

Clearwater, Florida, October 4, 2012

The Unified Personnel Board (UPB) met in regular session at 6:30 P.M. on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room, Fifth Floor, Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida, with the following members present: Daniel M. Andriso, Chair; Andrea S. Daggett; Ricardo Davis; Keith C. Dekle; James P. Koelsch; and Joan Vecchioli.

Not Present: George E. Tragos, Vice-Chair.

Also Present: Peggy Rowe, Director of Human Resources; Lisa Wombles, Employees' Advisory Council; Michael P. Schmidt, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk; and other interested individuals.

#### AGENDA

EAC

##### Item I. Employees' Advisory Council Representative

##### Item II. Consent Agenda

- |  |    |  |
|--|----|--|
| Human Resources                            | 1. | Request Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Personnel Board Meeting held September 13, 2012.  |
| Human Resources                            | 2. | Request Approval of Housekeeping Addition and Revisions of Class Specifications in the Pay and Classification Plan.                                  |
| Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller | 3. | Request Approval of the Audit of One Encumbered Court Records Specialist 2 Position in the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller. |
| Real Estate Management                     | 4. | Request Approval of the Audit of One Encumbered Craftworker 2 Position in the Real Estate Management Department. No Change is Recommended.           |
| Environment & Infrastructure               | 5. | Request Approval of the Audit of Priority Encumbered Positions in the Finance Division of the Department of Environment and Infrastructure.          |

##### Item III. New Business

- |                 |    |  |
|-----------------|----|--|
| Personnel Board | 1. | Request approval of Change in Meeting Date from January 3, 2013 to January 10, 2013. |
| Personnel Board | 2. | Annual Performance Review of the Human Resources Director.                           |

October 4, 2012

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Andriso called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.; whereupon, he led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

### EMPLOYEES' ADVISORY COUNCIL (EAC) REPRESENTATIVE

EAC Vice-Chairman Lisa Wombles thanked the Board of County Commissioners and the Appointing Authorities for granting employees a \$1,200.00 one-time wage disbursement and three days of Special Administrative Leave; and related that County Administrator Robert S. LaSala had attended a recent Delegate meeting, during which he thanked County employees for the hard work they are doing due to the reduced workforce.

Ms. Wombles indicated that 95 percent of County employees have thus far completed the United Healthcare online survey and will avoid a \$500.00 surcharge on their health insurance premiums; whereupon, she reported that an EAC/Appointing Authority joint meeting will take place in the Clerk's Conference Room, Clearwater Courthouse, at 11:00 A.M. on October 19, 2012.

Ms. Wombles discussed the Employee Advocate Program, indicating that it was re-instated approximately three years ago; that the program is administered by the EAC; and that the advocates assist employees in dispute resolutions. She expressed her concerns regarding the loss of 14 advocates since the program was re-instated and the difficulty of maintaining an Advocate Program with the five remaining advocates, noting that the County allows advocates to spend three hours a week working on appeals, but they usually work many extra hours on their own time. During discussion, Mr. Dekle emphasized that the EAC and the Employee Advocate Program are both considered legitimate County business, and suggested several ideas to attract, retain, and recognize employees who become employee advocates.

In response to queries by the members, Ms. Wombles, with input by Ms. Rowe, discussed the minimum requirements for becoming an advocate, and related that a candidate should be comfortable with public speaking and be familiar with the Personnel Rules. Ms. Vecchioli suggested that the Stetson University College of Law be contacted to see if law students might like to volunteer as advocates to gain experience, and Chair Andriso and Mr. Dekle expressed support for the idea. During discussion, Ms. Vecchioli related that the University and the County Attorney's Office could work through any ethical or logistical issues that may need to be resolved; and Mr. Dekle recommended getting buy-in from the various stakeholders; whereupon, Ms. Wombles agreed to bring the idea forward at the upcoming EAC/Appointing Authority joint meeting.

Mr. Dekle suggested that the Board task Ms. Rowe with bringing some other ideas before the Board; whereupon, Ms. Rowe proposed that Ms. Wombles and the EAC come up with some recommendations for her staff to consider.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS NOS. II.1 THROUGH II.5 – APPROVED

Motion - Ms. Vecchioli  
Second - Mr. Davis  
Vote - 6 – 0

- #1 Minutes of regular meeting held September 13, 2012, approved as submitted.
- #2 Addition and revisions of class specifications in the Pay and Classification Plan approved; changes reflect the current duties and responsibilities of the classifications, are housekeeping in nature, and will not affect the pay grade level of the classifications.
- #3 Audit of one encumbered Court Records Specialist 2 position, Pay Grade CL8 (\$28,246 – \$42,806), in the Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court and Comptroller approved; position reclassified to Office Specialist, Pay Grade CL6 (\$25,625 – \$38,667), without benefit of examination and with the establishment of a probationary period as outlined in Personnel Rule IX.
- #4 Audit of one encumbered Craftworker 2 position, Pay Grade CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169), in the Real Estate Management Department approved; no change is recommended.
- #5 Audit of priority encumbered positions in the Finance Division of the Department of Environment and Infrastructure (DEI) approved as follows:

RECLASSIFIED FROM CLASSIFIED SERVICE TO EXEMPT SERVICE

<u>Present Position</u> <u>Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade</u> <u>(Salary)</u>	<u>Approved</u> <u>Classification</u>	<u>Pay Grade</u> <u>(Salary)</u>
Accounting Services Coordinator	CL17 (\$43,825 – \$69,596)	Department Administrative Manager	SM6 (\$64,055 – \$96,083)

UPWARD RECLASSIFICATIONS

Senior Office Specialist	CL8 (\$28,246 – \$42,806)	Accounting Support Specialist	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)
Administrative Support Specialist	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)	Administrative Secretary	CL12 (\$34,340 – \$53,019)
Accounting Support Specialist	CL11 (\$32,697 – \$50,169)	Accountant 1	CL13 (\$36,046 – \$56,056)
Accountant 1	CL13 (\$36,046 – \$56,056)	Accountant 2	CL15 (\$39,748 – \$62,420)
Customer Service Analyst	CL13 (\$36,046 – \$56,056)	Systems Support Analyst	CL17 (\$43,825 – \$69,596)
Customer Services Supervisor	CL16 (\$41,724 – \$65,998)	Revenue Management Supervisor 1, DEI	CL18 (\$46,009 – \$73,174)
Accounting Services Coordinator	CL17 (\$43,825 – \$69,596)	Revenue Management Supervisor 1, DEI	CL18 (\$46,009 – \$73,174)
Customer Services Manager	CL19 (\$48,318 – \$77,313)	Revenue Management Supervisor 2, DEI	CL20 (\$50,731 – \$82,014)
Accountant, Senior	CL19 (\$48,318 – \$77,313)	Finance and Accounting Analyst	CL20 (\$50,731 – \$82,014)

During discussion and in response to queries by Mr. Dekle, Ms. Rowe provided general, financial, and statistical information with regard to pay grade changes and reclassifications; whereupon, she stated for the record that the purpose of a reclassification is not to provide employees with a pay raise, but to ensure that a position is classified properly.

## NEW BUSINESS

### PROPOSED CHANGE IN DATE OF JANUARY PERSONNEL BOARD MEETING FROM JANUARY 3 TO JANUARY 10, 2013 – APPROVED

---

### ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF THE HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR

Attorney Swain provided information regarding the Sunshine Law and Public Records Laws, relating that some members of the Board had inadvertently violated the law during the evaluation process by forwarding their individual evaluation forms of Ms. Rowe's Annual Performance Review to Chair Andriso for compilation, and engaging in two-way email communications. He indicated that:

- UPB meetings are required to be publicly noticed.
- Any matter that will come before the Board, or is likely to come before the Board, can only be discussed by the members at a publicly-noticed meeting.
- Emails between members mentioning anything that could potentially be acted upon at a meeting are prohibited, a violation of the Sunshine Law, and would require some degree of cure.
- Even though one-way email messaging is allowed, any two-way communication could be troublesome to the members; therefore, the best course of action is for members to not discuss work-related items by email.
- Members may freely communicate with staff by email. Staff may freely communicate with any and all members of the Board by email. Staff may not act as a conduit between Board members.
- Although the Sunshine Law contains areas that are vague, there is a \$500.00 non-criminal infraction and the possibility of criminal penalties for sufficient violations of the Law.

October 4, 2012

Ms. Vecchioli offered some suggestions as to how the evaluation process could be handled in the future to mitigate for potential infractions of the law, and lengthy discussion ensued.

\* \* \* \*

In order to provide a cure for the abovementioned violations and in accordance with the direction of Attorney Swain, copies of the email communications between the members and the performance evaluation forms compiled by the Chair were provided to the Clerk, incorporated as part of the minutes, and labeled Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2.

\* \* \* \*

Noting that the UPB members are not able to observe Ms. Rowe's performance on a consistent basis throughout the year, Mr. Davis requested that, in the future, the comments of the Appointing Authorities be provided to all the Board members to assist them in writing their evaluations; whereupon, in response to queries by Mr. Koelsch, Attorney Swain advised that evaluations are public records; and that for members to receive the information would not be a violation of the Sunshine Law. During discussion and in response to queries by Ms. Daggett, Ms. Rowe indicated that a self-appraisal is not part of the appraisal process, but could be if the Board so desires; and upon inquiry by Mr. Dekle as to whether the Board would like to be provided with a self-appraisal, no objections were noted.

Thereupon, Chair Andriso indicated that input has been received from the Personnel Board and the Appointing Authorities relating to the performance review of the Human Resources Director. He read comments from those who contributed to the review, noting that all reviewers rated Ms. Rowe as "exceeds expectations," with the exception of one "meets expectations," and congratulated Ms. Rowe on her outstanding performance appraisal; whereupon, Ms. Rowe thanked the Chair, the Board Members, and the Appointing Authorities for their comments and expressed appreciation to her staff.

Chair Andriso provided Ms. Rowe with the comments of the reviewers; whereupon, following the advice of Attorney Swain, Ms. Rowe related that following her review of the comments, she would forward the information to the Clerk to be included as part of the record.

Chair Andriso reported that this is the first year that the new "Managerial Performance Appraisal System" has been used by the Appointing Authorities; that numerous requests had to be made for the Appointing Authorities to complete and return the appraisals;

October 4, 2012

that the length and complexity of the form may have dissuaded Appointing Authorities from completing and returning them in a timely manner; and that reevaluating the usage of the new form may be warranted; whereupon, Ms. Rowe indicated that others within the County consider the new review forms to be burdensome.

#### MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

Chair Andriso read an email received from Ms. Rowe pertaining to Pinellas County Government being selected as one of three public sector plans to be highlighted in a national study by the International Foundation of Employee Benefit Plans, and congratulated her on a job well done; whereupon, Ms. Rowe thanked Compensation and Benefits Manager David Blazewitz and his staff for their work.

Mr. Swain related that a Grievance Appeal will be heard at the November 2012 UPB meeting; and that an Appeal of Termination will be heard at the December 2012 meeting.

#### MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION ITEMS RECEIVED

The following miscellaneous information items were received for filing:

1. Management and Supervisory Notes for October 2012.
2. Training Schedule for October 2012.
3. Minutes of the EAC Representatives meeting of August 15, 2012.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 P.M.

---

Chair

October 4, 2012

## **EXHIBIT A**



October 4, 2012

**Swain, Robert C**

---

**From:** Dan Andriso [dan1520@tampabay.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 04, 2012 3:47 PM  
**To:** Swain, Robert C  
**Subject:** FW: HR Dirs Performance Review and Acknowledgement to the Employee Advocates

This deals with another issue that was emailed to me from Keith Dekle.

---

**From:** Dan Andriso [mailto:dan1520@tampabay.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 12, 2012 2:40 PM  
**To:** 'Keith Dekle'  
**Cc:** Peggy Rowe (prowe@co.pinellas.fl.us)  
**Subject:** RE: HR Dirs Performance Review and Acknowledgement to the Employee Advocates

Keith:

In response to your request for recognition of the Employee Advocates, I agree some recognition may be in order. What form it takes should be decided by the entire board. Perhaps a letter of recognition placed in their individual personnel files is appropriate. I suspect once it's placed on the board agenda and discussed, other ideas will come forth.

I sending a copy of this email to Peggy so she can place the item on the October Agenda. I'm sure a discussion by the entire board of what's appropriate will result in some excellent suggestions.

Dan Andriso

---

**From:** Keith Dekle [mailto:kdekle@live.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 12, 2012 10:49 AM  
**To:** Dan Andriso  
**Subject:** RE: HR Dirs Performance Review and Acknowledgement to the Employee Advocates

Attached is my response. I'll bring a signed hardcopy to our meeting tomorrow night.

Thanks,

Keith

PS: Dan, on another subject, I'd like to have the Board consider a motion, create a thank you or other form of appropriate recognition to the EAC's Employee Advocates. I think they have done a great job. It is a voluntary activity that takes away some time from their work and usually requires that they spend a not insubstantial amount of their personal time in support of employees and the Board. Perhaps we could make sure the County Commission gets a copy also, perhaps presenting the award/proclamation in front of the Board and again in front of the County Commission. I think they've earned some publicized Kudos.

---

**From:** dan1520@tampabay.rr.com  
**To:** george@greeklaw.com; JoanV@jpfirm.com; kdekle@live.com; rick.davis27@verizon.net  
**Subject:** FW: HR Dirs Performance Review  
**Date:** Thu, 6 Sep 2012 08:29:10 -0400

October 4, 2012

Peggy Rowe's performance review is scheduled to be acted upon at the October 4 Personnel Board meeting. Page 2 of the memo is the performance/salary review form, which is the same as last year, that you will complete and send by email to me at [dan1520@tampabay.rr.com](mailto:dan1520@tampabay.rr.com). Also, attached for your information, is a copy of the Excel spreadsheet that will be provided to the Appointing Authorities for their evaluation.

As of today, I've only received completed forms from Andrea Daggett and Jim Koelsch. Please take a few minutes to complete the forms and email them back to me so I can compile them for review at the meeting on October 4.

Thanks

Dan Andriso

--Forwarded Message Attachment--

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

Version: 2012.0.2197 / Virus Database: 2437/5169 - Release Date: 08/01/12

October 4, 2012

**Sanzeri, Carole**

---

**From:** Keith Dekle [kdekle@live.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2012 12:30 PM  
**To:** Dan Andriso; Rowe, Peggy; Andrea Daggett; Rick Davis; Jim Koelsch; Linda Hatton; Pam; George Tragos; Joan Vechioli; Sanzeri, Carole  
**Cc:** Pressoir, Gene  
**Subject:** RE: reviews

Assuming that you participate in the vote on Peggy's review, then you have all of the information on which the vote will be made whereas the other members of the Board do not have the information and the information has not been presented in a public, noticed meeting, then it could be construed as inconsistent with the Sunshine Law.

I'm not an expert on the Sunshine Law and I'm not an attorney. I would defer to Mr. Swain or Ms. Sanzeri's opinion on this question. Perhaps we could spend a minute at the meeting on Thursday to discuss the issue further.

Best Regards,

Keith

---

**From:** dan1520@tampabay.rr.com  
**To:** kdekle@live.com; prow@co.pinellas.fl.us; andrea.daggett@techdata.com; rick.davis27@verizon.net; jimkoelsch@aol.com; lindac@jpfirm.com; pam@greeklaw.com; george@greeklaw.com; joanv@jpfirm.com; csanzeri@pinellascounty.org  
**CC:** gpressoir@co.pinellas.fl.us  
**Subject:** RE: reviews  
**Date:** Tue, 18 Sep 2012 16:10:24 -0400

Unless I'm missing something, I don't see how my participation in the evaluation process is a sunshine violation. My role is to compile all the evaluations and present it to the board. I don't communicate with other members about the process nor do I discuss their particular appraisal. It's been done this way for as many years as I've been chair. If it's a violation, I believe we should discuss it at some point before next year's performance appraisal.

Dan Andriso

---

**From:** Keith Dekle [mailto:kdekle@live.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 1:54 PM  
**To:** Peggy Rowe; Dan Andriso; Andrea Daggett; Rick Davis; Jim Koelsch; Linda Hatton; Pam; George Tragos; Joan Vechioli; csanzeri@pinellascounty.org  
**Cc:** Gene Pressoir  
**Subject:** RE: reviews

I previously e-mailed my input to Mr. Andriso. I gave a hard copy, signed, to Dr. Davis since Mr. Andriso wasn't at the meeting and Dr. Davis was the acting Chair with the agreement that he would get my evaluation input to Mr. Andriso.

I missed Mr. Swain's comment about sharing performance evaluation information possibly being a sunshine violation.

Since Mr. Andriso receives the evaluation input and, being a Board member, he has access to all of the evaluation information as he compiles it, one could stretch it and say that his having all the information is maybe a sunshine violation unless he recuses himself from the evaluation process. Interesting. I certainly wish to comply with the sunshine law, and being a team player, I'll forward a copy to Ms. Sanzeri for her use in compiling the information.

Best Regards,

Keith

October 4, 2012

**Sanzeri, Carole**

---

**From:** Dan Andriso [dan1520@tampabay.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 4:10 PM  
**To:** 'Keith Dekle'; Rowe, Peggy; 'Andrea Daggett'; 'Rick Davis'; 'Jim Koelsch'; 'Linda Hatton'; 'Pam'; 'George Tragos'; 'Joan Vechioli'; Sanzeri, Carole  
**Cc:** Pressoir, Gene  
**Subject:** RE: reviews

Unless I'm missing something, I don't see how my participation in the evaluation process is a sunshine violation. My role is to compile all the evaluations and present it to the board. I don't communicate with other members about the process nor do I discuss their particular appraisal. It's been done this way for as many years as I've been chair. If it's a violation, I believe we should discuss it at some point before next year's performance appraisal.

Dan Andriso

---

**From:** Keith Dekle [mailto:kdekle@live.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 18, 2012 1:54 PM  
**To:** Peggy Rowe; Dan Andriso; Andrea Daggett; Rick Davis; Jim Koelsch; Linda Hatton; Pam; George Tragos; Joan Vechioli; csanzeri@pinellascounty.org  
**Cc:** Gene Pressoir  
**Subject:** RE: reviews

I previously e-mailed my input to Mr. Andriso. I gave a hard copy, signed, to Dr. Davis since Mr. Andriso wasn't at the meeting and Dr. Davis was the acting Chair with the agreement that he would get my evaluation input to Mr. Andriso.

I missed Mr. Swain's comment about sharing performance evaluation information possibly being a sunshine violation.

Since Mr. Andriso receives the evaluation input and, being a Board member, he has access to all of the evaluation information as he compiles it, one could stretch it and say that his having all the information is maybe a sunshine violation unless he recuses himself from the evaluation process. Interesting. I certainly wish to comply with the sunshine law, and being a team player, I'll forward a copy to Ms. Sanzeri for her use in compiling the information.

Best Regards,

Keith

---

**From:** [prowe@co.pinellas.fl.us](mailto:prowe@co.pinellas.fl.us)  
**To:** [dan1520@tampabay.rr.com](mailto:dan1520@tampabay.rr.com); [andrea.daggett@techdata.com](mailto:andrea.daggett@techdata.com); [rick.davis27@verizon.net](mailto:rick.davis27@verizon.net); [kdekle@live.com](mailto:kdekle@live.com); [jimkoelsch@aol.com](mailto:jimkoelsch@aol.com); [LindaC@jpfirm.com](mailto:LindaC@jpfirm.com); [Pam@greeklaw.com](mailto:Pam@greeklaw.com); [george@greeklaw.com](mailto:george@greeklaw.com); [joanv@jpfirm.com](mailto:joanv@jpfirm.com)  
**CC:** [gpressoir@co.pinellas.fl.us](mailto:gpressoir@co.pinellas.fl.us)  
**Date:** Tue, 18 Sep 2012 08:50:31 -0400  
**Subject:** reviews

Hello,

At the meeting last week it was pointed out by Bob Swain that allowing communication from the Board members to another Board member regarding my performance evaluation might be a sunshine violation. Therefore, if you could forward your comments to Carole Sanzeri at [csanzeri@pinellascounty.org](mailto:csanzeri@pinellascounty.org) or directly to me, one of us will make sure that the chair receives them for compilation.

Thank you,

Peggy

October 4, 2012

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

Version: 2012.0.2221 / Virus Database: 2437/5275 - Release Date: 09/18/12

October 4, 2012

**Swain, Robert C**

---

**From:** Dan Andriso [dan1520@tampabay.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2012 8:30 AM  
**To:** 'George Tragos'; Swain, Robert C  
**Cc:** kdekke@live.com; Rowe, Peggy; andrea.daggett@techdata.com; rick.davis27@verizon.net; jimkoelsch@aol.com; lindac@jpfirm.com; pam@greeklaw.com; joanv@jpfirm.com; Pressoir, Gene; Sanzeri, Carole  
**Subject:** RE: Evaluation - Sunshine - Public Record

We should discuss this at Thursday's meeting and put it to bed once and for all.

Dan

---

**From:** George Tragos [mailto:george@greeklaw.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2012 11:44 PM  
**To:** Swain, Robert C  
**Cc:** kdekke@live.com; Rowe, Peggy; andrea.daggett@techdata.com; rick.davis27@verizon.net; jimkoelsch@aol.com; lindac@jpfirm.com; pam@greeklaw.com; joanv@jpfirm.com; dan1520@tampabay.rr.com; Pressoir, Gene; Sanzeri, Carole  
**Subject:** Re: Evaluation - Sunshine - Public Record

I agree

George

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 1, 2012, at 2:26 PM, "Swain, Robert C" <[rswain@co.pinellas.fl.us](mailto:rswain@co.pinellas.fl.us)> wrote:

I need to point out a couple of things. All emails, even those on your personal account, related to any Board business are public record and subject to disclosure and must be retained in accordance with State Law.

Regarding the Sunshine issue, generally any communication between Board members on matters that either will or may come before the Board for action may not be discussed outside of a noticed, public meeting. If there have been communications, those must be disclosed prior to taking any action. The Sunshine law is such that no third party can be a conduit for the opinions of Board members. There is a limited exception which we can discuss at the Board meeting. To be on the safe side, I would strongly recommend that there be no communications regarding Board business between Board members outside of the regularly scheduled meetings. If you have any questions, please contact me or Peggy directly without copying any other members.

**Robert C. Swain**  
Senior Assistant County Attorney  
Pinellas County Attorney's Office  
315 Court Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Clearwater, FL 33756  
Phone: (727) 464-3354  
Fax: (727) 464-4147  
[rswain@co.pinellas.fl.us](mailto:rswain@co.pinellas.fl.us)

*All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.*

October 4, 2012

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

Version: 2012.0.2221 / Virus Database: 2441/5304 - Release Date: 10/02/12

October 4, 2012

## **EXHIBIT B**



## Peggy Rowe Performance Appraisal 2012

This is the first year where the Appointing Authorities used the Managerial Performance Appraisal system to evaluate Peggy's performance. It was the first time we did not receive responses from all the Appointing Authorities even after several reminders. Perhaps the complexity and length of the form dissuaded them from completing it. Perhaps the board should re-evaluate usage of the form by the Appointing Authorities in the future.

LATE  
01/7/12

In the past, the standard Performance /Salary Review form was used where each evaluator wrote comments under Areas of Strength, Suggested Areas for Improvement, and Overall Level of Performance. The board members continued to use this form for this years appraisal.

Rather than review each individual score, As in the past, I will give Peggy the entire folder of returned forms so she can review their content at her leisure. For the record however, those Appointing Authorities who did respond, ten indicated her Overall rating as EXCEEDS and one as MEETS.

The following comments are from board members who completed the Performance/Salary Review Form:

### **Areas of Strength:**

Leading People: Communication Skills, consideration for relevant development& performance factors; HR Program Management.

Communications/Building Coalitions: Excellent Public Sector knowledge and HR skills; very good presence and thought given to enhancing county workers' community spirit. Good facilitation for change management objectives.

Public Sector Business Knowledge: good insight, skill and applications of best practices and government operations.

Technical Credibility: Uses knowledge management, effectively conducts executive meetings regularly; and explains rationale for decisions made Peggy has a strong understanding of the laws and regulations governing human resources for Pinellas County. She is effective communicating these regulations to the board and county employees. She appears to have a good relationship with, and respect of, members of the Personnel Board, the

**Appointing Authorities and county employees**

Peggy has been innovative as Director of Human Resources. For example, her department worked to increase the effectiveness and reduce the cost of medical insurance for the county. She has been especially effective administering the HR department during a period of declining budgets and fiscal hardship for the county. Her steadfast leadership has been an important major factor guiding the county through difficult times of the past few years. Peggy provides agenda information to the board in a timely, complete and understandable format.

She uses various tools to respond to county employees and to keep them informed. I.e. "Ask Peggy". She attends EAC meetings and attends Appointing Authority meetings.

Encourages innovation such as the improved medical insurance programs to promote health which was recently acknowledged by renowned authorities as exceptionally well done.

Accepts requests and moves to fulfill them such as the revamping of the personnel Rules which is not a simple task.

Responds to requests from employees, commissioners, appointing authorities as well as the board quickly and completely.

Has the respect and willing cooperation of her entire staff.

**Suggested Areas of Improvement:**

Consider seeking additional formal input in addition to EAC, for HR staffing, planning if not already in place.

Use of external SME's for training and development opportunities, in addition to e-learning options and classroom options.

Some of the very good work that she and her staff does is not sufficiently publicized to show what an excellent job they are doing. Her humility probably plays a role in this. I feel that it would be to everyone's advantage if, in a quiet way, she made her support of the county and all its functions more visible.

**Overall Level of Performance:**

All respondents rated her as **Exceeds Expectations**

## **CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS 2012**

Over the many years I was in HR and then as owner of a temporary staffing service that dealt with HR daily there were few individuals I have had the pleasure of working with who demonstrated a level of professionalism, compassion, integrity and knowledge of human resources and it's role in contributing to an effective work force. Peggy's knowledge of the laws affecting HR along with the policies she recommends for changes and adjustments have resulted in a more effective HR department and a more efficient work force especially in the past few years when the county had to make major personnel adjustments as a result of the economic downturn.

In reviewing the Performance Review forms that I received from the Appointing Authorities and the Personnel Board, it is very clear that Peggy continues to have their trust and respect. It is also obvious by reading the remarks, she has performed admirably throughout the difficult years when we went through adjustments to the workforce.

Because of the existing economic conditions, we are not in a position to grant a pay raise to her at this time. However, we have the hope that conditions will change in the future and we will then be in a position to grant pay raises not only for Peggy but all the deserving employees throughout the county.

I believe I speak for the board when I say congratulations to Peggy Rowe on an outstanding performance appraisal and, we look forward to working with you during the next year and beyond.

October 4, 2012

**Pinellas County Director of Human Resources  
Performance/Salary Review  
2011-2012**

**Areas of Strength:**

Peggy has a strong understanding of the laws and regulations governing human resources for Pinellas County. She is effective communicating these regulations to the Board and county employees. She appears to have a good relationship with, and respect of, members of the Personnel Board, the appointing authorities, and county employees.
Peggy has been innovative as Director of Human Resources for Pinellas County. For example her department worked to increase the effectiveness and reduce the costs of medical insurance for the county. She has been especially effective administering the Human Resources Department during a period of declining budgets and fiscal hardship for the county. Her steadfast leadership has been an important major factor guiding the county through the difficult times of the past few years.

**Suggested Areas For Improvement:**

None

**Overall Level of Performance**

Exceeds Expectations	X
Meets Expectations	
Below Expectations	

James P. Koelsch  
Printed Name of Rater

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Rater

October 4, 2012

UNIFIED PERSONNEL SYSTEM  
Annex Building 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
400 S. Fort Harrison Ave  
Clearwater, FL 33756  
Phone: (727) 464-3367  
Fax: (727) 453-3638  
Website: www.pinellascounty.org/hr



TO: Members of the Unified Personnel Board

FROM: Daniel M. Andriso, Chairman, Unified Personnel Board

SUBJECT: Performance and Salary Review of Director of Human Resources

DATE: August 1, 2012

It is time for Peggy Rowe's annual performance review which is scheduled to be acted upon at the Personnel Board meeting on October 4, 2012.

At the February 2012 Personnel Board meeting, Peggy provided us with a draft of her goals and expectations as a part of the performance standards established on the standard Performance Appraisal form that is being used as part of the Unified Personnel System's appraisal program. In addition, the Appointing Authorities approved the standards and expectations that were proposed at the February Personnel Board meeting.

The competencies and individualized performance expectations are on an Excel spreadsheet (hard copy attached) that has been provided to the Appointing Authorities for their recommendation and will be forwarding their responses to me that will be factored into Peggy's overall evaluation.

In past years the Board agreed that it both simplifies and improves the process if the Board does Peggy's rating in a narrative format rather than by use of a rating form. Please make any comments you may have on the following Performance/Salary Review form and return it with your level of performance recommendation to me.

Due to the county's financial constraints, Peggy, like other employees in the Unified Personnel System, is not eligible for a merit increase. She can be rated as Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations or Below Expectations in accordance with the Performance Management System. For your information, Peggy was rated Exceeds in her last review.

In following the usual practice, I will summarize the results and assign Peggy the appropriate rating. Please return your evaluation to me by September 5th, by email to dan1520@tampabay.rr.com.

October 4, 2012

**Pinellas County Director of Human Resources  
Performance/Salary Review  
2011-2012**

**Areas of Strength:**

1. Leading People: Communication skills, consideration for relevant development & performance factors; HR program management.
2. Communications/ Building Coalitions: Excellent Public sector knowledge and HR skills; very good presence and thought given to enhancing County workers' community spirit. Good facilitation for change management objectives.
3. Public Sector Business Knowledge: good insight, skill and applications of best practices and government operations.
4. Technical Credibility: Uses knowledge management, effectively conducts executive meetings regularly; and explains rationale for decisions made.

**Suggested Areas For Improvement:**

1. Consider seeking additional formal input in addition to EAC, for HR staffing, planning, if not already in place.
2. Use of external SMEs for training and development opportunities, in additional to e-learning options and classroom options.

**Overall Level of Performance**

Exceeds Expectations	X
Meets Expectations	
Below Expectations	

Andrea Daggett 9/5/2012  
Printed Name of Rater

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Rater

**Pinellas County Director of Human Resources  
Performance/Salary Review  
2011-2012**

- Provides agenda information to the Personnel Board in a timely, complete, and understandable format.
- Uses various tools to respond to County employees and to keep them informed, i.e., "Ask Peggy", attends EAC meetings, attends Appointing Authority meetings.
- Encourages innovation such as the improved medical insurance programs to promote health which was recently acknowledged by renowned authorities as exceptionally well done.
- Accepts requests and moves to fulfill them such as the revamping of the Personnel Rules; a not simple or easy task.
- Responds to requests from employees, commissioners, appointing authorities as well as the Board quickly and completely
- Has the respect and willing cooperation of her entire staff

**Suggested Areas For Improvement:**

- Some of the very good work that she and her staff does is not sufficiently publicized to show what an excellent job they are doing. Her humility probably plays a role in this. I feel that it would be to everyone's advantage if, in a quiet way, she made her support of the County and all of its functions more visible. An example would be a recent change in class and a raise for a position that at first appeared to be an increase in costs to the County but, when viewed from a broader perspective, was actually a reduction in cost due to the elimination of a position at Animal Services.

**Overall Level of Performance**

Exceeds Expectations	X
Meets Expectations	
Below Expectations	

Keith C. Dekle  
Printed Name of Rater

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Rater

October 4, 2012

**Pinellas County Director of Human Resources  
Performance/Salary Review  
2011-2012**

**Areas of Strength:**

Interpersonal Skills - tactful; compassionate  
Team Building - acknowledges contributions of others  
Integrity - fair; ethical  
Oral & Written Communication - good presentation  
Organizational Awareness - understands structure & culture  
Problem Solving - constructive & effective solutions  
Technical Credibility - knowledgeable; sound recommendations

**Suggested Areas For Improvement:**

I am unaware of any areas needing improvement at this time.

**Overall Level of Performance**

Exceeds Expectations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/>
Below Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/>

Joan M. Vecchioli  
Printed Name of Rater

Joan M. Vecchioli  
Signature of Rater