

The District assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The evaluation process assesses the effectiveness of personnel and encourages improvement. All statements within the evaluation shall relate to job performance as specified in the position description, may include mutually agreed upon goals, and shall be supported by appropriate documentation, if applicable. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Faculty, Classified Staff, and Police Officers

Faculty members, classified employees, and police officers shall be evaluated in accordance with their respective negotiated labor agreements.

Confidential Employees

Confidential employees shall be evaluated in the same manner as classified employees.

Administrators

The District establishes written criteria for evaluating Administrators. Administrators for the purposes of this AP shall include:

- educational administrators,
- administrative administrators,
- directors,
- managers, and
- supervisors

Administrators' Annual Review Process

Administrators shall be evaluated annually or more frequently on an "as needed" basis.

The annual review process shall include a self-evaluation and the immediate supervisor's evaluation.

Administrators' Comprehensive Review Process

Once every three years, the evaluation process for an administrator shall include a self-evaluation, a 360-review, and the immediate supervisor's evaluation. Participants in the 360-review may consist of the following rater types: management, direct reports, subordinates, peers, and others (may include individuals outside El Camino as appropriate.) The number of participants within each rater type shall be limited to no more than ten individuals, but no less than five evaluators per rater type. The administrator-evaluatee may suggest participant names for each rater type, but the administrator-evaluatee's choices shall not exceed more than half the number of participants in each rater type category. The remaining participants in each rater type category shall be chosen by the supervisor.

The administrator-evaluatee shall receive a copy of the immediate supervisor's evaluation which, if applicable for that evaluation year, will summarize feedback received from the 360-review. Specific responses in the 360-review shall not be revealed to the administrator-evaluatee to preserve confidentiality and encourage open and honest feedback from the review participants.

The immediate supervisor shall schedule an evaluation review meeting with the administrator-evaluatee. Mutually agreed upon edits may occur as a result of this meeting. When the immediate supervisor submits the finalized evaluation for the administrator-evaluatee's review, the evaluatee shall

have ten work days to submit a response and e-sign the review. Once a review is officially finalized following the ten work days, no additional edits may occur.

If the administrator-evaluated's overall performance is identified as "needs improvement," the immediate supervisor shall document desired goals for improvement and a reasonable timeline for demonstrated improvement to occur. This timeline for improvement is not to exceed one year. At the end of the designated timeline, a follow-up evaluation shall occur.

If the administrator-evaluated's overall performance is "unsatisfactory," the evaluatee may request that an evaluation panel be formed. This panel shall include the immediate supervisor, a representative selected by the administrator-evaluated, and an administrator appointed by the Area Vice President who is not the supervisor of the evaluatee. The panel shall review all documentation including any rebuttals and responses from the 360-review. The panel may administer an additional 360-review, hold conferences with the evaluatee, and/or require the evaluatee to present additional materials if appropriate. The panel shall establish a reasonable timeline for demonstrated improvement to occur but not to exceed one year from the unsatisfactory performance evaluation. At the end of the designated timeline, a follow-up performance evaluation shall occur at which point a final determination shall be made. At this time an unsatisfactory performance recommendation may lead to a recommendation for termination. If the immediate supervisor or panel recommends termination, the administrator-evaluated has the right to appeal the recommendation as determined by California Education Code.

Official performance reviews (comprised of the self-evaluation and immediate supervisor's evaluation) shall be digitally archived and electronically accessible by both the administrator-evaluated and the immediate supervisor for the duration of the evaluatee's employment with the District.

Reference:

Accreditation Standard III.A.5 (*formerly III.A.1.b*)

El Camino College

Adopted: January 21, 2014

Revised: 10/15/18