

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE: FEBRUARY 24, 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS TAYLOR
MONROE
VANSELOW
SEEBER
GIRARD

OTHERS PRESENT:

GRETCHEN STEFFAN, COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
FRANK E. THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS BROCK
MERLINO
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
CHARLENE DiRESTA, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

Mr. Taylor called the meeting of the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee to order at 10:35 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Vanselow, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the agenda packet were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda packet is on file with the minutes.*

Commencing the agenda review, Mr. Taylor commented the only item on the agenda was continued discussion regarding a performance evaluation form for the County Administrator position. He mentioned the Committee had commenced this process with varying levels of exposure to the performance evaluation process. He apprised the Committee had decided at the beginning of the process not to include the Human Resources Department in the initial meetings. He said the Committee probably should have included Gretchen Steffan, County Human Resources Director, in all of the meetings and he took responsibility for suggesting otherwise. He said he felt the Committee would end up with a good product for the performance evaluation of the County Administrator position. He advised that Ms. Steffan had emailed draft forms to the Committee members for review and he had reviewed them and found them acceptable.

Ms. Steffan reviewed the draft documents which had been previously emailed to the Committee members, as follows:

- Warren County, New York, County Administrator Performance Management System;
- Exhibit A - Warren County Administrator Self-Evaluation Form;
- Exhibit B - Warren County, County Administrator, Board of Supervisors Performance Evaluation Input Form; and
- Exhibit C - Warren County, New York, Annual Performance Evaluation - County Administrator.

Ms. Steffan explained the County Administrator Performance Management System document contained guidelines and instructions for the performance evaluation process which she felt were necessary to keep Supervisors informed due to the turnover resulting from the by election cycles. She noted this was a guide book which would be part of the process and she felt it was important. She said Exhibit A reflected the self-evaluation form containing eight questions which would be completed by the County Administrator. She added this was a narrative which would set the goals for the upcoming performance period. She advised this was a collaborative process with the Board of Supervisors and she recalled she had recommended an Executive Committee be established. She commented Exhibit A would elicit sufficient information to be able to formulate the appropriate performance feedback, such as whether the expectations had been met.

Ms. Steffan stated Exhibit B was a Board of Supervisors Performance Evaluation Input Form which could be utilized if the Board decided to solicit the input of all 20 members in the evaluation process. She noted this form contained several questions which would elicit sufficient feedback for the Executive Committee to use during their comprehensive evaluation. Exhibit C, she continued, was the Annual Performance Evaluation Form which represented the conclusion of the evaluation process. She advised this form would be used by the Executive Committee to provide the County Administrator with feedback on the performance period. Ms. Steffan recalled previous discussions where she had discussed competencies and she said she had included those competencies in Exhibit C based on the goals formulated by Paul Dusek, County Administrator. She listed the competencies included on Exhibit C, as follows: Planning; Finance; Compliance; Communication-Written; Communication-Verbal; Organization; Judgement-Decision Making; Judgement-Crisis Response; Project Management; Leadership; and Continuing Professional Education. Ms. Steffan commented that if the Committee was amenable to the draft evaluation forms the next step would be for the County Administrator to continue to develop his goals with specific deliverables and due dates.

Mr. Taylor stated he felt the draft forms presented had been well done and his only concern was with Exhibit B which was for input from the Board members. He said he had never seen an evaluation completed by the "Board of Directors" of a business and he felt it would be difficult to process the input from 20 Supervisors. He commented it would make more sense if Exhibit B was used by the Executive Committee. He mentioned all Supervisors could be invited to submit a letter to the Executive Committee if they had any concerns or comments pertaining to the performance of the County Administrator.

Mr. Brock opined the County Administrator position required evaluation on two separate aspects: the administration of the County Departments and meeting the needs of the Board of Supervisors. He said the evaluation of the administration of the Departments was based on how well each Department was operated and meeting the needs of the Board of Supervisors pertained to matters, such as disseminating information to the Board members. Mr. Taylor commented there were County Departments which might not be familiar to every Supervisor because they did not deal with them on a regular basis. Mr. Brock agreed and noted the Executive Committee would review the operation of the individual Departments and the Board of Supervisors input would pertain to how the County Administrator met their needs. Ms. Steffan asked if Mr. Brock was suggesting that the Department Heads submit feedback which she said would be a 360-degree evaluation and a totally different process. Mr. Brock explained that in government there was an executive branch and a legislative branch. In this instance, he continued, the executive side pertained to how well the Departments were administered and the legislative side pertained to the needs of the legislators being met. His point, he said, was that the input of the Supervisors would be valuable in evaluating the legislative portion of the County Administrator position. He asserted that he would be unable to evaluate the County Administrator position as far as how well the Departments operated but he would be able to evaluate the position as far as how well his needs had been met.

Mr. Vanselow asked if Exhibit C could be used by the Executive Committee as proposed and a simpler one or two page document could be developed for use by the Supervisors to provide input. He expressed there was value in having the individual Supervisors take part in the evaluation process but he did not think that Exhibit B as presented was necessary. Mr. Taylor reiterated his suggestion that each Supervisor be invited to submit a letter containing their concerns, comments and input regarding the County Administrator evaluation. He commented this would not be a requirement and it was possible that not all 20 Supervisors would submit a letter. Mr. Vanselow countered if a form was provided the level of participation would be higher. He agreed with the concept of input from the Supervisors but he felt that input should be broader and not as detailed. Mr. Brock reiterated that the administration of the County Departments and meeting the needs of

the Board of Supervisors were two separate aspects of the County Administrator position. He said he would want to have input on whether or not his needs as a legislator were being met by the County Administrator. He pointed out this would be a separate evaluation than the one to determine how well the Departments were operated.

Ms. Seeber agreed with Messrs. Vanselow and Brock that the Exhibit B form would probably be too detailed of a document to ask the Board members to complete and she noted there were 14 questions on the proposed form. She commented a proposed form had been presented at the previous meeting which contained 5 questions and she felt this form would be fairly easy for the individual Supervisors to complete. She noted the completion of the form would not be a requirement and it could be noted how many of the 20 Supervisors had elected to complete a form. She stated the collective ratings and comments from the Supervisors who chose to complete the form could be presented to the evaluating committee. She mentioned the County Administrator reported to all 20 Supervisors and it made sense that this would be a responsibility of those Supervisors to the people who elected them. She added if she was unwilling to take the time to complete the evaluation form then the people who elected her should be made aware of that fact. She stated the evaluation should be transparent and should not be left to a group of 3 or 4 Supervisors to determine the evaluation rating. She added the evaluating committee should have feedback from all of the Supervisors who voluntarily provided it. Mr. Taylor advised there seemed to be an agreement that the Committee wanted input from all of the Supervisors and the current discussion was how that feedback should be garnered. For example, he said, another form could be created or the Supervisors could be requested to submit letters. Ms. Seeber asked what was wrong with the proposed form presented at the previous Committee meeting and Mr. Taylor opined the style of the form would not matter to him because he would make the form match his evaluation needs. Ms. Seeber apprised there had been comments that 14 questions might be too many for the Supervisors' evaluation form and the form presented at the previous Committee meeting contained 5 questions.

Mr. Monroe stated he had no issues with the Executive Committee completing the performance evaluation for the County Administrator position because those were the Supervisors who worked with Mr. Dusek on a daily basis. Ms. Seeber asked the members that comprised the Executive Committee and Mr. Monroe responded the County Administrator Performance Management System document suggested the Executive Committee be comprised of the Chairman of the Board, the Budget Officer and the Chairmen of the Personnel, Finance and Support Services Committees. Ms. Seeber commented that an official Executive Committee had not yet been determined and Mr. Monroe replied the concept had been discussed at previous Committee meetings. Ms. Seeber advised Chairman Geraghty had given the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee the task of keeping the evaluation process and forms as simple as possible and she noted he had also discussed the possibility of the Personnel Committee performing the evaluation. She commented the County did not have a formal Executive Committee and Mr. Monroe countered he felt that was one of the recommendations this Committee should make. Mr. Monroe stated the Supervisors suggested as members of the Executive Committee were involved in the day to day operations of the County. Ms. Seeber opined the members of the Personnel Committee typically had seniority on the Board of Supervisors and would provide a broader spectrum for the evaluation. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Thomas stated that Exhibit B was acceptable as presented and provided the leeway and latitude to cover both the administrative and legislative aspects of the County Administrator position and Mr. Taylor agreed. Mr. Vanselow asked if all the Supervisors should be given an opportunity to complete Exhibit C and Mr. Taylor replied he saw no reason to do so. Mr. Taylor agreed that Supervisor input would be beneficial but he felt that Exhibit C was too detailed for that purpose. Mr. Vanselow recalled he had suggested a simpler form than Exhibit B and the form presented by Ms. Seeber at the

previous Committee meeting was simpler. Mr. Monroe said he did not feel the 14 questions contained in Exhibit B were too large of a burden for the Supervisors.

Ms. Steffan stated she had developed the system and the forms based on recommendations she had received. She said it was important to keep in mind when evaluating performance that it was vital to set clear expectations. She advised that offering the Supervisors an opportunity to provide feedback in an unstructured format would result in an unwieldy process to try to condense that information into constructive performance feedback. She said it was difficult to quantify performance unless there was a system in place. She stated Mr. Dusek was an experienced County Administrator who had been with Warren County for several years; however, she continued, at some point in the future it would be necessary to hire a new County Administrator and it was important to set goals and performance expectations for that candidate. She recalled a presentation she had given at a previous Committee meeting wherein she had stated that an organization needed to be driven by a vision, mission and overall goals. She commented if the County wanted to recruit an Administrator in the future it would be necessary to clearly define how they would measure that individual's performance and a system was required to do so.

Mr. Monroe apprised that Exhibit B only contained 9 questions involving ratings (exceeds standards, meets standards and does not meet standards) and 5 open-ended questions for comments. He added it did not seem as if this form would be too burdensome for the Supervisors to complete. He stated if the consensus of the Committee was that input from the Board of Supervisors was desired then he did not see anything wrong with the use of Exhibit B. Mr. Taylor asked if the Committee members agreed with Mr. Monroe's statement.

Mr. Girard stated the Board of Supervisors was comprised of people from various backgrounds and membership had the potential to change every two years. As a Supervisor, he continued, he tried to do the best that he could on all of the Committees he was assigned to for the sake of the taxpayers who elected him. He said he was limited in his capacity with all of the matters that came before him but he tried to absorb as much knowledge as he could and make the best decisions. He commented that he looked at matters in generalities and he depended on people with experience, such as Mr. Dusek to assist him. Mr. Girard informed Mr. Dusek had previously been the Attorney for the Town of Queensbury followed by the County Attorney and he was currently the County Administrator. Mr. Girard stated Mr. Dusek's exposure to the internal matters of government far exceeded his. He advised Mr. Dusek was judged on a regular basis for what was completed and how the County proceeded. He commented if Mr. Dusek made a mistake the result could be a lawsuit, potential injury or financial difficulties. Mr. Girard compared this performance evaluation process to having a high school junior varsity coach critique the New England Patriots on their performance during the Superbowl. He opined it was unfair because there were times that Mr. Dusek had to thoroughly explain things to him in order for him to be able to ask intelligent questions. Pertaining to the County Administrator Performance Management System document, Mr. Girard mentioned the Evaluation Objectives had been developed by Ms. Steffan and the only one that seemed to pertain to the Committee was No. 6, provide unbiased performance information and documentation to support compensation decisions. He stated he had voted in opposition of Mr. Dusek's salary increase although he believed it was deserved. He mentioned Mr. Dusek had been successful in his negotiations with the Unions and he felt it had not been the right time for Mr. Dusek to receive a salary increase because it would appear he was receiving it on the back end. He opined a person could not sit in meetings with the Unions and indicate that they were not receiving a salary increase and then receive an increase after the fact. He reiterated he felt Mr. Dusek deserved the salary increase but he had voted in opposition.

Mr. Girard mentioned that Mr. Dusek needed to be all things to all people and was very exposed due to media attendance at Committee and Board meetings. He opined that Mr. Dusek was evaluated on a regular basis and he had difficulty with the concept of evaluating him with a simple form. He suggested an annual meeting with Mr. Dusek to ask questions and make comments pertaining to job performance. He said he saw a lot of negatives with the proposed performance evaluation process and he would prefer a simple meeting to discuss any matters. Mr. Taylor agreed with the majority of Mr. Girard's comments; however, he continued, the Committee needed to determine a method to evaluate the performance of the County Administrator. Mr. Girard mentioned he felt as if he were detracting from the process and Mr. Taylor disagreed. Mr. Vanselow said that Mr. Girard's comments were an example of Supervisor input which could be beneficial to the performance evaluation of the County Administrator. He added this type of testimony about the performance of Mr. Dusek could be beneficial to the Executive Committee. He opined the input of Supervisors should be welcomed although not mandatory.

Ms. Seeber mentioned the formation of the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee had resulted from issues over salary increases and performance. She said Department Heads requested salary increases for staff members and the Board of Supervisors were not provided with documentation to support the requests. She advised she had attended the Department Head Meeting that morning and heard that performance evaluations were being initiated in some of the County Departments. She suggested they were over thinking the establishment of a performance evaluation for the County Administrator position and she reiterated that Chairman Geraghty had wanted the process to be kept simple. She suggested a possible recommendation from the Committee could be a semi-annual and annual meeting in an executive session to discuss the performance of the County Administrator. She added questions and concerns could be submitted in writing to be asked by Chairman Geraghty. She said she understood Ms. Steffan's comments pertaining to having a system in place for the next County Administrator; however, she added, it seemed as if Mr. Dusek had done well without such a system. She said they needed to focus on what was in place now and slowly move toward a performance evaluation process. She opined that if they would not complete a performance evaluation for the top position then it would send mixed messages to the County Departments that were initiating performance evaluations. Mr. Girard stated he understood what Ms. Steffan was saying about performance evaluation systems; however, he continued, these generally pertained to businesses. In businesses, he said, an employee was evaluated by the best person capable of that evaluation. He stated the County had several Administrators in the past and when he had first learned that Mr. Dusek would assume the position he had been pleased.

Ms. Steffan informed that when she had been interviewed by the Personnel Committee for the position of County Human Resources Director it had been stated that the County needed to be operated more like a business. She advised that the vision, mission and goals established by the County would set the tone for the direction of the organization. She said Warren County did not have succession plans in place. She commented she had developed the proposed forms at the request of the Committee based on discussions from previous meetings. If the County were to recruit candidates for the County Administrator position, she continued, it would be necessary to determine exactly what was desired of those candidates. She added it would be necessary to let the candidates know exactly what the County was and what it was expected to be in the future. She apprised the next County Administrator would have some very large shoes to fill. She commented the multi-factor performance competencies listed on Exhibit C were criteria and qualities the County would look for in candidates for the County Administrator position. She advised the County had an experienced Administrator who knew all of the facets of the job. She noted each element of the performance competencies would change weight based on the financial position and goals of the County. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Monroe commented that the Committee was over thinking the process; he said the forms presented were acceptable and he agreed with the concept of Exhibit C being completed by the Executive Committee as the people who worked with the County Administrator on a daily basis. He noted if the consensus of the Committee was that the final evaluation should be completed by the Personnel Committee as opposed to an Executive Committee, he was amenable to that concept, as well. Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Monroe and noted that changes could be made to the system in the future if it was determined they were necessary. He advised Mr. Girard had just spoken with passion about the performance of Mr. Dusek and he felt Mr. Girard's verbal statement was more valuable than a written form would have been. He commented the Supervisors could simply write a letter advising of their opinion of the performance of the County Administrator. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Monroe suggested the possibility of a meeting in an executive session between the Board of Supervisors and the County Administrator, as previously discussed; however, he continued, following the meeting, the Supervisors could complete the evaluation form which would be sent to the Executive Committee or Personnel Committee to assist in the completion of the final evaluation. Motion was made by Mr. Monroe to initiate the performance evaluation system as presented by Ms. Steffan; however, no second to the motion was received.

Mr. Monroe stated he was unsure of the next step; he pointed out the proposed performance evaluation system was a great process which established goals and would evaluate the County Administrator on how those goals were accomplished. He continued by saying everyone would have input to the process with an evaluating committee determining the final evaluation rating. Mr. Girard asked if the proposed documents could be forwarded to the Personnel Committee for review. Mr. Taylor said the charge had been given to the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee to develop a process and make recommendations. Ms. Seeber stated the information had just been received on Sunday and she felt it was too soon to make a decision about the process. She recalled that at the previous Committee meeting, it had been requested that the information be emailed to the Committee members as soon as possible for review. She stated she would like the opportunity to make some changes to the proposed process, such as removing some open ended questions and adding the executive session meeting. She pointed out the executive session meeting would allow an opportunity for the Supervisors to ask questions and hear responses prior to completing an evaluation form. Mr. Taylor asked for clarification purposes if Ms. Seeber was amenable to the forms presented with the addition of the executive session meeting being held prior to completion of Exhibit B. Ms. Seeber responded she felt there were a couple of additional steps to be taken and documented. She said she felt strongly that the final evaluation should be completed by the Personnel Committee, as opposed to an Executive Committee and she reiterated that she would like to add the executive session meeting prior to completion of the evaluation form by the Supervisors.

Mr. Merlino said he felt the discussion was beneficial and he agreed with some of the comments which had been made. He stated it would be difficult to find a new County Administrator with the level of experience of Mr. Dusek. He advised Mr. Dusek had worked for many years as the County Attorney attending Committee meetings and learning all of the aspects of the County Departments. He apprised the County was very different from a business and the County Administrator position was an important one where the employee learned by doing the job. He commented that one bad rating from a member of the Board of Supervisors would not mean that Mr. Dusek was not doing a good job. He said it would be difficult to find a replacement for Mr. Dusek upon his retirement or resignation. He stated some Departments were able to provide a backup person, such as Joan Sady, Clerk of the Board, who had trained a replacement to assume her duties if she decided to retire.

Mr. Monroe apprised the County needed a system wherein the Board of Supervisors established the goals and discussed them with the County Administrator and evaluated him based on how he accomplished those goals. He opined the performance evaluation system presented met that criteria.

He said if the Committee members disagreed they should present another system which would also meet the criteria. Mr. Taylor agreed with Mr. Monroe and advised that the County had a Human Resources Department and it was not being utilized appropriately. A brief discussion ensued.

Ms. Steffan stated that with all of the Committee meetings and the time spent developing proposed forms by Ms. Seeber and her, a lot of organizational energy had been invested into the development of an evaluation system for one person. She questioned if this had been the intent and it had been her understanding that the establishment of the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee had resulted from the salary increase approved for Mr. Dusek during the budget process. She said a tremendous amount of energy and time had been expended thus far and a performance evaluation system was still not in place. She questioned if this had been a good use of everyone's time. Ms. Steffan said she was partly offended by Ms. Seeber's comment that the proposed forms had not been received until Sunday. She advised she had expended 11 hours over the weekend developing the proposed forms because she did not have enough staff members in her Department to complete them during the work week. Last year during the budget process, she continued, the Board of Supervisors had been split as to whether to allow additional staff for the Human Resources Department. She commented she did not have enough staff members to complete the necessary duties of the Department. She advised if this performance evaluation system was a priority item then she would channel resources toward that end; however, she continued, if it was not a priority she needed to channel resources in another direction.

Mr. Monroe exited the meeting at 11:38 a.m.

Mr. Merlino suggested Exhibit B should be disseminated to the Supervisors for completion and the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee should review those completed evaluation forms. He said this would determine if these forms would be appropriate to assist the evaluating committee with the final evaluation.

Ms. Seeber stated it was important to understand that the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee had not been established as a result of just the salary increase for Mr. Dusek as it had resulted from the Board of Supervisors collectively deciding they needed to look at the performance of County employees, as well as their longevity. She said the County was different from a business; she added the Board of Supervisors were elected by the people to make determinations on the direction of the County. She apprised the Committee members had met and developed performance elements which did not appear in a Warren County form but instead simpler forms from other Counties were presented. She commented the forms presented at the previous Committee meeting which were developed by her had been discarded. Ms. Seeber advised it was the prerogative of the Board of Supervisors to determine the staffing levels for each Department. She stated she relied on the County Administrator to explain to Ms. Steffan that the best use of her time was not sitting in a Board meeting for 5 hours but rather developing the forms for this meeting as requested. At the previous Committee meeting, she continued, Ms. Steffan had indicated the proposed forms would be sent to the Committee members in advance of the meeting with plenty of time to review them but they were not. She suggested the problem was more about time management, such as dedicating time to the priorities set by the Board and not sitting on different boards or being away from the office for various reasons. She commended Ms. Steffan on completing the proposed forms in 11 hours and noted the forms she had developed had taken well more than 11 hours, as well. She stated this was a responsibility she assumed when she ran for office and agreed to be on the Committees defined by the Chairman. Ms. Seeber stated Chairman Geraghty set the goal of this Committee which was to develop a simple form to evaluate the performance of the County Administrator. She recalled at the beginning of this meeting, Ms. Steffan had indicated that she had been requested to develop an evaluation form but she felt an evaluation system was needed, as

well. She apprised if Ms. Steffan spent 11 hours developing an evaluation system when she had only been requested to develop an evaluation form then the County Administrator should spend time discussing time management and priorities with her. Ms. Seeber opined the priority was not sitting in a Board meeting for 5 hours and should have been working on the priority requested by the Board.

Mr. Taylor stated he did not feel the conversation was furthering the goals of the Committee. He apprised Chairman Geraghty had given this Committee a responsibility which he asserted had resulted from a discussion on the salary increase approved for Mr. Dusek. He mentioned the responsibility had been to develop an evaluation system for the County Administrator by the end of February. He commented that so much time had been wasted arguing about the form and the content. He apprised the County had a Human Resources Department and a County Administrator and sometimes the Board of Supervisors did not listen to the advice given by these professionals.

Mr. Dusek said he had listened to the discussion today and had found it helpful; he added he did not feel the Committee was wasting time. He stated this was the highest level position in the County and it was important to have these conversations because it would be necessary to hire another County Administrator at some point in the future. He opined the conversations were healthy and none of them had wasted time or effort. He agreed the County had a Human Resources Department which should be responsible for the development of the performance evaluation form. He said it seemed there were some positive aspects of the performance evaluation system presented today and it seemed there would be value in having the executive session meeting, as suggested. Mr. Dusek recommended that Ms. Steffan revise the forms based on the comments made today and he indicated he would discuss the matter further with her. He said it seemed the majority of the Committee was in favor of the executive session meeting as part of the process with more simplified forms. He remarked the process was taking some time but he felt it was important.

Mr. Taylor asked the Committee members for input as to what direction should be taken. Mr. Girard commented that a few meetings prior, the Committee had agreed to 5 specific measurable goals and he would like to return to that concept. He added he was aware that Ms. Steffan preferred a more detailed evaluation form. He agreed the discussion had been healthy but he felt the end result was not an evaluation of Mr. Dusek but rather an evaluation of Ms. Steffan. He commented there were many professionals that he knew and respected with great work ethics who would not make a great fit for Warren County and would leave within a couple of weeks. He said he hoped that Ms. Steffan would not fall into this category because she was a human resources professional working in a difficult to navigate environment with 20 or more bosses. He said he did not understand the criteria Ms. Steffan was submitting to get to the end result and he preferred a simpler format because he was a simple guy.

Mr. Vanselow suggested the performance evaluation system be looked at again; he said it was apparent that most of the Supervisors would appreciate an opportunity to be heard at some point in the process of evaluating the County Administrator position. He stated if the Committee went forward with this in a more simplified format he would want to include an executive session meeting with Mr. Dusek. He said he would like to see the forms be a lot simpler with input from the Supervisors encouraged in some format. He apprised it seemed as if Exhibit C would be valuable for the recruitment of a potential new County Administrator but he did not find it necessary for a person who had been in the position for a number of years. Mr. Taylor asked for clarification purposes if the intent was to request Ms. Steffan to revise the forms to be simpler; he noted he had reviewed the form and found it fairly simple. Mr. Vanselow replied one of the forms was fairly extensive and he noted human resources was not his area of expertise. Pertaining to Mr. Girard's analogy of the junior varsity coach critiquing the New England Patriots on their performance during the Superbowl, Mr.

Vanselow opined there were a lot of people who could watch the tape of the game and comment on what had been done wrong.

Ms. Seeber agreed with Mr. Dusek that it was worth the time to continue the process of developing an evaluation system which worked well. She acknowledged the Board members were not experts in human resources but she felt they should be well invested in what was going on in the County and what they expected from their County Administrator. She said the Board members had a very different type of expertise than the County Human Resources Director. She commented they had reviewed forms and determined what was desired of a proposed form a few meetings prior and they needed to go back and look at the performance elements which had previously been agreed upon.

Mr. Taylor apprised it seemed to be the consensus of the Committee to include an executive session meeting with Mr. Dusek prior to starting the evaluation process; Mr. Vanselow interjected the executive session meeting should be part of the process. Mr. Girard and Ms. Seeber agreed and Mr. Girard pointed out the style of the evaluation form was not an issue for him. Ms. Seeber stated the executive session meeting should be structured in some way and questions should be solicited from the Supervisors in advance of the meeting. Mr. Taylor disagreed and he stated a review of the County Administrator would be completed annually and Supervisors would have plenty of questions and comments formulated in advance of the meeting without the need to solicit the same.

Mr. Taylor stated the executive session meeting would be part of the process and it would be necessary to determine the forms to be used. He said the proposed forms presented seemed acceptable to him and they did not seem difficult to work with. He reiterated if the Committee approved the proposed forms they could still make changes in the future. Mr. Vanselow apprised if every Supervisor was given the opportunity for a discussion during the executive session meeting, it might not be necessary to have the Supervisors fill out a form. He said if a form was only going to be used by the evaluating committee he would prefer a simpler version of it. Mr. Brock said Mr. Merlino's suggestion of a trial run of the forms with the Supervisors was a good idea. Mr. Taylor asked if they were discussing Exhibit B and Mr. Merlino replied affirmatively and added this would determine what each of the Supervisors was thinking. Ms. Seeber stated she required more time to review the proposed forms; she commented the County Administrator Performance Management document seemed to suggest that input from the Supervisors would be determined by the Chairman of the Board. She said the consensus of the Committee was that they wanted the input of the Board of Supervisors in some format. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Dusek suggested he work with Ms. Steffan to simplify the proposed forms and process and to incorporate an executive session meeting in the evaluation process. He agreed the process would be best served with open communication in an executive session meeting. Ms. Seeber requested the proposed revised forms be disseminated to the Committee members at least a week in advance of the meeting and she noted the date of the next Committee meeting should be determined after the information was available. Mr. Dusek stated he and Ms. Steffan would ensure the Committee members had at least a week to review the information before the next Committee meeting. Mr. Taylor said the meeting would be scheduled after the work was completed and Mr. Dusek stated they would make it a priority and complete the work as soon as possible.

As there was no further business to come before the Performance Evaluation Sub-Committee, on motion made by Mr. Girard and seconded by Ms. Seeber, Mr. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlene DiResta, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist