

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
10:00 a.m., Tuesday, July 1, 2014

The regular meeting of the Personnel Committee was held at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, July 1, 2014 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmembers Bettelli and Harrington, Chair Ferencz, Administrator Tucker, Assistant to the Administrator Dziuban and City Clerk Copeland; a quorum was present to conduct business.

1. Chair Ferencz called the meeting to order and acknowledged that the press and public were duly notified of the meeting in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 3, 2014 as submitted; Councilmember Harrington seconded.

Chair Ferencz directed attention to paragraph 5 on page 11 of the minutes; she recalled that the question referred to a total of forty-six thousand dollars (\$46,000), not sixty-one thousand five hundred dollars (\$61,500) as stated. After a brief discussion, Clerk Copeland stated that she would listen to the tape of the meeting again to confirm what was said. Councilmembers Bettelli and Harrington withdrew their motion and second respectively.

3. Citizens' Comments – None

4. Old Business

A. Discussion of Vacancies on Boards and Commissions

Chair Ferencz stated that two (2) new applications had been included in the meeting packet and recalled that the Planning Commission vacancy was filled at the last meeting with the appointment of William Mills.

Administrator Tucker commented that the Code Board of Appeals and Board of Zoning Appeals (BOZA) each have one (1) vacancy. The Administrator noted that the Committee agreed that the person appointed to BOZA should have some legal knowledge since this is a quasi-judicial committee; having someone with legal knowledge can be very useful when some issues are presented to the Committee.

Although the new candidates have excellent backgrounds, neither has legal expertise, but Chair Ferencz thought that one (1) of them could contribute greatly to the Planning Commission.

The Administrator added that all committees will have openings to be filled January 2015; she noted that the Code Board of Appeals meets very infrequently and currently has enough members to have a quorum if a meeting were called. Administrator Tucker, therefore, stated that the Committee could delay filling that vacancy until making appointments for 2015.

Councilmember Harrington said that he was a friend of Mr. Dougherty's and that, as such, he would inquire whether Mr. Dougherty was interested in serving on BOZA until the end of the year.

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to recommend to Council the appointment of Peter Doherty to fill the vacancy on BOZA until the end of 2014, if he is interest in serving; Councilmember Bettelli seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION: Chair Ferencz moved to re-order the *Agenda* to discuss item 4C before Item 4B; Councilmember Bettelli seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Consideration of New City-wide Evaluation Tool

Included in the meeting packet were the new evaluation tools, supervisor and employee, developed by Chief Buckhannon; the supervisor evaluation tool has five (5) categories more than the employee evaluation dedicated to the person's supervisory skills.

Administrator Tucker explained that these evaluation forms were Chief Buckhannon's creation based on the tools that the City has been using successfully for a number of years, and all department managers have liked this tool. This is a fillable form that makes it very efficient and, when completed, the program does the calculation of the rankings. The Administrator reminded the Committee that the only reason the City has made a change is that the existing software will no longer be supported.

Chair Ferencz voiced her understanding that the evaluator must qualify the ranking before the program will advance to the next category. Administrator Tucker voiced her belief that the commentary is useful for those being evaluated to be able to hear the things they have done well and the areas that may need improvement.

Chair Ferencz asked whether employees were asked to do self-evaluations with rankings to compare to the supervisor's evaluation. The Chair commented that, when discussing the comparison, often issues relative to miscommunications are revealed between the supervisor and employee; she suggested that this might be a good tool for the City.

The Administrator responded that these evaluation tools are interactive in that department managers tend to work with employees and go through and discuss the evaluations. For the City, the evaluation process is long, beginning in January and some years the process is not completed until May. Administrator Tucker explained that the each evaluation has to be done; they are reviewed by the supervisors, reviewed by employees with supervisors and finally reviewed by the City Administrator. No wages are changed until the process has been completed; employees who merited an increase receive them at the same time.

Councilmember Bettelli commented that the size of the organization should also be considered; the City has small departments, and department managers interact with staff a great deal of the time to know what and how an employee is doing.

Both Director Pitts and Director Page reported that they have had their employees self-evaluate. Director Page found that the best employees were more critical of themselves, while those who needed improvement evaluate themselves very highly.

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to recommend to City Council to adopt the new evaluation forms for supervisors and employees; Councilmember Bettelli seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Review of City Administrator's Job Description and Evaluation

Chair Ferencz stated that she had requested that the City Administrator's current job description, the Archer job description and the Administrator's 2014 Performance Objectives; the Chair pointed out the fact that the existing job description was written in 1993. In reading the Archer job description written in 2007, the Chair commented that it looked as if Archer had asked the Administrator to tell them everything she does.

Administrator Tucker recalled that employees completed a questionnaire from Archer as well as a one-on-one with Archer; the job descriptions were written based on them. The Administrator noted that the two (2) descriptions contained similar language to the 1993 job description; the Archer job description has more detail, such a mention of the marina that was not included in the 1993 version. The City had not purchased the marina in 1993; therefore, the Administrator's position did not include language relative to the marina; Administrator Tucker added that, in 1993, the City had not had a beach restoration.

Chair Ferencz stated that she thought that there were enough things picked up in the Archer description that are relevant today but are not evident in the 1993 job description to consider inclusion in a revision of the Administrator's description. She noted that a revised job description should not be written for Administrator Tucker, but for anyone who will fill the position in the future.

The Chair asked Committee members to review both documents and to bring a draft job description to the August meeting that would be a combination of the two (2) descriptions updating the 1993 version. She also encouraged the Committee members to look around the island and note the things on the island the City wants to preserve, i.e. safety of residents, visitors and City employees, and then look at what the City's expectations from the City Administrator should be relative to safety.

Director Pitts commented that all real property of the City should be included, not just the marina; he commented that she has spent a lot of time on Front Beach, whether in dialogue or meetings.

Chair Ferencz also stated that the 1993 job description does not include disaster management. The Administrator would be the incident commander with the department managers and Assistant Dziuban reporting to her; she is the point of contact with Charleston County and the state. Despite training, in the Administrator's opinion, the best training is gained in experience.

Councilmember Bettelli suggested that Administrator Tucker be included in taking the best from both job descriptions to create an updated version. He stated that he was under the impression that the Archer job descriptions were currently being used by the City.

Administrator Tucker reported that City Council did not adopt the job descriptions. The fact that the City did not adopt the job descriptions had nothing to do with the job descriptions; Council, at the time of the Archer study, did not agree with the results of the compensation portion that caused a reaction to reject everything. The Administrator stated that there was likely merit in adopting the job descriptions or generating a hybrid version of them; Archer personnel did spend time with department managers and employees to learn who does what and to re-write them. They also looked at what physical attributes one should have in order to perform the functions of positions within the City.

Councilmember Bettelli then asked whether the Committee wanted to modify the 1993 version or the Archer version.

Councilmember Harrington stated that he did not want to add to the Administrator's work load by asking her to update her job description, but, if she had input, he wanted to hear it.

Chair Ferencz agreed that Administrator Tucker should be a part of the process; the Administrator would know if new responsibilities or tasks had been assigned to her since the Archer study in 2007.

The Chair commented to the Committee that they should review the job descriptions for the department managers, not just the Administrator's.

Responding to Councilmember Harrington's question, Administrator Tucker confirmed that job descriptions exist for all positions in the City.

Councilmember Harrington suggested that each department manager review his/her job description for recommendations for changes, additions or deletions.

Administrator Tucker noted that, periodically, department managers do come forward with suggestions for alterations for job descriptions. Typically the suggestion would go to the City Administrator, and then go to the Personnel Committee to be forwarded to the committee that has purview over that department, and, ultimately, a recommendation is made to City Council to adopt the change. Usually the changes made to job descriptions came as a result of department managers bringing them forward.

Administrator Tucker reported that all approved job descriptions are on the Intranet; the Administrator indicated that she would send the Archer descriptions electronically; Assistant Dziuban commented that the Archer job descriptions were not currently available electronically.

Director Page explained that the job descriptions are by position not by employee; therefore, they are not too specific to eliminate the opportunity for an employee to say "not my job." She added that Director Pitts has nine (9) CDL drivers, but they all have the same job description whether they drive a truck or operate the Cat.

Councilmember Bettelli reminded the Committee that this is the busiest time of the year for the City; therefore, this should be a long-term project, especially for the department managers and those under their supervision.

The next order of business was to review the second half of the City Administrator's evaluation; according to Chair Ferencz, the main discussion has been the actual weighted percentages, i.e. they need to be studied and, possibly, changed.

The Chair asked Administrator Tucker to explain how this portion of her evaluation came to be. The Administrator stated that the objective portion of her evaluation began in 2009 to try to prevent a circumstance where the evaluation was completely subjective and, if only two to three (2-3) Councilmembers scored and turned in the evaluation for whatever reason and they scored low or in the middle, that would be the score that was held for the year and it might not be representative of everything that objectively happened. Such a circumstance could occur in a year when the City has been extremely busy or in a year when the City has won many awards, so it would be inconsistent with a punitive score on the subjective portion, when objectively looking at the year's accomplishments, the score should be higher. It was put in place to prevent that from happening. The Administrator commented that only a couple of times have all members of Council that could evaluate the City Administrator turned in the forms.

Chair Ferencz tasked the members of the Personnel Committee to push for one hundred percent (100%) participation in the Administrator's evaluation. Councilmember Bettelli stated that, in his opinion, participation has been better in recent years.

Administrator Tucker commented that, since adding the objective portion and knowing in advance how much has been accomplished, there has been a higher percentage of participation. Councilmembers score the subjective portion that the Personnel Committee tabulates and that is then added to the objective portion.

The Chair noted that Council has very little input to the objective part of the evaluation. The Administrator explained that Council approves the tasks to be accomplished, and the Administrator is responsible for seeing that they are accomplished through monthly monitoring of each department's progress; at the end of the year, the Administrator generates a report for Council on how well the staff did.

Chair Ferencz' next question was how the categories were selected for the objective section of the evaluation, and the Administrator acknowledged that Council had agreed on the categories which are fiscal management, delegation, communication and a personal goal. Administrator Tucker recalled that, for the Personnel Committee and Council at the time, those were the things that they felt needed to be considered, and the percentages were originally established by them, but they have been tweaked and changed a little since that time. The City has continued with that pattern since 2009.

Director Page expressed the opinion that, on fiscal management, department managers work very hard to end the year three percent (3%) under budget, but accomplishing that goal gets harder and harder as Council makes the budget leaner and leaner each year. In staff meetings, the Director has stated that department managers are being setup to fail; she noted that the City has experienced warm winters for several years, this year being an exception; therefore, she has had to buy very little gas to heat the Rec Center. If the coming winter mimics last year, the Director feels that she will exceed that line item in her budget; in addition, she noted that last year she had exceeded the budget for part-time employees because instructors had to be paid

more for more people coming to the Rec Center creating more classes. As a result, the City Administrator looked bad on her evaluation because the Recreation Department had exceeded its budget. The only way that Director Page can control that problem was to limit the number of people that come to class or reduce the number of classes. The Director acknowledged that coming in under-budget is important, but she finds it hard to reconcile that so much weight is tied to it in the Administrator's evaluation when every year the budget for items that are not employee-related have been reduced.

Administrator Tucker stated the crux of the Director's comments was that, in the budget process, Council is getting the budget so lean when passed that it does not allow for any kind of unexpected event to occur. The Administrator recalled that, when this issue was originally discussed as three percent (3%) under on the General Fund budget, staff thought that it would be fairer if the three percent (3%) was applied to the Capital budget and not the General Fund budget because many items included in the operating budget are beyond the control of the department managers and City Administrator, making it difficult to attain the three percent (3%) under-budget.

Chair Ferencz indicated that she did not understand a dictate to come a percentage under-budget; she added that, if a budget is done correctly, the City Administrator's task should be to meet the budget, not to exceed and not to be under. In her opinion, such a dictate meant that the budget did not mean anything because the Administrator was expected to end the year three percent (3%) under. The Chair agreed that a component of the Administrator's evaluation should be fiscal management that should be interpreted as the Administrator should meet budget in both the Capital and General Funds.

Councilmember Bettelli said that he thought this was initiated from a mindset of certain members of Council at that time that, if an amount was included in the budget, it would be spent; it was meant to be a safeguard for "if you don't need it, don't buy it."

Chair Ferencz countered that, if Council put the money into the budget, Council was telling staff to spend it as intended when the budget was approved.

Councilmember Bettelli reminded the Chair that many items in the budget are "only with failure," and, if the money is not spent, the mindset of some is why was it put into the budget? He continued that the City has tried to produce a conservative budget, but, if the item failed and it was replaced, the budget would be "blown."

Administrator Tucker voiced her understanding of the discussion that the Committee would like to have a different scoring, rating system, for fiscal management that would not include the three percent (3%) under budget, but some other way to rank fiscal management.

The next item is whether fiscal management should be fifty percent (50%) of the Administrator's evaluation.

Councilmembers Bettelli and Harrington agreed that an important step in this process would be to keep Council informed about what the Committee is doing and not to just go to a meeting and present that these are the changes made by Committee.

Chair Ferencz suggested that, at the next Council meeting, to ask that Councilmembers review the objective portion of the Administrator's evaluation and to send recommended changes to her.

Administrator Tucker noted that the information in packets was approved for 2014 and that the Committee needs to decide if it wants to redesign the process for the evaluation for 2015. The Administrator cautioned that giving the 2014 approved goals and objective would confuse them into thinking they needed to change things to this information that the Committee would not want to be changed.

Chair Ferencz stated that she would give Councilmembers a copy of the document that basically has the categories to be considered in the Administrator's evaluation with the percentages that are in place now assigned to them. The Committee would be asking that they review the process, and, if there are goals under delegation, for instance, that they would like to see as goals under the four (4) broad headings.

The Administrator commented that she understood the intent to keep Council up-to-date on this subject, but she also advised the Committee the danger of starting dialogue via electronic communication that might end up being three (3) members of a Committee discussing something. She said that the Mayor's emailing all of Council to learn days when Councilmembers were and were not available for meeting would not be at issue, but getting into electronic dialogues would negate the need for the Personnel Committee. The Administrator further advised that the Personnel Committee needs decide what they think is a good idea and present that to Council to either adopt or to give feedback at that time. They do not have to adopt it just because the Personnel Committee has done their work; they could ask that this or that be tweaked or to send back to Committee with this feedback to consider.

Chair Ferencz stated that the next step for the Committee was to make the recommended changes to the objective portion of the Administrator's evaluation based on whether the members agree with the percentages and the titles of the categories. The Chair asked how it was determined that the Administrator needed a personal goal, and the Administrator responded that the Personnel Committee had made that decision and presented it to her.

Administrator Tucker commented that she has had the most difficulty with accomplishing the personal goal because her "plate is full," and identifying a personal goal was something that she had to get done in her off-time.

Councilmember Bettelli recalled from his days in the private sector that personal goals were referred to as "stretch commitments" which were add-ons to evaluations improving an employee's score.

Chair Ferencz also questioned giving each department an additional task for which the Administrator is judged.

The Administrator recall that, in 2009, the City began to tip into the crisis point, so there was a lot of effort "in the lean years" to do a lot of stretching – how much under budget the City can end the year, how much more can be accomplished without increasing expense. The

Administrator remarked that she and the department managers think that they do that without being instructed. At the time, some quantification of these tasks was meaningful to Council, but the Administrator added that keeping the records to quantify that has been tedious and time-consuming.

The Chair asked whether the information gathered was of any use other than the Administrator's evaluation; to which the Administrator answered with a no.

Director Pitts stated that he is charged with performing eight (8) "random acts of kindness" per week, but he stated that he normally does about sixteen (16) per week. He indicated that he only reports eight (8) to the Administrator because he does not want to be recognized for this work.

Chair Ferencz stated that she did not think that these efforts would stop if taken out of the Administrator's evaluation because it is part of what each department does anyway.

Councilmember Harrington said that he did not want to increase the workload for the Administrator or department managers.

The Chair reiterated the task for the next meeting was to bring an objective form, it could be the same, include these areas or have totally different categories.

D. Establish Timeline for Review of Department Managers Job Descriptions

Chair Ferencz said that the Committee had agreed not to have a stringent timeline, but they have been asked to review them over the next couple of months for any changes that they would suggest.

Administrator Tucker asked that the outreach to them can be made now, but the Departments in the City were being taxed to the maximum with the tourist season in full swing. The Administrator reminded the Committee that the recommendations for filling vacant seats on boards and commissions must be made to Council in November and it was a priority for the Personnel Committee.

5. New Business – None

6. Miscellaneous Business

Employee Recognition and Recommendation for Employee of the Month

Administrator Tucker announced the two (2) officers from the Police Department, Ptl. Postell and Ptl. Reynolds, were being formally recognized for interaction with Mr. R.W. Newsome when "you were very helpful, understanding and professional" displaying "the positive attitude and professionalism" wanted in all IOP officers.

The employee being recommended for Employee of the Month is Pfc. Matt Storen for his actions in the theft of a moped from the locked storage area belonging to the Windjammer.

Captain Usry stated that Storen “and the other officers worked together as a team to ensure that witness statements were obtained and all other aspects of the incident were properly documented. Your attention to the area and your actions are commendable. You continue to be a valuable asset to this department; your professionalism and dedication to your duties is an example to others. Keep up the fantastic work!”

Next Meeting Date: 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, August 6, 2014 in the Conference Room.

Assistant Dziuban pointed out that, at 11:00 a.m., August 6th, the ATAX Committee has a meeting scheduled which staff would need to attend. Since the Personnel Committee has been running past 11:00 a.m., she wanted to make sure that the Committee was aware.

7. Executive Session – Not needed

8. Adjourn

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 a.m.; Chair Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted:

Marie Copeland
City Clerk