MINUTES

Present:

Mark Bryan, County Administrator's Office; Natalie Dillon, Child Support Services; Amy Dyer, Public Health; Brody Lorda, Human Resources; Stacey Peterson, Human Resources; Suzanne Ramalia, Sheriff's Department; Svitlana Shramenko, Mental Health Services; Ginger Hashimoto, Intern

Not present:

Aundrea Garvin, Child Support Services; Jenna Jae Templeton, Clerk-Recorder-Assessor; Kevin Martyn, Agriculture & Standards Inspector; Tracie Olson, Public Defender's Office; Tanya Provencher, Employment & Social Services; R.C. Smith, District Attorney's Office; John Young, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights & Measures

Introduction of new members

- The group introduced themselves and welcomed Stacey Peterson, the County's new Human Resources Director and Mark Bryan, the County's Financial Systems Manager as well as the County's Project Manager for Infor.

Infor status update

- Natalie invited Mark to discuss Infor and provide an update on the Talent Management module.
- Mark explained that the Payroll module is live and the Financial as well as Timekeeping modules are in development. Once complete, his team will focus on the Talent Management module. He anticipates an initiation date of September 1. While it is not clear how long the planning and implementation stage will last, early projections estimate that the module could go live by spring of 2016.
- Natalie asked Mark to clarify the process for determining the module's content and functionality. Mark explained that the County creates a steering committee for each module comprised of key managers, employees, and an Infor consultant. The committee provides input to the Infor consultant who ultimately builds out the module.
- Natalie reminded the group that Mark and Stacey are working to schedule a vendor-led demo. Natalie stated she would invite group members to participate in the demo as soon as it is scheduled.
- Stacey emphasized that the County should not feel obligated to use the Talent Management module if the system does not seem like an effective tool. She mentioned other performance and goal management software that the County could explore as alternative options.

Performance evaluation next steps
- Natalie suggested that the group hold off on further discussion about performance evaluations until after the Infor demo. Group members agreed.

Website build-out/content update
- John and Kevin were not in attendance.

Mentoring document review
- Ginger passed out a packet of draft documents that she repurposed from the District Attorney's Office mentor program. The documents included a program overview, an initial agreement form, a mentee questionnaire, and a mentor questionnaire.
- After reviewing the documents, Natalie asked the group members for feedback. The group liked the idea of offering the documents to department heads interested in launching a mentor program. The documents would serve as a baseline tool that could be customizable. Overall, the group favors the notion of creating and administering a mentor program, but the group needs to conduct more research. Several key parameters need to be determined including whether or not participation in the program includes paid time.

- *Action item: **Stacey** to review the mentoring documents from an HR standpoint and make recommendations for improvement.*
- *Action item: **Ginger** to research mentor program best practices to share with group members at the next meeting.*

Yolaborate
- Tracie was not in attendance.

Future Discussion
- Natalie reiterated that much of the group's future discussion depends on the Infor demo.

Additional Meetings
Next Meeting: Contingent upon Infor demo.

Future agenda topics

- **Infor update (Natalie)**
- **Performance evaluation next steps (Natalie)**
- **Mentor program research/document update (Stacey/Ginger)**
- **Website research update (John/Kevin)**