

Research on Performance Evaluation of University Administrative Staff and Its Countermeasures

Xingwang Wang^{1,a,*}, Juan Chen^{2,b}

¹President's Office, Sichuan Vocational College of Science and Technology, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, 620500, China

²Digital Business College, Sichuan Vocational College of Science and Technology, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, 620500, China

^aWangjun202606@126.com, ^bwenzi202603@163.com

*Corresponding author

Keywords: Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, Urban Complex Environment, Intelligent Obstacle Avoidance and Trajectory Planning

Abstract: Regarding the problems such as disconnection in performance assessment strategies, loose indicators, formalized processes, weak result application, lack of communication and feedback, and insufficient incentives among university administrative staff, based on the theories of goal management and performance management, this paper analyzes the causes of these problems and identifies the inherent mechanism for the compatibility of the performance system with the development of the university. It proposes solutions from five aspects: performance goals, indicator systems, guarantee mechanisms, etc. Through empirical analysis and verification, the countermeasures are found to be scientific and feasible, and have reference significance for improving the management level of universities.

1. Introduction

At present, in the development of universities, there is a common tendency of emphasizing teacher recruitment while neglecting the motivation of administrative staff. This has led to low credibility in the assessment process, low administrative efficiency, and staff turnover, which seriously restricts the overall improvement of the university's management level and its high-quality development. Therefore, it is highly necessary to conduct research on optimizing the performance assessment of university administrative staff.

Domestic academic circles have conducted numerous studies on the performance assessment of university administrative staff. Du Xudong pointed out that universities lack training and motivation for administrative personnel, and the guiding effect of performance assessment is insufficient, resulting in the administrative team becoming a weak point in the reform [1]; Xie Qiang proposed that the current performance salary assessment method of universities is difficult to fully reflect the work effect and progress of administrative personnel, and scientific methods need to be introduced to improve the assessment system [2]; Yue Yuan found that the performance assessment of university administrative staff is merely formal and lacks scientific standards and system construction mostly remains at the theoretical level [3]; Wang Xu sorted out that there are multiple defects in the university's assessment, such as single methods, unclear positioning, and unclear job responsibilities [4]; Fang Zhenbang studied the standards, procedures, and application results of administrative staff performance assessment in five American universities, providing domestic experience reference [5]. However, the existing research lacks targeted analysis of universities after transformation and is mostly theoretical discussions. There are few empirical studies based on specific universities, and there is a lack of a feasible performance assessment optimization system.

The existing research lacks systematic solutions to the problems of the entire assessment process. Based on theories such as target management, systematically analyze the problems and causes of the performance assessment of university administrative staff, propose optimization countermeasures,

and provide references for the practical implementation of the performance assessment of university administrative staff.

2. Conceptual Definition and Theoretical Foundation

2.1 Performance and Performance Evaluation

Performance refers to the measurable behaviors and outputs demonstrated by an organization or an individual to achieve set goals within a specific period. The core of performance is the integration of "behavior and result", emphasizing systematicity and correlation. It covers task completion, ability display, and contribution to organizational goals, and is a comprehensive measurement of work value.

The practicality of performance focuses on achievable and measurable actual results, emphasizing the work performance of individuals or departments. It mainly uses quantitative indicators (such as efficiency, performance, error rate) and clear behavioral standards as the core, simplifying the abstract dimensions in theory, with the aim of providing direct basis for salary distribution, promotion, and rewards and punishments, and meeting the actual management needs of enterprises/units.

Performance assessment is defined as the process in which evaluators, following a set procedure, indicators, and standards, measure and evaluate the behaviors and work results of employees or teams within a fixed period. Its essence is a comprehensive assessment of work completion. In this article, it specifically refers to the annual assessment of administrative management personnel in universities.

The method is mainly top-down, led by the personnel department and assisted by various administrative departments. It is implemented once every academic year (usually in June), and a comprehensive evaluation is conducted based on the established standards.

The role of performance assessment is an important part of human resource management, providing data support for management decisions, directly serving salary adjustments, bonus distribution, and facilitating the high-quality integration of human resources; at the same time, as a communication process between evaluators and the evaluated, it has a cyclical nature, can discover and solve work problems, takes into account both performance and behavior assessment, and also has a significant impact on the career development of employees.

In human resource theory, assessing the work completion of employees is the essence of performance assessment, which can make the assessment results conducive to helping achieve the management goals of the enterprise. Performance assessment can provide decision-making data, is an important part of human resource management, can have an impact on individual careers. Salary increases, bonus distributions, etc. are all manifestations of the application of performance assessment results, and are also important references for high-quality integration of human resources.

2.2 The Theory of Management by Objectives

The theory of goal management was proposed by the American management expert Drucker in the 1950s. It is a management method that sets goals, decomposes them, implements them, and checks their completion status, using means such as goal setting and decomposition, goal implementation and completion inspection, rewards and punishments. It achieves the enterprise's business goals through employees' self-management.

The organization and employees jointly determine the goals and clarify the responsibilities, guided by the goals, through self-management and self-control, to achieve the coordinated development of organizational and individual goals. It emphasizes "goal orientation + self-driven". It addresses the pain points in traditional management such as vague goals, unclear responsibilities, and passive execution by employees. It also resolves the internal consumption dilemma of "managers urging, employees evading", as well as problems such as disconnection between individual goals and organizational goals, and lack of clear assessment basis.

The implementation methods mainly consist of three steps: First, goal setting, where the

organization and employees jointly negotiate to formulate quantifiable and achievable goals; Second, process control, where employees independently advance the goals, and managers provide guidance and supervision, promptly adjusting deviations; Third, assessment and feedback, where the assessment results are evaluated based on the preset goals, feedback deficiencies and optimize subsequent goals, forming a set, execute, evaluate, and optimize closed loop.

The organization's goals can be divided into three levels: strategic goals, tactical goals, plans, and tasks, which are formulated by managers at all levels and ordinary employees within the organization. Strategic goals can make the grassroots employees in the organization understand the significance of organizational success and motivate morale. The theory of goal management emphasizes the correlation between goal management and self-control, and has certain authority. Individuals should use effective goals to guide their work tasks, and managers should scientifically apply goals for supervision and management of subordinates' behaviors. In the enterprise, the overall goals set should be decomposed layer by layer, specifically to departments and individuals, and the realization of departmental and individual goals should be objectively evaluated. Those with excellent performance should be rewarded, while those who fail to meet the requirements should receive corresponding punishments.

In essence, goal management establishes a common negotiation model between the upper and lower levels of the organization in terms of goals. Under the guidance of the overall organizational goals, determine the performance goals for a certain stage, and divide them into the responsibilities of each individual, then monitor and evaluate the realization of each individual's responsibilities on a certain date.

2.3 Performance Management Theory

Performance management theory is a systematic management theory centered around employee performance. Organizations achieve the goal of enhancing employee performance and aligning it with organizational goals through the formulation of performance targets, implementation of process control, conducting performance evaluations, and providing feedback for improvement. This involves a complete process management from start to finish.

The core issue it addresses is the shortcomings in traditional management, such as isolated performance evaluation, lack of process control, and insufficient feedback. It aims to solve the problems of disconnection between employee performance and organizational goals, ineffective incentives, and difficulty in improving capabilities. It also tackles issues of ambiguous assessment standards and single application of results.

The main implementation methods include: first, setting goals by breaking down individual performance targets based on the organization's strategy and clearly defining quantitative standards; second, process control through regular communication and periodic reviews to promptly correct deviations in execution; third, performance evaluation by using methods such as 360-degree evaluation and KPI to objectively measure performance outcomes; fourth, feedback and improvement by conducting interviews based on evaluation results, formulating improvement plans, and linking them with incentives such as salary and promotion, to drive the growth of both employees and the organization together.

Performance management theory is one of the core theories in modern human resource management, focusing on the complete process management of organizational and individual performance. It aims to stimulate employees' potential, optimize work behaviors, and ultimately achieve the organizational strategic goals through systematic management methods.

This theory emphasizes the strategic and all-inclusive nature of performance management, requiring that performance targets be highly aligned with the organization's overall strategy and be decomposed layer by layer to departments and individuals. It also places emphasis on the joint participation of managers and employees, rather than merely top-down assessment and management. Its ultimate goal is not only to evaluate employees' work results, but also to enhance employees' work capabilities and organizational management efficiency through continuous performance communication and improvement, achieving a win-win situation where both employees' personal

development and the organization's long-term development are realized, providing systematic theoretical and methodological support for the human resource management and strategic implementation of various organizations..

3. The current situation of performance assessment for administrative staff in universities

3.1 The characteristics of the administrative management system in universities

The administrative management system of universities, which serves teaching and research and guarantees the development of the school, has both administrative and educational characteristics. It has three main features. First, it has a clear hierarchical structure, implementing a bureaucratic management system, forming a three-level framework of "school - functional departments - departmental administration". The Personnel Department takes the lead in coordinating all administrative work, with each department working collaboratively and having clear responsibilities and authorities. The operation mode mainly relies on top-down instructions, emphasizing hierarchical obedience and following the rules.

Second, it has diverse functions, covering areas such as personnel, finance, student affairs, logistics, and teaching management, and it needs to implement superior policies, coordinate school development, serve the needs of teachers and students, and coordinate academic and administrative affairs. The work content is complex and has both service and public welfare characteristics, making it difficult to measure the work effectiveness with a unified standard. Third, it is significantly influenced by academic orientation. The core mission of universities is to cultivate talents and conduct research, and administrative management work needs to revolve around academic affairs. Administrative power needs to operate in coordination with academic power, and there are problems such as administrative power being prone to interfere with academic affairs and having a high management focus. The efficiency of grassroots administration needs to be improved. In addition, some university administrative institutions have an overstaffing phenomenon, with redundant personnel and uneven workload, which brings certain difficulties to performance evaluation.

In terms of the application of assessment results, it is deeply linked with the career development and salary benefits of administrative personnel. This is specifically reflected in four dimensions: First, honorary title selection, those with excellent grades are given priority for selection, and those with unqualified grades are not allowed to participate in any selection for two years; Second, salary promotion, a points-based advancement system is implemented, with excellent grades receiving 3 points, good grades receiving 2 points, qualified grades receiving 1 point, and unqualified grades receiving a deduction of 1 point. When the points reach 5, the promotion to the next level is achieved; Third, salary rewards and punishments, the coefficient of performance salary is classified by grades, excellent grades receive 1.2, good grades receive 1.1, qualified grades receive 1.0, and unqualified grades receive 0; Fourth, position adjustment and contract employment, those with unqualified grades face position adjustment, layoff training, those who refuse to comply or still fail the new position assessment are dismissed from the labor relationship, and those who rank at the bottom for three consecutive years are required to submit a "Personal Improvement Plan" and receive counseling talks.

3.2 Investigation on the Incentive Mechanism for University Administrative Staff

The current incentive mechanism for administrative staff in universities generally presents the characteristics of "dominant material incentives, insufficient spiritual incentives, and narrow promotion channels". This is specifically manifested in four aspects: salary, incentives, rewards, and promotion:

In terms of salary, the salary structure is relatively simple, mainly consisting of basic salary and performance-based salary. Some universities have a small amount of subsidies, quarterly bonuses, etc. as additional income. The overall salary level is lower than that of teaching and research staff, and the gap is significant, failing to reflect the work value and efforts of administrative staff. At the same time, salary distribution is mostly linked to years of service and professional titles, with a low

correlation with performance assessment results. The principle of "more work, more pay, better performance, better rewards" has not been fully reflected. Some university administrative staff do not receive additional compensation for overtime work, further reducing the effectiveness of salary incentives.

In terms of the incentive mechanism, the overall form is simple, mainly relying on material incentives, with insufficient spiritual incentives. Most universities neglect the spiritual care and recognition of administrative staff, lack personalized incentive measures, and are unable to meet the career satisfaction and sense of belonging needs of employees. At the same time, the incentives lack specificity and are not designed based on the different job positions and administrative staff at different levels' needs, resulting in a significant reduction in incentive effectiveness. Some administrative staff show low work enthusiasm and weak service awareness.

In terms of the reward mechanism, the types of rewards are limited and the standards are vague. Most are based on annual awards and public commendations, with low material reward amounts and a narrow coverage, mostly concentrated on a few key personnel. This fails to form a widespread incentive effect. In addition, the reward selection process is not transparent, with phenomena such as "favoritism awards" and "average awards", and some rewards are disconnected from work performance, unable to fully motivate all administrative staff. The promotion mechanism mainly focuses on administrative position promotion, with fierce competition and limited quotas from clerk to department head and bureau head. There is a lack of a regular promotion mechanism like that for professional technical personnel. Some universities have unclear promotion standards and a phenomenon of seniority-based selection, making it difficult for outstanding young administrative staff to obtain promotion opportunities, resulting in limited growth space, significant psychological disparity, and even talent loss problems.

3.3 Survey on Performance Evaluation Methods for University Administrative Staff

The performance assessment of administrative staff in universities is led by the Personnel Department and coordinated by various administrative departments, adopting a top-down assessment method. It is mostly conducted on an annual basis, usually in June each year. The overall characteristic is "more qualitative assessment, less quantitative assessment, and formalized process".

In terms of assessment content, it mainly focuses on the five dimensions of "morality, ability, diligence, performance, and integrity", with a particular emphasis on evaluating the annual work performance. It covers aspects such as fulfilling duties, service quality, and internal management. However, it lacks specificity and does not design differentiated indicators based on the functional differences of different positions such as the office, personnel, and finance departments. There is a phenomenon of one-size-fits-all. Some universities have introduced assessment contents such as teacher-student satisfaction and cross-departmental collaboration effectiveness, but the weight is relatively low, failing to fully reflect the service nature of administrative work.

In terms of assessment methods, the traditional report on duties, democratic evaluation, and scoring by superiors are the main approaches, supplemented by a small amount of daily work inspections. There is a lack of scientific and systematic assessment methods. Some universities have attempted to apply the goal management method and the key performance indicator method (KPI), but the indicator design is not scientific and its operability is not strong; the 360-degree evaluation method is not applied comprehensively, with mostly superior evaluations, and the participation of colleagues' evaluations and students' evaluations is low, which is prone to be influenced by "human relations points and impression points", and the objectivity of the assessment results is insufficient.

In the assessment process, it is mostly a one-way process of "setting goals at the beginning of the year and evaluating performance at the end of the year", lacking mid-term monitoring, process feedback and dynamic adjustment steps. There is a phenomenon of "accounting after the fact". The announcement of assessment results is not standardized and the feedback is not in place. Administrative staff have no formal channels for appealing or reviewing the assessment results, which further reduces the credibility of the performance assessment.

4. Analysis of the Problems and Causes of Performance Evaluation for University Administrative Staff

4.1 Problems in the Performance Evaluation of University Administrative Staff

Although the performance assessment system for university administrative staff has a basic framework, it has exposed many prominent problems in actual operation. The core issues lie in aspects such as performance goals, assessment process, indicator system, and result feedback, which directly affect the scientificity, fairness, and incentive nature of the assessment, and do not match the development needs of the school after its reconfiguration.

The performance goals are set unreasonably and disconnected from actual work. The performance goals lack scientificity and specificity. The primary problem is the disconnection from the organizational strategy and job functions. Most universities do not break down the strategic goals of school talent cultivation and scientific research innovation into specific performance goals for administrative staff, resulting in the goals being merely about "completing daily tasks" and failing to guide employees to focus on core work. Secondly, the goals are mostly set by superiors unilaterally without seeking the opinions of employees, leading to overly high or low scores, which dampens enthusiasm or lacks incentive. Moreover, the goal setting lacks a dynamic adjustment mechanism. The goals are set at the beginning of the year and remain unchanged throughout the year, unable to adapt to policy adjustments, changes in work priorities, etc., weakening the guiding role.

The assessment process lacks rigor and is difficult to ensure objective and fair results. Firstly, the assessment cycle is unreasonable. Most universities only conduct annual one-time assessments, lacking phased assessments, and the phenomenon of "calculating accounts after the autumn" is prominent, making it impossible to promptly identify problems and correct deviations. Secondly, the process is not standardized, showing a tendency of going through the motions, lacking clear process standards and supervision mechanisms. Some departments simplify the process and there are cases of averaging scores and giving scores based on personal connections. Thirdly, the assessment entity is single, mainly relying on superior evaluations, with little participation from colleagues, teachers, and cross-department evaluations, and the evaluation standards are vague, resulting in distorted assessment results that fail to fully reflect work performance.

The indicator system for assessment is not scientific, lacking specificity and operability. The unreasonable indicator system is the core bottleneck restricting the assessment effect. Firstly, the indicators are uniform and not designed based on job differences. Administrative positions with different functions adopt the same vague indicators, which cannot reflect the nature, responsibility, and difficulty of each position, and cannot accurately measure work effectiveness. Secondly, there are too many qualitative indicators and insufficient quantitative ones. Most indicators are described vaguely such as "working actively and providing good services", lacking quantifiable standards such as document processing timeliness and error rate, and the scoring is highly subjective. Thirdly, the weight setting is unreasonable, overly focusing on daily affairs and giving too little weight to indicators reflecting work value such as service quality and process optimization, which fails to guide employees to improve service levels.

The result feedback is not in place and is not fully utilized, resulting in the loss of the core significance of the assessment. Firstly, there is a lack of a formal feedback mechanism. After the assessment, only the grades are simply publicized, without one-on-one discussions, and employees do not know their strengths and weaknesses and the direction for improvement. The assessment cannot play a promoting role. Secondly, the feedback method is single, mostly consisting of criticism and blame, lacking affirmation and guidance, which easily triggers employees' resistance. Thirdly, the result application is limited, only linked to a small amount of bonuses, without combining with salary, promotion, training, etc. High performance is not rewarded, and low performance is not penalized, which fails to motivate employees and also makes it difficult to urge low-performing employees to improve, resulting in the assessment becoming a formality.

4.2 Analysis of the Reasons for the Existing Problems in the Performance Evaluation of University Administrative Staff

The aforementioned problems in the performance evaluation system for university administrative staff are not caused by a single factor, but rather the result of the cumulative effect of various factors such as school system construction, management mechanism, and concept cognition. Considering the school's operating characteristics and management reality, the root cause mainly lies in four aspects.

First, the innovation of the performance evaluation system is insufficient, failing to adapt to the development needs after the school's transformation. The university was originally an independent college, and after completing the transformation in 2021, its educational positioning and development strategy underwent significant adjustments. However, the school's focus remained on the construction of teaching and research teams and the creation of professional brands, neglecting the innovation and optimization of internal management systems. The performance evaluation system still followed the framework of the parent university and was not systematically revised in accordance with the school's post-transformation characteristics and strategic goals.

Second, there is a lack of a powerful supervision mechanism for the performance evaluation process, and the implementation of the system lacks constraints. The standardized implementation of performance evaluation cannot be achieved without a complete supervision mechanism. However, the university only formulated the basic procedures for performance evaluation, did not establish a specialized evaluation supervision institution, nor clearly defined the supervision responsibilities, supervision processes, and supervision standards. There was a lack of effective supervision over the implementation of the assessment work by various departments. At the same time, the administrative staff team of the university has a complex internal interpersonal network. Some department managers were influenced by personal relationships during the assessment process and deviated from the assessment principles. The school lacked corresponding constraints and disciplinary mechanisms, resulting in a large degree of flexibility in the execution of the assessment procedures and prominent subjective and arbitrary issues.

Third, the setting of performance evaluation indicators lacks scientific method guidance and the job analysis work is not done properly. A scientific evaluation indicator system is based on precise job analysis. However, when designing the evaluation indicators, the formulators did not master systematic indicator setting methods and did not conduct in-depth research and detailed analysis of the work processes and job responsibilities of each administrative department. They simply set common indicators according to the "morality, ability, diligence, and performance" framework, without conducting refined design based on the nature, difficulty, and requirements of different positions.

Fourth, there is a lack of effective performance evaluation feedback channels, and the value of the feedback process is not fully recognized. The school management does not fully understand the importance of performance evaluation result feedback and simply equates it with awarding honors and rewards, salary rewards and punishments, ignoring the core role of the feedback process in improving employees' work and enhancing their capabilities. No regular performance feedback mechanism has been established. On the one hand, the school did not clearly define the responsible party, form of feedback, and time limit for feedback, and department managers lacked the awareness of active feedback. They did not conduct targeted performance interviews with employees, resulting in the inability to effectively convey the assessment results. On the other hand, the school did not combine the assessment results feedback with employees' training and career development. The feedback content only remained at the level of assessment grades, did not conduct in-depth analysis of employees' work problems, nor provide specific improvement suggestions, making the feedback process lose its practical significance.

5. Experience and Insights from Performance Appraisal of Administrative Staff in Domestic and Foreign Universities

5.1 Experience and Insights for Performance Evaluation of Administrative Staff in Domestic Universities

The scientific nature of the performance assessment for administrative staff directly affects the educational effectiveness of universities. Many domestic universities have formed mature models that can be referred to. The following will explain the assessment characteristics of three public universities (Peking University, Zhejiang University, Henan Institute of Engineering) and one private university (Chongqing Finance College) as examples.

Peking University focuses on combining virtue and talent and integrating assessment and application, and has established a standardized assessment system. It sets up an assessment working group to coordinate the overall situation, with the personnel department taking the lead in implementation. It combines annual assessment and term assessment, as well as regular assessment and special assessment. The assessment content covers five dimensions: virtue, ability, diligence, performance, and integrity. It emphasizes the core position of virtue and performance, prioritizing political standards, and implements classified assessment based on the differences in administrative job functions. It adopts a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, introducing diversified evaluation means such as democratic assessment and service object satisfaction surveys. The number of outstanding grades is controlled within 20%, and it gives priority to front-line administrative positions. The assessment results are directly linked to salary adjustments, promotions, and awards, creating a favorable atmosphere of "the capable will rise, the outstanding will be rewarded, and the mediocre will be downgraded".

Zhejiang University focuses on KPI and strengthens goal orientation and process control. The assessment of administrative staff is centered around the school's annual work plan, decomposes key performance indicators, and implements a step-by-step assessment model. The center assesses the administrative departments, and each department assesses the employees. The assessment process is standardized, including self-assessment, review, deliberation, and face-to-face interviews, with clear time nodes for each stage. It relies on the human resources management system to achieve onlineization of the entire assessment process. Based on the departmental assessment scores, the distribution ratio of employee performance grades is determined, and the results are strengthened in application. Performance grades directly relate to bonus distribution, position adjustment, and promotion. For employees with unsatisfactory performance, they will be placed on hold for training or have their positions adjusted. This forces administrative staff to improve their work efficiency.

Henan Institute of Engineering adheres to "classified assessment, performance orientation", focusing on the improvement of service efficiency. It divides administrative departments into party and mass departments, administrative departments, etc., and designs differentiated assessment indicators based on job responsibilities differences. It adds indicators such as revenue and cost reduction, service for master's degree point construction, etc., highlighting incremental assessment. It strengthens the leading role of party building and ideological education, increases the weight of party building assessment, promotes the deep integration of party building and administrative work, and adds a service object evaluation link to guide administrative staff to practice the first-line service rules. The assessment results are closely linked to departmental rewards and punishments and personal promotions, effectively stimulating the enthusiasm of administrative staff to do their jobs well.

Chongqing Finance College relies on the "positive triangle" evaluation system, highlighting the flexible advantages of private universities. The assessment of administrative staff adopts a "basic performance + competitive performance" dual-track model, conducting quantitative assessment around four dimensions: teacher ethics and style, service quality, etc., and determining the assessment grade based on the total score ranking. It implements classified assessment, dividing administrative staff into middle-level cadres, department-level and below personnel, etc., and conducts a quantitative ranking throughout the school, highlighting the reward for excellent

performance. It establishes a complete result application mechanism, linking the assessment results directly to salary adjustments, professional title promotions, and position appointments. At the same time, it sets up competitive salary incentives, conducting monthly, mid-term, and final assessments, balancing incentive and restraint. This effectively improves the quality of administrative services.

All four universities have based on their own educational characteristics and solved problems such as "one-size-fits-all" assessment and formalized process. Their experiences of classified assessment, performance orientation, diversified evaluation, and strengthened result application provide important references for the performance assessment of administrative staff in universities.

5.2 The main insights on performance assessment of administrative staff in domestic and foreign universities, as well as the content and weight settings of the assessment indicators

The practical exploration of performance assessment for administrative staff in domestic and foreign universities has provided three core insights, which are in line with the principles of performance management and also conform to the characteristics of university operation and management.

1) The assessment goals should be deeply adapted to the school's strategy. An assessment without a connection to the school's strategy is merely a formal scoring. Universities should base themselves on the school's positioning and development strategy, establish a coordinating institution, and decompose the strategic goals layer by layer to each department and position, clearly defining the connection points between job performance and the school's strategy.

2) The assessment system should balance scientificity and practicality. The indicator design should avoid "one-size-fits-all", combine the nature of the position for refinement, introduce scientific tools, reasonably set the proportion and weight of qualitative and quantitative indicators; at the same time, standardize the assessment process, clarify the responsibilities and standards of each link, establish a multi-party supervision mechanism to ensure the fairness and impartiality of the assessment.

3) The assessment value should be realized through feedback and guarantee systems. Through regular performance interviews to provide feedback on results and propose improvement suggestions, build a guarantee system covering supervision, appeal, and incentives, link the assessment results with salary, promotion, and training, stimulate the enthusiasm of administrative staff for work, and form a "assessment - feedback - improvement - incentive" closed loop.

The assessment indicators and weights (out of 100 points) are set around performance efficiency, service quality, work style improvement, and innovation enhancement, which are in line with the core needs of university administrative work. Specifically as follows:

1) Completion of duties (40%): Core indicator, assessing the implementation of job responsibilities, the timeliness and quality of work tasks, including document processing, meeting support, process coordination, data submission, etc., to ensure the orderly progress of administrative work.

2) Service quality (25%): Assessing the service attitude and response efficiency to teachers and students, as well as departments, combined with teacher satisfaction surveys and department feedback, reflecting the public welfare and effectiveness of administrative services.

3) Work style improvement (20%): Assessing work discipline, integrity, and collaboration ability, eliminating shirking and buck-passing, and ensuring the cohesion of the administrative team.

4) Innovation and improvement (15%): Assessing innovative measures and business learning effectiveness, including process optimization, energy conservation and efficiency improvement, policy mastery, etc., to help administrative work improve and upgrade.

Note: The indicators can be adjusted according to the position (such as comprehensive administration, educational administration, student administration), with the weight fluctuating by no more than 5%, ensuring the assessment is scientific and reasonable and in line with reality.

6. Conclusion

Through a systematic study of the performance evaluation of administrative staff in universities,

combined with the practical experience of universities both at home and abroad, and focusing on the optimization of the performance evaluation system for university administrative staff, an in-depth analysis was conducted, and the following conclusions were drawn:

Through a systematic study of the performance evaluation of university administrative staff, combined with the practical experience of universities both at home and abroad, and focusing on the optimization of the evaluation system, an in-depth analysis was conducted, and the following conclusions were reached:

Firstly, the evaluation goals need to be deeply adapted to the school's development strategy. The current core problem is that the performance goals are disconnected from the development strategy after the transformation, lacking a mechanism for the decomposition and implementation of strategic orientation, and failing to play the supporting role of the evaluation in the school's development.

Secondly, scientific and standardized systems and mechanisms are the guarantee for the effectiveness of the evaluation. The evaluation process lacks supervision, the indicators do not reflect the differences in positions and are insufficiently quantified, and the absence of a result feedback mechanism affects the fairness and scientific nature of the evaluation and makes it difficult to form a closed-loop management.

Thirdly, the optimization of the evaluation is a systematic project, and it needs to be advanced collaboratively from five dimensions: goals, indicators, guarantees, result application, and awareness cultivation. Based on the actual operation of the school, a scientific, highly targeted, and operable evaluation system should be constructed.

Fourthly, the core value of the evaluation lies in motivation and development. We should abandon the cognition of "emphasizing rewards and punishments, neglecting improvement", deepen the application of results based on the dual-factor incentive theory, cultivate a performance-oriented culture, and promote the dual improvement of team quality and school management level.

Fifthly, the evaluation system needs to be in line with the school's own characteristics. It should not be blindly copied while balancing the norms and flexibility, highlighting the service attribute. The optimization ideas of this system can provide reference for similar restructured universities.

Acknowledgment

The author expresses heartfelt gratitude to the following sponsors for their support in this research: The soft science project of the Sichuan Provincial Science and Technology Department, titled "Research on the Path and Influencing Factors of Promoting Major Technological Transformations through Cheng-Mei Synergy", 24RKX0065. The high-end talent introduction project of the Sichuan Provincial Science and Technology Department, titled "Research on the Intelligent Networked Physical Entity Numerical Control System Based on Physical Motion Laws", 25RCYJ0011.

References

- [1] Du Xudong. Practical Research on Performance Management of University Administrative Staffs [J]. Education Management, 2019 (12).
- [2] Xie Qiang. Improving the Performance Evaluation System for University Administrative Staffs under the Background of Performance Pay [J]. Talent Resources Development, 2020 (10).
- [3] Yue Yuan. Performance Evaluation of University Administrative Staffs Based on Factor Analysis Method [J]. Human Resources, 2017 (11).
- [4] Wang Xu. Analysis of Performance Evaluation of University Administrative Staffs [J]. Contemporary Education Practice and Teaching Research, 2019.
- [5] Fang Zhenbang, Liu Qi. Performance Management of University Administrative Staffs in the United States: Standards, Procedures and Application of Results [J]. Journal of National Education Administrative College. 2019, (6): 89-95.