



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

APPROVED
Chancellor's Council
06 APR 2017

POLICIES AND GUIDELINES ON PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS / ASF / APSP

Rationale:

An effective performance review process is grounded on a spirit of providing feedback for growth, not on finding evidence of shortcomings. The purpose of this process is to improve performance, not prove incompetence of the administrators, academic service faculty (ASF), and administrative and professional service personnel (APSP).

Principles:

1. Principles of equity and fairness should be upheld in the evaluation process.
2. The performance evaluation process should not be used in a punitive, retaliatory or discriminatory fashion. Rather, it should provide University personnel with constructive comments that enable them to develop professionally and make improvements in performance.
3. Evaluation results should not be used as the sole basis for promotion, remuneration or other administrative decisions.
4. Performance evaluation results should be treated as private and confidential information.

Policies:

1. Coverage
 - 1.1 The evaluation shall include administrators, ASF and APSP who have held their position for at least four (4) months. In cases where the incumbent administrator has held the position for less than four months, he/she shall be evaluated in his/her previous position, if necessary. Administrators are University personnel who administer and supervise the affairs and operations of a particular office/department/center/unit; they are also called the unit heads and may be teaching faculty, ASF or APSP; they are limited to the positions of Directors/Vice Chairs and higher.
 - 1.2 To identify the list of administrators/ASF/APSP and their respective raters, the following documents shall be requested from the concerned



Institutional Testing and Evaluation Office

offices: (1) official organizational charts from the Risk Management, Compliance and Audit Office (RMCA), (2) list of CAP and APSP from the Office of the Personnel Management (OPM), (3) list of ASF from the Office of the Chancellor.

- 1.3 Any administrator/ASF/APSP may be requested for a special evaluation by the unit head outside the evaluation period for purposes of promotion, renewal, reclassification, permanency, or other administrative decision. The request must be coursed through the Office of the Personnel Management (OPM) for APSP, and Office of the Chancellor (OC) for administrators and ASF.

2. Raters

- 2.1 The raters of an administrator/ASF/APSP shall include his or her (1) immediate superior, (2) skip-level superior, (3) peers, (4) subordinates, and (5) service recipients. The superior, peer and subordinate raters are based on the official organizational chart as per the RMCA. Only the Department Chairs/Directors and lower positions shall have service recipients as raters.
 - 2.1.1 Superior rater shall be the personnel to whom the administrator/ASF/APSP reports directly.
 - 2.1.2 Skip level superior rater shall be the superior of the immediate superior of the administrator/ASF/APSP concerned.
 - 2.1.3 Peer raters shall include administrators/ASF/APSP who also report directly to the same superior within the administrative cluster in the organizational chart. Personnel reporting to the same superior but outside the cluster shall not be considered as peers. Cluster refers to positions of the same rank/level reporting to the same superior (e.g., all Directors reporting to AVC are considered peers but they are not peers with the personnel assigned in the office of AVC).
 - 2.1.4 Subordinate raters shall include personnel who are directly below the administrator/ASF/APSP, based on the organizational chart.
 - 2.1.5 Service recipient raters shall include individuals who have been rendered service by the administrators/ASF/APSP concerned. They may be individuals external or internal to the



Institutional Testing and Evaluation Office

office/group/division. Service recipients shall be identified by the superior of the administrators/ASF/APSP concerned, who will then submit the list to the Office of the Chancellor. The official list of service recipients shall originate from the Office of the Chancellor. CAP shall not be included as service recipients of administrator/ASF/APSP. A rater who is already classified as immediate superior, skip level superior, peer or subordinate shall no longer be identified as service recipient.

- 2.2 The raters shall only include teaching faculty, ASF, and APSP. CAP shall not evaluate the administrators. Agency personnel are excluded from being raters.
- 2.3 The list of Administrators/ASF/APSP to be evaluated and their proposed raters shall be submitted to the following offices for review, where applicable:
 - 2.3.1 President
 - 2.3.2 Chancellor
 - 2.3.3 Vice-Chancellors /Vice-Presidents
 - 2.3.4 Associate Vice-Chancellors
 - 2.3.5 Deans
 - 2.3.6 Directors with ASF/APSP subordinates

3. Performance Evaluation Area and Rating Scale

- 3.1 The performance evaluation areas included in the evaluation of the administrators/ASF/APSP by immediate superior, skip level superior, peers and subordinates are as follows:

Performance Evaluation Areas	Operational Definition
Planning	Ability to set and define priorities clearly, to establish goals and objectives, and to formulate programs to achieve these goals and objectives
Communication Skills	Ability to use/demonstrate effective communication skills through clear and concise written and oral communications, and to listen and be receptive to the ideas of others



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

Effectiveness in Dealing with People	Ability to promote and maintain healthy interpersonal and productive working relationships among the people around him/her
Administration	Extent to which he/she exhibits sense of vision and innovation for future developments and the ability to supervise the overall operations of the office
Decision-Making	Ability to anticipate and analyze potential problems and to make sound decisions and timely actions based on available data and through consultation
Professional Self-Improvement	Extent to which he/she demonstrates working knowledge and skills appropriate to the job functions as well as participates in personal and professional development programs
Institutional Commitment	Extent to which he/she actively participates in programs and activities as well as contributes to the external relations of the office or University

- 3.2 An area on Job Description shall be included for the evaluation of Administrators under the Academics Division.
- 3.3 The evaluation form has a 5-point scale as follows:

Rating	Equivalence	Description
5	Outstanding	The administrator/ASF/APSP <i>consistently exceeds</i> the job requirements or expectations
4	Very Satisfactory	The administrator/ASF/APSP <i>frequently exceeds</i> the job requirements or expectations
3	Satisfactory	The administrator/ASF/APSP <i>meets</i> the job requirements



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

		or expectations
2	Needs Improvement	The administrator/ASF/APSP <i>rarely meets</i> the job requirements or expectations
1	Poor	The administrator/ASF/APSP <i>never meets</i> the job requirements or expectations
0	No Answer	The item is not applicable to the administrator/ASF/APSP being rated or the rater does not have enough information/knowledge to rate on the particular item

- 3.4 The performance evaluation areas included in the evaluation of the administrators/ASF/APSP by the service recipients are as follows:

Performance Evaluation Areas	Operational Definition
Knowledge and Competence	Extent to which he/she demonstrates knowledge and competence in responding to queries and requests
Effectiveness in Dealing with Clients	Ability to deal with clients in order to promote and maintain healthy interpersonal and productive working relationships with them
Responsiveness to the Needs of Client	Ability to provide prompt and timely attention to the needs of the clients
Reliability in Responding to Request	Ability to provide the promised service consistently, accurately, and efficiently
Communication Skills	Ability to present ideas with clarity and to demonstrate professionalism



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

	when talking to clients
Quality of Service Provided	Extent to which he/she provides correct, accurate, complete, and relevant service/data and in visually-appealing manner
Institutional Commitment / Lasallianess	Extent to which he/she demonstrates behavior and attitude in accordance with the University policies and expectations

3.5 The performance evaluation results of the Administrators/ASF/APSP shall comprise the following:

3.5.1 average rating by immediate superior, skip level superior, peer/s and subordinates

3.5.2 average rating by service recipients

4. Evaluation Procedures:

4.1. The evaluation of administrators/ASF/APSP shall be conducted online through the My.Lasalle (MLS) portal. Upon log-in to the account, the rater is automatically prompted by the system to accomplish the evaluation. This prompt (pop-up message) will continually appear on the MLS page until the rater has finished the evaluation for all the administrators/ASF/APSP on his/her list.

4.2 The online evaluation shall be conducted for two (2) weeks starting Week 4 of Term 3.

4.3 The rater is required to give a fair rating and specify the strengths and areas for improvement of the administrator/ASF/APSP in the comments section.

4.4 The evaluation results shall be released to the following:

4.4.1 In printed form



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

- Administrator/ASF/APSP concerned

4.4.2 Online

- Administrator/ASF/APSP concerned
- Department/Office Heads

4.4.3 In CD form:

- President (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP)
- Chancellor (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP)
- Vice Chancellors for Academics (results of all administrators/ASF/ APSP under his/her division, all ASFs, all administrators with faculty status)
- Vice Chancellor for Administration (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP under his/her division)
- Vice Chancellor for Research and Innovation (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP under his/her division)
- Vice Chancellor for Lasallian Mission (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP under his/her division)
- Vice President for External Relations & Internationalization (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP under his/her division)
- Associate Vice Chancellors (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP under his/her group)
- Deans (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP under his/her college/school)
- Directors / Office Heads (results of all administrators/ASF/APSP under his/her department/office)



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

APPROVED

Chancellor's Council
06 APR 2017

Annex B

Guidelines for Selecting Service Recipient Raters

Rationale:

Quality service is an organization's commitment to provide the best service to internal and external clients or customers. It entails providing efficient, quick, reliable, and friendly service, building strong relationships with the clients. How well the service is rendered by the service providers is based on the comparison between the customer's expectations about the service to be rendered on one hand and customer's experience resulting from the use of the service, on the other hand. As such, service recipients are the best source of feedback on the quality of service, which may be used as bases for the improvement and more positive performance of the service providers.

As a general rule, service recipient raters shall be identified by the superior of the administrators/ASF/APSP and Co-Academic Personnel (CAP) concerned, who will then submit the list to the Office of the Chancellor and Office of the Personnel Management (OPM), respectively. The official list of service recipients shall only originate from these offices. As such, the selection of service recipients of administrators/ASF/APSP and CAP shall be governed by the following guidelines:

Guidelines:

1. Evaluation of the quality of service rendered by university personnel shall be conducted every year as part of the performance evaluation of the administrators/ASF/APSP and Co-Academic Personnel (CAP).
2. Only the Department Chairs/Directors and lower positions shall be evaluated by the service recipients.
3. Service recipient raters shall include individuals who have frequent/recurring work-related interactions with the administrators/ASF/APSP and Co-Academic Personnel (CAP) concerned.
4. Service recipient raters shall be the direct recipients (clients) of the service, which are individuals external or internal to the office/group/division and may include the following:



Institutional Testing and
Evaluation Office

- 4.1 administrators
 - 4.2 faculty (teaching and academic service faculty)
 - 4.3 APSP
 - 4.4 CAP (not applicable to Administrators)
 - 4.5 students (not applicable to Administrators)
6. A rater who is already classified as immediate superior, skip level superior, peer or subordinate shall no longer be identified as service recipient.