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Session Objectives

Gain insights in setting reasonable, specific performance goals for city managers
See some high-level examples of performance goals
Learn about different approaches to performance evaluations
Help Wanted: City Manager

Must be:
Skilled in land use, budgeting and finance, labor relations, strategic planning, economic development, communications, police/community relations, public works

The “Fine Print” Says...
- Able to solve all problems without making anyone mad
- Willing to work 24/7
- A mind reader
- Able to please all of the people all of the time
- Show up at all the community events

Setting Goals

“If you don’t know where you’re going, you’ll end up someplace else.”
- Yogi Berra
Steven Covey’s Big Rock’s

Tips to Setting Useful Goals for Your City Manager

**Do...**
- Use goal setting as an opportunity for dialogue
- Ask the City Manager to suggest goals
- Articulate expectations so everyone has the same understanding
- Ensure they are attainable
- Focus on what you want the Manager to pay particular attention to
- Have a consensus of the Council agree on the goals
- Ensure the City Manager agrees

**Don’t...**
- Fill the City Manager’s bucket with so many small things that he or she can’t get to the big things
- Rely on the budget to say those are the goals
- Solely focus on projects
- Have individual Councilmembers add goals – it should be a consensus effort
- Ignore capacity of the City Manager and staff
Examples of Goals

**Project Goals**
- Streamline the development review process
- Complete negotiations on a refuse franchise agreement

**Organizational and Communication Goals**
- Strengthen communications with school district management over shared interests
- Plan and carry out a Council strategic planning workshop to set three-year citywide goals

Why Have a Performance Evaluation Process?

- Ensure the Council work from the same priorities and assumptions
- Do course corrections if needed
- Strengthen the Council/City Manager relationship
## Evaluation Process

**The Day the Earth Stood Still**

## Typical Performance Evaluation Processes

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mayor or Chair of Personnel Committee collects feedback and leads a discussion in closed session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- City Attorney collects feedback and shares it in closed session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Outside facilitator is hired to interview the Council and prepare a consolidated evaluation report to discuss in closed session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t wait until the storm is brewing...

Courage is being scared to death – and saddling up anyway.”
- John Wayne

Regardless of the Process Used...

KEEP IT SIMPLE
Create Questions to Get Meaningful Council Feedback

Some Guidelines for Creating Questions

- **A.** Select the topics carefully; don’t use boilerplate forms.
- **B.** Open-ended questions will get the best information.
- **C.** Ask questions that relate to what the Council expects of the City Manager.
- **D.** Assess progress on goals established for the City Manager.
- **E.** Ask questions related to what the City Manager wants feedback on.
- **F.** Keep the number of questions manageable.
- **G.** Assess how well the Council is supporting the City Manager’s success.
### Examples of Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>What do you view as the City Manager’s key accomplishments over the past year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Does the City Manager have an effective working relationship with you? If so, what makes it effective? If not, what should be changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>How well does the City Manager hire and develop top talent that reflects diversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>What goals would you suggest be set for the City Manager for next year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>How well does the City Manager deal with emerging issues as they arise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>In what ways does the City Manager help the Council identify its priorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>In what ways does the City Manager model ethical behavior?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rating Scale or Not

- YUCK!
- MEH
- GOOD
- AWESOME!
Process With An Outside Facilitator

- Create questions
- City Manager prepares performance report
- Interview Council
- Prepare consolidated report
- Review with City Manager and Mayor
- Facilitate Closed Session
- Prepare Summary Memo with Agreed Upon Goals

Sometimes A City Manager May Want to Hear From His or Her Direct Reports

360° Feedback
City Manager’s Performance Report

- Status of prior year’s City Manager goals
- Recap of unplanned accomplishments
- Goals for next year
- Other strategic issues

Closed Session Discussion

- Include the City Manager
- Provide enough time
- Begin with positive comments
- Have City Manager highlight her or his performance
- Review evaluation report
- Discuss agreements and disagreements
- Consensus on expectations and goals – including agreement from the City Manager
Talk About Difficult Things

“What we’ve got here is a failure to communicate.”

-Strother Martin in Cool Hand Luke

Close the Discussion With One Voice

“The count is six ‘ayes’ and one ‘neigh.’”
Summary

- Have a structured conversation each year
- Create an environment for constructive feedback
- Keep it simple
- Make it timely

Thank You

Wade McKinney, City Manager, Indian Wells
wmckinney@indianwells.com

Dan Keen, City Manager, Vallejo
Daniel.Keen@cityofvallejo.net

Jan Perkins, Management Partners
jperkins@managementpartners.com

Rod Gould, Management Partners
rgould@managementpartners.com
Facilitated performance evaluations emerged as an important tool in helping local government managers succeed, according to the 2015 study, Challenges and Strategies: Maximizing Success for City and County Managers in California. Conducted by Cal-ICMA—the official state affiliate for ICMA members in California—the study involved an online survey and several focus groups of local government managers to gather information.

Managers said that one of their key stressors was their relationship with elected officials. They also pointed out that an annual facilitated performance evaluation process can be a way to engage the governing body and manager in a constructive dialogue that can strengthen the relationship.

Focus group members mentioned the value of facilitated performance reviews, particularly in politically turbulent environments. These managers said that such a performance evaluation process was helpful in getting useful feedback from elected officials. The process also offers a venue for the manager to say difficult things to elected officials about what is needed for the manager to be successful.

In the focus groups, the managers who suggested a facilitated evaluation process said that it surfaced important issues and improved the relationship with the governing body. It allowed an important dialogue between members of the governing body so they could know—face-to-face—what each other was thinking about on some critical issues. That is an opportunity often unavailable in the open, public arena.

This is what Erik Kvarsten, city manager of Gresham, Oregon, thinks about the facilitated process: "I have always appreciated facilitated performance evaluations because they are thorough, and stimulate an environment where councilors can most freely engage the process and express themselves.

"In my experience, this has resulted in far more constructive and useful performance feedback than other approaches. In addition, I have been fortunate enough in a number of cases to have former city managers facilitating the process, who fully know and understand the job and its challenges.

"This has opened the door for extremely useful exchanges with the elected officials I serve and opportunities to receive timely and candid advice from the facilitator, in addition to the formal performance review."

AN OVERVIEW

When it comes to performance evaluations, the most typical options are:

• The mayor, governing body president, or chair of the personnel committee collects performance comments from governing body members and leads the performance discussion.

• The manager facilitates and manages the process, including sending out the evaluation format and facilitating the conversation. While this is not a best practice, managers sometimes find themselves needing to do this
Because the governing body will not.

- The city attorney or county counsel manages the performance review.
- A review does not happen because the elected officials either do not want to do it, see no need for an evaluation, or claim they do not have the time for a review process.

Yet another option is for a third-party facilitator to conduct the evaluation process. The manager or governing body hires an experienced adviser to conduct the review in a timely manner and reach consensus on the evaluation.

A good facilitator will be able to conduct interviews with officials, facilitate governing body discussions, and keep the conversation balanced and moving toward consensus. A background in local government, particularly as a manager, is a bonus.

A facilitated performance evaluation may be especially useful if:

- Past feedback has not been helpful or specific.
- There are strong differences on the governing body and the elected officials cannot constructively have a conversation about such an important matter without help.
- It’s difficult for the governing body to forge a consensus about the manager’s performance.
- The governing body resists doing an evaluation.
- Past evaluations were not completed in a timely manner.

**UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS**

A December 1999 PM article by George Caravalho, then city manager, and Jo Anne Darcy, then mayor of Santa Clarita, California ("Manager Appraisals Can Be Nothing but a Benefit," available by searching ICMA’s Knowledge Network at icma.org/kn), outlined the process they used and the benefits of a facilitated performance evaluation, many of which still hold true today.

In their case, the facilitator met with the manager and councilmembers individually, eliciting ideas and feedback on issues facing the local government, relationships, and the manager’s strengths and areas for improvement.

The facilitator then met with the city council in an executive session for discussion as a group, after which the manager joined the meeting to hear feedback presented from the group perspective and offered thoughts on it.

The facilitator guided the group toward a list of action statements, an overall summary evaluation and a report from the facilitator, along with any proposed compensation increase. A follow-up report was scheduled for six months later to update the council on the goals and action items agreed to during the review.

In many cases, the manager is included in the entire executive session in order to fully understand the differing and similar points of view and to be part of the entire discussion.

Some managers are interested in more input than only from the governing body, so they pursue what is sometimes referred to as a 360 review, in which direct reports or even other people can be asked for their input about the manager.

The manager needs to be extremely clear about what he or she is hoping to gain from that input and to whom it will be presented. Input can be gained through a confidential survey conducted by a third party or through individual interviews.

With either approach, the responses are consolidated into a report and reviewed with the manager. The facilitator and manager can decide early in the process whether the responses will also be reviewed with the governing body as part of the closed-session discussion.

Every situation, of course, is different, and the process must be tailored to the unique circumstances of the local government. If evaluations are public record, participants may wish to present findings verbally rather than in a written report.

Some states require disclosure of personnel evaluations, including those of the manager. In closed sessions, it may be necessary beforehand to set ground rules regarding confidentiality and the use of social media.

Even though, for instance, the rules for executive sessions are that the discussions will be confidential, some elected officials have been known to tweet during the session, as remarkable as that may seem. A skilled facilitator will work with participants to devise a process that works for everyone.

THE RATINGS ISSUE

The questions used in the evaluation are critically important. The questions should relate to the chief executive’s job and not be the same questions used for the organization’s other managers, including department heads or mid-level managers.

The job of executive is quite different from the job of an organization’s other managers because it involves relationships with the governing body; particular types of interactions with the community; overall management and organizational leadership; budget and finance; and specific goals for the individual.

Some governing bodies like the idea of ranking the manager’s performance with numerical scores, while others find that numbers become the focus and detract from specific feedback and suggestions. The manager has to first determine what the value of ratings would be in deciding whether or not to attach them to questions.

Governing body members can be “hard” or “soft” graders. Ratings can end up being the focus of the conversation. The true focus should be on the specific feedback.

The greatest value to the manager and to the governing body is the conversation during the executive session. Keeping the focus on the governing body members’ responses to the questions and forging consensus from the conversation is a way for everyone to come out of the session with a clear understanding of expectations for the manager. Numerical ratings can distract from this focus.

If there is a reason that an overall rating is necessary, asking for an overall rating, after all of the questions are asked, would be a way to gauge a governing body’s view of the manager, particularly in consideration of compensation.

TANGIBLE BENEFITS

A facilitated process can provide benefits for both the manager and the governing body. The facilitated process can offer opportunities to head off problems before they grow; recognize and celebrate successes; provide dedicated time to reflect on the working relationship and consider feedback that may not arise in day-to-day dealings; design an action plan with specific ideas; and communicate openly and honestly without becoming personal or defensive.

Specific benefits for the manager include:

• A timely and well-managed process.
• Specific, useful feedback.
• Consensus view of the manager’s performance and clarity about the majority’s desires regarding future performance and priorities.
• An opportunity to discuss compensation or contract changes in a constructive manner.

For the governing body, a facilitated process can be valuable because:

• The process consumes less time and effort.
• All governing body members have their say; one or two members do not dominate the conversation.
• The dialogue is less politicized and more focused on objective criteria.
• The governing body achieves a consensus about a few priorities moving forward and the desired role of the manager in achieving those priorities.

Dan Keen, city manager, Vallejo, California, says this about the benefits he perceives from facilitated performance evaluations: “Earlier in my career, I didn’t use a facilitator, instead relying on mayors and councilmembers to provide me with their feedback using checklist forms.”
"Some of those evaluations were simply awful experiences. Councilmembers wouldn't give honest feedback in front of one another, petty issues received more discussion than core performance objectives, and discussions sometimes became difficult and emotional between the councilmembers.

"Since using a facilitator, I've found that I get much more valuable feedback, from every councilmember, and the discussions are appropriately focused on my performance and my team's performance, rather than the minor issues."

"Plus, these sessions often turn into mini team-building sessions with the council and manager, with typically positive outcomes."

OBSTACLES EXIST

While a statistical survey has not been conducted, our conversations with colleagues around the country indicate that only a small minority use facilitated performance evaluations. There may be any number of reasons that facilitated processes are not used:

• The internal process has worked well in the past and there is no perceived need for outside help.

• The manager or governing body has no experience with facilitated evaluations and doesn't know how the process can help.

• If performance evaluation reports or discussions from closed sessions could be made public, the manager may be reluctant to have a structured process.

The cost may be viewed as an obstacle.

• Cost will differ by region as well as complexity of the process. A general guide would be the cost of a facilitator for a one-day workshop in your area. To better determine the cost in your region, reach out to colleagues who have used facilitated evaluations.

• The cost will also depend on how complex the process is. If it involves only the governing body and manager, then it will be lower than if the manager desires a 360-degree evaluation, with input from direct reports or others.

SETTING THE STAGE

For managers interested in the idea of facilitated performance evaluations, there are a few ways to raise the topic with a governing body. Some managers include the practice as a provision in their employment agreement.

Others identify governing bodies in their region that have used facilitated evaluations and then present a report on the process to their elected officials.

Another good approach is to raise the idea after a regular performance review. Include an overview with the board or relevant board committee that looks at what went well, what was difficult, and whether a facilitated evaluation would improve the process.

THE BOTTOM LINE

Every employee deserves to know what supervisors think of his or her performance, and everyone involved in the evaluation benefits from a process that is well-organized, helpful, specific, and timely.

For the unique circumstances of local government managers, a facilitated evaluation process can eliminate many potential obstacles to a constructive review, ensuring that all involved are working toward the goal of continuous improvement.

There are a variety of means to achieve that end. An outside facilitator can be an addition to the manager's toolbox to use to discern what his or her governing body members truly think.

City Manager Wade McKinney, Indian Wells, California, and president, California City Management Foundation, believes this about the facilitated process: "Evaluations are beneficial to maintain a healthy council-manager relationship, which is key to our success and sanity.

"The facilitated evaluation provides more feedback to both the council and manager in a useful way. Councilmembers can each communicate in their own way, and the facilitator can help them clarify their
thoughts and make productive suggestions.

"The facilitator makes the discussion between the two engaging, positive, and useful. I find that I come away with an actual understanding of where I can improve and what the council expects.

"A clear benefit is the advice and counsel that the facilitator provides to both elected officials and managers on building relationships and keys to success."

Jan Perkins, ICMA-CM, is senior partner, Management Partners, Laguna Beach, California (jperkins@managementpartners.com) and an ICMA Liaison assisting with ICMA’s Women Leading Government initiative. Frank Benest, Ed.D., ICMA-CM, is ICMA Liaison for Next Generation Initiatives, Palo Alto, California (frank@frankbenest.com).
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A Building Block to Better Performance:
Using Council-Manager Goal-Setting to Support Performance Evaluation

“If you don’t know where you’re going, you might wind up someplace else.” -- Yogi Berra

August 2016

As managers, we’re used to setting goals. We help our city councils set annual and long-range goals. We ask our department managers to set goals for the budget. We measure the success of our local governments by whether we meet organization-wide goals.

But like cobblers’ children who go shoeless, many of us do our jobs in the absence of specific goals for our own work. The lack of annual goals for the manager does a disservice to not only to the manager, but to the local government as a whole. Goal-setting at the manager’s level will reinforce organization-wide goals, while neglecting the exercise for an individual manager hinders the government’s ability to perform at maximum effectiveness.
Set Goals Early On, Working with the Council

Ideally, a new city manager should establish a set of 12-month goals for council approval within his or her first three or four months of service. For a city manager who’s been in the job a while but is operating without specific goals, plan to include goal-setting as part of your next performance evaluation.

The manager can propose a list or solicit ideas for goals from council members to come up with an initial draft. It is important that council discuss the goals and, after an iteration or two, approve them so that there’s agreement on what success would look like for the first year.

Keep Goals Attainable, Limited and Specific to the Job of Manager

The manager’s goals will likely be somewhat different than the goals that appear in the budget, department work plans or various strategic/long-range plans. After all, there are many moving pieces in a city and having too many major goals or priorities generally means that few are truly accomplished well. We suggest the manager synthesize what he or she believes are the most salient city goals from the various policy documents and, based on an assessment of the council’s preferences, create 10-12 overarching goals to guide priorities for the coming year.

The council should discuss and ultimately approve the list, and there may be some editing and horse-trading, which is healthy. But once agreed upon, these are the manager’s marching orders. These goals, once set, will be critical in the performance evaluation.

When the evaluation occurs:

- *High levels of goal attainment* should be recognized by the council as resulting from the city manager successfully leading the staff, volunteers and community partners for civic improvement.
- *Low levels of goal attainment* may signal trouble with communication, overly ambitious goal setting or performance.

Refer to the Goals Regularly Throughout the Year

The goals approved by the council should serve as a roadmap for the city manager’s priorities throughout the year.
• As the manager writes reports & updates for the council and meets with council members individually, he or she should provide information on progress or challenges in meeting the goals.

• Community addresses, public communications and staff presentations should reference the goals set by the council and information about their completion.

• At evaluation time, the council should be familiar with the status of council goal achievement due to this steady city manager-initiated communication throughout the year.

Make Adjustments as Needed Without Simply Adding Goals

In real life, things change (sometimes rapidly) throughout the 12-month evaluation cycle. The council may approve new efforts and initiatives as the year progresses. The city manager should add these to the current goals, but be confident enough to ask the council for guidance if new directives exceed staff or resource capacity. This may require a reordering or prioritizing of the original goals, which is fairly normal.

The manager who simply agrees to add more goals throughout the year risks falling short of council expectations if there isn’t capacity to accomplish them all. Conversely, refusing new council goals during the year because they were not part of the original council goal listing is not recommended. As is so often the case in this profession, communication is key.

Use the Goals as the Basis for Performance Review

In preparation for the annual evaluation, the city manager should prepare a document that sets forth the agreed-upon goals and the progress made toward accomplishing them. The report should also include other priorities that popped up during the year and unexpected challenges along the way. If a council goal was stymied or dropped due to special circumstances, it should be noted as to why. Also, additional accomplishments that the city manager wants the council to note but were not necessarily tied to council goals should also be listed, but probably not in as much detail.

This report and the managers’ reflections on the year, including candid assessment of his or her own performance and opportunities for improvement, are important documents for the performance evaluation and the council-manager
discussion that should occur. It provides the structure for a more complete and factual appraisal than simply asking the council members to fill out evaluation forms based on a number of desirable traits and performance categories.

Some managers are uncomfortable in embracing organization-wide goals, as they don’t wish to be seen taking credit for the efforts of many others in goal attainment. But remember that the manager is held responsible for organizational performance. A good manager is liberal in giving praise and thanks to others for the many when things go well, and steps up and accepts responsibility when the city comes up short. Such is the stuff of leadership.

Embrace Goal-Settings as a Means to Effective Engagement

Goals will help make the manager’s performance evaluation a constructive and meaningful process. Elected officials sometimes avoid evaluations because they can lead to difficult conversations among themselves and with their city managers. Some city managers don’t want an annual evaluation, believing that they are essentially evaluated every day because the city council can fire them at any time for any reason.

But if a manager’s primary goal is merely keeping his or her job, it is difficult—if not impossible—to actually accomplish the central purpose of city management. The council-manager form of government is not just about elected officials and their key appointees having warm and amicable relations (although it sure helps!). City management is about translating the collective will of the community as expressed by its representatives into effective, efficient and equitable programs, initiatives and projects. It’s about getting important things done, and doing them well.

Managers can miss important things and be distracted by unimportant things if they don’t take the time to establish meaningful goals for themselves that the council has endorsed and helped create.

Goal-Setting Exercise Is Worth the Effort

City managers and their city councils need to get goal-setting right. Elected officials have a right and a duty to fairly and constructively evaluate the manager’s performance, and that evaluation ought to be as objective as possible. It is in the manager’s interest that the evaluation includes a review of demonstrated progress toward council-approved goals during the evaluation period. The alternative can be
a subjective and often arbitrary discussion that centers on how the manager did last week or last month, or based on recent emotions and political views.

Clearly, a manager wants and deserves a better review than that. It is crucial for successfully steering the city and for a healthy and productive working relationship. Spend the time and improve each year.

Examples of City Manager Performance Goals

A manager’s goals should be verifiable, measureable, broad and challenging without being unattainable or too easily achievable, either. You don’t want to set the bar above the world record, nor place it so low the manager may trip going over it. City manager goals should be the top priorities for the council as relates to community priorities (e.g., completing a general plan update), critical internal organizational priorities (e.g., succession planning or labor negotiations), or relationship goals (e.g., with the community or council).

Some examples of typical city manager goals are listed below. Most often, the city manager would not have all of these as goals, since the ones listed for the city manager’s attention should be the most critical ones that are meaningful to the council as well as to the city manager.

- Delivering and administering a balanced budget while improving reserves and maintaining a favorable bond rating.
- Completing, on time and on budget, major infrastructure capital projects.
- Negotiating new labor agreements and filling key positions with highly competent people.
- Meeting or exceeding certain approval levels for city services, if the city gathers data on resident attitudes.
- Implementing major new systems or employing new techniques for civic engagement and public involvement in government.
- Achieving public-safety milestones such as “reducing part-one crime by five percent” or “reducing response time for Advanced Life Support EMS calls to an average of six minutes.”
- Achieving major milestones in planning, such as adoption of key plans and updates, and in economic development would be fair game for council goals.
• Hitting community-wide marks for such things as water conservation, alternative transportation mode use, waste diversion from the landfill or emissions reductions could figure in the council’s goals for a city manager.
• Achieving professional development milestones such as becoming an ICMA-certified city manager.
• Maintaining positive working relations with the neighborhood organizations, chamber of commerce or school district.
• Creating new forms of reporting on achievement of the annual city council priorities.
• Streamlining the development review process.

Conclusion

Establish a set of meaningful goals that are mutually agreed-upon by the manager and council is the best way of ensuring that everyone is on the same page with expectations. If the manager and council all have different expectations for what the manager will be doing and how he or she will be focusing their efforts, it can lead to frustration and dissatisfaction on everyone’s parts. Open, collaborative discussions about goals, followed by discussions about progress during the year, can foster an effective working relationship that is satisfying to everyone.
About the Authors

Rod Gould had a 35-year career in public management. He served as city manager of Santa Monica, Poway, San Rafael, and Monrovia as well as assistant city manager of Walnut Creek. Prior to city management, he served as senior management consultant for the firm of Deloitte, Haskins and Sells and assistant director of operations for the Boston Housing Authority. Rod has held leadership positions with CCMF, ICMA and the League of California Cities. Rod is currently a management consultant to local governments.

Jan Perkins had a 30-year career in local government. She served as city manager of Fremont and Morgan Hill, and served the city of Santa Ana as deputy city manager; Grand Rapids, Michigan as deputy city manager; and Adrian, Michigan as community development director/assistant city administrator. She is a senior partner with Management Partners and provides assistance to government leaders in organizational analysis, strategic planning, teambuilding, executive performance evaluation, and council/staff effectiveness. Jan served on the board of CCMF, chaired a number of ICMA committees, is on the board of ICMA’s Women Leading Government, and serves as an ICMA Liaison.