
MINUTES

TALENT DEVELOPMENT WORKGROUP
MAY 27, 2015 1:30 PM TO 3:00 PM
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING – ROOM 106

Present:

Natalie Dillon, Child Support Services; Amy Dyer, Public Health; Jenna Jae Templeton, Clerk-Recorder-Assessor; Brody Lorda, Human Resources; Tracie Olson, Public Defender's Office; Tanya Provencher, Employment & Social Services; Suzanne Ramalia, Sheriff's Department; R.C. Smith, District Attorney's Office; John Young, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights & Measures; Kevin Martyn, Agriculture & Standards Inspector; Ginger Hashimoto, Intern

Not present:

Aundrea Garvin, Child Support Services; Val Manning, Human Resources; Diane Parro, Board of Supervisors; Svitlana Shramenko, Mental Health Services

Introduction of new members

- The group introduced themselves and welcomed two new workgroup members: Suzanne Ramalia, an Operations Technician for the Sheriff's Department and Ginger Hashimoto, an Extra Help Intern.
- Natalie announced that the County's new Human Resources Director, Stacey Peterson will join the workgroup in June. Stacey previously served as the Chief People Officer for the city of Rancho Cordova. Mary Khoshmashrab from the Auditor's Office as well as Gina Rowland from Health and Human Services will also join the workgroup within the next few months.

Performance evaluation form and manager instruction document for evaluations

- Natalie asked the group to share their thoughts on the *Wall Street Journal* article and video that she sent out.
- Amy agreed with the article and video. She expressed concern about the punitive nature of the County's current evaluation process. She favors restructuring the process to be more of a strengths-based narrative.
- Tracie agreed; however, she expressed concern in building a compelling case against substandard employees who managers may eventually need to terminate.
- As a potential solution, Brody suggested that the general evaluation become more of a strengths-based narrative. When necessary, managers could use a second, more quantitative-based performance/coaching plan to better document poor performance for substandard employees.
- R.C. commented by saying that if a department has a substandard employee, the manager has already lost by waiting for the one year evaluation to document the employee's deficiencies. He challenged the group to think about who the evaluation is for, the individual or the

organization.

- Natalie passed out copies of the revised evaluation template according to recommendations from the Auditor's Office. The new template uses the rating scale of "A" for above the line; "B" for below the line; and "O" for outstanding.
- John expressed concern about the A, B, and O scale. He asked how managers would rate employees who were "at the line" versus "above" or "below." He also underscored the importance of ensuring compliance with Infor even though the County does not plan to implement the system for another few months.
- The group ultimately agreed that Natalie and Brody would discuss whether to recommend a paradigm shift toward a more narrative performance evaluation with Stacey.

Mentoring programs

- DA's Office
 - R.C. passed out documents about the DA's Office mentoring program. He explained that through his research he determined that it was important to make the mentoring program voluntary. Other best practices included establishing good pairings by having a thorough intake form as well as maintaining confidentiality. While initial feedback is positive, R.C. cautioned that the program is still in its early stages. He plans to send out an email seeking more feedback from colleagues participating in the program.
 - Tracie asked how the program differs from the natural office relationships that form.
 - R.C. answered that the program gives people a formal and structured framework to view what mentorship could or should be. In many ways, the program provides an outlet for people to seek out a mentor or participate as a mentee who may have not done so otherwise.
 - R.C. also shared that he saved several mentoring videos related to public service in the workgroup's I drive folder.
- Health Services Model
 - Brody talked about the Health Services mentorship program. Unlike the DA's Office, the Health Services model is geared more toward new supervisors and is cross-disciplinary in terms of departments and agencies. The program intake process includes a Myers-Briggs personality test to help determine good matches. Brody mentioned that she saved more information about the program in the workgroup's I drive folder. In addition, Brody shared two books that the County could provide mentors and mentees to help guide the process: Seven Keys to Successful Mentoring and The Mentee's Guide.
- Overall, Natalie favored exploring mentorship programs further especially given the survey results. Natalie suggested that a two-pronged mentoring program might be a good model. Similar to the DA's Office, the first prong could be department or agency specific, while the second prong could be countywide. This may not only promote collaboration and interagency partnership, but also help employees who may want to explore a career shift.
- Natalie asked the workgroup their thoughts on the CSAC Best Practices video featuring Stanislaus County's employee mentor program. Everyone liked the idea as a long-term goal, but questioned whether it was outside the primary charge of the workgroup. Tracie stated there are several ways to give back to the community that already exist particularly within

probation and the library. Tracie also mentioned Yolaborate as something to research further. R.C. suggested that we could create some kind of volunteer opportunities clearinghouse on the County's intranet.

- *Action item: **Natalie** to send to Suzanne the link to CSAC video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vt5CoFuMt6Y&feature=youtu.be>, and other recent materials.*
- *Action item: **Tracie** to research more about Yolaborate and report back at the group's next meeting.*
- *Action item: **Ginger** will rework the DA's Office and Health Services models to be more generic for potential use countywide.*

Website (cost estimate for build-out)

- Natalie reported that she spoke to the County's IT Department about replicating San Mateo's Human Resources webpages. The Department estimated it would cost approximately \$800 to build out the pages using the County's existing intranet as long as Ginger can develop and post the content.
- The group agreed that this would be the most cost effective approach.
- *Action item: **Natalie** will continue working with the IT Department and Patrick to coordinate the logistics of the website build-out.*

HR Shorts

- Natalie asked the group about the articles that Val had created called "HR Shorts". The group liked the name "HR Shorts" and thought the articles would be a helpful resource.

Future Discussion

- Natalie expressed her concern about the amount of time it has taken the committee to accomplish tasks. In order to make the workflow more efficient, she recommended that the workgroup appoint one point person per subject area. The group agreed as long as the members maintain reasonable expectations about the amount of work the group accomplishes. R.C. volunteered to lead mentoring. John volunteered himself and Kevin to research website content. Natalie and Brody volunteered to talk to Stacey about performance evaluations.

Additional Meetings

Next Meeting: June 24, 2015 1:30-3 p.m., County Administration Building, Room 106

Future agenda topics

- **Performance evaluation next steps**
- **Mentoring program model progress**
- **Website research update**