

Item # 61

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

SUBMITTED AT THE REQUEST OF

**FINANCE & ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
DEPARTMENT**

December 1, 2009

10:00 a.m.



DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 508 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

MEMORANDUM

TO: Broward County Board of County Commissioners

FROM:  James R. Acton, Jr., Director
Human Resources Division

DATE: November 30, 2009

RE: Agenda Item No. 61 - December 1, 2009

Attached, please find the Consolidated Performance Review and Summary Rating Grid for the County Administrator. Thank you.

JRA:pj

Attachment

Broward County Board of County Commissioners

Sue Gunzburger • Kristin D. Jacobs • Albert C. Jones • Ken Keechl • Ilene Lieberman • Stacy Rilter • John E. Rodstrom, Jr. • Diana Wasserman-Rubin • Lois Wexler
www.broward.org

Board of County Commissioners, Broward County, Florida
Finance and Administrative Services Department
Division of Human Resources

EXECUTIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: Bertha W. Henry
Rating Period: October 1, 2008- – September 30, 2009

The County Administrator's report of accomplishments for this rating period is attached for review and consideration in evaluating the following performance measurements. Circle the applicable performance rating for each statement below.

PART I: PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS:

Performance rating as follows:

1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Needs Improvement 3 = Meets Expectations 4 = Exceeds Expectations 5 = Outstanding DK = Don't Know

<u>❖ COMMUNICATIONS WITH COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:</u>	Average Rating
• To what degree does the County Administrator meet with and respond to Board members on their priorities for matters affecting the County?	4.3
• How effectively does the County Administrator communicate to the Board regarding recommendations on major issues which affect the County?	3.8
• How effectively does the County Administrator provide assistance to the Board in the development of policy agendas, community programs and services, and strategic goals which are in the best interest of the County and community?	3.6
• How well does the County Administrator keep the Board informed on the state of the County's affairs and future needs?	4.0
Average Section Rating:	3.9

Comments on Communications with County Commissioners:

<u>❖ ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS:</u>	Average Rating
• How well does the County Administrator demonstrate knowledge and understanding of regional/state/federal issues impacting the County's various agencies and operations?	4.1
• How well does the County Administrator maintain effective communications and professional relationships with other organizations and governmental agencies in order to effectively manage the County's operations and services?	3.9
• How effectively does the County Administrator lead by example in maintaining integrity and positive professional relationships in the course of representing the County?	4.3
• How well does the County Administrator address issues by resolving disputes constructively and taking prompt and effective action?	3.4
• How well does the County Administrator develop and maintain cooperative relationships with other public and private organizations on which the County is dependent, seeks to serve, or has a business relationship?	3.7
• How effective is the County Administrator in demonstrating an awareness of cultural diversity within the County's operations and services?	4.8
Average Section Rating:	4.0

Comments on Administrative Management and Intergovernmental Relations:

Commissioner Lieberman: *Personnel issues are not quickly resolved.*

<u>❖ FISCAL OPERATIONS:</u>	Average Rating
------------------------------------	-----------------------

• How effective is the County Administrator in providing information to assist the Board in making informed decisions regarding budget and management policies?	4.4
• How well does the County Administrator prepare a realistic annual budget?	4.5
• How well does the County Administrator control expenditures in accordance with the approved budget?	4.8
• How innovative is the County Administrator regarding budget format and policies?	4.2
• How well does the County Administrator link the Board's goals and objectives to the budget process?	4.3
Average Section Rating:	4.4

Comments on Fiscal Operations:

❖ <u>MEDIA AND PUBLIC RELATIONS:</u>	Average Rating
• How well does the County Administrator respond to media and public inquires regarding sensitive topics and emergency situations?	4.0
• How well does the County Administrator represent the County in building positive relationships with the media?	4.0
• How effective is the County Administrator in maintaining a positive and professional image and demeanor when communicating with the media and the public?	4.2
• How effective is the County Administrator in fostering innovative public outreach efforts?	3.8
Average Section Rating:	4.0

Comments on Media and Public Relations:

Commissioner Rodstrom: *Low profile - good.*

❖ <u>INITIATIVE AND STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT:</u>	Average Rating
• How well does the County Administrator demonstrate initiative and foresight in efforts to address the needs of the community by proposing goals, objectives and/or services in response to those needs?	3.5
• How well does the County Administrator demonstrate a strategic focus in anticipating the needs of the County's operations to support the goals and objectives of the County while ensuring the stability of the County's operations and services?	3.8
• How clearly does the County Administrator utilize information technology, ensuring that it is incorporated appropriately in plans to improve the County's operations and delivery of services to the community?	3.5
• How well does the County Administrator provide leadership and direction to the "talent development" efforts of County staff?	3.6
• How well does the County Administrator provide a High Performance Model/Umbrella for the County's strategic initiatives?	3.5
Average Section Rating:	3.6

Comments on Initiative and Strategic Management:

❖ <u>POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND SERVICE DELIVERY:</u>	Average Rating
• How efficiently does the County Administrator develop, evaluate and implement policies,	3.7

programs, and services which are presented to the Board for consideration?

- How adequately does the County Administrator evaluate current County operations and services, making necessary recommendations and changes to ensure that they function effectively and efficiently? 3.6
- How well does the County Administrator establish and maintain a consistently high level of quality in work product, operational procedures, and service delivery? 3.6

Average Section Rating: 3.6

Comments on Policy Implementation and Service Delivery:

Commissioner Lieberman: *This is not a reflection of work product by the County Administrator. Work product of subordinates not consistently high level in completeness or accuracy.*

Commissioner Rodstrom: *(ex) Traffic signalization*

PART II – ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OBJECTIVES:

Attached is the County Administrator's report on goals, projects and objectives accomplished for this rating period and a description of the goals, projects and objectives proposed by the County Administrator for the upcoming year

COMMENTS ON PREVIOUS YEAR'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

COMMENTS ON NEXT YEAR'S GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

PART III – OVERALL ANNUAL ASSESSMENT:

Please provide your comments regarding the County Administrator's overall performance during this rating period.

Evaluator's Comments:

Mayor Keechl: As stated publicly, Ms. Henry handled FY 2010's budget process extremely well.

Commissioner Lieberman: *Given the current financial challenges, Ms. Henry deserves major recognition for the FY 10 budget issues. She recognized the issues early on and took proactive steps to minimize impact. Moreover, given the number of jobs eliminated, she did an extraordinary job in finding placements for affected employees.*

Her weakness is in personnel issues and sometimes situations drag on which should be more quickly addressed.

Commissioner Wexler: *The most glaring organizational deficit is the lack of understanding and implementation of Sterling as an improvement tool two years after adoption. This very instrument with the attachment of "Annual Accomplishments" is the poster child for not getting it! This document is merely a list; not measureable and not performance based.*

In May of 2009 the County Administrator presented to the BOCC a vision, goals and objectives document. That document is what should be used to measure achievement.

Commissioner Rodstrom: *Did a superb job in managing the budget. Thought the budget cuts were deliberate and resulted in the least harm to County Government. This was the issue of the year and she managed it!*

She needs to be more proactive with the staff. She should investigate things and not always take the staff's word for it. Should be fully aware of staff's relationship to lobbyists. Should establish and enforce policy in regards to lobbyists.

Commissioner Wasserman-Rubin: *Bertha has always been responsive to the needs of my constituents. She is a true professional; demonstrating her leadership, knowledge and expertise with this year's budget process.*

I am grateful for her commitment to Broward County, and commend her for taking progressive action, despite any and all interference/obstacles.

I am proud to work with her. She is truly an asset to this County.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: Bertha Henry

Consolidated Executive Performance Review
 Rating Period: October 1, 2008 - September 30, 2009

RATING GRID – Average Rating by Commissioner and by Factor

	Communications with County Commissioners:	Administrative Leadership and Intergovernmental Relations:	Fiscal Operations:	Media and Public Relations:	Initiative and Strategic Management:	Policy Implementation and Service Delivery:	Average Rating by Commissioner:
Ilene Lieberman District 1	4.3	4.3	5.0	4.5	4.4	3.8	4.4
Kristin D. Jacobs District 2	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Stacy Ritter District 3	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Ken Keechl District 4	3.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.4	4.0	3.8
Lois Wexler District 5	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.6	2.9	2.9	3.3
Sue N. Gunzburger District 6	4.3	3.7	4.2	3.5	3.0	3.3	3.7
John E. Rodstrom, Jr. District 7	4.3	4.0	4.8	4.3	3.8	3.7	4.1
Diana Wasserman-Rubin District 8	4.3	4.0	5.0	NR	4.0	4.0	4.3
<u>Average Rating by Factor</u>	3.9	4.0	4.4	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.9

* NR = No Response