Procedures for the Evaluation of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

The performance of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness will be reviewed in his or her third year in the first evaluation cycle. Subsequent reviews will be on a five year cycle, unless, at the conclusion of a review, the Executive Committee of the Senate votes to implement the next review cycle in fewer than five years. The purpose of such comprehensive reviews is to evaluate the progress of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, to provide the opportunity for constructive input from faculty and other constituencies, to review the individual’s professional contributions and performance as a “leader” and as an “administrator,” and to provide feedback to improve his or her performance.

The faculty portion of the evaluation of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness is a summary of faculty responses to the Georgia State University Evaluation Form by those faculty members listed in this document as designated evaluators and holding rank as defined in the Statutes Art. V, Sec. 1 and contract with .75 EFT or above. The evaluation of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness also will contain a staff component which is a summary of staff responses to the Georgia State University Staff Component Form for the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness by staff members listed in this document as designated evaluators. Additionally, feedback from outside evaluators identified through the procedures described in this document will provide a supplementary perspective to the internal appraisals. This evaluation does not preclude evaluations by other constituencies, as approved by the Executive Committee. The Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness is not eligible to complete an evaluation on him/herself.

Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee
On or before August 10 in the designated evaluation year, the Provost will notify the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee that an evaluation will be conducted by an elected Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee. The committee will consist of one faculty member elected from each college, one staff member elected by Staff Council, as well as one member from the Counseling Center or the University Library (membership from these two units on the presidential and vice presidential Ad Hoc Evaluation Committees will rotate in the alphabetical order listed, starting first with the Counseling Center). These eight (8) elected members may include departmental chairs, but may not include deans. The committee also will include the chairs of the Senate Academic Programs and Planning and Development Committees.

Before the end of the fall semester, the election of the faculty members to the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee shall be conducted in general college faculty meetings. Nominations will be made from the floor. Nominees must be tenured faculty members. Voting will be done by secret ballot. The election of committee members will be by simple majority. Members of an elected committee of the college such as the Faculty Affairs or Executive Committee will serve as tellers to count the votes. By December 15, the election of the staff member to the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee shall be conducted in a general meeting of Staff Council. By December 15, the President of Staff Council and the deans will send the names of the elected faculty and staff members to the Provost.

On or before January 10, the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness will provide to the Provost a three-page single-spaced narrative (maximum) listing and describing accomplishments of the past three years or the years since the last evaluation, and documents to support these accomplishments. This narrative, supporting documents, and a current job description of the position being evaluated should be submitted to the Senate Office by the Provost.
On or before January 15, the Chair of the University Senate Executive Committee will call the first meeting to elect the chair for the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee. The chair for the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee will be elected by all the committee members from among the faculty members of the committee who are not department chairs. The elected chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee will inform the Provost of the results of this election. Prior to this first meeting, the Senate Office administrator will provide the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee with a copy of the procedures, the evaluation instrument, and the list of designated evaluators via email. The Provost and/or the Chair of the Executive Committee will attend this first meeting to brief members on their charge and the expectations for the data analysis and subsequent report, and to answer questions.

On or before February 1, the Provost will notify each University faculty and staff member announcing the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee members and chair. The letter will describe the designated evaluators and explain that other faculty and staff members who wish to participate in the evaluation can contact the Senate Office administrator. Respondents who are not listed as designated evaluators will be considered faculty or staff volunteers. Such volunteer responses and written comments of volunteers will be analyzed separately for the final report. A record will be kept of the number of faculty and staff volunteer requests, but not of the names.

Before the end of the fall semester, the Senate Office administrator will send the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) a copy of the evaluation instrument and a listing of all designated evaluators and their email addresses.

**Staff Component of the Evaluation of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness**

The purpose of the staff component of the Evaluation of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness is to seek feedback in this nonacademic area from designated staff members in order to assist the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee in making recommendations for improving the performance of the administrator. The certification, distribution, collection, and analysis of the staff questionnaire will be conducted separately from the faculty questionnaire. The written comments from the staff respondents also will be recorded separately from the faculty comments. The staff responses will be reviewed and summarized by the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee, which includes the previously mentioned elected faculty members.

**Outside Evaluators**

By January 10th, the administrator will submit a list of six names of potential outside evaluators to the Provost, listing their qualifications and relationship to the administrator. The Provost will forward this list to the Executive Committee along with the names of four additional potential outside evaluators with a description of their qualifications and relationship to the administrator. The Executive Committee will choose two names from the administrator’s list and two names suggested by the Provost. The final list of four names approved by the Executive Committee will not be shared with the administrator. The narrative and supporting documents provided by the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness will be sent to the four outside evaluators selected by the Executive Committee. The outside evaluators will be asked to review this material and to submit their evaluations on or before February 28.

The letters give a supplementary perspective to the Senate appraisals, but the latter provide the specific context and conditions under which the administrator performed. The evaluation committee should consider that such letters may be, at times, both more and less reliable than internal appraisals of an administrator’s work: more reliable because the reviewer may be a more objective judge, but less reliable because the reviewer may lack an understanding of the specific context. Therefore, the evaluation committee shall attempt to interpret and contextualize the letters from the outside evaluators in the SEA report.
Distribution of Evaluation Forms
Each designated evaluator will receive notification, via email, that the evaluation process is beginning. Attached to this email will be a current job description of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the 3-page summary of accomplishments for the administrator being evaluated. The evaluators also will be informed that an email will be sent to them from OIR explaining the anonymity of the online process and a URL for them to complete the evaluation. Only designated evaluators will be given access to the online evaluation. Faculty and staff members who want to complete a “faculty volunteer” or “staff volunteer” evaluation should contact the Senate Office administrator.

Faculty members receiving the evaluation will consist of, but not be limited to, the following categories:

(1) Administrators holding faculty rank (including Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Associate Provosts, Deans, Associate and Assistant Deans, Chairs, and University Council);

(2) All faculty members of the current Senate and of the preceding two Senates;

(3) The Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee members.

Staff members receiving the evaluation will consist of the following categories, including all direct reports and subordinates per the organizational chart:

(1) All staff members in the Office of Institutional Research;

(2) All staff members in Decision Support Systems;

(3) Director of Administrative Support Unit Planning and Assessment;

(4) Director of Academic Assessment;

(5) Associate Provost for IS&T;

(6) VP for Finance and Administration, Assistant VP for Finance and Administration, Assistant VP for Human Resources;

(7) Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinator and Faculty Ombudsperson; Director of Affirmative Action

(8) University Attorney

(9) Assistant to the Provost

(10) Director of University Auditing and Advisory Services

(11) All staff members of the Administrative and Support Unit Review Committee

Guidelines for Questionnaire Forms
A similar but separate procedure will be followed for both the faculty evaluation and the staff evaluation unless otherwise indicated.
ALL PARTS OF THE EVALUATION WILL BE ANONYMOUS.

On or before February 1, OIR will contact all designated evaluators and provide them with the URL for completing the questionnaire. From the date of University distribution, faculty and staff members will have two weeks (14 calendar days) to complete the evaluation. Faculty volunteers may request a “faculty volunteer” evaluation instrument from the Senate Office before or during the 14 day period, but all questionnaires must be completed by the appointed due date. A parallel process will be used for staff members who wish to complete a “staff volunteer” evaluation instrument. The following efforts will be made to achieve the highest response level possible. Up to three rounds of emails will be sent to evaluators within this two-week period requesting the return of the evaluation instruments.

The questionnaires and the written comments will be assembled, processed, and analyzed in the following manner:

Within one week of the survey closure, OIR will export the data file generated in E-Listen to SPSS for analysis. Analysis of quantitative data will include frequency counts, percentages and, if applicable, means and standard deviations. Tables and graphs will be exported from SPSS into a PDF document for electronic dissemination. Qualitative responses will be downloaded from E-Listen directly into a Word document without any changes to wording, punctuation, or grammar. Data will be partitioned into a faculty and staff data set. Each of these data sets will be partitioned further to show those respondents who have indicated a working relationship with the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness during the previous evaluation period and those who have not so indicated. In order to make evident which responses are those of a single evaluator, comments from all sections of the survey submitted by an individual respondent will be presented in unison. Because the survey is anonymous, respondents will be assigned numbers only for organization purposes (e.g., respondent 1, respondent 2). These numbers cannot be linked to individual identities. A PDF file will be created for the electronic dissemination of survey comments.

All electronic and hard-copy reports will be given to the Senate Office administrator.

OIR will retain all raw data files. Six months after completion of the survey analysis, E-Listen files and SPSS files will be eliminated.

Summary Report
Upon conclusion of the review, on or before March 27, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee will provide the Provost with a confidential written report (Summary Evaluation of the Administrator [SEA] report) of no more than eight single-spaced pages in length. Faculty and staff content of the report should be presented separately as should content on those having reported a working relationship with the administrator and those who did not. Letters from outside evaluators will be attached to the report, but not made available to the administrator; the SEA will attempt to contextualize this content. Using the response items and a comprehensive summary of the written comments, including direct quotations, the report should provide the overall findings, proposed performance goals for the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, and recommendations to the Provost. The analysis, comments, and demographic data of faculty and staff volunteers will be presented and summarized separately.
On the same day, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee will give a copy of the report and the organized written comments to the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the Senate Office Administrator.

On or before April 1, the meeting for the formal presentation and discussion of the SEA report will be conducted by the Provost and will include the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee chair. At that time, the Provost also will present a draft one-page single-spaced summary report to the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee.

On or before April 5, the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee may submit comments on the one-page summary report to the Executive Committee.

On or before April 6, the Provost will provide an opportunity in a secure area for the Executive Committee of the University Senate to read the SEA report, data, and the draft one-page summary report. The full Executive Committee will finalize the one-page single-spaced summary report upon the conclusion of reading the SEA report and the draft one-page single-spaced summary report, and any comments on the one-page summary report submitted by the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee.

Subsequently, the Provost will forward the one-page summary report to the President and the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness. The Provost will make a recommendation to the President on reappointment of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness.

On or before April 1 of the year following the designated evaluation year, the Provost will give a follow-up report to the Executive Committee on the areas of concern raised in the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness’s evaluation report. The Provost’s follow-up report should include specific actions taken for each area of concern and performance goal identified in the evaluation report.

**Distribution of Results**

The one-page summary report will be sent to all faculty and staff of the University at the conclusion of the evaluation process. The one-page summary also will be sent to the University Senate as an information item at the first full non-organizational meeting of the University Senate upon conclusion of the evaluation process.
Georgia State University
Faculty Evaluation of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

There are five categories in this section. If you have been employed in the University fewer than the number of years under which this evaluation falls, please consider the performance of the administrator since your hire date. Please respond to each category according to the scale below.

A. Strongly Agree
B. Agree
C. Neither Agree nor Disagree
D. Disagree
E. Strongly Disagree
F. Don’t know

Self Identification: Respondent Category

Please identify yourself as follows:

My respondent category is:
1. Evaluator -- Administrator (half-time or more)
2. Evaluator -- Teaching and/or Research Faculty
CATEGORY I. GOALS AND PRIORITIES

1. The Associate Provost has provided leadership in developing and advancing appropriate goals and priorities that enhance the effectiveness of the University (its administrative and support units and academic programs).

2. The Associate Provost has provided leadership in developing and advancing the University’s continuous planning, assessment, and evaluation efforts.

3. The Associate Provost has developed appropriate priorities in accomplishing the goals of the Institutional Effectiveness office.

4. The Associate Provost has effectively articulated and communicated the goals of the Institutional Effectiveness office.

5. The Associate Provost has effectively attained the goals of the Institutional Effectiveness office.

6. The Associate Provost has provided appropriate leadership to advance or facilitate strategic planning of the University.

7. The Associate Provost has provided appropriate leadership to advance or facilitate the strategic planning of administrative and academic units.

8. The Associate Provost has worked effectively with academic units and with administrative and support units to present resource needs to the Provost.

9. The Associate Provost has provided leadership in review and evaluation of academic programs, including centers.


(Please use the comments section for any comments on Category I.)

CATEGORY II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

10. The Associate Provost operates according to the Bylaws and the Statutes of the University.

11. The Associate Provost effectively works with the colleges and schools of the University.

12. The Associate Provost makes appropriate use of and acts on the recommendations of Senate and University committees.

13. The Associate Provost has good working relations with other administrators at the University.

14. The Associate Provost interacts effectively with the faculty and University committees.

15. The Associate Provost effectively supervises the Office of Institutional Research.
17. The Associate Provost effectively supervises the Director of Administrative and Support Unit Review.
18. The Associate Provost effectively supervises the Director of Academic Assessment.

19. The Associate Provost effectively supports the work of the Academic Program Review Committee.
20. The Associate Provost effectively supports the work of the Administrative and Support Unit Review Committee.
21. The Associate Provost effectively supports the work of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

22. The Associate Provost effectively administers and follows up on detail work.
23. The Associate Provost keeps the faculty of the University fully informed on all important matters relating to the institutional effectiveness of the University.

(Please use the comments section for any comments on Category II.)

CATEGORY III. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

24. The Associate Provost encourages an environment that rewards individual initiative.
25. The Associate Provost encourages an environment that rewards teamwork and collaborative efforts with faculty and other units of the University.
26. The Associate Provost is willing to explain thoroughly the reasons for decisions.
27. The Associate Provost uses sound judgment in issues of appointments, reappointments, dismissals, and promotions.
28. The Associate Provost maintains appropriate levels of confidentiality in personnel matters.
29. The Associate Provost promotes a positive stance towards diversity in light of race, gender, age, religion, color, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran status, or disability in his or her hiring, promoting, and managing of faculty and staff.

30. The Associate Provost actively supports and promotes affirmative action policies and diversity programs at the University.

(Please use the comment section for any comments on Category III.)

CATEGORY IV. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
31. The Associate Provost relates well to the employees and students of GSU.

32. The Associate Provost is accessible to the GSU community (e.g., responds to inquiries via e-mails or phone calls in timely manner).

33. The Associate Provost is open to suggestions and new opportunities.

34. The Associate Provost responds constructively to criticism.

35. The Associate Provost respects the rights and dignity of others.

36. The Associate Provost maintains a creditable standing in his or her area of professional expertise.

(Please use the comment section for any comments on Category IV.)

CATEGORY V. OVERALL EVALUATION

37. Overall, I rate the performance of the Associate Provost as:

   A. Excellent   B. Good     C. Fair   D. Poor    E. Unable to rate

38. On at least one occasion over the past evaluation period I have had a working relationship with the individual being evaluated (e.g., working together on a project or committee).

   A. Yes   B. No

(Please use the comment section for any comments on Category V.)
SECTION B. WRITTEN COMMENTS

INSTRUCTIONS

Written comments provide important and specific information that cannot be obtained by the questionnaire responses. You are strongly encouraged to offer both positive and negative comments. For the committee report, all comments will be directly quoted.

CATEGORY I. GOALS AND PRIORITIES

CATEGORY II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

CATEGORY III. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

CATEGORY IV. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

CATEGORY V. OVERALL EVALUATION
1. What is your rank?
   A. Professor or Regents' Professor
   B. Associate Professor
   C. Assistant Professor
   D. Instructor or Lecturer

2. Are your responsibilities primarily administrative (e.g., associate/assistant dean, department chair, center director)?
   A. Yes
   B. No

3. What is your tenure status?
   A. Tenured
   B. Not tenured, but on tenure track
   C. Not on tenure track

4. How long have you been employed at Georgia State University?
   A. Less than one year
   B. One to less than three years
   C. Three to less than six years
   D. Six to less than fifteen years
   E. Fifteen or more years
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Staff Evaluation of the Associate Provost of Institutional Effectiveness

SECTION A. RATINGS OF THE ASSOCIATE PROVOST OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

INSTRUCTIONS
There are five categories in this section. If you have been employed in the University fewer than the number of years under which this evaluation falls, please consider the performance of the administrator since your hire date. Please respond to each category according to the scale below.

A. Strongly Agree
B. Agree
C. Neither Agree nor Disagree
D. Disagree
E. Strongly Disagree
F. Don’t know

Category I. Organizational Matters
1. Operates according to the Bylaws and the Statutes of the University
2. Communicates priorities and administrative procedures effectively
3. Keeps staff fully informed on all important matters relating to the University
4. Works effectively with staff in identifying short-term and long-term goals, in setting priorities and in focusing resources
5. Maintains appropriate administrative organization, sharing governance with staff when appropriate
6. Is available to administrative staff
7. Facilitates open communication among staff in the University
8. Is effective in distributing resources to staff including merit raises and support for professional development

*(Please use the comments section for any comments on Category I.)*

Category II. Leadership
10. Develops and communicates a clear strategic and management direction
11. Encourages an environment that rewards individual initiative
12. Encourages an environment that rewards teamwork and collaboration in the University

13. Creates a climate of respect and high morale

14. Provides sound fiscal management in line with the strategic plan

15. Portrays a progressive and positive image of the University

16. Consults with appropriate individuals before making decisions

17. Provides leadership in securing appropriate compensation for staff consistent with aspirational institutions

*(Please use the comments section for any comments on Category II.)*

**Category III. Personnel Management**

18. Promotes fair staff workloads

19. Is willing to explain thoroughly the reasons for decisions

20. Uses sound judgment in issues of reappointments, dismissals, and promotions

21. Provides support for the successful recruitment and retention of staff

22. Recognizes contributions of staff

23. Lets people know what is expected of them

24. Supports staff in providing service to the greater University community

25. Holds staff accountable for their responsibilities

26. Responds to issues of concern from staff

27. Encourages and promotes career and professional development among staff

28. Evaluates staff effectively and fairly, according to established measures and standards for staff performance

29. Maintains appropriate levels of confidentiality in personnel matters

Promotes a positive stance towards diversity in light of race, gender, age, religion, color, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran status, or disability in his or her hiring, promoting, and managing of faculty and staff

30. Actively supports and promotes affirmative action policies and diversity programs at the University.

*(Please use the comments section for any comments on Category III.)*

**Category IV. Personal Characteristics**
31. Relates well to employees and students of GSU

32. Is accessible to the GSU community (responds to emails and phone calls in a timely manner)

33. Is available, approachable and open to suggestions

34. Respects the rights and dignity of others

35. Provides innovative leadership and promotes an environment which nourishes individual staff growth

(Please use the comments section for any comments on Category IV.)

Category V. Overall Performance Evaluation

36. Overall I rate the performance as:
   A. Excellent   B. Good   C. Fair   D. Poor   E. Unable to Rate

37. On at least one occasion over the past evaluation period, I have had a working relationship with the individual being evaluated (e.g., direct report, project or committee work, etc.).
   A. Yes   B. No
(Please use the comments section for any comments for Category V.)

SECTION B. WRITTEN COMMENTS

INSTRUCTIONS

Written comments provide important and specific information that cannot be obtained by the questionnaire responses. You are strongly encouraged to offer both positive and negative comments. For the committee report, all comments will be directly quoted.

Category I. Organizational Matters

Category II. Leadership

Category III. Personnel Management

Category IV. Personal Characteristics

Category V. Overall Performance Evaluation