

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA**

**June 16, 2015 – 7:00 PM
Council Chamber**

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Minutes of the April 28, 2015 Boards and Commissions Review Committee Meeting
3. Discussion and Approval of Evaluation Format
4. Discussion and Potential Recommendation to Council Regarding Advertising Current or Future Vacancies on the City's Boards and Commissions and the Procedures for Filling Out Applications
5. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Amending the Schedule of Committees to Be Reviewed
6. Public Comment
7. Introduction of New Business
8. Setting of Next Meeting Date
9. Adjournment

The above agenda is intended to be followed, but is subject to changes, deletions, additions, and modifications, as permitted under the Freedom of Information Act of the State of Delaware. The agenda is posted (7) seven days in advance of the scheduled meeting in compliance with 29 *Del. C.* Section 10004 (e)(2). Copies may be obtained at the City Secretary's Office, 220 South Main Street, or online at www.cityofnewarkde.us.

Agenda Posted – June 9, 2015

Attest:

Sworn by:

City Secretary

Notary Public

(Seal)

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES
APRIL 28, 2015**

Those present at 7:00 p.m.:

Members: Vice Chair John Morgan, District 1
Jo Anne Barnes, District 2
Christopher Laird, District 3
Roberta Sullivan, District 4
Maria Aristigueta, District 5
M. Howland Redding, District 6

Absent: Chairperson, Rebecca Powers, At Large

Staff: Renee Bensley, City Secretary

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY JO ANNE BARNES AT 7:04 P.M.

2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRPERSON

MOTION BY MS. BARNES, SECONDED BY MR. LAIRD: TO NOMINATE DR. JOHN MORGAN TO THE POSITION OF VICE CHAIR.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. VOTE: 6 TO 0. (ABSENT: POWERS)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MARCH 31, 2015 BOARDS AND COMMISSION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms. Bensley reviewed changes to the minutes that Dr. Morgan had submitted.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS AMENDED.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. VOTE: 6 TO 0. (ABSENT: POWERS)

4. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF EVALUATION FORMAT

Ms. Barnes requested that each committee member who submitted a proposed changed format explain their rationale.

Ms. Sullivan stated she took each of the attributes currently on the existing form and reordered them in what she felt was a more logical order. They were as follows:

- What was the Code section being addressed?
- What were the qualifications of the person?
- How were they trained?
- How were they selected?
- How many members were there and their longevity?
- How often did they meet?
- How did they report to Council?

Ms. Sullivan suggested that a section for the board or commission members to include their overall impressions, the views of the department heads who work with the board or commission and the views of the public that interact with that board or commission should be added.

The section on Necessity should be at the end after the review has been completed. Ms. Sullivan's proposed evaluation form did not include a numerical grade as she thought it important to first emphasize areas of strength, note any weaknesses and any summary comments. She also added a section on the appeals process for decisions of the board.

Ms. Barnes concurred with Ms. Sullivan's proposal and added she preferred the simple and concise approach. Ms. Barnes stated she liked Mr. Redding's suggestion to "weigh" different areas and give them different point values. She also liked the location of the comment section.

Dr. Aristigueta included an example performance evaluation tool from the Health Information Management Association as part of her submission. When determining what format she would suggest, she started out by thinking what the purpose of the review was. She wanted to make sure they would not be just evaluating strengths and weaknesses without being able to spend thorough time on all areas. She suggested using a yes and no response and removing the numerical ratings previously discussed. She additionally changed some of the yes and no to answers that would provide a value (i.e. how often a group meets). It was not necessarily what she would use but wanted to provide it for a comparison.

Ms. Barnes stated she liked the organization of Dr. Aristigueta's form. She liked the logic of putting the membership orientation first. She also found the reporting and the rules section useful. However, she found the way the question section was laid out cumbersome and not streamlined.

Dr. Morgan stated he liked the order of Dr. Aristigueta's suggested form and liked the fact that the form would be completed by the chairman of the board or the commission. Dr. Morgan stated it was his belief that every board or commission is required to have minutes. Ms. Bensley reported that per FOIA, any public board, committee or commission is required

to have minutes. There are some boards that have additional reporting requirements (i.e. the Conservation Advisory Commission is required to submit a yearly report to Council, etc).

Dr. Morgan suggested rather than approving the evaluation form at this meeting, he suggested further discussion and approval at the next meeting. He suggested talking to current board members and getting their opinions about the format of the evaluation forms. Ms. Bensley suggested not delaying the approval of the evaluation form longer than necessary as the evaluation of the committees needs to proceed.

Mr. Redding stated it was his opinion a solution needs to be decided this evening on the evaluation form. He does not see what is wrong with the form was produced by the City. It is his opinion it was more than adequate.

Ms. Barnes concurred with Dr. Morgan that the evaluation form needs to be further evaluated. She did not like the ratings as they are not clearly presented and she did not like the fact there is not a place for comments. She believed it is important to include what is required and then what is actual. In addition, she understood they were not going to be evaluating people per se but evaluating boards and commissions.

Dr. Aristigueta agreed and believed it was necessary to be objective. It was her opinion that the descriptions were convoluted and the result may be someone attained part of the objective but not all of it. The same applied to ratings; someone may get a partial rating. However, it would be necessary to back this all up with detailed comments. She was concerned that commissions may compete for high scores. Ms. Barnes responded they need to be clear that each commission stands on its own.

Mr. Redding stated he agrees with Ms. Barnes and the ranking system she proposed along with the section on the back of the City's suggested form to add comments and expand for each category (page 2). He would like to see the City form changed to reflect the rating form Ms. Barnes suggested. He also cautioned on using stringent grading type systems for volunteer organizations.

Ms. Sullivan agreed that the members of these commissions should be commended for their service. Part of an evaluation is noting the positive as well as what needs to be improved.

Ms. Bensley reported the Council's intent is not to create any kind of comparison between boards. What Council would like is concrete evaluation comments from this committee and suggestions how the boards could be improved; as well as what they are doing well. Council may then be able to implement recommendations from this committee on how to help boards be more effective.

Dr. Morgan expressed concern because these results will be posted publically. In his

experience at UD, numerical ratings are usually a substitution for subtle thought. He did not take issue with the vast majority of the questions being asked or categories. He believes the right way to answer is to have two or three sentences of what the strengths and weaknesses are and make recommendations to Council.

Ms. Barnes suggesting utilizing the format Ms. Bensley submitted. Categories on page one could be a reference sheet to revise and clarify the descriptions, but the actual format could be the type of format they are discussing. She would like to finalize the format on the evaluation form sooner rather than later as well.

Dr. Aristigueta suggested using the form Ms. Sullivan proposed. Ms. Barnes concurs. Mr. Redding still believes in the rating system and wants to emphasize that the committee would not be rating individual volunteers but rating committees. He would hope that an individual volunteer would not be offended.

Ms. Sullivan asked how a "number" gets the analysis of a committee further than just comments or observations. Mr. Redding stated he is a quantitative person and numbers help him when he compares them to benchmarks. It is his opinion that if a committee scores lower on the scale then Council may have to take action or revamp the committee. He believes most committees will score favorably and the ones that do not may help eliminate ones that are not functioning properly.

Ms. Barnes suggested using the numerical rating system internally. As the recommendation process progresses it may be used along with other categories to complete the assessment.

Dr. Morgan's understanding is that anything that is put down on paper becomes a public document. Dr. Morgan stated he is satisfied with the form Ms. Sullivan proposed without numerical ratings and felt it would provide Council all the information required.

Mr. Laird stated he liked the form Ms. Sullivan proposed along with incorporating Ms. Barnes overall rating. Mr. Redding concurred. Ms. Bensley suggested the commission use the categories Ms. Barnes suggested and the commission make their own notes and evaluations for discussion and do not assign a number to it. Dr. Morgan would be agreeable to that. Mr. Redding is agreeable to using "boxes" versus numbers. However, he is still concerned with the notion of "damaging the psyche of volunteers." He would rather as a volunteer get a "3" than to see a "major improvement needed."

Ms. Bensley stated the items that will be published for public view are: the minutes, the draft of the report, and the final report to be submitted to Council.

Ms. Sullivan stated there is demographic information on Dr. Aristigueta's form that would be important to capture (i.e. name of the group, total number of members).

Mr. Redding stated if a committee member resides outside the City he would like that information captured as well. Dr. Morgan agreed.

Ms. Barnes asked Ms. Sullivan how she envisioned governing authority and how she envisioned that being addressed. Ms. Sullivan stated she is assuming part of the background information will be given and the particular committee will address City Code as it pertains to that committee.

Ms. Bensley stated if the committee so desires, the evaluation form will be sent out to the relevant committee chair and department staff to have them fill out a self-evaluation prior to the evaluation of the committee. Additionally, a packet of background information will be included such as relevant City Code, or resolution that constituted any changes such as ordinances, membership list, etc.

Dr. Morgan suggested dedicating no more than 15-20 minutes more to this discussion; then continuing at the May meeting. Mr. Redding suggested the commission get Council's input of what kind of forms they would like use. Ms. Bensley recommended against this idea as it may take Council some time to accomplish.

Ms. Bensley suggested that she take the proposed ideas and synthesize the examples into one form to be sent out in advance of the next meeting. Members could send comments to Ms. Bensley and she will refine the form for final presentation at the next meeting for approval.

MOTION BY MS. BARNES, SECONDED BY MR. REDDING: TO PERMIT MS. BENSLEY TO RE-CREATE THE EVALUATION FORM WITH THE PROPOSED COMMENTS INCLUDING WHETHER A COMMITTEE MEMBER IS A CITY RESIDENT FOR APPROVAL AT THE NEXT MEETING.

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5 TO 1.

**YES: ARISTIGUETA, BARNES, LAIRD, REDDING, SULLIVAN
NO: MORGAN
ABSENT: POWERS**

Dr. Morgan suggested moving item number nine of the agenda up for discussion.

MOTION BY DR. ARISTIGUETA, SECONDED BY MR. REDDING: TO PERMIT ITEM NINE ON THE AGENDA TO BE MOVED UP FOR IMMEDIATE DISCUSSION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. VOTE: 6 TO 0. (ABSENT: POWERS)

5. SETTING OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee discussed scheduling of the next Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting.

MOTION BY MR. REDDING, SECONDED BY MS. BARNES THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE HELD ON TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2015. A TENTATIVE MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2015 PROVIDED THE EVALUATION FORM IS NOT FINALIZED AT THE JUNE 16, 2015 MEETING. ADDITIONALLY, REVIEW OF THE COMMITTEES WILL COMMENCE THE FOURTH TUESDAY IN JULY 2015.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. VOTE: 6 TO 0. (ABSENT: POWERS)

6. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE RECRUITMENT AND NOMINATION OF BOARDS AND COMMISSION MEMBERS

Ms. Bensley said traditionally the Mayor and members of Council have recruited boards and commissions members. There are two types of distribution for the different boards and commissions as it stands currently. The first is geographic, meaning that each district has representation along with an at-large member. The committees that followed that criteria are the Planning Commission, the Conservation Advisory Commission, Community Development & Revenue Sharing and the Election Board. There are a minimum of seven members. The exceptions were the Conservation Advisory Commission and the Community Development & Revenue Sharing Advisory Committee which have multiple at large members in addition to members representing the six districts. If it is not geographically distributed then they are all at-large members nominated by the Mayor for appointment by Council. They include: Downtown Newark Partnership, Board of Adjustment, Board of Building Appeals, Board of Business License Review, Board of Ethics, Newark Housing Authority, Memorial Day Parade Committee, Personnel Review Committee, Property Maintenance Appeals Board and Board of Sidewalk Appeals.

The application form for any board or commission is posted on the City website. There have been two unsolicited applications submitted since the application form was posted in June 2014. However, there may have been Council members that have been contacted directly with applications. Boards and commissions appointment also were removed from the consent agenda and are now individual agenda items open for public comment.

The opinion of the applications is mixed. Some have said the content requested in the application and content typically in a resume/bio are duplicative. There have been questions from existing board members of whether they should need to submit the application and resume or should they be grandfathered. There is also personal information contained on the application and the question of whether it should be redacted has been raised. Some have suggested that applicants be required to be present when their nomination is considered,

which is currently at the discretion of the Council member.

Ms. Barnes asked if there is a resolution that addresses each of the boards that are to be evaluated or should it be an overall recommendation about the application process. Ms. Bensley stated Council is looking for a more global recommendation to apply to the application process as a whole.

Dr. Morgan stated he had received feedback that some applicants did not want to provide a home address and perhaps a business address could be used instead. Ms. Bensley stated certain information could be redacted prior to posting and could be considered. It is valuable information for an administrative process. Dr. Morgan would like the feedback from individual committee members. It was Dr. Morgan's opinion that residency requirements were a requirement for a particular board then it may be necessary to publish the information.

Mr. Redding would like the question to be basic and ask if the person is a City resident. He would also like the applicant to include additional boards and commissions on which they serve.

Ms. Sullivan stated she would not be on this board as she would not have participated had she known ahead of time that the information would be available on the web. She would have revised her application had she known.

Ms. Barnes was not aware this information was on the website as well. She wants that to be made known to all potential applicants. Ms. Bensley stated a disclaimer could be added to the form. All these issues can be addressed by this board.

Mr. Redding agreed with Ms. Sullivan and does not think that an individual should be excluded if they choose not provide personal information.

Ms. Bensley stated the previous process was far less detailed, invasive and much more simplistic. This is a new process. She further stated it would be a Code change to have the applications not be posted on the website as part of the Council packet. However if it was a partial compromise such as redaction that may only have to be a recommendation rather than a Code change.

Ms. Barnes suggested adding evaluation of the application process. Dr. Morgan stated the form could be changed with a recommendation to Council to take it under advisement. Ms. Bensley stated the recommendation does not have to be completed this evening. Dr. Morgan would like to offer redaction options or make the provision of it optional.

Dr. Morgan was disappointed that there had been only two unsolicited applications. He believed there may be a problem with communicating to the public there are open positions. He would like to suggest City staff send out an email to all the citizens on the City's

email list advertising open positions on the City's boards and commissions. Ms. Bensley noted that the InformMe system that the City uses for email distribution was limited in that people who register sign up for specific topics, i.e. refuse collection changes, and that there currently was no general category that this type of notification could fall under.

Additionally, Ms. Bensley recommended discussing this topic with Mayor & Council as they may like to reappoint an individual and this would not be a true vacancy. Mr. Redding stated he would like openings to be advertised regardless. It may find someone more qualified.

Dr. Morgan would like to recommend the Boards & Commissions Review Committee ask staff to compile a list of all vacancies and expiration of terms on the City's boards and commissions and distribute it in some manner to all citizens of Newark on its email lists with information about how to apply to fill such positions. It is his opinion that there are more people available for these positions than it appears.

Ms. Bensley stated a section could be added to the website that shows upcoming vacancies and openings. New Castle County offers this option on their website. Dr. Morgan suggested that a Council member discuss this at an upcoming meeting. Ms. Bensley stated any Council member can place an item on the agenda. Dr. Morgan stated and all concurred that Council should be aware of their opinion that a more public process of informing about upcoming vacancies and expiring appointments. Ms. Bensley stated there is a foundation to start with as Boards and Commissions do have a section on the City website. With Council direction, it can be changed to reflect these suggestions.

7. DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION REGARDING OPEN MEETING REQUIREMENTS FOR BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

Ms. Bensley stated all Boards and Commissions in the City met the minimum obligations of Delaware FOIA. Meeting notices were posted in the municipal building a minimum of seven days in advance, summary minutes were kept of all meetings and meetings were held where the public is able to attend and observe the proceedings. There were additional committees that go into more detail. Audio recordings are not currently posted for any boards and commission meetings. Only Council meetings have audio recordings posted on the website. Notices of the boards and commissions meetings are also placed on the calendar on the City's website and sent out by text and email messages through the InformMe notification system for those who have signed up for those notifications. The InformMe notification goes out on Thursdays for the following week's meetings.

The Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission require advertisements be mailed to adjacent property owners (within the next five properties) for Board of Adjustment and for the Planning Commission it is within 300 feet of the lot in question. They are also required to publish notice of their meeting fifteen days prior to the meeting date in a newspaper of general

circulation.

All of these issues should be assessed and reviewed by this commission. Additionally, there are meetings that are held offsite and those need to be considered when contemplating recording additional meetings.

Ms. Bensley suggested getting feedback from the Boards on these issues as the commission is evaluating them. This can be included in the global recommendation.

Ms. Sullivan asked what the plan was for this commission. Ms. Bensley stated the agenda and packet were posted to the website. Once minutes are approved in their final form, they were posted. Recordings were not being posted.

Dr. Morgan stated it was his opinion all boards and commissions' recordings should be posted. The only exceptions were some of the appeals boards. Additionally, Dr. Morgan stated there may be issues with recording the meetings as Council Chamber is the only location available with a recording system. Ms. Bensley noted that another issue was groups holding meetings in rooms that may not have good recording where there may be background noise. Also, the City's website has some issues with long recordings, which staff was working to address.

Mr. Redding stated it would be helpful to have a spreadsheet of boards and commissions that post agendas and minutes, etc. Ms. Bensley will compile this. Mr. Redding suggested adding this to the evaluation form.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present from the public.

9. INTRODUCTION OF NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to address.

10. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:15 P.M.

Renee K. Bensley
City Secretary

/tas

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

June 9, 2015

TO: Boards & Commission Review Committee Members

FROM: Renee Bensley, City Secretary

**CC: Mayor and Council
Carol Houck, City Manager**

SUBJECT: Boards and Commissions Review Committee Evaluation Format

At the Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting held on April 28, 2015, the Committee decided to postpone consideration of the final adoption of the evaluation format for the City's boards, commissions and committees to the June 16, 2015 meeting. The Committee requested that the City Secretary compile the comments from the April 28 meeting and circulate a revised draft of the evaluation format to the Committee member. Committee members were asked to provide comments on the revised form to the City Secretary by June 7, 2015 to be compiled and distributed to the Committee.

As of June 8, four Committee members submitted comments for consideration by the committee: John Morgan, Roberta Sullivan, Jo Anne Barnes and Maria Aristigueta. Changes that were not considered substantive (i.e. adding the header row to each page, changing the word "your" to "this", and ensuring that categories do not break between pages) have been included in the draft attached. Additional commentary that would provide more substantive changes (i.e. rewording/adding questions, adding a rating system, adding a weighted rating system) have not been included in the draft. However, the correspondence from the committee members regarding substantive changes is attached for discussion.

Recommendations:

Staff recommends that the Boards and Commissions Review Committee review the comments provided by Committee members and approve an evaluation format to be used by the Committee.

Thank you for your consideration and please contact me if you have any questions.

/rkb



BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

Name of Board/Commission/Committee: _____

Representatives Present For Review: _____

CATEGORY	ASPECTS	AREAS OF STRENGTH	AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	COMMENTS
Governing Authority	City Code and/or resolutions governing the body			
Qualifications	Are the required qualifications appropriate for the body?			

CATEGORY	ASPECTS	AREAS OF STRENGTH	AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	COMMENTS
Orientation/ Training	Existing orientation and/or training for the body			
	Level of participation by members of the body in the above training			
Rules of Procedure	Selection of chair and other officers			
	Meeting procedures			
Activity Level	Amount of active participation by members			

CATEGORY	ASPECTS	AREAS OF STRENGTH	AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	COMMENTS
Reporting	Existing reporting requirements			
	Compliance with existing reporting requirements			
	Appeal process for decisions of the body			
Stakeholder Viewpoints	Views of members of the body being evaluated			
	Views of department heads who work with the body			
	Views of the public who interact with the body			

CATEGORY	ASPECTS	AREAS OF STRENGTH	AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	COMMENTS
Necessity	Scope of duties			
	Similarity to other bodies			

Activity Level

1. This committee meets Monthly Quarterly Annually As Needed Other (Explain) _____

2. How many members are on this committee? _____

3. How many vacancies are currently on this committee? _____

Board Membership

4. How long is a committee member's term on this committee? 1 year 2 years 3 years Other (Explain) _____

5. Is City residency a qualification for membership on this committee? Yes No

6. If City residency is not a requirement, does this committee have any members who are not City residents? Yes No

7. How long is the committee chair's term on this committee? 1 year 2 years 3 years Other (Explain) _____

8. How is the Chair selected for this committee? Volunteer Elected by Committee Appointed by Mayor

Compensation

9. How much is the compensation for this committee? _____

Final overall recommendations of the Boards and Commissions Review Committee:

DRAFT

Approved by the Boards and Commissions Review Committee on _____, 2015.

Vote: __ to __.

Attest:

City Secretary

Chairperson
Boards & Commissions Review Committee

For Office Use Only:

Date Submitted to Council: _____, 2015

Action Taken by Council:

Renee K. Bensley

From: John <jdmorgan33@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2015 9:28 PM
To: Renee K. Bensley
Cc: John
Subject: RE: Revised Evaluation Draft

Dear Renee,

Thank you for sending us the revised evaluation form, which I am now examining.

At the outset, I should say that I am very much opposed to having any sort of numerical rating system.

On the whole the revised evaluation draft looks very good. I have just one suggestion for improving it, based on my readings of the minutes of the Board of Adjustment and the Planning Commission and the DNP going back a few years. There are very few boards or commissions which actually meet as regularly as "monthly" or "quarterly" or "annually". If having such regular meetings is in the charge to a particular board or commission, that should be stated on the evaluation form, and such a statement should be followed by a statement of how often that board or commission has actually met during the past year or two or three. There should also be a statement about whether the board or commission has been keeping and posting up-to-date minutes, in accordance with Delaware's FOIA and more generally in accordance with the goal of keeping the public informed about what it has been doing.

The evaluation form could be revised so that Question 1 is replaced with the following, and the following questions are added:

1. When is this board or commission required to meet?

Monthly Quarterly Annually As needed Other (explain)

2a. Since _____ this board or commission has met _____ times.

2b. Its last meeting was on _____.

3a. Do the minutes of meetings of this board or commission maintained on the city's website appear to be complete and up-to-date? Yes No.

3b. If "no", identify any apparent deficiencies:

Best regards,

John

From: RBensley@Newark.de.us

To: laird.360@gmail.com; hr87@hotmail.com; jobarnes2@gmail.com; jdmorgan33@hotmail.com;

mariaa@udel.edu; rfayepowers@gmail.com; bookreader26@comcast.net

Subject: RE: Revised Evaluation Draft

Date: Tue, 2 Jun 2015 21:44:01 +0000

One more note: I did not include any type of rating system in the evaluation draft as there was not consensus among the committee members to do so. If you would like to see a ratings system included, please let me know and I can present that information as part of my presentation to the committee on 6/16.

Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
302-366-7000 – Office
302-366-7067 – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

From: Renee K. Bensley

Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 5:41 PM

To: Chris Laird; Howland Redding; Jo Anne Barnes; John Morgan; Maria Aristeguetta; Rebecca Faye Powers; Roberta Sullivan

Subject: Revised Evaluation Draft

Good afternoon all. Attached is a revised evaluation draft based on the discussion from the 4/28 Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting. Please forward me any comments you have on the revised evaluation form no later than Sunday, June 7th, so they may be incorporated into the packet to be distributed on Tuesday, June 9th. I apologize for the delay in getting this out to the group, however, I was out of the office for extended periods in May due to a death in my family and an out-of-town training conference and I am still catching up. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Renee
Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
302-366-7000 – Office
302-366-7067 – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

Renee K. Bensley

From: Roberta <bookreader26@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 4:19 PM
To: Renee K. Bensley
Subject: Re: Revised Evaluation Draft

Hi Renee,

First of all I am very sorry to hear of your loss - my sympathies to you and your family. I hope everything went ok with the funeral etc.

I have a couple of small comments on the document. Overall I think you did a very nice job combining the various parts of the previous submissions made, and avoiding duplication, and the form is very easy to use. Thank you.

One overall question is whether the committee being reviewed will be filling out portions (specifically bottom of page 4) this form. If not, and if we are filling it out, should the wording be "how many members are on THIS committee" rather than "how many members are on YOUR committee"? same goes for some of the other questions, which may be the reason for some of my questions below..... there seems to be a mix of questions which should be provided as background (how many members, etc) and some as input from committee being reviewed (how many vacancies, how was your chair selected, etc). Would it be possible to separate the two? not knowing what the background we will be provided makes it tough to know what we fill in, and what will be provided to us.

in addition, specifically:

- can we have the titles of the columns (category, aspects, etc.) on top of the columns on each of the 4 pages where the columns appear? it will make it easier to know which ones to write in.
- it is possible to quantify activity level of % attendance or other means on either page 2 or page 4 (under activity level - % attendance, or % vacancy or some other means) ?
- under Activity Level page 4 Item 2 - how many members - will we have a list of names and addresses for members on committee as part of our background materials? Do we fill this in?

Finally, in reference to your second email - I am against a numerical rating system as it ends it morphing into an A grade, B grade, etc. and causes undue pride or unintended hurt feelings. I think verbage is more effective in conveying messages clearly.

I would be most grateful if you could represent my input above during the upcoming meeting on 6/16. As you know, I will be on my vacation which was pre-paid prior to the re-scheduling of the meeting. Thanks in advance.

With best regards,

Roberta

From: "Renee K. Bensley" <RBensley@Newark.de.us>
To: "Chris Laird" <laird.360@gmail.com>, "Howland Redding" <hr87@hotmail.com>, "Jo Anne Barnes" <jobarnes2@gmail.com>, "John Morgan" <jdmorgan33@hotmail.com>, "Maria Aristeguieta" <mariaa@udel.edu>, "Rebecca Faye Powers" <rfayepowers@gmail.com>, "Roberta Sullivan" <bookreader26@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2015 5:40:41 PM
Subject: Revised Evaluation Draft

Good afternoon all. Attached is a revised evaluation draft based on the discussion from the 4/28 Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting. Please forward me any comments you have on the revised evaluation form no later than Sunday, June 7th, so they may be incorporated into the packet to be distributed on Tuesday, June 9th. I

apologize for the delay in getting this out to the group, however, I was out of the office for extended periods in May due to a death in my family and an out-of-town training conference and I am still catching up. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Renee

Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
302-366-7000 – Office
302-366-7067 – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

Renee K. Bensley

From: John <jdmorgan33@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 5:22 PM
To: Renee K. Bensley
Cc: John
Subject: RE: Revised Evaluation Draft

Dear Renee,

Given another day of reflection, I'd like to request that my question 2b below be reworded as follows:

2b. Its last two meetings were on _____ and _____.

The reason is that some boards meet so infrequently that the date of a board's last meeting could provide a misleading impression of how frequently it meets. E.g., the Board of Assessment Appeals met on May 26, 2015, for the first time in the past several years. If I only knew the date of the last meeting, I might assume that it meets much more frequently.

Best regards,

John

From: jdmorgan33@hotmail.com
To: rbensley@newark.de.us
CC: jdmorgan33@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: Revised Evaluation Draft
Date: Wed, 3 Jun 2015 21:27:46 -0400

Dear Renee,

Thank you for sending us the revised evaluation form, which I am now examining.

At the outset, I should say that I am very much opposed to having any sort of numerical rating system.

On the whole the revised evaluation draft looks very good. I have just one suggestion for improving it, based on my readings of the minutes of the Board of Adjustment and the Planning Commission and the DNP going back a few years. There are very few boards or commissions which actually meet as regularly as "monthly" or "quarterly" or "annually". If having such regular meetings is in the charge to a particular board or commission, that should be stated on the evaluation form, and such a statement should be followed by a statement of how often that board or commission has actually met during the past year or two or three. There should also be a statement about whether the board or commission has been keeping and posting up-to-date minutes, in accordance with Delaware's FOIA and more generally in accordance with the goal of keeping the public informed about what it has been doing.

The evaluation form could be revised so that Question 1 is replaced with the following, and the following questions are added:

1. When is this board or commission required to meet?

____ Monthly ____ Quarterly ____ Annually ____ As needed ____ Other (explain)

2a. Since _____ this board or commission has met _____ times.

2b. Its last meeting was on _____.

3a. Do the minutes of meetings of this board or commission maintained on the city's website appear to be complete and up-to-date? ____ Yes ____ No.

3b. If "no", identify any apparent deficiencies:

Best regards,

John

From: RBensley@Newark.de.us

To: laird.360@gmail.com; hr87@hotmail.com; jobarnes2@gmail.com; jdmorgan33@hotmail.com; mariaa@udel.edu; rfayepowers@gmail.com; bookreader26@comcast.net

Subject: RE: Revised Evaluation Draft

Date: Tue, 2 Jun 2015 21:44:01 +0000

One more note: I did not include any type of rating system in the evaluation draft as there was not consensus among the committee members to do so. If you would like to see a ratings system included, please let me know and I can present that information as part of my presentation to the committee on 6/16.

Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
302-366-7000 – Office
302-366-7067 – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

From: Renee K. Bensley

Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 5:41 PM

To: Chris Laird; Howland Redding; Jo Anne Barnes; John Morgan; Maria Aristeguetta; Rebecca Faye Powers; Roberta Sullivan

Subject: Revised Evaluation Draft

Good afternoon all. Attached is a revised evaluation draft based on the discussion from the 4/28 Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting. Please forward me any comments you have on the revised evaluation form no later than Sunday, June 7th, so they may be incorporated into the packet to be distributed

on Tuesday, June 9th. I apologize for the delay in getting this out to the group, however, I was out of the office for extended periods in May due to a death in my family and an out-of-town training conference and I am still catching up. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Renee
Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
302-366-7000 – Office
302-366-7067 – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

Renee K. Bensley

From: Jo Anne Barnes <jobarnes2@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 05, 2015 11:16 AM
To: Renee K. Bensley
Cc: Chris Laird; Howland Redding; John Morgan; Maria Aristegueta; Rebecca Faye Powers; Roberta Sullivan
Subject: Re: Revised Evaluation Draft

Renee,

Nice job pulling together the Evaluation Form. A couple suggestions:

1. Where a category item is thrown into a new page (Orientation/Training extends into page 2; and Reporting extends to page 3), please insert the category name in the new page far-left box, with the word "continued" added.
2. I would like to see a rating system included for the commission's internal use only. Suggest we use the criteria I outlined in my proposed form, or it could be with other criteria, per the other committee members' preference. It should be inserted at the end of the evaluation section. It would be part of our working papers, but would not be included in our official Final Recommendations.

Thanks for your good work.

Jo Anne

On Tue, Jun 2, 2015 at 5:44 PM, Renee K. Bensley <RBensley@newark.de.us> wrote:

One more note: I did not include any type of rating system in the evaluation draft as there was not consensus among the committee members to do so. If you would like to see a ratings system included, please let me know and I can present that information as part of my presentation to the committee on 6/16.

Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
[302-366-7000](tel:302-366-7000) – Office
[302-366-7067](tel:302-366-7067) – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

From: Renee K. Bensley
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 5:41 PM

To: Chris Laird; Howland Redding; Jo Anne Barnes; John Morgan; Maria Aristeguieta; Rebecca Faye Powers; Roberta Sullivan

Subject: Revised Evaluation Draft

Good afternoon all. Attached is a revised evaluation draft based on the discussion from the 4/28 Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting. Please forward me any comments you have on the revised evaluation form no later than Sunday, June 7th, so they may be incorporated into the packet to be distributed on Tuesday, June 9th. I apologize for the delay in getting this out to the group, however, I was out of the office for extended periods in May due to a death in my family and an out-of-town training conference and I am still catching up. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Renee

Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
302-366-7000 – Office
302-366-7067 – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

Renee K. Bensley

From: Aristigueta, Maria P <mariaa@udel.edu>
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2015 2:17 PM
To: Renee K. Bensley; Chris Laird; Howland Redding; Jo Anne Barnes; John Morgan; Rebecca Faye Powers; Roberta Sullivan
Subject: RE: Revised Evaluation Draft

Renee, nice job! I think you have captured our discussion. Thanks, Maria

From: Renee K. Bensley [mailto:RBensley@Newark.de.us]
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 5:44 PM
To: Chris Laird; Howland Redding; Jo Anne Barnes; John Morgan; Aristigueta, Maria P; Rebecca Faye Powers; Roberta Sullivan
Subject: RE: Revised Evaluation Draft

One more note: I did not include any type of rating system in the evaluation draft as there was not consensus among the committee members to do so. If you would like to see a ratings system included, please let me know and I can present that information as part of my presentation to the committee on 6/16.

Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street
Newark, DE 19711
[302-366-7000](tel:302-366-7000) – Office
[302-366-7067](tel:302-366-7067) – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

From: Renee K. Bensley
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2015 5:41 PM
To: Chris Laird; Howland Redding; Jo Anne Barnes; John Morgan; Maria Aristegueta; Rebecca Faye Powers; Roberta Sullivan
Subject: Revised Evaluation Draft

Good afternoon all. Attached is a revised evaluation draft based on the discussion from the 4/28 Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting. Please forward me any comments you have on the revised evaluation form no later than Sunday, June 7th, so they may be incorporated into the packet to be distributed on Tuesday, June 9th. I apologize for the delay in getting this out to the group, however, I was out of the office for extended periods in May due to a death in my family and an out-of-town training conference and I am still catching up. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Renee

Renee K. Bensley
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary/Treasurer
City of Newark
220 South Main Street

Newark, DE 19711
302-366-7000 – Office
302-366-7067 – Fax
rbensley@newark.de.us

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

June 9, 2015

TO: Boards & Commission Review Committee Members

FROM: Renee Bensley, City Secretary

**CC: Mayor and Council
Carol Houck, City Manager**

**SUBJECT: Boards and Commissions Review Committee Recommendation to
Council on Posting Boards and Commissions Vacancies**

At the Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting held on April 28, 2015, the Committee discussed the recruitment and nomination process of the City's boards and commissions members. After that discussion, John Morgan forwarded the following motion to be added to the June 16, 2015 Boards and Commissions Review Committee agenda for consideration:

"The Boards and Commissions Review Committee recommends that the City of Newark use its website and/or email lists to inform its citizens about current or future vacancies on the City's boards and commissions, and about the procedures for submitting applications to fill such vacancies."

Recommendations:

Staff recommends that the Boards and Commissions Review Committee discuss Dr. Morgan's submitted motion and consider whether to forward the recommendation to Council.

Thank you for your consideration and please contact me if you have any questions.

/rkb

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

June 9, 2015

TO: Boards & Commission Review Committee Members

FROM: Renee Bensley, City Secretary

**CC: Mayor and Council
Carol Houck, City Manager**

SUBJECT: Boards and Commissions Review Committee Schedule Change

At the Boards and Commissions Review Committee meeting held on March 31, 2015, the Committee set the order of review for the City's boards, commissions and committees as follows:

- Board of Building Appeals, Property Maintenance Appeals Board, Board of Sidewalk Appeals
- Board of Business License Review, Personnel Review Committee
- Newark Memorial Day Parade Committee
- Board of Ethics
- Election Board
- Board of Adjustment
- Downtown Newark Partnership
- Planning Commission
- Community Development/Revenue Sharing Advisory Committee
- Conservation Advisory Commission

Since that time, Mayor Sierer has submitted a request to the Committee asking that the Memorial Day Parade Committee be the first committee evaluated. The reason for this request is that all committee members are serving on expired terms and terms are for one year, which begin in January. Prior to engaging current committee members in the reappointment process and recruiting new members to fill vacancies if necessary, Mayor Sierer would like the recommendations of the Committee to be forwarded to Council for their consideration so that any suggested changes may be considered.

Recommendations:

Staff recommends that the Boards and Commissions Review Committee consider and approve the request of Mayor Sierer to amend the review schedule to consider the Memorial Day Parade Committee first.

Thank you for your consideration and please contact me if you have any questions.

/rkb