

Chair Report

March 2023

Fellow Commissioners,

As mentioned at the February meeting, I am sending an early Chair Report that focuses on our preparation for the Director performance assessment process coming up this spring. All of my other activities have been routine administration and support. I did receive a media query from a free lance journalist from outside of Colorado which I referred on to Director Alvarez.

Below is a brief timeline and list of items for discussion regarding the director performance assessment process.

1. Director Job Description

Assuming the Office is successfully established for expansion, the Director's job description will likely require revision. At minimum, it will need to include addition of the deputy director role, expansion of staff and scope, replacement of the final report with routine ongoing reporting and annual reports, and Commission v Board adjustments. I imagine you will have additional ideas. Because a new Board will not likely be fully in place until the fall and the performance assessment process runs parallel to the budget year, I believe the current Commission should assume this task for the coming year so that the new Board's first assessment cycle is based on a current job description that has been in place for the full year. I will have Director Alvarez or AG Finke forward what I think is the current job description and the performance assessment document we have been advised needs to be used with the current job description along with the current staff and stakeholder surveys. Revision of the performance assessment document itself can be delegated forward to the new Board.

2. Stakeholder Feedback

The Commission initiated a stakeholder feedback process that involved a brief stakeholder survey. The first of these did not yield a meaningful number of responses. Last year, we repeated the survey but with an electronic survey process distributed to every stakeholder on our contact list. We did receive an excellent response; however, because of the breadth of the list, the feedback was very mixed. While almost uniformly positive, many stakeholders who work directly with Director Alvarez did provide specific feedback on their work with her; however, as many or more responses were more general to the Office itself so not as helpful to the assessment. Finally, the whole labor intensive process, including distribution of the survey and collation of the results, fell to the AGs office to ensure confidentiality.

I would like the Commission to consider revising this process to a 360 degree format with a few targeted key stakeholders identified jointly by the Director and the Commission. The existing questions should be examined and revised at the discretion of the Commission. This process is more likely to yield performance specific feedback recognizing strengths and opportunities relevant to the assessment process. It would also greatly reduce the work of the AG's office to support the process.

My second recommendation here is to create a more generalized stakeholder satisfaction survey that could be distributed more broadly on an annual or other basis that would address a more collective view of the Office performance. I would consider distribution in the fall to inform SMART Act quality targets. This process would completely eliminate reliance on AG's office while improving targeted performance data. Summary survey results can be made public, enhancing transparency.

Timeline

March/April 2023

- Review of staff survey questions
- Review of 360 degree process and questions
- Review of stakeholder satisfaction survey including timeline
- Process for review of the job description

May 2023

- Dissemination of staff and 360 degree surveys
- Submission of the Director's self-assessment (May 26th)
- Executive session to discuss weighting of the evaluation rubric and answer questions regarding the review process (if needed).

June 2022

- Dissemination of evaluation materials to the Commissioners
- Receipt of staff and 360 degree surveys by AG Office; forwarded to Commissioners
- Initial evaluation feedback from all Commissioners returned to Chair no later than June 9th
- Executive session/Special Meeting in June dedicated to approval of any revisions to the Director job description and an initial executive session discussion of the collated Commission feedback and goals for the next review period

July 2022

- Final evaluation prepared and approved by the Commission at the regular meeting (July 27th)

I look forward to your thoughts on how best to approach the assessment process this spring.



PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC GUARDIANSHIP

Executive Director Name: _____

Review Period: _____

Type of Evaluation: __ Annual __ Formal Comprehensive __ Interim

I. INTRODUCTION

The Executive Director (“Director”) of the Office of Public Guardianship (“Office”) manages the daily operations of the Office, under the supervision of the Office of Public Guardianship Commission (“Commission”). The Director’s responsibilities and duties can be divided into three main responsibilities that can be derived from statute: (I) Administrative Oversight of the Office; (II) Reports and Recommendations; and (III) Public Relations and Educational Outreach. Under each main responsibility are sub-categories in which the Commission evaluated the Director’s performance during an Annual or Formal Comprehensive Evaluation. If certain information was not available to the Commission for feedback during an Annual Evaluation, some categories of evaluation may remain blank.

This _____ (“Evaluation”) relied on the following documents or information:

<p>LIST ALL DOCUMENTS / INFORMATION RELIED ON. This can include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Evaluation of the Director • Staff comments or documents • Public Comments/Complaints • Reports or Information provided to the Commission from the Director during the evaluation period • Public comments or documents from adult protection service providers and agencies



Section II of the Evaluation focuses on the Director’s job duties and responsibilities. The Director was evaluated based on a set of Responsibilities that encompasses all facets of the Director’s job duties, as approved by the Commission. Commissioners scored the Director per Responsibility on the following basis:

- Exceptional = 5
- Highly Effective = 4
- Proficient = 3
- Inconsistent = 2
- Unsatisfactory = 1

An average score based on the individual Commissioner evaluations was computed for objective evaluation. Any score of “proficient” or above is a positive rating of the Director’s performance. Commissioners were encouraged to support individual ratings above or below proficient with that Commissioner’s personal interactions with the Director or reviews of specific work product. These might include reference to documentation, such as the Director’s self-evaluation, reports drafted and distributed by the Office, and feedback received from staff, the public or stakeholders.

The subjective evaluation is provided in the form of comments and feedback under each Responsibility with reference to documents or information relied on by the Commission to support each score. The individual comments will be aggregated so that the Commission speaks with one voice in the evaluation that is provided to the Director. The aggregated comments will include any specific information provided by an individual Commissioner in support of a rating above or below “proficient” on the objective portion.

Section III evaluates the Director’s progress toward, or completion of, the goals that the Director set forth in his or her Self-Evaluation to accomplish for the Review Period, as well as any goals that the Commission established for the Director.

Section IV sets forth the goals for the Director for the upcoming Review Period, and establishes any Commission specific goals.



II. EVALUATION – RESPONSIBILITIES

RESPONSIBILITY I: ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC GUARDIANSHIP

Responsibility I evaluated the Executive Director’s performance as leader of the Office, including but not limited to, performance of administrative duties, management of human resources and staff relations, oversight of budget and fiscal matters, and substantive work completed by the Office.

Responsibility I.A: Strategic Goals and Long-Term Plan for Office (2-3 Year Vision)

Because the Office is in early stages of establishment as an independent agency, the Director was evaluated based on development, discussion, and planning, rather than execution of a long-term vision and goals.

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5 Highly Effective = 4 Proficient = 3 Inconsistent = 2 Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements	
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements	
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements	
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works with OPG Staff and Commissioners to develop long-term vision for the office, including strategy for advocating continuation and expansion of the Office. • Works with OPG Staff and Commission to plan for termination of the pilot program, if not extended by the General Assembly. 	Average Score: _____ Average Score: _____
This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]	



Responsibility I.B: Compliance with MOUs and State Agency Agreements

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements. Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures the Office’s compliance with the MOU with State Judicial, as required by law. • Ensures the Office’s compliance with any other agreements between other state agencies or adult welfare agencies/providers. • Ensures that Agreements are entered into, updated, and revised, as needed and as required by law 	Average Score: _____ Average Score: _____ Average Score: _____				
This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]					



Responsibility I.C: Financial Planning and Oversight

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements					
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements					
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements					
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiates a planning process to create and fulfill the annual long and short range financial plans, goals and objectives of the Office. • Develops, implements and administers the Office’s budget, operating accounts, and expenses. • Works with Joint Budget Committee and staff analysts on budget and budget related items for information and supplemental requests. • Assesses potential viable funding sources outside the General Assembly budgeting and appropriations process on an ongoing basis. • Ensures that the Office’s financial resources are managed in accordance with State Judicial fiscal rules, as required by law. 	<p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p>				
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



Responsibility I.D: Human Resources

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements. Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hires, supports, and leads effective guardian-designees and Office staff. • Ensures that all Office staff are adequately and appropriately trained, including any necessary continuing education, for their roles in the Office and as employees of the state. • Oversees the Office’s human resource policies and ensures compliance with the Office’s policies, procedures, applicable state and federal law, and contractual obligations. • Delegates appropriate responsibilities to optimize staff autonomy and efficiency while providing needed guidance and advice. 					
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



Responsibility I.E: Oversight of Substantive Services Provision

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements. Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely reviews referrals to the Office to determine eligibility and priority of referrals. • Evaluates guardian and staff performance on an ongoing basis to ensure Office compliance with policies, procedures, and Office standards. • Provides oversight and direction to staff and guardians to ensure that clients receive appropriate and timely services. • Proactively identifies areas for performance improvement for self and staff. • Investigate and respond to complaints against the Office, including complaints against the Director and Office staff. • Maintains high standards of ethics and professionalism in the treatment of and services provided to clients served through the Office. 					Average Score: _____ Average Score: _____ Average Score: _____ Average Score: _____ Average Score: _____
This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]					



Responsibility I.F: Commission Relations

<p>Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.</p> <p>Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements</p> <p>Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements</p> <p>Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.</p>	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informs Commission members on a timely basis on the overall condition of the Office including financial status, human resource issues and external operations. Timely basis generally means 7-10 days' notice absent emergency circumstances. • Is available or responsive to the Commission's requests or inquiries, either collectively or individually. • Clearly communicates to the Commission about the Office's strategies, policies, programs, operating documents, and outcomes, especially changes that affect the Office's provision of services to clients. • Works with the Commission to ensure that the Commission is effective in promoting the mission and strategic goals of the organization. 	<p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p>				
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



Responsibility I.G: Development of Policies and Procedures

<p>Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.</p> <p>Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements</p> <p>Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements</p> <p>Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.</p>	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and maintain eligibility and prioritization criteria to maximize the number of public guardianship cases the Office serves and ensure appropriate case selection practices. • Develop and maintain procedures for modification or termination of public guardianship services, as required by law. • Develop and maintain process for receipt and investigation of complaints against the Office, the Director, and Office staff. • Develop and maintain a policy concerning conflicts of interest between Office staff and individuals referred for public guardianship services. 	<p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p>				
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



RESPONSIBILITY II: REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Responsibility II evaluated the Director’s performance in drafting, distributing and submitting reports on the activities, investigations, findings, and recommendations of the Office as required by law and in accordance with the Office’s Operating Procedures. This Responsibility also evaluates the Director’s performance in making such activities of the Office transparent by distributing those reports to the General Assembly, stakeholder agency/providers, and the public as permitted or required by law.

Responsibility II.A: Data Collection and Management

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements					
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements					
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements					
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collects data that is relevant and meaningful to a determination of the need for statewide public guardianship services. • Collects data that is relevant and meaningful to a determination of the average annual cost of providing for the unmet public guardianship needs throughout the state. • Collects data that is relevant and meaningful to a determination of the net cost or benefit to the state that may result from providing for the unmet public guardianship needs throughout the state. • Implements and maintains an effective and secure data management system for the data collected. • Works with appropriate vendors to collect and interpret data to maximize its usefulness in furthering the purposes of the organization. 	<p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p>				
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



Responsibility II.B: Preparation and Distribution of Reports

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements					
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements					
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements					
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepares for drafting a report to the General Assembly Judiciary Committees according to criteria required by statute. • Drafts a report to the General Assembly Judiciary Committees according to the criteria required by statute. • Collects, drafts and distributes to the public (as permitted by law) data collection on the Office’s findings and recommendations related to provision of services and the need for a statewide Office. 	<p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p>				
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



Responsibility II.C: Activities Before the General Assembly

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements. Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective spokesperson for the Office before the General Assembly. • Responds to legislative requests or provides testimony before the General Assembly on public guardianship issues. • Provides to the General Assembly (as permitted by law) information about the activities, findings, and recommendations of the Office. • Works with the General Assembly when legislation is pending that was proposed by the Office or introduced by the legislature concerning public guardianship issues. • Advocates at the General Assembly for Office resources and increase in budgets as necessary. 		Average Score: _____	Average Score: _____	Average Score: _____	Average Score: _____
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



RESPONSIBILITY III: PUBLIC RELATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

Responsibility III evaluated the Director’s performance in building, maintaining and expanding relationships between the Office and public guardianship stakeholders and the public, as well as measures the Director’s effectiveness with educational outreach of the Office’s mission, the need for public guardianship services, and the Office’s potentially expanded role throughout the state.

Responsibility III.A: Public Relations to Stakeholders

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements					
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements					
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements					
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes and maintains good working relationships with public guardianship stakeholders, agencies, and providers at the local, state, and national levels. Provides updates about the Office’s activities and recommendations (as permitted by law) at stakeholder meetings, conferences, during one-on-one interactions, or on the Office website. 	<p>Average Score: _____</p> <p>Average Score: _____</p>				
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



Responsibility III.B: Public Relations to Public Individuals and Organizations

<p>Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.</p> <p>Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements</p> <p>Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements</p> <p>Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.</p>	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works to address any issues that are raised and brought to the attention of the Director from the Commission through the public complaint process. • Establishes and maintains good working relationships with citizen advocacy groups. • Attends citizen advocacy group meetings or other community outreach events or activities to update the public about the Office’s services and recommendations (as permitted by law). • Provides timely and updated information to the public through the Office’s website. • Develops pamphlets or other educational materials that are circulated at citizen meetings, or where adult guardianship services/offices are provided or located concerning the Office’s services and work. 	Average Score: _____	Average Score: _____	Average Score: _____	Average Score: _____	Average Score: _____
<p>This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]</p>					



Responsibility III.C: Visibility of Office

Visibility can be difficult to measure and often is subjective based on a Commissioner’s individual experience with the community. The Director’s effectiveness, therefore, was measured through objective means, including but not limited to, increased number of calls taken, increased number of complaints received, increased traffic on website, increased number of invitations to speak or attend conferences or meeting, etc.).

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements					
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements					
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements					
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases the visibility and role of the Office as being a resource and leader in the provision of adult guardianship services. 	Average Score: _____				

This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]



III. EVALUATION: DIRECTOR GOALS FOR REVIEW PERIOD _____

In this Section, the Director was evaluated based on his or her goals set forth in the Self-Evaluation for the Review Period _____. The Director set forth ___ goals.

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5 Highly Effective = 4 Proficient = 3 Inconsistent = 2 Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements	
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements	
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements	
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.	
Goal #1:	Average Score: _____

This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]



COLORADO
Office of Public Guardianship

Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements					
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements					
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements					
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.					
Goal #2:	Average Score: _____				

This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]



Exceptional: Performance is consistently superior and significantly exceeds position requirements.	Exceptional = 5	Highly Effective = 4	Proficient = 3	Inconsistent = 2	Unsatisfactory = 1
Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds position requirements					
Proficient: Performance consistently meets position requirements					
Inconsistent: Performance meets some, but not all position requirements					
Unsatisfactory: Performance consistently fails to meet minimum position requirements; employee lacks skills required or fails to utilize necessary skills.					
Goal #3:	Average Score: _____				

This score was subjectively based on the following: [INSERT COMMENTS WITH SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENTS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT FROM DOCUMENTS/INFORMATION RELIED ON]



**IV. EVALUATION: DIRECTOR GOALS FOR UPCOMING REVIEW
PERIOD _____**

The Director goals from his or her Self-Evaluation for the upcoming Review Period and those voted on by the Commission include the following:

Director Goals:

- Goal #1:**
- Goal #2:**
- Goal #3:**

Commission Goals (if any):

- Goal #1:**
- Goal #2:**
- Goal #3:**

FOR THE COMMISSION:

Approved on this ___ day of _____, 20__.

Commission Chair

Commission Vice-Chair

I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this _____ and had an opportunity to discuss the contents with the Commission.

Executive Director

Date

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC GUARDIANSHIP PILOT PROGRAM

Opportunity Information		Contact Information	
Opportunity Title:	Executive Director of the Office of Public Guardianship Pilot Program	Name:	Deb Bennett-Woods
Location:	Denver	Title:	Chair of the OPG Commission
Department:	Office of Public Guardianship Pilot Program	Address:	
Posted Date:	07/11/2019	Phone:	720-320-2405
Closing Date:	08/11/2019	Email:	OPGCommission@gmail.com

Brief Description

This is a courtesy posting for the Office of Public Guardianship Pilot Program.

The Office of Public Guardianship (OPG) Pilot Program is now accepting applications for the position of Executive Director.

Compensation for this position ranges from \$115,000 to \$120,000.

Mission of the Office of Public Guardian Pilot Program:

The mission of the Office of Public Guardianship Pilot Program is to:

Provide guardianship services for indigent and incapacitated adults, within the targeted judicial district(s), when other guardianship possibilities are exhausted. If Colorado adults lack willing and appropriate family or friends, resources to compensate a private guardian, and access to public service organizations that offer guardianship, the OPG provides guardianship services to secure the health and safety of these individuals while preserving their independence wherever possible. Assess the need for and feasibility of a statewide office of public guardianship services and provide detailed recommendations for action to the Colorado General Assembly.

*Until 2023, the Office of Public Guardianship will be a pilot program serving the second, seventh, and seventeenth Judicial Districts of Colorado, conditional upon funding as it becomes available.

OPG Values:

Dignity: At risk adults are treated with individual dignity and respect.

Self-determination: The concerns and decisions of at-risk adults are, to the greatest extent possible, considered with assistance to regain or develop capacities and participate in supported decision-making and person-centered planning

Access and Quality: At risk adults should receive timely access to appropriate services, consistent with best practice, to ensure personal safety and well-being.

Collaboration: The OPG actively seeks collaborative relationships with governmental and community stakeholders to maximize resources and support continuous improvement of policies and processes.

Accountability and Transparency: Outcomes of the pilot project are defined, documented and made available to the Colorado General Assembly and the public, as required by statute, accurately and on a timely basis.

Executive Director Position Description

Applicants should refer to § 13-94-104, C.R.S., for a comprehensive description of the pilot project.

The Executive Director serves at the pleasure of the five-member appointing Commission and is responsible for ensuring that the Office meets the requirements of § 13-94-104 et seq.

Qualifications

Minimum Requirements:

The candidate must:

- Hold a BA/BS in a relevant field, including but not limited to human services social work, nursing, law, or public health with 5 years related work *experience*

OR

- *Hold a BA/BS in an unrelated field with certification/licensure in a relevant field and 5 years related work experience. Have a working knowledge of guardianship or case management*

Preferred Requirements:

The ideal candidate will:

- *Hold a masters or doctoral degree in a related field, including but not limited to, human services, social work, nursing, law or public health, with relevant licensure or certification, and with 6-8 years of relevant work experience*
- *Have a working knowledge of guardianship or case management, as well as experience in public sector or non-profit management*

Preferred Skills and Abilities

- *Ability to engage the support and collaboration of a wide range of community stakeholders and state legislators and administrators*
- *Demonstrated abilities in marketing, public relations, fundraising and advocacy in non-profit, for-profit or governmental environments*
- *Demonstrated abilities in the collection, analysis, synthesis and reporting of data for needs assessment and service expansion*

The Executive Director will perform the following:

- *Establish, develop, direct, and administer the Office of the Public Guardianship, including creation of professional standards and a code of ethics for office employees and guardian-designees, cultivation of relationships with relevant stakeholders, implementation of a data management system, and adoption of eligibility and prioritization criteria for referrals*
- *Conduct recruitment, hiring, training, supervision and termination of office employees, including:*
 - *Establishing expectations and provide employee performance feedback on an on-going and annual basis, and assist employees in establishing goals*
 - *Providing recommendations regarding employee's employment probationary/trial period*
- *Initiate and manage internal MOUs and external contracts as needed*
- *Review referrals to the Office*
- *Establish a policy and respond to complaints against the office, including oversight of investigations as needed*
- *Create and maintain a public guardianship data management system*
- *Office management, financial planning, and budgeting*
- *Assure financial viability of the pilot project through working with the General Assembly and Joint Budget Committee as well as development of a fundraising plan, policies, procedures and materials; identification, cultivation and solicitation of donor prospects; identification and pursuit of grant opportunities; and effective collaboration with the Commission on fundraising initiatives*
- *Initiate and deliver public education and outreach regarding the role of the office and guardian-designees, including requests for information*
- *Analyze legislation impacting the OPG, inform the Commission of necessary responses, and advocate for the interests of the OPG and the individuals it represents*
- *Collect, analyze and synthesize data from the pilot project to prepare and justify strategic and operational plans and legislative funding requests for the permanent establishment and legislative funding of the statewide Office of Public Guardianship*
- *Report on OPG activities, concerns, and issues to OPG commission members, including the OPG budget, legislation, policies, and statutory mandates*
- *Prepare interim and final reports to the Colorado General Assembly, including recommendations, on the activities of the OPG and the need of guardianship services in Colorado to the General Assembly; the Executive Director is*

responsible for special duties pursuant to the statutory evaluation of the OPG occurring by January 1, 2023 and found in C.R.S. 13-94-105(4) et seq

HOW TO APPLY:

- Please provide cover letter, resume, and respond to the two application questions below. For the application questions, please provide responses for both questions that are no more than five pages total length in 12-point Century Schoolbook font. Please submit the completed application package to Careers@judicial.state.co.us
- THE TWO APPLICATION QUESTIONS:
 - Briefly describe your knowledge and prior experience with (a) project management; (b) research; (c) fundraising or grant writing; (d) hiring and supervision; (e) budget management; and (f) strategic planning.
 - Describe your interest in this position, including what excites you and what challenges you anticipate.

Detailed Job Information



PUBLIC COMMENT FORM FOR EVALUATION
OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC GUARDIANSHIP

Executive Director Name: _____

Review Period: _____

Type of Evaluation: __ Annual __ Formal Comprehensive __ Interim

I. INTRODUCTION

The Executive Director (“Director”) of the Office of Public Guardianship (“Office”) manages the daily operations of the Office, under the supervision of the Office of Public Guardianship Commission (“Commission”). To assist the Commission in evaluating the Director’s performance, members of the public and stakeholders are invited to submit comments on this form. The Commission’s evaluation will rely on a wide variety of information, and comments from the public and stakeholders will be one of several perspectives gathered.

This form presents a set of statements related to the Director’s duties to members of the public and stakeholder. Commenters are asked to rate their agreement with each statement according to the following rating scale:

- Strongly Agree = 5
- Agree = 4
- Neutral = 3
- Disagree = 2
- Strongly Disagree = 1

Following each statement, there is space to provide written comments in support of the rating selected. The Commission encourages written comments to give a more complete public perspective to inform the evaluation of the Director. The Commission also encourages submission of additional materials, such as written communications with the Director, educational materials distributed by the Office, public reports and notices, contracts and agreements, and any other documentation that would assist with a complete evaluation of the Director. This form will not be shared with the Director, and comments included in the Commission’s comprehensive evaluation will not identify the individual making the comment.

Please submit your completed form to _____, by _____.



II. EVALUATION

Please read the following statements and rate your agreement with each statement according to the following scale:

- Strongly Agree = 5
- Agree = 4
- Neutral = 3
- Disagree = 2
- Strongly Disagree = 1

The Director provides timely and clear communication regarding the process for referring individuals to the Office and the status of referrals received.				
Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Comments:				

The Director ensures that the Office provides guardianship services that comply with relevant court orders and least restrictive alternatives.				
Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Comments:				

The Director provides sufficient oversight to Office staff to ensure that public guardians provide adequate and timely services to wards under guardianship of the Office.				
Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Comments:				



COLORADO
Office of Public Guardianship

The Director operates the Office with transparency that promotes public awareness of issues affecting the Office and individuals in need of public guardianship services.				
Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Comments:				

The Director provides sufficient public education opportunities for members of the public to become aware of the Office and the need for public guardianship services throughout the State (this may include, but not be limited to, written education materials, online presence, and group presentations).				
Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Comments:				

The Director maintains high standards of ethics and professionalism at all times in leadership and operation of the Office.				
Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Comments:				

Submitted by: _____

Date: _____

The Commission is seeking staff input to assist us with completing the Director performance review for the period of July 2021 through June 2022. Please include comments and specific examples when applicable.

1. The Director provides timely and clear communication regarding my job duties.
2. The Director responds to my questions and requests for guidance in a timely and effective manner. I feel supported by the Director in challenging client situations.
3. I feel adequately and appropriately trained for my job responsibilities. The Director provides opportunities for additional continuing education and professional development.
4. The Director treats me fairly and consistently when ensuring compliance with OPG policies and procedures.
5. The Director provides timely and constructive feedback on my performance.
6. The Director seeks staff suggestions regarding office operations and delegates responsibilities when appropriate.
7. The Director communicates regularly with the OPG staff regarding legislative and related issues impacting the OPG and/or the pilot project.
8. The Director consistently advocates for the safety and well being of all OPG clients.
9. The Director maintains a positive and motivating office culture based on high standards of ethics and professionalism.
10. Question regarding the workplace assessment from the fall of 2021?
11. Do you have additional comments to share regarding the performance of the Director during this review period?