
6

Information/Action Item

California Student Aid Commission

Process for evaluating the Executive Director's performance

The Personnel, Evaluation and Nominations (PEN) Committee Chair Solorzano will present the PEN Committee's recommendations on this item.

The materials for consideration include:

- Tab 6.a Timeline for the 2009-2010 Performance Evaluation of the Executive Director
- Tab 6.b Recipients of Performance Evaluation Survey (2008-09)
- Tab 6.c Role of PEN Committee in Conducting the Executive Director's Performance Evaluation
- Tab 6.d Survey of Employees and Stakeholders Regarding Annual Performance Evaluation of CSAC's Executive Director

Responsible Person(s): Antonio Solorzano, Jr., Chair
Personnel, Evaluation and
Nominations (PEN) Committee

**Timeline for the 2009-2010 Performance Evaluation of the Executive Director
(Proposed)**

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| June 23, 2010 | PEN meets to discuss performance evaluation instrument to be used and the process. |
| June 24, 2010 | Evaluation instrument presented to full Commission for approval. |
| July 16, 2010 | Survey forms sent to stakeholders |
| August 6, 2010 | Survey forms due back |
| August 18, 2010 | PEN meets to review surveys |
| September 2, 2010 | PEN meets in closed session with the Commission and Executive Director to summarize the information it has received and receive comments and suggestions on the evaluation |
| November 19, 2010 | PEN makes final report to Commission in closed session and provides the Executive Director with the Commission's evaluation orally and in writing |

Recipients of Performance Evaluation Survey (2008 - 09)

1. Members of the California Student Aid Commission
2. Senior Staff of the Commission (Chief Deputy and Division Chiefs)
3. Random sample (Keri Tippins sent this under separate cover to the PEN chair)
4. President of Ed Fund
5. UC Representative: Kate Jefferey
6. CSU Representative: Dean Kulju
7. CCC Representative: Linda Michalowski
8. AICCU Representative: Lisa Douglass
9. Grant Advisory Committee Chair: Susan Gutierrez
10. Loan Advisory Council Chair: Carrie Steere-Salazar
11. Cal-SOAP Advisory Committee Chair: Kathy Degan
12. CASFAA President: Barbara Bickett
13. CCCSFAAA President: Brad Hardison
14. Secretary of Education Office: Glen Thomas
15. Department of Finance: Lynn Podesto
16. Legislative Analyst's Office: Steve Boilard
17. Senate Rules Committee: Darrell Steinberg
18. Senate Subcommittee#1 on Education: Senator Gloria Romero
19. Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee: Senator Denise Ducheny
20. Speaker of the Assembly: Karen Bass
21. Assembly Committee on Higher Education: Assembly member Anthony Portantino
22. Assembly Budget Subcommittee: Assembly member Wilmer Amina Carter
23. State Superintendent of Public Instruction: Jack O'Connell
24. L.A. Chamber of Commerce: David Rattray
25. College Access Foundation: Julia I. Lopez
26. John Burton Foundation: Diane Matsuda
27. The Campaign for College Opportunity: Michele Siqueiros
28. The Institute for College Access and Success (TICAS): Lauren Asher

California Student Aid Commission

Role of PEN Committee in Conducting the Executive Director's Performance Evaluation

The Personnel, Evaluation, and Nominations (PEN) Committee conducts regular evaluations of the Executive Director, nominates the annual slate of officers for the Commission, and recommends appointments to the Commission's advisory bodies and to the EdFund Board of Directors. This committee also develops and oversees the orientation process for new Commissioners. In addition, this committee exercises general oversight of the administrative concerns of the Commission and its staff.

The PEN Committee membership is composed of five (5) Commissioners.

General Framework for Conducting the Executive Director's Performance Evaluation

The performance evaluation for the Executive Director covers the period from November 1 through October 30. By June, the Committee begins both the process for establishing the evaluation for the upcoming year and the instrument which will be used for the Executive Director's evaluation for the previous year.

For the upcoming year: The evaluation process begins a year in advance with the development by the Executive Director and discussion/approval by the PEN Committee and the Commission of the Executive Director's Performance Goals and Management Plan for the coming year. The process includes PEN discussion of her/his goals and plans with the Executive Director as needed/desired by PEN or the Executive Director. The performance goals and management plans are discussed in open or closed session, according to statutory requirements.

For the previous year: In the late spring, the PEN Committee develops the evaluation instrument to be used to evaluate the performance of the Executive Director for the year coming to a close. The instrument should be based on the performance goals and management plan approved by the Commission the year before. This evaluation instrument should be approved by the Commission at its June meeting, with surveys sent out as soon as feasible following that meeting. Also in advance of the June Commission meeting, the PEN Committee develops the letter to participants, the deadline, and a list of recipients of the survey, after identifying the number and names of recipients they deem appropriate for a particular year. The list of recipients need not be submitted to the Commission for approval. In the past, the Executive Director has been invited to submit the names of up to two legislators with whom the Executive Director has worked, for participation in the evaluation survey.

At the request of the PEN Chair, the staff liaison develops the random sample of CSAC employees (in addition to the Chiefs) to whom the survey will be sent. The PEN Committee determines the percentage for the random sample. The staff liaison and staff send out the surveys with instructions developed by the PEN committee. The survey may be either in an electronic or paper format. If a paper survey is used, the survey packet includes stamped envelopes marked Confidential, and addressed to the PEN Chair at his/her home or office.

PEN invites the Executive Director to develop his/her self-evaluation, according to a format and guidelines identified by the PEN Chair.

PEN meets to review and discuss the tabulated responses to the performance evaluation and the initial draft of the evaluation letter which has been sent to PEN members in advance. PEN makes any desired changes.

The Commission meets in closed session to discuss/revise/approve the Commission's letter to the Executive Director, which has been provided in advance, along with the tabulations. Performance goals/expectations and a management plan for the coming year may be revised, according to Commission wishes, as a result of the performance evaluation.

Once the evaluation letter has been approved by the Commission, it is signed by the Chair of the Commission and the Chair of PEN and sent to the Executive Director. If the Executive Director so wishes, discussion of the letter is available to her/him in closed session at the next Commission meeting.

NOTE: The Office of the Attorney General of California ("AG") has opined that the FULL Commission, not one of its Committees, must make final performance evaluation decisions for the Commission's Executive Director. The AG has also specified that there can be no discussion between/among PEN members or Commissioners of any confidential aspect of the evaluation outside of closed sessions. Even if the materials have been tabulated for ease of discussion, the PEN Committee members and the full Commission MUST have available to them the original submissions by participants.

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
Rancho Cordova, California

SURVEY OF EMPLOYEES AND STAKEHOLDERS
REGARDING ANNUAL PERFORMANCE
EVALUATION OF CSAC'S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Executive Director: Diana Fuentes Michel
Date of Evaluation: August, 2009
Evaluation Period: September 1, 2008 – August 31, 2009

Instructions

Read carefully the definitions of “degrees” and the goals. Evaluate each goal separately. Please feel free to provide comments and/or suggestions for each appraisal factor. **If degree 1 is indicated, comments and/or suggestions for improvement must be provided.** Definitions of performance level degrees are as follows:

Degree 1-Improved performance on this goal is needed.

Degree 2-Performance is consistent with reasonable expectations of an Executive Director.

Degree 3-Performance shows consistent and important contributions which exceed normal expectations of an Executive Director.

No Basis for Judgement-Use this category when there has been no opportunity to observe or evaluate the Executive Director on this goal.

VISION

Works with the Commission to set strategic direction for the organization.

COMMUNICATIONS

Communicates vision and direction to staff, Governor’s Office and Legislature, state agencies, institutional partners, students and constituents at all levels.

LEADERSHIP AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Develops staff at all levels, retains and recruits individuals to key post.

EXECUTION

Sets specific and measureable goals that are consistent with the strategic direction of the organization and provides opportunities for people to meet them.

REWARDS

Effectively recognizes the contribution of all people in many ways and encourages their efforts in order to reinforce the goal of the organization.

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
 Rancho Cordova, California

**SURVEY OF EMPLOYEES AND STAKEHOLDERS
 REGARDING ANNUAL PERFORMANCE
 EVALUATION OF CSAC’S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Executive Director: Diana Fuentes Michel
 Date of Evaluation: August, 2008
 Evaluation Period: September 1, 2007 – August 31, 2008

Evaluator’s Name: _____

Evaluator’s Title: _____

Completing the Survey

The California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) has the responsibility to evaluate the performance of its Executive Director, who reports directly to the Commissioners of CSAC. In order to do so most effectively, the Commission seeks the input of employees, stakeholders and other individuals who work with the Executive Director. Your thoughtful comments, based upon your own independent judgment, will be very much appreciated by CSAC as it fulfills its responsibility to evaluate the performance of its Executive Director. Your honesty and objectivity is needed and appreciated.

Completion of this performance evaluation survey is optional. The Commission will attempt to keep the information contained herein confidential to the maximum extent possible. Unless required by law, procedure or legal process, the Commission will generally only share information with the evaluated employee in summary form. However, there may be circumstances where this evaluation, if used in whole or in part as the basis for a negative evaluation, discipline, or other action with respect the evaluated employee, or as the Commission otherwise deems necessary, may be disclosed to the employee if the Commission believes it is necessary or if it is required by law, legal process, rule or procedure. The Commission forbids retaliation against employees for participating in a performance evaluation.

Instructions

Read carefully the definitions of “degrees” and the goals. Evaluate each goal separately. Please feel free to provide comments and/or suggestions for each appraisal factor. **If degree 1 is indicated, comments and/or suggestions for improvement must be provided.** Definitions of performance level degrees are as follows:

Degree 1-Improved performance on this goal is needed.

Degree 2-Performance is consistent with reasonable expectations of an Executive Director.

Degree 3-Performance shows consistent and important contributions which exceed normal expectations of an Executive Director.

N/A-Use this category when there has been no opportunity to observe or evaluate the Executive Director on this goal.

Tab 6.d.1

GOALS

PERFORMANCE LEVEL

Degrees

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Development and implementation of long-term financing and development plan for outreach, including leveraging strategies for other agencies/groups.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											
								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Solid collaboration/ participation of stakeholders in Phase II of the Grant Delivery System and completion of the comprehensive communication plan for Phase II.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											
								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Development, in collaboration with appropriate stakeholders, of a strategic plan with respect to the future of CalSOAP, including resolution of the meetings and role of its Advisory Committee.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											
								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Hiring of an internal legal counsel and chief internal auditor for the Commission.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											
								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Priority attention to an internal auditing plan for high-risk areas within the Grant program.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											
								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Continued focus on hiring, retention and training of employees.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											
								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>More effective use of the Loan Advisory Council</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											
								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>

Tab 6.d.1

GOALS

PERFORMANCE LEVEL

Degrees

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Development of a comprehensive plan to education new legislative members and Administration officials on the Commission's mission, goals and programs.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Development/implementation of a specific communications plan for stakeholder groups.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Facilitation of communication with GAC by appointment (and subsequent process evaluation) of someone within the Grants division as staff liaison for arrangements with GAC, for example, timing of meetings, agendas, timely distribution of materials, etc.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

PERFORMANCE LEVEL

Degrees

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Approach disputed issues in a noticeable mode of listening and finding common ground for resolution/compromise</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Signal to stakeholders interest in their issues by being available, insofar as feasible, for their conferences/meetings/personal contacts</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Facilitate agreeable and timely solutions in situations that involve conflicting and competing demands by applying conflict resolution skills.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

PERFORMANCE LEVEL

Degrees

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Demonstrate and promote, verbally and by behavior, the desire for collaboration among staff, peers and stakeholders and their workgroups.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
Proactively staffing/managing resources to ensure consistent/timely operations of processes.											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Identify and sustain a culture which promotes continuous quality improvement through review and evaluation of processes and procedures</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Delegate responsibility, authority, accountability to the extent it is prudent, including action on issue of more effective use of GAC expertise.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											

								N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Expand the focus on on-going training of new staff in positions critical to the core of CSAC's mission.</i>											
Comments and/or Suggestions:											