

1. Do you have a written Action Plan/Job Description

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes | 89.13% | 410 |
| No | 10.87% | 50 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 2 |

2. Do you and/or your supervisor modify your Action Plan/Job Description during the year as priorities shift?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Yes | 51.75% | 237 |
| No | 48.25% | 221 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 4 |

3. Do you provide input into your Action Plan/Job Description?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes | 90.04% | 407 |
| No | 9.96% | 45 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 10 |

4. Have you had at least one annual performance review since you have been in the College?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Yes | 98.26% | 451 |
| No | 1.74% | 8 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 3 |

5. Prior to the annual performance review meeting, do you submit yearly accomplishment to your supervisor?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes | 85.62% | 393 |
| No | 14.38% | 66 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 3 |

6. Do you have a face-to-face annual performance review meeting with your supervisor each year?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes | 96.07% | 440 |
| No | 3.93% | 18 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 4 |

7. What do you do to prepare for your performance review meeting?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Submit accomplishments to my supervisor | 87.28% | 398 |
| Have a preliminary meeting with supervisor | 24.78% | 113 |
| Nothing | 4.82% | 22 |
| Other (please specify) see below | 14.04% | 64 |
| Skipped question | | 6 |

Other Comments:

| |
|--|
| Benchmarks |
| I have contact with my supervisor at least 3 times a week. |
| Collect all other support material that seems to not fit directly into the plans. |
| I fill out the SRDP form |
| Keep records of accomplishments to present to my supervisor when we meet. |
| Six month review |
| Notebook with accomplishments is shared with CED |
| Put together a list of what needs to be completed in the following year. |
| Do Action plan and accomplishments. |
| Report my time and contact information in CASPAR |
| Create a dossier-style report with goals, actions and impacts, and provide it to my supervisor at the preliminary meeting for the supervisor to use in evaluation of my performance. |
| I fill out sections I and II of the SRDP form. |

7. What do you do to prepare for your performance review meeting?

| |
|---|
| I do my Caspar reporting - don't we all? |
| Prepare written trainings and diversity attendance. |
| Discuss the past year and the coming year Discuss the ACTION PLANS for the next year |
| Have 1 or 2 other brief meetings throughout the year to talk about any shifting priorities and new developments impacting my job and dept. |
| Submit accomplishments & training (completed SRDP) |
| I keep my supervisor apprised of changes in my plan and the accomplishments on a quarterly basis. |
| Including the staff input section part I and II |
| Submit the staff input section of the SRDP to my supervisor |
| Provide a self evaluation (pencil copy) |
| Do a self evaluation |
| Fill out the SRDP |
| Submit SRDP form to supervisor |
| I actually have a review meeting with my supervisor after and sometimes before each conference, project, etc. I do submit an annual report of accomplishments and things I would like to work on, but reviews are done throughout the year. |
| Complete SRDP only |
| Submit action plans for upcoming year. |
| Fill out and submit a "draft" performance review document; submit preliminary action plans for the upcoming year |
| Fill out the form that comes from HR for my part of SRDP. Also update the action plan from previous yr. |
| Fill out staff portion of SRDP |
| ANY AND ALL CLASSES OR CON ED ATTENDED CONCERNING MY POSITION, NEW INFORMATION THAT I HAVE COME BY AND HOW. ETC. |

7. What do you do to prepare for your performance review meeting?

| |
|--|
| Action plans and SRDP |
| We have a mid year review to discuss progress and changes. |
| Complete staff input portion of SRDP |
| Review action plan but usually never changes. |
| Along with accomplishments we submit a written account very similar to the promotion dossier requirement. |
| I work up my accomplishments and work plan for the next year, meet with my supervisor to go over it. My supervisor types up his part of it and then we meet again to go over what he types and then he submits the paperwork. My supervisor and I keep copies and we file them in our files. |
| Prepare a list of yearly accomplishments to discuss at the review meeting |
| I complete all of the review except for his comments. |
| Submit a draft version of SRDP (staff section) |
| Quarterly reports of activities and accomplishments important correspondence at it occurs |
| Totally review all programming done in prior 12 [or 15] month period and tabulate numbers, gender diversity etc. then create summary of perceived impact from major "groupings" of presentation topics; propose changes in focus for coming year; evaluate perceived strengths as well as areas needing additional effort and/or training. |
| Action and Development Plans also. |
| CASPAR reporting |
| Never had one |
| Fill out the form and go find my supervisor to get him/her to read it. |

7. What do you do to prepare for your performance review meeting?

| |
|---|
| I prepare board reports every 2 months that detail work, time and contacts. I also put a daily record of all work in Outlook that is accessible for anyone to see work accomplished every day and hours worked (my choice). This should make everything I do totally transparent in case anyone should ever have a question on the cost/benefit of their money (e.g., county commissioners, administrators, colleagues). It also makes it easy for me to see hours worked, jobs completed, contacts, etc. If I get down about the pile on my desk, I am comforted by the fact that I got a lot done and there is no way I can do it all (main reason for keeping a daily log, as well as simplifies reporting). |
| Fill out my section of the Staff Review and Action Plan. |
| Spend time going back over the years calendar and CASPAR reports as well as my professional development file to gather specifics to note in my self review. |
| Professional Development activities Grants submitted Invited presentations |
| Wrote my own review |
| Finish my part of the SRDP. |
| Complete the appropriate section of the SRDP form. "Employee Input", I think it is. |
| Submit completed SRDP with Action Plan prior to meeting. |
| Complete all appropriate sections of the SRDP form. |
| I write my accomplishments and goals before my review but my supervisor does not take the time to look it over before writing my review, so how can he properly write my review! |
| Prepare the SRDP and provide appropriate information on that form on my duties, accomplishments, etc. |
| Prepare list of accomplishments and special responsibilities to assist us in our meeting. |
| Have not done |
| Complete the SRDP |
| Compile what I have done. |
| Submit SRDP and action plan to supervisor prior to meeting |

7. What do you do to prepare for your performance review meeting?

Go through calendar to see what conferences, meetings I attended. Try to remember major projects worked on throughout the year.

8. What is your annual performance review based on? Check all that apply.

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Accomplishments related to your Action Plan/Job Description. | 79.43% | 363 |
| Accomplishments over the past year but not related to your Action Plan/Job Description. | 56.89% | 260 |
| Whatever my supervisor wants to discuss. | 43.33% | 198 |
| Not sure. | 6.78% | 31 |
| Other (please specify) | 11.16% | 51 |
| Skipped question | | 5 |

9. What items do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| Answer options | Always | Sometimes | Never | Response Count |
|--|--------|-----------|-------|----------------|
| Positive performance from the preceding year | 367 | 74 | 13 | 454 |
| Suggestions to improve performance | 316 | 114 | 20 | 450 |
| Opportunities for professional development | 261 | 156 | 34 | 451 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | | | 7 |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| Answer options | Response Count |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| (see below) | 163 |
| Skipped question | 299 |

Answers:

| |
|--|
| Plans for future job responsibilities and roles. |
| Opportunities for the future year |
| Funding issues |
| Possibility of seeking promotion through the dossier preparation process. |
| My supervisor will ask what items I believe s/he can improve upon to aide work process that will benefit the entire unit. We often discuss "what if" scenarios; and we discuss pro's and con's of overall operational aspects of the department to assess needs and improvements that benefit the whole operation of the department. |
| Future project and program plans. These are often grant directed. |
| New, innovative ideas for programming. |
| University benefits. |
| How I can be more of an asset to Penn State. |
| Administrative responsibilities |
| Committee involvement |
| My concerns about where our lab is doing, how we can improve service to clients, the relationship of the SRDP to any salary increase or lack thereof. |
| How irrelevant and useless these performance forms are. |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| |
|--|
| Shortcomings mainly. Not always considering the "why" of things always turning out as planned and the additional "as needed" things that come up that need immediate attention. |
| The coming year's action plan. |
| Affirmative Action issues |
| We always discuss what needs to be done to improve the service we provide to the funding agency. |
| Areas of emphasis |
| Fill out action plan/accomplishments and give to supervisor. Supervisor fills out form. Usually hands it to me ahead of time. Meet for short period of time. Any questions. Sign form. Meeting over. |
| The operation of the department and issues that have or may arise at the research farm or other areas of my responsibilities. |
| A general discussion of how the program area is evolving and where it might go in the future |
| Ideas to improve current processes |
| What the future looks like. |
| The office in general |
| General needs to improve the unit's performance Any changes needed in other staff action plans |
| Office morale |
| I feel that my supervisor doesn't use the time as efficiently as he should to talk about my job performance, and suggestions for improvement. He always seems to ramble on about other issues pertaining to our section. |
| General items related to the job and issues in the overall program. |
| Challenges to be addressed in the coming year or other issues. |
| Who I have to cover for now on account of downsizing. I don't just do my job - I do 3 people's job and so we always have to discuss how that is working out! |
| Equipment needs |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| |
|--|
| Leadership and responsibilities within the unit |
| How to continue working around staff shortages |
| Talk about other staff. |
| Trainings, team work, frustrations and positive team work |
| Any problems I need help with. |
| My goals for the coming year |
| Interactions between group members |
| All the negative aspects that my supervisor dislikes about my program and me. |
| Opportunities to attend conferences What type of professional development opportunities to seek out. Personal development -- educational opportunities to meet other interests |
| Personal strengths and weaknesses. |
| What equipment do I need to do my job. Ideas on improving the unit. |
| Discussions on department-wide changes and developing commitments. |
| Anything that has come up in the past year, or past several years, as well as upcoming issues. |
| Future big tasks that may come up. |
| Goals/objectives for the upcoming year |
| Cost recovery opportunities. Objectives related to my grant funding |
| General programmatic discussions |
| I have no clue. What a waste of time. |
| Don't usually remember. |
| Chit chat, time filler to make the meeting last longer so my supervisor can say there was a "positive" meeting. |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| |
|--|
| Weather, office politics, the general perception that the SRDP process is a charade in our department |
| Problems that impacted my job Personnel issues |
| Office interactions/management and community relations |
| Current accomplishments; Personal professional needs; Attendance; Participation in activities for the good of the organization; Caspar |
| Future directions for our entire team and how my work facilitates those directions. |
| Interpersonal skills and how to communicate with others in the department, but conflict resolution on their part is all wrong. I get reprimanded for things beyond my control with regards to faculty members. |
| Opportunities for new programming |
| My goals both short and long term, and other things I would like to learn/do that may not be in my job description. |
| Unfortunately, if there's been a problem, my supervisor tends to focus on that and may skim by the positive accomplishments. |
| General goals for the organization and how I can take on more duties. There is discussion of how we can find money to hire another person to take on some of my present duties allowing me time for some different responsibilities. |
| Goals for the next year Possible program collaborations within my work unit and with the community. Any needs or assistance I may have to accomplish my goals |
| Case load |
| Personal factors that may relate to my performance. Office and personnel factors that influence productivity within the office. |
| Staffing issues, and current trends (political, financial, etc) that affect job climate and skill set needed for successful completion of my job responsibilities. |
| We discuss the supervisor comments on performance and suggestions. These are provided to us in advanced so we can have an informed discussion. |
| How to align action plans and accomplishment better. Constructive criticism and brainstorming ways to make the job better. |
| Brainstorming to modify or extend current programs. |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| |
|---|
| Upcoming projects for the next year. |
| Current office issues. |
| Goals for coming year. Ideas and thoughts I have concerning my position, our local office and Extension in general. |
| How many action plan pieces I have and that it is a lot and those are just the ones that are common from year to year - I can have an event, meeting or conference added at any point - which could add tremendous work to an already overloaded person. |
| The influence my performance has on our group. |
| Problems with other coworkers |
| Challenges faced during the year. Although these are also discussed in bi-weekly meetings throughout the year, time is taken to summarize actions taken and plans for the coming year. |
| How to meet the overall goals of the office versus the individual goals of specific positions How to meet personal/professional individual goals Possible professional development opportunities for the upcoming year |
| Usually the supervisor fills out form. I review what was said, we meet and may or may not discuss the form. There have been years where I sign without any meeting. I usually write what I did for professional development but it never discussed what I may want to do. |
| My supervisor reinforces the need to properly format and archive my annual reviews to allow the ACTS dossier process to run smoothly. How my job description could be improved to better reflect my contributions to my School and College. |
| Organizational goals and direction Family Time Balancing with work |
| I AM BUDGET MINDED AND TRY TO KEEP A TIGHT REIGN ON MY SPENDING, LETTING THE OFFICE ALWAYS KNOW WHERE I AM, KEEPING MY MILEAGE DOWN BY DOING PROGRAMS IN THE SAME AREA WHEN POSSIBLE. MAKING SURE THE INFORMATION I AM GIVING IS CORRECT. ETC. |
| The focus is on the weaknesses. |
| Future goals and benchmarks of performance |
| Plans for the coming year and "best efforts" to reach underserved populations. |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| |
|--|
| Any current job issues as it relates to the work I am responsible for. |
| Any other items we think are important to discuss. Future plans. |
| Just overall program and what can be done to improve the program. |
| Accomplishments of staff that report to me |
| Suggestions to improve the work flow within the work unit. |
| Job satisfaction Cooperation between staff members/volunteers Funding /cost recovery issues |
| % raise that will be given |
| Time involved in community-based collaborations as it relates to my job/action plan |
| Accomplishments |
| Nothing really -- just gets recorded as a "meeting". |
| How things are going with the job in general. Often it involves funding issues because I have a year to year contract. |
| Additional items may be personnel related - ex. office politics, etc. , relationships within the office. |
| We also discuss future goals of the project and what aspects of my position will help to achieve these goals. |
| What we are planning for the upcoming year. |
| Frustrations related to system. |
| None. |
| How to get funding to keep the position going |
| What my job responsibilities are as my job is in constant change |
| Plans for coming year including priorities. |
| Office related issues and ways in which my supervisor can assist in my plans for the upcoming program year. |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| |
|--|
| Any possible changes that may apply to my position. |
| My health, as it relates to my performance. Other staff in the department. |
| Supervisor discusses with me new duties that will be appointed to me in the following year. |
| Supervisor presents challenges to me for the upcoming year. Areas where I may be able to develop new opportunities. |
| Over 20+ years - a variety of issues - depends on the personality of the supervisor. |
| The effectiveness of the office atmosphere, support received throughout the year, staff relations, etc. |
| I supervise other staff so we talk about some staff members I need to work with more closely. |
| Changing focus within the university and how that may impact my particular area of community education focus. Team player efforts and appreciation thereof; expansion of my educational efforts on how to document local affirmative action efforts, i.e.. offer to take it to adjacent counties as my local schedule permits. |
| I have only had a primary meeting with my supervisor because I have not been here for a full year yet. |
| Goals and opportunities for upcoming year. |
| Changes in the program if we are aware of any in the near future. |
| Last year, there were negative comments that were not my fault. I finally got brave and brought it to my supervisor's attention that the comments were not fair and they were not my fault. Those comments were then removed from my performance review. |
| Personal goals |
| Programming trends and future needs |
| Review of what has happened during the year that changed the program thrusts or action plans How to improve on some of the items identified as needing improvement Written follow up to what is discussed in the review |
| Goals and priorities for the upcoming year |
| What we are going to do for the next year. |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

| |
|--|
| Funding situation for coming year--i.e., how likely am I to still have a position? |
| How I feel things are going in our group, what issues or problems I see or have. What do I think we could do as a group to improve. What do I think the goals of our group should be? What can the faculty do to help meet goals and make my job experience better. |
| Future direction of programs, funding issues |
| Any problems or concerns that I may have in my current work environment...people or otherwise. |
| Ask about their performance as supervisor |
| Dilemmas in securing support and or funding to keep a program and position in the county. |
| Unfortunately, anonymous feedback is requested from others in the department about an individual's performance. This anonymous feedback has trended toward "revenge" and negative feedback that becomes a part of the review. The anonymous feedback is unchallenged and is considered true. I am certain that staff use this against other staff members. |
| Future direction for the program. Suggestions for enhanced participation from clientele |
| Do not have a meeting unless I have a question. |
| suggestions for next year, support I get from him in accomplishing the suggestions, actions I have done that went beyond my duties to help the department. |
| External issues but which tie into my job |
| Future projects for our Center. |
| Everything negative for the year. |
| Office issues |
| Any other things that might have impacted my work in the past year (health, family); other administrative priorities |
| Very difficult to recall - Have only had one in 13 years. |
| Suggesting infrastructure changes related to my job that I have or will be initiating. |

10. What additional items, other than those listed in #9, do you discuss in your performance review meeting?

Specific strategies or needed changes in office logistics to accomplish agreed upon goals for the upcoming year.
 Explanations of why certain goals from the current or past year were not accomplished.

Things that can help to perform my job better, etc.

Extra responsibilities that are helpful to the research station.

This may vary from year to year. These would be specific indicators of the above items, perhaps.

Discuss any questions, problems, and what we would like to see accomplished during the next year.

Work climate of our office and unit.

Accountability

Weaknesses, problems, problems elsewhere in the unit unrelated to my position. Problems from many years gone by not related to the particular year being reviewed. Meetings are not particularly focused. Some years I have had multiple supervisors, but not all of them attend the review meeting. In two instances, the annual review meeting was not held by the supervisor to whom I directly report. (That's not good.)

Opportunities for affirmative action

Plans for the future.

Future plans.

My supervisors always ask me if there is anything that they can do to help me or if I have had any problems with anything in the past year. They are always very supportive of me.

Overall job climate in the office. Suggestions to enhance the office and department work environment. My supervisor also encourages me to discuss my job satisfaction level and what if anything may need to be done to improve overall satisfaction.

Additional factors for evaluation.

Office climate (This is usually one of the few times I feel I can openly express my thoughts about the negative atmosphere in the office and what can or should be done to help it more)

I share updates on my current active projects.

11. Do you have more than one formal performance review meeting a year with your supervisor?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes | 16.74% | 76 |
| No | 83.26% | 378 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 8 |

12. When does your supervisor provide you with an overall performance evaluation rating?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| During the performance review meeting | 67.83% | 312 |
| At a later date | 24.35% | 112 |
| Doesn't provide me the overall performance rating | 2.39% | 11 |
| Other (please specify) | 5.43% | 25 |
| Skipped question | | 2 |

13. What is your understanding of how the overall performance evaluation rating is used? Check all that apply.

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Communication | 53.07% | 242 |
| Salary increase | 76.97% | 351 |
| Coaching | 36.62% | 167 |
| Other (please specify) see below | 18.64% | 85 |
| Skipped question | | 6 |

Other:

| |
|---|
| Hopefully all above |
| Just because these are part of understanding doesn't mean I know how they actually affect me |
| Never explained what this is used for. |
| There seems to be NO relationship between overall performance rating and a salary increase. If you do an excellent job, you receive 3%; if your job performance is fair or so-so you receive 21/2%. Is this fair??? The SRDP in our case is NOT used properly |
| They seemed to be tied to nothing. |
| Definitely not salary!!! |
| Discuss what needs to be done to best serve the needs of the funding agency. |
| Salary increase is alleged |
| Staying employed! |
| Not sure |

13. What is your understanding of how the overall performance evaluation rating is used? Check all that apply.

| |
|--|
| Positive ratings are hardly looked at. Negative ratings are used to terminate employees. |
| Not sure |
| Quota |
| Personnel issues within the office -- how to be a better team based on individual accomplishments/goals |
| Arbitrary number that must be sent to HR and useful for ACTS |
| Not sure |
| Assessing support of strategic plans |
| Not sure. |
| I have lately come to understand that it affects salary increment. I did not know that for a long time. |
| Not sure |
| Nothing |
| Salary increase appears to be a formula. |
| Paperwork for HR |
| Dust off and update meaningless paperwork. |
| It is not used - the process and the documents become important when due, and are then ignored again. |
| Although communication and coaching are nice terms, the money issue is always the driving force because we have what the "average" salary increase it. |
| To determine the employees personal professional needs and growth. |
| An annual summary of my accomplishments and performance, as well as a springboard for future plans. |
| In theory I've heard it's for salary increase, but in reality I don't think it matters. |
| Human Resource Decisions including transfer and promotion |

13. What is your understanding of how the overall performance evaluation rating is used? Check all that apply.

| |
|--|
| Don't know - none given |
| Retention of employment |
| Just a way of saying you're either doing a good job/ok job/or bad job |
| No |
| I have found it makes no difference when it comes to pay. Actually I have found that it causes tension amongst the staff assistants because they somehow find out what each of them rates. Since the process all depends on who your supervisor is, then I think it may be flawed. |
| To understand how all the positions within our office contribute to the overall mission of our office |
| It is my understanding that the rating is used to determine how much one's annual salary will increase if any. I have received ratings from "4" to "5" and my raises have ranged from 3% to 4%. Sometimes a rating of "Exceeds Performance Expectations" does not merit an annual pay raise greater than 3%. |
| No relevance |
| Feedback of performance. Salaries do not seemed to be linked to performance |
| Defining salary increases by department head. |
| I have no understanding |
| I don't think it means anything and has very little or no merit |
| I have no idea what the purpose is or what it is used for -- I would like to know. |
| Professional development |
| Not sure |
| A measure of where I should be with my performance. Even after 16 years, my position has no chance of promotion. |
| Establishing priorities |

13. What is your understanding of how the overall performance evaluation rating is used? Check all that apply.

| |
|--|
| Not sure how it will be used ultimately as I am on contract.... |
| * It does not effect salary increase. Salary increase is static and does not cover COL. * it supports communication at a basic level, * it allows my supervisor to glimpse what I do on a regular basis. |
| To satisfy university requirements |
| Sometimes it relates to salary increases, but not always - you never know. |
| I believe the intent or the original intent of the evaluation was to be a tool, a resource. Any tool in the wrong hands has the potential to be a device, a method of torture. |
| I have not seen evidence that it is used at all, but have not been here long enough to fully develop my opinion |
| To be honest I really don't know. Like I stated before if I am being evaluated and penalized because I did not take much training then the evaluations seem useless to me. |
| Review of how well the Action plan worked - realism. |
| I honestly don't think it is used at all. |
| Not sure. Seems to be used subjectively. |
| I don't think it means anything other than a number...in our dept it doesn't make a difference between the people that get a 3 or a 5...it should be reflected in the increases, but it's not |
| Pointless actually. |
| Technically, I have always been told that rating is linked to salary increase. Informally, I understand that a poor rating would indicate upcoming termination, while a good one makes no actual difference in salary increase--you get your cost of living raise but nothing more until you have met promotion criteria and gone through the promotion process. |
| Does not mean anything-People of all different ratings end up getting the same raise |
| Motivation - appreciation for the work done |
| To influence the ability to get another job at PSU |

13. What is your understanding of how the overall performance evaluation rating is used? Check all that apply.

| |
|--|
| A formal process that must be done as required by PSU policy. |
| Doesn't really count as anything but a formality. |
| Promotion |
| Achievement of objectives, work. |
| It doesn't appear to be used for anything, since we don't meet and discuss it with anyone. |
| To ensure the employee is an active member of their employment group. |
| Not sure there is a direct correlation of ratings and % of salary increase. |
| Documentation |
| Promotion |
| My director has claimed that the score received does not reflect our raises. Therefore, receiving a five is impossible, unless my immediate supervisor will not change it. |
| Does not seem to affect anything those with low rating get the same raise as those with high reviews. |
| It seems to be approached more as a fulfillment of HR expectations - going through the motions, rather than as the tool it's intended to be. The process is designed fine; it's just not followed! |
| To determine if a PIQ should be done |
| Performance reviews have nothing to do with salary increases, unfortunately. |
| Good question, answers above are assumed. |
| I presume by "communication" you mean communicating an overall performance score to let me know how I'm doing within my office and also within the department. |
| Ideally the above factors are to be used; however, they're not...realistically, it's those closest to the \$pot\$ that are rewarded while others are deemed in the background and get overlooked. |

14. Do you think your annual performance review was a fair and accurate assessment of your performance?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Yes | 81.51% | 366 |
| No | 18.49% | 83 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 13 |

15. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for Supervisors? Check all that apply.

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| SRDP process | 52.07% | 189 |
| Conducting Performance Reviews | 63.64% | 231 |
| Action Plans/Job Descriptions | 57.85% | 210 |
| Other (please specify) | 23.97% | 87 |
| Skipped question | | 99 |

| |
|--|
| Don't know |
| I really feel the tool itself needs to be revised to be more meaningful. The questions are rather nebulous and don't connect readily to performance activities. |
| Not sure what the college could do, have supers attend programs conducted by staff |
| Supervisory skills, communicating well, empowerment and engagement of employees, playing nicely with others. Breaking micro-management habits. |
| Dossier preparation |
| I believe that all supervisors should attend an HRDC supervisory session each year. This prevents complacency and narrow mindedness. Life/work balances affect the work place and Life/work circumstances evolved into different situations over 2-3 year periods. I believe supervisors owe it to the department s/he serves as well as to those s/he supervises to be proficient in exercising their supervisory duties. |
| I have no recommendations |
| Using the SRDP in the appropriate way, e.g. to evaluate strengths and areas where an employee needs to improve performance so that a decent salary increase (if appropriate) can be given. |

15. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for Supervisors? Check all that apply.

| |
|---|
| I have been to the above mentioned trainings and found them all to be very helpful |
| Develop a planning and performance reporting system that is not redundant or punitive |
| Employee recourse when the model is not followed or adhered to |
| How to prepare a measurable performance review with written agreed upon goals and indicators. |
| As with other situations, the faculty is very busy and probably not attend these. |
| Consistent rules to follow and enforcement of those guidelines. penalties for partiality |
| Supporting Performance Goals |
| Communication skills Motivation as it applies to this process |
| The SRDP process has no value when your supervisor knows nothing of your program area. I would be better served if my supervisor was a plumber! |
| Practicing objective review of ALL staff. Positive reinforcement, and not focus on shortcomings. |
| Any courses or workshops that offer supervisors help in improving their communication skills with employees. |
| not sure |
| No clue. This is a useless process. |
| I'm really not sure of this question. |
| Do away with this system. |
| Instruction on how to be a good supervisor? How to coach, reward the positive and criticize in a more positive manner. Treat employees as they would like to be treated instead of do as I say! |
| Time management Project Management |
| How to treat people nicely, with courtesy and respect. Don't belittle them. |
| How to make it useful. |
| Organizational Behavior |

15. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for Supervisors? Check all that apply.

| |
|--|
| Until supervisors and unit leaders accept the process as valuable no amount of training will enhance the system in the departments where is not valued. |
| All these should be consistently offered/taught to Supervisors. If these are not reinforced, it is very unfair to the employee. |
| Making evaluations fair and non-biased. |
| The workshops should be voluntary. More experienced supervisors know how to conduct performance reviews. |
| None |
| SRDP - what does the "number" really mean? |
| Please provide revisions ASAP so we may have this information prior to needing it to be completed. |
| None |
| For those working in Extension, reporting under the POW process and reporting through the SRDP process are redundant. There should be some way to link efforts so items would not have to be repeated. |
| The problem I see, is that unless the supervisor is held accountable for attending a workshop, that most would not take the time since it is not of high priority in the work load of faculty. All stated workshops would be of use to a supervisor. |
| Addressing staff appropriately with respect and dignity. Approaching the review as an opportunity for focusing on growth and reflection. Not approaching this time for negativity and belittling. Understanding the importance of positive feedback for accomplishments from the preceding year and constructively developing a plan for improvement for the future. |
| The relationships between CASPAR entries and work plans and performance reviews. |
| None |
| I don't understand the question |
| None |
| Dealing with employee apathy |
| Coaching on how to document/deal with unsatisfactory performance |
| An understanding that he should be obligated to attend one of my workshops or classes throughout the year. He shows no interest. I could say anything about the project if I were inclined to be dishonest...which I am not. |

15. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for Supervisors? Check all that apply.

| |
|--|
| I'm not sure. If the supervisor is new, then the above would help them, but if the supervisor is in the position for a long time, the above would not help at all. |
| Some things wouldn't have to be workshop or could be in addition to...they could be fact sheets which would likely reach more folks. How to effectively supervise such as: How to provide effective feedback throughout the year. The positive effects of providing positive feedback in addition to expressing concerns. The benefits of balancing the necessary drudgery work with interesting/challenging, even fun work. How to stay on the same page in terms of priorities. Working effectively with people who are different than one's self. How to work with an employee to develop a plan to rectify a problem area. |
| A workshop would not fix what is broken. The problem with the whole process is that different supervisors are evaluating different employees and sometimes this is related to annual salary increases. There is nothing fair about that process and it needs to stop immediately. The review process is a good idea and can be beneficial to both parties if they go in to it with a positive attitude, but the overall rating should either be eliminated as it relates to salary increases or simplified to the point where a rating of 3 - 5 will not make a difference in anyone's annual raise. |
| Leadership, particularly by example, responsibility, work ethic. |
| I do not think there is anything that would or could change it! The system is not fair. |
| Motivating individuals, giving negative information in a positive manner - that will inspire rather than defeat. |
| For supervisors - how we view physical presence at the office vs. getting the job done. |
| Our current CED did an excellent review; I don't know how effective the other CED's are/were so I cannot comment on need for a workshop about "conducting" reviews; obviously it would be a useful item for any newly appointed CED. |
| Assessing actual impacts that do not fit pre-set categories |
| Rewarding employees for review grades of 5 |
| The whole process is pretty pointless. My boss knows what I do, and how hard I work, so what does filling out some form have to do with that? |
| This isn't really a workshop, but I think a supervisor should attend at least one program per year for each staff person. I've been in the county for two annual reviews, my supervisor has never "seen me in action". Everything in the SRDP is based on my written accomplishments and our review. |

15. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for Supervisors? Check all that apply.

| |
|--|
| Workshops that would teach Regional Directors and the Director of Extension to appreciate the work of the employees! |
| I recommend that you put the employee input page into the personnel records instead of the one sided OPINIONS of ONLY the supervisor, especially when NO ACTION plan was EVER made to begin with and the accomplishments are completely ignored in the evaluation. I never saw any job description for my position. It was created for me when I was wage payroll so I didn't apply to an announcement. Provided my supervisor FAR too much license to decide retroactively what I 'should' have been doing and how. |
| Mid-year performance feedback sessions. how to motivate employees. |
| Coaching techniques and an all staff session for planning for the year and how staff can help each other |
| Coaching throughout the year for maximum effectiveness - people shouldn't have to wait a year to find out they are not meeting expectations |
| Standardization across units |
| I think it's important to have face-to-face meetings to discuss the SRDP after the supervisor submits input. |
| This year is the first year (and I've worked at Penn State for 15 years) that I've felt that my evaluation meeting and rating was an accurate assessment of my performance. Every other year the person who controlled my final evaluation score had very little comprehension of what I did/how I performed my job. There must be a fairer way to do this, to ensure that those who do exemplary jobs are recognized, and those who "talk the talk" but don't actually do the work are rewarded. I'm not sure if a workshop would help - possibly educating the person who gives the actual scores. |
| My supervisor needs no further instruction |
| Difficult-situation role-play: what to do if an employee won't sign; how to be professional when you have to give bad news (low rating) to an employee |
| Supervisory training - how to motivate employees and create a positive work environment - how to eliminate favoritism to increase morale and get the most from staff - how to manage staff fairly/equally |
| If it's implemented it should be a required process by all directors. |
| The SRDP process doesn't need to be improved, it needs to be replaced. |

15. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for Supervisors? Check all that apply.

| |
|---|
| None. Waste of time. Review has nothing to do with salary increases. For the most part, everyone gets the same raise, regardless of overall performance rating. Gives HR something to do. |
| Tips on approaching it from a coaching point of view rather than a judgment point of view. |
| "From Impediment to Improvement": How to turn the SRDP process from a once-a-year inconvenience and obligation to an effective tool for improving your unit's overall performance and job satisfaction. |
| How to stop wasting my time on writing up the paperwork and let me do my job. They don't get used for anything-we haven't had a decent raise over health care premiums in 3 years now! |
| The value of SRDPs in the ACTS process |
| Application of the process to accomplishments, growth and development. Moving through the for the sake of moving through the process seems wasteful to me. |
| What do the performance scores mean - 1-5; how to address variability among supervisors - some give all fives, some give no fives; overall stability would be nice. I am a supervisor, but I have also had four supervisors and SIX action plans in the last three years, but no change in job title or SPEC grade. I have had reviews over-ridden to prevent giving an employee a (deserved) "2" because that person was an ACTS participant. Suitability for ACTS was the determining factor, not the employee's (poor) performance--therefore my supervisors didn't want one bad year score to affect the employee's five year track record, thus depriving me, the supervisor, of this corrective option, followed by the required HR-78 letter. The SRDP process is fine, but a stable evaluation instrument amid an unstable department with a frequently changing vision and approach can only do so much. |
| Simplify the Action Plan process (take it out of CASPAR) and use the same format that is used for promotion. |
| Teaching employees to understand how their performance review and goal planning fits into the larger plan for the university and their department. |
| Better knowledge on how to increase an excellent performers salary - less use of anonymous what "they" will allow. |

15. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for Supervisors? Check all that apply.

I'm not sure. I am a supervisor and I don't have a problem with the process. It is pretty straight forward. I think there are issues on how supervisors feel about giving 4s and 5s. There are some folks that regardless of performance will never give a person a 5. I think that approach is wrong. I have given 5s to people that do a great job and I think they can be rewarded that way. My feeling is if you will never give a 5 why should they be motivated to do better. I'm not sure how you can get around that.

My supervisor takes the process seriously and does a very thorough, competent review. I believe she has taken a number of classes/workshops already on this topic.

Supv/Admin in charge be made more aware of and consider those down the chain of need to reward those individuals as well.

What happens if a low score is given? I would hope that it doesn't make the supervisor look bad, so a more fair assessment can be given.

Workplace Safety Establishing Positive Workplaces Supervisory Skills for Supervisors

16. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for non-supervisory staff?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Action Plans/Job Descriptions | 85.49% | 271 |
| Other (please specify) | 25.55% | 81 |
| Skipped question | | 145 |

| |
|--|
| None needed |
| More description on each section of what is required on each part of the SRDP. There really is none on the form. |
| Interacting with supervisors that use an industrial age top-down approach to the office environment. Working positively and proactively with the micro-manager. |
| Workshops showing the consequences of poor supervisory, or ill informed supervision. Instill the supervisor with the fact that s/he can make a significant difference in the work unit's work climate, turn over, job satisfaction, communication, professional development of subordinates, and etc. by understanding and following Penn State's SRDP and Action Plan tools. IF possible, I believe our college should require all supervisors to attend supervisory sessions on a regular basis. |
| Supervisory responsibilities and job descriptions. |
| Why don't you insist on the SRDP being used in the correct way? You are only asking the questions you want answered Why is there no place in this survey for employees to voice concerns? |
| Conducting Performance Reviews and SRDP Process |
| A reporting system that works with training on the use. System should be self explanatory...current system is open for too much leeway and not all folks are consistent or held to the same standard. |
| I think going over the SRDP process for staff would be a good idea. |

16. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for non-supervisory staff?

| |
|---|
| Have action plans from people who are willing to share be examples on how to do it. Most examples at meetings are so elemental that you have a hard time relating to your job. Many jobs are complex and how do you relate that complexity. |
| Won't make a difference |
| Impact Evaluation and Reporting |
| Value statements and how they can be developed and incorporated. |
| No clue. This is a useless process. A real waste of my time and my supervisors time. |
| Total Quality Management Techniques |
| Time management Project management |
| How to deal with difficult people. |
| Preparing for performance review |
| Relationship of specific performance factors to salary issues. |
| Job impacts. |
| Understanding of the system, how it relates to employees performance and salary increase. What are the expectation of the CoAs & University regarding the SRDP process? |
| Training non-supervisory staff in how the process should work provides only frustration when the process is of no consequence to leadership. |
| Communication with your manager/supervisor. How to get your work noticed. |
| SRDP Process |
| We could do with a few less meetings/workshops. Let me know what is expected and address problems if and when they arise |
| None, except for a beginning workers' orientation. |

16. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for non-supervisory staff?

| |
|---|
| Action Plans/Job Descriptions seem like daunting tasks. Perhaps meeting with offices individual during a workshop that would allow them to start writing during the workshop so that experts can provide guidance. If we participate in a workshop that doesn't allow us to use the knowledge in a meaningful way, it is less likely that we would go back to our office and write the desk job descriptions. |
| SRDP - what does the "number" really mean? |
| Besides action plan, have non specific SRDP examples for each category of employees -clerical, for each grade, administrative, etc. |
| “Developing an Outstanding SRDP for Review.” I want to feel more confident with my skills at developing or preparing the appropriate information for my annual SRDP. I receive no guidance from my supervisor. If I were to approach him, he would expect me to complete this on my own. I actually become physically ill when preparing for my review. I cannot approach my supervisor with my concerns for fear of being demeaned or ridiculed. |
| Using the SRDP process to identify training opportunities or training needs. |
| The relationships between CASPAR entries and work plans and performance reviews. |
| How to write one |
| How to integrate CASPAR info directly into the SRDP without a lot of time consuming repetition of the same results. This is a PAIN. |
| Support in writing PIC |
| SRDP process |
| How to solicit useful feedback on a regular basis. How to encourage one's supervisor to provide interesting/challenging work. |
| Possibly written examples |
| Explain how the document is used within the University. |
| How much detail is desired |

16. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for non-supervisory staff?

| |
|--|
| SRDP Process |
| How to interpret feedback from a more positive perspective. |
| How to gain skills/knowledge needed to advance position or advance to another position |
| Assessing actual impacts that do not fit pre-set categories |
| English! writing in complete sentences with correct sentence structure. |
| A workshop that actually demonstrates what to include in and how to prepare our accomplishment reports. There was a change in the format this year with minimum, if any, coaching from the supervisors on the "acceptable" way to complete them. |
| The SRDP process as well - the steps involved, how the evaluation rating effects raises, etc. |
| Managing Your Performance Review (HRDC Offering) |
| How to accurately report so we are all on the same page |
| Dossier Preparation |
| The entire SRDP process is a bit overwhelming and confusing. It would be nice to know what happens to them after they are completed. Does anyone at the College level review them? |
| Held as often as needed, especially for our new employees (maybe our older ones too! |
| The SRDP process doesn't need to be improved, it needs to be replaced. |
| Record keeping strategies to aid in the completion of the SRDP sections when the time comes. |
| Get rid of your SRDP process and let me get back to my work. |
| How to write these up to achieve the biggest effect possible. |
| Completing the SRDP documents each year. |

16. What workshops do you recommend be offered in the College that would improve our SRDP process for non-supervisory staff?

As stated before, some sense of how the numbers are applied, and what function they serve. If there is no great salary difference between a 3 and a 5, why should a supervisor subject him/herself and the employee to otherwise needless social awkwardness? If a supervisor doesn't feel free--or get supported by his or her supervisor--to award a corrective low grade, or feels coerced into giving only 4's and 5's, it does little to either address wrongs or reward good performances. It's easier to give a good grade and avoid the fallout. Grade inflation has hit more than just classrooms: employees who receive a 3 "meets performance expectations" feel as if they are being spanked. It "feels" like a "C" when in fact, it's a "B" or even an "A".

SRDP Process

This is especially important for new employees.

I believe the workshops now offered are sufficient.

How to best highlight your achievements over the past year and what constitutes "above and beyond"?

Effective Writing or Writing for Impact

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

| Answer options | Response Count |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| (see below) | 134 |
| Skipped question | 328 |

Answer:

Revise the tool. Connect more strongly to merit salary increases. Make sure those being evaluated have a chance to review the comments before having to sign the document. My supervisor seemed surprised that I wanted to read the document before signing it and even more surprised when I wanted a copy for my files.

Institute 360 Evaluations

Increase the number of rating options. 1 and 2 are basically for low performers and are not available for most staff. 5 is the highest and staff occasionally achieve that level of performance. That leaves 3 and 4 to be used for most staff.

Link with salary adjustment. Seems like positive actions should be rewarded. Not sure it is worth the effort. Boss can tell me anytime how I am doing not just once a year.

Thanks for asking!

I believe our college does a great job of helping individuals navigate the SRDP process. To raise awareness of staff annual review process, maybe quarterly emails to supervisors encouraging them to meet with the staff they supervise. These emails should encourage supervisors to talk about successes and areas that need to improve.

The only improvement I have is to give the highest rating to those of us who deserve it. I'm told that to get a 5 out of 5 is impossible in my department. Thus, I always get a 4 but I feel that I'm deserve a 5. I don't know why they even have a 5 if we can never achieve it??

Clarify the relationship between performance rating and salary increases.

Actual performance on the job other than reports and paperwork are not evaluated. The people the staff interact with should be asked about our interaction with them.

Simplify the reporting process.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

USE the SRDP in the correct way!!!! Why is this so hard to understand???

Think of some way to make these discussion relevant to someone that has been in the same position for years and intends to stay there.

Change the questions. Some are the same question but asked differently and each year I find I am copying and pasting my answers.

Training for employees and supervisors

The SRDP does appear to be linked to the Action Plans. The SRDP and Action Plans should be done together - review of last years AP during the SRDP mtg. and preparation of next year's AP at the same mtg. This would ensure that accomplishments would be measured against plans and any changes needed would be reflected against next year's AP. Further, the 1-5 scale for employee evaluation is not satisfactory. The guidelines are not well understood by supervisors or employees. Does a 3 mean that an employee is "average" or that they are meeting the requirements of the job. If the latter, then 80% of the college should be receiving 3's. However I suspect that 80% are receiving 4s or 5s. If that is the case then how can supervisors take the proper employee actions when staff are not meeting the expectations of their jobs. This really needs to be addressed.

Decide at which level the decision is made on performance appraisal. Is it my immediate supervisor or that persons' superior (2 levels above me)?

1) Utilize other or better people to lead the training sessions; same people lead each year and use similar simplistic examples that don't apply to all staff. 2) not necessary to complete SRDPs each year, especially since the pay increase percentage does not always correlate with performance evaluation (i.e., all employees in a certain unit get the same pay raise.) 3) some employees are already doing many and various activities (both work related and beyond) and still the SRDP requires us to list even more activities.

In our department, the supervisors are not encouraged to give ratings of 4. In fact, they are discouraged from doing this. If a supervisor recommends someone to receive a rating of 4, the department head most likely will NOT give this as the final rating, and the supervisor will be asked to change the rating. I think this is flawed because someone who does no work with you on a daily basis has the ultimate power in deciding your final rating. Further, the funding for our project comes from outside with the department with the maximum raise amount figured into the budget. However, given that the department head decides the rating, we can never receive the maximum amount of raises allowable by the budget.

Keep it simple, clear, and measurable.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

If faculty supervisors would be graded on their ability to supervise etc, it may become more important.

Let it be optional !! Change the format of it more to the union review form. You could still have optional blocks or areas if the employee or supervisor wanted to add additional input. Overall, SRDPs are a pain to do for both the employee and supervisor.

Make it a legitimate process

Fix the problem! Supervision should be by program area. The current County/Region system is provincial and only serves the traditional culture of Extension Education. In this current day and age, it is an impediment to the mission of Extension Education and erodes the professional equity of those trying to do their job!

It seems to me that there should be some relationship between the SRDP process and the promotion system. I'm not saying that as an Extension person we should not go through the dossier process but the SRDPs should also come into play and provide additional value to the process. Also there is such a time disconnect between when the SRDP is completed and when the raises actually occur that the time and effort that goes into the SRDP is not really associated with a the benefit of a pay raise.

More direct access to SRDP form on the HR Web site for all staff (not just under ACTS)

Annual review of Extension Directors to provide to their supervisors

I support the use of the SRDP process for giving feedback and coaching, but I don't believe that salary increases should be tied to the rating. In 2004 & 2005, I received the first "significantly exceeds expectations" (the old 5s) that I'd ever gotten (before that, it was always 4s). In 2006, I performed more strongly than ever, and was responsible for the receipt of several significant grants to Extension, and yet I received a 4+. When I carefully questioned my supervisor, I was told that "she had to pass the monetary increases around to others" so I had done 5 work, again, but she could only give me a 4+ on the books. I would have rather received the 5, with the understanding that others would receive the raises. The actual "significantly exceeds" on my record would have been reward enough!

Better raises. Salaries are not competitive or rewarding for the amount of work required for filed based extension positions.

Drop the number! I think it is just fine to categorize a person's work as meeting expectations, exceeds expectations, etc. I have seen that the numbers have an effect on some employees and some supervisors. I had heard years ago from a County Extension Director that "No one gets a 5". Then why have a 5. Drop the numbers. Measure performance in the various areas and then sum up the performance/expectations.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

The SRDP process needs to more closely match the promotion process and the CASPAR reporting requirements.

Decide what data are really desirable for reporting and reduce the time we are spending on the process. Eliminate CASPAR and incorporate all our reporting into one system.

Eliminate it.

Have some type of review that relates to the job. This system is way to generic. It doesn't allow for job specific evaluation nor does it allow for people who work long hours meaning lots of overtime. This system evaluates people as though they work the same hours and have the same conditions.

- Synchronize reporting for SRDP with CASPAR. - Design "one entry" system where staff enter data once and can be used for multiple reporting purposes.

I think the SRDP process needs to be simplified. Every time the process has been revised, it has become more complex. We spend more time reporting than working with the programming and our clientele.

Those who supervise should learn to encourage and motivate their employees.

The 1 to 5 scale is very limiting when comparing numerous staff...

IMPROVE the form. Make it a data base so that we can use the information to create our accomplishment reports for our dossiers.

Change it completely. Do something entirely new. This doesn't work at all.

The key issue that I've had with the SRDP process is that it originally started as a way to simply assess, mentor and improve performance. SRDPs BECAME key components of the whole ACTS process WELL after that fact and are now used in an unbalanced and biased way for final ACTS selection... WHICH WASN'T EVER THEIR ORIGINAL INTENT.

Stop it.

The employee should be allowed to first tell the supervisor all they have accomplished before being told what number they have been rated. If the rating is already given why discuss the accomplishments from the previous year?

Look at two books: Joy at Work by Dennis Bakke (former CEO of AES energy company) cf.

http://www.aes.com/aes/index?page=culture_and_values One Minute Manager - the section on a job description that can be reviewed in one minute.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

The SRDP process is a HUGE time waster

It is a very good process. Unfortunately, most of the action plans on the STATE POWs do not always apply to urban areas.

Stop doing it. Performance doesn't matter. Raises are pre-calculated and minimal. Above-average performance is not noticed or rewarded.

Overall there is only so much money to go around so I believe everybody gets about the same percentage increase! No matter what the SRDP quotes!!!!

Please do away with it. It's a useless, awful process that doesn't do much.

I think that the SRDP should be consistent. I know of some don't even do the performance evaluation, and their staff finds that frustrating.

Make it meaningful and not a tedious, annual process that is only used to update paperwork and comply with policy. This is not a motivational process. The paperwork (action plan) is used by Penn State to have a legal basis for firing an individual -- not for motivating the individual.

It's hard to make recommendations because you don't know what any other Extension Educator's SRDP looks like --- how much did they write?, did they include more program results? What is a "good" SRDP write-up? The diversity of programs and expertise (of Educators and CEDs) makes it hard. Maybe since the Regional Directors make the money decisions, they should do the SRDP interview.

How about making the forms less cumbersome and redundant?

It is unrealistic for a unit leader to make decisions regarding salary based on SRDPs for people with different supervisors. What is deemed a '5' to one supervisor may be a '3' to another.

There are major formatting problems with the form. Way too much time is spent cutting, pasting, reformatting. If this is not the case, I have just identified training that I need!

Just pull the bandage off - give it to me and get it over with. Cut back on some of the preliminaries. If there are problems, they need to be addressed before we get to the evaluation/review. I should have an opportunity to respond to any comments before signing off, or have a choice of comments to sign off from.

Get rid of the "significantly exceeds expectations" category.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

Allow more opportunity for ratings to be provided by performance factors. If I have a low score on one item, but a high score in another, it makes my overall performance look worse than it actually is. These numbers would also make it easier for me to see what specific areas I need to improve. Seeing number scales often is easier to comprehend than verbiage.

Provide examples of what is expected in each section.

At the beginning of performance review meetings each year, we always hear, "the SRDP is based on a 5-point rating scale, but we never give a '5.'" What's the point of basing ratings on a 5-point scale if no one can achieve the top rating? My work frequently changes. I add new projects throughout the year that weren't planned from the start and they are evaluated well, yet I know that I'll never achieve a "5." Is this really fair?

The process seems to be fatally flawed by differences between supervisors. There are few guidelines to help them assign a numerical ranking to your performance. Some supervisors, for example, refuse to give a "5" regardless of the employees effort and will openly admit that. There should be a method to help them give the numerical score.

Use information submitted in the POW reporting system instead of making us write it all over again. Even cutting and pasting information is time-consuming at a busy time of the year.

The process needs to be fixed before any workshops can be developed. After you submit accomplishments, your supervisor should do a PRELIMINARY review to discuss your performance over the last year. If you find that there are gaps in either what you submitted or their understanding of what you accomplished in the last year, there should be an opportunity to re-do the SRDP. Currently, what you get the first time is what goes into your file, regardless of how accurate it is.

I would like to see this process go to a 1/4 or six month process - not necessary for Staff, but for Staff assistants. I have found that most of the project staff in the Department have meetings throughout the year do to the nature of the job; but staff assistants are only getting it at the end of the year - I think if it were done on a 1/4 or six months basis the frustration would be dropped, because this is sometimes the first time they hear about complaints from their faculty members (and they don't hear it from their faculty member, but their supervisor). A little unfair, since it can weigh heavy on a final rating. It's nice to see everything we accomplish on one paper at the end of the year, but it does take up valuable time.

Elaborate on the overall performance evaluation rating so that the areas of evaluation are more detailed

I think another concept would be to have employees rate the supervisors on their ability to supervise. Do not believe that faculty have this as part of their review since I have never been asked for my evaluation of their ability to supervise.

Make SRDP documents identical to the required format for the ACTS dossier. This would greatly reduce the time required to prepare the ACTS dossier for review.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

The SRDP was just revised and there is no section for service to the organization which was on the previous form

There needs to be a process that allows staff to respond to inaccuracies in their review without fear of repercussions from their supervisor. The SRDP process expects staff to respond to their supervisor who may use it against them. It has been used against this staff through inappropriate or rude office communication. This is critical since there is concern that this may determine whether my position will be supported or eliminated in the future. I feel that Penn State University would not support or encourage this conduct with its supervisors. This information must be kept strictly confidential for risk of losing my job.

Few people are getting ratings of meets expectations (most get exceeds expectations or above). Seems like people are switched from a 4 or 5 each year more to equalize salaries than to reward actual performance. I think we have moved away from merit raises and there is more of an attempt to equalize salaries. There aren't any standards as to what one needs to rate a 4 or a 5.

Get rid of it.

Less repeat reporting. The Casper reporting covers most of the questions that are on the SRDP and AA report.

Not to sound brash but if it has no meaning why do it? You can get a rating of 2 and get a 2-3 percent raise, you can get a 5 and receive the same. I think the program is good for employees who have areas they need to improve on. I think once an employee gets a 5 rating for 2-3 consecutive years they should be exempt.

It is cumbersome and somewhat not in touch with the reality of what we do. The idea of completing your SRDP as if it were a promotion dossier is time consuming and totally unnecessary! Recommendations: make it less of a struggle and less cumbersome.

I was told by my supervisor that she would like to give me a 5 rating but, HR frowns upon perfect ratings. Therefore, I would like to see an improvement on this rating system.

We all have a limited amount of time to plan, promote, deliver and evaluate programming, as well as dealing with promotion, and reports for annual meetings/CASPER. I understand that we are going to utilize SRDP in a fashion which would compliment our efforts for dossier preparation. This sounds great and should save us valuable time.

Clarify expectations from personnel across units.

The SRDP is just a lot of paperwork that is just kept in a file. My work is critiqued in a much more meaningful way throughout everyday on the job.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

Make those in technical support areas aware of opportunities for advancement so the review process has some beneficial credibility. The questions of what more we can do to better the University seem unnecessary for a review.

SRDP needs to be a two way process. Staff needs a way to evaluate their supervisors.

If we are given supervisory responsibilities for employees, we should be given the authority to assign the rank (number.)

Try to impress on faculty the importance to HR the evaluation process. Often faculty don't schedule time for the meeting, or if a meeting is scheduled, something preempts it and the staff is left hanging.

I am very lucky in that I have an ongoing positive relationship with my supervisor that includes open communication if concerns arise and positive feedback on good work. But I know this is not always the case. Many times folks are surprised at their review that there is a problem which is devastating.

(This is mostly a copy/paste from item 15 - it's probably more appropriate here). The problem with the whole process is that different supervisors are evaluating different employees and sometimes this is related to annual salary increases. There is nothing fair about that process and it needs to stop immediately. The review process is a good idea and can be beneficial to both parties if they go in to it with a positive attitude, but the overall rating should either be eliminated as it relates to salary increases or simplified to the point where a rating of 3 - 5 will not make a difference in anyone's annual raise. My supervisor gave me a rating of 4 this year after giving me a 5 for the past 2 years. His reasoning was that he "didn't think he should give me a 5 every year". He didn't think I had done anything less this year. My point is that he should give me a 5 if I deserve it or a 4 if that is what I deserve. Don't just say "I don't think I should give you a 5 every year"!

Ensure that employees who are not directly affected by the outcome of the SRDP process (i.e.: Program Aides) "get something" out of completing the process. We do not receive salary increases or anything of the sort based on the SRDP process and it's a fairly lengthy process when you don't get anything out of it.

Training should have been given to all staff and everyone should have received their forms well in advance, not just given two weeks to complete them.

When negative comments are made, I feel you should know who made them and in regards to what? How can you improve a situation if you have no idea what it was? To me that is the supervisors fault. AND, they should NEVER happen at evaluation time!!!! Maybe a mid-year mini-review would be helpful.

I really don't like the wording and they really seem useless. It seems they ask the same question but word it differently. I find myself copying and pasting from one item to another.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

There should be a flexible timetable as to when the SRDPs are due on an annual basis. I have 4 employees that I supervise and have to evaluate each year in April. April is, by far, the busiest time of the whole year in my unit. It is a real challenge for me as well as the people I supervise to meet the end of April deadlines. Frankly, I often push off the formal meeting with some understanding employees because we are all just too busy to take time to meet. Once we do meet, some intent is lost therefore the full meaning is usually not conveyed. I would much rather prefer a June 1 to May 31 review year.

We presently have to develop other documents in addition to our reporting system in order to show our accomplishments. There is no easy way for a CED to see if specific plans were accomplished. The old PJO process was a much clearer way of defining programming priorities for the year.

Use something other than CASPAR

Please get rid of the question that asks how you plan to contribute to the organization beyond your regular job responsibilities. It is confusing and people get cynical about it, writing fluffy answers. You are either expected to contribute to the organization or you are not--if so, it is part of your job responsibilities.

I suggest having the SRDP actually mean something. From my point of view, it doesn't matter what I write in it. I would get the same treatment and same crappy raise whether I get an outstanding review or a terrible one. My supervisor and I don't put much effort into doing them because we know they don't mean anything.

Show supervisors how the SRDP can be used to help employees get to where the supervisor would like them to be versus the SRDP being just a chore for both parties

Get rid of pre-set inapplicable categories in the action plan and impact assessment process

The form doesn't fit all positions. Different forms for different types of positions (i.e. staff assistant, IT, extension, etc.) should be created.

Again...I think the review process should impact the salary increases. It should not just be a number that means nothing. I feel great about the year and my accomplishments when I'm told I got a 5 until I realize that it doesn't really matter anyhow.

If we invest copious amounts of time reporting data, time, accomplishments, and contacts in CASPAR, why do we need to duplicate much of this data in the SRDP format? CASPAR should capture the data we need for evaluation purposes and make it accessible to supervisors in a form that they can access and use for conducting evaluations. (CEDs, for example, cannot even access individual educators' CASPAR data. Educators must access it themselves and print it for the CEDs.) We waste a great deal of time reinventing the wheel every year instead of reporting once. Please develop a single reporting system that meets federal reporting guidelines AND captures data for staff evaluations--it would be a huge timesaver!

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

I'm very fortunate to have a CED who does a very good job with performance reviews. My biggest concern is the time disconnect. Our Programming year and review year and salary adjustment times are all jumbled-up. Good news! You are scheduled to get a raise, but it will be 4 to 6 months before you get it, and at that point there will only be two months left in the program year! Another problem is the different standards RD's have. I've heard some want a nice Bell Curve -- for every 4 there has to be a 2 and every 5 means there has to be a 1. Other RD's say, Outstanding performers should be recognized regardless of how many underperformers there are. What's up with different strategies? Who is managing/advising them?

I have only had one performance review done in the 4 years that I have been in this position. The scale of 1 to 5 for performance evaluation is very subjective, and I have been told that no one receives a score of 5. Why have a scale where no one can achieve a top score? It is demoralizing to the staff members to know that no matter how well we do our jobs that there is no way to achieve a top score. This is the most demotivating process I have ever been involved with. Further, the SRDP process should not rely solely on what we submit to our supervisor. The supervisor should take it upon themselves to see what the supervised staff member is doing on a regular basis.

1. Interpretation of how to answer the questions (in the accomplishment section) in format and degree of detail seems to vary. Each regional director directs counties to complete the SRDP as they want it done (at least that is the way it seems to me). Maybe this is a good thing?? 2. Questions that do not relate to job performance should not be on the SRDP. For example, "Identify ways that you would like to contribute to the organization beyond your job responsibilities?" The extension educators that I know give a major portion of their life to helping people through this job. This question gives me the impression of "what more can we squeeze out of them." Never makes me feel good when I answer it. 3. I question the need for the accomplishment portion of the SRDP. All of the information is on the CASPAR system, which supervisors have access to. Why do we have to rewrite what was already done? Could copies of accomplishments be printed from CASPAR and attached to SRDP to save supervisors time in looking them up? 4. Utilize the CASPAR system to streamline the SRDP process. Seems that the CASPAR system should be saving us time when completing the SRDP, but it does not.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

I have a new supervisor (last 3 months). Both current and previous supervisors here in my current county are Excellent and an extreme pleasure to work with. They understand their role in assisting work and motivating the motivated employee toward expanded work. Previous experience with supervisors in an academic department (2 years) and in another county were very poor and almost caused me to quit PSCE although I love the work. It reinforces the extreme importance of having competent supervisors. I don't know how you change incompetent supervisors. It probably is a good idea not to hire or promote them to that position because it has a very detrimental impact on work and motivation. From previous experience as a supervisor, it is important to select folks that are good people and not just ones who can talk the talk or are promoted because they are good buddies with other supervisors and like the power involved in 'supervising' people. It is also probably important not to hire folks who are overconfident in their own abilities.

Try to make it as fair as possible to all staff. It isn't now! Make sure our supervisors KNOW how to help us with the formatting and other details.

Put the ENTIRE review in the file NOT just the page 4 and 5 opinions. MAKE the supervisor address the (huge) list of accomplishments that the employee takes the time to complete throughout the year and list on the review!!!

Supervisors need to conduct reviews and give ratings in a comparable fashion across departments and offices. Currently the process seems to vary greatly depending on the specific department or supervisor.

In my opinion and from discussion the SRDP process with others, the process is a chore and a task that must be done as required by policy. In my opinion, it's not really a useful process that motivates the employee. In my opinion, the process is used to update formal paperwork required by HR but does little to coach the employee. Once a year is meaningless feedback when the supervisor is too busy to notice anyway.

The overall statistical reporting is not accurate of the work we do and the restrictions really hurt the value of using such statistics when it comes to legislators; we do so much with our clientele that is not reported; either reduce what we are allowed to do in programming or allow us to better report it; I have noticed the 4-H statistics and A-100 (old name I realize) don't seem to jive with what is done so we look like we are really dropping numbers; Look at the 4-H Facts Sheet and you will see how inaccurate those statistics are. That is part of how we get evaluated and that needs to be resolved.

Use a different form that allows for comments beyond the defined field.

Forms are too extensive and should be simplified

Provide more examples of what is expected

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

The ACTS Program has done much to improve this process (SRDPs, Action Plans). This has been an opportunity for me to prove in depth what I do in my position. It's difficult to do this in the average annual SRDP - it would be so helpful if all staff would be eligible for this program. The SRDP evaluation ratings vary greatly from area to area. If there was some way to ensure that fairer assessments were given, it would do so much to improve staff morale. Especially with the current economy, that annual raise is extremely important.

Professional Development offerings on the county level can be increased.

Not having everything positive or negative accumulate and then discussed once a year.

It feels like we're always evaluating, counting, tracking, adding contacts, finding contacts, contacting new contacts, re-contacting old contacts, etc, etc, etc....there is so much emphasis on evaluating the same thing every 12 months. It becomes redundant....

The Action Plan section needs to be revised for secretarial support staff. We basically do the same job year after year, unless something has been added to our job description. We should not have to do an "Action Plan" for each year. It is good to sit and discuss the year with my supervisor. We get to discuss what has transpired over the and make changes, if we need to.

The SRDP process doesn't need to be improved, it needs to be replaced.

Help with the action plan

It has been suggested that the SRDP should be moved online, so that it could be updated throughout the year. Various information could be stored in a database and updated continually.

The actual process should be started with the department's before March. It takes time to do the SRDP. I also feel the SRDP should be sent directly to the staff person from Human Resources and also can be sent to the department. I know of some cases where the supervisor never informs their staff on the date they are due to the department until a few days before.

Make it tied to a decent cost of living increase or something meaningful.

Not everyone performs this process the same way. Every supervisor and employee is different.

Supervisors need to not simply repeat past years commentaries

Year end reporting occurs in the fall. SRDP is over winter. Merit raise (if any) appears in summer. Is there a relationship between these activities? They seem completely disconnected in my life.

17. Please list additional recommendations to improve the College's SRDP process.

Simplify the SRDP process. It is incredibly labor intensive, especially considering that we already report to CASPAR and have a separate process to apply for promotion. Why three difficult and unrelated processes?

Since Action Plans and SRDPs go hand-in-hand, the formats for these should be standardized ONCE, and not re-tooled every few years so that persons in the ACTS program must repeatedly replace existing documents to fit the current model. I have had to re-issue numerous past Action Plans to accompany SRDPs because they didn't fit the ACTS model format. Those re-crafted Action Plans don't necessarily match the original ones upon which the SRDPs were based. We end up modifying the historically valid documents, and it's a flurry of busy-work. That's like only accepting money that was printed or minted this year, when you have perfectly good currency that's three to five years old.

Trash CASPER and find something that is easier to use.

Perhaps a required "mid-term" mini evaluation to better get a handle on action plan and accomplishments. Typically, everything is put together at once, several weeks before the evaluation. Sometimes it's difficult to review the whole past year. It might be an easier process if we had to put together something like a progress report half-way into the year.

Our system still allows for too much politics and favoritism - not all supervisors/admin are capable of maintaining objectivity being impartial.

Elimination of the four questions regarding self assessment in the staff input section. These question are almost meaningless in the evaluation process. Keep the SRDP to one page.

I think the entire SRDP form should be submitted to College administration not just a few comments and a number from 1 to 5. I think our office most likely gets all the same scores when some in the office are doing much less work than others. Unless someone besides the boss is looking at complete evaluations, supervisors can easily make a program look good by giving everyone the same score (a 4 or 5) without really having to justify it. I don't understand that logic. Why should I continue to work hard if I get the same as others who do significantly less? I think it is easy for supervisors to just do what is easy and not make waves for themselves. However, soon it will become apparent that staff are not really happy and eventually the productivity and quality of work in the office will start to suffer and by that time it is too late to do anything.

Conduct more surveys to determine staff and/or faculty issues/concerns

18. Please indicate the length of time you've been in your position.

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 0-1 year | 7.38% | 34 |
| 1-3 years | 11.50% | 53 |
| 3-5 years | 13.45% | 62 |
| 5-10 years | 25.60% | 118 |
| 10-15 years | 14.10% | 65 |
| More than 15 years | 27.98% | 129 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 1 |

19. Is your supervisor an administrator, county extension director, regional director, faculty or staff member?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Faculty | 18.78% | 86 |
| Staff | 24.02% | 110 |
| Administrator | 16.38% | 75 |
| County Extension Director | 32.10% | 147 |
| Regional Director | 8.73% | 40 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 4 |

20. What type of work do you do?

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Administrative/Management | 13.07% | 60 |
| Research | 11.55% | 53 |
| Staff assistant | 12.42% | 57 |
| Information technology | 6.10% | 28 |
| Extension | 44.01% | 202 |
| Other (please specify) see below | 12.85% | 59 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 3 |

Other:

| |
|--|
| Teaching/Extension |
| Lab Support Technician |
| Marketing |
| NEA |
| Staff Assistant, Financial Manager |
| Support staff |
| Diagnostic work. |
| Diagnostic testing |
| Why is information technology separated as a job classification? |
| Communications |

20. What type of work do you do?

| |
|--|
| Accounting |
| Extension, Research, and Guest Lecturer |
| My technical position is that of "systems administrator"; however, I also conduct research and participate in presentations and publishing articles. |
| Technical/creative professional |
| Both research and extension, but this form would only allow me to click on one |
| Specimen testing in a diagnostic laboratory |
| I am a 4-H Program Coordinator, which needs to be recognized as an extension administration position. |
| Communications (publications) |
| NEA |
| EFNEP |
| Administrative / management Research Extension |
| West Nile |
| NEA |
| Student advising |
| Support staff |
| Financial assistant/accountant |
| Diagnostic Testing |
| Diagnostic |
| Public services plus research! |
| NEA |
| EFNEP |

20. What type of work do you do?

| |
|--|
| Assistant Director |
| Lab technician (non-research) |
| Advising |
| Land Management |
| All of the above |
| NEA |
| Nutrition Links supervisor/trainer and Extension educator |
| Marketing/Communications |
| I do both Research and Information Technology |
| I am a research tech, but I do a lot of other things for my job |
| After-school programming |
| I am on contract to the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture in a regulatory/extension outreach/research position focusing on Noxious and Invasive weeds. |
| I do research, development of outreach/education materials and project management. |
| Customer service/research |
| I am a research assistant working for faculty who have split appointments in field investigation/extension/research and teaching. So, I do all of the above. |
| GIS |
| I am a staff assistant, but I also supervise work-study students. |
| Writer/editor |
| Histology |
| Staff-graphic designer |
| Field-based Extension Educator |

20. What type of work do you do?

Communications for all of the above.

Lab technician (necropsy technician in post mortem room)

Research support assistant and extension specialist

Communication

Exempt staff in a small (8 full time people) University Park Program that gets the majority of its operational budget from outside sources

21. Please check the type of position you are in.

| Answer options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Fixed term position | 31.15% | 143 |
| Standing position | 68.85% | 316 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 3 |

22. Do you supervise staff employees?

| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Yes | 39.26% | 181 |
| No | 60.74% | 280 |
| <i>Skipped question</i> | | 1 |