OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE®

Administrator Performance Evaluation

March 18, 2014

Prepared by:

College Brain Trust

Dr. George R. Boggs
Dr. Darroch Young
Consultants

Dr. George R. Boggs
Team Leader

Administrator Performance Evaluation

Introduction. CBT was charged with developing a performance evaluation system for administrators at OCC. The most important purpose of administrator evaluation is to measure performance against expectation. In order for that to happen, the starting place is a complete, accurate, and up-to-date job description.

The second condition for the development of administrator expectations is that the Chancellor and the Board must have established institutional strategic objectives. Ideally, these objectives will have been created in an integrated institutional planning effort. If not, they need to be extracted from the independent plans (e.g. Educational Master Plan, Financial Plan, Facility Plan, Technology Plan). Consistent with the integrated planning effort, the college should define its Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and its annual goals for each indicator. Furthermore, each supervisor must have designated the portions of the objectives and the KPIs for which each administrator will be held responsible, either in whole or in part. This should start with the Chancellor making the appropriate designations for the Cabinet and then each Cabinet member making the designations for their direct reports, etc.

There are generally four components to an effective employee performance evaluation system: a Board Policy, specific procedures with processes and expectations outlined, evaluation forms, and the use of evaluation data to drive planning for administrator development and training.

The adoption of a broad Board policy with accompanying specific procedures and tools provide both administrators and supervisors with clarity about the purpose of evaluation, standards for performance, the mechanism for evaluation, communication of feedback, and the role and process for evaluation in personnel actions. The Board policy is important in providing supervisors and the Chancellor with the authority to base personnel actions on documented evaluations of employee performance. The specific procedures should provide the clear framework for employee development, recognition, and disciplinary action. The procedures should also delineate the process to assure that the evaluations occur on a timely and consistent basis. Frequent review and revision will keep the procedures, approved by the Chancellor, vital and up-to-date. The evaluation tool that accompanies the evaluation procedures provides a road map for administrators and supervisors to ensure the process is followed, complete, and well

documented. All three components are crucial to an effective system of employee performance evaluation.

Performance evaluation needs to be thoughtfully connected to functions of the job found in an up-to-date job description.   Evaluation on specific measures, recognition of a job well done, and disciplinary action (up to and including termination) are based on the same criteria. Administrators need to know on what criteria they are being evaluated, and the instruments used to document performance need to be consistent with that criteria. The criteria will be clear if they are described at the point of hire and consistently applied.

Board Policy. An organizing system for Board policies and consistent administrative procedures can take many forms. There are a number of good examples of well-developed, clear, and concise Board policies that guide the development of procedures. The creation of a Board policy on evaluation would assist administrators by providing the overall expectation for regular evaluation and providing the authority to act on those evaluations.

An example of a Board Policy on evaluation is from El Paso Community College Board Policy 3.22.01 (Appendix HR 01). It provides a clear statement of the purpose of evaluation and the Board expectations for its use. The policy template provides for the documentation of the revision history. A good Board policy can be structured to provide clear direction to the Chancellor on the purpose of evaluation, the expectations that procedures will be developed and followed, and the assignment of responsibility for implementing the evaluation system.

Elements of a Good Administrator Performance Evaluation Procedure. While the Board Policy provides the expectations of the Governing Board and empowers action, the procedures should provide clear direction to administrators and their supervisors concerning the actions and processes to be followed and the tools or forms to be used to document implementation. The following are critical components of an effective system for administrator performance evaluation:

    A. Statement of Purpose
    B. Components
    C. Clear Timelines
    D. Criteria for Performance Measurement
    E. Components of the Process
    F. Clear Statements of Responsibility
    G. Providing Effective Performance Feedback

H. Performance Improvement Plan and Process for Disciplinary Action or Termination
I. Recognition of Excellent Performance
J. Application and Alignment with Professional Development
K. Documentation and Record Keeping
L. Verification and Oversight
M. Clear Forms

While there can be institutional variation in the design of performance evaluation procedures, these components will be found in most effective systems..

A. Statement of Purpose: The foundation of an effective evaluation procedure is a clear statement of purpose that is used to guide the entire process. Purposes of performance evaluation at a college might be to:

- improve performance;
- measure the level of performance;
- foster excellence;
- determine effectiveness in the position;
- determine contributions to the institution;
- communicate the expectations of the institution;
- increase alignment between individual administrators and college goals and key performance indicators;
- provide a basis for administrator recognition;
- provide due process prior to any negative employment action; and
- provide managers with input from those they supervise.

One example of a direct and effective purpose statement is contained in the Long Beach Community College *Manager Performance Evaluation* (Appendix HR 02). Note the clarity in communicating the purpose of the evaluation.

Long Beach Community College Manager Evaluation Procedure
Purpose*:*
- Recognize excellence.
- Provide rationale for decisions on retention, non-retention or reassignment.
- Identify areas of performance needing improvement.
- Identify areas for general management development training.

B.	Components: Once there is both a clear job description and a specific responsibility designation for institutional strategic objectives and KPIs, the next step is the development of the individual administrator's annual goals. Prior to the beginning of every academic year (assuming that evaluations correspond to academic years), each administrator will prepare his or her individual goal statement. Each goal statement will include the following:

1. Job Description Goals. The administrator will establish an annual measureable objective for each element within the job description. The objectives should apply to those items in which the administrator has the authority to fulfill the objective. Obviously people cannot be held accountable for outcomes in which they lack the authority or only held accountable for the submission of an item to the person with the authority.
2. Strategic Objectives. As described above, administrators should know the strategic objectives (or portions of objectives) and KPIs (or portions of KPIs) they are responsible for during the academic year. Administrators should, in turn, have an annual goal for each of those items assigned to them.
3. Individual Goals. Each administrator should have individual annual goals that are specific to his or her area of responsibility (e.g. campus presidents may have annual goals that are unique to their campus). Beyond that, administrators should have personal goals that concern their individual professional development.

Once the administrator has developed the goal statement, it needs to be discussed with the supervisor to be sure that both agree that this statement is the appropriate representation of expectations for that administrator and that it will form the basis for the evaluation. This final part of the goal formation should be completed prior to the start of the academic year.

If the number of direct reports is not too great, there should be a meeting between the supervisor and his or her direct report administrators at the midpoint of the year to discuss an administrator's progress on goal completion. If changes are necessary, this is the time to make them instead of waiting for the final evaluation. Of course, if a supervisor has too many direct reports this may not be practical.

As administrators approach the end of the academic year, they begin to develop their annual report. There are four sections of the annual report.

1. A self-evaluation of the administrator's performance during the academic year.

2. A review and report on each individual goal item and the performance outcome in comparison to the stated objective.
3. A description of the unexpected events during the year and their impact on the administrator's performance.
4. The preliminary goal statement for the following year.

C. Timelines: The timelines for each step of the process should be clear and in line with the renewal or contract deadlines. Timelines need to take into account probationary periods and contract renewal. Important considerations in determining timelines for the evaluation process include the following:

- How often are evaluations done?
- Does the procedure document the calendar dates for the period of the evaluation?
- Is there a probationary period for new administrators?
  - When is the first evaluation during a probationary period?
  - Are evaluations more frequent during the probationary period?
- Who is responsible for initiating the process and sending the forms to assure timelines are met?
- What is the deadline for completing evaluations?
- Does the timeline allow for the process to be completed in a timely manner to coordinate with employment decision deadlines?

If evaluation is to include thoughtful interaction with administrators and their supervisors, sufficient time should be built in to allow for both preparation and feedback.

D. Criteria for Performance Measurement: As noted above, the evaluation procedure should be carefully aligned with job descriptions. What principles ensure measurement based on appropriate criteria?

- Are the criteria measured on the evaluation form the same criteria in the current job description?
- Are the criteria measured a reflection of what the employee actually does on the job?
- Does the measurement include progress toward administrator annual goals and accomplishment of key performance indicators?

E. Steps: The performance evaluation procedures should clearly outline all of the steps involved to complete the evaluation and the responsible parties for each step.

- Who completes feedback during the evaluation?
    - Is the procedure clear that the immediate supervisor completes the evaluation?
    - Does the administrator complete a self-evaluation?
    - Are peer evaluations a part of the process?
- Does the administrator evaluation include the development of annual goals and a process to evaluate performance based on successful achievement of agreed upon goals?
- Is a review of the administrator's professional and personal goals a part of the evaluation?
- Is the discussion of administrator development and growth a part of the process?
- Is the administrator job description used as the basis for the evaluation?
- Does the supervisor meet with the administrator to discuss the evaluation and performance?
- Are there clear sign-off directions?
    - Is there a statement to indicate that the signature of the administrator means he or she has received the evaluation and has discussed it with the supervisor but that it does not necessarily mean the administrator agrees with the evaluation?
    - Are additional reviews and sign-off levels clear in the procedure and on the evaluation form? Is it clear which positions require Vice-Chancellor, President, or Chancellor review and sign-off? Does the procedure allow for the administrator to provide a written response to the evaluation?
- Is the administrator permitted to include written comments about the evaluation before it is placed in the personnel file?
- Does the procedure include the process for appeal of recommendations for termination, disciplinary action, or non-renewal? Does the procedure align with the process and the timelines for appeal?
- Are the steps for termination or disciplinary action outlined in the procedure or referred to in a companion procedure?
- Does the procedure contain or refer to a program of employee recognition based on outstanding performance?

- Do all administrator job descriptions include the requirement to conduct employee evaluations, and are those administrators themselves evaluated on completing these duties and meeting deadlines?

It may be helpful for administrators who interact frequently with peers to receive periodic performance feedback from colleagues and those who report directly to the administrator. This type of review is often referred to as a 360-degree evaluation. If OCC wishes to implement a 360-degree evaluation procedure, some considerations are outlined below. This element of the evaluation is performance assessments by other people within the organization. It is probably not appropriate to do this every year so it should be done every other year or every third year on a staggered basis (so the supervisors do not have to conduct them for more than half of their direct reports in any one year). The evaluations should be conducted by two cohorts – the peer group and direct reports. The peer group needs to be large enough to be meaningful (e.g. every member of the Cabinet who reports directly to the Chancellor would serve as a peer for every other member who similarly reports to the Chancellor). There are many different models that can be used but one such model is attached. It also has to be decided if the evaluations are done anonymously or not. Peer evaluations can be just one more input for the evaluator and need to be treated as such. If the evaluations are done anonymously, the supervisor should be cautioned to account for the fact that some people will use the evaluation process as an opportunity to vent grievances that may not be related to the performance of the administrator being evaluated. Forms used in the past by OCC for peer and 360 evaluations are included in the appendices (HR 03 and 04).

- The evaluation will alternate between informal and comprehensive 360-degree feedback evaluation on a three-year cycle with the comprehensive 360-degree feedback evaluation being conducted every three years.
- The 360-degree evaluation will solicit input from the administrator's direct reports and selected peers and colleagues who are appropriate for each position.
- Human Resources will administer the surveys at the request of the administrator/supervisor.

F.   Clear Statements of Responsibility: An effective administrator performance evaluation procedure clearly outlines the responsibilities for both the administrator and supervisor. In addition, it articulates the responsibility of the Human Resources Department for monitoring, overseeing, and verifying the completion of the process.

- Are the requirements of the supervisor clear in assuring the process is initiated, timelines met, and meetings scheduled?
- Does the procedure articulate the supervisor's role in communicating the purpose of the evaluation and its role in administrator growth and development?
- Is the expectation for supervisor's preparation for the administrator evaluation review meeting clear?
- Is the administrator responsibility clear for articulating goals, self-evaluation, and other components of the process?
- Are second-level review and sign-off expectations clear?
- Does the process provide the Human Resources staff with clear direction for its responsibility in initiating the process, providing clear direction for completion of the components of the process, providing current forms and tools, or initiating disciplinary action?

An example of how a procedure document can effectively delineate the process and roles clear communication of roles is provided from a Long Beach Community College *Manager Performance Evaluation, Procedural Information* (Appendix HR 02). Note that each step of the process is outlined with roles of both the manager and the supervisor clear and well-explained.

(Excerpt from) Long Beach Community College Manager Evaluation Procedure
1. Manager (Evaluatee) Notification

    - Supervisor schedules initial performance evaluation meeting.
    - Manager receives an Employee Performance Evaluation Packet to utilize as a basis for developing next year's manager objectives. The packet contains: the Performance Evaluation Procedures, the Performance Evaluation Forms, the College's Education Master Plan goals, the Board of Trustees' goals, and the Superintendent-President's goals.

2. Initial Performance Evaluation Meeting

    - Supervisor reviews the performance evaluation process, which includes an overview of the goals of the College's Educational Master Plan, the Board of Trustees, the Superintendent-President, and the supervisor.
    - Manager is charged with developing objectives (for upcoming year) that are aligned with the aforementioned goals.

- Supervisor and manager collaboratively discuss developing the manager's objectives.
- Supervisor directs the manager to prepare and return a draft of his/her objectives to the supervisor within two weeks of the initial performance evaluation meeting.

3. Supervisor Preparations for Final Meeting

- Supervisor receives manager's first draft of his/her objectives (within two weeks of initial meeting).
- Supervisor reviews and, if necessary, revises manager's objectives.
- Supervisor completes the three-part performance evaluation form, which includes both the evaluation of the previous year's objectives and the proposed objectives for the upcoming year.
- Supervisor schedules the final performance evaluation meeting.

4. Final Performance Evaluation Meeting

- Supervisor and manager establish the manager's final objectives.
- Supervisor discusses the manager's performance evaluation.
- Manager is provided with an opportunity to respond and comment in writing.
- Supervisor and Manager sign off on the document.

G. Providing Effective Performance Feedback: Because the primary purposes of performance evaluation are to improve performance and contribute to success in fulfilling the mission of the college, an essential component of an effective evaluation procedure is the clear communication of expectations for administrator growth and development. The supervisor should provide fair and honest feedback on areas for which the administrator can improve performance or foster new learning. The process should allow for preparation for discussion by the supervisor and the administrator. The completion of a self-assessment is often a helpful tool in preparing for a discussion concerning performance. An important tool to support effective feedback is the training of supervisors in how to evaluate employees and, in particular, how to provide feedback on performance that will assist employee growth and development. Providing honest feedback on performance is often a challenge for supervisors but is necessary to assure that the evaluation provides meaningful feedback that allows administrator development and connects that development to the mission of the college. The following are guiding elements to assure an effective performance plan component in the evaluation process:

- Is administrator performance based on the current and accurate job description and recommendations for performance improvement related to specifics in the job description?
- Do administrators develop annual performance and professional development goals?
- Do all administrators have recommendations for growth?
- Does the evaluation form itself have a place to clearly indicate whether the evaluation of the administrator's performance is excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory?

H. <u>Performance Improvement Plans and Process for Disciplinary Action or Termination</u>: In the case of performance that requires correction for successful employment continuation, the procedure should include specific directions and guidelines for the development of a specific improvement plan beyond the feedback found in the evaluation form, including the date and process for follow-up.

The improvement plan should be based on the documented job description and annual goals and should clearly outline the performance that must be improved, the expected actions by the administrator, the timelines and format for follow-up, and the potential consequences if the improvement plan is not successful. All of the components of the improvement plan should be documented and included in a sign-off process by both the administrator and the supervisor and, if appropriate, a second-line supervisor review.

While not the primary purpose, the performance evaluation system should also provide the feedback, documentation, and due process mechanisms in the event that unsatisfactory performance cannot be corrected and negative employment action must be taken, e.g., letter of reprimand, unpaid suspension leave, demotion, or employment termination. In a well-developed process, employees are well aware of deficits that have not been corrected as well as the potential consequences that may occur from that lack of progress. Following are some issues to consider regarding performance improvement and disciplinary action:

- Has the Improvement Plan been implemented and reviewed based on agreed-upon timelines?
- Are follow-up evaluations noted if required?
- If administrators have unresolved performance problems, are the steps and timelines for remediation and/or termination clear? Have this process and its results been documented?
- Is the disciplinary action or termination appeal process clear and referred to in the evaluation documents?

- Is there a clear line of administrative review for performance gaps requiring personnel action?

I. <u>Recognition of Excellent Performance</u>: An evaluation system can be an excellent means for collecting, documenting, and recognizing outstanding performance. The use of the evaluation system to reward and recognize excellence reinforces the stated goal of the procedure and lessens the fear or distrust of an evaluation process used primarily for negative employment decisions.

J. <u>Analysis of Evaluation for Planning Staff and Professional Development</u>: With the goal of performance improvement at the heart of an effective evaluation system, the data obtained from administrators and supervisors is a valuable resource that can inform and drive the development of staff and professional development within the College. In a well-developed system, administrators identify those areas in which they need additional training or growth, and supervisors have the opportunity to identify gaps in skills, currency and knowledge. The careful analysis of this information should lead to targeted improvement of employee growth and development across the institution. Focusing the professional development planning on employee needs (taken from individual evaluations) will assist the College in expending resources to documented areas of need. Some issues to consider include:

- Is evaluation data collected and aggregated for planning of professional development?
- Is the identification of professional development needs a part of the employee feedback on the evaluation form?
- Do supervisors discuss and act on administrator growth and development needs as a part of the evaluation process?
- Do supervisors use the evaluation form results to approve or encourage participation in professional growth activities?
- Do administrators identify their personal and professional goals for growth as a part of the evaluation?

K. <u>Documentation and Record Keeping</u>: Because of the importance of the integrity of the evaluation system, being clear on documentation and maintenance of records is an important part of an effective system. To ensure the appropriate documentation is in place, the following issues should be considered:

- Are signatures dated on evaluation documents?
- Are the documents date-stamped upon receipt in the Human Resources office?

- Is confidentiality maintained at all levels? Is copying and printing of evaluation documents secure and confidential? Are Human Resources files of personnel documents secure?
- Does the College have procedures determining who has access to personnel records including evaluations? Can any supervisor in the employee's chain of command access the file?
- Is access to a file documented each time it is reviewed?
- Are records maintained in accordance with legal requirements?

L. <u>Verification Process and Oversight</u>: The system for assuring the implementation of the procedures within the timelines should be clearly delineated. To include this guidance in the procedure document, the following issues should be reviewed:

- By position, who is responsible for tracking the evaluation system?
- Is the system automated or could it be included in an automated calendar?
- Is there a process for a reminder prior to the deadline?
- Are the supervisors trained or oriented to the expectations and timelines to ensure that they complete the process within the timelines?
- Is there a process for the Human Resources Department to notify the appropriate Vice Chancellor or the Chancellor if a supervisor does not complete the evaluations or does not meet deadlines?

There should be clear responsibility assigned, and supervisors should be held accountable for completion of evaluations in their areas. This process can be significantly streamlined with technology support for tracking and follow-up of evaluations.

M. <u>Clear Forms</u>: The forms used to guide the evaluation process are the roadmap used by both the administrator and the supervisor to complete an effective evaluation. They should also guide the supervisor and administrator in documenting goals, feedback, actions taken, actions recommended, dates of meetings, dates of review, and employee verification of the evaluation. Clear forms remove inaccuracy and inconsistency and assure that the administrator receives feedback that will support personal and professional growth, areas of strength, areas to be improved, and specific actions expected of the supervisor. Examples of forms to be used as models are found in the appendix. Some of the issues to be considered in the development of a clear set of forms and tools are:

- Does the evaluation system include a packet of forms to guide the process, including goal-setting instructions and results, self-evaluation,

employer feedback on strengths and development, and other components?

- Can the forms be developed for online use to include completion and transmittal to all appropriate parties as well as archiving electronically?
- Do the forms allow for the evaluator to include additional pages for more lengthy narrative?
- Do the forms clearly call for the documentation of evaluation period, dates of employee meetings, dates of review, and dates for secondary review?
- Are there forms to document an employee improvement plan?
- Does the packet used for administrator evaluation include the completion of annual department goals based upon key performance indictors and an assessment of their degree of completion?
- Is there a form for new or probationary employee review or an indication on the form to capture type of evaluation?
- Does the form include a place for the supervisor to mark whether the evaluation of the employee is excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory?

One example of how the evaluation form can serve as the road map or guide for the implementation of the procedure is the El Paso Community College *Non-Faculty Part-Time Employee Annual Evaluation* form (Appendix HR 05).   Note that the performance rating is clearly defined and the self-evaluation component is a part of the form. This assures that a self-evaluation is completed as a part of the process of the evaluation. The form also calls for a documented rating of performance, including outstanding, commendable, competent, needs improvement, or significantly below standards and provides for a recommendation on employment continuation. This example allows the supervisor to recognize outstanding performance or to document performance improvement expectations.

A second example is the Lone Star College System *Administrative/Professional Performance Profile* (Appendix HR 06) that includes a rating of performance, self-evaluation, personal and professional and overall goals as a part of the review. That document provides an example of how the evaluation forms and process can be tailored to the expectations of different employee groups. That in-depth evaluation, including goal review, varies from the example from El Paso Community College cited above that is geared to the assessment of part-time staff performance.   The Lone Star College System *New Employee Performance Review (Administrative/Professional)* (Appendix HR 07) form provides an example of a short instrument to be used for new staff for the quick review at the 30-day, 90-day, and 6-month periods of new employment. Again, it is an example of tailoring the form to communicate clear expectations and to document the results to the employee. In this case, the College bases continuation of employment

on these initial reviews for new employees and does not wait until a full year has passed before providing documented feedback to employees.

An example of how a form guides the evaluation process is the Long Beach Community College *Classified Confidential Employee Evaluation Form* (Appendix HR 08). That form provides for the documentation of follow-up evaluation for evaluations recommending action, including ratings of each performance criteria, overall performance rating, and recommendations for employment action or improvement required.

Chancellor Evaluation. Evaluation of the Chancellor is an important responsibility of the Board of Trustees and should follow a systematic process. Its purpose is to clarify the expectations placed on this position by the Board and to assess performance based upon these expectations. Evaluation of goal attainment, a collective sense of direction, and reinforcing recognition should be the primary goals of this policy. Formal evaluation should occur once each year. The process and criteria used shall be understood by and mutually acceptable to the Board and the Chancellor. The formal evaluation shall result in a written record of performance. Written evaluations should be sealed and placed in the Chancellor's personnel file.

Evaluation of the Chancellor is to be based upon performance of duties and upon accomplishment of goals and objectives developed by the Board and the Chancellor. It is reasonable for progress toward some district goals to change in nature or take longer than expected when other priorities emerge. At times, accomplishment of accepted organizational goals may require cultural changes and be unpopular; the board's evaluation of the Chancellor must be more than a reflection of current popularity. Instruments used in the evaluation will be reviewed periodically and may be revised by majority action of the Board in collaboration with the Chancellor.

Recommendations.

1. CBT recommends that the College adopt a Board policy providing the expectations and purpose for annual evaluation and the authority for personnel decisions based on evaluation documentation.

2. CBT recommends that evaluation goals be tied directly to college-wide goals, key performance indicators, and student success.

3. CBT recommends that the responsibilities for the entire evaluation process, including record keeping, maintenance of confidentiality, and process for accessing records be centralized, assigned to the Human Resources office, and clearly outlined in the procedures.

4. CBT recommends clear expectations for supervisors to place annual evaluation as a high priority and that supervisors are held accountable for assuring full compliance.

5. CBT recommends that the full implementation of annual evaluation be monitored through a verification system. While it can be done manually, the process for verifying that evaluations have been completed would be improved by an automated system that can track and report late or missing evaluations. Administrator performance evaluation is essential in assuring that they understand how their performance relates to the College's ability to fulfill its mission.

6. CBT recommends that the College administrator evaluation procedure reflects all components of an effective evaluation system: clear purpose, timelines, responsibilities, training, criteria based on accurate job descriptions, documentation requirements, performance improvement, recognition of excellent performance, disciplinary action, and oversight.

7. CBT recommends the development of administrator performance evaluation forms that guide administrators and supervisors in an effective process that provides the information necessary for administrator growth and development. The forms should serve as a roadmap through the process, requesting appropriate information (such as self- or peer-evaluation).

8. CBT recommends the development of procedures and forms for documenting performance improvement plans and resulting action in the case of performance that does not meet expectations. The process, responsibility, sign-off requirements, timelines for corrective action, contract non-renewal, or termination should be clear. The availability of an appeal process should be referenced or included in the evaluation procedures.

9. CBT recommends the development of an administrator recognition program and a process to provide for recognition for outstanding performance based on annual evaluations.

10. CBT recommends the use of evaluation feedback as the basis for appropriate professional development that will meet administrator needs and assist administrators in accomplishing the mission of the College.

11. CBT recommends that the evaluation procedures and forms be closely aligned and cross-referenced with the other components of the employment system, including the development and documentation of job specifications, current and accurate job descriptions, appropriate job title assignment, job announcements based on the job description, and hiring based on that set of expectations.