

Cost Estimate for Implementation of PPP Reviews on the UTK Campus

*Based on Information provided by Professor Louis Gross,
Past-Chair of the UTK Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee
September 2018*

This document is a revision of the document distributed by the UTK Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee in March 2018. This revision arises from the detailed procedures described in a draft posted by the Provost on September 12, 2018 which leads to some changes in expectations for the review from those assumed in the original version of this cost estimate.

For the integrity of the review process, we might compare the proposed Periodic Post-Tenure Performance Reviews (PPPR) held on a six-year cycle to promotion and tenure reviews. These reviews conducted for other institutions by individual faculty typically require about two days reading the research/scholarship materials of the individual being reviewed, compiling comments and then another day putting it together in a cohesive way in a 2 to 4-page letter based on an institution's criteria. For the draft PPPR process, each of the three members of a review committee would likely actually expend more effort than would be expected from an external reviewer because: (i) the review does not focus on the research emphasis typically expected in external reviews but also incorporates teaching and service activities typically not expected to be commented upon by external reviewers; (ii) the review materials include the whole range of materials associated with a faculty member's performance over a 6-year time period, including teaching evaluations by students and peers, research activities, service activities scholarship, and thus to be comprehensive will require even more effort of committee members for a fair review; (iii) the review committee members need to analyze the unit Bylaws and interpret the expectations for rank for units which are not their own and this could well involve extensive discussions among the review Committee members; and (iv) the review Committee must compose a comprehensive report explaining its decision according to the template from the Provost which includes not only a report regarding the faculty member under review but has a completely separate requirement regarding reporting on the quality of the annual evaluations carried out by the Head.

Due to all of the above, the previous estimate of time commitment for the faculty serving on a review Committee is likely more readily estimated as 4 days of effort rather than 3. Because the evaluation narrative requires input from multiple internal reviewers, the time needed to complete the written evaluation is expected to be longer than that expected from an external reviewer. External reviewers focus consideration on an individual's scholarship in an area the reviewers have some background, making review of scholarship particularly difficult for internal reviewers who are not even associated with the faculty member's main unit. To be fair and thorough, reviewers will expend a significant amount of time each and will not be readily able to transfer understanding of one unit's expectations to that of another unit's expectations. In cases of interdisciplinary work, or for faculty who have joint appointments, additional effort would be required than that estimated here.

Below is an estimate of the cost of implementation for a PPPR. There are three components of this: (i) the time of the review committee; (ii) the time of the faculty member under review and (iii) the time and effort of the administration involved in establishing the reviews and assessing them. The previous cost estimate made in March only estimated costs of the review committee.

1. Costs of the Review Committee

The calculation assumes that this review is in addition to any other reviews (it would exclude those for whom a promotion review has been held in the past 6 years and does not take the place of annual reviews). This calculation assumes that only half the associate professors would need a six-year review and all the full professors would need them. With 473 Full Professors and 345 Associate Professors (this

estimate does not include those with primarily administrative appointments since they are excluded in the draft), this means a total of $(473 + 345/2)/6 = 108$ reviews being done every year. For salaries (these are based on averages from the 2016-17 salary data in the survey compiled by the Senate), the assumption is that the average committee is a 3-person review team with two being Full Professors and one being an Associate Professor so the average salary across the review team is $(2/3)*141,512 + (1/3)*96,638 = 126,554$. With 196 working days in the nine months from August through April, the average daily cost of a faculty member is \$645 and at the standard UTK fringe rate of 32% the cost to UT per faculty day is \$852.

For this comprehensive PPPR review which includes research/scholarship/creative activity as well as teaching and service, with 4 days of effort for each of the faculty members costs $12*852 = \$10,224$ per review and the cost to UTK for 108 reviews is $108*10,224 = \$1,104,192$.

2. Costs for time of the Faculty member under review

Given the importance of preparing materials appropriately, an estimate of one day of the faculty members time to prepare the statement and ensure that the materials being included are complete is likely an underestimate. Again assuming the above estimates for which faculty are involved of only half of the Associate Professors and all the Full Professors who are not administrators, the average annual salary for the faculty member under review would be $(473/(473+172))*141,512 + (172/473+172)*96,638 = \$129,545$ with an average daily salary of \$660 and with fringe this is \$871. So the cost in reviewed faculty time for 108 reviews is \$94,068. This doesn't include any effort of the faculty member to possibly respond to any review.

3. Costs for Administration of the Reviews

The process will require effort by Deans and the Provosts office in particular to identify appropriate faculty members to serve on reviews, assign review teams, coordinate the review, and then assess the results of the review. This is in addition to staff time in doing all the variety of communication and collection of results. These are non-trivial time commitments but are rather difficult to estimate. The estimate here simply assumes that the effort will be a total of one month of a Dean's time and one month of a vice Provost time, plus one month of a staff member. These are estimated (including fringe) as \$30,000 for Dean's effort and \$30,000 for Provost's effort (assumes a \$200K salary plus standard fringe), plus \$5000 of staff effort. So the cost is an additional \$65,000.

Total cost is $\$1,104,192 + \$94,068 + \$65,000 = \$1,263,260$

An alternative additional cost is to consider the loss in teaching and scholarly productivity entailed in the above which may not be completely captured in the salary estimates above. The time and effort that faculty spend conducting peer reviews for this process is time that they are not writing grant proposals, recruiting the best post-docs and graduate students, doing field and lab work, preparing for classes, mentoring students, etc.

Finally, a cost not included is the potential loss of high-quality faculty members who decide it is not worth the potential problems associated with this form of PPPR and pursue a move to another institution. It is extremely expensive to replace faculty members who move, not just due to start-up costs but due to costs of the recruiting process itself. Having the PPPR process perceived as a completely separate review from the annual reviews may lead to additional incentives for faculty to leave who are meeting or exceeding their expectations for rank, but use this as an opportunity (as do faculty at the time of tenure reviews) to "assay" the options open to them elsewhere. Anecdotally this cost is a real one.