

Executive Summary:
Determine a ranking of the Alderman candidates in
terms of the better representative of the
Lethbridge community as a whole.

Completed by The Foundation for Democratic Political
Advancement, October 10, 2007

This determination is an outside perspective to give the residents and candidates of Lethbridge a different perspective on the Lethbridge Civic Election. The views in this Pilot Study are the views of the FDPA. Also, the Determination is an example of a different way to select candidates--through evaluation instead of voting.

The sixteen Alderman candidates:

Parker

Dodic

Tratch

Wickersham

Lacey

Ward

Carlson

Ferguson

Homan

Simmons

Hyggen

Connors

Hway

Layton

Madge

Graham

Basic Priorities of Lethbridge Community:

Leadership—identify issues and act on them, vision, strength to carry through, independent yet team player... fiscal soundness, accountability and communication with public

Resolve downtown issues—crime (including Galt Gardens and rest of Lethbridge), revitalization

Parking issue downtown and residential areas

Environment (sustainability of Lethbridge environment)

Methodology for Evaluation and Ranking:

Rank each candidate for each main section, and then rank overall based on a combination of all main sections.

Evaluation based on reasons themselves (from and/or about the candidates) in each main section and the reasons' comparative evaluation based on the established basic priorities of Lethbridge Community.

The main sections are (1) Background, (2) Policy, (3) Vision, (4) Character (demonstrated leadership), and (5) Time Available.

Information sources:

Public Forum on October 3—on basic priorities of Lethbridge Community

Media Forum on October 4—all candidates answered questions from media; met candidates

Seven questions answered by candidates via email (provide questions with answers) and follow-up questions

Policy and background information on candidates

News articles etc., on candidates

15 out of the 16 Alderman candidates participated in this Determination. Candidate Madge did not, even though she was approached three times. The FDPA through investigative research was able to get the necessary information about Candidate Madge to include her in the Pilot Study.

Evaluation by Stephen Garvey, CEO of the FDPA, and in consultation with members of the FDPA.

Evaluation of Alderman Candidates

1. Background of Candidates (financial management, experience representing, education formal and informal, professional experience)

Evaluation:

Evaluation in alphabetical order, and based on comparative evaluation of two candidates at a time.

Evaluation notes:

Parker best overall background (ahead of Dodic due to extensive volunteer and committee experience).

Dodic very well educated, municipal law experience, and political experience.

Tratch well educated, extensive political experience, and less relevant professional experience than Dodic.

Wickersham stronger background than Lacey due to professional experience (leadership role) and business experience.

Lacey strong political experience, well educated and strong professional experience.

Ward less volunteer than Lacey.

Ferguson strong experience in accounts receivable and housing.

Homan educator and studied and taught political and economic theory; less relevant experience than Ferguson.

Simmons less relevant experience than Ferguson.

Hyggen less formal education than Simmons.

Connors only strong volunteer experience.

Layton volunteer experience and active politically in non-representative role.

Madge some volunteer/committee experience.

Graham only long-term resident of Lethbridge.

* Note, based on the October 10th presentation of ranking results, Lacey has stronger volunteer and committee experience than she answered in the questionnaire. If her full volunteer experience and committee work were included, she would have likely improved in the ranking below by 3 to 5 positions, but her overall ranking would have not changed significantly.

Ranking for Background:

1. Parker
 2. Dodic
 3. Tratch
 4. Wickersham
 5. Lacey
 6. Ward
 7. Carlson
 8. Ferguson
 9. Homan
 10. Simmons
 11. Hyggen
 12. Conners
 13. Hway
 14. Layton
 15. Madge
 16. Graham
-

2. Policy of Candidates:

Evaluation:

Evaluation based on alphabetical order and comparative evaluation of two candidates at a time.

Notes:

Parker best overall--though needs to be cautious of Master Plan--too much focus on downtown core versus other areas, and financial costs of the Master Plan. Also, lacks environmental element.

Carlson strong commitment to making Lethbridge greener and actual, specific policies. Also, pragmatic view of Master Plan.

Connors emphasis on accountability of Council.

Dodic less pragmatic on Master Plan than Carlson; emphasis on balance--infrastructure and enjoyment.

Ferguson pragmatic view of Master Plan, good vision, lacks green element.

Graham pragmatic view of Master Plan. Emphasis on environment. Good overall policies.

Homan inclusion of all groups; less pragmatic on Master Plan than Graham ect.,

Hway less specific, less policies.

Hyggen less specific than Ferguson.

Lacey less specific, less policies.

Layton less broad in policies than Connors; no comment on Master Plan.

Ranking of Candidates' Policies:

1. Parker
 2. Carlson
 3. Graham
 4. Ferguson
 5. Hyggen
 6. Simmons
 7. Ward
 8. Tratch
 9. Wickersham
 10. Madge
 11. Dodic
 12. Homan
 13. Conners
 14. Layton
 15. Hway
 16. Lacey
-

3. Vision of Candidates:

Evaluation:

Evaluation based on alphabetical order and comparative evaluation of two candidates at a time.

Notes:

Carlson specific vision, include all citizens, environmental focus.

Conners limited, not specific.

Dodic good idea, not specific, not as broad as Carlson's vision.

Ferguson more specific than Conner's vision.

Graham less specific, clear than Dodic's.

Homan less idea of vision than Dodic's.

Hway less specific than Carlson's.

Hyggen specific, visionary idea "needs versus wants."

Lacey unique, distinct city--limited idea.

Parker best overall.

Tratch lacks environmental focus.

Simmons broader than Hyggen.

Layton less broad and specific than Simmons.

Ranking of Candidates' Vision:

1. Parker
 2. Carlson
 3. Wickersham
 4. Dodic
 5. Tratch
 6. Simmons
 7. Graham
 8. Layton
 9. Hyggen
 10. Madge
 11. Homan
 12. Ward
 13. Hway
 14. Ferguson
 15. Conners
 16. Lacey
-

4. Character of Candidates (demonstrated leadership):

Evaluation:

Evaluation based on alphabetical order and comparative evaluation of two candidates at a time.

Emphasis on forward, innovative, practical thinking.

Ranking of Candidates' Character:

1. Parker
 2. Carlson
 3. Ferguson
 4. Graham
 5. Hyggen
 6. Simmons
 7. Layton
 8. Tratch
 9. Wickersham
 10. Homan
 11. Ward
 12. Dodic
 13. Hway
 14. Madge
 15. Conners
 16. Lacey
-

5. Time Available for Alderman Position

Evaluation:

Almost all candidates expressed ability to meet time needs of the Alderman position.

Ranking:

Put all candidates at the same ranking. Therefore, the main section is removed from the evaluation process.

Comparative Evaluation

Combine ranking in each main section "background, policy, vision, character (demonstrated leadership)" and total (giving equal weight to each main section.)

Lowest scores determine highest ranking.

In the case of candidates having the same total, policy totals of candidates are compared. Candidate with higher policy ranking, gets higher overall ranking

	Background	Policy	Vision	Character	Total
Carlson:	7	2	2	2	13
Conners:	12	13	15	15	55
Dodic:	2	11	4	12	29
Ferguson:	8	4	14	3	29
Graham:	16	3	7	4	30
Homan:	9	12	11	10	42
Hway:	13	15	13	13	54
Hyggen:	11	5	9	5	30
Lacey:	5	16	16	16	53
Layton:	14	14	8	7	43
Madge:	15	10	10	14	49
Parker:	1	1	1	1	4
Simmons:	10	6	6	6	28
Tratch:	3	8	5	8	24
Ward:	6	7	12	11	36
Wickersham:	4	9	3	9	25

Overall Ranking:

- 1. Parker**
- 2. Carlson**
- 3. Tratch**
- 4. Wickersham**
- 5. Simmons**
- 6. Ferguson**
- 7. Dodic**
- 8. Graham**
9. Hyggen
10. Ward
11. Homan
12. Layton
13. Madge
14. Lacey
15. Hway
16. Conners

Analysis:

Parker and Carlson clearly the better representatives for the Lethbridge Community as a whole.

Top eight candidates determined represent a 50/50 cross section of incumbent and new candidates. (Tratch though not a Alderman incumbent, is a former three term Lethbridge School Trustee (including 3 years as Board Chair of the School District). Therefore, FDPA views him as an incumbent candidate.)

Simmons, Ferguson, Dodic, Graham, and Hyggen are all very close in terms of better representative.

The results of this evaluation, especially candidate pledges and policy statements, will be used to evaluate the incumbents at the next Lethbridge Civic Election.