



CPR and Annual Performance Review Recommendations

UTIA Advisory Council

October 26, 2001

Recommendation 1:

The Institute of Agriculture has successfully used Annual Performance Reviews (APR) to encourage and achieve scholarly achievement. Properly conducted APRs are the foundation for excellence within the University. The Advisory Council recommends continuation of relevant APRs as the process for rewarding higher-performing individuals with merit pay increases and for identifying individuals performing unsatisfactorily.

Based on recommendation number 1, we encourage the Vice President for Agriculture to further explore with the Board of Trustees the possibility of implementing recommendation number 2 within the Institute of Agriculture.

Recommendation 2:

UTIA administrators should only conduct the Cumulative Performance Review (CPR) process when a faculty member receives two consecutive unsatisfactory annual performance evaluations. An initial APR rating of unsatisfactory should immediately be followed with a remediation plan for the given faculty member. This recommendation is consistent with CPR guidelines at several major universities.

Recommendation 3:

The Advisory Council recommends that CPR be conducted using a peer-consensus evaluation of scholarly achievement. The CPR panel should use sound logic and judgment in evaluating performance. The evaluation criteria should not be based on a numerical quota system nor a quantization of scholarly achievement by categories. The Council thoroughly examined the faculty evaluation process and determined numerical/quantitative evaluation can be counter-productive and is not the best way to achieve scholarly work.

A Council-facilitated department-by-department survey of major and peer universities supports this recommendation (see attached survey results.) The vast majority of departments and institutions across the United States use a non-numerical approach to evaluate scholarly achievement. Most evaluation guidelines were developed or revised within the past three to five years, and indications are they will not change in the foreseeable future.

These three recommendations build upon each other. The recommendations should be considered as a comprehensive package. However, if recommendation number 2 is not allowed, the Council then recommends adoption of recommendations number 1 and 3.

Revised Summary

Department heads within the Institute of Agriculture were requested to survey department heads at major and peer universities regarding the criteria for post-tenure review at other universities.

Draft results are as follows:

- Seventy-one departments from 39 universities responded to the survey.
- Interest is strong in post-tenure review. Twenty-two of the 39 universities have post-tenure review. No university reported having standardized quantitative criteria across departments.
- During the past two to four years, interest in post-tenure review has accelerated. The majority of the guidelines have been recently created and finalized by the universities.
- Post-tenure review criteria generally focus on excellence. In a number of universities, CPR only deals with faculty who are not meeting expectations.
- Criteria for CPR generally stress quality of work. Only four departments out of the 71 departments surveyed reported the use of quantitative criteria.

As departments receive additional replies, the results will be added to the report.

Table 1. Universities Reporting Standardized Quantitative Post-Tenure Review Criteria Across Departmental Lines 2001.

Reporting University	Ag. Econ	Animal Science	Engineering	Entomology	Food Science	Forestry
Arkansas ¹					No	
Auburn						No
Clemson ¹			No	No		No
Colorado State ¹	No					
Connecticut		No				
Cornell ¹			No		No	
Florida ¹	No		No	No		
Georgia ¹	No			No		No
Idaho ¹	No	No				
Illinois ¹	No	No	No		No	
Iowa State ¹		No			No	
Kansas State ¹		No				
Kentucky ¹		No			No	
LSU		No	No			No
Maryland ¹	No				No	
Massachusetts					No	

Minnesota ¹					No	
Mississippi State						No
Missouri ¹	No	No			No	
Nebraska ¹		No				
New Hampshire	No					
New Mexico State	No					
NC State ¹	No	No		No	No	No
North Dakota State	No					
Ohio State ¹	No				No	
Oklahoma State		No	No			
Oregon State	No					
Penn State ¹	No	No				
Purdue	No				No	
Rutgers				No		No
Santa Clara U	No					
Texas A&M ¹		No	No			No ²
Texas Tech	No					
Utah State ¹	No					No
Virginia Tech	No		No			
Warnell School of Forestry ¹						No
Washington State	No				No	
Wisconsin ¹		No				
Wyoming	No					

¹ Blank spaces indicate no report was received from a given University for the specific discipline. Universities designated with 1 reported a post-tenure or extended review process.

² Texas A&M is in the developmental stages of post-tenure review.

Table 2. Departments Reporting Quantitative Post-Tenure Review Criteria 2001.

Reporting University	Ag. Econ	Animal Science	Engineering	Entomology	Food Science	Forestry
					No	

Arkansas ¹						
Auburn						No
Clemson ¹			No	No		No
Colorado State ¹	Yes ²					
Connecticut		No				
Cornell ¹			No		No	
Florida ¹	No		No	No		
Georgia ¹	No			No		No
Idaho ¹	No	No				
Illinois ¹	No	No	No		No	
Iowa State ¹		No			No	
Kansas State ¹		No				
Kentucky ¹		No			No	
LSU		No	No			No
Maryland ¹	No				No	
Massachusetts					No	
Minnesota ¹					No	
Mississippi State						No
Missouri ¹	No	No			No	
Nebraska ¹		No				
New Hampshire	No					
New Mexico State	No					
NC State ¹	No	Yes ²		No	No	No
North Dakota State	No					
Ohio State ¹	No				No	
Oklahoma State		No	No			
Oregon State	No					
Penn State ¹	No	No				
Purdue	No				No	
Rutgers				No		No
Santa Clara U	No					
Texas A&M ¹		No	No			No
Texas Tech	No					

Utah State ¹	Yes ²					Yes ²
Virginia Tech	No		No			
Warnell School of Forestry ¹						No
Washington State	No				No	
Wisconsin ¹		No				
Wyoming	No					

¹ Blank spaces indicate no report was received from a given University for the specific discipline. Universities designated with 1 reported a post-tenure or extended review process.

² Yes or no designates whether criteria guidelines are quantitative.

In summary, the survey revealed the Departments of Agricultural Economics and Forestry at Utah State and the Animal Science Department at NC State are the only departments in the survey which use quantitative criteria for post-tenure review. CPR guidelines are under review at Colorado State.

10/26/01

[[Top](#)]

Tennessee's Land Grant Institution
university of tennessee

| [UTIA](#) | [Site index](#) | [CASNR](#) | [Extension](#) | [TAES](#) | [Vet Med](#) | [Directories](#) | [Helpful UT links](#) |
