

April 14, 2005

To: Ann Mortenson
From: Discussion and Feedback.
Subject: Executive Director Performance Evaluation

At its March 17th meeting, the Executive Committee approved the use of the 360° Review model for this biennium's Executive Director performance evaluation. To assist in the development of this review, staff met with Jeff DeFranco, Community Relations Coordinator with School District 19, to discuss the various components of this internet-based review process:

Defining groups and participants in the evaluation:

At least three groups were defined for soliciting participation in the review: LCOG Board members, regional managers of member jurisdictions, and LCOG directors and management.

	Board Members	Regional Managers	Staff
Coburg	Judy Volta		Bob Swank
Cottage Grove	Gary Williams	Richard Meyers	Ted Stevens
Creswell	Ron Petitti	Mark Shrives	Byron Vanderpool
Dunes City	John Scott	Joanne Hickey	Jamon Kent
Eugene	Gary Pape	Dennis Taylor	Kay Metzger
		Jim Carlson	Marlene Siavitz
Florence	Phil Brubaker	Rodger Bennett	Jim Walsh
Junction City	Dwight Coon	Michael Leighton	Ann Mortenson
Lowell	Warren Weathers	Chuck Spies	
Oakridge	Sue Bond	Gordon Zimmerman	
Springfield	Sid Leiken	Mike Kelly	
		Cynthia Pappas	
Veneta	Darrell Carman	Ric Ingham	
Westfir	Diana Tonkin	Beth Murray	
Lane County	Anna Morrison	Bill Van Vactor	
	Bill Dwyer		
SD 4J	Anette Spickard		
SD 19	Al King		
SD 52	Alan Laisure		
Lane ESD	Jerry Miller		
LCC	Dennis Shine		
EPUD	Patti Chappel		
EWEB	Patrick Lanning		
Willamalane	Greg James		
Port of Siuslaw	Ken Miller		
W. Lane Ambulance	Bob Snedden		
Siuslaw Library	Mary Lehman		
Fern Ridge Library	David Dickman		

Determining format and length of evaluation:

In an attempt to encourage responses from participants, it was determined that a quantitative format would be more attractive for evaluators. The majority of questions would require yes/no or scalar responses; however, there would be one or two qualitative questions for those who appreciate the freestyle response.

Developing questions tailored to each group:

The Executive Committee is encouraged to seek input from Board Members on specific questions or focus areas they wish to have included in the review. Questions for the regional managers and staff groups will be tailored to reflect the administrative relationships among the jurisdictions.

Establishing a timeline for the entire process:

The goal is to present the final review at the June 23rd Board meeting. For this to happen, a preliminary timeline has been established:

April 14	Introduce Jeff DeFranco and discuss review content
April 28	Solicit review questions from board
Early May	Finalize questions and group participants
Late May	Post evaluation questions to secure website for two weeks
Early June	Compile results (Jeff's staff)
Bef. June 16	Hold meeting with Jeff, Gary Williams and George Kloeppel to review the results
June 16	Present evaluation to the Executive Committee
June 23	Present evaluation to the Board

As requested by the Executive Committee last month, the self-evaluation has been completed and is in your packet materials.