

3.2.10

Governance and Administration: Administrative staff evaluations

The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators.

Judgment

Compliant Non-Compliant Not Applicable

Narrative

Note: Text for all linked documents below can be increased/decreased for ease of reading by pressing your keyboard's Ctrl key while rotating the mouse wheel.

To encourage continuous improvement and ensure effectiveness, Angelo State University annually evaluates the effectiveness of its employees, including all administrators.

EVALUATION OF THE ASU PRESIDENT

The Chief Executive Officer of the institution is the ASU president, who is evaluated by the chancellor based on performance in meeting defined responsibilities. Annually, the chancellor presents to and discusses with the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System the chancellor's evaluation of the performance of the president. Subsequent to the chancellor's review with the board, the chancellor's evaluation of the president may be modified if such action is deemed appropriate (Section 02.03.3.b, *Regents' Rules*). The most recent evaluation of the ASU president was conducted by the Board of Regents in executive session of its December 2011 meeting (Board of Regents minutes December 15-16, 2011, Section V.A, Personnel Matters and Board of Regents memo May 17, 2012 confirming evaluation of the ASU president).

EVALUATION OF OTHER ADMINISTRATORS

All other ASU administrators are evaluated by the person to whom they report. Thus, the president evaluates vice presidents, the provost, and other direct reports, such as the directors of Athletics and of Communications and Marketing. The provost and vice president of academic affairs evaluates the vice provost, deans, and other direct reports, including associate and assistant vice presidents and directors of entities such as the library and Honors Program. The vice provost evaluates direct reports, including directors of support services such as Extended Studies and Supplemental Instruction. The other vice presidents evaluate their associate and assistant vice presidents, executive directors, and directors (ASU Organization Chart).

Performance reviews are conducted in accordance with ASU OP 52.35, Performance Evaluations. During the review process, supervisors meet with their employees and review work-related performance for the previous calendar year. In addition, supervisors discuss the performance expectations for the current year. To facilitate the review process, performance review forms have been developed that define specific job performance factors for different types of employees. The form used to evaluate administrators is the Supervisor Performance Review Form. The form outlines expectations for the evaluation, defines the

rating system, and includes an Employee Self-Review section, which administrators complete prior to submitting the form to their superior. The superior uses the form to rate the administrator in several areas of job performance, including, but not limited to, job knowledge and skill set, interpersonal skills, compliance with university policies and rules, leadership, resourcefulness, and problem-solving and decision-making skills. The final sections of the form provide space for the superior and administrator to address both critical success factors and development opportunities for the next evaluation cycle. Redacted examples for a vice president and associate vice president are included. (NOTE: Both parties gave permission for their redacted evaluations to be included herein for the use of the Off-Site Review Team.)

Administrators review the completed form before both the superior and the administrator sign it. Administrators are expected to sign the form regardless of their agreement with the contents, as indicated on form page 11. A short statement above the signature explains the meaning of signing, and an optional section is provided for employees to provide additional comments (form page 10). Copies of reviews are retained by Human Resources.

USE OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

ASU uses the annual evaluation process—especially the Employee Self-Review, Critical Success Factors and Goals for Next Performance Period, and Training and Development Opportunities sections on the Supervisor Performance Review Form—to encourage continuous improvement. When improvement is needed, supervisors and employees work together to develop a plan for the coming year that may include workshops, specialized training, goal setting, and other professional development activities. Each plan is developed to fit the needs of the individual employee.

EVALUATION OF DEANS AND ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT HEADS BY FACULTY

In addition to the annual evaluation described above, deans and academic department heads are evaluated by their faculty on a two- to three-year cycle. The recurrence is based on stability of data, number of new department heads or deans, special circumstances such as academic reorganization, and budget. Historically, these evaluations were administered on an annual basis. However, most of the evaluations were the same from year to year, making for very similar results at each administration. The cost was large compared to usefulness of the results. The two- to three-year cycle optimizes data usefulness and cost. For these evaluations, ASU uses the Faculty Perceptions of Department Head/Chair survey from The IDEA Center. Each dean discusses the individual reports with his/her department heads (IDEA Feedback for Department Chairs Report sample). The ASU office of Institutional Research and Accountability aggregates results from the department-head evaluations and shares them with the deans. The latest department-head evaluations were conducted in spring 2012 (IDEA Feedback for Department Chairs Report: Aggregated Results for ASU, 2012).

Results from IDEA evaluations are used to help administrators improve. The 2012 department head report includes scores in areas of administrative responsibilities, personal characteristics such as fairness, and administrative methods. The report also includes two summary scores—faculty confidence and an overall evaluation of leadership excellence.