more opportunity than I already would have had.
- None
- Discussion of long team goals

Question 16: What changes do you suggest be made to the planning stage of the Performance Management Process?

- Make sure all supervisors carry out the process.
- None
- Do away with this
- Some areas are not completing the forms or the process—This is not a high priority and it should be.
- N/A
- Make it simpler! Don't make it so bureaucratic!
- More role reversal (employee reciprocates with suggestions for management) greater efforts to insure anonymity for PM3 more assistance setting goals to align with dept. (group work, collaboration)
- Delete
- Get rid of the competency section. It seems pretty useless so far. It's too vague.
- Don't let academics or non-IT people supervise IT personnel.

Question 23: What suggestions do you have to improve this stage of the program?

- Meet with my supervisor in the first place!
- ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SUPERVISORS NOT FOLLOWING THROUGH WITH THIS PROGRAM.

- None-my manager has always been proactive and highly motivated in objectives, clear goals and communicating expectations and feedback.
- None
- Do away with this
- Do it.
- Not very effective
- Too Structured
- NA-process did not occur
- Goals should not be set independently by individual then reviewed, altered by management. goals should be created as a collaborative project with peers and management input
- Not needed
- None, I get enough feedback from my supervisor b/c O wrote bi weekly staff reports
- I don't know as I haven't gone through this stage
- Don't let academics or non-IT people supervise IT personnel

Question 24: What are the benefits you have incurred from this stage of the program?

- My manager has continued to provide me with insight & encouragement in professional development & goal achievement.
- None
- NONE
- NONE
- N/A
- None
- None
- NA-process did not occur
- None
- None, I already get constant feedback from my supervisor
- Do it
- Absolutely none
- None

Question 34: Do you have any training needs that still need to be fulfilled? (Check all that apply) Other:

- New technology & software improvements
- COMPUTER SKILLS TRAINING IS NECESSARY FOR IT FOLKS!!
- Get better categories
- Technical training related to position
- Technical issues

- Keeping current with software & hardware changes for IT personnel for today's standard. & keeping current with today's technology changes.

Question 35: What are the main benefits of the Performance Management Program?

- Objective evaluation linked to increases in salary.
- Improved planning process
- DO NOT KNOW
- NONE AS OF YET WHILE I THINK THIS IS AN AWESOME DIRECTION, MANY MANAGERS/SUPERVISORS ALSO HAVE WORK/DEADLINES THEY HAVE TO MEET, AND THE AMOUNT OF TIME REQUIRED TO DO THIS PROGRAM PROPERLY IS UNREALISTIC, GIVEN EVERYTHING ELSE THAT HAS TO GET DONE...
- Increased Communication
- Sets goals, keeps you on track – overall effective!
- Causes people to think about what we do
- It is a top down joke
- Interaction with supervisor
- It creates an open communication between you 2- you know what is expected of you and it is in writing.
- N/A- Nothing has been done here!
- So far I see None
- I think the program and forms are vague as a result of making a standard form for everyone. The categories being reviewed/evaluated for the employee have little or no objective criteria. I do not like the process as it stands and wish I had been given the opportunity to give input beforehand on the forms and process.
- More dialogue between staff and supervisor regarding expectations and goals.
- ? Not sure
- Establishes standards of Accountability
- None
- Meeting with supervisor more than once a year to discuss performance.
- It's good to have that contract w/ my boss about my project goals for the year.
- Better than having nothing in place at all but if we are still guided in pay by what is established by the unions what's the point.
- I don't know-I have not participated, other than filling out the JIQ.
- It's nice to see O.U. pursuing a standards-based approach to Performance Eval. could/should help level the playing field.
- Increased ability to perform paperwork

Question 37: What are the areas for improvement in the Performance Management Program?

- It needs to be done by all supervisors.
- Needs to address ways of (*Unreadable writing*) goals.
- Understanding the forms
- Utilize it
- Management must get with the program.
- Evaluate only objectively measurable categories. It appears every category has the same weight and that is not true in the actual importance and successful job performance.
- Fewer evaluations/ forms – Prefer one initial goal setting, then review at the end of year.
- The recent suggestion that the managers evaluation be completed with the manager present is outrageous.
- The schedule for the process is completely off! FINAL should be due by March and midyear in Sept or Oct.
- Simplify! We have already reduced the process to forms members (PM2? PM3?) Cut the bureaucracy!!!
- Making the supervisor do their part in the performance mgt. prog.
- My supervisor and dept head have informed me that we will not be participating in the IT Performance Management until 2003
- SUPERVISORS MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE BY SOMEONE FOR NOT DOING THIS...TOO EASY TO IGNORE WITH EVERYTHING ELSE THAT HAS TO GET DONE
- Overall PM Process has too many forms to complete.
- There should be consequences when it is not implemented by supervisors
- Currently, there seems to be no benefit to the employee, only to management. Viewed as top-down only, and only serves as a dangerous exercise for the employee
- The amount of overhead and paperwork for this does not support the minimal benefits received.
- Less Paper work!
- The competency category are not at All useful this section is way to vague and useless
- Get a real pay scale separate of outside departments
- It would seem that the process should be streamlined—there are too many forms and meetings on the schedule.
- Don't let academics or non-IT people “supervise” IT personnel. Find a way to encourage chairs to be objective, non-biased toward fellow academics.
- Needs steamlined, needs tied to salary/merit

*Question 38:*What else do you need in order to be successful in the Performance Management Program?

- That's all. I am eager to show my efforts and accomplishments w/ objective criteria.
- Why is the supervisor performance sheet to be filled out by employee AND supervisor? Kind of defeats the purpose.
- More input on the forms and objective criteria in evaluating categories.
- Please cut the bureaucratic taste and make this a true evaluation. Or, at least, pony up the dollars to make this work.
- Better communication with my supervisor.
- TIME
- Unit-Wide coordination of work plans
- Simply to be treated like the professional I am, if I get the job done leave me alone if I am not simply talk to me about it, do not make me have to log every little thing I do and then rail on me when I don't get a lot done some days because other days I get twice as much done. Just let it even itself out as it does. If you don't know what I do then learn or get out of my way and let me get my work done.
- Less paper work!
- A more useful form
- More money, more direction, less guessing
- First of all I need to find out if I should be participating or not. My supervisor has never mentioned the process or program.
- Given its history thus far- LEAVE ME ALONE- I do a very good, thoroughly professional job on my own.

Appendix E

Additional letters from survey respondents