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
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
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Evaluation Areas</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Ability to set and define priorities clearly, to establish goals and objectives, and to formulate programs to achieve these goals and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An area on Job Description shall be included for the evaluation of Administrators under the Academics Division.

The evaluation form has a 5-point scale as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Equivalence</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>The administrator/ASF/APSP <em>consistently exceeds</em> the job requirements or expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
<td>The administrator/ASF/APSP <em>frequently exceeds</em> the job requirements or expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>The administrator/ASF/APSP <em>meets</em> the job requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Evaluation Areas

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>The administrator/ASF/APSP rarely meets the job requirements or expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>The administrator/ASF/APSP never meets the job requirements or expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Service Provided</td>
<td>Extent to which he/she provides correct, accurate, complete, and relevant service/data and in visually-appealing manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment / Lasallianess</td>
<td>Extent to which he/she demonstrates behavior and attitude in accordance with the University policies and expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
- 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)
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:
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.