

**3.2.10** The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators on a periodic basis. **(Institution Administrative Staff Evaluations)**

**Judgment of Compliance**

Compliance

**Narrative**

Albany State University (ASU) evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators on a periodic basis, generally in the spring of each academic year. These evaluation procedures are governed by the University System of Georgia, Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 803.07 [\[1\]](#), which stipulates:

“senior administrators shall be evaluated by the administrator's supervisor, using a performance management instrument which emphasizes leadership qualities, management style, planning and organizing capacities, effective communication skills, accountability for diversity efforts and results, and success at meeting goals and objectives”.

As Chief Executive Officer, the President is evaluated annually by the chancellor of the University system in accordance with Section 803.07 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual [\[1\]](#) (see memo from chancellor detailing evaluation process for system presidents [\[2\]](#)). The president's evaluation is kept on file in the Office of the President of ASU. All vice presidents and other members of the president's cabinet are evaluated by the president [\[3a\]](#), [\[3b\]](#). Deans are evaluated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs [\[4a\]](#) and by his/her faculty [\[4b\]](#). The department heads are evaluated annually by their respective academic Deans [\[4c\]](#). The department heads are responsible for evaluating all of the faculty and staff under their supervision.

The Human Resources form used at ASU has evaluation rubrics to standardize and operationally define performance levels on a five-category scale [\[3a\]](#), [\[3b\]](#). Overall ratings are recorded with optional supervisor's comments and recommendations. The supervisor shares the evaluation with the respective employee and both the evaluator and the evaluated administrator/employee sign the evaluation form, noting that the evaluated administrator's/employee's signature does not dictate agreement with the evaluator's comments. The evaluated administrator/ employee is then given an opportunity to review, agree or challenge the evaluation with his/her supervisor [\[3a\]](#), [\[3b\]](#).

**Supporting Documentation**

[1] [Board of Regents Policy Manual on Evaluation of Administrators, see 803.07](#)

[2] [Chancellor's Memo Detailing Evaluation of the President](#)

[3a] [Evaluation of Administrators Rubrics](#)

[3b] [ASU Performance Evaluation of Administrator by the President](#)

- [4a] [Evaluation of Academic Dean Report, Spring \(2002\)](#)
- [4b] [Evaluation of Dean by Faculty](#)
- [4c] [Evaluation of Academic Chairs Report](#)