



City of Dallas

Timeline to Conduct the Annual Performance Review for City Council Appointed Officials (City Attorney, City Secretary, City Manager, and Inspector General)

Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Affairs
Tuesday, January 21, 2024

Nina Arias, Director of Human Resources

Agenda



- Background
- Proposed Process and Timeline
- Timeline in Action
- Recommended Actions
- References
- Next Steps



Background



Challenges in Current Framework

- **Lack of Structured Goal-Setting:** No formal process for setting goals for Council Appointed staff (City Manager, City Attorney, City Secretary, Inspector General) leading to a disconnect between leadership performance and the city's budgeting cycles.
- **Inconsistent Evaluation Criteria:** Absence of standardized Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and alignment with fiscal goals resulted in evaluations that lacked consistency and strategic insight.
- **Disjointed Planning and Evaluation:** Planning, budgeting, and evaluation were handled separately, preventing synchronization for a cohesive evaluation framework.
- **Limited Stakeholder Input:** Minimal engagement with residents, staff, and external partners for feedback, hindering comprehensive performance assessments.



Background



Why Align Performance Evaluations with the Fiscal Year?

- 1.Consistency with Budget and Planning** - Aligns officials' goals with the city's budget and priorities, ensuring effective leadership and resource allocation.
- 2.Relevant Performance Review** - Evaluates achievements based on completed projects and budget goals for a comprehensive assessment.
- 3.Clear Accountability and Focus** - Aligns priorities between Council and officials, with regular check-ins to track progress and make adjustments.
- 4.Encourages Proactive Leadership** - Motivates officials to focus on both immediate needs and long-term goals, with opportunities for course correction.
- 5.Public Transparency** - Ensures taxpayer dollars are spent effectively and invites public input during evaluations tied to the budget.



Proposed Process and Timeline



February - April

(Pre-Fiscal Year)

- Council Reviews Evaluation Criteria and set Performance Goals attached to upcoming Fiscal Year

Recommend that this step be guided by an external vendor or consultant.

August

- Council appointed staff present their proposed budgets, aligned with KPIs and strategic priorities.
- Council reviews and provides feedback on the proposed budgets and performance goals.

September

- Council adopts the final budgets and performance goals, formalizing objectives for the fiscal year.

Quarterly Reviews

Throughout the Fiscal Year (October - September)

- **Q1 (October - December):** Progress reports submitted by mid-January.
- **Q2 (January - March):** Mid-year performance review and adjustments by April.
- **Q3 (April - June):** Progress reports submitted by mid-July.
- **Q4 (July - September):** Annual reports due in October, summarizing prior fiscal year performance and achievements.

Annual Evaluation

September-October (End of Fiscal Year)

- **Self-Assessments:** Staff submit self-assessments outlining achievements, challenges, and opportunities.
- **Council Member Assessments:** Council members complete individual evaluations.
- **Stakeholder Feedback:** Gather input from residents, city staff, and external partners.
- **Council Evaluation Meeting:** Consolidate feedback, discuss findings, document performance evaluation results.

Currently guided by a consultant.

January
Approved merit increases implemented



Timeline in Action



*Last review completed August 23, 2022	Jan 25	Feb 25	Mar 25	Apr 25	May 25	Jun 25	Jul 25	Aug 25	Sep 25	Oct 25	Nov 25	Dec 25
*Catch-up 2023-24 Evaluations (Self Assessment & Review)		X	X	X								
Merit Increases					X							
Council Develop Evaluation Criteria (KPIs) Q3-Q4 2025 and FY 25-26		X	X									
FY 2024-25 Q3 Review								X				
FY 2024-25 Q4 Review (Annual Report) Performance Evaluation										X		
Performance Evaluation – Catch-up Partial Year (Q3 and Q4 2025)										X		
Staff Present Proposed Budget/KPIs for FY 2025-26								X				
Council Finalize/Approve FY 2025-26 Budget and Performance Goals									X			

Standard Review Year – Going Forward	Jan 26	Feb 26	Mar 26	Apr 26	May 26	Jun 26	Jul 26	Aug 26	Sep 26	Oct 26	Nov 26	Dec 26
Merit Increases	X											
Council Develop Evaluation Criteria for FY 26-27		X	X									
FY 2025-26 Q1 Review	X											
FY 2025-26 Q2 Review				X								
FY 2025-26 Q3 Review								X				
FY 2025-26 Q4 Review (Annual Report)										X		
Annual Performance Evaluation (FY 2025-26)										X		
Staff Present Proposed Budget/KPIs for FY 25-26								X				
Council Finalize/Approve FY 25-26 Budget and Performance Goals									X			



Recommended Action



- 1. Adopt the Evaluation Framework and timeline** - Formally adopt the proposed framework, aligning it with the fiscal year cycle. This will clarify processes, timelines, and performance expectations.
- 2. Approve Performance Metrics (KPIs)** - Approve a set of KPIs aligned with the city's strategic priorities and budget goals during the budget process to measure performance at the end of the evaluation period.
- 3. Set Annual Evaluation Discussion Date** - Establish a consistent annual evaluation discussion in October, integrating it into Council's regular calendar.
- 4. Approve Stakeholder Feedback Process** - Approve a process to gather feedback from residents, city staff, and external stakeholders, ensuring diverse perspectives are included in the evaluation.



References



1. International City/County Management Association (ICMA). *Guidelines and Manager Evaluation Handbook*. The recommended approach aligns with ICMA's recommended practices for effective local government management. ICMA emphasizes the importance of meaningful feedback and a structured evaluation process for managers at all levels. [Link](#)
2. NAFSA. *Strength in Numbers: Demonstrating Leadership Through Budget Management*. Highlights the benefits of synchronizing leadership evaluations with budget cycles for improved fiscal responsibility. [Link](#)
3. RAND Corporation. *Performance-Based Accountability for Public Services*. Explains the value of using fiscal milestones and goal-setting to provide measurable performance insights. [Link](#) and [Video](#)
4. McKinsey & Company. *Performance Management That Puts People First*. Describes how effective performance management systems, focusing on aligned goal-setting, performance reviews, and rewards, can significantly boost performance and employee satisfaction when designed to be agile, provide regular feedback, establish a comprehensive fact base, maintain appropriate rating systems, and leverage new technologies. [Link](#)
5. Center for Creative Leadership. *Make Leadership Happen with DAC Framework*. Demonstrates how structured evaluation cycles improve clarity and foster alignment between stakeholders. [Link](#)
6. International City/County Management Association (ICMA). *High-Performance Budgeting & Planning Handbook*. Provides insights on why high performance and budgets are tied and how a performance-based budgeting process looks through the five tenets of high-performance government. [Link](#)
7. U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM). *Performance Management Cycle*. Explains how the performance management cycle is a continuous process involving planning work, setting expectations, monitoring performance, developing capacity, rating performance periodically, and rewarding good performance. [Link](#)
8. McKinsey & Company. *Performance Management: Why Keeping Score is So Important and So Hard*. Explains why effective performance management systems are crucial for organizational success, but remain challenging to implement correctly. [Link](#)
9. Government Executive. *Should Government Do Away with Annual Performance Reviews?* Discusses the benefits and challenges of replacing single annual performance reviews in government with more frequent feedback, inspired by Deloitte's new system. [Link](#)
10. Schnell, S., Miheş, D., Sobjak, A., & van Acker, W. *Performance Management in the Public Administration — Seven Success Factors*. Emphasizes that performance management should be viewed as a continuous cycle of planning, monitoring, measuring, evaluating, and rewarding employee performance at both individual and team levels at all levels of the organization.
11. International City/County Management Association (ICMA). *City Manager Evaluation*. Describes how the evaluation of a city manager serves two purposes: to evaluate the performance of the city manager and to act as a communication bridge for the mayor, city council, and the city manager. [Link](#)
12. National League of Cities (NLC). *Performance Management: A Guide for City Leaders*. A report that provides a comprehensive guide to empower city leaders to implement data-driven performance management strategies to improve municipal service delivery and decision-making.



Next Steps



- 1. Collect Committee Feedback**
- 2. Submit Recommendation to Council**
- 3. Finalize Vendor Selection** - Select the most suitable vendor based on defined criteria.
- 4. Implement and Evaluate** - Roll out the process and assess its effectiveness.

