

AGENDA ITEM REQUEST FORM

Department: Rent Program

Department Head: Nicolas Traylor

Phone: 620-6564

Meeting Date: June 19, 2019

Final Decision Date Deadline: June 19, 2019

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE: As a new governmental agency, it is important to put in place evaluations policy and practices for all Rent Program staff, including the Executive Director. In particular, the salary of the Executive Director can only be raised by order of the Rent Board, and as such, the Rent Board needs a mechanism to evaluate any proposed salary adjustment.

INDICATE APPROPRIATE BODY

- | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> City Council | <input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Surplus Property Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Powers Financing Authority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finance Standing Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Safety Public Services Standing Committee | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Reuse Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Rent Board</u> | |

ITEM

- Presentation/Proclamation/Commendation (3-Minute Time Limit)
- Public Hearing Regulation Other:
- Contract/Agreement Rent Board As Whole
- Grant Application/Acceptance Claims Filed Against City of Richmond
- Resolution Video/PowerPoint Presentation (contact KCRT @ 620.6759)

RECOMMENDED ACTION: APPROVE the proposed staff evaluation plan for the Rent Program and DIRECT staff to begin implementing the evaluation plan beginning in Fiscal Year 2019-20 – Rent Program (Nicolas Traylor 620-6564).

AGENDA ITEM NO:
H-2.



AGENDA REPORT

DATE: June 19, 2019

TO: Chair Gray and Members of the Rent Board

FROM: Nicolas Traylor, Executive Director

SUBJECT: STAFF EVALUATIONS AND THE EVALUATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE:

As a new governmental agency, it is important to put in place evaluations policy and practices for all Rent Program staff, including the Executive Director. In particular, the salary of the Executive Director can only be raised by order of the Rent Board, and as such, the Rent Board needs a mechanism to evaluate any proposed salary adjustment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

APPROVE the proposed staff evaluation plan for the Rent Program and DIRECT staff to begin implementing the evaluation plan beginning in Fiscal Year 2019-20 – Rent Program (Nicolas Traylor 620-6564).

FISCAL IMPACT:

The fiscal impact of the proposed evaluation plan will be minimal and within the Rent Board's adopted Fiscal Year 2019-20 budget. Evaluating line and management staff members is already built into the budgeted salaries as a part of management staff's regular duties. The evaluation of the Executive Director would require a short-term subscription to an online evaluation tool. Expected costs would be approximately \$100-\$200 based on subscription costs. This amount is already budgeted for in the miscellaneous budget line item.

DISCUSSION:

General Plan

The City of Richmond has an existing evaluation process, which the Rent Program plans on utilizing for all staff, except for the Executive Director. The evaluation plan for the Executive Director is to use an online evaluation tool known as a "360-Degree

Evaluation.” The 360-Degree Evaluation survey would be provided to all Rent Program staff members, Boardmembers, and contractors. Currently, the plan is to use Survey Monkey or similar evaluation platform. Staff members would be evaluated annually on their employment anniversary date. The Executive Director will be evaluated annually each May.

For the 2018-19 fiscal year, it is proposed that the evaluation of the Executive Director take place in August 2019.

Staff Evaluations

Utilizing the City of Richmond’s existing evaluation process, all Rent Program staff members other than the Executive Director will use the City’s standard evaluation forms for SEIU 1021 General Employees (Attachment 1) and Local 21 Management Employees (Attachment 2). Rent Program staff members will be evaluated by their direct supervisor. The Executive Director shall sign off on all evaluations and append any comments offered by the direct supervisor.

360 Degree Evaluation of the Executive Director

By the end of May each year, the Rent Board and all employees and contractors shall receive an online 360-Degree Evaluation. The evaluation submissions would be anonymous, so that participants feel free to express their views candidly. Wikipedia defines a 360-Degree Evaluation as follows:

A 360-degree feedback (also known as multi-rater feedback, multi-source feedback, or multi source assessment) is a process through which feedback from an employee's subordinates, colleagues, and supervisor(s), as well as a self-evaluation by the employee themselves is gathered. Such feedback can also include, when relevant, feedback from external sources who interact with the employee, such as customers and suppliers or other interested stakeholders. 360-degree feedback is so named because it solicits feedback regarding an employee's behavior from a variety of points of view (subordinate, lateral, and supervisory).

Rationale for Performing a 360-Degree Review

The Executive Director position was specifically approved by the voters of Richmond as part of the passage of Measure L. The Executive Director does not report to the City Manager but instead to the five member Rent Board. Therefore salary adjustments of the Executive Director are at the discretion of and determined by the Rent Board and not the City Manager or City Council. The Executive Director must work directly with three main entities: Rent Program staff members, contractors, and Rent Board members.

The position of the Executive Director is unique in that the Executive Director has a higher level of accountability to the Richmond community and Rent Board. A 360-

ITEM H-2

Degree Evaluation is appropriate for a position that is uniquely charged with interacting with a myriad of internal and external sources to whom they are accountable.

Who Would Evaluate the Executive Director and How Would This Evaluation be Tied to Any Proposed Salary Adjustment?

Each May, the Rent Board, Rent Program staff members and contractors that work directly with the Executive Director, will be given the opportunity to perform the online evaluation. Rent Board members will be able to distinguish between reviews provided by Rent Program staff members, Rent Board members and contractors. The results of the evaluation would be sent directly to individual Rent Board members and the Executive Director at the same time. Only Rent Board members and the Executive Director would have access to the evaluation in accordance with personnel rules. At the first Rent Board meeting after the evaluation is completed and compiled, Rent Board members shall decide if a salary adjustment to the budgeted amount is appropriate.

Conclusion

Rent Program staff members recommend the adoption of two evaluation structures: all staff members, other than the Executive Director would be evaluated using the City of Richmond's standard evaluation forms (as provided by the Human Resources Department), and the Executive Director would be evaluated annually using a 360-Degree Evaluation.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

Attachment 1 – Sample Local 1021 Employee Evaluation Form

Attachment 2 – Sample Local 21 Employee Evaluation Form

**ITEM H-2
ATTACHMENT 1**

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE RECORD

Date: _____

Department: _____

Division: _____

Name: _____

_____ _____

Months Final /Probation _____ Anniversary Date: _____ Job Title: _____

(Check which applies.)

1. KNOWLEDGE OF WORK: Knowledge and understanding of all phases of this job and closely related matters.	Needs frequent instructions, even on routine jobs.	Fair knowledge but needs more training or experience.	Has a good working knowledge of job.	Well informed on all phases of job.	Has a thorough knowledge of job.
	REMARKS:				
2. INITIATIVE AND APPLICATION: Resourcefulness, independent thinking, attention, and application to work.	Wastes time. Needs close supervision.	Inclined to take things easy. Requires occasional prompting.	Steady and willing worker. Requires little direction.	Energetic and conscientious. Goes ahead on own judgment.	Exceptionally industrious. Highly resourceful and self reliant.
	REMARKS:				
3. QUALITY OF WORK: The accuracy and thoroughness with which work meets recognized standards of performance.	Below standard. Needs close supervision.	Usually acceptable but must be checked occasionally.	Meets accepted standards regularly. Needs very little checking.	Uniformly accurate and thorough.	Maintains highest quality.
	REMARKS:				
4. QUANTITY OF WORK: Volume of work based upon recognized standards of performance.	Consistently low and behind schedule.	Fair amount. Should be increased.	Steady producer. Regularly meets recognized standards.	Always turns out a good volume.	Unusually high output.
	REMARKS:				
5. RELATIONS WITH OTHER WORKERS: Disposition, tact, courtesy, and enthusiasm and sincerity as they affect fellow workers & others.	Creates unfavorable impression.	Gets along reasonably well.	Makes a satisfactory impression.	Well liked and respected.	Highly regarded. A splendid influence.
	REMARKS:				
6. DEPENDABILITY: Compliance with instructions and regulations; reliability under varying conditions.	Frequently undependable.	Fairly dependable but required more than normal follow-up.	Dependable under normal circumstances.	More than normal dependability.	Thoroughly reliable on all assignments.
	REMARKS:				
If present job required leadership, or if you have had an opportunity to observe evidence of leadership on the job, appraise leadership characteristic below; otherwise disregard this factor.					
7. LEADERSHIP: Ability to lead and train others and to get results through teamwork.	Has difficulty in getting satisfactory output from his/her group.	Gets some results but should enlist more support from his/her group.	Good on routine work. Has respect of group.	Leads with confidence. Gains support of others.	Outstanding leader. Obtains high morale and output.
	REMARKS:				
8. PUNCTUALITY: Promptness in reporting for work.	Often tardy.	Occasionally tardy.	Rarely tardy.	Never tardy.	
	REMARKS:				

1. **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

2. **NAMES OF SUPERVISOR AND OTHER RATERS:**

3. **REVIEWED WITH EMPLOYEE ON _____ BY _____ AND DISCUSSED SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS FOR HIS/HER DEVELOPMENT OR IMPROVEMENT AS NOTED BELOW:**

4. **EMPLOYEE CERTIFICATION:** I have reviewed this report. In signing it, I do not necessarily agree with the evaluation. I understand that if I desire, I have the privilege of adding any comments in the space below: (Use additional sheets if needed).

Signature of Employee _____ Date _____

5. **RECOMMENDATION IN VIEW OF THIS APPRAISAL:**

(The following to be filled out only upon making out the final rating sheet on a probationary employee).

I recommend that this employee be placed on permanent status.

I recommend that this employee be dismissed at the end of the probationary period.

Remarks:

SIGNED: _____
DEPARTMENT HEAD

CITY OF RICHMOND
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT
Supervisory Management

Type of Evaluation: ___ Probationary No. Of Months ___ ___ Annual ___ Special	Employee Name: Department: Time in This Job Class: Rating Supervisor:	Job Classification: Division: Time in the Present Assignment: Supervisor=s Title:
Evaluation Period: From: To:		

Instructions:

Performance Rating Factors: Each rating factor is to be rated according to the following scale (please rate each job factor separately: one rating should not unduly influence the rating for other factors):

Commendable - Exemplary performance which consistently exceeds job expectations at an exceptional level.

Fully Competent - Performance normally meets expectations of the job.

Needs Improvement - Performance more than occasionally falls below expectations and for which some specific remedial action is recommended.

Unsatisfactory - Unacceptable performance which has received prior notification of needing improvement and which must receive immediate attention and improvement to avoid discipline.

Please remember to rate each of the performance standards as separate and distinct performance elements. Comments are desirable for each factor and are **required** if other than a "Fully Competent" rating is given.

Accomplishment of Prior Objectives: Summarize whether the work outcome and/or work behavior objectives for the past rating period were met. If not, indicate any circumstances that may have prevented them from being achieved and be sure to update them in this year's objective.

Objectives for the Upcoming Rating Period: Summarize the work outcome (related to the goals of the unit) and work behavior (individual development) objectives for the next rating period. These objectives should be developed in concert with the employee.

Employee Comments: Employees may comment directly on the form or may submit separate written comments within 30 days. In addition any employee may discuss the review with the next level of department or City management.

Administrative Management:

Commendable - Works with the department/division head in establishing meaningful goals and objectives for the work unit and its staff. Such goals and objectives are consistent with and supportive of those of the department and the entire City. Goals and objectives are not only met, but modifications are implemented to meet changing conditions and are constantly exceeded.

Commendable
 Fully Competent
 Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory - Unable to establish goals which are consistent with the goals and objectives of the City as a whole and/or the department. Consistently fails to meet goals and objectives or to implement modifications to such goals and objectives to conform to changing needs.

Comments:

Resource Management:

Commendable - Makes the most effective and efficient use of budgetary, staff, community and other available resources. Finds creative ways to not only provide, but also expand upon, required services and support within budgetary, policy, procedural and other constraints.

Commendable
 Fully Competent
 Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory - Is consistently unable to deliver required services and/or support within budgetary, staff, community and other available resources. Appears to be unaware of or unable to, meet goals and objectives within budgetary, policy, procedural or other constraints.

Comments:

Personnel Management:

Commendable - Attains unit goals and objectives through developing and motivating employees. Observes classification and bargaining unit constraints while encouraging employees to reach their potential. Provides a role model for staff, including conforming to normal work standards, maintains a positive working environment and is respected for timely performance evaluations and honest criticism when necessary. Actively supports EEO/AA goals and creates a comfortable work environment free from harassment.

Commendable
 Fully Competent
 Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory - Staff apparently feels alienated, frustrated and not a part of the overall City, as evidenced by an excessive amount of grievances, complaints, turnover or lack of conformance to normal work standards. Little or no evidence of staff development or motivation. Is unable to meet goals and objectives with allocated staff resources and often request additional temporary or permanent support. Does not evaluate employee performance in an effective and/or timely manner. Does not actively support EEO/AA goals and/or accepts a hostile or non-supportive environment.

Comments:

Independence of Action:

Commendable - Consistently anticipates problems before they arise and initiates improvements to procedures without prompting. Thinks in advance, is realistic, evaluates outcomes and does not make decisions that prompt crises or have unforeseen outcomes. Knows limits and works within them, but doesn't use limits to avoid making decisions.

Commendable
 Fully Competent
 Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory - Apparently does not recognize problems and/or is unwilling to deal with them without prodding or before they become crises. Does not think in advance or anticipate consequences; tends to "shoot from the hip" Gives totally impractical or insensitive solutions to problems, or may refuse to make decisions because he/she is apparently "afraid of failure."

Comments:

Peer Interaction:

Commendable - Is both a leader and a team player. Contributes to overall goals and is supportive of policy while being instrumental in building group consensus. Is aware of and contributes constructively to the overall goals and objectives of the department/division.

Commendable
 Fully Competent
 Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory - Is viewed as using his/her position for personal gain or advantage at the expense of peers. Tends to break down, rather than contribute to, the group consensus.

Comments:

Technical Skills:

Commendable - Demonstrates a full understanding of the technical/operational aspects of the unit supervised. Can analyze and deal with problems in the unit and train staff in the required activities. Provides required technical support to management staff.

Commendable
 Fully Competent
 Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory - Cannot respond to technical matters raised by subordinates and/or peers. Must rely heavily on the expertise of subordinates and is not in a position to train subordinates in work performed.

Comments:

Communication Skills:

Commendable - Written materials are well organized, logical, complete, yet concise. Oral communication is professional, credible and responsive to the thoughts and needs of others. Public presentations are effective and reflect well on the City. Listens well to others and responds accordingly. Written and oral language skills facilitate communication and provide a positive example to staff.

- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commendable |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fully Competent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory |

Unsatisfactory - Written materials are disorganized, illogical, incomplete and/or excessively long. Oral communication is imprecise, unprofessional and does not reflect responsiveness to the thoughts and needs of others, reflective of careful listening. Public presentations are ineffective and reflect poorly on the City. Written and/or oral language skills hinder communication and cannot be emulated by staff.

Comments:

Commitment to Safety:

Commendable - Consistently stresses safety on the job, whether in a low risk situation, such as an office setting, or in a high risk situation, such as police, fire or maintenance. Establishes departmental programs to encourage safety and employee wellness, and actively cooperates with City staff to minimize accidents, workers' compensation claims and staff time off work.

- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commendable |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fully Competent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory |

Unsatisfactory - Apparently is unconcerned with safety, as evidenced by a high level of preventable accidents and/or workers' compensation claims. Refuses to cooperate with City staff in developing or implementing safety programs and ignores safety policies and procedures.

Comments:

Accomplishment of Prior Objectives

Summarize whether the work outcome and/or work behavior objectives for the past rating period were met. If not, indicate any circumstances that may have prevented them from being achieved.

Objectives for the Upcoming Rating Period:

- Work Objectives for the Department/Division

- Work Outcome and/or Work Behavior Objectives for the Employee

**ITEM H-2
ATTACHMENT 2**

Reviewer Comments:

Employee Comments:

Recommendation for Action:

Compensation - annual increase

Recommended
 Not Recommended

Probationary Status Recommendation:

Continue Probation
 Grant Permanent Status
 Terminate Probation

Next review date (annual, unless probationary or 30, 60, 90 day follow-up required):

Certification:

Rater: This report is based upon my own personal knowledge of the employee's performance and represents my best judgment and evaluation of his/her performance for the rating period.

Signature

Date

Reviewer: I have reviewed and attached additional comments as required.

Signature

Date

Employee: This report has been discussed with me and I have been given the opportunity to submit comments or to discuss it with the next level supervisor.

Signature

Date

Return this completed form to the Personnel Department after completion and employee review.

**ITEM H-2
ATTACHMENT 2**

(03/98/gd)