
MINUTES

TALENT DEVELOPMENT WORKGROUP
FEBRUARY 25, 2015 1:30 PM TO 3:00 PM
CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES ~ 100 W. COURT STREET

Present:

Natalie Dillon, Child Support Services; R.C. Smith, District Attorney; Brody Lorda, Human Resources; Amy Thurman, Public Health; John Young, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights & Measures; Jenna Jae Templeton, Clerk-Recorder-Assessor; Yovana Gojnic, Intern

Not present:

Aundrea Garvin, Child Support Services; Svitlana Shramenko, Mental Health Services; Mashan Wolfe, Sheriff; Kevin Martyn, Agriculture & Standards Inspector; Tracie Olson, Public Defender; Diane Parro, Board of Supervisors; Tanya Provencher, Employment & Social Services; Val Manning, Human Resources

San Mateo County Talent Management Initiatives

- Natalie shared San Mateo County's online portal where they house all of their employee training information. The group discussed how we might create something similar to San Mateo's Collaborative Performance Management System. John suggested that we reach out to San Mateo County to talk to them about how they got to this point and whether it was uniquely developed. With a good framework, we can make our model specific to Yolo County's needs. Natalie suggested that Yovana contact Donna Vaillancourt with San Mateo County's HR department to gather some more information on this.
- Brody mentioned that we could potentially link our new employee talent development system to Inside Yolo. RC commented that it might be useful to reach out to Yolo County IT staff to determine the feasibility of this. John said that because of the workload of IT staff, it might be easier to hire someone from the outside to set up the initial framework.
- *Action items: Yovana will contact Donna Vaillancourt, Human Resources Director with San Mateo County and inquire about their employee training framework. Natalie will contact County IT to determine whether Inside Yolo could be used to develop a similar solution.*

Performance evaluations

- Yovana distributed copies of some sample template ideas for the performance evaluation. The samples of the County-wide performance evaluation included a model that had a numeric rating scale (1-4) and another with word rating scale (I-O).
- Brody said some of the County MOUs require an overall rating.

- The group discussed the wording of rating categories. RC said that he doesn't like the word "satisfactory," since it sounds condescending. The group agreed to change the word "satisfactory" to another term.
- The format of the evaluation is still very long, which Natalie anticipated that other supervisors/managers probably wouldn't like. Jenna said that it is very thorough, but somehow we should balance thoroughness with length and suggested making the form double-sided. RC said that some categories can join into one and that there is no need to ask for conclusions and recommendations after each section.
- The group discussed the competencies that we are using and that some of them are more geared toward supervisors and managers, rather than all employees. RC said that it would be unfair to rate line employees on certain things. The group agreed that we should determine the core competencies that apply to all employees rather than just a specific group of employees.
- The group discussed automating the evaluation so that each department can choose from a drop down menu of additional competencies other than the core ones to add to the rating scale. There could be some problems with this option though, as many employees might wonder why they there score in an optional competency cannot count toward their overall rating score. John mentioned that we should be careful in crafting the new evaluation to protect from any legal repercussions. If optional competencies are selected within departments, they should probably only be used for added feedback rather than to be rated on. Brody will look up the MOU versus code requirements.
- The group also discussed the use of an employee self-evaluation. Amy said that she used the San Mateo self-review model in her department and that it worked well. Since employees were able to select from a list of competencies, it helped them to be able to frame what they felt their strengths were. From their responses, it was easier for Amy to go back and use their words to write up their evaluations.
- Yovana also distributed sample copies of 30/60/90 day evaluations from various sources. The group agreed that the model from Lake Superior State University is the most fitting for our purposes, since all of the categories are good and managers can add comments with no need to use a rating scale. The group agreed that a qualitative evaluation would be best for new employees. Jenna said that this model is informative for managers and more empowering for employees for what they can work toward.
- *Action item: **Brody** will look up what is required for the MOU and what is required per code. **Yovana** will edit the County-wide performance evaluation model and the 30/60/90 model.*

Mentoring Programs

- RC shared the DA mentoring model. He said that the framework of the program is from the San Diego Harbor Police Department. RC said that the mentoring program is for tenured and new employees alike. The program matches people that would like to mentor in a certain area with people that would like to be mentored in a similar area, to create a good fit between the two. RC said that in their program, there are currently nine mentoring

relationships and that the program is going well. The current struggle is how to create mentoring connections outside of the department.

Additional Meetings

Next Meeting: March 25, 1:30-3:00

Future agenda topics

- **Performance evaluation development**