

Annual Performance Peer Review Committee Summary - March 31, 2003

OVERALL NORMS

1. Confidentiality is to be maintained. All communications in committee are considered confidential.
2. Balance efficiency with fairness
3. Focus on positives and strengths, find positives to say about each packet. Suggestions for improvement should be handled in a positive manner. Each packet needs positive comments and/or constructive comments for each sub-section. Where appropriate, include ways to make changes—explain how.
4. Use logic model.
5. Base evaluation on rank and time in rank, i.e., consider stage of career
6. Recognize difference in culture, geographic area, ethnic population and work plan
7. Maintain an appreciation for individual circumstances; however, should be left to CED to lower or increase overall score if individual circumstances are a consideration.
8. Base evaluations upon what is presented only, don't make assumptions.
9. Read for "what happened, why, and what remains to be done".
10. State what needs to change - may need to explain how.
11. Everybody starts at the '3' level and work up. A '3' means that you do your job.
12. Respect for professionalism.
13. Compare job description/commitments vs. results/impacts.
14. Need flexibility on evaluation of the appearance of APROL. Commend people for staying within guidelines. No penalty this year for APR's over 6 pages.
15. Focus on content not writing style.
16. Comments should match numerical score.
17. Make appropriate comments regarding those scoring 5 or under 3 before the whole group reconvenes.
18. Abstain from an evaluation (leave the room) if not comfortable (e.g., same county as person, or work too closely). Reviewer will not comment on APR's from same county.
19. Committee will do a standard deviation exercise when all the groups are done.
20. Any questions from individual faculty regarding their peer review score and comments should be referred to the co-chairs for their feedback/answers so there is no conflicting information given.

CATEGORY SPECIFIC NORMS

1. Extension Programs A,B,C,D,E

21. Impact(s) should be appropriate for specific program.
22. Research enhances not replaces programs
23. Programs should be "locally" relevant, there should be a rationale for doing the program included.
24. Objectives should match implementation and outcomes

F. Team Efforts

25. Give credit for collaborative, team efforts. Team efforts are reported in different places, i.e., service. Need to look for evidence of teamwork in entire report. Maybe another 'Help' feature to indicate where this should be reported?

G. Gifts, Grants, Contracts

26. Grants should be linked to a program.
27. Look at Grants, Gifts and Contracts as appropriate to programming efforts

2. Service

3. Creative/Scholarly Works

28. Understand that people heavily involved with research will have more peer-reviewed journals and publications
29. Evidence of scholarship is required under all programs. Type and number of publications should be appropriate to position description and rank.
30. Technology related presentation, need similar consideration as publications
31. Consider the impact that publications (Powerpoint, CDs, slides, etc.) have and how they are used by clientele; consider circumstances (demographics) and how the situation determines whether technology is appropriate.

4. Professional Improvement

32. Watch balance on Professional Improvement vs. other areas
33. Relevance of Professional Improvement to Programming

5. Awards and Recognition

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FACULTY

- < Agents should report as appropriate to their appointment. Agents with 100% Extension appointments do not report under the research or teaching category. Any research or teaching should be integrated into the Extension Programs category. Mentoring/advising of students should be listed under #9 'Contributions Not Covered Elsewhere'
- < Page Length. The page limit is 6 pages. Scores may be reduced for those significantly over the page limit.
- < Take time with grammar and spell checking.
- < Bibliographical citations should be used for publications. Include percentages of effort for publications.
- < Feedback needs to be given to agents who are continuing-eligible status that peer-reviewed publications are very important in the Promotion and Continuing Status process.
- < Faculty should state in program identification on how local advisory boards are involved in putting on programs. Why are they doing the program(s) they are.
- < Faculty need to clarify roles in programs and grants.
- < Administrative responsibilities should not be included in APR's unless they are specifically related to a program.
- < Need to clearly state where data comes from.
- < Need to separate out categories in publications, e.g., peer-reviewed, county publications, etc.
- < Cost recovery and livestock auction dollars should not be reported under grants/contracts/gifts.
- < 4-H Foundation funds may be reported if you were lead in the contract and you get an increase in the future, but not if it is automatic each year.

- < Teams should talk beforehand about percentages of effort and amount of funds for each, so they are not under- or over-reported.
- < Include percentages in team efforts.

SUGGESTED CHANGES TO APROL/ADMINISTRATION

- < (APROL header needs to include rank). Having rank and time in rank might be helpful if included on APROL header
- < Need some way to limit agents to six pages. Ideally we would like for the program to not allow submission if over 6 pages. If not possible there should be a ½ point reduction if Agents go over 6 ½ pages for not following instructions correctly, with a warning in the near future about it and again at the end of the year. Recommend that Agents be advised of what Explorer version to print in that will give the most room (margins, etc.) so that APRs will print out in the 6-page limit.
- < Suggest a blurb at top of APROL stating 'as you get ready to enter your information, please be sure to check the help sections'. Also send this statement when reviews go back to counties.
- < Suggest a 'Help' section in APROL to define 'scholarship'.
- < Grants reporting should be changed to reflect what agents are doing (involvement) in relation to grant.
- < Publications categories need to be cleaned up - some should be reported elsewhere. There is no poster option, for example - this should be listed under Popular Articles, etc. Need to clarify Scholarly Activity. Suggest taking a look at Jeff Schalaus's packet and his organization. Need to separate out categories in publications, e.g., peer-reviewed, county publications, etc. There is a need for a definition of peer-reviewed publications in APROL.
- < Denote competitive vs non-competitive grants. Need better criteria - what are expectations? Possibly a drop-down menu in APROL listing competitive, non-competitive, contract, gift, not-funded, etc.
- < A notice should be sent out to all faculty when the next year's APROL is ready for input. Some faculty enter their information every month. Would like to be able to start inputting each new year in early January.
- < The 'great' APRs should be used as examples for everyone in coming year(s).

QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED/ADDRESSED BY SUB-COMMITTEE CHAIRS AND/OR AGENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

- < Where should team efforts be reported?
- < Definition of scholarship?
- < When should Powerpoint (or other graphics programs, web sites, CDs) presentations be considered publications? Only if they are peer reviewed?
- < Need examples of what publications are and what publications are not.
- < Multi-year grants and how they are reported. There seems to be a format problem, and faculty are inconsistent on how they report. It may be a training issue. How should they be done?
- < Need clearer identification of exactly what service means. Need a better definition of intramural and extramural service. What kind of things should be reported under each.
- < What is the maximum of professional development expected? How much is too much?
- < Need to communicate clearly to agents what exactly a '3' score means. Criteria should have a list of things to look for in APRs.
- < Percentage of responsibilities need clarification. Some agents take 100% if they have program

assistants or volunteers, because they are told to do so. Some agents report their actual efforts, but then include their 'helpers' as working with them. What does the percentage next to program title really mean? How is it being interpreted? The Agent is ultimately responsible for their programs.

- < Should there be a separate category to report what an Agent has done to promote Extension - but there are two components to this the whole of Extension or just your program? This might be helpful for other Agents to see what others are doing. This may also be reported under Service Other. Most Agents do not market total Extension.
- < Gifts and Grants are an on-going problem for the committee. This is also a problem for the Agent Professional Development working group. Should the impact of the grant be given more weight? Should a gift be given less? The number of efforts are more important than the amount of funds received. Competitive grants are more important. Gifts should not be listed as a grant. A gift is non-competitive. Non-funded grants should be reported since there could be considerable time spent on them.
- < The monetary value of volunteers should come from administration so that everyone is consistent.
- < There should be a list of what should not be included under certain sections.
- < With reduced funding, how much weight do you put on Service without travel funds? Sheila Merrigan is working on a Website with links to free training opportunities that should be available in the next couple of weeks for professional development. A message will be sent to all faculty when it is ready. The committee does not evaluate the quality of professional development, only the appropriateness.