

City of Northfield, Minnesota	Policy Number: 3.02
	Adopted: April 17, 2018
COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY	Revised: Not Applicable
CITY ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS	

I. PURPOSE:

- A. The purpose of the City Administrator Performance Evaluation Process policy is to establish guidelines and procedures for the City Administrator’s regular annual performance evaluation. The performance evaluation process is intended to establish and communicate performance expectations, goals, and objectives for the City Administrator; identify the City Administrator’s strengths and areas for improvement in meeting these expectations; and foster the City Administrator’s job development. This policy ensures the performance evaluation process is standardized, consistent, clear, and continuous.
- B. The City Administrator Performance Evaluation will incorporate a 360-degree feedback process where information will be provided by the Mayor and City Council, direct reports, and community peers about the City Administrator’s performance. 360-degree feedback is an effective means to meet the objectives of a performance evaluation of establishing and communicating performance expectations, goals, and objectives; identifying the City Administrator’s strengths and areas for improvement in meeting these expectations; and fostering the City Administrator’s job development. When used for professional development, 360-degree feedback offers a number of benefits, including increased self-awareness, identification of potential problem areas and gaps in perception (blind spots, disagreements, hidden strengths and weaknesses, etc.), professional development, and increased communication and openness among employees.

II. PROCESS:

- A. The Council Employment Policy Committee will work with the Communications and Human Resources Director to recommend to the City Council the City Administrator performance evaluation timeline, evaluation tool(s) to be used, and a possible third party to assist with the evaluation. Each year, the performance evaluation process will be reviewed shortly after the evaluation is completed so as to be established at the beginning of the new review period.
- B. Approximately every three years of a City Administrator’s tenure as City Administrator, no less than three and no more than seven names of individuals for a community peer group to provide feedback on the City Administrator’s performance will be identified by the Council Employment Policy Committee and be recommended to the City Council for approval.
- C. Communications & Human Resources Director submits the following to Mayor and City Council as governed by the State of Minnesota Government Data Practices Act:
 - 1. A copy of most recently completed performance evaluation that also includes the most recently completed self-review and goals.
 - 2. A City Administrator self-evaluation of the progress of the most recently completed self-review and goals from the current review period.

Electronic evaluation tool for completion by the Mayor and each City Council member, which will include ratings and comments in specific areas of the City Administrator's job performance and goals.

- D. Communications & Human Resources Director submits to direct reports and community peers group (if applicable) an electronic evaluation tool for completion.
- E. Evaluators complete the performance evaluation through the electronic evaluation tool.
- F. Communications & Human Resources Director will tabulate the evaluation results and provide the electronic aggregate and summary evaluation report to the City Administrator and Mayor and City Council.
- G. At least seven calendar days before the scheduled performance evaluation, the City Administrator submits to Communications & Human Resources Director a completed self-evaluation and performance goals for the subsequent year. Communications & Human Resources Director submits City Administrator's completed self-evaluation and performance goals to Mayor and City Council.
- H. At a properly noticed and scheduled regular or special City Council performance evaluation meeting, the Mayor, City Council, and Communications & Human Resources Director, and/or third party will discuss with City Administrator the aggregate and summary evaluation report and the City Administrator's self-evaluation and the intertwined issues of goals, application of the employment agreement, and salary change.
- I. If the performance evaluation meeting was closed, the Mayor and City Council will summarize its conclusions regarding the evaluation and take action on any salary change at its subsequent open meeting.
- J. The Communications & Human Resources Director will prepare resolutions for consideration of compensation of the City Administrator in the open meeting. The following five options will be included in the resolutions for consideration:
 - 1. No change (0%) to salary if performance did not meet expectations. In this circumstance, similar to other employees the City Administrator would continue to receive Council approved cost of living adjustments to the City's Base Pay Schedule at the current pay grade.
 - 2. One step increase upon anniversary date if performance meets or expectations.
 - 3. Other option more than on step increase (such as two step increase or more) upon anniversary date if performance meet or exceeds expectations. If the City Council action directs another salary change concept, the Communications & Human Resources Director will add the appropriate language in the resolution(s) as directed by Council with the salary change that was proposed.

III. EVALUATION GUIDANCE FOR EVALUATORS:

- A. Evaluate work performance for the entire period being evaluated. Evaluators should refrain from basing evaluations on recent events or isolated incidents only.
- B. Disregard your general impression of the employee and base the evaluation on one factor at a time.

- C. Evaluate the employee on the basis of standards you expect to be met for the job considering the length of time in the job. Choose the rating which most accurately reflects the level of performance for the specific factor being evaluated using the rating scale in the evaluation tool.
- D. Make sure feedback is provided in a confidential, non-threatening manner. If the participant feels threatened by getting feedback, they will be less open to receiving it.
- E. Describe concrete examples to support your evaluation of each factor.
- F. Much or most of the data collected, received, and disclosed in the City Administrator performance evaluation process is not public data. Therefore, any individual collecting or receiving this data can only disclose or discuss the data as expressly authorized under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act and/or Minnesota Open Meeting Law or successor laws, which provide that such data can only generally be disclosed or discussed at a City Council or committee meeting as reasonably necessary to discuss the performance evaluation of the City Administrator.