

**COUNTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1999, 3:30 PM**  
**RECESSED FROM THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1999**

**Present:** Talmage S. Baggett, Chairman of Personnel Committee  
H. Mac Tyson II, Commissioner  
J. Lee Warren, Jr., Commissioner

**Others:** Ed Melvin, Chairman, Board of Commissioners  
James Martin, Deputy County Manager  
Juanita Pilgrim, Assistant County Manager  
Grainger Barrett, County Attorney  
Amy H. Cannon, Finance Director  
James Lawson, Personnel Services Manager  
Rhonda C. Raynor, Deputy Clerk to the Board

Chairman Baggett called the meeting to order.

Chairman Baggett noted the meeting was being held to continue discussion of performance pay evaluations for the Human Service Agency Directors.

Commissioner Warren advised he did not have a problem with allowing the Human Services Boards to evaluate their directors. If a problem develops with this procedure at a later date, it can be addressed.

Chairman Baggett stated there was some discussion that the entire board of some of these agencies had not participated in the evaluations. In some instances, the Chairman of that particular board was the one who did the evaluation of the Director. The committee needs to decide whether or not they want to give direction in this matter.

Commissioner Warren noted that generally the Chairman of a board has more contact with the Director than any other board member. He does not have a problem with either the Chairman or the entire board doing the evaluation. He would leave that decision to the board.

Commissioner Tyson advised he does not have any disagreement with what Commissioner Warren has said. He asked who decides the amount of increase once it is determined the person has achieved a score high enough to be eligible for the merit increase?

Mr. Martin advised once the evaluation is completed, it is forwarded to the Payroll Section of the Finance Department. The information is keyed in with all the other scores. Once all the information is keyed in, the merit factor is determined and then the amount of merit increase. The amount of the merit increase is determined by the data entered into the computer from all the evaluations.

**Personnel Committee  
December 21, 1999  
Page 2**

Commissioner Tyson asked what would happen if an employee receives a score of 5.

Mr. Barrett noted one Director has already received a score over 5. He noted some boards are not considering some factors when the evaluations are done.

Commissioner Tyson stated he feels that if Commissioners' hands are taken off the process entirely, there will be problems.

Commissioner Warren stated he has a problem with any employee receiving a score of 5.

Chairman Baggett asked if the form for the director who received a score of 5 was properly completed.

Mr. Martin noted there was a mistake in the form. The factors were added incorrectly.

Commissioner Tyson suggested that everyone receiving a score of 4 or more should have their evaluation reviewed by the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Barrett advised the board of Commissioners or the Personnel Committee could do the review.

Commissioner Warren asked if it would pose a legal problem if the Board set parameters in this area and then changed them if it was determined there was need to do so at a later date.

Mr. Barrett noted there needs to be horizontal and vertical equity. Everyone should be similar in the plan. He feels objectives can be developed that will be legally adequate.

Commissioner Tyson asked Mr. Barrett if an employee could allege discrimination if the parameters were changed.

Mr. Barrett advised he would hope the changes would be made to the plan and not for a specific person.

Chairman Melvin stated he would feel comfortable in reviewing all scores over 4.5.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Warren offered a motion to allow the Human Services Boards or the Chairman of the board to evaluate their Directors and that an evaluation score of 4.5 or higher would require a review of the evaluation by the Personnel Committee.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Tyson

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Martin advised other employees have received a score of 5. He asked if the Personnel Committee would want to review those evaluations as well. Commissioner Tyson stated he would suggest the motion be modified to include all evaluations over 4.5. He would recommend the evaluation first be reviewed by the County Manager and then the Personnel Committee. An employee could have the option of accepting a score of 4.5 or having the evaluation reviewed by the County Manager and the Personnel Committee. The system must be uniform.

Commissioner Warren stated he is not suggesting an evaluator could not rate someone a 5, but he feels it should be justified.

Mr. Barrett stated the high score doesn't express a flaw in the person being evaluated, but a flaw in the evaluator's proper application of the evaluation instrument.

Mr. Martin noted there are approximately 25 evaluation scores that have not yet been keyed into the system.

Commissioner Warren stated he doesn't know that he has a problem with a score of 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 or higher. He has a problem with a 5. With a score of 5, there is no room for improvement. He has a problem with manipulation of the system.

Mr. Martin noted approximately 200 employees scored a 4 or over. That would equate to approximately 10% of all county employees. He noted the desire is for the scores to improve each year. He feels the evaluation forms are being taken seriously. However, he also feels there is some manipulation.

Ms. Pilgrim noted last year's process was a good starting point. She feels the evaluation should eliminate a score of 1 and 5. If an employee doesn't score over 1, they do not need to be employed. A score of 3 indicates the employee has met expectations. A score of 4 indicates the employee has exceeded expectations. A score of 5 indicates the employee always exceeds expectations and *never* has a problem. She feels a score of 2-4 is appropriate.

Commissioner Tyson asked if it was feasible for the Board of Commissioners to limit the total score to a 4.

Mr. Martin stated he feels it is too late to limit the total score at this point. Most all employees have been evaluated and given their scores.

Chairman Baggett asked if it could be agreed upon that the process be completed as it stands for this year. Then, after a review of the data, discuss a further examination of the process for next year.

Mr. Martin stated the Committee could decide to let the process be completed this year and then review the data to determine if any action is needed.

Mr. Barrett noted this is a dynamic process. They will understand more as the data is evaluated. This is a continuing process and he feels it should be revisited each year.

Commissioner Tyson stated there is a distinct difference between evaluation and compensation. No checks have gone out. He feels a cap should be set in order to assure fairness.

Mr. Martin stated that the Board of Commissioners determines the amount of funds available. The way the plan is implemented, everyone could make the same score and get the same amount of increase. If you have a large number of people receiving one score and a few people get a higher score, the few people will get a greater increase.

Chairman Baggett stated he feels comfortable with running through the process this year and evaluating the data next year to address any problems.

Commissioner Warren stated that since a trial run was done last year and this is the first true run, they should let the process be completed. He feels the Committee will have justification to change things once they see the data from a completed process.

**COMMISSIONER WARREN WITHDREW HIS MOTION.**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Warren offered a motion to allow the Human Services Boards or the Chairman of the board to evaluate their Directors.  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Tyson  
**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

Mr. Martin noted that more than 50% of the 1,881 evaluations received had a score in the 3 to 3.5 range.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM.