

City of Alamosa
Performance Evaluation

City Manager

PURPOSE

The purpose of the employee performance evaluation and development report is to increase communication between the city council and the city manager concerning the performance of the city manager in the accomplishment of his/her assigned duties and responsibilities, and the establishment of specific work-related goals and objectives.

PROCESS

The city council shall conduct an annual review and evaluation of the city manager's work performance. The results of such evaluation shall commend areas of good performance and point out areas for improvement. The evaluation may also serve as a means of establishing goals for the coming year. It shall also be the basis for contract extension and compensation decisions.

1. Evaluation forms are distributed to all council members.
2. The city manager prepares a memorandum to the council including his/her self-evaluation in a narrative format.
3. Each council member completes the form, signs, dates and returns to the mayor.
4. The mayor and council president tabulate the results of the evaluation forms. The mayor and the council president will summarize the results of the evaluation forms as submitted.
5. A composite evaluation form and the city manager's self-evaluation is distributed to the council prior to the executive session evaluation meeting.
7. The council meets with the city manager in executive session to review the evaluation, unless the city manager requests an open hearing.

INSTRUCTIONS

Review the city manager's work performance for the entire period; try to refrain from basing judgment on recent events or isolated incidents only. Disregard your general impression of the city manager and concentrate on one factor at a time.

Evaluate the city manager on the basis of standards you expect to be met for the job to which assigned considering the length of time in the job. Check the number which most accurately reflects the level of performance for the factor appraised using the rating scale described below. If you did not have an opportunity to observe a factor during this evaluation period, please indicate so in the "N/O" column next to the factor.

City Manager Performance Evaluation

Date:

Rating Scale Definitions (1-5)

- Unsatisfactory (1) The employee's work performance is inadequate and definitely inferior to the standards of performance required for the job. Performance at this level can not be allowed to continue.
- Improvement (2)
Needed The employee's work performance does not consistently meet the standards of the position. Serious effort is needed to improve performance.
- Meets Job (3)
Standard The employee's work performance consistently meets the standards of the position.
- Exceeds Job (4)
Standard The employee's work performance is frequently or consistently above the level of a satisfactory employee, but has not achieved an overall level of outstanding performance.
- Outstanding (5) The employee's work performance is consistently excellent when compared to the standards of the job.

I. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND ACHIEVEMENTS

1. City Council Relationships	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
A. Effectively implements policies and programs approved by the city council.						
B. Reporting to the City Council is timely, clear, concise and thorough.						
C. accepts direction/instructions in a positive manner.						
D. Effectively aids the City Council in establishing long range goals.						
E. Keeps the City Council informed of current plans and activities of administration and new developments in technology, legislation, governmental practices and regulations, etc.						
F. Provide the City Council with clear report of anticipated issues that could come before the City Council						

Comments:

2. Public Relations	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
A. Projects a positive public image						
B. Is courteous to the public at all times.						
C. Maintains effective relations with media representatives.						

Comments:

3. Effective Leadership of Staff	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
A. Delegates appropriate responsibilities.						

Comments:

4. Fiscal Management	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
A. Prepares realistic annual budget						
B. Controls expenditures in accordance with approved budget.						
C. Keeps City Council informed about revenues and expenditures, actual and projected.						
D. Ensures that the budget addresses the City Council's goals and objectives, including readability.						

Comments:

5. Communication	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
A. Oral communication is clear, concise and articulate						
B. Written communications are clear, concise and accurate.						

Comments:

6. Personal Traits	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
A. Initiative						
B. Judgment						
C. Fairness and impartiality						
D. Creativity						

Comments:

7. Intergovernmental Affairs	1	2	3	4	5	N/O
A. Maintains effective communication with local, regional, state and federal government agencies.						
B. Financial resources (grants) from other agencies are pursued.						
C. Contributions to good government through regular participation in local, regional and state committees and organizations.						
D. Lobbies effectively with legislators and state agencies regarding City programs and projects.						

Comments:

II. ACHIEVEMENTS RELATIVE TO OBJECTIVES FOR THIS EVALUATION

PERIOD:

Comments:

III. SUMMARY RATING

Overall Performance Rating – Considering the results obtained against established performance standards as well as overall job performance, the following rating is provided:

- Unsatisfactory ___
- Improvement needed ___
- Meets Job Standards ___
- Exceeds Job Standards ___
- Outstanding ___

Comments:

IV. FUTURE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Specific goals and objectives to be achieved in the next evaluation period:

Goal 1:

Goal 2:

Goal 3:

Goal 4:

This evaluation has been reviewed and discussed between the City Council and the City Manager on _____

City Council

Concurrence

Mayor Kathy Rogers

YES NO

Josef Lucero

YES NO

Marcia Tuggle

YES NO

Greg Gillaspie

YES NO

Rusty Johnson

YES NO

Charles Griego

YES NO

Leland Romero

YES NO

Nathan Cherpeski
City Manager

Next Evaluation Date