

Date: December 7, 2023

Annual Evaluation Process of the Director of Elections (DRAFT)

1. The Elections Commission (“Commission”) shall conduct its annual evaluation of the Director of Elections (“Director”) starting at or around the Commission’s July meeting of each year. In years where the Director’s five-year term will be ending afterwards, the Commission should work backwards and aim to complete the evaluation at least six months before the deadline to make an appointment for a new five-year term. (Note that the deadline is one month before the expiration of the term.) The six months is to allow enough time for a competitive selection process, including an executive recruitment, to take place after the evaluation and be finished before the appointment deadline.
2. During a meeting at least three months before the Commission first discusses the evaluation (e.g. during the April meeting), the Commission will have a meeting in open session to finalize any additional specifics of the evaluation process to be used that year. The three months is to allow enough time in case any of the specifics require additional meetings or time to compile or prepare. The Commission can also use this meeting to decide if it would like to have any additional information available when the Commission conducts the evaluation. For example, this can include things like—
 - a. A document listing the turnover among Department employees in the past year (e.g. hirings, firings, departures, etc.). The Director would need time to compile this information for the Commission.
 - b. An anonymous survey of Department employees that the Commission can use to learn more about the Director’s management of the Department. The Commission would need to work with HR and decide on a survey format if it wanted to perform this step as part of the evaluation.
 - c. Statistics about EEO complaints from the previous year or years. This would need to be gathered and compiled from the appropriate location.
 - d. Performance evaluations from the previous year or years for comparison.
 - e. Inviting one or more employees to discuss the Director’s performance in closed session, as the Commission used to do—as spelled out in its evaluation guidelines as adopted at its March 16, 2016 meeting.
3. During a meeting at least two months before the Commission first discusses the evaluation (e.g. during the May meeting), the President will ask the Director to fill out their self-evaluation on the following page, to be completed by the meeting one month before the Commission discusses the evaluation. The agenda packet of the meeting during which the Director is asked will include a copy of the evaluation to be filled out, with the Policy section of the evaluation filled in with the Commission’s current policy priorities. This will also serve as the evaluation the Commissioners need to fill out later.

For reference purposes, the Commission's current policy priorities should also be attached to this agenda packet.

4. During the meeting one month before the meeting the Commission first discusses the evaluation (e.g. the June meeting), the President will ask all Commissioners to fill out the evaluation form on the following page, for completion at least one week before the next month's meeting. Before or immediately after the meeting one month before, the President will email the Director's self-evaluation to all Commissioners so the Commissioners can read the self-evaluation when completing their evaluation.
5. By at least one week before the meeting at which the evaluation is discussed, Commissioners should send their completed form to the President. The one week is to give Commissioners enough time to read and review each other's forms before the meeting. Once the President has received all the Commissioner evaluations, the President will confidentially send the completed forms to all Commissioners for review.
6. Also before the meeting, the President will ask the Director if they would like an opportunity to speak with the Commission about their performance evaluation during the meeting closed session. It's not necessary for the Director to do this.
7. At the meeting, the Commission will discuss the Director's performance and all the completed forms. The Commission will come up with and vote to approve a single completed evaluation form that reflects the evaluation of the Commission as a whole. If necessary, the Commission can take more than one meeting to do this.
8. After the meeting at which the Commission approves an evaluation form coming from the Commission as a whole, the President will share the completed form with the Director, either in person or by emailing it to the Director and copying the Vice President. If the President chooses to share it in person first, afterwards the President should email it to the Secretary, copying the Vice President, to provide a written record that the evaluation was sent. The President will then forward the email thread to the rest of the Commission so other Commissioners can have for future reference a record of what was sent.
9. After the evaluation process is complete, the Commission should start discussing policy priorities for the next year. The Commission can modify or keep the existing priorities, or replace some of them with new ones. While the Commission is discussing priorities for the next year, the existing policies should be assumed to continue, unless the Commission has decided that a policy has been completed.

Director Evaluation Form

(This form will be used for both the evaluation and self-evaluation.)

Date:

Director Name:

Start and end date of current five-year Director term:

Commissioner Name (if not a self-evaluation):

For the questions below that ask for a rating between 1 and 5, the rating scale is:
1=unsatisfactory, 2=needs improvement, 3=average, 4=above average, 5=superior

I. Operations

A. ELECTIONS

1. Ensures free, fair, and functional elections with no or only non-material errors, and deals effectively with anomalies. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*
2. Demonstrates an understanding of and effectively implements election laws, codes, and deadlines. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*
3. Shows innovation and effectiveness in the elections process. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*
4. Implements programs to effectively communicate with voters and educate them on election requirements, deadlines, and procedures. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*

Rating (1 – 5):

Comments/Reason for Rating:

B. COMMUNICATION

1. Effectively communicates the Department of Elections' mission, strategy, goals, and other essential information to the Commission including, but not limited to duties specified in City Charter Sec. 13.104. Department of Elections. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*
2. Effectively communicates and interacts with the Commission. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*

Rating (1 – 5):

Comments/Reason for Rating:

C. ADMINISTRATION

1. Builds and maintains an environment that fosters and contributes to the effective operation of the Department of Elections (DOE) including teamwork among DOE staff. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*
2. Effectively uses and manages DOE personnel. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*

Rating (1 – 5):

Comments/Reason for Rating:

D. RESOURCES

1. Effectively uses and manages DOE budget and resources. *[Insert criteria from 2020-21 form]*

Rating (1 – 5):

Comments/Reason for Rating:

E. OVERALL (OPERATIONS)

The overall rating for operations below should be an overall assessment (so not a computed average of the ratings above).

Rating (1 – 5):

Comments/Reason for Rating:

II. Commission Department Policies

For each of the Commission's current policy priorities for the Department listed below, rate the Director's progress on implementing the policy.

A. [INSERT CURRENT POLICY NAME]

Rating (1 – 5):

Comments/Reason for Rating:

B. [INSERT CURRENT POLICY NAME]

Rating (1 – 5):

Comments/Reason for Rating:

[INSERT MORE POLICIES AS NEEDED]

III. Overall

A. Without giving a numeric rating, what is your overall assessment of the Director's performance, spanning operations and implementing current policies?

B. What are the areas in which the Director can improve, and what steps can the Director take to improve in these areas?