



January 17, 2020

Mr. Dan Siegel
District Counsel
Los Altos Hills County Fire District
Los Altos Hills, CA 94023

RE: General Manager Evaluation Process

Dear Mr. Siegel:

Thank you for contacting Municipal Resource Group (“MRG”) Consultant Marcie Scott to discuss facilitating the General Manager evaluation process for the Los Altos Hills County Fire District (“District”). Evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer is one of the two most important tasks undertaken by a governing body; the other being budget review and adoption.

Marcie would be very pleased to work with the District Commission and General Manager, and staff to the extent desired, to establish a process for assessment of the Chief Executive Officer and goal setting for the coming year. Input from each Commission Member and the General Manager’s self-assessment will be summarized into a written evaluation that accurately and concisely documents areas of consensus as well as areas of divergent opinions. Comments are themed and not attributed to any one person. Careful attention is given to describing expectations and goals going forward to ensure the Commission and General Manager are moving forward in the same direction.

A typical appointed officer evaluation process utilizes 2-3 closed sessions. We are flexible in our approach and want to ensure the process meets the needs of the District.

The typical steps following confirmation of the process are described below:

- 1) A self-evaluation and performance achievement summary are developed by the General Manager along with anticipated goals and work plan for the coming year.
- 2) Optional - Gather 360 Degree feedback from District staff using on-line survey tool. Feedback will be aggregated and summarized by consultant without attribution to specific individuals.
- 3) Commission Member Input: Commission Members will be provided the General Manager’s self-assessment prior to each Commission Member completing an online evaluation. Consultant will meet with each Commissioner to discuss observations on performance, communication style and leadership competencies of the General Manager; level of satisfaction with overall services; perceptions about the health of the organization; and desired areas of change or performance improvement. (Meetings can be in person or via phone as preferred by each Commission Member; Consultant is local.)
- 4) Consultant will prepare a draft evaluation to include the themes from the Commission evaluations and interviews, and feedback from any other individuals concerning General



Manager performance. We do not attribute comments to any one member and focus on areas of success and potential improvement. This draft is circulated confidentially to each Commission Member in advance and is typically reviewed by the Commission in closed session.

- 5) Goal setting – the closed session reviewing the draft evaluation also includes discussion of goals for General Manager. Progress is then measured in each subsequent annual evaluation.
- 6) The final step is a closed session in which the Commission meets with the General Manager to discuss and provide the evaluation. It is an option to have Consultant present in this step of the process.
- 7) Follow-up with General Manager to help generate work plan to achieve Commission’s desired objectives and close out the process.

These evaluations typically cost between \$6,000 and \$7,500 plus expenses, assuming in person facilitation. The costs can be managed with some elements handled via teleconference and limiting the number of in-person closed sessions.

I have attached a summary of our methodology and related costs. I would be pleased to assist with an analysis of compensation or survey data as a second phase of this initiative if needed, and will provide additional proposals for that phase of work should the Commission wish to begin this initiative.

Sincerely,

Mary Egan
CEO/Managing Partner
Municipal Resource Group LLC
916-261-7547
egan@solutions-mrg.com

Attachment A: Biography, Marcie Scott

**Summary of Proposed Process for Los Altos Hills County Fire District
General Manager Evaluation Process**

I. PROJECT SCOPE

- Facilitation of General Manager Evaluation Process
- Request self-evaluation from General Manager, (optional) conduct 360-degree feedback survey from staff if desired, gather input from each Board Member
- Interview each Board Member individually
- Compile all input into a draft evaluation
- Review draft evaluation with Commission in closed session
- Make final edits; prepare Commission for issuing the final evaluation
- Optional – provide salary survey data or other analysis if desired

II. WORK PLAN

TASK 1: GATHER AND REVIEW RELEVANT INFORMATION

Information provided by the District will be reviewed prior to the evaluation process, and includes:

1. Schedule for Commission availability for closed session(s);
2. Confirm timeline of evaluation period;
3. Any Commission goal setting and performance measurement documentation that defines ongoing expectations and goals;
4. Current employment agreement;
5. Commission contact information;
6. List of all District staff and contact information if needed.

Obtain information from District to identify elements that should be included, and input concerning process and timelines. Review how input will be communicated and expectations of confidentiality.

TASK 2: DEVELOP AND REVIEW PROPOSED PROCESS AND TIMELINE

Develop a proposed process and timeline. Meet with Commission in closed session to discuss:

1. Evaluation process (confidential employee evaluation – expectation of privacy and expectations for communication and transmittal of documents);
2. Recommended competencies;
3. Attributes that describe each competency;
4. Recommended rating/agreement scale;



5. Expectations for and definitions of managerial excellence;
6. Format of proposed evaluation questionnaire;
7. Method for conducting interviews, and proposed interview dates; and
8. Review timing for Commissioner receipt of packet including process, General Manager self-assessment, draft evaluation and any additional feedback collected. Typically sent directly from Consultant to Commissioners electronically.

TASK 3: OPTIONAL - GATHER 360 DEGREE INPUT

This process often includes summary feedback from staff. Given the District's small staff population, this may or may not be desired. If collected, a summary memo of input, without attribution to any individuals, and recommendations will be provided to the Commissioners.

TASK 4: MEET WITH COMMISSIONERS IN INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS AND COMPLETE INPUT

Commission members individually complete on-line questionnaire. Consultant meets with elected officials in person, and via telephone if necessary, for approximately 60-minute meetings. Review responses to questionnaires, ratings in each category, any input from staff, and self-assessment from General Manager. Obtain input and perspective. Develop summary of input for inclusion in draft evaluation.

TASK 5: REVIEW DRAFT DOCUMENTS IN CLOSED SESSION OR VIA EMAIL

Review confidential draft evaluation to confirm each Commissioner's perspectives are appropriately included and reach consensus where possible. Seek to produce a document that provides clear summary of majority perspective and minority concerns where possible to provide clear feedback to General Manager.

Draft evaluation is circulated to Commissioners in advance or shared prior to the closed session for early review - depending upon circumstances and interest of Commission.

TASK 6: FINALIZE DOCUMENTS

Develop confidential final draft of evaluation, which includes, by reference, employee self-evaluation.

TASK 7: PREPARE COMMISSION TO DELIVER EVALUATION TO ITS EMPLOYEE

Develop agenda and work with Commission President to prepare for closed session discussion with General Manager.

TASK 8: DEBRIEF AND FINE TUNE PROCESS

Debrief with Commissioners and General Manager as appropriate to identify any adjustments needed for future evaluation processes. Confirm method for ongoing communication. Finalize all



templates for Los Altos Hills County Fire District. Determine plan for ongoing monitoring of performance goals as needed.

III. TIMELINE

Timeline begins once agreement is finalized. The Project is anticipated to take about 7 weeks to complete.

This timeline is subject to the availability of Commissioners for closed session, individual interviews and the provision of relevant documents by the District.

| | TASK | DATE |
|---|--|----------|
| 1 | GATHER, RECEIVE AND REVIEW RELEVANT DISTRICT INFORMATION OUTLINED ABOVE MEET WITH GENERAL MANAGER TO DISCUSS PROCESS; REQUEST GENERAL MANAGER TO PREPARE SELF-ASSESSMENT | WEEK 1 |
| 2 | DEVELOP PROPOSED PROCESS AND TIMELINE. SCHEDULE SPECIAL OR REGULAR CLOSED SESSION TO REVIEW PROCESS WITH COMMISSION. | WEEK 2 |
| 3 | MEET WITH COMMISSION IN CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS AND CONFIRM PROCESS AND ANSWER QUESTIONS. DISTRIBUTE ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE TO COMMISSION CONDUCT INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS WITH COMMISSIONERS TO REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE | WEEK 3-4 |
| 4 | CONSULTANT PREPARES DRAFT EVALUATION AND SENDS TO COMMISSION MEET WITH COMMISSION IN CLOSED SESSION TO REVIEW AND FINALIZE DRAFT EVALUATION PREPARE COMMISSION TO DELIVER EVALUATION | WEEK 5-6 |
| 5 | CLOSED SESSION FOR COMMISSION TO DELIVER AND DISCUSS EVALUATION WITH GENERAL MANAGER | WEEK 7 |
| 7 | DEBRIEF AND FINE TUNE PROCESS | WEEK 8 |



IV. FEES

The professional fee for conducting the above-referenced services is \$200 per hour, not to exceed \$7,500 for the General Manager evaluation and related goal setting, plus minor expenses. If the optional 360-feedback process is requested the total fee will be \$8,500. Expenses, include but are not limited to, mileage at current IRS rates, printing, postage, parking, and tolls.

POTENTIAL GENERAL MANAGER EVALUATION RATING CRITERIA:

COMMISSIONER- MANAGER RELATIONSHIP:

Indicators of successful performance of the General Manager:

- Actions encourage mutual honesty, respect and trust
- Facilitates open two-way communication
- Provides for direct contact with each Commissioner that is tailored to the individual preferences and needs of each Commissioner
- Does not play favorites – takes direction from Commission as a whole
- Provides “complete staff work” to Commission
- Provides staff recommendations and provides Commission with options
- Is responsive to Commission requests and needs
- Provides high level of information to Commission relating to District programs, services, issues – keeps Commission well informed
- Effectively carries out Commission policy direction
- Helps Commission members field issues and concerns
- Provides leadership on significant issues or crises
- Maintains order, professionalism, and confidence during difficult times

LEADERSHIP OF ORGANIZATION:

Indicators of successful performance. The General Manager:

- Inspires teamwork and cooperation
- Provides effective link between staff and Commission
- Maintains high standards of honesty, integrity, and trust
- Holds staff accountable for results
- Delegates sufficiently – while being aware of details
- Provides guidance and direction to the staff
- Is action and results oriented – and expects this from staff
- Serves as both a teacher and coach to staff
- Demonstrates care for the welfare and success of staff
- Is approachable, accessible and friendly
- Works to maintain and improve employee morale



- Provides for quality programs and services
- Introduces new ideas, concepts, and best practices
- Encourages education and research to stay current on new methods and technology

COMMUNITY RELATIONS/EXTERNAL LEADERSHIP:

Indicators of successful performance. The General Manager:

- Engenders customer satisfaction as a value in the organization
- Provides high level of public information regarding District programs and services
- Encourages citizen feedback and acts on this information
- Is accessible to the public
- Ensures quick follow up and resolution to complaints and requests for service
- Deals efficiently with the media and represents the District well in this medium
- Effectively represents the District with outside agencies
- Contributes to regional cooperation and the resolution of regional issues
- Serves on regional boards/committees as required
- Maintains effective and cooperative relationship with local cities, the County and regional schools and fire districts
- Maintains an effective relationship with the business community
- Provides support for intergovernmental relations program

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:

Indicators of successful performance. The General Manager:

- Effectively reports and projects the financial condition of the District.
- Designs management practices/policies to maintain a sound, long-range financial position
- Implements effective programs to limit liability and loss
- Establishes short- and long-term goals for asset management
- Develops creative solutions to financial issues
- Effectively implements Commission budgetary goals



MAJOR GOALS:

General Manager's success at accomplishing prescribed goals:

CURRENT YEAR ACHIEVEMENTS:

CURRENT YEAR CHALLENGES OUTSIDE OF GENERAL MANAGER'S CONTROL:

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS/HIGH PRIORITY OBJECTIVES OR TARGETS FOR 2020:



ATTACHMENT A



Marcie G. Scott – Human Resource Services

Marcie Scott has provided personnel management services and guidance to all levels of staff in full-service California cities and special districts for 20 years. Key appointments include serving as Director of Human Resources at the City of Manhattan Beach for 6 years, Manager of Employee/Labor Relations in the City of Palo Alto for 4 years as well as Human Resources Manager at Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for 6 years. In her tenure with these agencies, along with several smaller California cities, she has managed very challenging issues while maintaining strong working relationships with managers, employees and unions. Examples include reductions in service costs, developing and implementing strategies for under-performing personnel, and concession bargaining.

Marcie has managed disciplinary and grievance processes, developed labor strategy with executive and elected officials in multiple jurisdictions, and negotiated at the bargaining table. She has conducted performance evaluation and improvement plans, and is also recognized for her in-depth knowledge of budget and personnel costing as well as her expertise in human resources functions, including recruitment and new employee on-boarding, compensation, training development and delivery, and Workers' Compensation.

Marcie's work in her consulting capacity has included serving as an interim department head, conducting investigations, organizational assessment, facilitating the evaluation process of appointed officials, recruitment and selection, and coaching new managers and supervisors.

In addition to her significant field experience with major clients, Marcie received her Master of Public Administration (MPA) degree from University of Southern California and a Bachelor's Degree in Political Science from the University of California, Irvine. She has also presented at the League of California Cities and testified in Superior Court and at the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB).