

SILICON VALLEY
ANIMAL CONTROL AUTHORITY

AGENDA ITEM

Evaluation Process

RECOMMENDED MOTION

That a conversational approach be used to annually evaluate the Executive Director.

DISCUSSION

The SVACA Board of Directors requested a review of the Executive Director's evaluation process and the potential hiring of a consultant to lead it.

HISTORY

The current practice of a conversational approach between the Executive Director and the SVACA Board of Directors has been the status quo over the years. Various additions including evaluation forms have been implemented at times as well.

PROFESSIONAL FACILITATOR

Staff contacted a professional facilitator and inquired about their process which would include various meetings and facilitating the evaluation. A proposal was provided (attached) at a cost not to exceed \$14,000.

CONVERSATIONAL

A conversational approach has been used for many years. Short and long-term goals are set and past ones reviewed along with accomplishments. There is no additional cost to the agency for this approach.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends continuing with the conversational approach as it has been effective for the employee and the agency for many years at no additional cost to the agency. Staff would continue to work with the SVACA Chairperson and provide requested data for the entire Board of Directors to review at the evaluation.

ATTACHMENTS

RPMG Proposal



MANAGEMENT GROUP

350 Sansome Street | Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94104

Nelson A. Fialho
Executive Director
925-437-4002
nfialho@publiclawgroup.com

January 29, 2024

Ms. Heidi Springer
Silicon Valley Animal Control Authority (SVACA)
3370 Thomas Road
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Re: Executive Director Performance Review Process

Dear Ms. Springer,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this proposal **to facilitate a Performance Review Process for the SVACA Executive Director**. Renne Public Management Group (RPMG) has the expertise and skills necessary to provide this assistance and we would be pleased to take part in this project.

About Renne Public Management Group

Renne Public Management Group (RPMG) is a division of the Renne Public Law Group based in San Francisco. Our firm's attorneys, public policy experts, and executive leadership consultants provide services and solutions for most of the pressing needs and challenges facing public agencies. RPMG services include everything required to support elected and appointed leaders. We offer a balance of perspectives with a practitioner's mindset and proven record of successful implementation. This experience gives us a sensitivity that produces positive outcomes and ensures each of our projects are individually tailored to the unique needs of the client.

Description of Process

This letter outlines the RPMG process and general timeline for conducting a performance review for the Executive Director. The process and timeline are reflective of best practices for the evaluation of public agency appointees and follows the same format and structure offered to other RPMG clients.

As a facilitator to the process, our aim is to bring consistency and professionalism to the process and to allow everyone's opinion to be expressed in a thoughtful, reflective manner. When structured correctly, the evaluation is a forward-looking process, focused on aligning the Board's expectations with an appointee's performance. The best processes expand opportunities for continued collaboration and contribute to the success of both the appointee and governing body. Attached for your reference are some additional thoughts regarding the facilitation process, titled: *Facilitated Performance Reviews – A Better Way*.

Executive Director Performance Review Process

January 29, 2024

Page 2

Given that good relationships promote candor and constructive planning, the process also provides a forum for both parties to discuss and strengthen the elected body–appointee relationship, ensuring better alignment of goals while reducing misunderstandings and surprises. When elected bodies conduct regular appraisals of their appointee, they are more likely to achieve their collective goals and objectives and to serve the communities and region more effectively.

Performance Review Process and Timeline

The performance review process occurs by conducting the following (4) steps. The process takes approximately two to three months to complete.

Step 1: RPMG meetings with Board of Directors and Executive Director regarding Process and Timeline:

- Facilitator meets with the Board of Directors (or a subcommittee of the Board) to discuss process and develop timeline.
- Facilitator distributes process and timeline to the Board of Directors.
- Facilitator meets with the Executive Director to discuss process and timeline.
- The Executive Director drafts a self-assessment memo reflecting on the past 12+ months, utilizing facilitator-developed prompts.
- Facilitator holds second meeting with the Executive Director to discuss and finalize self-assessment memo.
- Upon completion, the self-assessment memo is distributed to the Board of Directors for review.

Step 2: Meetings with Board of Directors:

- Facilitator meets with each Boardmember separately to receive guided and structured feedback regarding the Executive Director. These meetings take about 45 to 60 minutes each to complete.

Step 3: Closed Session and Evaluation Process:

- In preparation for closed session, facilitator consolidates feedback from individual meetings with each Boardmember into a written draft performance evaluation.
- The draft performance evaluation is circulated to the Board of Directors prior to the closed session.
- During closed session, the Board meets with the Executive Director to review and discuss performance matters and self-assessment memo. This portion of the closed session takes about 45 to 60 minutes to complete and is facilitated by RPMG. The Executive Director is then dismissed from closed session.



MANAGEMENT GROUP

Executive Director Performance Review Process

January 29, 2024

Page 3

- Next, the facilitator reviews the draft written evaluation with the full Board. As a group, the Board discusses performance and provides final comments to the facilitator.

Step 4: Final Action:

- Following the closed session, facilitator finalizes the performance evaluation and delivers the review to the Executive Director, which also includes a verbal sit-down with the appointee to convey results.
- If necessary, the Executive Director is afforded 2 weeks to provide a written response to the Board of Directors.
- Final performance evaluation document(s) is then placed in the appointee's personnel file.
- If desired, RPMG is available to review compensation studies for the appointee and to facilitate and recommend compensation adjustments for the Board to review and consider.

Payment Schedule

Based on the scope of work described above, SVACA would be billed in accordance with the following terms:

- **Professional Services:** Services will not exceed \$12,500, billed hourly at the following rates: Nelson Fialho (Lead) at \$300 and Luke Jensen at \$265.
- In addition to the Professional Services above, normal and direct out-of-pocket expenses associated with the project are charged back to the client. Expenses for this assignment will not exceed \$1,500. These expenses include, but are not limited to, clerical/administrative time, supplies, printing, postage, and consultant travel, as necessary. All expense items are reimbursed "at cost" and detailed and billed monthly.

RPMG appreciates the opportunity to be of assistance. Please feel free to contact me directly at 925-437-4002 if you have any questions regarding this proposal.

Sincerely,

/s/

Nelson A. Fialho
Executive Director, RPMG



MANAGEMENT GROUP

Executive Director Performance Review Process

January 29, 2024

Page 4

cc.

Luke Jensen, Senior Management Analyst, RPMG

Elsa Grandvoinet, Program Analyst, RPMG

Attachments:

1. Facilitated Performance Reviews – A Better Way

Accepted by:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

NF/C: RPMG Silicon Valley Animal Control Authority.



MANAGEMENT GROUP

350 Sansome Street | Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94104

Nelson Fialho
RPMG, Executive Director
925.437.4002
nfialho@publiclawgroup.com

Facilitated Performance Reviews – A Better Way

For Elected Officials:

1. Professionalizes the process

- a. Most elected officials are not trained in performing or writing employee evaluations.
- b. The facilitated process brings consistency and professionalism to the process.

2. It values all opinions

- a. Allows for everyone's opinion to be expressed in a thoughtful, reflective setting, rather than a group discussion that can meander or become contentious.

3. It makes the process easier

- a. In a facilitated process, one person is responsible for managing the evaluation from start to finish, and boardmembers can instead concentrate on formulating useful feedback for the appointee.

4. It creates clarity

- a. The facilitated process allows boardmembers to share with each other how they perceive the appointee's role and consider views other than their own.
- b. As a result, a much richer and more nuanced picture of the board's vision emerges when they have a chance to consider other perspectives.

For Appointees:

1. It results in meaningful feedback

- a. This kind of evaluation includes the important step of analyzing and synthesizing the feedback so the appointee gets a clear picture of how the governing body as a whole sees the appointee's work.

2. It clears the air

- a. When the facilitator has a background in local government, the facilitator can point out little things gathered in the process that the appointee can attend to immediately.

3. It separates the message from the messenger

- a. When a boardmember makes a pointed criticism of an appointee during the evaluation, it can sting. But when the criticism is presented as a data point in a comprehensive evaluation report/memorandum, it often feels less personal and more actionable.

4. It focuses on opportunities

- a. When structured correctly, the evaluation is a forward-looking process, focused on aligning the Board's expectations with an appointee's performance.
- b. The best processes increase collaboration and contribute to the success of both the appointee and governing body