Procedures for the Evaluation of the 
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

The performance of the Provost 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 Provost, 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 Provost 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 Provost also will contain a staff component which is a summary of staff responses to the Georgia State University Staff Component Form for the Provost 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 Provost 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 President will notify the Provost 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 University Library. These eight (8) elected members may include departmental chairs, but may not include deans. The committee also will include the chair of the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.

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 Chair of Staff Council and the deans will send the names of the elected faculty and staff members to the President.

On or before January 10, the Provost will provide to the President 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 also be submitted to the Senate Office administrator 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 President 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 Chair of the University Senate 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 Chair of the University Senate Executive Committee 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 Provost**

The purpose of the staff component of the Evaluation of the Provost is to seek feedback in this non-academic 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 10\textsuperscript{th}, the Provost will submit a list of six names of potential outside evaluators to the Chair of the University Senate Executive Committee, listing their qualifications and relationship to the administrator. The Chair of the University Senate Executive Committee 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 President. The final list of four names approved by the Executive Committee will not be shared with the Provost. The narrative and supporting documents provided by the Provost 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 position being
evaluated and the 3-page summary of accomplishments for the Provost. 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, Senior Faculty Associates, Director of Center for Instructional Innovation; Director of Critical Thinking through Writing; and Director of Writing across the Curriculum and the University Administrative 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. Administrators without faculty rank (including Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Deans; the University Administrative Council);
2. Director of Affirmative Action;
3. Director, Employee Relations;
4. All staff members in the Office of the Provost;
5. Ombudsperson.
6. All staff senators of the current Senate and of the preceding two Senates;
7. All members of current Staff Council and of the preceding two Staff Councils.

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 Provost 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 President 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 Provost, 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 Provost 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 President and will include the Provost and the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee chair. At that time, the President also will present a draft one-page single-spaced summary report to the Provost and the chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee.

On or before April 5, the Provost 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 President 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 Provost and the chair of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee.

The President will make a recommendation on reappointment.

On the first working day in July and after the discussion of the reports with the Executive Committee of the Senate, the responses, written comments, and copies of the SEA report used by the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee will be destroyed. One copy of the SEA report will be maintained in the Senate Office for the remainder of the term of the administrator, after which it will be destroyed. The President and the Provost can either maintain or destroy their copies of the report but each should keep a copy of the final one-page summary report. Reports of the evaluation of the Provost shall be disseminated only as described below. The reports will not be disseminated in the public domain (Internet, news, media, etc.).

On or before April 1 of the year following the designated evaluation year, the President will give a follow-up report to the Executive Committee on the areas of concern raised in the Provost’s evaluation report. The President’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 Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

SECTION A. RATINGS OF THE PROVOST

There are eight 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
Scale: A. Strongly Agree  B. Agree C. Neither Agree nor Disagree  D. Disagree E. Strongly Disagree F. Don't know

**Category I. Goals and Priorities**

1. The Provost has fulfilled an appropriate leadership role for the University.

2. The Provost has developed and pursued appropriate priorities in accomplishing the goals of the University.

3. The Provost is an articulate and effective communicator of the goals of the University.

4. The Provost is effective in efforts to attain the goals of the University as described in the University Strategic Plan.

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

**Category II. Academic Programs**

5. The Provost has provided leadership for the development and advancement of the University’s curriculum.

6. The Provost has provided and fostered an effective teaching environment at the University.

7. The Provost has provided leadership in enhancing the research environment of the University.

8. The Provost has provided leadership in enhancing the service efforts of the University, both within the University and in the community.

9. The Provost has provided for the professional development of the faculty of the University.

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

**Category III. Development of Resources**

10. The Provost works effectively under the President’s direction with staff of the University System of Georgia.

11. The Provost works effectively with the President to present the University in the community.

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

**Category IV. Resource Allocation**

12. The Provost involves appropriate Senate committees and the Deans in developing the budget of the University.

13. Within budgetary constraints, the Provost has been effective in overseeing budget
allocations.

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

Category V. Organizational Matters

14. The Provost operates according the *Bylaws* and the *Statutes* of the University.

15. The Provost appropriately appoints and effectively directs those who directly report to the Provost (e.g., Vice Presidents, Associate Provosts, Senior Faculty Associates, Deans, etc.)

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

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

18. The Provost keeps the faculty of the University fully informed on all important matters relating to the University.

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

Category VI. Personnel Management

19. The Provost encourages an environment that rewards individual initiative.

20. The Provost encourages an environment that rewards teamwork and broad camaraderie in the University.

21. The Provost is willing to explain thoroughly the reasons for decisions.

22. The Provost uses sound judgment in issues of faculty compensation.

23. The Provost uses sound judgment in issues of reappointments, dismissals, promotions, and tenure of faculty.

24. The Provost is effective in supporting the recruitment of qualified faculty.

25. The Provost maintains appropriate levels of confidentiality in personnel matters.

26. The 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.

(Please use the comment section for any comments on Category VI.)
Category VII. Personal Characteristics

27. The Provost relates well to the employees and students of GSU.

28. The Provost is accessible to the GSU community (e.g., responds to e-mails, phone calls in timely manner.)

29. The Provost is open to suggestions and new opportunities.

30. The Provost responds constructively to criticism.

31. The Provost respects the rights and dignity of others.

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

33. The Provost maintains a personal professional development program.

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

Category VIII. Overall Evaluation

34. Overall, I rate the performance of the Provost as:

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

35. On at least one occasion over the 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 VIII.)
Georgia State University  
Faculty Evaluation of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

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. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

CATEGORY III. DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES

CATEGORY IV. RESOURCE ALLOCATION

CATEGORY V. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

CATEGORY VI. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

CATEGORY VII. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

CATEGORY VIII. OVERALL EVALUATION
SECTION C. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

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
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

SECTION A. RATINGS OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND
PROVOST

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

9. Develops and communicates a clear strategic and management direction
10. Encourages an environment that rewards individual initiative
11. Encourages an environment that rewards teamwork and collaboration in the University.
12. Creates a climate of respect and high morale
13. Provides sound fiscal management in line with the strategic plan
14. Portrays a progressive and positive image of the University
15. Consults with appropriate individuals before making decisions
16. 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

17. Promotes fair staff workloads
18. Is willing to explain thoroughly the reasons for decisions
19. Uses sound judgment in issues of reappointments, dismissals, and promotions
20. Provides support for the successful recruitment and retention of staff
21. Recognizes contributions of staff
22. Lets people know what is expected of them
23. Supports staff in providing service to the greater University community
24. Holds staff accountable for their responsibilities
25. Responds to issues of concern from staff
26. Encourages and promotes career and professional development among staff
27. Evaluates staff effectively and fairly, according to established measures and standards for staff performance
28. Maintains appropriate levels of confidentiality in personnel matters
29. Promotes a positive stance towards diversity in light of race, gender, age, religion, color, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran status, or disability in his/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 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