



EXECUTIVE APPOINTEE

SCORING RUBRIC

While DC Council is responsible for enacting legislation and approving the annual budget, their policy decisions must be upheld by those who are in charge of implementing our budget.

Executive agencies are responsible for the implementation of DC's budget, but many residents may not realize that several of the positions that hold this power **are appointed by the Mayor**.

Though DC's new Mayor will not be inaugurated until January 2027, the winners of this year's primaries will soon begin, if they have not already, looking at their options to fill their cabinet.

Our Coalition members collectively possess the depth and breadth of knowledge of the landscape, as well as a wealth of shared experience of working with current agency heads. We are able to provide solid and actionable guidance around what makes **quality and accountable appointed officials**.

Our hope is that our next mayor is able to use this rubric to assess their potential appointees against our seven areas of criteria to ensure that our future agency heads have the skill, experience, and willingness to stand up in defense of our local decision-making and **DC's autonomy itself**.

Potential appointees can receive up to **50 points**. We recommend only moving forward with candidates that score more than a minimum of **40 points**.

DESCRIPTION OF CRITERIA	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS ACTUAL
CRITERIA 1: History of local engagement	8	
Do they engage folks who are grassroots and impacted?	2	
Do they have support from the grassroots and impacted folks they have engaged?	2	
Do they have a wide variety of relationships that give them insight and ability to do this work; i.e. community and government relationships?	2	
Do they have a pre-existing network that allows them to hop into the work meaningfully?	2	
Do they have at least 3-4 years of this kind of engagement with local DC?	2	
CRITERIA 2: Commitment to meaningful engagement with communities of impact	7	
Can they exemplify how their relationship with community has shaped their body of and approach to work?	2	
Do they have relationships with impacted workers and community members, and can demonstrate being led by and accountable to them?	2	
Can they articulate a commitment to including lived experience experts on decision making boards, committees, decision making or evaluation bodies?	1	
Quantifier: Do they have the requisite experience being accountable to impacted community/communities of impact in meaningful ways? Deputy Mayors: 10-15 years, Agency Directors: 7-10 years, Senior staff in EOM/ Agencies: 5-7, Boards and Commissions: 3-5 years.	2	
CRITERIA 3: Commitment to implementing change-management initiatives	7	
Have they implemented evaluation processes that include structured community feedback loops and clear impact measures?	2	
Can the appointee build change strategy toward innovation? Are they able to get folks to do things differently? Can they ID skill gaps and create agency development plans?	1	
Can they create meaningful assessments of their agency and pivot for change?	1	
Do they have demonstrated experience that actually results in agencies responding to staff voice	2	
Do they have a history of steering an organization or agency through structural change or transformation?	1	
CRITERIA 4: On-the-ground experience in the specific issue area of appointment	7	
Have they worked on the specific issues they would be in charge of in this appointment as part of the public or non-profit sector?	2	
Has their work included both policy work and work with directly affected populations?	1	
Can folks in the landscape attest to the work? Can they give at least three references that can corroborate their experience in doing this work?	1	
Have they worked in this issue area for at least: 10-15 years for Deputy Mayors: 7-10 years for Agency Directors, 5-7 years for Senior staff in EOM/ Agencies and 3-5 years for Boards and Commissions.	2	
CRITERIA 5: Vision for modernizing the agency, department, or office	6.5	
Have they used technology to increase efficiency internally in government or another large organization?	0.5	
Are they open to bringing technology use in-house to increase efficiency and save on contractual costs?	1	
Are they committed to tech that serves the community, while resisting corporate influence?	1	
Is the vision for the agency one that makes it more responsive to communities? Does the vision prioritize and protect the relational aspects of work with participants/clients and meeting their needs?	1	
Are they committed to transparency, public access and protection of whistleblowers?	1	
Time-Criteria: Deputy Mayors: 10-15 years Agency Directors: 7-10 years Senior staff in EOM/ Agencies: 5-7 Boards and Commissions: 3-5 years	2	
CRITERIA 6: Lateral and Vertical Management Experience	6.5	
Have they moved a multi-stakeholder group toward a shared goal effectively?	1	
Have they led in resolving conflict?	1	
Does their experience show that they retain and grow their people?	1	
Have they held superiors accountable? Do they only defer to leadership, or can they advocate for their agency and mission?	1	
Do they have a history of both providing staff members sufficient support, promoting their wellbeing and holding staff accountable when necessary?	1	
Are there 3 local folks who can attest to this work (a superior, a direct report, a peer)?	1.5	
CRITERIA 7: Are their values aligned with FBC?	8	
Do they have a history of prioritizing racial justice in their work and is committed to anti-racism	4	
Do they have a history of prioritizing systemic work to address social, racial and economic inequality	3	
Are they able to build a team that represents different perspectives, expertise types, talent sets, social including folks with visible and hidden disabilities? Can they articulate a theory of diversity for the sake of best serving community needs?	1	
	TOTAL AVAILABLE	TOTAL ACTUAL
	50	