MINUTES

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

Present:
Natalie Dillon, Child Support Services; Brody Lorda, Human Resources; Kevin Martyn, Agriculture & Standards Inspector; Tracie Olson, Public Defender; Diane Parro, Board of Supervisors; Aundrea Garvin, Child Support Services; Svitlana Shramenko, Mental Health Services; Val Manning, Human Resources; Yovana Gojnic, Intern

Not present:
R.C. Smith, District Attorney; Amy Thurman, Public Health; John Young, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights & Measures; Tanya Provencher, Employment & Social Services; Jenna Jae Templeton, Clerk-Recorder-Assessor

Department Head Meeting report
- Tracie reported from the Department Head meeting in terms of how the employee survey results and evaluation progress were received. Since a lot of information was presented to them in a short period of time, not much feedback was not given. One Department Head asked whether a 360 survey would be included.
- Natalie said she will email each department their specific results from the employee survey before the end of the month.
- The group will ask for input from the Employee Council to ensure that everyone is on board with the changes made to the performance evaluation. Brody will share the updated evaluation with the Council.

Performance evaluations
- The group discussed the most recent changes to the performance evaluation and decided to:
    1. Use alpha scoring
    2. Move the employee signature space to the last one listed on the final page
    3. Change the phrase "Goals and Development Plan" to "Coaching Plan."
    4. Rewrite the "Note" section on the first page to clarify instructions for the evaluator.
    5. Change the term "rater signature" to "evaluator signature."
- Alpha scoring still allows for an overall score at the end, but this decision led to a deeper discussion of the future of the evaluation using the Infor system. Brody said that the long-term intent is to put the evaluation in Infor because of its functionality to assess job- specific competencies. Tracie asked if our project is premature, since Infor isn't set up yet, but Brody said that it is not because the competencies are needed as a baseline before the job specific functions are built into the system. Once Infor starts, the evaluation may need to change a bit,

but the system won't be completely ready for some time.

- Val brought up the placement of the employee signature, since it is best that they sign the evaluation last to ensure that they have seen all supervisor and manager comments. Natalie said that depending on the size of the department, procedures for signing the form may vary. Val said that the main issue is ensuring that the evaluation is not changed after the employee signs it, unless the employee is given a copy of the final evaluation to "close the loop." The group decided to place the employee signature line at the end.
- Val said that there is an instruction document for managers on how to complete the evaluation process. Natalie said that at the next meeting, the group will look over this document to update relative to the new evaluation form. Val added that this is an important process, since we are focused on encouraging employees to articulate their goals. In the past, if employees needed improvement, there was nothing in place for how to get there.
- The group discussed whether an employee that is rated "needs improvement" in a certain area is required to have a PIP detailing what they need to do to improve. The group agreed that employees should have specific things to work on, but since we are focused on developing a positive goal setting culture, maybe we find another name for "performance improvement plan." Val suggested that we rename it "Coaching Plan," which the group agreed with.
- The group discussed clarifying the "Note" section on the first page of the evaluation, which Tracie agreed to rewrite. Lana also suggested changing the term "rater signature" to "evaluator signature", which the group agreed upon.
- Natalie said Department Heads may provide more feedback when they have more time to look at the document. The revised draft will be sent to them again and they will be informed that a draft will be send to the Employee Council.

- *Action item: **Brody** will find the manager instruction document for evaluation procedures and bring to the next meeting.*

Supervisory & STAR Training programs
- Val explained the STAR program and distributed a handout showing the training topics offered, with asterisks next to the topics that should ideally be mandatory for supervisors. She said that in a perfect world, the training would completed within one week of intensive training, where participants can remain in the same cohort and finish with a final requirement to present a topic in front of the group.
- Tracie agreed that a week-long training would be ideal, but due to staffing constraints, it wouldn't be feasible for all departments. She asked if we could keep the same cohort, but have them go to a day or two of training spread out over a longer period of time. Natalie explained that she did this with a prior group, and the time between allowed them to do homework and practice the techniques they learned between sessions.
- The group discussed whether certain training courses, such as ethics, should be "mandatory." Val said that there needs to be sustained leadership buy-in to do this, and that the issue is not so much making courses mandatory, as marketing them as something employees should want to do. Natalie agreed that "mandatory" has a bit if a negative connotation and said that we need to discuss how to sell the value of what we build. Diane added that until managers and

supervisors support the training, employees won't go. Val agreed that the training needs to be supported from the top-down. She said that the training can be customized to department schedules and that training can be brought to employees, to make it more convenient.

- The group discussed whether through training, there is an opportunity for participants to earn course credits through UC Davis or the local community college. The main issue with UC Davis credit is the cost. The main issue with community college credit is that the trainers themselves need to be accredited, which is not always the case.
- The group discussed the training curriculum and how if it is made consistent, there can at least be a more diverse trainer base. This requires creating a standardized curriculum though and an investment to build quality trainers.
- Brody mentioned that she likes the San Mateo model that has specific training tracks to follow. Natalie said that she has a contact in Solano County that may have some curriculum to share with us.

Additional Meetings
Next Meeting: April 22, 1:30-3:00

Future agenda topics

- **Performance evaluation development**
- **Mentoring programs (DA & Health Services model)**
- **Manager instruction document for evaluations**
- **Website**