
MINUTES

TALENT DEVELOPMENT WORKGROUP
DECEMBER 1, 2014 10:00AM TO 12:00 PM
CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES ~ 100 W. COURT STREET

Present:

Natalie Dillon, Child Support Services; R.C. Smith, District Attorney; Brody Lorda, Human Resources; Kevin Martyn, Agriculture & Standards Inspector; Tracie Olson, Public Defender; Amy Thurman, Public Health; Svitlana Shramenko, Mental Health Services and Yovana Gojnic, Intern

Not present:

John Young, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights & Measures; Diane Parro, Board of Supervisors; Aundrea Garvin, Child Support Services, Mashan Wolfe, Sherriff

Leadership's role in talent development efforts

- Natalie gave a brief overview of a November 12 Department Head/Assistant Dept Head meeting with Frank Benest where Talent Development was discussed. The primary theme was the importance of leadership taking an active role in talent development and committing to it as a top priority. According to Frank Benest, talent development should be 70% on the job training, 20% mentoring, and 10% formal education. Overall, it is important that leadership models desired behaviors and shows commitment to the broader effort, so that it becomes a part of the County culture.

Discussion of survey results

- Brody distributed copies of the summary survey results and gave a brief overview of each question. A total of 463 employees took the survey, with the largest percentage in non-supervisory roles.
- The broader results seem to show a positive response to talent development, but the amount of feedback declined toward the end of the survey. This is possibly due to the length of the survey and confusion around the meaning of certain questions. Some of the most pertinent questions to talent development were towards the end and unfortunately a greater number of employees skipped them. Overall, the group was pleased at the strong response to the survey.
- The results of Q9 (encouraged to share new ideas and offer suggestions) seems to indicate a greater sense of morale and eagerness to share ideas.
- Some of the county versus department responses indicate that employees within departments work better together than county-wide.
- The group discussed how they would like the raw data broken up to provide the most insightful information for talent development purposes. The group determined that the data for each question should be analyzed by department and job role. So that department

names remain somewhat anonymous, they will be broken into band identifiers, based on FTE groups, and renamed.

- The group spent a good amount of time discussing our role in providing each department with the results specific to it. On one hand, it is not necessarily our role to address department-specific issues, and some department heads may not be open to receiving negative feedback. On the other hand, since the success of talent development depends on the buy-in of leadership, it is necessary that they are aware of department specific issues so that they can be addressed.
- The group also discussed how to go about organizing and interpreting all of the comments made by survey respondents. RC raised some concern with releasing any of the department specific comments, since we promised anonymity. He suggested possibly coming up with some sort of electronic venue where employees can post suggestions and choose whether or not they would like to be anonymous, so that our group does not have to go against any promise of anonymity.
- Kevin suggested compiling all of the department specific comments, but waiting until after further analysis to share with the Departments. The group agreed and decided to sift through the comments to screen for any inappropriate and irrelevant responses. Each group member will be assigned a couple of survey questions and provide a general summary for the next meeting, where we can decide how to merge the information into a standardized format. Natalie asked to please keep any controversial/Department specific information within the confines of the group.
- Lana asked if members of the group could each offer their general observations of how the survey turned out, since we spent a great deal of time creating it. She said that overall, it seems that we received a positive response. Brody, Natalie, and Kevin all agreed and said that hopefully the comments will provide us with further insight to understand exactly where people are. Kevin said that we seem to have enough information to get things going and Natalie offered that San Mateo's website offers a good template to follow in creating our own.
- *Action item: **Brody** will break down the departments into FTE groups and provide the information to Yovana. **Yovana** will conduct the data analysis for each question. **Brody** will designate a couple of survey questions with comments for **each group member** to summarize for the next meeting.*

Performance evaluation sample

- Yovana and the other intern Carolyn created two sample performance evaluation templates, based on the competencies chosen by the group. The format of one evaluation is based on San Mateo's current model, which is a much more concise format. The other is based on the template used by Yolo County's Public Defender's Office, but is longer totaling 12 pages. The group preferred the second version because although the length is longer, all of the competency expectations are well defined and employees get a clear idea of the level of performance they are being evaluated at. Tracie and RC said that this version takes more of the guess work out of the evaluation process.

- RC suggested adding the opportunity for all higher up signatories on the last page to offer comments.
- *Action item: Yovana will revise the preferred survey format, by eliminating some unnecessary elements and adding comment boxes to the last page. She will re-share edits with the group.*

Additional Meetings

December meeting is cancelled due to the holidays. Next Meeting: January 28, 1:30-3:30

Future agenda topics

- **Survey comments and data analysis results**
- **Performance evaluation development**