

RESOLUTION NO. 494

A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE CRITERIA AND PROCESS TO BE USED BY THE STAYTON CITY COUNCIL IN THEIR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR.

WHEREAS, the Stayton City Council wishes to establish criteria to evaluate the City Administrator in July of each year.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF STAYTON RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: ADOPTION OF CITY ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION CRITERIA

The attached evaluation criteria and process is hereby adopted.

SECTION 2: REPEAL

Resolution No. 398 is hereby repealed.

PASSED BY THE STAYTON CITY COUNCIL THIS 17<sup>th</sup> DAY OF August, 1992.

Date: 8-18-92 By: Willmer Van Vleet  
WILLMER VAN VLEET, Mayor

ATTEST

Date: 8-18-92 By: David W. Kinney  
DAVID W. KINNEY, City Administrator

RESOLUTION NO. 494  
CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR

CITY OF STAYTON  
CITY ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION  
SCORING EXPLANATION

I. OBJECTIVES

- A. *Qualitatively measure the Administrator's performance.*
- B. Assist the Administrator by providing direction and by identifying the Council's expectations.
- C. Identify and re-establish the Council/Administrator roles.
- D. Identify and reinforce positive aspects of the Administrator's performance.

II. EVALUATION PROCESS

- A. Blank evaluation sheets provided to Mayor, Council members, and Administrator.
- B. Mayor, Council members, and Administrator complete evaluation sheets, including comments if desired.
- C. Mayor retains all worksheets, papers, and notes prepared by mayor and individual council members during the work sessions. These documents shall be available to council members upon request at subsequent work sessions. Mayor shall collect all documents prior to everyone leaving each of the meetings.
- D. Within two (2) weeks, Administrator meets with Mayor and Council to discuss evaluate and compare composite evaluation with Administrator's self-evaluation. Composite evaluation may be modified based upon input from Administrator. Evaluation finalized in triplicate: 1 copy for personnel file; 1 copy for Administrator; 1 copy for Mayor.
- E. Follow-up scheduled within ninety (90) days to review progress on areas identified as needing improvement.

III. EVALUATION RATING

The numerical rating (1 to 5) is an effort to quantify opinions and judgments about a specific management responsibility or skill and/or a personal/interpersonal skill. While admittedly subjective, it suggests a useful emphasis or relative degree of acceptability.

A 5. rating represents "very satisfactory" performance of behavior; a 4. indicates performance or behavior that "exceeds standard;" a 3. is "satisfactory;" a 2. is indicative of performance or behavior that is "below standard." The n/o represents "no opinion" or "no observation" or performance or behavior.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

Administrator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Period: \_\_\_\_\_ Last Evaluation Date: \_\_\_\_\_

- SCORING SCALE:
- 1. = Unsatisfactory
  - 2. = Below Standard
  - 3. = Satisfactory
  - 4. = Exceeds Standard
  - 5. = Very Satisfactory
  - n/o = No Opinion or No Observation

EVALUATION FACTORS

1. RELATIONSHIP WITH CITY COUNCIL

A. Staff Reporting to City Council: How useful and timely are reports? Are they too long, too short, with insufficient data to supporting too few alternatives? Do they appear balanced, well-reasoned and supported with facts? Where applicable, are there recommendations for actions?

SCORE:                                                          
                         1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

B. Communication with City Council: Does the Administrator make an effort to communicate both in writing and in person? Is this communication useful, objective, and supportive of the councilmember's role? Is the Administrator available on a reasonable basis when contacted by the councilmember? Does the Administrator keep the City Council informed appropriately?

SCORE:                                                          
                         1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

C. Planning, Organizing, Execution of Work: Does the Administrator plan, organize, and execute all approved Council policies, programs, and his day-to-day responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner?

SCORE:                                                          
                         1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

D. Council Relations: Is the Administrator open and honest with the Council? Does he present all sides of an issue and all possible effects on the city? Is he able to accept constructive criticism and live with and support Council reversals? Is he able to follow the Council's intentions and directions with enthusiasm?

SCORE:      1      2      3      4      5      N/O

COMMENTS:

2. RELATIONSHIP WITH COMMUNITY

A. Community Activities: Does the Administrator become involved in community activities? Is he visible? Does he project a solid, competent image of the City? Does he have the ability to work with and understand the needs of the business community?

SCORE:      1      2      3      4      5      N/O

COMMENTS:

B. Communication with Community: Does the Administrator demonstrate effective communication with citizens? Does he resolve citizen complaints consistent with Council policy in a timely manner and report the same to the Mayor and Council? Does he communicate the image of a positive and productive CITIZENS' government to citizens?

SCORE:      1      2      3      4      5      N/O

COMMENTS:

2. ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTION

- A. Ordinance/Contract Enforcement: Does the Administrator ensure all ordinances are enforced and that provisions of all franchises, leases, contracts, permits, and privileges granted by the City are enforced?

SCORE:            1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

- B. Collection of Money Owed: Are all sums of money due the City, whether by way of fees, liens, assessments, taxes, special assessments, or any other source whatsoever, collected and accounted for?

SCORE:            1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

- C. Delivery of City Services: Does the Administrator, through the various departments and staff, provide effective and efficient delivery of city services as authorized and budgeted by the Council?

SCORE:            1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

D. **Project Accomplishment:** Is there evidence of systematic progress toward completion on all special projects? Is there adequate documentation and reporting to the Council? Are there unexplainable delays? Is the Council able to get rapid and accurate responses about a project status?

SCORE:                                                          
                         1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

E. **Intergovernmental Relations:** Does the Administrator appear to be effective in dealing with other governmental units at the local, regional, state, and federal level? Are these responsibilities productive in terms of needed services or financial support? Does he have the ability to use the resources of other agencies?

SCORE:                                                          
                         1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

F. **City Recorder:** Does the Administrator perform his duties as city recorder?

SCORE:                                                          
                         1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

G. **Budget Development and Control:** Does the Administrator demonstrate budget skills and experience through which to propose a balanced, understandable, and well-documented budget? Does the council have sufficient lead-time during which deliberations and adjustments in the proposed budget document can be made? Does the Administrator provide effective management and control of the approved budget documents? Are there procedures established to ensure that departments stay within the approved budget totals for their program activities?

SCORE:                                                          
                         1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

H. Budget/Finance: Does the Administrator have the ability to be innovative with a lean budget? Is he able to separate "musts" from "needs and wants?" Does he have an understanding of public financing and budget law?

SCORE:                                                      
                  1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

I. Purchasing: Does the Administrator follow generally accepted principles of purchasing? Are state laws and local requirements followed? Are bids complete, accurate, and thrifty? Is the Council provided the necessary information to make bid decisions?: is the city getting the most for its money?

SCORE:                                                      
                  1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

#### 4. RELATIONSHIP WITH EMPLOYEES

A. Subordinate Personnel Supervision and Development: Does the Administrator supervise effectively all personnel who report to him? Does he provide sufficient training for their personal/professional development and, accordingly, their contribution to the city organization? does he demonstrate sufficient care and concern about employee needs?

SCORE:                                                      
                  1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

- B. Labor Relations/Personnel: Does the Administrator communicate city goals and needs to employees as public servants? Does he exercise firm but fair relations with employees in both hiring and firing? Is he willing to train and promote from within whenever possible? Does he have experience in personnel administration?

SCORE:            1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

- C. Communication with Employees: Does the Administrator attempt to keep all employees informed appropriately of city affairs and policies which may affect them? Does he pass down feedback and requests from councilmembers adequately? Does he listen and is he willing to accept feedback from employees?

SCORE:            1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:

## 5. PERSONAL SKILLS

- A. Personal/Professional Development: Does the Administrator demonstrate that he has kept himself informed and abreast of the latest information and technology available in municipal affairs generally? Does he appear to have the information on matters about which he should be informed?

SCORE:            1        2        3        4        5        N/O

COMMENTS:



B. Innovation: Is he always on the lookout for ways to improve the city? Is he creative and aggressive in seeking new solutions to old problems? Is he a goal setter and achiever?

SCORE:                                                              
                 1           2           3           4           5           N/O

COMMENTS:

C. Leadership: Does the Administrator have the capacity, through example, confidence, competence, and enthusiasm to inspire and motivate others to achieve their best and fulfill the objectives of the organization?

SCORE:                                                              
                 1           2           3           4           5           N/O

COMMENTS:

6. OVERALL EVALUATION COMMENTS

A. Specific accomplishments for the past year:

B. Improvement Areas:

C. Goals and Objectives for next year:

**7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**A. Administrator Comments:**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator's Signature

**B. Mayor's Comments:**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor's Signature

dk:b(8-5-92)  
/u/usr1/res/494