

ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION AND APPOINTMENT RENEWAL PROCEDURES

I. EVALUATION PROCESS

- A. City College of San Francisco administrators (including exempt administrators) will be evaluated annually to provide a comprehensive assessment of the administrator's performance. The immediate supervisor of the administrator will be responsible for managing the evaluation process and establishing in which semester the administrator will be evaluated.
- B. The purposes of administrative evaluation are:
1. To give accurate feedback to an administrator regarding his/her job performance from faculty, classified staff, administrators and, where appropriate, students.
 2. To document an administrator's accomplishments during the period under review.
 3. To identify ways that an administrator can improve his/her job performance and thereby better serve all segments of the District community.
- C. The administrator will submit to the supervisor a brief self-evaluation that includes an assessment of the progress on the objectives established as part of the previous evaluation and steps taken to address any areas of improvement identified in the last evaluation.
- D. The supervisor will administer confidential evaluation forms that provide feedback from:
1. Individuals working with administrator: The supervisor and the administrator will develop a list of individuals to be surveyed. The list will include faculty, administrators, and classified staff who directly report to the administrator. For school deans, the list will include, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the department chairs and program coordinators in the school. For campus deans, the list will include, but not necessarily be limited to, department chairs and/or coordinators whose departments regularly offer courses at the campus. For other deans with district-wide responsibilities, the list will include, but not necessarily be limited to, all of the department chairs and program coordinators district-wide.
 2. Faculty, staff, and other administrators: The administrator will submit to the supervisor a proposed list of additional individuals to be surveyed (including appropriate faculty, administrators, and classified staff), not covered in #1 above. The supervisor may augment the final list of individuals to be surveyed and that list shall not be restricted to the proposed list provided by the administrator.
 3. Faculty: Faculty survey forms will be available from the Office of the Academic Senate to any faculty member who desires to provide an assessment of the administrator's performance. The purpose of the faculty survey forms is to provide additional separate feedback directly to the administrator's supervisor.

4. Students: For administrators with direct responsibility for working with individual students on a regular basis, the supervisor, in consultation with the administrator, will develop a list of individuals to be surveyed. One of the criteria for selecting students will be regular contact between the administrator and the individual student over a period of time.

Evaluation forms will be anonymous.

Ratings on the evaluation surveys will be scaled as follows:

- 5 Outstanding
- 4 Above Average
- 3 Satisfactory
- 2 Improvement Needed
- 1 Unsatisfactory
- N/A Not Applicable/Not Observed

- E. The supervisor will summarize the results of the evaluation forms and write a draft evaluation report based on the data collected from the forms (including average scores for survey items and a summary of the comments on each item) and the supervisor's assessment of the administrator's performance including, but not limited to, progress on the objectives established at the end of the previous evaluation. The supervisor will provide a rationale for the final overall rating as it relates to the numeric summary of surveys, comments on the surveys, and the supervisor's assessment. The final overall ratings for the evaluation will be

- Outstanding
- Above Average
- Satisfactory
- Improvement Needed
- Unsatisfactory

- F. The supervisor and the administrator will examine and discuss all evaluation forms submitted under the provisions of I. D. 1, 2, 3 and 4. The supervisor will review the draft of the evaluation report with the administrator and solicit feedback from the administrator. The supervisor and the administrator will develop a set of objectives for the next year based on the current year's evaluation and the goals in the annual plan that the supervisor and administrator agree are appropriate to the administrator's areas of responsibility. The supervisor will then prepare a final assessment report for review and comment by the Chancellor. The administrator has the right to attach comments or rebuttal to the final assessment report. The supervisor will meet with the Chancellor to review the final assessment report. After the Chancellor's review, the administrator will receive the final evaluation report signed by the supervisor and the Chancellor. The administrator has the right to meet with the Chancellor to appeal the evaluation. The administrator will sign off on the evaluation as an acknowledgement of receipt. The

administrator has the right to attach comments or rebuttal to the final report that will be included as part of the administrator's personnel file.

- G. Anytime an administrator receives an over-all rating of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" on an evaluation, the objectives developed by the supervisor and the administrator for the following year's evaluation will clearly articulate the areas for improvement and indicate the criteria to be used to assess that improvement. The supervisor and administrator will develop a plan for professional development that will provide that administrator the opportunity to improve performance in the designated areas. The supervisor will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the plan, providing institutional support related to the plan, and monitoring and advising the administrator on his/her progress toward meeting the objectives of the plan.

For the next annual evaluation, the supervisor will be responsible for ensuring that the progress on objectives of the plan are assessed using criteria established at the time of the previous evaluation.

II. EVALUATION AND APPOINTMENT RENEWAL

All administrators will be evaluated annually. Appointment renewal will be based on the administrator's status with the District as follows:

- A. Continuing Administrators: Each administrator has a three-year appointment that is extended for an additional year if the administrator receives a satisfactory annual evaluation. If an administrator receives a "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" annual evaluation, the administrator will not receive the additional year. If the administrator shows significant improvement in the following year (i.e., does not receive a "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" evaluation), the three-year appointment is restored. If the administrator receives a "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" evaluation the following year, the administrator will be given a one-year appointment. If an administrator is on a one-year appointment due to a series of less-than-satisfactory evaluations, the administrator's supervisor will be responsible for completing the evaluation for that academic year by December 15. The evaluation schedule will provide adequate time for the administrator to have the opportunity to demonstrate improvement as stipulated in the previous evaluation(s). If the administrator receives a less-than-satisfactory evaluation, the administrator will receive notification of the District's intent to terminate employment as an administrator no later than January 15 of that academic year.
- B. New Administrators: New administrators are individuals not previously employed by the District as an administrator. New administrators will receive a two-year appointment and be evaluated during the first year of service. If the new administrator receives a satisfactory evaluation, he/she will receive a three-year appointment and will be treated as a continuing administrator in future evaluations and appointment renewals. If a new administrator receives an over-all rating of "needs improvement," the new administrator

will have one-year to correct deficiencies. If the new administrator receives an over-all rating of “unsatisfactory,” the Chancellor or his designee may reassign the new administrator to other administrative duties during the second year of the initial appointment.

The administrator’s supervisor will be responsible for completing the evaluation for that academic year by December 15. The evaluation schedule will provide adequate time for the administrator to have the opportunity to demonstrate improvement as stipulated in the previous evaluation. If a new administrator receives a satisfactory evaluation in the second year, he/she will receive a three-year appointment and will be treated as a continuing administrator in future evaluations and appointment renewals. If the new administrator receives a less-than-satisfactory evaluation in the second year, the administrator will receive notification of the District’s intent to terminate employment no later than January 15 of that academic year.

- C. Continuing Administrators, Faculty or Classified Staff in New Administrative Assignments: Continuing administrators in new assignments or former faculty/classified staff in new administrative assignments will receive an initial appointment of one year in the new assignment and the administrator’s former position will be filled on a one year interim basis for that year. If the administrator receives a satisfactory evaluation in the first year in the new assignment, the administrator will receive a three-year appointment and appointment renewal will be based on the criteria for continuing administrators. If the administrator receives a less-than-satisfactory evaluation in the first year in the new assignment, the administrator will return to the former assignment.

III. OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

- A. The Administrative Evaluation Oversight Committee is an advisory committee to the Chancellor and will be responsible for ensuring that the evaluation process was followed, was conducted appropriately, and that there was reasonable input by the constituencies described in these procedures. Each semester, each Vice-Chancellor will prepare a summary of the results of each evaluation conducted including: the name of the administrator evaluated; whether the evaluation was satisfactory or less-than-satisfactory (i.e., needs improvement or unsatisfactory); and the statistics on the number of individuals who participated in each evaluation. The Chancellor will prepare similar reports on the evaluation of Vice-Chancellors and other administrators who report directly to the Chancellor. If the Committee is concerned that the process was not followed, or was not conducted appropriately, or that there was not reasonable input by the constituencies described in these procedures, the Committee may make recommendations to the Chancellor regarding any deficiencies identified as a result of its review of the Vice Chancellors’/Chancellor’s reports.

Individual evaluation reports are confidential personnel documents and therefore may not be reviewed by Committee members other than the appropriate Vice-Chancellor and the Chancellor.

- B. The Committee shall consist of: the Chancellor; each of the Vice-Chancellors; Administrators' Association Chairs; and members of shared governance bodies: the President of the Academic Senate or designee; three faculty appointed by the Academic Senate; the Chair of the Department Chairs' Council or designee; the President of the SEIU 790 (Classified); the Student Trustee or designee. When a Vice-Chancellor is presenting the results of evaluations conducted in his or her area of supervision, that Vice-Chancellor shall act in an advisory role and not as a member of the Committee in its review of those evaluations. The Committee will meet at least once each semester. The Chancellor will chair the Oversight Committee.

IV. TERM OF THIS EVALUATION PROCEDURE

These procedures will be adopted and reviewed for a two-year trial period. That trial period shall include two complete cycles of this annual evaluation process. At the end of the two-year trial period after consultation conducted by the Chancellor with appropriate parties including the Administrator's Association, these procedures may be continued.