

# Meeting Minutes

## City Council Work Session

January 22, 2026 | 4:00 p.m.  
Council Chambers Conference Room  
88 E. Chicago St., Chandler, AZ



### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Kevin Hartke at 4:00 p.m.

### Roll Call

#### Council Attendance

Mayor Kevin Hartke  
Vice Mayor Christine Ellis  
Councilmember Angel Encinas  
Councilmember Jane Poston  
Councilmember Matt Orlando  
\*Councilmember OD Harris  
Councilmember Jennifer Hawkins

#### Appointee Attendance

John Pombier, City Manager  
Kelly Schwab, City Attorney  
Dana DeLong, City Clerk

\*Councilmember Harris arrived at 4:10 p.m.

#### Staff in Attendance

Tadd Wille, Assistant City Manager  
Dawn Lang, Deputy City Manager / Chief Financial Officer  
Ryan Peters, Deputy City Manager  
Leah Powell, Deputy City Manager  
Kristin Maier, Human Resources Director  
Jennifer Ekblad, City Clerk  
Alexis Apodaca, Mayor & Council Public Affairs Senior Manager  
Matt Burdick, Communications & Public Affairs Director  
Alicia Skupin, Presiding City Magistrate

### Discussion

1. Presentation and Discussion of Performance Evaluation Process for Appointed Officials

MAYOR HARTKE called for a staff presentation.

JOHN POMBIER, City Manager, introduced the discussion item.

KRISTIN MAIER, Human Resources Director, presented the following presentation.

- Appointed Performance Review Process
- Appointed Positions
  - City Manager
  - City Attorney
  - City Clerk
  - City Magistrate
- Chandler's Current Process
  - Individual meetings with City Council in executive session
  - No standard evaluation form
  - Meetings may be different for each appointed staff member
  - Inconsistent approach across positions
- Comparator Cities
  - Avondale, Mesa, Phoenix, Scottsdale, Queen Creek
  - No formal evaluation form
  - Council meets with employee in executive session
- Gilbert
  - 360-Degree evaluation by direct reports
  - Council review in executive session
- Goodyear, Tempe, Peoria
  - Forma; evaluation form
- Key Principals for Effective Evaluations
  - Six-month evaluations at onset, annually thereafter
  - Self-Assessment by appointee (accomplishments, challenges & needs)
  - Performance Goals & Objectives
  - Leadership & Management
  - Opportunity for Communication
- Option 1: Universal Evaluation
  - Singal Evaluation Form Used for All Appointed Employees
  - Narrative Format
  - 3-6 Evaluation Categories
  - Standardized Process Across All Positions
  - Goal Setting for Future
- Option 1: Universal Evaluation
  - Considerations
  - Advantages
    - Consistency
    - East to Administer

- Comparable Results
  - Challenges
    - May Not Capture Role-specific Responsibilities
    - Generic criteria may miss unique contributions
- Option 2: Role-Specific Evaluation
  - Tailored Evaluation for Each Unique Role and Responsibilities
  - Position-Specific Performance Categories
  - Criteria Relevant to Each Role
  - Open ended narrative format
- Option 2: Role-Specific Evaluation
- Category Examples
- City Manager
  - Policy Execution
  - Fiscal management
  - Strategic Planning
  - Organizational
  - Leadership
  - Community Relations
- City Attorney
  - Legal Advice Accuracy
  - Ordinance Drafting
  - Litigation Management
  - Risk Management
- City Clerk
  - Meeting Minutes
  - Election Management
  - Records Management
- City Magistrate
  - Courtroom Management
  - Customer Focus
  - Judicial Consistency
  - Legal Compliance
- Option 2: Role-Specific Evaluation
- Considerations
- Advantages
  - Captures Role Responsibilities
  - Relevant Performance Criteria
  - Meaningful Feedback
- Challenges
  - Increased time to Develop
  - Less Comparability across positions
  - Multiple Forms to Manager

- Process Support and Options

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS asked if Option 1 is chosen, who will document the evaluation.

MS. MAIER explained that Human Resources would work closely with Council to assist them in creating criteria and forms. The evaluation would be completed by each member of Council.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS noted the responsibility of Council to determine objectives and criteria. She asked if Option 2 would require each councilmember to write their own evaluation and come to a consensus for each appointed officer.

MS. MAIER agreed that, under the proposed Option 2, each Council member would complete an individual evaluation, which would be compiled by HR.

MAYOR HARTKE said if Council chooses to go this route, Council would each write their own comments but come to any consensus in an executive session. Despite differing opinions, Council would come to a consensus.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON said if Council is creating a public record, it needs to be done in a thoughtful and respectful way. She shared that the evaluation is for the purpose of setting goals, checking in, and supporting the appointed officers, instead of a punitive measure. She thought that it would be better to do role specific evaluations and suggested referring to the best practices of the professional organizations that these employees are a part of.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said evaluations for appointed officers were done previously in the 2000s. He asked about the current evaluation process for city employees.

MS. MAIER said the current evaluation system for employees is in place with a ranking 1-5 survey, but HR is moving away from that measurement as it is not best practice in the field.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO shared the current evaluation system measures the goals and objectives for employees, and said overall goals could be specific for each appointed officer. Allowing both Council and the employee to complete the same evaluation helps the city stay on target and come to a consensus.

MS. MAIER continued the presentation.

- Process Support from HR
  - Work with Council to establish evaluation criteria
  - Create online evaluation forms
  - Compile Councilmembers' individual evaluations
  - Summary of common themes without attribution
  - Individual & Final combined evaluations will become public record

- Key Decisions and Next Steps
  - Selection of Evaluation Format
  - Establish Evaluation Criteria/Categories
  - Determine Timeline
  - Development of evaluation forms
  - Establish evaluation timeline & process
  - Present final recommendations for Council approval
- Thank you!
- Questions

MAYOR HARTKE asked why some comparable cities do not have a formal evaluation form.

MS. MAIER said she did not know.

KELLY SCHWAB, City Attorney, explained that Scottsdale does not use a formal written evaluation form due to previous litigation involving release of executive session meeting materials, which was never appealed.

MR. POMBIER explained that in Mesa, individual meetings took place between each councilmember and each appointed officer to discuss goals and objectives, but no written documentation.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS emphasized that Council should always address merit and performance with appointed officers, and suggested the formula needs improvement to include merit. He noted he would like to see a simple evaluation form with yes or no questions with room for comments. He explained the quarterly meetings with appointed officers are an opportunity to discuss goals and accomplishments. The goals are set by Council in a retreat, that is collaborative and incorporated into the management of the city.

COUNCILMEMBER ELLIS explained that Council will have to put in work with each appointed officer to draft their evaluations. She asked whether peer evaluations would be conducted for appointed officers.

VICE MAYOR ENCINAS said he considers this another tool within the whole evaluation process for employees. He said he would like to see a simple version, including a grading scale to determine if goals and objectives were met. He asked if there were any examples from other municipalities that could be shared to see what their evaluation template looks like.

MS. MAIER said that information will be provided to Council.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS said she would like to see a hybrid of both options to keep it simple but demonstrate flexibility.

MAYOR HARTKE said there is consensus to proceed with a simple evaluation for appointed officers, Council will review other municipalities' templates and build something based off of that research.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if a public records request could be made to see an employee's evaluation.

MS. SCHWAB said yes.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO said the evaluation is public and able to be shared to demonstrate how an employee has met Council's goals.

MS. SCHWAB explained that another city's position on this in the past was that the evaluation was prepared for the purpose of being shared in an executive session, which was not open to the public.

COUNCILMEMBER ORLANDO asked if any employee's evaluation could be requested.

MS. SCHWAB said yes, evaluations can be provided with appropriate redactions.

MR. POMBIER explained that city employee evaluations will be revised to include four quarterly meetings with their supervisor where they discuss goals, objectives, and alignment with the city vision. The city is moving away from ranked scales to follow best practices in the industry where performance is measured with examples and to generate actionable follow up. Performance reviews will be conducted without disciplinary action. Disciplinary action would be considered separately.

MS. MAIER brought up that the city has a 360° evaluation tool that can be used, information about this will be shared with councilmembers.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if the evaluation process mentioned by City Manager would include department directors and deputy city managers.

MR. POMBIER said yes, this will apply to every non-appointed officer position. There will be a universal change to how evaluations are done to ensure employee development and alignment with Council goals.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS asked why individual councilmembers meet with appointed officers quarterly.

MAYOR HARTKE said it is more of an informal or intimate meeting with these employees.

COUNCILMEMBER HAWKINS suggested a quarterly meeting with all the councilmembers present for each appointed officer.

COUNCILMEMBER HARRIS said one-on-ones help build relationships with the appointed officers. He shared that sharing feedback with appointed officers is essential.

## Public Comment

None.

## Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

Approval Date of Minutes: February 5, 2026

## Certification

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Work Session of the City Council of Chandler, Arizona, held on the 22nd day of January 2026. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of February, 2026.

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk