

**Procedures for the Evaluation of
Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and Associate Provosts**

Passed by Senate: October 6, 2016

Typos Corrected on January 20, 2017

The performance of Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and Associate Provosts (hereafter “administrators”) will be reviewed in their 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 administrator, to provide the opportunity for constructive input from faculty and other constituencies, to review the administrator’s professional contributions and performance as a leader and as an administrator, and to provide feedback to improve his or her performance.

If an administrator’s appointment begins between July 1 and December 31, notification of the first review will be given in January of the third year following the date of the appointment and the review will take place during the following 12 months (the calendar year review cycle). If an administrator’s appointment begins between January 1 and June 30, notification of the first review will be given in August of the third year following the date of the appointment and the review will take place during the following nine months (the academic year review cycle). The second and subsequent reviews will be given on the academic year review cycle.

If an administrator is officially on leave for more than 90 days in any 12-month period, that period will not be counted as a year for purposes of determining when an administrator is evaluated.

If an administrator is hired with an interim/acting qualification and still holds that interim/acting position three years later, that administrator will be evaluated on the cycle as indicated in the table below. When an interim/acting qualification is removed, the official effective date of the removal of the interim/acting qualification will count as the administrator’s date of appointment.

Timeline Table

All reviews will be conducted according to this table, depending on the date of appointment.

Evaluation Cycle	Academic Year Review Cycle	Calendar Year Review Cycle
Date of appointment	Jan. 1-June 30	July 1-Dec. 31
Notification of candidates	August 10	January 15
Elections to evaluation committee	By end fall	By end spring
Submission of narrative	January 10	August 10
First meeting of evaluation committee	January 25	August 25
Notification of faculty and staff	February 1	September 15
Designated evaluators contacted	February 1	September 15

Written report due	March 27	November 10
Discussion of report	April 1	November 15
Comments on report	April 5	November 19
Executive Committee review	April 6	November 20
Document destruction	1st day July	1st day February
Follow-up report	Subsequent April 1	Subsequent November 1

The faculty portion of the evaluation 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 0.75 EFT or above. The evaluation also contains a staff component which is a summary of staff responses to the Georgia State University Staff Component Form by staff members listed in this document as designated evaluators. This evaluation does not preclude evaluations by other constituencies, as approved by the Executive Committee. The individual being evaluated is not eligible to complete an evaluation on him/herself.

***Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee**

At the end of each semester, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Senate will confirm which administrators are to be evaluated during the following academic or calendar year. At the beginning of the appropriate cycle, the Provost will notify the administrator 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, and one member from the University Library. The elected members may include departmental chairs, but may not include deans or associate deans. The committee also will include the chair of a Senate Committee as follows:

Title	Committee
AP for Faculty Affairs	Faculty Affairs
AP for Graduate Programs	Academic Programs
AP for Institutional Effectiveness	IS&T
AP for International Initiatives	Cultural Diversity
AP for Strategic Initiatives and Innovation	Sustainability
Senior VP for Finance & Administration	Budget
VP for Development	Planning and Development
VP for Public Relations and Marketing Communications	Athletics
VP for Research & Economic Development	Research
VP for Student Affairs	Student Life and Development
Vice Provost and VP for Enrollment Management and Student Success	Admissions and Standards

A college, Staff Council, or the library faculty is allowed to decide that it does not wish to have a representative on the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee. In order for this to occur, a motion to have no representative must be made and seconded at a general meeting of the college faculty/Staff

Council/library faculty. The motion must then receive a majority of the votes cast. Voting must be by secret ballot.

If a new Vice President, Vice Provost, or Associate Provost title is created, the Senate Executive Committee will designate a Senate committee whose chair will serve on the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee.

The election of the faculty members to the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee will be conducted before the end of the first semester following notification by the Provost. Nominees must be tenured full professors. The nominee(s) receiving the most votes will serve on the Committee. Elections may be held at a physical meeting or electronically. However, the procedures for electronic elections must be approved at a physical meeting of the general college faculty and electronic voting must be by secret ballot. If the election is held during a physical meeting, nominations will be made from the floor and voting will be done by secret ballot.

The election of the staff member to the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee will be conducted before the end of the first semester following notification by the Provost. The nominee(s) receiving the most votes will serve on the Committee. Elections may be held at a physical meeting or electronically. However, the procedures for electronic elections must be approved at a physical meeting of the Staff Council and electronic voting must be by secret ballot. If the election is held during a physical meeting, nominations will be made from the floor and voting will be done by secret ballot.

The election of the library member to the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee (if necessary) will be conducted before the end of the first semester following notification by the Provost. The nominee(s) receiving the most votes will serve on the Committee. Elections may be held at a physical meeting or electronically. However, the procedures for electronic elections must be approved at a physical meeting of the general library faculty and electronic voting must be by secret ballot. If the election is held during a physical meeting, nominations will be made from the floor and voting will be done by secret ballot.

Within seven days of the election, the Chair 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 or August 10, depending on the evaluation cycle, the administrator will provide to the Provost a dossier that includes: (i) a three-page single-spaced narrative (maximum) listing and describing accomplishments of the years since the last evaluation, (ii) a current CV, and (iii) a one-page organization chart that indicates the offices supervised by the administrator. In addition to covering work at Georgia State University, the narrative and CV should cover service to the administrator's professional community. The Provost will add (iv) a current job description of the position being evaluated to the dossier and submit it to the Senate Office

On or before January 25 or August 25, depending on the evaluation cycle, 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 Chair of the University Senate Executive 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. The Chair of the Executive Committee will remind all members that the deliberations of the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee are confidential. The only information the administrator should receive about the deliberations are those explicitly set out in this policy.

On or before February 1 or September 15, depending on the evaluation cycle, 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 first semester following notification, 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

The purpose of the staff component of the Evaluation is to seek feedback 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.

Distribution of Evaluation Forms

Each designated evaluator will receive notification, via email, that the evaluation process is beginning. Attached to the email will be the administrator's dossier. 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.

All faculty and staff will receive notification, via email, that the evaluation process is beginning and that, if they want to complete a "faculty volunteer" or "staff volunteer" evaluation, they should contact the Senate Office administrator. Volunteers will receive the same dossier as the designated evaluators. The responses of faculty and staff volunteers will be collected in the same manner as those of designated evaluators and will be similarly anonymous.

Designated faculty evaluators are:

- (1) Administrators holding faculty rank (including Vice Presidents, Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Associate Provosts, Deans, Associate and Assistant Deans, Chairs, Institute Directors, and University Council);
- (2) All faculty members of the current Senate and of the preceding two Senates;
- (3) All faculty who hold the title “director” (e.g., Directors of Undergraduate Studies, Directors of Graduate Studies, Director of academic center, area directors, etc.)
- (4) All faculty who the administrator appointed to serve on a committee in the preceding three years.
- (5) The *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee members.

In addition, the following faculty members will be designated evaluators for particular positions as follows:

Title	Additional faculty members
AP for Faculty Affairs	None
AP for Graduate Programs	None
AP for Institutional Effectiveness	None
AP for International Initiatives	None
AP for Strategic Initiatives and Innovation	None
Senior VP for Finance & Administration	None
VP for Development	All past and present co-chairs of the faculty/staff campaign.
VP for Public Relations and Marketing Communications	None
VP for Research & Economic Development	All faculty who have applied for an internal or external grant in the preceding three years.
VP for Student Affairs	None
Vice Provost and VP for Enrollment Management and Student Success	None

If the administrator’s job description indicates that additional faculty evaluators are needed to provide a complete picture of the administrator’s performance, the Senate Executive Committee may select additional faculty evaluators for a position.

Designated staff evaluators are:

- (1) All the administrator’s direct and indirect reports per the organizational chart, including all those who dual-report to the administrator and to someone else.
- (2) All members of the current Staff Council and the two previous Staff Councils.
- (3) All non-faculty vice presidents, all non-faculty associate vice presidents, all non-faculty assistant vice presidents, and all non-faculty assistant provosts.
- (4) All staff in the office of the University Attorney.
- (5) All staff in the Ombudsperson’s Office.

In addition, the following staff members will be designated evaluators for particular positions as follows:

Title	Additional staff members
AP for Faculty Affairs	None
AP for Graduate Programs	None
AP for Institutional Effectiveness	None
AP for International Initiatives	The lead staff member in each college's international programs office as designated by the Dean of the college. (The title of this staff member and this office varies across colleges.)
AP for Strategic Initiatives and Innovation	None
Senior VP for Finance & Administration	The lead financial administrator for each college-level unit (as identified by the Dean) and any other college- or department-level financial administrators with material interaction with the Senior VP for F&A (as identified by the Dean)..
VP for Development	None
VP for Public Relations and Marketing Communications	None
VP for Research & Economic Development	All staff in the following offices: Comptroller, IS&T, Finance and Administration, Staff Development Services The staff members in each college's grants and contracts office as designated by the Dean of the college. (The title of this office varies across colleges.)
VP for Student Affairs	None
Vice Provost and VP for Enrollment Management and Student Success	All staff in International Student and Scholar Services, all staff in Study Abroad Office, all IS&T web services staff.

If the administrator's job description indicates that additional staff evaluators are needed to provide a complete picture of the administrator's performance, the Senate Executive Committee may select additional staff evaluators for a position.

Guidelines for Questionnaire Forms

A similar but separate procedure will be followed for both the faculty evaluation and for the staff evaluation unless otherwise indicated.

ALL PARTS OF THE EVALUATION WILL BE ANONYMOUS.

On February 1 or September 15, depending on the review cycle, OIR will send out the initial survey invitations (one for faculty, one for staff) to all designated evaluators. The invitation will contain a link and random code that will give each individual evaluator access to the appropriate online questionnaire. After a successful submission of the completed questionnaire, the link will become inactive. From the date of University distribution, designated evaluators will have two weeks (14 calendar days) to complete the surveys. Faculty or Staff volunteers may request access

to the appropriate online survey from the Senate Office before or during the 14 day period, but all surveys must be completed by the appointed due date. No one may reveal that someone has volunteered.

In an effort to increase response rates, during the two-week period OIR will send out two survey reminder emails to those designated evaluators who have not completed the survey.

Reporting

After the surveys are closed, OIR will begin the reporting phase. The report of the quantitative data will include frequency counts, percentages, and, if applicable, means and standard deviations. Qualitative data will be downloaded directly from OIR's survey system into a PDF document without any changes to wording, punctuation, or grammar. Quantitative and qualitative data from each survey will be cross tabulated with data indicating whether the respondent is faculty or staff, is a designated or volunteer responder, and has had a working relationship with the person being reviewed. Further, comments will be grouped by each topic area of each survey and then grouped by each participant in order to make evident all responses submitted by a single individual. Because both surveys are anonymous, respondents will be assigned numbers only for organizational purposes (e.g., respondent 1, respondent 2). These numbers cannot be linked to individual identities.

OIR will retain all data files. Six months after the completion of the analysis of the survey, all data files will be deleted.

OIR reports will be completed and sent two weeks after the close of the surveys. Reports of all survey findings will be sent in PDF format to the Senate Office Administrator. Reports will consist of the following:

- Overall Faculty Survey Report
- Designated Faculty Survey Report by Working Relationship
- Volunteer Faculty Survey Report by Working Relationship
- Designated Faculty Qualitative Comments by Topic Area and by Individual Respondent
- Volunteer Faculty Qualitative Comments by Topic Area and by Individual Respondent
- Overall Staff Survey Report
- Designated Staff Survey Report by Working Relationship
- Volunteer Staff Survey Report by Working Relationship
- Designated Staff Qualitative Comments by Topic Area and by Individual Respondent
- Volunteer Staff Qualitative Comments by Topic Area and by Individual Respondent

Summary Report

Upon conclusion of the review, on or before March 27 or November 10, depending on the review cycle, the Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee will provide the Provost with a confidential written report (Summary Evaluation of the Administrator 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. The Summary Evaluation of the Administrator 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, 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 administrator and the Senate Office Administrator.

On or before April 1 or November 15, depending on the review cycle, a meeting for the formal presentation and discussion of the Summary Evaluation of the Administrator Report will be conducted by the Provost and will include the administrator and the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee chair. At that time, the Provost will present a draft one-page single-spaced summary report to the administrator and the chair of the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee.

On or before April 5 or November 19, depending on the review cycle, the administrator 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 or November 20, depending on the review cycle, the Provost will provide an opportunity in a secure area for the Executive Committee of the University Senate to read the Summary Evaluation of the Administrator 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 Summary Evaluation of the Administrator Report and the draft one-page single-spaced summary report, and any comments on the one-page summary report submitted by the administrator and the chair of the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee.

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

On the first working day in July or February, depending on the review cycle, and after the discussion of the reports with the Executive Committee of the Senate, the responses, written comments, and copies of the Summary Evaluation of the Administrator Report used by the *Ad Hoc* Evaluation Committee will be destroyed. One copy of the Summary Evaluation of the Administrator 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, the Provost, and the administrator can either maintain or destroy their copies of the reports but each should keep a copy of the final one-page summary report.

Reports of the evaluation will 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 or November 1, depending on the review cycle, 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 evaluation reports. The follow-up report of the Provost should include specific actions taken for each area of concern and performance goal identified in the evaluation reports.

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**

SECTION A. RATINGS

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 of the categories 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

Relevant Offices

The offices under the jurisdiction of the [title] are:

[List of offices from University organizational chart. This list should be the same as the list in Question 6 below.]

CATEGORY I. GOALS AND PRIORITIES

1. The [title] has effectively developed and advanced goals and priorities for the offices under his or her jurisdiction.
2. I believe that these goals are appropriate.
3. I agree with the priorities of the [title] in addressing these goals.
4. The [title] is an articulate and effective communicator of these goals and priorities.
5. The [title] is effective in efforts to attain these goals.

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

CATEGORY II. LEADERSHIP

6. Under the leadership and supervision of the [title] the following offices have demonstrated excellence in fulfilling their assigned responsibilities:
 - a. [office].
 - b. [office].
 - c. [office].This question is repeated once for each office that reports, directly or indirectly, to the administrator. In light of the University's organizational chart, the Senate Executive Committee will resolve any questions regarding the list of offices under the supervision of an administrator.
7. The [title] has effectively completed the duties set out in his or her job description.

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

CATEGORY III. DEVELOPMENT AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

8. The [title] has been successful in procuring resources to support the offices under his or her jurisdiction from within Georgia State University.
9. The [title] has been successful in procuring resources to support the offices under his or her jurisdiction from outside sources.
10. The allocation of resources by the [title] to and within the offices under his or her jurisdiction reflects the goals, priorities, and developmental needs of the University.

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

CATEGORY IV. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

11. The [title] operates according the Bylaws and the Statutes of the University.
12. The [title] works effectively with the colleges and schools of the University.
13. The [title] makes appropriate use of and acts on the recommendations of Senate and University committees.
14. The [title] has good working relations with other administrators at the University.
15. The [title] effectively administers and follows up on detail work.
16. The [title] keeps the faculty of the University fully informed on all important matters relating to the offices under his or her jurisdiction.

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

CATEGORY V. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

17. The [title] encourages an environment that rewards individual initiative.
18. The [title] encourages an environment that rewards teamwork and broad camaraderie in the University.
19. The [title] is willing to explain thoroughly the reasons for decisions.
20. The [title] uses sound judgment in issues of raises, reappointments, dismissals, and promotions of heads of offices under his or her jurisdiction.
21. The [title] maintains appropriate levels of confidentiality in personnel matters.
22. The [title] has provided for the professional development of the staff in the offices under his or her jurisdiction.
23. The [title] promotes a positive stance towards diversity in light of race, gender, age, religion, color, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran status, and disability in his or her hiring, promoting, and managing of faculty and staff.
24. The [title] actively supports and promotes affirmative action policies and diversity programs at the University.

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

CATEGORY VI. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

25. The [title] relates well to the employees and students of GSU.

26. The [title] is accessible to the GSU community (e.g., responds to e-mails, phone calls in timely manner).
27. The [title] is open to suggestions and new opportunities.
28. The [title] responds constructively to criticism.
29. The [title] respects the rights and dignity of others.
30. The [title] maintains a creditable standing in his or her area of professional expertise.

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

CATEGORY VII. OVERALL EVALUATION

31. Overall, I rate the performance of the [title] as:

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

32. 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 VII.)

SECTION B. WRITTEN COMMENTS

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 preparing the report, all comments will be directly quoted.

Category I. Goals and Priorities

Category II. Leadership

Category III. Development and Allocation Of Resources

Category IV. Organizational Matters

Category V. Personnel Management

Category VI. Personal Characteristics

Category VII. Overall Evaluation

SECTION C. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1. What is your rank?

- A. Professor or Regents' Professor
- B. Associate Professor
- C. Assistant Professor
- D. Non-Tenure Track Faculty

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 in a unit that is part of 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**

SECTION A. RATINGS

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 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 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

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 preparing the 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 Evaluation