State Forester 360 Degree Evaluation for 2006

Instructions: For each question below, please circle a number on the scale that represents your perception of the State Forester's performance for 2006. If you feel you have inadequate knowledge of a particular question in order to answer it, please circle the X at the end of the scale, indicating "Cannot Evaluate."

1. How successfully did the State Forester meet the Board of Forestry's mission and objectives?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Unsuccessful						Very Successful	Cannot Evaluate

2. As Secretary to the Board of Forestry, how effectively did the State Forester set up agendas and follow up to assure action was taken on Board decisions?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Ineffective						Highly Effective	Cannot Evaluate

3. How effectively did the State Forester assure appropriate and responsible planning and administration to ODF's five major forestry programs and four major administrative services programs?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Ineffective						Highly Effective	Cannot Evaluate

4. Did the State Forester appropriately set organization priorities by listening to and evaluating the needs of forest landowners and the general public?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Inappropriately						Highly Appropriately	Cannot Evaluate

5. How efficiently and effectively did the State Forester oversee the department's budget, including requests for additional resources?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Inefficient/ Ineffective						Very Efficient/ Effective	Cannot Evaluate

6. Were agency services provided in an excellent manner to land owners, legislators, interest groups, and the Governor's Executive Staff?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Inadequate Service						Excellent Service	Cannot Evaluate

7. Is the implementation and monitoring of the Forestry Program for Oregon on track?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Off Schedule						On Track	Cannot Evaluate

8. Did the State Forester effectively evaluate and modify Board and agency business practices to seek continuous improvement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Inadequate Evaluation and Action						Effective Evaluation and Action	Cannot Evaluate

9. Were sound business ethics applied in the planning, implementation and monitoring of Board and agency activities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Unethical						Highly Ethical	Cannot Evaluate

10. Was adequate time spent by the State Forester on relationship building and strategic planning?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Inadequate Time Spent						Substantial Time Spent	Cannot Evaluate

11. How well were partnerships developed within and external to the agency?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Not Very Well						Very Well	Cannot Evaluate

12. Did the State Forester adequately listen to opinions, feelings, beliefs and ideas?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Did Not Listen						Listened Very Well	Cannot Evaluate

13. Was information shared in a timely, efficient and effective manner by the State Forester?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Not Shared						Very Effective	Cannot Evaluate

14. Was flexibility demonstrated in meeting the needs of the Board and agency stakeholders and customers?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Inflexible						Highly Flexible	Cannot Evaluate

15. How effectively were controversial issues collaboratively resolved both internally and with external groups and individuals?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	X
Unresolved						Sustainable Resolutions	Cannot Evaluate

16. In the three spaces below, in concise bulleted statements, please list the strengths of the State Forester's performance during 2006.
    -
    -
    -

17. In the three spaces below, please list suggested areas of improvement in the State Forester's performance.
    -
    -
    -

18. Any other comments regarding the State Forester's Performance during 2006?
    -
    -
    -