



City of Goodyear

Meeting Minutes

City Council Work Session

Mayor Georgia Lord

Vice Mayor Bill Stipp

Councilmember Joe Pizzillo

Councilmember Sheri Lauritano

Councilmember Wally Campbell

Councilmember Brannon Hampton

Councilmember Laura Kaino

Goodyear Municipal Court
and Council Chambers
14455 W. Van Buren St.,
Suite B101
Goodyear, AZ 85338

Monday, September 28, 2020

Goodyear Municipal Court and Council
Chambers

Immediately following the Regular Meeting which begins at 6:00 p.m.

While the Goodyear City Council meetings are open to the public, the occupancy has been reduced to implement social distancing. Seating is generally available on a first come basis.

Face Masks are required and must be worn when moving throughout the building.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Lord called the Work Session to order at 7:49 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Mayor Lord, Vice Mayor Bill Stipp, Councilmember Pizzillo, Councilmember Lauritano, Councilmember Campbell, Councilmember Hampton, and Councilmember Kaino

Staff Present: City Manager Julie Arendall, City Attorney Roric Massey and City Clerk Darcie McCracken

AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. [2020-7074ws](#) City Council will receive an update and provide direction on the development of the evaluation process work of the Judicial Advisory Committee. (Lyman Locket, Human Resources Director)

Human Resources Director Lyman Locket appeared before Council to receive clarification on the evaluation process for the Presiding Judge. Mr. Locket wanted to ensure that the Judicial Advisory Committee was aligned with delivering the Council's needs based on their feedback in relation to the process.

Mr. Locket provided background information on how the Committee was formed and established

beginning in January 2019. He explained the Committee's purpose is assisting Council in the process of judge appointments, reappointments, development of performance review criteria, conducting performance review surveys, and providing performance review feedback. Mr. Locket added that the Committee consisted of two Presiding Judges, two Arizona Bar Association members, three citizen members, and the Presiding Judge, as a non-voting member on all aspects of the evaluation process.

Mr. Locket stated that the primary focus was to receive Council's feedback on the aspects of the evaluation process for the Presiding Judge which was to occur in January 2021. He provided details on the components of the judicial evaluation process which would begin in November. These components included a Presiding Judge self-evaluation, courtroom observation, and surveys.

Council provided some feedback on their experience with judicial surveys and stated they did not believe the Police Department should be rating the Judge in a survey because it could be a possible conflict of interest.

Council thanked the Vice Mayor for his research on possible questions to include in the survey and for the feedback on the evaluation process.

Council stated they were confident in the Committee that was formed because there were attorneys and sitting judges on the Committee who were familiar with how a judge is supposed to perform. Council added they were looking forward to the Committee's evaluation before Council made any recommendations.

Council commented they were more interested in a narrative or summation approach rather than having to fill out a form because they did not have firsthand observation on the Judge's performance.

Council asked how the courtroom observation would be conducted. Mr. Locket replied that it would be a combination of both in person courtroom observation and reviewing recordings from inside the courtroom.

City Manager Julie Arendall clarified that there was three options for evaluation that could be considered such as creating a form with a series of questions, asking the Judge to provide a narrative, or allowing the Committee to conduct their evaluation and provide recommendations to Council.

Council asked why an in depth evaluation was conducted only for the Judge and not conducted on any other charter member such as the City Manager or City Attorney. Mr. Locket stated an evaluation of the Presiding Judge was a typical process for judges.

Council discussed the various options and formats for evaluating the Presiding Judge.

Mr. Locket summarized the Council's direction stating that Council desired to have the Committee provide to Council information and a recommendation on the Presiding Judge's evaluation. Council

would also like to evaluate the managerial side of the Court's operations and that could be conducted through an evaluation form for an ultimate decision to be made.

Council asked to have the evaluation form that was developed, shared with them before it was finalized so that they may provide any feedback as needed.

INFORMATION ITEMS

There were no information items.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Mayor Lord adjourned the Work Session at 8:39 p.m.

Darcie McCracken, City Clerk

Georgia Lord, Mayor

Date: _____