

Memorandum

Date: November 3, 2011

To: John Kovash, Mayor
Members, West Linn City Council

From: Chris Jordan, City Manager 

Subject: November 7 Work Session

The Council is scheduled to meet in a work session on November 7. The following items are on the agenda for discussion:

- Neighborhood Association Mission and Vision Statements.

At its October 24 meeting, the Council heard from presidents of some of the neighborhood associations discussing their collaborative effort to develop a neighborhood association mission statement. Their proposed Mission and Vision statements are as follows:

Mission:

The West Linn Neighborhood Associations exist to facilitate and improve communications to and from the city and its leadership, facilitate healthy active neighborhood connections and interactions, and to make it easy for residents to become engaged at whatever level in the planning and policy level of the city...all to improve the livability, character and quality of life in West Linn.

Vision:

The NA leadership sees a time...

--when neighbors at the street, block, neighborhood, and even at the city level are engaging with each other and city resources to maximize the livability of West Linn.

-- where the flow of information, input, perspective, and feedback, both to and from the city and among neighbors, is such that the residents are engaged, satisfied that they are an active part of determining the livability of the city and the city's decision making process, and aware that on particular issues they have an easy and comfortable means to become more engaged.

The Council agreed to discuss these statements at an upcoming work session.

- City Attorney Evaluation Process

At a recent work session, the Council requested that Council President Carson and I review the evaluation form utilized by Lake Oswego to evaluate its City Attorney and provide the Council with a modified version that would better meet the needs of West Linn. I have edited that form, but I do not believe Council President Carson has had the opportunity to adequately review it. I have attached that draft form to this memorandum for Council consideration.

I would suggest the following process and timeline for this review:

November 7: Council agrees to the format for the City Attorney review

November 23: City Attorney self evaluation

December 2: Councilor evaluations completed and provided to Jeri Knudsen

December 9: Councilor evaluations compiled and returned to Councilors and City Attorney

December 12: Executive session evaluation with City Attorney (following regular council meeting)

(Note: The original timeline would have the City Attorney evaluation December 5 – the same evening as the City Manager evaluation was planned. However, at least one member of the Council is not available that evening. Therefore, I am suggesting that the City Attorney evaluation take place on December 12 and the City Manager evaluation take place at 6:00 on December 13. This should be discussed at the November 7 work session.)

- Review of the November 14 Agenda

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Attachment

DRAFT – 10/24/2011
City Attorney Evaluation

1. Advice provided is objective and unbiased, professional and adequate for use in formulating policies and making decisions.

Far Exceeds Expectations
 Exceeds Expectations
 Meets Expectations
 Expectations Not Completely Met
 Fails to Meet Expectations

2. Effectively represents the City's interests in litigation, administrative hearings, negotiations, and similar proceedings.

Far Exceeds Expectations
 Exceeds Expectations
 Meets Expectations
 Expectations Not Completely Met
 Fails

3. Effectively provides legal analysis, which facilitates legally sound policy/program implementation.

Far Exceeds Expectations
 Exceeds Expectations
 Meets Expectations
 Expectations Not Completely Met
 Fails

4. The legal advice provided by the City Attorney is competent, and presented in a constructive, results-oriented and usable manner.

Far Exceeds Expectations
 Exceeds Expectations
 Meets Expectations
 Expectations Not Completely Met
 Fails

5. Accomplishments: Has the City Attorney accomplished or worked toward accomplishing the goals established by the Council? Why or why not?

Far Exceeds Expectations
 Exceeds Expectations
 Meets Expectations
 Expectations Not Completely Met
 Fails

6. Overall evaluation of City Attorney's performance.

Satisfactory
 Unsatisfactory

7. Strengths: Based upon your overall evaluation of the City Attorney, what areas would you list as his strong points as an Attorney?

8. Improvements suggested: Based upon your evaluation, what areas would you suggest the City Attorney work on to improve his skills and to be more effective in specific situations?

9. Goals for next year: What are the major goals on which the City Attorney needs to focus in the coming year?