



The University of Georgia Employee Performance Evaluation
Guidelines

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
The essence and purpose of the evaluation	3
Performance evaluation commission	3
The Evaluation process	4
Performance evaluation methods	5
Questionnaire	5
The Ranking.....	6
Pair comparison method.....	6
Goal Management (MBO).....	7
360-degree evaluation	7
Potential risks of evaluation	8
Feedback with staff.....	9
The performance evaluation result management.....	9
Annexes.....	10
Annex 1. Pair Comparison Method Sample	10
Annex 2. Rated Scale Sample	11
Annex 3. 360 Degree Evaluation Method	11
Annex 4. Sample evaluation questionnaire	14

Introduction

The Performance Evaluation Guide is a handbook for the performance evaluation and management for the University of Georgia's administrative and support staff.

The essence and purpose of the evaluation

Performance evaluation is the process by which an organization measures each employee's contribution to the organization's overall performance. The purpose of a systematic evaluation is to identify gaps and weaknesses in the work of the employees for their further correction.

As part of the evaluation process, communications between employees, the HR department and the organization's managers are substantially improved.

The purpose of the performance evaluation is to:

1. Inform the employee about the university's obligations/expectations towards him/her;
2. Provide the employee with feedback on the quality/amount of work performed;
3. Distinguish gaps in employee performance and identify ways to correct them;
4. Identify employee strengths and ways for their further development;
5. Increase the quality/amount of work performed by the employee;
6. Provide the employee with an appropriate recognition;
7. Increase communication between the employee and the manager;
8. Outline opportunities for promotion/relocation of employees.

Performance evaluation commission

The University of Georgia's Employee Performance Evaluation Commission consists of permanent and special members. The permanent members include the Rector of the University, the Head of the Human Resources Management Department and the Dean / Vice-Rector of the relevant department. Special members of the Employee Performance Evaluation Commission are invited by the decision of the Rector of the University.

The members of the commission are authorized to evaluate the employee's performance by the predetermined evaluation method and give feedback to the employee.

The Evaluation process

The employee performance evaluation at the University of Georgia is done twice a year: at the end of the spring and fall semesters.

The evaluation process consists of several stages:

- **First stage:** The Head of Department sets out the action plan and tasks for the structural units/employees subordinate to him/her. The department action plan derives from the university's strategic plan and the supervisor and staff work together closely to identify specific tasks and resources needed to accomplish them.
- **Second Stage:** Formulation of evaluation criteria. Evaluation Criteria are the characteristics that will then be used to evaluate an employee's performance. A list of goals/objectives assigned to the employee is considered as such. Only characteristics closely related to the performance of the work should be used as criteria.
- **Stage Three:** Progress monitoring is conducted in April and October, where the supervisor, together with the staff, monitors the progress of the work. Depending on the specifics of the job, in agreement with the employee, the supervisor may conduct the monitoring process at a different frequency. At this stage, it is important to identify the factors that hinder the work progress and to analyze the causes and ways of overcoming them.
- **Fourth stage:** At the end of the semester, a formal evaluation of the work is done at the university. At this stage, the staff of the various structural units is evaluated using a predetermined evaluation method selected by the relevant commission. The HRM coordinates the selection of the evaluation method, the process of collecting data on the staff to be evaluated and the sources of information obtained. Information can be obtained from the employee's direct supervisor, colleagues, subordinates, or partners outside the organization. It is also possible to directly interview employees.

- **Fifth stage:** After analyzing and processing the data, the evaluation commission conducts feedback interviews with the staff. During the interview, employees receive detailed information not only on the progress made towards achieving the goals but also on the identified professional behavior. The process is conducted in full confidentiality. It is prohibited to disclose employee results and discuss them with third parties. At this stage, professional development or adjustment of the employee may be planned, reflecting the identified needs. The results can also be used to refine a university-based routine.
- **Sixth Stage:** The HR department representative documents the results of the evaluation and keeps it in the employee's file.

Performance evaluation methods

Questionnaire

To evaluate an employee's performance, a special questionnaire is developed, which includes questions about important job-related criteria. The subject is required to carefully read each question and mark / or write down their answer. To simplify the manner of processing the results, each answer has a certain numerical value (score), so simply summing up the scores is sufficient enough for the final evaluation of the employee. The questionnaire can be conditionally divided into several thematic sections (according to the evaluation criteria), with questions on one specific criterion or a set of subsequent criteria in each section. Thus, it is possible not only to evaluate the employee in general (calculating the total score of the whole questionnaire) but also to identify the direction in which he/she needs to develop and in which criteria (in the criteria group) the lowest score is achieved.

The main advantage of the questionnaire is that its format is clear and understandable to all, making it relatively easy and convenient for the evaluators. However, this method often points to the need for experience. Otherwise, less experienced evaluators tend to have a natural tendency to rate each employee equally or to evenly (positively) rate a particular employee according to all criteria. A high degree of free interpretation and subjectivity are sometimes

also considered as the flaws of this method. The evaluation of the same employee may vary depending on who thinks what and how the question is asked. Besides, the accuracy of the evaluation may be reduced by the overall scores due to the severity or leniency of the particular evaluator.

The Ranking

This method involves sorting employees from best to worst. The source of evaluation at this time is the general effectiveness of the employee and not any specific criteria. The advantage of this method is that it eliminates the tendency of the heads of structural units to roughly equally (average or good) evaluate all employees. The ranking forces the supervisor to give a different evaluation to each employee. The essence of the method is very simple, the evaluator is given a list of evaluative staff and asked to sort them from the best to the worst. Regarding the shortcomings of the method, the most important is its inability to show how big the difference is between the productivity of the two employees. Therefore, the method is used to evaluate a more general picture than to measure the specific contribution made by each employee to the work process. Another major drawback of the method is that it is not informative for employees; when ranking, employees do not know why they were placed in a particular place on the list and by what criteria is the person on the top of the list better than them. Consequently, this method fails to support the professional development of employees and their aspiration to correct existing gaps.

Pair comparison method

This method is somewhat like the ranking method, and its end product is also a ranked list of employees. However, instead of sorting the staff from best to worst, the manager here is required to compare each employee with the entire staff (within the structural unit). At the same time, the comparison is carried out step by step, by evaluating each employee together with one of his/her colleagues. This method of comparison leads the supervisor to more thinking /opposing until the final rated list is developed. To compare each pair, he or she will

have to analyze in detail the quality of the work performed by the employees, allowing for more accurate results. However, as with rankings, Pair Comparison tells us nothing about the real difference between employees. In the comparison list, all employees are separated by one unit, which does not necessarily mean that their work efficiency also differs from each other with exactly one unit.

Goal Management (MBO)

When using this method, the evaluator is interested in what the employee has achieved in the evaluation period, not in what he was doing, how did he behave or what did his work routine look like. The uniqueness of this method is that, instead of the process, it focuses on results. The method involves setting specific goals for the employee and evaluating their progress in achieving those goals after the end of the evaluation period.

Several principles need to be followed to implement this method. These principles are: The goals/objectives set for the employee must be derived from the strategic plan of the organization; Each employee's tasks should be tailored to the university's mission and strategic plan, allowing employees to see the benefits of achieving the university's mission, vision, values , and strategic goals; Employee goals should be formulated so that progress can be objectively assessed. For achieving / not achieving the goal not to become an emotional dispute between the supervisor and the employee, the goals set must meet the SMART criteria, that is, be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely. Active involvement of the employee in the process of setting goals should be ensured. The supervisor shouldn't set goals independently for the employee and simply hand over the list of tasks to be performed without any discussion. The employee should be actively involved in the goals formation process, agree with each specific detail with the supervisor and set goals and other criteria for evaluating progress.

360-degree evaluation

A 360-degree evaluation involves obtaining information about the employee not only from the supervisor (as is traditionally the case), but also from colleagues, subordinates, outside partners, and others around him. This is possible by any of the methods described above

A 360-degree evaluation provides more assurance of objective evaluation, as obtaining information from different sources somehow neutralize the potential bias of one particular source and help us obtain more comprehensive, reliable information about the employee. In a 360-degree assessment, evaluators also feel less "weight" of the evaluation, as they realize that their answers will be discussed with others. Evaluators are also more likely to trust the results, knowing that the subjective opinions of the supervisor or colleague will not substantially alter their overall, objective assessment. The main drawback of the method is that it is highly dependent on the cooperation of the employee and the evaluator. It is considered to be the most reliable and objective evaluation if the parties have known/cooperated for at least 3 years. The shorter the employee experience, the more biased the information obtained in the 360-degree evaluation becomes.

Potential risks of evaluation

Ambiguous Standards - This problem arises in the case of questionnaires, 360-degree assessments, MBOs and implies that evaluators interpret the words "good", "fair", "creative" and so on differently. The solution lies in the detailed definition of each standard.

Halo / Horn Effect - This problem refers to cases where the evaluator evaluates the work done positively / negatively, based on the overall impression of him/her (Positive in Halo Effect and Negative in Horn Effect).

Centralization Trend -When employees are rated average. For example, if an evaluation is to be rated on a 7-point scale, the evaluator avoids high scores (6 and 7) and low scores (1 and 2) and scores the majority of employees with the scores from 3 to 5. Based on the above, all employees are valued on average and this completely disregards the evaluation process. Due to this problem, it is not possible to use the evaluation results for promotion, salary review and other purposes. This problem can be overcome by using a ranking or a comparison method.

Loyalty / Severity - When a manager gives high/low ratings to all employees. At this time, the evaluator should be advised not to rate all employees with very high/low scores.

Novelty Problem - This concerns the impact of the employee's recent work activities/results on the evaluation process. The evaluator should take into account not only recent activities but also the activities carried out during the whole evaluation period.

Feedback with staff

Regardless of the method used to evaluate the University's administrative and support staff, the evaluation process is necessarily followed by a process of analyzing the results and discussing them with the staff. For this, a special meeting is usually called after the evaluation, an interview, in which, on the one hand, the supervisor is given the opportunity to explain/justify the results of the evaluation, and on the other hand, the employee can express his or her position.

The environment in which the conversation is taking place should be calm, positive, and constructive; the employee should not be inclined to engage in self-defense. This, of course, does not imply that the supervisor is obliged to hide the weaknesses he sees in his/her work. The meeting should take place in a constructive, collaborative format. It should be clear to both parties that the purpose of the meeting is not to discourage or encourage anyone, but to analyze the issues identified and to develop plans for the future.

There may be a need to formally "punish" the employee only if, despite a number of negative evaluations, he or she fails to improve the quality of work and fails to utilize the help that the university provides for further improvement. The employee participates with the supervisor in setting and planning new goals, and when discussing their achievements, they address existing obstacles and ways to solve them.

The performance evaluation result management

The results of the employee's job performance evaluation can be used to develop his / her professional development plan, for training planning, promotion/retirement, rotation, salary adjustment, motivation, and other personnel decisions.

Annexes

Annex 1. Pair Comparison Method Sample

Punctuality	A: K. Topuria	B: E. Topuria	C: D. Abkhazava	D: N. Sturua	E: R. Janelidze
A: K. Topuria		1	1	0	0
B: E. Topuria	0		0	0	0
C: D. Abkhazava	0	1		1	0
D: N. Sturua	1	1	0		1
E: R. Janelidze	1	1	1	0	

Punctuality	Sum	Rating
A: K. Topuria	2	3
B: E. Topuria	4	1
C: D. Abkhazava	2	2
D: N. Sturua	1	5
E: R. Janelidze	1	4

Interpersonal relationships	A: K. Topuria	B: E. Topuria	C: D. Abkhazava	D: N. Sturua	E: R. Janelidze
A: K. Topuria		1	1	0	0
B: E. Topuria	0		0	0	0
C: D. Abkhazava	0	1		1	0
D: N. Sturua	1	1	0		1
E: რ ჯანელიძე	1	1	1	0	

Interpersonal relationships	Sum	Rating
A: K. Topuria	2	3
B: E. Topuria	4	1
C: D. Abkhazava	2	2
D: N. Sturua	1	5
E: R. Janelidze	1	4

All criteria	Sum	Rating
A: K. Topuria	2	3
B: E. Topuria	4	1
C: D. Abkhazava	2	2
D: N. Sturua	1	5
E: R. Janelidze	1	4

Annex 2. Rated Scale Sample

Alternate Ranking Scale

Evaluate employees in turn, from best to worst on one common criterion.

Put the best employee 1st, the worst on 20th and etc.

Evaluate employees in turn, from best to worst on one common criterion.

The Best			
1		11	
2		12	
3		13	
4		14	
5		15	
6		16	
7		17	
8		18	
9		19	
10		20	

The Worst

Annex 3. 360 Degree Evaluation Method

University of Georgia Employee Evaluation in 360-Degree Method

Date

You are evaluating: First name, Last Name

Structural subdivision, position

The purpose of the evaluation is to enable the employee to identify and correct his / her strengths and weaknesses, which will increase the effectiveness of his / her work.

Please be advised that the evaluation is anonymous. For the information you provide to be useful to the above employee, do not be overly critical or uncritical. Please evaluate it objectively, sincerely and fairly.

Employees are rated on a 10-point system. Please read the point distribution system:

1 - 2 points. - **Low:** Does not meet the relevant evaluation competency requirements;

3 - 4 points - **Below Average:** Weakly meets the requirements, requires constant control, supervision, and guidance;

5 - 6 Points - **Average:** Meets the relevant evaluation competency requirements. Does not care about competency development and refinement;

7 - 8 points - **Above average:** Finely meets the relevant evaluation competency requirements. Cares about competency development and refinement;

9 - 10 points - **High:** Meets the relevant evaluation competency requirements very well. Constantly tries to improve and develop;

The competencies to be evaluated are divided into sections. At the end of each section, you will be able to write a comment.

When writing a comment, keep in mind:

- What do you like about the employee's performance style?
- What drawbacks should the employee work on?
- What would you recommend to the evaluating employee?

Please send the completed questionnaire to _____ and delete the sent letter.

1. Professional qualification

1.1. Has theoretical knowledge related to the job (qualification knowledge, knowledge of procedures and standards);

1.2. Seeks to advance current qualifications and gather new information;

1.3. Develops a work strategy;

1.4. Is proactive, responding appropriately to opportunities and problems;

1.5. Comment - Regarding job-related knowledge and experience.

2. The quality and volume of work

2.1. Performs duties well. Constantly strives to improve the quality of work;

2.2. Performs a large volume of work;

2.3. Is an organized, consistent and purposeful performer;

2.4. Operatively performs the task within the prescribed timeframe;

2.5. Has initiatives, constantly thinking about refining the work done;

2.6. Has the ability for a flexible approach to the job;

2.7. Is stress-resistant and does not heat up in critical situations;

2.8. Comment - On the quality and volume of work.

3. Interpersonal relationships

3.1. Aspires to work in a team with colleagues, ready to collaborate and help others;

3.2. Is relatively constructive, manages to avoid conflict situations and handle them when needed;

3.3. Has the ability to encourage listening and dialogue;

3.4. Is diplomatic, can negotiate and is capable of developing relationships at all levels;

3.5. Fits personal interests into job interests;

3.6. Comment - On interpersonal relationships.

4. Discipline

4.1. Abides by University's internal regulations and ethical norms;

4.2. Is disciplined, orderly and uses the working time to fully devote himself to accomplishing tasks;

4.3. Comment- On Discipline.

Annex 4. Sample evaluation questionnaire

The University of Georgia Employee Evaluation by Questionnaire Method

May 2013

You are evaluating: First name, Last name

Structural subdivision, position

The purpose of the evaluation is to enable the employee to identify and correct his / her strengths and weaknesses, which will increase the effectiveness of his / her work.

Please be advised that the evaluation is anonymous. For the information you provide to be useful to the above employee, do not be overly critical or uncritical. Please evaluate it objectively, sincerely and fairly.

Employees are rated on a 10-point system. Please read the point distribution system:

1 - 2 points. - **Low:** Does not meet the relevant evaluation competency requirements;

3 - 4 points - **Below Average:** Weakly meets the requirements, requires constant control, supervision, and guidance;

5 - 6 Points - **Average:** Meets the relevant evaluation competency requirements. Does not care about competency development and refinement;

7 - 8 points - **Above average:** Finely meets the relevant evaluation competency requirements. Cares about competency development and refinement;

9 - 10 points - **High:** Meets the relevant evaluation competency requirements very well. Constantly tries to improve and develop;

The competencies to be evaluated are divided into sections. At the end of each section, you will be able to write a comment.

When writing a comment, keep in mind:

- What do you like about the employee's performance style?
- What drawbacks should the employee work on?
- What would you recommend to the evaluating employee?

Please send the completed questionnaire to appraisal@ug.edu.ge

1. Professional qualification

#	Criteria	Score
1.1	Has theoretical knowledge related to the job (qualification knowledge, knowledge of procedures and standards)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
1.2	Seeks to advance current qualifications and gather new information	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
1.3	Develops a work strategy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
1.4	Is proactive, responding appropriately to opportunities and problems	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
1.5	Comment - Regarding job-related knowledge and experience	

2. The quality and volume of work

#	Criteria	Score
2.1	Performs duties well. Constantly strives to improve the quality of work	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2.2	Performs a large volume of work	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2.3	Is an organized, consistent and purposeful performer	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2.4	Operatively performs the task within the prescribed timeframe	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2.5	Has initiatives, constantly thinking about refining the work done	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2.6	Has the ability for a flexible approach to the job	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2.7	Is stress-resistant and does not heat up in critical situations	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2.8	Comment - On the quality and volume of work.	

3. Interpersonal relationships

#	Criteria	Score
3.1	Aspires to work in a team with colleagues, ready to collaborate and help others	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3.2	Is relatively constructive, manages to avoid conflict situations and handle them when needed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3.3	Has the ability to encourage listening and dialogue	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3.4	Is diplomatic, can negotiate and is capable of developing relationships at all levels	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3.5	Fits personal interests into job interests	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3.6	Comment - On interpersonal relationships.	

4. Discipline

#	Criteria	Score
4.1	Abides by University's internal regulations and ethical norms	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4.2	Is disciplined, orderly and uses the working time to fully devote himself to accomplishing tasks	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4.3	Comment- On Discipline	