Executive Summary

Tennessee Extension Performance Appraisal System

for Extension Agents, Extension Agents and County Directors, and Extension Area Specialists

Real. Life. Solutions.™

UT**EXTENSION**
INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
Cooperative Extension

Authors: Joseph L. Donaldson, Hunter Isbell, Thomas Broyles, Troy Dugger, Beth Duncan, Tracy Hagan, Connie Heiskell, Mary Beth Henley, Martin Koon, Latif Lighari, Dallas Manning, Tyrone Miller, Gary Rodgers, Izetta Slade, Justin Thomas, John Toman, Anthony Tuggle, and Glenn Turner

Contents

Introduction

The Cooperative Extension System in Tennessee is composed of University of Tennessee Extension (UT Extension) and the Tennessee State University Cooperative Extension Program (TSU Extension). The Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 provided land-grant university status to both the University of Tennessee (1862) and Tennessee State University (1890). Tennessee is one of the only 18 states with both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions.

A hallmark of UT Extension and TSU Extension is strong cooperation. In fact, more than one-third of Tennessee counties have both UT and TSU Extension agent working collaboratively in joint UT-TSU Extension offices. All UT and TSU Extension agents personnel use a one-stop reporting software, System for University Planning, Evaluation, and Reporting (SUPER). Despite this high level of cooperation, both UT and TSU have maintained separate performance appraisal forms. In October 2014, a team of 16 UT and TSU personnel (Performance Appraisal Revision Committee) began work to revise the performance appraisal system for three job positions: Extension Agents, Extension Agents and County Directors, and Extension Area Specialists. For clarity's sake, the term "County Director" is used in place of "Extension Agent and County Director," and the term "Area Specialist" is used in place of "Extension Area Specialist" in this publication.

This work was designed as a two-year process. This summary describes an overview of performance appraisal as well as the purpose, methods, findings and recommendations for the revised performance appraisal system.

Performance Appraisal in Society

"The performance appraisal process has become a powerful institution within the employment relationship, having significant impact upon employees." (Fay, 2006, para. 1)

Performance appraisal is ubiquitous in the public and private sectors. It involves interpreting and measuring the degree of effectiveness, standards achieved or performance goals met (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). Dulewiz (1989) postulates that performance appraisal is a basic human behavior of evaluating the work performance of oneself and others.

Performance appraisal is one of the most important influences in developing a high-performing, satisfied workforce (Donaldson, 2011). Stufflebeam (1988) writes that performance appraisals for educators are important to document whether the clientele and society's educational needs are met. Organizations use performance appraisal for a number of puposes, such as making merit pay decisions, making promotions, helping employees to improve performance, assigning work more effectively, and identifying instructional needs of employees (Baker, 1988; Bamberger & Meshoulam, 2000; Bennett, 1981; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Daley, 1992; Patterson, 1987).

In the 1960s and 1970s, researchers and practitioners worked to improve performance appraisal through the civil rights movement, the women's movement, and resulting federal legislation (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Throughout government, business and industry, and education, the major goals were to produce more objective techniques using rating scales and management by objectives (MBO). Modern day performance appraisal has its roots in these two approaches.

MBO is characterized by the supervisor and employee setting mutually agreed upon performance goals and using objective measures to monitor goal progress.

Performance Appraisal Outcomes

"A well-designed and well-executed performance appraisal system could lead to greater efficiency, effectiveness, and improved employee morale." (Davis & Verma, 1993, p. 1)

A literature review conducted by Donaldson (2011) found a number of research-based potential positive outcomes of performance appraisal systems. These potential outcomes include increased communication between supervisors and employees and improved action plans (Bennett, 1981). Other benefits are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.
Performance Appraisal's Positive Outcomes

Outcome	Source
Distinguish employees for merit pay	Bamberger & Meshoulan, 2000
Increase communications between supervisors and employees	Bennett, 1981
Set action plans for the coming year	Wright & Evans, 2008; Bennett, 1981
Promote overall organizational and employee effectiveness	Daley, 1992
Improve the quality of personnel decisions, i.e., promotions	Murphy & Cleveland, 1995
Increase employee engagement in and commitment to their jobs	Gilliland & Langdom, 1998; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995
Improve employee self-development and recognition	Brown & Larson, 1962
Improve employee job performance	Gililand & Langdom, 1998

An effective performance appraisal system should be viewed as such by both supervisors and employees (Schuman & Olufs, 1988). It is imperative that performance appraisals be based on job descriptions and be implemented with fidelity. If not, potential negative outcomes of a poorly designed and poorly executed performance appraisal system are conflict and misunderstanding between employee and supervisor (Baker, 1988) and reduced teamwork (Middlewood, 2001; Walton, 1986). Research has shown that employees' perception of the performance appraisal system is related to their job satisfaction (Lawler, 1994; Taylor et al., 1995).

Performance Appraisal in Cooperative Extension

"Agents are trained professionals and wish to be treated as professionals when they're evaluated on job performance." (Davis & Verma, 1993, p. 1)

The first commentaries about Extension performance appraisals were made nearly 50 years ago by Warner (1967) who proposed that Cooperative Extension programs would be strengthened if supervisors would provide frequent feedback to employees and Bruce and Carter (1967) who noted the need for employee recognition and self-appraisal through program statistics. This thought was echoed by Durfee (1970) who implored Extension administrators to adopt a MBO approach and to more effectively coach Extension agents for better performance. Buford (1990) posited that Cooperative Extension performance appraisal systems were subjective and ambiguous. In an information age, Buford proposed, Cooperative Extension needed to devote more effort to employee recognition and career advancement opportunities. Likewise, Boone (1990) noted that Cooperative Extension performance appraisal systems completely ignored interdisciplinary work, despite the fact that modern-day societal problems need solutions from interdisciplinary teams.

Kuchinke, Correthers, and Cecil (2008) studied 16 performance appraisal systems used by state Extension organizations, and their study showed that it was adequate for the Regional Director to conduct the annual performance appraisal and the performance appraisal interview with Extension agents. However, they stated that lack of input from multiple appraisers was a weakness of the performance appraisal system used for 10 years by the University of Illinois Extension. They also found a need for alignment between the performance appraisal system and the overall strategic goals of the Extension organization.

Davis and Verma (1993) linked Extension agents' views of their numeric performance appraisal to the agents' perceptions of the ideal performance appraisal system in a seven-state study of 602 agents. They found that agents identify ideal performance appraisal as one in which their appraisers had adequate instruction, and the agents' plan of work was incorporated into the appraisal. Heckel (1978) stated that performance appraisals for Extension agents should include a review of the current Extension plan of work and include outputs, such as the number of people reached through the individual agent's programming.

Purpose/Objectives

The Performance Appraisal Revision Team's ultimate goal is to improve the performance appraisal process for Extension Agents, County Directors and Area Specialists.
Objectives include:
1. Review job descriptions and PDQs to identify major performance criteria.
2. Review appraisal forms, research and other applicable resources to select performance factors and criteria, and descriptions of each criterion.
3. Conduct administrative and Extension Agent review of performance factors, criteria, descriptions and form.
4. Streamline forms and provide one shared UT and TSU form that is acceptable to both universities' human resource offices.

Methods

A number of methods were used to inform the performance appraisal revision project. We chose to conduct a document review of job descriptions and position description questionnaires for several reasons. Document reviews provide detailed information representative of a large sample size that would be difficult and unrealistic to collect using direct data collection methods.

Document reviews also provide information over several years and conducting a document review does not interrupt existing programs. Document reviews are helpful for corroborating with other sources and are inexpensive compared to other data collection alternatives.

To prepare for the document review, a sample was drawn in February 2015, stratified by position, from the population of Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists. The population consisted of 230 Extension agents, 84 County Directors and 21 Area Specialists. Tennessee has 95 counties with an Extension agent and County Director in each county. However, at the time the sample was drawn, only 84 counties had named County Directors, mostly due to recent retirements. The sample consisted of 105 Extension employees from both UT and TSU, stratified by position as shown in Table 2.

Table 2.
Sample of Job Descriptions and Position Description Questionnaires by Job Title

Job	Population	Sample
County Director	84 (25%)	26 (25%)
Extension Agent	230 (69%)	73 (69%)
Extension Area Specialist	21 (6%)	6 (6%)

Literature and resources were identified that reflected Extension performance appraisal, Extension program development and evaluation, and Extension job competencies. Appraisal forms used for Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists were requested from all Extension program and staff development professionals in 13 southern states representing both 1890 and 1862 institutions. Appraisal forms were received and reviewed from the University of Florida, University of Florida A&M State University, University of Kentucky, University of Virginia and Virginia Tech.

Findings

Objective 1 — Review job descriptions and PDQs to identify major performance criteria.

The Performance Appraisal Revision Team reviewed the job descriptions and PDQs for the entire sample, noting the most frequent job responsibilities across the entire sample. This review identified 14 major job responsibilities: individual annual plan, implementing, evaluation, reporting, resource management, base programs, equality, access and opportunity, outcomes/impacts, policy compliance, professional development, technology and innovation, interpersonal skills, leadership, and optimizing human capital (Donaldson et al., 2015). This

work was predicated on the idea that major job responsibilities should be represented as the performance criteria.

Objective 2 — Review appraisal forms, research and other applicable resources to select performance factors and criteria and descriptions of each criterion.

The University of Tennessee (2013) and Tennessee State University (2015) use a five-part scale for all system-wide appraisals. In addition to these system-wide appraisal forms, two other forms were studied that also had a five-part scale:

- University of Florida IFAS Extension, 2014 (University of Florida and Florida A&M State University)
- Virginia Cooperative Extension, 2015 (Virginia Tech and Virginia State University)

Regarding research of Extension personnel, two sources were studied to understand Extension agents' perspectives on appraisal (Davis & Verma, 1993) and Extension agents' competencies (Laki, Jayarante, Moore, & Kistler, 2014). The Tennessee Extension Program Planning and Evaluation Model (Donaldson, 2008) and Ohio State University Extension Core Competencies (2015) were also reviewed to identify performance factors and criteria and descriptions of each criterion.

This review of appraisal forms, research and other applicable resources confirmed the 14 major appraisal criteria from the review of job descriptions and PDQs. Yet, it also provided two additional criteria, customer service and work habits, for a total of 16. Customer service was mentioned in the Ohio State University Extension Competencies (2015), University of Tennessee system-wide appraisal form (2013), Tennessee State University system-wide appraisal form (2015), and Virginia Cooperative Extension Agent appraisal form (2015). Work habits was mentioned in Lak, Jayarante, Moore, and Kistler (2014), Ohio State University Extension Competencies (2015), University of Tennessee system-wide appraisal form (2013), Tennessee State University system-wide appraisal form (2015), and Virginia Cooperative Extension Agent appraisal form (2015). Both customer service and work habits were viewed as important performance appraisal criteria by the Performance Appraisal Revision Team members.

The 16 criteria were then organized into major categories or performance factors. Table 3 shows the selected performance factors, criteria and applicable references that were used to author the descriptions of each criterion. See Appendix A for the descriptions.

Table 3.
New Performance Factors, Criteria and References

Performance Factors	Criteria	Reference
Program Development	• Individual Annual Plan	• A, B, C, E, F
Program Management	• Implementing • Evaluation • Reporting • Resource Management	• A, B, E, H • A, C, E, H, I • A, H, I • A, C, D, H, I
Program Accomplishments	• Base Programs • Equity, Access and Opportunity • Outcomes/Impacts	• A, C • A, D, F, H • A, F, H, I
Professionalism	• Customer Service • Policy Compliance • Professional Development • Technology and Innovation • Work Habits	• D, F, G, H • A, C • A, C, D, E, H • B, C, D, E • C, D, F, G, H
Community and Organizational Leadership	• Interpersonal Skills • Leadership • Optimizing Human Capital	• A, C, D, F, G, H • A, C, D, G, H • A, C, D, G, H, I

Note. The following letters are used to identify references as follows:
A. Donaldson et al. Document Review (2015)
B. Davis & Verma (1993)
C. Lak, Jayarante, Moore, & Kistler (2014)
D. Ohio State University Extension Competencies (2015)
E. University of Florida IFAS Extension (2014)
F. University of Tennessee (2013)
G. Tennessee State University (2015)
H. Virginia Cooperative Extension (2015)
I. Donaldson (2008)

Objective 3 — Conduct administrative and Extension agent review of performance factors, criteria, descriptions and form.

In July 2015, the draft performance appraisal factors, criteria and descriptions were submitted to Regional Extension Directors, Regional Program Leaders and State Program Leaders for their review and feedback. Minor changes were made to the descriptions to reflect their feedback. The major suggestion was to remove the five-part scale for the IAP and instead use a rating of unsatisfactory (1) or exemplary (5).

Regional Directors were asked to select nine total personnel (Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists) per region who were the top three performers in the region. These nine personnel were asked to select one person from each program area: 4- H Youth Development, Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Family and Consumer Sciences.

The Regional Directors were also asked to include one Tennessee State University and two University of Tennessee agents per region, consistent with the different sizes of the UT and TSU workforce. The group of nine Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists participated in a review session with the committee chair and TSU HR representative. The agents were asked to provide feedback regarding the draft performance appraisal factors, criteria, descriptions and form. During this review session, the agents focused on goals, written comments, criteria and process.

Regarding the review of goals for the current year, the group expressed that the use of "accomplished, progress and no progress" for assessing goals would be helpful to themselves and other agents. The review panel stressed the need for supervisors to provide comments regarding all five performance factors (program development, program management, program accomplishments, professionalism, and community and organizational leadership), and the form was modified to require supervisor comments. Agents said that the criteria and descriptions fairly reflected their jobs and job descriptions. They stated that the criteria and descriptions were worthwhile to measure for appraisal purposes. Additionally, this review panel supported using SUPER Vita Builder for appraisal documentation.

Objective 4 — Streamline forms and provide one shared UT and TSU form that is acceptable to both universities' human resource offices.

A joint form was created for both the University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University that reflects the performance factors, criteria and goals needed. A five-part scale was chosen to be in line with the five-part scales already in use by the HR departments across departments in both universities. The number of performance factors was reduced to streamline the process and encourage discussion between employer and supervisor, promoting performance appraisal as a tool for personnel development. The form also includes appropriate administrative signatures as required by the institutions (see Appendix B).

Recommendations

Recommendation 1 — It is recommended that SUPER produce the performance appraisal form (Appendix B) and display the employee's annual summarized data.

The data elements from the SUPER Vita Builder should be displayed in the appraisal for the year of the appraisal. All of the following data elements, when summarized on an annual basis, have utility for appraisal purposes:
- Employee Profile
  - Position Information
  - Professional Development
  - Grants/Gifts/Contracts
  - Professional Experience
  - Education
  - Professional Service
  - Achievements

- Professional Development
  - Courses Facilitated/Taught
  - Courses Taken
  - Other Professional Development
- Impact Summaries
  - Direct Education Contacts
  - Indirect Education Contacts
  - Volunteer Contacts
  - Impact Statements

Recommendation 2 — It is recommended that individual annual plans continue to be prepared by Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists and rated by Regional Program Leaders.

Both the individual annual plan comments and ratings from Regional Program Leaders should transfer to the program development section of the performance appraisal form (Appendix B). Furthermore, it is recommended that the annual plan contents and process be simplified to reduce the reporting burden on employees and create plans that reflect the flexibility, focus and efficiency demanded for organizations in the 21st century. In addition, the performance appraisal and annual planning deadlines cannot be achieved with lengthy plans. Thus, a more streamlined and reasonable approach is needed, without multiple reviews, edits and resubmission of plans.

Recommendation 3 — A revised annual performance appraisal schedule and process is recommended.

Regarding the annual performance appraisal schedule, the following milestones are recommended:
- It is recommended that the IAP for the coming year be submitted to County Directors on or about October 31 and to Regional Program Leaders on or about November 4.
- Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists should ensure that they have completed Impact Statements and updated employee profile, professional development, and impact summaries on or about December 1.
- Area Specialists' performance appraisal should be submitted to the Regional Director on or about December 1.
- As a best practice, the County Director should conduct a coaching session with Extension Agents in December and share preliminary performance appraisal ratings and comments with Extension Agents prior to meeting with the Regional Director.
- The Regional Director and County Director should then finalize scores via an in-person meeting in which the County Director's appraisal is also conducted.
- The County Director conducts the formal appraisal interview with the Extension agents and submits signed appraisal forms (Appendix B) to the Regional Director on or about February 15.
- Regional Directors submit forms to the Dean's Office on or about February 24 with signatures by Extension agents, County Directors and Regional Directors.

The recommended performance appraisal schedule for 2017 is shown in Table 4.

Table 4.
Recommended 2017 Performance Appraisal Schedule

Date	Description
November 4, 2016	2017 Individual Annual Plans (IAPs) submitted to Regional Program Leader. (County Directors will have reviewed and submitted IAPs from their unit on or before October 31, 2016).
December 16, 2016	Regional Program Leaders will review, rate and make comments or suggestions for improvement of the IAP as appropriate no later than December 16, 2016.
December 1, 2017	2017 Impact Statements completed. Consider the performance factors, criteria and annual summarized data. Create goals for the coming year, review goals for previous year, and enter comments in the employee section of the performance appraisal form.
December 1, 2017	Extension Agent performance appraisal due to County Extension Director. Area Specialist performance appraisals due to Regional Director.
January 5, 2018	County Directors review annual summarized data, goals for the coming year and previous year; make supervisory comments, and coach personnel regarding the appraisal. County Directors make preliminary rating and may suggest changes to goals. County and area performance appraisals submitted to Regional Directors.
January 6, 2018	All activity reports for January 1, 2017 - December 31, 2017 entered in SUPER Delivery module.
January 31, 2018	The County Director and Regional Director jointly review annual summarized data, goals for the previous year and goals for the coming year; review any input from Regional Program Leaders (if applicable); and discuss employee's performance and goals. The County Director and Regional Director finalize ratings and make supervisory comments for every performance factor and for all goals.
February 16, 2018	The County Director conducts formal, individual performance appraisal interviews with County Extension staff. Individual employees finalize their comments, and the County Director and employee sign the appraisal form. The County Director submits signed forms to the regional office.
February 23, 2018	All county and area performance appraisal documents completed by Regional Directors and submitted to the Extension Dean.

Regarding the annual appraisal process, the following is recommended for Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists:

Extension Agents

1. Agent
   - Considers performance factors, criteria and annual summarized data.
   - Creates goals for the coming year, reviews goals for previous year.
   - Enters comments in employee section.
2. County Director
   - Reviews annual summarized data, goals for the coming year, goals for the previous year, makes supervisory comments, and coaches agent.
   - Makes preliminary rating.
3. County Director and Regional Director
   - Review annual summarized data, goals for the previous year, goals for the coming year, reviews any input from Regional Program Leaders and discusses employee's performance and goals.
   - Finalize ratings, supervisory comments for every performance factor and goals.
4. County Director and Agent
   - County Director conducts formal appraisal interview with Agent.
   - Agent finalizes comments in employee section.
   - Signs the appraisal form.
5. County Director
   - Submits forms to regional office.
6. Regional Director
   - Submits forms to Dean/Associate Dean.

County Directors

1. County Director
   - Considers performance factors, criteri, and annual summarized data.
   - Creates goals for the coming year, reviews goals for previous year.
   - Enters comments in employee section.
2. Regional Director
   - Reviews annual summarized data, goals for the coming year, goals for the previous year, makes supervisory comments and coaches County Director.
   - Reviews annual summarized data, goals for the previous year, goals for the coming year, reviews any input from Regional Program Leaders and county Extension personnel (if applicable).
   - Regional Director finalizes ratings, goals and makes supervisory comments for every performance factor.
3. County Director and Regional Director
   - Regional Director conducts formal appraisal interview with County Director.
   - County Director finalizes employee comments.
   - Signs the appraisal form.
4. Regional Director
   - Submits forms to Dean/Associate Dean.

Extension Area Specialist

1. Area Specialist
   - Considers performance factors, criteria and annual summarized data.
   - Creates goals for the coming year, reviews goals for previous year.
   - Enters comments in employee section.
2. Regional Director
   - Reviews annual summarized data, goals for the coming year, goals for the previous year, makes supervisory comments and coaches Area Specialist.
   - Reviews annual summarized data, goals for the previous year, goals for the coming year, reviews any input from Regional Program Leaders, County Directors, and Department Heads (if applicable).
   - Regional Director finalizes ratings, goals and makes supervisory comments for every performance factor.
3. Area Specialist and Regional Director
   - Regional Director conducts formal appraisal interview with Area Specialist.
   - Area Specialist finalizes comments in the employee section.
   - Signs the appraisal form.
4. Regional Director
   - Submits forms to Dean/Associate Dean.

Recommendation 4 — It is recommended that work habits and customer service standards be emphasized in job descriptions and PDQs.

In the present job descriptions and PDQs used by both UT and TSU Extension, work habits and customer service standards are implied, but not overtly stated in all cases. It is recommended that all job descriptions be updated to reflect these important criteria.

Recommendation 5 — It is recommended that the performance appraisal process, factors, criteria, description and form be reviewed at least every five years.

This review should be used to confirm and/or update factors, criteria, descriptions and processes. This practice is consistent with research by Davis and Verma (1993) that showed that Extension agents have a more positive perception of performance appraisal when the system itself is periodically reviewed.

Recommendation 6 — Research regarding the new appraisal factors, criteria and process is recommended.

Research about this new approach is needed in several areas. Most notably, research is recommended to gauge Tennessee Extension agents' perceptions of the Tennessee Extension Performance Appraisal System. Little is known about the perceptions that Extension agents have toward their performance appraisal system. The increasing influence of performance appraisal in public agencies warrants crucial investigation of employees' perceptions including ways that the appraisal may support professional development, teamwork and increased morale.

Conclusion

"Ideally, performance appraisal is a tool used by both parties in the employment relationship to reduce uncertainty by informing [professionals] about job performance, job opportunities, rewards, and sanctions." (Fay, 2006, p. 2)

The new shared performance appraisal process, factors, criteria, description and form strengthen the strong cooperation between UT and TSU Extension. This new approach may be useful in strengthening employee growth and engagement among Extension agents, County Directors and Area Specialists.

References

Boone, E. J. (1990). Crossing lines. *Journal of Extension, 28*(3). Retrieved from
http://www.joe.org/joe/1990fall/tp1.php

Davis, W. L., & Verma, S. (1993). Performance appraisal: How extension agents view the system. *Journal of Extension, 31*(4). Retrieved from
http://www.joe.org/joe/1993winter/a3.html

Donaldson, J. L. (2008). *Tennessee Extension Program Planning and Evaluation Model.* The University of Tennessee Extension Publication W 240.

Donaldson, J. L. (2014). Appraising the appraiser: Extension agents' and county directors' perceptions of their appraisers. *Journal of Extension.* Available at
http://www.joe.org/joe/2014april/rb2.php

Donaldson, J. L. (2008). Tennessee Extension Program Planning and Evaluation Model. University of Tennessee Extension Publication W 240. Available
https://extension.tennessee.edu/eesd/Documents//PlanningEvaluation/TennesseeLogicMo
delExplanations.pdf

Donaldson, J. L., & French, R. L. (2013). Tennessee extension agents' perceptions of performance appraisal. *Journal of Extension, 3*(51). Available at
http://www.joe.org/joe/2013june/a10.php

Donaldson, J. L., Broyles, T., Dugger, T., Duncan, B., Hagan, T., Heiskell, C., Henley, M. B., Koon, M., Lighari, L., Manning, D., Miller, T., Rodgers, G., Slade, I., Thomas, J., Toman, J., Tuggle, A., & Turner, G. (2015). [Document review of Extension job descriptions and position description questionnaires]. Unpublished raw data.

Fay, C. C. (2006). *Social context of the performance appraisal process: Exploring individual, organizational, job, and social effects on employee reactions to performance appraisal* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from UMI-ProQuest Dissertations.

Heckel, M. C. (1978). Measuring the performance of extension educators. *Journal of Extension, 16*(6). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1978november/78-6-a1.pdf

Laki, D., Jayarante, K. S. U., Moore, G. E., & Kistler, M. J. (2014). Identification of current proficiency level of Extension competencies and the competencies needed for Extension agents to be successful in the 21st century. *Journal of Extension and Human Sciences*, *2*(1). Available at http://www.jhseonline.com/#!current-issue/c227d

Ohio State University Extension. (2015). *Core competencies*. Retrieved from http://pde.osu.edu/coreCompetencies

Tennessee State University. (2015). *Annual Employee Performance Evaluation*.

University of Florida IFAS Extension. (2014). *County Faculty Appraisal Form*. Retrieved from http://ded.ifas.ufl.edu/resources/appraisals.shtml

University of Tennessee. (2013). *Performance Review Summary Form.*

Virginia Cooperative Extension. (2015). *Extension Agent/Unit Coordinator Performance Evaluation*. Available from Author.

Appendix A — Performance Appraisal Criteria, Description and Ratings

Performance Factor: Program Development

Individual Annual Plan

Unacceptable (1)				Acceptable (5)
Individual Annual Plan is poorly constructed, lacks alignment or is missing one or more components. Sources and information are not adequate to justify the educational program, and the advisory committee did not adequately represent the county or area served. Issues were not clearly identified.				Individual Annual Plan shows alignment among needs assessment, plans for the coming year, collaborators/partners/ volunteers, evaluation and funding. Advisory committee input was obtained in developing the Individual Annual Plan. The committee is representative of the county or area served.

Performance Factor: Program Management

Implementing

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Rarely uses research-based information in programming. Program delivery is rarely adapted to meet clientele needs. Demonstrates no collaboration and/or Extension marketing efforts.	Occasionally uses research-based information in programming. Program delivery is occasionally adapted to meet clientele needs. Lacks collaboration and/or Extension marketing efforts.	Uses research-based information in programming. Program delivery is routinely adapted to meet the needs of the clientele and various delivery methods are used. Plans a regular, ongoing effort to market Extension. Uses materials provided by specialists.	Uses real-life problems to teach subject matter with relevance to clientele. Collaborates well across program areas with other units and organizations.	Leads major collaborations or partnerships across program areas with other units and/or organizations. Adopts new methods and demonstrates connectivity and engagement with various audiences.

Performance Factor: Program Management

Evaluation

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Provides no evaluation results and no program impact.	Has a plan for program evaluation with minimal accomplishment or progress toward goals.	Indicator data are fully aligned with program pbjectives, and standard measurement tools properly demonstrate accomplishment or progress toward improving the program.	Program evaluation results contribute to improved programs, and outcomes demonstrate progressive clientele behavioral or practice change.	Program evaluation represents the highest levels of program quality and outcome measurement with results showing improved quality of life, economic, and/or environmental conditions.

Performance Factor: Program Management

Reporting

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Does not complete and/or submit reports in a timely manner.	Completes and submits reports that are incomplete or with errors.	Submits complete and accurate reports in a timely manner. Keeps data up-to-date and readily accessible.	Reports are completed accurately showing program progress and accomplishments. Reports are frequently shared with stakeholders.	Completes all reports on time and consistently shares impact with stakeholders. Consistently reports progress and program outcomes. Utilizes the reports to improve programming efforts.

Performance Factor: Program Management

Resource Management

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Does not seek outside sources of funding to support Extension programs and/or fails to manage accounts according to University policy.	Occasionally seeks outside sources of funding to support extension programs.	Routinely seeks and obtains extramural funding (including gifts, grants and fees), maintains budgets and accounts to provide a quality program.	Secures and utilizes extramural funding (including gifts, grants and fees) to enhance quality programs.	Secures and utilizes extramural funding (including gifts, grants and fees) through a comprehensive program to invest in high-quality and/or new programs.
County Director — Rarely meets fiscal needs of the county program; demonstrates poor fiscal management; and/or physical resources meet minimal program and staff needs.	*County Director —* Occasionally meets fiscal needs of the county program; lacks fiscal management; and/or physical resources meet occasional program and staff needs.	*County Director —* Routinely meets fiscal needs of the county program; fosters transparency in resource management; meets expectations for fiscal management; physical resources are adequate, updated, clean and address all program and staff needs.	*County Director —* Frequently provides fiscal resources to address emerging and new county program efforts; exceeds expectations for fiscal management; and works to improve physical resources to support innovative programs.	*County Director —* Consistently provides fiscal resources to address emerging and new county program efforts; exceeds expectations for fiscal management; and has a long-term plan for physical resource needs of programs and staff.

Performance Factor: Program Accomplishments

Base Programs

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Rarely shows effective base programming or responsiveness to community needs.	Occasionally conducts effective base programming.	Routinely conducts base programming efforts with participation levels that meet expectations for county or area served.	Frequently conducts base programming efforts with participation levels that exceed expectations for county or area served.	Consistently manages effective base programming. Anticipates and addresses emerging community needs or requests through effective base programming.

Equity, Access and Opportunity

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Shows no effort in reaching diverse and underserved clientele. Does not use Americans with Disabilities Act, Equal Employment Opportunity, Civil Rights, and/or Affirmative Action guidelines.	Occasionally reaches diverse and underrepresented clientele.	Repeatedly strives to reach diverse and/or underrepresented clientele. Participation includes diverse and underrepresented clientele.	Successfully demonstrates an involvement of diverse and underrepresented clientele. Serves as a resource for equity, access and opportunity issues. Plans specifically for equity, access and opportunity issues.	Engages stakeholders in reaching diverse and underrepresented clientele. Provides support, opportunity, resources, scholarships, etc., for underrepresented clientele. Implements sustainable approaches to involve underrepresented clientele.

Performance Factor: Program Accomplishments

Outcomes/Impacts

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
No or minimal program participation or outcomes reported.	Occasionally documents outcomes and program participation.	Routinely documents outcomes which are at expected levels. Outcomes demonstrate clientele knowledge, attitude and/or skills change.	Frequently documents outcomes which exceed expectations. Documented outcomes demonstrate progressive clientele behavior and/or practice change.	Consistently documents outcomes which exceed expectations. Documented outcomes demonstrate improved quality of life, economic and/or environmental conditions.

Performance Factor: Professionalism

Customer Service

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Does not communicate in response to client needs/requests and/or ignores client needs.	Occasionally fails to respond to client needs or requests.	Responds to client needs or requests in a timely and professional manner. Works well with all clientele groups. Communicates respectfully to all requests.	Proactively addresses client needs or requests.	Anticipates and addresses emerging client needs or requests.

Performance Factor: Professionalism

Policy Compliance

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Does not follow nor demonstrates minimal knowledge of applicable policies.	Occasionally does not follow policy and/or lacks knowledge of applicable policies.	Understands and follows all applicable policies.	Interprets and encourages others to follow all applicable policies.	Recognized as a resource on applicable policies and procedures and is a role model to others.

Professional Development

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Rarely attends recommended professional development opportunities. Is not a member of a professional organization.	Occasionally attends recommended professional development opportunities. Is a member of a professional organization, but only occasionally participates.	Attends relevant professional development opportunities. Is a member of professional organization and attends meetings. Has a current professional development plan.	Incorporates knowledge from relevant professional development into the Extension program. Seeks additional development resources through research literature. Actively participates on a professional organization committee.	Facilitates the professional development of agents and/or volunteers in specialized content. Receives recognition through relevant professional associations. Mentor and role model for new employees. Active in professional association at or beyond state level.

Performance Factor: Professionalism

Technology and Innovation

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Minimal use of technology.	Occasional use of technology.	Routine use of appropriate technology for communications. Takes advantage of training opportunities to stay on the cutting edge with technology advances in content and program delivery.	Serves as a resource for using the latest technology for communications and programming. Shares innovative practices.	Recognized by Extension professionals and volunteers as highly competent in using the latest technology and/or innovation for teaching, communications, programming and/or technical assistance.

Performance Factor: Professionalism

Work Habits

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Often displays a negative, uncooperative attitude toward coworkers, clientele, work assignments and requirements. Is frequently noncompliant with established work rules and organizational policies/protocol. Rarely demonstrates the ability to manage time and resources to meet commitments within established time frames.	Occasionally displays a positive, cooperative attitude toward coworkers, clientele, work assignments and requirements. Is occasionally noncompliant with established work rules and organizational policies/protocol. Requires assistance to manage time and resources to meet commitments within established time frames.	Displays a positive, cooperative attitude toward coworkers, clientele, work assignments and requirements. Complies with established work rules and organizational policies/protocol. Manages time and resources and demonstrates initiative to meet commitments within established time frames.	Contributes to an effective work environment by displaying a positive, cooperative attitude toward coworkers, clientele, work assignments and requirements. Frequently complies with established work rules and organizational policies/protocol. Frequently demonstrates the ability to manage time and resources to meet commitments within established time frames.	Inspires others to display a positive, cooperative attitude toward coworkers, clientele, work assignments and requirements. Almost always complies with established work rules and organizational policies/protocol. Coaches others to manage time and resources to meet commitments within established time frames.

Performance Factor: Community and Organizational Leadership

Interpersonal Skills

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Demonstrates minimal interpersonal skills as needed to serve as a leader or effective team member; minimal collaboration with other agents and coworkers; and/or rarely utilizes appropriate communication methods to communicate with others.	Occasionally communicates with other agents and coworkers; focused on personal recognition over success of the team; and/or occasionally collaborates with other colleagues, volunteers, clientele and partners.	Communicates with all agents and coworkers and supports other agents and coworkers with their programming efforts.	Focused on success of team over personal recognition; successful collaboration with other agents and coworkers; contributes to both team projects and harmony in the workplace.	Readily utilizes interpersonal skills to mentor, develop and coach others. Brings out the best in others by inspiring, motivating, and guiding them toward a goal. Builds and maintains effective relationships with colleagues, volunteers, clientele and partners. Actively works to resolve conflicts and contributes to harmony in the workplace.
County Director — Fails to foster open communication among staff and/or rarely conducts office conferences.	*County Director —* Lacks open communication among staff and/or occasionally conducts office conferences.	*County Director —* Routinely fosters open communication among staff and routinely conducts office conferences.	*County Director —* Frequently fosters open communication and frequently conducts office conferences.	*County Director —* Consistently fosters open communication among staff through regular office conferences and effective one-on-one communication.

Performance Factor: Community and Organizational Leadership

Leadership

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Does not serve on any teams and/or special assignments at the county, region or state level. Does not recognize the benefit to the organization or themselves by serving.	Occasionally serves on teams and/or committees only when specifically asked or directed. Consistently fails to follow through with commitments.	Routinely seeks and serves on county, multicounty and regional teams. Completes county, multicounty, regional and/or state assignments.	Frequently serves on county, multicounty, region and/or statewide teams and is a participating member. Leads county, multicounty, regional and/or state assignments.	Consistently leads and serves on county, multi-multicounty, region, statewide, multistate, national teams. Mentors others in these roles.
County Director — Demonstrates minimal county and stakeholder relationships, networking and/or marketing of all Extension programs.	*County Director —* Occasionally demonstrates county and stakeholder relationships, networking and/or marketing of all Extension programs.	*County Director —* Routinely demonstrates county and stakeholder relationships, networking and marketing of all Extension programs. Meets quarterly with the County Agriculture Committee.	*County Director —* Frequently demonstrates effective county and stakeholder relationships, networking and marketing of all Extension programs.	*County Director —* Consistently demonstrates exemplary county and stakeholder relationships, networking and marketing of all Extension programs.

Performance Factor: Community and Organizational Leadership

Optimizing Human Capital

Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Exemplary (5)
Minimally engages staff, volunteers and/or participants as applicable for Extension operations and programming.	Occasionally engages staff, volunteers and/or participants as applicable for Extension operations and programming.	Routinely engages staff, volunteers and/or participants as applicable for Extension operations and programming. Effectively manages the volunteer process.	Frequently engages staff, volunteers and/or participants as applicable for Extension operations and programming. Delegates appropriately to staff and volunteers to meet objectives of Extension operations and programming.	Consistently engages staff, volunteers and/or participants as applicable for Extension operations and programming. Delegates appropriately and mentors staff and volunteers to meet objectives of Extension operations and programming.
County Director — Provides minimal direction of staff toward common goals, counseling, mentoring and/or conflict management. Fails to conduct effective performance management.	*County Director —* Occasionally provides direction of staff toward common goals, counseling, mentoring and/or conflict management. Performance management lacks effectiveness.	*County Director —* Routinely provides direction of staff toward common goals, counseling, mentoring, conflict management and effective performance management.	*County Director —* Frequently provides direction of staff toward common goals, counseling, mentoring, conflict management and effective performance management.	*County Director –* Almost always provides direction of staff toward common goals, counseling, mentoring, conflict management, and effective performance management.

Appendix B — The University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University Performance Review Summary Form

The University of Tennessee and Tennessee State University
Performance Review Summary Form
Extension Agent, Extension Agent and County Director, Extension Area Specialist

Employee Name (Last, First, MI):	
UT IRIS Personnel Number:	TSU T#:
Division: Extension	Unit/Department:
Review Completed By:	Reviewer's Personnel Number:
Review Period: FROM:	TO:
_____ Annual_____Enhanced Annual_____Other	

Performance Factors	Criteria	Points (1-5)*
Program Development	Individual Annual Plan	
Program Management	Implementing	
	Evaluation	
	Reporting	
	Resource Management	
Program Accomplishments	Base Programs	
	Equity, Access, and Opportunity	
	Outcomes/Impacts	
Professionalism	Customer Service	
	Policy Compliance	
	Professional Development	
	Technology and Innovation	
	Work Habits	
Community and Organizational Leadership	Interpersonal Skills	
	Leadership	
	Optimizing Human Capital	

*5=exemplary, 4=exceeds expectations, 3=meets expectations, 2=needs improvement, and 1=unsatisfactory

Employee Name (Last, First, MI):	
UT IRIS Personnel Number:	TSU T#:

Averages	*Score*
Sum of ***Program Development*** Criteria Rating____/1 = *Supervisor Comments*:*	
Sum of ***Program Management*** Criteria Ratings____/4 = *Supervisor Comments*:*	
Sum of ***Program Accomplishments*** Criteria Ratings____/3 = *Supervisor Comments*:*	
Sum of ***Professionalism*** Criteria Ratings____/5 = *Supervisor Comments*:*	
Sum of ***Community and Organizational Leadership*** Criteria Ratings____/3 = *Supervisor Comments*:*	
Overall Score =	

*Supporting comments are required.

	Overall Rating	*Total Points*
☐	Exemplary	= 23-25
☐	Exceeds Expectations	= 19-22
☐	Meets Expectations	= 15-18
☐	Needs Improvement*	= 10-14
☐	Unsatisfactory*	= 9 or less

*An overall rating of 14 or below requires a performance improvement plan.

Review of Goals for the Current Year

Goal 1		☐ Accomplished ☐ Progress ☐ No Progress
Goal 2		☐ Accomplished ☐ Progress ☐ No Progress
Goal 3		☐ Accomplished ☐ Progress ☐ No Progress
Comments		

Employee Name (Last, First, MI):	
UT IRIS Personnel Number:	TSU T#:

Establishment of Goals for the Coming Year
The goals and objectives should include both departmental goals and plans for personal and professional development. The time frame indicates when the goal should be accomplished. Evaluation indicates how accomplishment will be measured.

	Description	Timeframe	Evaluation
Goal 1			
Goal 2			
Goal 3			
Comments			

Supervisor Comments:

Employee Comments: *(Required – Please respond about anything you need help with, how can your supervisor assist you in accomplishing your goals, and/or what resources you need.)*

This report represents my true and complete appraisal of this employee during the evaluation period.

County Director's Signature:	Date:
Regional Director's Signature:	Date:
Dean's/Associate Dean's Signature*:	Date:

*TSU Employee forms must be signed by TSU Associate Dean.

I understand that my signature does not mean that I necessarily agree or disagree with the performance appraisal. It has been discussed with me, and I have received a copy of the performance appraisal document.

Employee's Signature:	Date:

August 2016

UTIA
INSTITUTE OF
AGRICULTURE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
Real. Life. Solutions.™

AG.TENNESSEE.EDU