



Richland County Council

EMPLOYEE EVALUATION OVERSIGHT AD HOC COMMITTEE

June 11, 2020 – 1:00 PM

Zoom Meeting

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chakisse Newton, Chair; Yvonne McBride, Paul Livingston, Joe Walker and Bill Malinowski

OTHERS PRESENT: Jim Manning, Michelle Onley, Leonardo Brown, Kimberly Williams-Roberts, Angela Weathersby, Brad Farrar and Ashley Powell

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Ms. Newton called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. May 5, 2020 – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Malinowski, Livingston, Walker and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

b. May 14, 2020 – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the minutes as distributed.

In Favor: Malinowski, Livingston, Walker and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

3. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** – Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to adopt the agenda as published.

In Favor: Livingston, Malinowski, Walker and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. Newton noted the 2 documents include in the agenda packet essentially contain the same information. The document dated June 9, has the list of the evaluation criteria; therefore, it is the one that she will reference during the meeting. She also noted there is a representative from Find Great People on the call, if anyone has questions.

4. **REVIEW OF EVALUATION PROCESS**

a. Evaluation Process for County Administrator – Ms. Newton stated Find Great People is proposing a two-phase process, when evaluating the Administrator. Considering that we have

to complete an evaluation by July, the thinking is that when we hired the Administrator, Council had already agreed on the characteristics and qualities they thought were important. It would be fair to base the evaluation on those qualifications and behaviors we identified in the interview process. Those qualities are: Leadership; Strategic Planning and Initiative; Council, Community and Media Engagement; Crisis Management; and Financial and Budget Oversight. For this evaluation process, Find Great People would work with us to create an instrument to get Council feedback. Each member would work with individually. We would have an opportunity to decide if we want to do this, and get Council member feedback by phone, in writing, or online. They would also speak with the Administrator to get his feedback, and then bring that back to us, so we could complete an evaluation. In Phase II, Find Great People would work with us to help us decide if there is different criteria or goals we want to establish for next year's evaluation. They would also identify and establish the criteria/goals, so the Administrator knows what they are, moving forward.

Ms. Dennis Chapman Hughes, Find Great People, reiterated that determining the performance program for Phase II would be approved by Council. There would be feedback and listening sessions with each Council member, to determine the goals, priorities, and opinions, so that an appropriate performance review/evaluation process can be established for Council to use for an extended period of time.

Mr. Malinowski stated, it was his understanding, Council approved utilizing this company for the first portion in an effort to conduct a timely appraisal of the Administrator near his one-year anniversary with County. He thought after that Council was going to consider opening this entire matter up for bids, based on qualifications and proposals. Not that this company would be automatically locked-in, and continue to move forward into next year.

Ms. Newton responded that is one of the things we discussed, and it is at Council's discretion. If you do not want to do Phase II, once the evaluation process is complete, but instead open this up for bids that is certainly Council's prerogative. The arrangement with Find Great People occurs on an hourly basis for things we request them to do for us.

Mr. Livingston inquired if Find Great People will develop questions, for an evaluation, around the identified areas.

Ms. Newton responded in the affirmative. She noted, starting on p. 18 of the agenda packet, they have broken out the characteristics, and the descriptions of those characteristics. They would come to us with an instrument, and we would decide if a certain number of us wanted to do that online versus a paper process, or by phone. They would ask us to evaluate based on each of these item. As we look at these characteristics, if we agree we definitely want to talk about Leadership and Strategic Planning, but there are some items on here we would like to take off, we can direct them to do that. The form would absolutely ask questions about these characteristics.

Mr. Livingston stated, rather than take some off, right now, he would rather be able to provide some feedback on the instrument before it is finalized.

Ms. Newton inquired if Mr. Livingston is asking how the instrument is going to be delivered.

Mr. Livingston responded he is asking about whether Council has questions (i.e. the way questions may be phrased).

Ms. Newton requested Ms. Hughes to address how the instrument would be developed, and how Council would review it.

Ms. Hughes responded the competencies, and the accountabilities in each area, were those that were identified through your recruitment phase. Her recommendation would be to continue with those consistently. When the Administrator was hired, these were the competencies, and accountability areas, he was expected to be held accountable for.

Mr. Livingston stated, for clarification, the instrument we complete will simply be a copy of these categories.

Ms. Hughes responded that is correct. You would rate the performance off of rating guidelines we would provide.

Ms. McBride stated, during the beginning stages, when we were developing the plan for the hiring of the Administrator, we had full involvement of the Council in every stage, so everyone had an opportunity to review those competencies.

Ms. Newton stated there was one item, Management of County Property, which was not put in the instrument. The item can be put back, but it did not seem as relevant as the other items.

Mr. Livingston inquired at what point, in the process, will; the Administrator be able to provide feedback.

Ms. Hughes responded there will be a self-evaluation of the past year of service.

Mr. Livingston inquired if there is a specific process used to get feedback from the Administrator.

Ms. Hughes responded the recommendation would a self-evaluation, whereas the Administrator would include accomplishments in each of the competency areas. Then, he would focus on strengths and what goals would be established for next year.

Ms. Newton inquired, from a timing perspective, we would accept these criteria. The Administrator would be asked to do his self-evaluation, and the results would be shared with Council prior to them doing their evaluations.

Ms. Hughes responded there would be one overall summary document for Council to review prior to it being provided to the employee.

Ms. McBride noted this is a normal process, and has been very effective. In addition, she requested clarification on the item that is not being placed in the criteria.

Ms. Newton stated there is a section that is on Property Management.

Ms. Hughes responded the item is entitled "Property and Equipment".

Ms. McBride stated that is the overall scope of the County, in terms of how the County manages property and equipment. That is not individual facilities, which is why it was a part of the job criteria.

Ms. Newton stated it can be included as an evaluation criteria. It did not have some of the same similarity with some of the other broad characteristics we were looking at.

Ms. McBride stated if we want to wait and carry that over into the next evaluation that is fine, but it is something that Council recommended, when we were doing the search for the Administrator.

Ms. Newton stated the criteria says, responsible for the care, custody and proper use of all County properties delegated by Council control, assures that provisions of all franchises...are fully observed, evaluates equipment needs of County departments, manages capital improvement programs, and partners with department heads to understand personnel.

Ms. Hughes stated, not being involved in the conversation to remove the criteria, she believes if it is an important piece of what Council have deemed important for the Administrator, then it may be worthwhile to leave in, as a competency.

Ms. McBride stated it is an important part of the competency, but she is not sure, given the situation Mr. Brown came in under, that it is appropriate to evaluate him on, at this time.

Ms. Newton suggested including Talent and Team Development, which was not included in the proposed competencies.

Ms. McBride noted she believes we should follow everything listed under the competencies in the hiring of the Administrator.

Ms. Newton suggested including the five (5) characteristics listed in the proposal. In addition, to add Property and Equipment Management and Talent and Team Development to the list of characteristics.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Livingston, to include the following characteristics in the evaluation process: Leadership; Strategic Planning and Initiative; Council, Community and Media Engagement; Crisis Management; Financial and Budget Oversight; Property and Equipment Management; and Talent and Team Development.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Walker and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

- b. Job Description Development and Evaluation Process for other Council Direct Reports – Ms. Newton referred to Mr. Malinowski's previous comment that we do not have to move forward with having Find Great People develop Mr. Brown's subsequent evaluation. However, one of the items we discussed at our previous meeting was updating the job descriptions for the County Attorney and Clerk to Council. If the Internal Auditor Committee so desired, or if they delegated it to this body, to develop a job description.

Ms. Hughes stated we would need speak to those individuals to develop job descriptions. They would then draft job description documents for review by both the employee and Council to ensure accuracy. Once edits have been made, the document would be provided for final review and approval to both the employee and Council.

Ms. McBride stated some of the job descriptions have mandates, based on law, so we need to follow those mandates. In addition, we need to look at the type of job and explore recommendations from the consultant.

Ms. Newton stated her understanding, based on the size of Find Great People's team, is that the job description process could move concurrently, as we are working on the evaluation process for the Administrator.

Ms. Hughes responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to adopt the process for creation of job descriptions.

Mr. Malinowski noted we just mentioned that we were going to determine if we were going to move forward with anything other than the Administrator's evaluation, and anything else would be left up to full Council.

Ms. McBride responded that was not her understanding of the committee's charge. She thought the committee was charged with employee evaluation, giving priority to the evaluation of the Administrator.

Mr. Malinowski stated the issue he sees is, in the past, there have been consultants hired to assist Council with employee evaluations. Whether those evaluation forms are available or not, he does not know. He is not certain we can move forward with something like this without some type of Procurement offer being made to allow everyone the opportunity. His recollection is that we were told because we had contracted with this company previously, we could have them work with us on an immediate need. Beyond that immediate need, we are going into areas that everyone should have the opportunity to tell us what they can provide.

Mr. Livingston inquired if this would be moving us into Phase II.

Ms. Newton responded it is listed as Phase II in the document. She noted the scope of work we approved includes job descriptions and subsequent evaluations, if we decide to go that route. Her understanding was that we were going to proceed with the job descriptions. The only remaining question was what we may want to do for year two evaluations.

In Favor: Livingston, McBride, Walker and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski

The vote was in favor.

5. **CONTRACTUAL MATTER**

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Mr. Walker, to go into Executive Session.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Walker and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

***The Committee went into Executive Session at approximately 1:52 PM
and came out at approximately 2:03 PM***

Mr. Livingston moved, seconded by Ms. McBride, to come out of Executive Session.

In Favor: Malinowski, McBride, Livingston, Walker and Newton

The vote in favor was unanimous.

Ms. McBride moved, seconded by Ms. Newton, to accept the discussion from Executive Session.

Mr. Malinowski requested clarification on the motion.

Ms. McBride responded the motion is to forward the recommendation, as discussed in Executive Session, to full Council.

In Favor: McBride, Walker and Newton

Opposed: Malinowski and Livingston

The vote was in favor.

6. **ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:06 PM.