

Cosumnes River College - Standard Operating Procedure

EVALUATING REGULAR CLASSIFIED STAFF

Responsible Division: VPA

(03/14)

Purpose: Identify procedures for evaluating regular classified staff – completing [Report of Job Performance \(RJP\) Form](#)– to provide consistency and ensure compliance with district policies and regulations (Classified R-6141, Confidential R-9141), and collective bargaining agreements (CBA) (LRCEA Article 4, SEIU 6.1, LRSA 5.4).

An evaluation (or RJP) is a recurring, formal process of assessing and providing feedback to employees with the goal of continuous improvement. It is generally separate from a disciplinary process. While the two processes may inform each other, they are distinctly different in their purpose and form.

Note: *An effective evaluation begins with regular employee observations and clear communications about expectations and performance throughout the evaluation period and, when substandard performance is noted, clear and accurate documentation of such communications, including specific plans for improvement.*

Notification and Due Dates

1. Human Resources emails monthly list of current and past due evaluations to VPA.
Note: Evaluation intervals can vary by CBA; for LRCEA, new employees have a 12 month “probationary” period with evaluations after 3, 7 and 10 months (4, 8 and 11 months per Board Regs and SEIU); promotion/transfer employees have a 6 month “conditional” period with evaluations after 3 and 5 months. Final probationary and conditional evaluations must be completed before 12 and 6 months, respectively. After the initial probationary year, employees are evaluated annually – or bi-annually if they receive two successive annual evaluations with overall competent or commendable ratings.
2. VPA emails list to Managers/Supervisors.
3. Evaluations (RJP) are due on the last day of the evaluation period and late 30 days after. Please complete them timely, not early or late. An early evaluation creates a gap between the current and subsequent periods. Late evaluations are problematic because the memory about the specific circumstances fades with time – unless you have taken good notes. It is also more difficult to hold employees accountable if we don’t provide timely feedback about expectations and substandard performance through regular communication, including timely evaluations.

Preparing the Evaluation

4. Review the appropriate CBA article on evaluations prior to completing the form and the Instructions on Page 2 of the RJP form. Remember that the goal is to provide effective feedback to employees to improve services in support of the District/College mission by fairly evaluating their levels of proficiency, promoting self-improvement and identifying objectives for continuous improvement.
5. Complete the current RJP form using consistent, reasonable and objective standards for all employees. Each factor should be rated with respect to the following standards relevant to the performance of job duties:
 - “Competent” – employee is performing at a satisfactory level, i.e., meeting reasonable expectations. No comments are required in the narrative; however, a narrative is recommended to highlight areas of strengths or weaknesses that may not warrant a “Commendable” or “Needs to Improve” rating.
 - “Commendable” – employee is consistently and significantly performing above the standard – exceeding expectations. A narrative is required to specifically describe how the employee exceeds expectations.
 - “Needs to Improve” – performance is somewhat inadequate to reach the standard of a competent permanent employee. A narrative is required to specifically describe the issues – including how and when the expectations, and failure to meet them, were communicated to the employee during the evaluation period and the strategies to improve performance to reach competency.
 - “Unacceptable” – performance is very inadequate; special training, reassignment or separation may be advised. A narrative is required to specifically describe the issues – including how and when the expectations, and failure to meet them, were communicated to the employee during the evaluation period, the strategies to improve performance to reach competency, and a timeline for improvement and re-evaluation – i.e., a specific performance improvement plan. In general, the overall rating should be consistent with the average of the individual ratings, adjusting for some factors that may be weighted more heavily for a particular individual or job.
Note: A substandard rating (“Needs to Improve” or “Unacceptable”) should never come as a surprise to an employee and should be based on direct observations by the rater – not based on input from faculty or other staff.
6. Write a narrative in third person with specific comments describing each individual category rated as “Commendable”, “Needs to Improve” and “Unacceptable” as indicated above as well as summary comments about the employees overall job performance. Include in the heading: Report of Job Performance, Employee Name and ID # and Evaluation begin and end dates. At the conclusion, provide lines for the employee, rater and reviewer to sign and date. It is not required but if preferred, you may also include a statement above the employee’s signature that states: “My signature below indicates that I have read the above narrative but does not necessarily indicate my agreement with its content.” The body of the narrative may be

organized either by major sections from the RJP or by sections for commendations and recommendations. Make sure that the narrative is consistent with the RJP with respect to terminology. For example, a section titled “Commendations” should be restricted to areas marked as “Commendable” on the RJP to avoid inconsistency or confusion between the ratings and comments. Additional strengths or recognitions may be detailed in a separate section if desired. The narrative should be accurate and detailed but concise. Provide the basic details to satisfy a third party reader that the performance assessment is fair and reasonable and based on due diligence by the rater.

Sample Narrative Comments for “Commendable” rating: “Joe has been extremely punctual during this report period, consistently arriving ready to work at or before his scheduled start time almost every day. On the very rare occasion when circumstances beyond his control prevented him from being on time, he always promptly notified his supervisor.”

Sample Narrative Comments for “Needs to Improve” or “Unacceptable” (depending on severity and regularity of actions and employee responsiveness – or lack of – to supervisor instructions) rating: “Joe has consistently been late during this report period, repeatedly (or consistently/regularly) arriving 20-30 minutes late, 2-3 days per week. Joe and the supervisor have discussed the cause for the lateness (on 11/15/2013 and 2/15/2014) and options were provided including making a change to his work hours. However, even with this change, Joe has continued to be late and this has affected his co-workers’ workload. Joe will be required to arrive on time, every day for the duration of this next reporting period. A special evaluation will be conducted in 60 days to review and discuss Joe’s progress. Failure to see a change in Joe’s behavior may lead to disciplinary action.”

7. E-mail draft of RJP and Narrative to the appropriate reviewing officer (Dean and/or VP) **prior to** meeting with the employee. In addition to providing a second viewpoint, a reviewer ensures that evaluations are objective and apply a consistent and reasonable standard across the division or college. When appropriate, particularly on difficult evaluations with overall “Needs to Improve” or individual “Unacceptable” ratings, Dean or VP should forward evaluation to VPA for review.
8. Dean or Supervisor signs as the rater; VP or Dean signs as the reviewing officer.

Meeting with Employee

9. Schedule a meeting with the employee to review the evaluation. The employee has 48 hours to review the report before signing. You may provide a copy in advance of the meeting or at the meeting, providing time to review it together first, whichever is appropriate. Discuss strengths and areas identified for continuous improvement. Listen to employee input and, if appropriate, modify the evaluation and/or comments based on the input to make sure that they are accurate and fairly represent the employee’s performance during the evaluation period.
10. Employee may sign at the meeting or if more time is allowed, can continue to review up to 48 hours. Employee checks the appropriate box – agreeing with rater, not necessarily agreeing or asking for a meeting with the VPA – or rater can check if employee refuses to sign. If employee does not agree with the ratings, contact the VPA to discuss the employee’s opinions and determine if a meeting between the VPA and employee is appropriate or necessary (if employee asks for meeting). The employee has the right to submit a response for their official personnel file at DO.
11. Forward signed RJP and narrative to VPA.
12. VPA signs as the administrative officer after meeting with the employee – if meeting is requested by the employee – and forwards original to HR and copy to Dean/Supervisor and employee.