3

Action /Information Item

Personnel, Evaluation and Nominations Committee

Consideration of the Process for Evaluating the Executive Director's Performance

The PEN Committee used the attached survey as part of the evaluation process of the Executive Director's performance for 2006-07. The questions in the survey were coordinated with the goals and expectations the Commission had set for the Executive Director earlier in that fiscal year.

The survey was sent to over 45 persons, including Commissioners, a random sample of Commission employees, and the Commission's division chiefs; the EDFund President; certain Legislative members, including the Assembly Speaker's Office, the Senate Rules Committee, Chairs of Legislative Higher Education Policy and Budget Committees and Subcommittees; representatives of the Administration, including the Department of Finance; representatives of higher education segments; and representatives of Commission advisory committees.

The then-Chair of the PEN Committee directly received all returned surveys and prepared a report for the Committee and, ultimately, for the Commission. Staff was only involved to the extent that it developed the randomly selected list of Commission employees and mailed out all the surveys.

The Commission may decide on a different method by which the Commission evaluates its Executive Director's performance, as there is no method specified in law by which an evaluation must be accomplished.

Responsible Person: Yasmin Delahoussaye
Chair

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, 2007

Evaluation Period: Fall, 2006 – Summer, 2007

Evaluator's Name: _____

Evaluator's Title: _____

Completing the Survey

The California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) has the responsibility to evaluate annually 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 and may have important insights into her performance. 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, rule, 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 to 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.

Please complete the form objectively, focusing on performance, and not on the person. The evaluation should be based upon your personal knowledge of performance as compared to the performance goals and standards. Comments are encouraged and should be related directly to job performance. If you do not have information about an area of performance, you should not evaluate that area.

We ask that surveys be completed and mailed in the enclosed, stamped envelope by Monday, August 20, 2007 at latest (earlier if possible), to

Commissioner Sally Furay
Chair, PEN Committee (Personnel, Evaluation, and Nomination)
_____
_____

Anyone who prefers to respond on line may do so by sending an e-mail before August 12, 2007 to _____ requesting an electronic copy of the survey form. The deadline of August 20, 2007 remains the same for on line participants.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. Evaluation of the Executive Director's Performance On Goals which She Established for 2006-2007:

For each area, please identify which category best describes your observation and personal knowledge of the Executive Director's performance:

- "Exceeds Expectations" indicates exceptional performance that consistently exceeds the requirements of the position.
- "Meets Expectations" indicates performance that consistently meets the requirements of the position.
- "Below Expectations" indicates performance that is below what is normally expected of an executive with this person's level of experience in this position.
- "No Basis" is used when: a) the evaluator is unable to form a judgment on the Executive Director's performance on this factor, or b) situations outside of the Executive Director's control have prevented her from acting.

Space is provided for further comments, if desired, on each aspect of the Executive Director's accomplishment of her Performance Goals.

1. Goal 1: Adequate staff and fiscal resources are in place to carry out the Commission's mission, as judged by "reduction of vacancy rate, improved turnover rate, implementation of human resource procedures that maintain a productive work environment where work productivity and efficiency is rewarded."

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

2. Goal 2: There is continued advocacy for state general fund support by the governor and legislature of Cal Grant entitlement/competitive programs, and for specialized programs for teacher/nursing loan assumption, for grants or scholarships for foster youth, law enforcement, and federally funded programs, and new nursing programs. This includes renewal and implementation of a communications and advocacy plan.

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

3. Goal 3: Continuation of the Commission's grant outreach programs, including adoption of a long-term financing and development plan for leveraging strategies with other agencies.

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

4. Goal 4: Adoption and implementation of Bureau of State Audit recommendations and findings, including implementation of required program/policy changes as prescribed in the project involving Roles and Responsibilities in the relationship between CSAC and EdFund.

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

5. Goal 5: Continued, improved communication with Commissioners, legislature and Governor to ensure understanding and knowledge of the Commission's programs and mission, including development and execution of a comprehensive plan to educate new legislative members and Administration officials on the Commission's mission, goals, and programs.

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

6. Goal 6: Successful completion of Phase I of the Grant Delivery System improvements to accomplish an on-line, real time CalGrant data base for students and schools in coming years, while meeting the goals of the 2006-2007 grant delivery system and not compromising ongoing operations during system changes.

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

7. Goal 7: Successful implementation of the necessary programmatic changes to the Commission's administration of its grant programs to comply with internal audit findings, including recommendations from the Bureau of State Audit report, hiring of a new internal auditor, reexamination of the audit plan to ensure correct prioritization of high-risk areas, and implementation of Information Security recommendations from the risk assessment.

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

8. Goal 8: Improved communication with students and institutional representatives who participate in Cal Grant and other specialized programs, including working with the Commission and its advisory committees on adoption of proper policies and procedures and identification, and implementation of a specific communications plan for stakeholder groups.

___Exceeds expectations ___Meets expectations ___Below expectations ___No basis to judge

Comments:

****

B. Evaluation of the Executive Director's Performance on Leadership Behavior Goals:

Response Categories for Leadership Behaviors Section

Please identify which response category best describes your perception of the Executive Director's performance for each factor, commenting as you wish on response categories, after reviewing the Key Success Indicators identified by the Commission and communicated to the Executive Director.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Not enough information

Space is provided for further comments, if desired, on each aspect of the Leadership Behaviors.

1. Communications:
(Key Success Indicators: Ensuring full cooperation and consultation with stakeholders as CSAC proceeds with implementation of the new grant delivery system; continuing to identify synergies between CSAC and EdFund which cultivate and encourage savings and efficiencies; identifying and focusing on Partnerships with stakeholders and stakeholder organizations in joint efforts to assist students; working with the CSAC Executive Team immediately to develop and implement a communication plan as outlined in personal goal #8; ensuring immediate oral and direct communication with segment officials when problems or issues arise which affect campuses.)

- The Executive Director facilitates agreeable and timely solutions in situations that involve conflicting and competing demands within or between Commission staff and EdFund, and among Commission staff and Commission stakeholders.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

- The Executive Director demonstrates willingness to listen and be influenced.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

- The Executive Director demonstrates and promotes collaboration among staff, peers, and all stakeholders and their work groups.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

- The Executive Director considers the impact of the recommendations/decisions of GAC and its work groups on other stakeholders before acting.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

2. Personnel Management:

(Key Success Indicators: Meeting with Department of Personnel Administration to ensure proper job pay for job functions; ensuring adequate staffing levels to deliver timely programs to students; proactively accessing and developing employee resources, strengths, and competencies to ensure staffing levels are adequate for work load; ensuring consistent and sufficient advance preparation by the divisions for Commission and Committee meetings.)

- The Executive Director proactively staffs/manages resources to ensure consistent/timely operations of processes.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

- The Executive Director recruits talented personnel who possess appropriate skills and experience for job function.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

- The Executive Director creates and sustains a culture which promotes continuous process improvement.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

- The Executive Director acts quickly to resolve performance issues and/or problems.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments:

- The Executive Director delegates responsibility, authority, and accountability to the extent it is prudent.
  ___Strongly Agree ___Agree ___Disagree ___Strongly Disagree
  ___Not enough information

Comments: