| FORMAT: |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. The meeting format fostered an exchange of ideas. | 27 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. The meeting fostered an understanding of stakeholder issues other than mine. | 17 | 14 | 1 | 0 |
| 3. The meeting created an opportunity to meet other stakeholders. | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. The facilitator enhanced the meeting’s outcome. | 19 | 11 | 2 | 0 |

| SUBSTANCE: |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 5. The meeting provided me information concerning methods other agencies are using to collect existing employee competencies. | 7 | 13 | 2 | 1 |

Why or why not?

Not research for improved agency performance—more on what is needed for pay for performance—as separate from engaging employees
Provided exchange and ideas associated with the proposal implementation of what’s to come
Steve Nelson talked about concrete CLC research on the subject and the mention of Q12—both of which we can follow up on
Presented/alluded to research studies/survey data about PFP. Clearly identified key points relative to the topic
Nelson put together points from many studies to illuminate the performance, pay, and turnover interplay
Not an executive branch agency
MSPB study
Empirical data important
Liked info Bob spoke about (CLC) and info Steve provided, but more information may have helped
It was helpful to hear how emotional factors can impact successful implementation of pay for performance
Learned about relevant MSPB studies and was able to meet other stakeholders who had other material of interest
Good data and guidance on what steps can be taken to improve performance without pay reform

6. The meeting provided me with information concerning how I might overcome the barriers to collecting existing employee competencies.

Why or why not?

No—discussion more on what we need to do to increase engagement by changing behaviors—with or without pay for performance
Provided more insight on the leadership issue and how it affects agency culture and value of employees and how it affects contribution of employees
Good info—but topics we are already discussing at our agency
Some key points were made, however, I didn’t feel “critical” ingredients for successful implementation were presented
Lots of important drivers, and a way to anchor a program
I don’t know of any documented successes of PFP
Some ideas were helpful, but will have to be adopted to a non-executive branch agency
Focus on engagement and middle 80%
Did not address how to use employee engagement or how to get management to engage employees
Empirical data important
This implies that there is one critical ingredient—this seemed to suggest a wider spectrum
Helped to understand the pitfalls
All about leadership, whether you implement change in program, or not
To make proposal to managers to go forward
Specific management behaviors that will be required
Provided general overview
7. The meeting provided me with information concerning how I might better describe the link between existing employee competencies and creating high performing organizations.

Why or why not?
Will keep me focused on seeing what is working
Information assisted my thoughts on how the size and demographics of my agency will affect the pay for performance initiative across the board
Varied audience with different experience backgrounds and perspectives
Divergent experience and cultures, it takes a little more time to set on the same wavelength
It always pays to hear and understand how issues are seen on the ground in agencies
This will without question impact my work
Not at this time—most are still too early in the process
Experience in pay for performance system in place was very helpful from table discussions
It is interesting to find out the group of behaviors that can help increase organization performance
To implement all goals within department

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. My expectations were met. □ Yes □ No
Y-31 N-0

Was just looking for general discussion on current status

9. I liked most:

- Dialogue
- Speaker’s information on pay for performance issue
- Open discussion
- Steve’s presentation
- Bob’s info at start of program
- Question and table talk
- A presenter with a message
- Steve’s presentation and preview of MSPB study, which I am very interested to see
- Bob did a good job of leading the discussion
- Information provided to take back with you
- The format. The opportunity to engage in table discussions centered around a featured topic and followed with a featured speaker
- Networking

10. I liked least:

- Many questions still to answer
- Guest speaker’s presentation—Steve Nelson is obviously very knowledgeable—but I thought his presentation just scratched the surface
- No clear answer/response to the question posed about available resources/on “getting it right”
- Needed more depth of content
- Wanted discussion on change in environment since 2000
- Absence of handouts when Steve Nelson was presenting
- Sitting at a table with people that don’t want to contribute
- ISPPi pitch
- Only one presenter
- Telephones ringing during the session
11. Suggestions for future meetings:

Best practices—how do we move from GS to pay for performance?
What works—what doesn’t?
How do we engage managers?
PPT slides to follow along with speaker
Employee engagement
Management accountability for employee performance
Perhaps moving part of the table folds around so it is not the same groups in both discussion
Have tables introduce themselves to find out what agency everyone is from
To change time to be longer
How do you create a performance culture? Needs to be a broader focus than pay, performance, appraisal, etc.
Clear proposals