

**Self-Evaluation:**

The College meets this Standard. New hires are determined through a documented planning process that begins at the unit level with a review of the unit's effect on student achievement. Every new hire proposal must align with the department or unit's mission and goals and be supported by data and other evidence. The College engages in inclusive, informed, and intentional dialogue about selection of personnel, from the determining of positions to be hired to the selection of successful candidates.

Criteria, qualifications and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly stated in HR Operational Guidelines for classified personnel and in board policy for faculty and confidential/management positions. KCCD board policy, California Education Code, and CBA's are utilized to ensure all positions are distinctive yet uniform.

Selection of successful candidates is based on evidence of subject/service area knowledge, teaching/service and communications skills, commitment to professional growth, and skill demonstrations.

Hiring procedures are consistently applied. Previously, the colleges and District employed Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) compliance managers separately at each college and the District Office, but the District has since hired a centralized position to administer its EEO programming across the whole of the organization. This shift away from the reliance on district or college staff in other departments outside of HR has improved monitoring and facilitating EEO compliance.

Evidence that this hiring process yields highly qualified candidates is found in the successful probationary evaluations of hired personnel. The College maintains detailed records on all employee evaluations. The institution relies on the knowledge and expertise of supervisors and human resources personnel to identify any problems or concerns. Some committees have been known to informally debrief after completing their part of the screening process to discuss the quality of questions, the value of the skills demonstration, any problems or difficulties encountered, etc. But this informal assessment is not required or formalized in any established feedback loop.

**Actionable Improvement Plan:**

None

**III.A.1.b**

The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities

and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

### **Descriptive Summary:**

Cerro Coso Community College evaluates its employees for the purpose of continuous quality improvement. Quality personnel are essential to the academic excellence of an institution. The College follows California Education Code, KCCCD board policy, and the CBA's to ensure all personnel are comprehensively evaluated. All employee classifications are evaluated on a regular, scheduled basis.

### **Faculty**

Faculty evaluations are handled in accordance with Education Code as well as with procedures outlined in the collective bargaining agreement between KCCCD and the Community College Association (CCA), and included in Board Policy as Article 5. Evaluations include several components and consider the actual assignment. The process includes classroom observation by administration and colleagues, student evaluations, instructional materials review, professional responsibilities review and, when applicable, evaluation of non-instructional assignments [**doc. 190\_45, doc. 133**]. Probationary faculty are evaluated every year for the first four years ("Mode A"). Tenured faculty are on a three-year cycle that alternates between a comprehensive and brief evaluation process ("Mode B").

Part-time faculty evaluations are also conducted in accordance with Education Code and through procedures outlined in the agreement between KCCCD and the Community College Association (CCA). The components are the same as those for full-time faculty with the exception of the professional responsibilities review. Adjunct faculty members are evaluated during their first semester and each year for the first two years and every three years thereafter [**doc. 190\_49, doc. 134**].

It is the stated philosophy of faculty evaluations, whether full-time or part-time, that they are formative with the goal of improving student learning through focusing on professional growth and improvement and promoting faculty service [**doc. 190\_46**]. The connections between the faculty evaluation process and institutional effectiveness and improvement are direct. Faculty are assessed on the performance of the full scope of assigned duties in the areas of

- discipline knowledge
- creation and facilitation of the learning environment
- individual and professional responsibility
- participation in institutional activities
- effective teaching methods.

Full-time faculty goals and accomplishments are expected to be linked to departmental and institutional mission and goals. It is a requirement of the contract that faculty portfolios contain a brief narrative summarizing the faculty member's unique contributions to student learning outcomes and assessment strategies [doc. 190\_47].

If a faculty member's performance is rated less than satisfactory during a comprehensive Mode B evaluation, a special ("Mode C") follow-up evaluation may be declared by the college president. This evaluation includes a remediation plan and a timeline for completing the remediation [doc. 148]. If a less than satisfactory rating is determined during a brief Mode B evaluation, then a Comprehensive Mode B is triggered the following semester.

### ***Classified***

Classified evaluations are completed as per the written agreement between KCCD and California School Employees Association (CSEA), which is Article 9 in Board Policy. Evaluations are based on job-related criteria and completed by their supervisor on a regular basis [doc. 190\_62, doc. 131]. A required component of the evaluations is goal-setting to be measured in the next cycle. During the probationary period, classified personnel are evaluated at 3, 6, and 11 months of employment, and then annually thereafter.

Classified evaluations which are less than satisfactory include detailed information relating to the rating and recommendations for improvement. At their discretion based on the nature of the 'Needs Improvement,' supervisors may schedule off-cycle evaluations for follow up. [doc. 149].

### ***Confidential and Management***

Per KCCD board policy, confidential and management employees are evaluated annually the first two years of employment and every two years thereafter. The process includes a written evaluation completed by the supervisor, an evaluation survey that includes a 360 input, the job description, and a written self-assessment. Confidential and management employees are evaluated on performance of assigned duties as well as participation in institutional responsibilities [doc. 190\_74, doc. 132].

If an evaluation results in a rating of 'Needs Improvement,' KCCD board policy provides that goals for improvement and an appropriate timeline shall be established for demonstrated improvement to occur. At the end of the timeline a follow-up evaluation shall occur [doc. 150].

### **Self-Evaluation:**

The College meets this Standard. All full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, classified and confidential/management employees are evaluated on a consistent basis. Employees are evaluated on performance of assigned duties as well as participation in institutional responsibilities. Processes are in place to assure that evaluations lead to improvement of job performance.

It was a recommendation of the visiting team in 2006 that the College follow board policy in evaluating adjunct faculty in a consistent, timely manner with procedures that assess current performance and promote improvement. As described in the 2009 Midterm Report, this recommendation was met [**doc. 58**]. The College now has all full- and part-time instructors on a formal schedule for evaluation, and all adjunct evaluations are up to date [**doc. 151**]. Adjunct faculty members are part of the faculty union and are now covered by similar policies, procedures, and practices as full-time faculty, including the same expectations for performance and for student evaluations and peer observation. This has greatly regularized the timeliness and consistency with which part-time instructors are evaluated for performance and improvement.

	Scheduled	Completed	Percentage
Fall 2009	47	37	78.7%
Spring 2010	48	34	70.8%
Fall 2010	46	39	84.8%
Spring 2011	70	65	92.9%
Fall 2011	64	63	98.4%

**Completion of Adjunct Evaluations** – source: Cerro Coso HR

Within the last year, the College has recognized that the 360 survey for management evaluations is not effective at getting at specific job performance. It is generic to all types and levels of administrators and designed to assess the evaluatee’s management skills broadly considered. But it does not directly contextualize these skills in the evaluatee’s specific job, and so evaluations have tended to generate less useful feedback than they could. A revision of this instrument is underway at the district level, including a better description of each rating. A draft of the new instrument for feedback was presented at a college administrative retreat in January 2012 [**doc. 298**].

One improvement needed in the full-time faculty evaluation instrument is better determining local expectations for what constitutes an appropriate level of institutional responsibilities for faculty participation. Two stated areas of performance for evaluation are “individual responsibility” and “participation in institutional activities.” Currently, the College has no established rubrics, guidelines, or even expectations for judging this.

### **Actionable Improvement Plan:**

Develop a set of expectations of faculty responsibility for participation in institutional activities.

### **III.A.1.c**

Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.